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Abstract

Despite DH’s long history, it is still perceived as a relatively emergent academic discipline, rather than an established one [Borgman 2009; #canadian2006; [Juola 2008]. This perspective has several implications for the ongoing development and acceptance of the field. First, the valuation and creditability of electronic publishing, and digital resources and tools development and application for purposes of employment, salary, tenure and promotion have still not been resolved despite many ongoing efforts on the part of community members [Borgman 2009; [Schreibman and Hanlon 2010]. Further, a vibrant core of digital humanists exists, the DH community is still exploring ways to encourage both “traditional” graduates and scholars to create and use digital tools, resources and methodologies. Finally, digital humanists, administrators, and granting agencies alike continue to struggle with age-old questions about the type and amount of resources, including not limited to computing infrastructure and funding, needed to support and grow DH’s academic capacity.

Within this larger context, Canada’s Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council (SSHRC) is evaluating its role in the ongoing development and acceptance of DH within Canada and beyond. Historically, SSHRC’s primary financial support was through the Canada Council for the Arts to support these and other channels. (This echoed the approach used in earlier surveys [Siemens et al. 2002].) A total of 227 usable responses were received.

For this reason, it is important to understand the issues in the community and the types of academic capacity that need to be funded. This paper will report on the survey results.

Introduction

Despite Digital Humanities’ (DH) long history, it is still perceived as a relatively emergent academic discipline, rather than an established one [Borgman 2009]. Within Canada, two studies have measured other channels. (This echoed the approach used in earlier surveys [Siemens et al. 2002].) A total of 227 usable responses were received.

Context

As a community of practice, DH has had a long history with its roots in the work of Roberto Busa, who developed a machine-generated concordance with BIM [Water 1999]. From there, more researchers saw the potential of computers in their work and worked to incorporate the ever growing computational capacity into their research and teaching. To support these efforts and provide outlets for research dissemination, the Association for Computing and the Humanities formed in 1978 and the Association for Literary and Linguistic Computation formed in 1973. The Canadian association (now known as Society for Digital Humanities/Société pour l’étude des médias interactivs) followed in 1986 (ADCH). Despite this established history, this field is still considered to be a relatively emergent academic discipline #canadian2006; [Juola 2008]. As Borgman argues, DH is at a “pivotal moment” and, with the right support and argument for funding and professional acceptance, the field can transition to an established discipline [Borgman 2009].

This raises the question about the nature of that “right” support needed to enable the field to become mainstream. To this end, several barriers have been identified. First, given the reliance on technology and computing power, the Digital Humanist needs computers and cyberinfrastructure, accessible from their desk, within their institution and across organizational and national boundaries. Further to this, the researcher also needs access to data in electronic form and the tools that allow them to analyze, reconfigure and otherwise visualize data that are no longer understandable. Of course, this requires more money than the traditional humanist researcher who has been traditionally seen to rely solely on their books and pencils. This funding is needed not just to start projects but to subsequently maintain and sustain them, an expectation not often applied to books. Finally, researchers, particularly those in traditional academic positions, need the support of their peers in order to be able to disseminate their research in discipline-approved venues and ultimately receive tenure [Borgman 2008; [Jarvenpaa 2007]; [Bakken 2011].

Despite these challenges, progress has been made on a variety of fronts to the community’s strength. First, various national granting agencies and non-profit foundations have provided funding for digital initiatives, including programs such as individual projects [SSHRC 2010], [National Endowment for the Humanities Digital Humanities Projects 2010], [Canada Council for Innovation 2010], and support for digital research [The Andrew W. Mellon Foundation 2011]. Further, some leading agencies are contributing to funding large collaborative projects, such as the Digging Into Data Challenge (Office of Digital Humanities 2010). At the same time, outlets for electronic dissemination have increased through online versions of print journals as well as open access ones, many of which are supported through the Open Journal System [Public Knowledge Project] and through more informal means such as personal webpages, blogs and wikis. Finally, researchers, particularly those in traditional academic positions, need the support of their peers in order to be able to disseminate their research in discipline-approved venues and ultimately receive tenure [Borgman 2008; [Jarvenpaa 2007]; [Bakken 2011].

This paper is structured as follows. First, the context for the study will be discussed. Then, the survey methodology will be outlined followed by a detailed discussion of the survey results with the implications both for the Canadian DH community and beyond. It will conclude with recommendations to support the ongoing development of larger DH communities. [1]

Methodology

This survey was developed in January 2009 and focused on three components of academic capacity: research activity and dissemination, professional development, and teaching and student development. Given the broad audience for this survey, the term “digital methods, technologies and resources” was used in place of Digital Humanities or Humanities Computing for several reasons. First, the broader term was intended to capture those who may not consider themselves to be a “Digital Humanist,” but yet undertake that type of work using create datadises, analytical tools, digital manuscripts, electronic resources, and others. A list of these digital-oriented methods, technologies and resources can be seen in Table 2. Second, the DH community, as a whole is debating the skills and knowledge required to be a “Digital Humanist,” as evidenced by blog postings. For example, see [Howe 2010]; [McCarty 2011]; [Readie 2011]; [Pannapacker 2011]; [Armstrong 2011]; [Ramsey 2011].

In order to provide some comparison to earlier data related to the credibility of electronic publishing and determine if attributes to electronic resources and materials have changed over the past 10 years [Archer 1995] [Siemens et al. 2002]; demographic information and several questions related to electronic dissemination and tenure and promotion policies were repeated from these earlier surveys. Given the Canadian audience, the survey was translated into French. The English and French versions can be found in Appendix 1 and 2.

The survey was distributed in May and June 2009 with data collection closing on June 19. In an attempt to reach the full Humanities and Social Sciences community in Canada, it was distributed through the emailing lists of the Society for Digital Humanities/Société pour l’étude des médias interactivs; the Canadian DH society, the Digital Humanities Summer Institute; and the 5 Canadian schools. The survey was distributed in May and June 2009 with data collection closing on June 19. In an attempt to reach the full Humanities and Social Sciences community in Canada, it was distributed through the emailing lists of the Society for Digital Humanities/Société pour l’étude des médias interactivs; the Canadian DH society, the Digital Humanities Summer Institute to the attention of Canadians, and email messages to the associations which comprise the Canadian Federation of Social Sciences and Humanities.

This paper is structured as follows. First, the context for the study will be discussed. Then, the survey methodology will be outlined followed by a detailed discussion of the survey results with the implications both for the Canadian DH community and beyond. It will conclude with recommendations to support the ongoing development of larger DH communities. [1]

Survey Results

The following section will explore the results from the survey, including demographic information, research activity and dissemination, professional development, and teaching and student development. [This order reflects the survey’s structure.] The full implications of these results along with recommendations will be discussed in the paper’s final sections.

