

Digital Humanities Quarterly: A Case Study in Bibliographic Development

Jim McGrath, Northeastern University

Digital Humanities Quarterly is building a centralized bibliography of material cited by the journal's various contributors. This poster describes the project's aims, challenges, and practices, in the hopes of highlighting some of the key issues at the heart of creating, preserving, and assessing bibliographic data. On its "About" page, *Digital Humanities Quarterly* notes that its contents "are encoded in a TEI-compatible format for longevity and ease of management" ("About DHQ"). But on this particular project, *DHQ* has opted to move away from TEI. *DHQ* General Editor Wendell Piez, in collaboration with *DHQ* Editor-in-Chief Julia Flanders and with the aid of graduate students like myself, has developed (and modified) a bibliographic schema ("Biblio") to help create and inventory data about the journal's citation practices. This poster will not insist that all bibliographic projects follow similar trajectories, but its documentation of its particular workflow, methods, and revisions situates the *DHQ* project as a case study of sorts that may be of use to scholars interested in similar initiatives.

Past contributors to *DHQ* have examined the journal's bibliographic data: for example, Amanda Visconti created visualizations of *DHQ*'s citations "with an eye toward identifying the flow and reuse of key texts in the DH community" ("View *DHQ*: Visualizing Data From *Digital Humanities Quarterly* (Part I of II)"). Our current work is similarly invested in identifying interesting patterns in citational practices: we are creating data that will enable the journal (and interested researchers) to more easily examine trends related to how often particular authors, publishing houses, and genres are cited by contributors, and we are also creating data that will be useful when exploring the shelf life (or afterlives), impact, and reach of texts across DH scholarship.

More broadly, the creation, implementation, and refinement of the bibliographic schema utilized in this particular project (and the various public and private discussions that have and continue to inform these developments) highlight the power dynamics underwriting all bibliographic projects. Visconti and other DH scholars (Rorabaugh and Stommel, Cohen, among others) have cited the potential ways in which hyperlinks and references to discourse communities beyond conventional academic confines can reveal the ways traditional academic publications privilege particular forms of knowledge-making, institutions, and non-collaborative scholarship methodologies. The range of media (video games, programming languages, social media content), authors (graduate students, librarians, adjuncts), and genres (conference papers, blog posts) evident in the citations composed by *DHQ*'s contributors demonstrates commitments on behalf of its writers and editors to a more expansive base of knowledge in the field of digital humanities. That being said, the mechanics and documentation practices of bibliographic data in the journal typically resemble the patterns of citation found in more conventional academic confines and publications.

Piez notes that “markup languages are far more than languages for automated processing: they are a complex type of rhetoric working in several directions at once, often in hidden ways” (162). Bibliographic standards and practices insist on particular conventions: certain modes of communication (book-length studies) may be privileged, while others (conference papers) might barely extend their reach beyond their initial audience. Encoding *DHQ*'s bibliographic data serves several functions: it allows us to see what ideas, authors, and modes of circulation are privileged by contributors, but it also might tell us about the implicit and explicit ways the journal and its architects enforce and reinforce particular ideas of scholarly value. And we might also attend to the ways these values are not always distinct or competing, but rather diverse, highly particularized, and often entwined.

My poster will point to particular examples in *DHQ*'s bibliographic data that highlight such tensions. It will also invite considerations of the benefits and drawbacks of the particular bibliographic schema utilized to gather and refine this data. What are the advantages of moving away from the generic distinctions and emphases privilege by TEI standards? What is potentially lost or de-emphasized when we attempt to organize massive data sets that aren't controlled or adherent to more universal standards? How might we move beyond the “descriptive” and “procedural” distinctions favored by certain designers of markup languages (as discussed by Piez), and when might stricter definitions and points of emphasis be useful? The implementation of our bibliographic schema helps us document citational practices of *DHQ*'s authors, and it also evaluates, critiques, and reshapes some of these methods. In creating a schema and its attendant validation criteria, we are also making particular claims for the value of particular bibliographic data, and we may also be revealing gaps in particular bibliographic practices and conventions. This poster hopes to demonstrate the broader value this particular bibliographic project might have to conversations about TEI and citation practices.

Works Cited

“About DHQ.” *Digital Humanities Quarterly*.

<http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/about/about.html> Last updated January 30, 2014.

Cohen, Dan. “Catching the Good.” *Dan Cohen*. March 30, 2012.

<http://www.dancohen.org/2012/03/30/catching-the-good/>

Piez, Wendell. “Beyond the ‘descriptive vs. procedural’ distinction.” *Markup Languages: Theory and Practice*. 3.2. (2001) 141-72

Rorabaugh, Pete and Jesse Stommel. “The Four Noble Virtues of Digital Media Citation.” *Hybrid Pedagogy*. April 25, 2012.

<http://www.hybridpedagogy.com/Journal/the-four-noble-virtues-of-digital-media-citation/>

Visconti, Amanda. "View *DHQ*: Visualizing Data From *Digital Humanities Quarterly*."
Literature Geek. July 11, 2012.

<http://www.literaturegeek.com/2012/07/11/viewdhqpt1/>