Demographic Characteristics

The respondents represented a broad cross-section of a broadly defined DH community of practice in Canada. As can be seen in Table 1, most respondents work in English and are affiliated with a university. Of those who indicated their gender, females were the larger group. The spread of academic rank and age was reasonable with 45% between the ages of 30 and 49, and 16% were at the Assistant Professor level, 17% at the Associate, and 17% at the Full Professor. Graduate students comprised 8% of the respondents.

The respondents represented 35 disciplines from the social sciences, humanities, library and information sciences, computer science and business. (Respondents could check more than one discipline.) The best represented disciplines were English (35%), Humanities (12%), Culture and Language Studies (12%), and History (10%). Approximately 8% of the respondents identified humanities computing as their discipline, which suggests that DH is beginning a recognized discipline in its own right. An overwhelming majority of the respondents (89%) have undertaken research projects involving digital methods, technologies and resources. Those who answered “no” to this question still provided information about their research dissemination, professional development, and teaching and student development activities.
Table 1. Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic Characteristic</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English (89.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French (2.2%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both (15.4%)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (43.6)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (37)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer (5.7)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affiliation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research Centre</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>83.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Professor</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor or Lecturer</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian/Archivist</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Fellow</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20–29 (10.1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–29 (24.2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49 (21.3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59 (12.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over (11.9)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer (4.4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Discipline (top 5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Literature</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Humanities</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture and Language Studies</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Digital Methods, Technologies and Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Methods, Technologies and Resources</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Tools</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoring Tools</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webpages</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Manuscripts</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Resources</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs/Wikis</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Project Planning Spaces</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Software</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook/Social Networking</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Capacity: Research

As the survey results show, Humanists and Social Scientists are actively embracing digital technologies and resources, and to a lesser extent, digital methods, in their research. In particular, they are using and creating software, databases, digital manuscripts and electronic resources within a traditional approach to research. For some, the digital has created new research avenues. The survey participants have been successful in accessing funding for their projects. They are also overwhelmingly using formal and informal electronic outlets to disseminate their scholarship. However, as a group, these participants are not generally presenting their digital-oriented research at conferences. Finally, they have received very little training in digital technologies, resources and digital methods.

Research Activity

As stated above, 80% of respondents indicated that their research projects involve digital methods, technologies and resources at some level. As seen in Table 2, databases, software, webpages, digital manuscripts, and electronic resources were used most regularly. Approximately one-third of respondents use analytical tools, authoring tools, bibliographic software, and wikis and blogs in their research.

As evidenced in their responses to an open-ended question about their research focus, respondents are involved in both the creation of these digital methods, technologies and resources and their application. They are also grounding their research in traditional Humanities and Social Sciences research approaches and within new fields of studies such as virtual worlds, interface design and online gaming. Further, they are using digital methods, tools and resources to facilitate and enhance collaborations.

By way of example and to name but a few, the “creators” are creating online scholarly annotated editions and digital editions, preparing and then using “electronic versions of historic texts” with the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI), building a “database that will be a scholarly reference work,” developing search tools and building “a digital library of illustrations and books from the 1860s.” Further, the “users” draw upon digitized images, manuscripts, and other materials, encoded texts, electronic editions and databases, online journals, websites, and software such as TEI, googledocs, Zotero, and authorship attribution. For others, the digital has created new opportunities such as “examining social media ‘best practices,’ ” researching “game studies, the development of synthetic worlds and experiential simulations,” and undertaking “in-game ethnography of virtual worlds.”

Table 2. What digital methods, technologies and resources do you incorporate into your research?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Methods, Technologies and Resources</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>38.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Tools</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>19.4%</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoring Tools</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webpages</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Manuscripts</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Resources</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs/Wikis</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Project Planning Spaces</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Software</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook/Social Networking</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is some variation among age groups on the use of these methods, technologies and resources. In particular, the younger age groups were more likely to use Facebook and social networking. Approximately 34% of the 20–29 age group and over 25% of the 20–29 age group indicated that they were regular users of Facebook/Social Networking. This is in contrast to the 40–49 age group (14.5%), 50–59 age group (8%), and 60 and older (15.8%).

The respondents also indicated the type of electronic resources that they used within their research. As seen in Table 3, they primarily drew upon electronic versions of previously paper resources, such as journals, government resources, newspapers and archival materials. However, they do not appear to be using tools such as TAPoR, OJS and Conftool, tools that can make some aspects of academic life easier to coordinate. Further, sizable portions of respondents (up to 10% in some cases) do not appear to be aware of these types of resources.
At one level, the respondents said an "all of course" perspective with regard to their use of digital tools, methods and resources in their research. As one respondent said about the research in which they are involved,

"Locs of research are: (1) scholarly editing & bibliographical work, for which the development and use of digital tools is necessary & commonplace; (2) historical research, whose data sets are often of a size to make manual management hard, so digital tools (e.g., databases) are a necessity; (3) literary-critical projects.

For another respondent, they had difficulty even asking the question. As they commented,

"I’m having trouble here because I’m not sure what you mean by digital methods, technologies and resources. Broadly speaking, ALL of my research involves this because it’s all written on computer, submitted to publishers electronically, and typically the data collection and analysis is done on computer as well. I don’t think there’s much of a dividing line between digital and non-digital anymore.

Research Funding

Given the size and scope of many DH projects, research funding is necessary. Just under half (47%) of the respondents have applied for funding for their digital-oriented research in the last 10 years. As can be seen in Table 4, most of those seeking funding generally applied and received funding as graduate students, postdoctoral fellows or faculty members, either from SSHRC or their own university.

Findings from the survey showed that several types of DH projects require additional funding. These included:

- Digital tools and technologies
- Online archives of rare materials
- Online government resources
- Online scholarly journals
- Online archival materials
- On-line archiving materials
- On-line scholarly journals
- TAPoRware tools
- Open Journal System
- Open Conference System
- TAPoR

The respondents provided guidance on the type of funding they felt was needed to support digital-oriented research. First, a segment of respondents recommended more funding from SSHRC. This included a request for an independent application category for DH/ Humanities Computing scholarship while another suggested an extended Image, Text, Sound and Technology program.

Second, respondents specifically suggested funding for technical support and infrastructure in their institutions. One respondent commented that

"...we definitely need infrastructure here in Canada, e.g., something like surveymonkey, space for setting up interactive web sites for participant engagement. Right now, each team and each university reinvents the wheel, leading to a huge waste of precarious resources. Researchers should have a service for digital humanities research to go to that includes design and software experts, etc.

Further, several respondents called for renewal-based funding programs for ongoing research agendas, similar to that seen in the sciences. As one respondent argued, "Programmes permettent un financement à plus long terme pour financer l’embauche de personnels techniques; programmes permettent la mise en place de digital humanities centers (acceptant la dimension hybride de services et de recherche)."

"Finally, some respondents argued for grant funding for maintenance and renewal of existing projects. One respondent commented that funding is needed "to ensure that we can continue to update and improve the resource. But funding bodies (perhaps understandably) want to support new digital projects, rather than helping to make existing ones continue to be relevant and cutting edge."

Amongst the calls for additional funding was the recognition that digital projects experience challenges that are often not associated with traditional forms of scholarship, such as long term usability, accessibility, quality standards and training. For example, one respondent called for "more funding for projects that involve substantial work on conservation, archiving and upgrading digital collections and research databases for ongoing work that keeps research data and archival collections in usable form."

Another argued for additional "support for online archiving of rare materials, which probably includes support for continued training (a bigger problem in DH than in other branches of scholarship) and access to sophisticated technologies for rendering manuscripts in high def or under different kinds of light, etc."

At the same time, a portion of the respondents suggested that additional support from colleagues and knowledgeable grant adjudicators and reviewers were just as important. One commented that they think digital projects should be treated exactly as other research projects are treated, and judged on their own merits. As long as we have knowledgeable SSHRC committees who understand the place of digital tools, resources and practices in humanities research, we should be able to compete on a level playing field with other grant applicants.

Another echoed that "I’d like to see it incorporated more into the ‘normal’ grant processes, rather than it being a ‘special’ thing to use digital methods."

Research Dissemination

The respondents are actively disseminating their research through electronic means with over 72% of all respondents having made their scholarship available in some digital form. This suggests the use of electronic dissemination is increasing, albeit with some variation among age groups. As compared to the younger age groups, older respondents were more likely to have made their scholarship available electronically, as seen in Table 5.
While they are disseminating electronically, respondents appear to be hesitant to present their digital-oriented research at conferences. Only 37% have presented their digital-oriented research at discipline-specific conferences. A still smaller number (21%) have presented at a digital-oriented conference. Of those who have, they have presented primarily at Society for Digital Humanities/Société pour l’étude des médias interactifs (7%), Digital Humanities (6%) and Canadian Symposium on Text Analysis (5%). Other venues named include Text Encoding Initiative Annual meeting, International Conference on Electronic Publishing, Digital Resources in the Humanities, Digital Games Research Association, Computer Assisted Language Instruction Consortium, and Association for History and Computing. Following the trends highlighted above, the 40–49 age group and Associate Professors tend to be the most active in this regard, as can be seen in Tables 8 through 11.

### Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Yes: 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>No: 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>Yes: 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Professor</td>
<td>No: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>Yes: 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>No: 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor or Lecturer</td>
<td>Yes: 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian/Archivist</td>
<td>No: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Fellow</td>
<td>Yes: 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>No: 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only a small percentage of respondents are members of DH associations. Approximately 9% are members of the Society for Digital Humanities/Société pour l’étude des médias interactifs, 7% are in the Association for Computing in the Humanities and 6% are members of the Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing.

The final set of questions within this category related to training. Less than one-third of respondents have attended digital methods institutes, workshops or courses for skill development. Of those who indicated that they had, over 50% named the University of Victoria’s Digital Humanities Summer Institute (DHSI) and its courses including text encoding, digitization, text analysis, and project management. Respondents also mentioned other institutes and workshops such as Nineteenth Century Scholarship Online (NINES), Digital Humanities Observatory (Royal Irish Academy), University of Illinois Urbana Champagne Software Environment for the Advancement of Scholarly Research (SEASR). The respondents also noted that they have taken courses in website development, graduate courses and programs, computers and composition, and media applications. As seen in Tables 12 and 13, the 40–49 age group and associate professors are more likely to have undergone training of some nature.

### Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>Yes: 5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>No: 91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>Yes: 16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>Yes: 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>Yes: 28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>No: 17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Yes: 54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>No: 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Professor</td>
<td>Yes: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>No: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Yes: 23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor or Lecturer</td>
<td>No: 13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian/Archivist</td>
<td>Yes: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Fellow</td>
<td>No: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Yes: 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>Yes: 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>No: 78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>Yes: 25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>No: 75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>No: 28%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>No: 22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>Yes: 35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>No: 21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Professor</td>
<td>Yes: 100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>No: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>Yes: 18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor or Lecturer</td>
<td>No: 44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian/Archivist</td>
<td>Yes: 20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Fellow</td>
<td>No: 80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>Yes: 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20–29</td>
<td>Yes: 21.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>No: 78.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>Yes: 27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>No: 70.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 and over</td>
<td>Yes: 29.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assistant Professor</td>
<td>Yes: 51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate Professor</td>
<td>No: 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctoral Student</td>
<td>Yes: 42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emeritus Professor</td>
<td>No: 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Professor</td>
<td>Yes: 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Student</td>
<td>No: 47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor or Lecturer</td>
<td>Yes: 32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Librarian/Archivist</td>
<td>No: 40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postdoctoral Fellow</td>
<td>Yes: 37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Researcher</td>
<td>No: 25%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Capacity: Professional Development

Respondents were asked their expectations and understandings of the impact that their digital-oriented work will have on their professional development and career trajectory, particularly in relation to tenure, salary and promotion. As seen in Table 14, approximately 10% of respondents answered that their institutions had policies regarding electronic documents and publication and development and use of digital technologies, tools, and resources for purposes of tenure, salary and promotion. However, the majority did not know if their institutions had these policies, which means that scholars are undertaking their work without knowing how it will count in professional contexts.

### Table 14

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1. Does your institution have a policy concerning how electronic documents are to be evaluated in tenure, salary, and promotion procedures?</td>
<td>Yes: 9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know: 56.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2. Does your institution have a policy concerning the consideration of electronic publication in cases of promotion and tenure?</td>
<td>Yes: 11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 22.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know: 58.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3. Does your institution have a policy of the consideration of the development and use of digital technologies, tools, and resources in cases of promotion and tenure?</td>
<td>Yes: 9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No: 21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t know: 62.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Academic Capacity: Teaching and Student Development

When it comes to teaching and working with students, the survey respondents are actively including digital resources, methods and technologies in the classroom. This level of interaction is further supported by digital program development, particularly at the undergraduate level. Finally, the survey respondents suggested that their students are actively incorporating digital methods, technologies and resources into their course work and personal lives, something that was encouraging, or even pushing, instructors to do the same within their teaching.

### Teaching

Over 80% of respondents are actively incorporating electronic resources into their teaching. As outlined in Table 15, the most popular digital methods, technologies and resources incorporated include electronic resources, webpages, course management systems, digital manuscripts, and databases. At the time of the survey, respondents were not incorporating web 2.0 technologies, such as second life and Facebook and other social networks, though this may be different today.

### Table 15

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Digital Methods, Technologies and Resources</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Management Systems</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Space (Second Life)</td>
<td>80.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical Tools</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoring Tools</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webpages</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Manuscripts</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Resources</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs/Articles</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Project Planning Spaces</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic Software</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook/Social Networking</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 16

As above with other questions, some variation exists among age groups. As seen in Table 15, the use of electronic resources within courses tended to increase with each age group, peaking with the 40–49 age range.

### Institution Level

In terms of university programs, approximately 40% of respondents indicated that their university has programs with a digital focus within their faculties of Humanities, Arts, Social Sciences and Information Sciences, primarily at the undergraduate level (35%), with fewer at the masters (24%) and PhD level (14%). Approximately 41% indicated that their universities had plans to develop courses or programs at the undergraduate (33%), the masters (22%) and PhD (15%) levels. This growth is expected to be in the longer term with 26% indicating that this development will likely occur in the next few years.

### Student Development

Respondents were also asked about whether students use digital methodologies, tools and resources. Perhaps not surprisingly, as seen in Table 17, many students were perceived to be actively incorporating digital methodologies, tools and resources in their course and thesis work, teaching assistantships, research assistantships and particularly their social lives.

### Table 17

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>In their course work</th>
<th>in their thesis work</th>
<th>in their TA work</th>
<th>in their RA work</th>
<th>in their social life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Few</td>
<td>Some</td>
<td>Most</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>29.1%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>11.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Further, approximately 50% of respondents indicated that their departments encourage students to use these in their course work. At the same time, 21% did not know if this was the case. These results suggest that undergraduate and graduate students are learning and using digital tools, methods and resources within various aspects of their student, professional and personal lives.

### Final Comments from Respondents

All the end of the survey, the respondents were asked a series of open-ended questions regarding the future of DH and the supports required to develop capacity in this community.

The first question focused on the respondents’ use of their “crystal ball” to envision future directions of DH. Collectively, the respondents provided thoughts along a series of themes. Several respondents indicated that they foresee DH moving beyond a narrow disciplinary focus into more collaboration and broader questions. For example, one suggested that there would be increased “cross-discipline work with computer science, library/information science and the fine arts in areas such as data mining and multimedia incorporation” while another foresaw the following activities:

- Interconnecting researchers and building links; archiving and analysis of large amounts of textual, audio, and visual data; working more closely with colleagues in other fields to solve problems rather than remaining within a purely disciplinary framework; new ways of relating text to image as the latter grows in importance; using resources to provide the public with informed, scholarly materials aimed at a popular audience.
Others suggested that the field would be developing new tools, especially those that would "facilitate the migration of humanities scholars into digital environments." For example, "Digital Humanities will need to develop the skills required to conduct lab and field experiments. We will also need to develop methods to support such research." There is also a need for the "computational infrastructure in the humanities, generally, that plus appropriate instruction, expertise, and support." A key component is to ensure adequate research funding to both individuals and universities so that they "can keep digital technologies up-to-date and the infrastructure to support such technologies well into the future — this is the biggest problem at my institution." Finally, there was also a call for maintenance and sustainability. As one stated, "Invest in training and tools, but not only for new researchers. We need a system in place for ensuring project sustainability." Beyond more dollars, some respondents indicated the need to educate grant adjudicators and reviewers to ensure that they have the knowledge needed to effectively evaluate a digital-oriented application.

Discussion

This survey provides a snapshot of DH capacity within the Canadian context. These opportunities and ongoing challenges are, however, not unique to Canada, but reflect issues in the larger DH community.

In a second open-ended question, respondents offered recommendations on the capacity needed to strengthen the DH community. First, they called for more infrastructure such as networks, labs, supply workstations, and computer programming. One individual stated that this included "computational infrastructure in the humanities, generally, that plus appropriate instruction, expertise, and support." A key component is to ensure adequate research funding to both individuals and universities so that they "can keep digital technologies up-to-date and the infrastructure to support such technologies well into the future — this is the biggest problem at my institution." Finally, there was also a call for maintenance and sustainability. As one stated, "Invest in training and tools, but not only for new researchers. We need a system in place for ensuring project sustainability." Beyond more dollars, some respondents indicated the need to educate grant adjudicators and reviewers to ensure that they have the knowledge needed to effectively evaluate a digital-oriented application.

This trend is also carried through to an acceptance of research dissemination and teaching materials through various electronic outlets, especially compared to Archer [Archer 1990] and Rockwell/Siemens [Siemens et al. 2002]. As can be seen in Table 19, individual respondents have embraced broader methods of dissemination beyond the traditional print journal. Many faculty, staff, students and projects have webpages which provide links to research and journal articles [Harley et al. 2010] [Research Information Network 2010]. Further, over the past decade, several projects which make access to online materials easier have started and grown in size and acceptance, including initiatives such as the Public Knowledge Project [PKP] (http://pkp.sfu.ca/), the Open Journal System (http://pkp.sfu.ca/?q=ojs), Synergies (http://www.synergiescanada.org/), NINES (www.nines.org), and other open access and open source projects.

Finally, a third group provided an unqualified "yes." One suggested "Yes — I think there is rich terrain there for publication and experience, and often junior faculty have more experience with these methods in their PhD programs, so the trajectory of this research and teaching, but that it not be "at the expense of traditional research and teaching." This caution recognized that "the academy does not yet take new methods seriously across the board." Another echoed that "steady still dictates that "traditional" scholarship be strong." For example, "Absolutely. Tenured or untenured shouldn't really make any difference, but it's a greater expectation that tenured colleagues can keep up with their students and will have the know-how to make time-efficient use of technology to help in course-management and demonstrating the learning process." Finally, "Yes, it is the way of the future, and the way to keep ahead of and in tune with students."
Further, many faculty are drawn upon this potential by employing students within their digital-oriented research. The additional training opportunities are providing additional support and skill development.

First, given that most respondents appear to be learning digital methods, technologies and resources on their own rather than through more formal settings, more opportunities for the development of training and skill development opportunities must be created. For example, departments, faculties and universities need to continue their plans for additional undergraduate and graduate courses and degrees, combining skill and knowledge development in traditional disciplinary methods with digital and project management skills. Further thought should also be given to certificate programs that could be taken in parallel to traditional graduate programs or in addition to these [Sprö2010]. The recently launched Press Program at the Scholars’ Lab [Brasch2011] at University of Virginia is one example of this type of program. It would also be beneficial for students to have hands-on experiences through internships with libraries and DH centers, to the benefit of the students and the projects [Merritt2010]. At the same time, individuals who are interested in developing their skills can take advantage of the growing number of courses, such as DHSI (dhsi.org), THATCamp (thatcamp.org), One Week|One Tool (oneweekonetool.org), the Advanced Topics in Scholarly Text Encoding (wet您的孩子) and many others.

As indicated by these respondents and in other forums, such as a recent DH funding conference panel [ADH02011], DH projects continue to demand funding and often on a scale that is not typically seen within the Humanities. Lobbying efforts with various funding agencies should continue, not only for resources to support the creation of new digital resources and tools, but also for the ongoing maintenance and sustainability as technology and scholarship advances. Users expect that these will stay current and survive changes in hardware and software and not “gather dust” like a book on a shelf, particularly given the sometimes large amounts of money that was invested to create the resource at the outset. The DH community may also need to look beyond traditional funding sources to include alternative revenue models, some of which may be borrowed from the private sector [Guthrie et al. 2008]. For example, while the success of these efforts still have to be determined, the Internet Shakespeare Editions has moved in this direction with cooperative advertising and click-through ads with AbeBooks.com and Amazon.com [Internet Shakespeare Editions 2010].

Another challenge identified by these results is the apparent hesitancy for individuals to present their digital-oriented research at discipline-specific and digital-oriented conferences. Perhaps, given the growing ubiquity of digital materials, many respondents may not think of presenting at digital-oriented conferences or identify these as parts of their paper at discipline-oriented conference, such as the Modern Languages Association (MLA) and Renaissance Society of America (RSA). Alternatively, the younger scholars may be reluctant to identify themselves in this manner, particularly at those conferences which are an important contribution to the CV of a starting scholar. More work will need to be done to understand this trend.

As always, issues of funding for both initial development and ongoing sustainability and relevance of digital resources remains unresolved and may become more critical in the future. Unlike books where an expectation of updates does not exist, this group appears to be the most active in terms of making their research available electronically, presenting on their digital-oriented research at both discipline-specific and digital-focused conferences, and employing these materials in the classroom, a finding echoed by [Harley et al. 2010]. If this is the case, despite the growing acceptance of things digital, then more work needs to be done to ensure that graduate students and pre-tenured faculty feel confident to embrace the digital methods, technologies, and resources and to incorporate these into their professional portfolio [Harley et al. 2010] [Schonfeld and Housewright 2010] [Babaei2011]. Some of this reluctance on the part of the community’s junior members may be explained by the apparent lack of headway that has been made in the valuation of these within the salary, tenure and promotion process, especially when compared against past surveys. As can be seen in Table 20, while the number of respondents who said “yes” that their institution has policies related to the evaluation of digital methods, technologies and tools has increased and the percentage of “no” has decreased, the percentage of respondents who do not know has increased. This trend comes despite work done over the past decade following examples from other institutions [Price and Weller 2010] and work by organizations such as the MLA ([Modern Language Association 2002], [Modern Language Association 2003]). In particular, Scheneman and Hanlon [Scheneman and Hanlon 2010] have identified tool development as one area where more work is required to value this activity for the purposes of employment, professional advancement and tenure.

As is often said, strength comes with numbers and larger membership bases will give these associations more credibility when engaging with administration, granting councils and other key stakeholders. Finally, efforts to both create more general acceptance of digital methods, technologies and resources? The answers to these questions will drive many aspects of determining the type of support that is needed — whether funding, tools, training, infrastructure and others — to increase academic capacity. For example, if the goal is to attract more users, then perhaps the response is the creation of more “tools for the novice” [Flanders 2009] or “killer apps” [Juuta 2008]. If the goal is to develop more creators, more training in these skills and knowledge will be required.

Significant change may be slow to come in the short term. The more senior scholars do not appear to be pursuing digital-oriented research, disseminating electronically or employing digital resources in the classroom. Given their roles as researchers, administrators, decision makers, and grant reviewers, if this group does not support DH’s potential, efforts on the part of graduate students and pre-tenured faculty to employ these methods may be stymied.

Table 20. Treatment of digital humanities in salary, tenure and promotion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Rockwell/Siemen 2003</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Do your institution have a policy concerning how electronic documents are to be evaluated in tenure, salary, and promotion procedures?</td>
<td>Yes: 4%; No: 47%; Don’t know: 48%</td>
<td>Yes: 10%; No: 26%; Don’t know: 56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Have you a policy concerning the consideration of electronic publication in causes of promotion and tenure?</td>
<td>Yes: 4; No: 44; Don’t know: 50</td>
<td>Yes: 12; No: 23; Don’t know: 58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Have your institution a policy of the consideration of the development and use of digital technologies, tools, and resources in causes of promotion and tenure?</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Yes: 10; No: 23; Don’t know: 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Conclusions and Recommendations

The following conclusions and recommendations are designed to support the already strong efforts that are in place to develop and strengthen academic capacity in Digital Humanities both within Canada and beyond.

First, given that most respondents appear to be learning digital methods, technologies and resources on their own rather than through more formal settings, more opportunities for the development of training and skill development opportunities must be created. For example, departments, faculties and universities need to continue their plans for additional undergraduate and graduate courses and degrees, combining skill and knowledge development in traditional disciplinary methods with digital and project management skills. Further thought should also be given to certificate programs that could be taken in parallel to traditional graduate programs or in addition to these [Sprö2010]. The recently launched Press Program at the Scholars’ Lab [Brasch2011] at University of Virginia is one example of this type of program. It would also be beneficial for students to have hands-on experiences through internships with libraries and DH centers, to the benefit of the students and the projects [Merritt2010]. At the same time, individuals who are interested in developing their skills can take advantage of the growing number of courses, such as DHSI (dhsi.org), THATCamp (thatcamp.org), One Week|One Tool (oneweekonetool.org), the Advanced Topics in Scholarly Text Encoding (wet您的孩子) and many others.

As indicated by these respondents and in other forums, such as a recent DH funding conference panel [ADH02011], DH projects continue to demand funding and often on a scale that is not typically seen within the Humanities. Lobbying efforts with various funding agencies should continue, not only for new and ongoing funding models that will support not only the development of these resources, but changes and updates that come with advances in both technology and scholarship [Kroescheimer 2008]. Given the amount of resources needed for many DH projects, every effort should be made to ensure ongoing sustainability [Moira and Thorpe 2002].

Appendix 1. Survey on Academic Capacity: Digital Humanities/Humanities Computing (English language version)

This section will concern funding, developing, presenting, and disseminating research that includes digital methods, technologies and resources.

Part 1. Research Capacity

A. Your Current Research

1. Do your research projects include digital methods, technologies and resources?
   - Yes
   - No

If yes, please describe your research.

2. What digital methods, technologies and resources do you incorporate in your research?
1.3 Do you ever incorporate the following electronic resources into your research?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Electronic Resource</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>On-line scholarly journals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line government resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-line archival materials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPoR (<a href="http://portal.tapor.ca/">http://portal.tapor.ca/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPoRware Tools (<a href="http://taporware.mcmaster.ca">http://taporware.mcmaster.ca</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Text Encoding Initiative (<a href="http://www.tei-c.org/index.xml">http://www.tei-c.org/index.xml</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Journal System (<a href="http://ojs.ualberta.ca/index.php">http://ojs.ualberta.ca/index.php</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Journal System (<a href="http://ojs.ualberta.ca/index.php">http://ojs.ualberta.ca/index.php</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflisc (<a href="http://www.conflisc.net">http://www.conflisc.net</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACT (<a href="http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/tact/">http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/tact/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperpo (<a href="http://hyperpo.org/">http://hyperpo.org/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.T.O (<a href="http://www.eng.uqam.ca/sato">http://www.eng.uqam.ca/sato</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please list)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 21.

1.4 Do you work in teams to undertake your research?

- Yes
- No

1.5 How often do you work in teams to undertake your research?

- I usually research with a team
- I sometimes research with a team
- I occasionally research with a team
- I rarely research with a team

1.6 The teams that I research with consist of (Check all that apply)

- Designers
- Colleagues in my discipline
- Colleagues from other disciplines
- Software developers
- Content specialists
- Librarians
- Computer Scientists
- Students
- Other (please list)

B. Research Funding

These questions will focus on funding for your research.

1.7 Have you applied for funding for your research incorporating digital methods, technologies and resources?

- Yes
- No

1.8 To which grant programmes have you applied to fund digital-oriented research in the past 10 years (Please check all that apply)

- Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Graduate Scholarship
- SSHRC Post Graduate Fellowship
- SSHRC Standard Research Grant
- SSHRC Image, Text, Sound and Technology Fund
- SSHRC Research Development Initiative
- SSHRC Research Creation in the Fine Arts
- Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council
- Canadian Foundation for Innovation
- Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada Établissement de nouveaux professeurs-chercheurs
- CRSH Établissement de nouveaux professeurs-chercheurs-createurs
- CRSH Appui à la recherche-creation
- CRSH Appui aux arts et technologie médiatiques
- CRSH Soutien aux équipe de recherche
- Fond québécois de recherche sur la société et la culture (FQRSC) Établissement de nouveaux professeurs-chercheurs
- FQRSC Établissement de nouveaux professeurs-chercheurs-createurs
- FQRSC Appui à la recherche-creation (individuel)
- FQRSC Appui à la recherche-creation (équipe)
- FQRSC Appui aux arts et technologie médiatiques
- FQRSC Soutien aux équipe de recherche
- Financement inter universitaire
- Internal University Funding
- Other (please list)

1.9 Was your digital-oriented application successful (please check all that apply)

- Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council Graduate Scholarship
- SSHRC Post Graduate Fellowship
- SSHRC Standard Research Grant
- SSHRC Image, Text, Sound and Technology Fund
- SSHRC Research Development Initiative
- SSHRC Research Creation in the Fine Arts
- Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council
- Canadian Foundation for Innovation
- Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines du Canada Établissement de nouveaux professeurs-chercheurs
- CRSH Établissement de nouveaux professeurs-chercheurs-createurs
- CRSH Appui à la recherche-creation
- CRSH Appui aux arts et technologie médiatiques
- CRSH Soutien aux équipe de recherche
1.10 What sort of grant program would you like to see to support digital-oriented research?

C. Research Dissemination

These questions will concern the dissemination of your research in publications and at conferences.

Publications

1.11 Have you ever made your scholarship available electronically in any way?
   - Yes
   - No

1.12 Please briefly describe the ways you have made your scholarship available electronically.
1.13 Have you published or attempted to publish any item of scholarship in a refereed electronic outlet?
   Yes    No
   Published
   Attempted to Publish
   Table 23.

1.14 If yes for either, please describe the outlet.

C. Research Dissemination

These questions will concern the dissemination of your research in publications and at conferences.

Conferences

1.15 Have you presented research with a digital focus at a discipline specific conference?
   - Yes
   - No
   If Yes, indicate which ones. If No, why not?
1.16 Have you ever presented research at a digital content oriented conference?
   - Yes
   - No

1.17 If yes, please indicate digitally focused conferences at which you have presented (Check all that apply):
   - Society for Digital Humanities/Société pour l’étude des médias interactifs
   - Canadian Symposium on Text Analysis
   - Digital Humanities (previously ALLC/ACH)
   - Digital Curation
   - Text Encoding Initiative Annual Meeting
   - International Conference on Electronic Publishing
   - Joint Conference on Digital Libraries
   - Digital Resources in the Humanities
   - Digital Games Research Association
   - Canadian Games Studies Association
   - American Association for History and Computing
   - Other (please list)

1.18 Are you a member of a digital association (Check all that apply)
   - Society for Digital Humanities/Société pour l’étude des médias interactifs
   - Association for Computing in the Humanities
   - Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing
   - Text Encoding Initiative
   - Digital Games Research Association
   - Canadian Games Studies Association
   - American Association for History and Computing
   - Other (please list)

1.19 Have you attended a digital methods institute/workshop or course?
   - Yes
   - No

1.20 If yes, please list the institute/workshop and/or course(s)
   - Institute
   - Workshop
   - Course

Part 2. Professional Development

This section will focus on your expectations and understanding of the impact that your digital work will have on your professional development and career trajectory.

2.1 Does your institution have a policy concerning how electronic documents are to be evaluated in tenure, salary, and promotion procedures?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

2.2 Does your institution have a policy concerning the consideration of electronic publication in cases of promotion and tenure?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

2.3 Does your institution have a policy of the consideration of development and use of digital technologies, tools and resources in cases of promotion and tenure?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

Part 3. Teaching and Student Development

A. Your Teaching
These questions will concern the use of digital methods, technologies and resources within your teaching.

2.4 Have you integrated electronic resources into any of the courses that you teach?
   - Yes
   - No

2.5 Please indicate the digital methods, technologies, and resources that you incorporate into your teaching.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method/Resource</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Seldom</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course Management Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtual Space (Second Life)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Databases</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analytical tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authoring tools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Webpages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital manuscripts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electronic Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blogs/Wikis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online Project Planning Spaces</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bibliographic software</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facebook/social networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please list)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.6 Does your university have programs with a digital focus within the Faculties of Humanities, Arts, Social Sciences and Information Sciences?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know

If yes, please list the programs.

2.7 At which academic level are these programs?
   - Undergraduate
   - Masters
   - PhD

2.8 Does your university have plans to develop courses or programs with a digital focus within the Faculties of Humanities, Arts, Social Sciences and Information Sciences?
   - Yes
   - No

2.9 At which academic level will these programs be?
   - Undergraduate
   - Masters
   - PhD

2.10 At which academic level will these programs likely to be developed?
   - Within the next six months
   - Within the next year
   - Within the next few years

2.11 Are your students or students in your institution incorporating digital methodologies, tools and resources:
   - No Students
   - Few Students
   - Some Students
   - Most Students
   - All Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>No Students</th>
<th>Few Students</th>
<th>Some Students</th>
<th>Most Students</th>
<th>All Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Course work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thesis work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching assistant work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research assistant work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social life</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.12 Does your department encourage students to use digital methodologies, technologies and resources in course work?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don't know

Part 4. Final Thoughts

3.1 Using your crystal ball, what do you envision the future directions in digital humanities to be? Please explain.

3.2 What kind of capacity needs to be developed to strengthen the digital humanities community? Please explain.

3.3 What kind of support would help the digital community develop this capacity? Please explain.

3.4 Do you recommend that untenured faculty undertake digital research and teaching? Please explain.

Part 5. Information about yourself

4.1 Working Language:
   - English
   - French
   - Both

4.2 Gender:
   - Female
   - Male
   - I prefer not to answer

4.3 Affiliation:
   - University
   - Publisher
4.4 Role:
- Academic
  - Assistant Professor
  - Associate Professor
  - Full Professor
  - Instructor or Lecturer
- Programmer/Developer
- Librarian/Archivist
- Researcher
- Other
- Student
  - Undergraduate
  - Graduate
  - Doctoral
- Postdoctoral Fellow
- Other (please explain)

4.5 Age:
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60 and over
- I prefer not to answer

4.6 Academic Discipline:
- Social Sciences
  - Anthropology
  - Archaeology
  - Economics
  - Geography
  - History
  - History and Politics
  - Industrial Relations
  - Information and Communication
  - Political Science
  - Social Sciences
  - Sociology
  - Sociology and Anthropology
  - Psychology
  - Other
- Humanities:
  - Arts
  - Arts and Communication
  - Asian Studies
  - Classics
  - Culture and Language Studies
  - English
  - French Studies
  - German
  - Humanities
  - Languages/Languages and Linguistics
  - Literature
  - Native Studies
  - Philosophy
  - Religious Studies
  - Russian
  - Theology
  - Women and Gender Studies
  - Other
- Computer Science
- Library and Information Science
- Business

4.7 Level of Academic training:
- BA/BSc
- MA/MSc
- PhD
- Other:

Appendix 2. Survey on Academic Capacity: Digital Humanities/Humanities Computing (French language version)

Partie 1. Capacité de recherché
Cette section portera sur le financement, le développement, la présentation et la diffusion de la recherche qui comprend des méthodes numériques, technologiques et des ressources.

A. Votre recherche actuelle

1.1 Est-ce que vos projets de recherche incluent des méthodes numériques, technologiques et des ressources?
- Oui
- Non

Si oui, veuillez décrire votre recherche:

1.2 Quelles méthodes numériques, technologiques et des ressources intégrez-vous dans votre recherche?
Tableau 26.
1.3 Examinez-vous d'inclure des ressources électroniques dans votre recherche?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type de ressources électroniques</th>
<th>Oui</th>
<th>Non</th>
<th>Pas certain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revues savantes en ligne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ressources gouvernementales en ligne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journaux en ligne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documents d'archives en ligne</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAPoR (<a href="http://portal.tapor.ca">http://portal.tapor.ca</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;TAPoRware Tools&quot; (<a href="http://tapo">http://tapo</a> rmware.mcmaster.ca)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Text Encoding Initiative&quot; (<a href="http://www.tei-c.org/index.xml">http://www.tei-c.org/index.xml</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Open Conference System&quot; (<a href="http://openconf.ca">http://openconf.ca</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confosol (<a href="http://www.confosol.net">http://www.confosol.net</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACT (<a href="http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/tact/">http://www.chass.utoronto.ca/tact/</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyperpo (<a href="http://hyperpo.org">http://hyperpo.org</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A.T.O (<a href="http://www.sato.org">http://www.sato.org</a>)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autres (veuillez lister)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tableau 27.
1.4 Travaillez-vous en équipe pour faire votre recherche?
1.5 Travaillez-vous en équipe pour faire votre recherche?
1.6 Les équipes avec qui je fais de la recherche consistent en (Cocher tout ce qui s'applique):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Les financements de la recherche</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ces questions porteront sur le financement de vos recherches.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.7 Avez-vous sollicité le financement pour vos travaux de recherche qui intègrent les méthodes numériques, technologiques et des ressources?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oui</th>
<th>Non</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.8 Pour quels programmes de subventions avez-vous sollicité le financement de votre recherche basée sur des médias interactifs au cours des 10 dernières années? (Prêter de cocher tout ce qui s'applique).

| Bourses et subventions d'études supérieures en Conseil de recherches en sciences humaines (CRSH) |
| Subvention ordinaire de recherche du CRSH |
| Programme CRSH « image, texte, son et technologie » |
| Programme CRSH « initiative du développement de la recherche » |
| CRSH recherche/creation dans le domaine des Beaux Arts |
| Conseil de recherches en sciences naturelles et en génie |
| Fondation canadienne pour l'innovation |
| Fonds québécois de recherche sur la société et la culture (FRQSC) Établissement de nouveaux professeurs-chercheurs |
| FRQSC Établissement de nouveaux professeurs-chercheurs-chercheurs |
| FRQSC Appui à la recherche-chronique (individuel) |
| FRQSC Appui à la recherche-chronique (équipe) |
| FRQSC Appui aux arts et technologies médiatiques |
| FRQSC Soutien aux équipes de recherche |
| Financement interne universitaire |
| Autres (veuillez lister) |

1.9 Est-ce que votre demande d'application a été acceptée? (Prêter de cocher tout ce qui s'applique)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oui</th>
<th>Non</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.10 Quel type de programme de subvention aimeriez-vous voir pour soutenir la recherche orientée vers les médias interactifs (Digital Humanities)?

C. Diffusion de recherche

Ces questions concernent la diffusion de votre recherche dans des publications et à des conférences.

Publications

1.11 Avez-vous déjà mis votre recherche ou les articles qui en découlent?

- Oui
- Non

1.12 Veuillez décrire brièvement le format dans lequel vous avez mis votre recherche/érudition en ligne.

1.13 Avez-vous publié ou avez-vous tenté de publier un ou plusieurs travaux de recherche dans un forum arbitré en ligne?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Oui</th>
<th>Non</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publié</td>
<td>Tenté de publier</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 26

1.14 Si oui pour l’un ou l’autre, veuillez décrire le contexte :

C. Diffusion de recherche

Ces questions concernent la diffusion de votre recherche dans des publications et à des conférences.

Conférences

1.15 Avez-vous déjà présenté votre recherche/érudition avec un focus sur les médias interactifs à une conférence ayant pour thème une discipline spécifique?

- Oui
- Non

Si oui, veuillez indiquer les conférences spécifiques. Si non, pourquoi?

1.16 Avez-vous déjà présenté à une conférence ayant comme thème principal les médias interactifs?

- Oui
- Non

1.17 Si oui, veuillez indiquer les conférences sur les médias interactifs auxquelles vous avez présenté (Veuillez cocher toutes les réponses qui s’appliquent):

- Society for Digital Humanities/Société pour l’étude des médias interactifs
- Canadian Symposium on Text Analysis
- Digital Humanities (Auparavant connu sous les noms : ALLC/ACH)
- Digital Curation
- Text Encoding Initiative (rencontre annuelle)
- International Conference on Electronic Publishing
- Joint Conference on Digital Libraries
- Digital Resources in the Humanities
- Digital Games Research Association
- Canadian Games Studies Association
- American Association for History and Computing
- Autres (veuillez noter)

1.18 Êtes-vous membre d’une association de médias interactifs (Veuillez cocher tout ce qui s’applique):

- Society for Digital Humanities/Société pour l’étude des médias interactifs
- Association for Computing in the Humanities
- Association for Literary and Linguistic Computing
- Text Encoding Initiative
- Digital Games Research Association
- Canadian Games Studies Association
- American Association for History and Computing
- Autres (veuillez noter)

1.19 Avez-vous déjà visité une école d’été ou avez-vous participé à un atelier ou cours?

- Oui
- Non

1.20 Si oui, veuillez énumérer le(s) institut(s) / atelier(s) et / ou cours

Institut:

Atelier:

Cours:

Partie 2. Développement Professionnel

Cette section mettra l’accent sur vos attentes et la compréhension de l’impact que les médias interactifs auront sur votre développement professionnel et votre cheminement de carrière.

2.1 Votre institution a-t-elle une politique sur la façon dont les publications électroniques doivent être évaluées en ce qui concerne la titularisation, le salaire, et les procédures de promotion?

- Oui
- Non
- Je ne sais pas

2.2 Votre institution a-t-elle une politique qui considère les publications électroniques en cas de promotion et titularisation?

- Oui
- Non
- Je ne sais pas

2.3 Votre institution a-t-elle une politique qui considère le développement et l’utilisation des médias interactifs, d’outils et de ressources électroniques en cas de promotion et titularisation?

- Oui
- Non
- Je ne sais pas

Partie 3. Développement des enseignements et élèves

Cette section mettra l’accent sur l’intégration des médias interactifs dans les sciences humaines au sein de votre enseignement, ainsi que plus généralement au sein de votre établissement.

A. Votre enseignement

Ces questions concernent l’utilisation des médias interactifs, de la technologie et des ressources dans votre enseignement.

2.4 Avez-vous intégré des ressources électroniques dans l’un des cours que vous enseignez?

- Oui
- Non

2.5 Veuillez indiquer les médias interactifs, la technologie et les ressources que vous intégrer dans votre enseignement
Cette section met l'accent sur l'intégration des médias interactifs dans les sciences humaines au sein de votre enseignement, ainsi que plus généralement au sein de votre établissement.

B. Votre enseignement

Ces questions concernent l'utilisation des médias interactifs, la technologie et des ressources dans votre enseignement.

2.6 Est-ce que votre université offre des programmes qui mettent l'accent sur les médias interactifs dans les facultés de lettres, arts, sciences sociales et sciences informatiques?

- Oui
- Non
- Je ne sais pas

Si oui, veuillez énumérer les programmes

2.7 A quels niveaux académiques sont offerts ces programmes?

- Baccalauréat
- Maîtrise
- Doctorat

2.8 Est-ce que votre université a des plans pour développer des cours ou des programmes avec un accent sur les médias interactifs dans les facultés de lettres, arts, sciences sociales et sciences informatiques?

- Oui
- Non

2.9 A quels niveaux académiques seront offerts ces programmes?

- Baccalauréat
- Maîtrise
- Doctorat

2.10 Veuillez préciser (ou estimer) quand ces programmes seront développés

- Dans les six prochains mois
- Au cours de la prochaine année
- Au cours des prochaines années

C. Développement des étudiants

Ces questions porteront sur l'utilisation des médias interactifs, la technologie et les ressources par les étudiants

2.11 Est-ce que vos étudiants ou les étudiants de votre institution d'enseignement intègrent les méthodologies de médias interactifs, les outils et les ressources?

Aucun étudiants   Peu d'étudiants   Quelques étudiants   La plupart des étudiants   Tous les étudiants

- Dans leurs travaux de cours
- Dans leurs travaux de thèse
- Dans leurs travaux d'assistant d'enseignement
- Dans leurs vies sociales

Table 29.

2.12 Est-ce que votre département encourage les étudiants à utiliser les méthodologies de médias interactifs, les outils et les ressources dans leurs cours?

- Oui
- Non
- Je ne sais pas

Partie 4. Pensées finales

3.1 Selon vous, comment envisagez-vous l'orientation future de l'enseignement des sciences humaines en fonction des médias interactifs et des développements des communautés de sciences humaines en ligne? Veuillez expliquer.

3.2 Quels types de capacités doivent être développés pour renforcer la communauté des sciences humaines en ligne? Veuillez expliquer.

3.3 Quel type de support permettrait la communauté des sciences humaines en ligne de développer ces capacités? Veuillez expliquer.

3.4 Recommenderiez-vous que des enseignants non-permanents développent l'enseignement et la recherche en médias interactifs? Veuillez expliquer.

Partie 5. Des informations sur vous-même

Cette information nous permettra de mieux comprendre le développement de la capacité d'enseignement des sciences humaines dans l'étude des médias interactifs et la communauté des sciences humaines en ligne.

4.1 Langue de travail:

- Anglais
- Français
- Les deux

4.2 Sexe:

- Femme
- Homme
- Je préfère ne pas répondre

4.3 Affiliation:

- Université
- Éditeur
- Centre de recherche
- Autres (veuillez expliquer)

4.4 Rôles (veuillez cocher une case):

- Professeur adjoint
- Professeur agrégé
- Professeur titulaire
4.5 Age:
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-59
- 60 et plus
- Je préfère ne pas répondre

4.6 Discipline Académique (veuillez cocher toutes les cases qui s’appliquent):
- Anthropologie
- Archéologie
- Économie
- Géographie
- Histoire
- Histoire et politique
- Études des médias interactifs dans les sciences humaines
- Relations industrielles
- Information et communication
- Nouveaux médias
- Science politique
- Sciences sociales
- Sociologie
- Sociologie et Anthropologie
- Psychologie
- Arts
- Arts et communication
- Études Asiatiques
- Études classiques
- Études de langue et de culture
- Études anglaises
- Études françaises
- Études allemandes
- Sciences Humaines
- Langues / langages et linguistiques
- Littérature
- Études américaines
- Philosophie
- Études religieuses
- Études russes
- Théologie
- Études des femmes
- Science informatique
- Sciences de l’information et des bibliothèques
- Entreprises
- Autres (veuillez spécifier)

4.7 Plus haut niveau de formation universitaire:
- B.A./B.Sc.
- M.A./M.Sc.
- Doctoral
- Autres (veuillez lister)

Notes

[1] I would like to thank Drs. Michael Eberle-Sinatra and Geoffrey Rockwell, and Caitlin Brownrigg for their contribution to the development of the survey and SSHRC for the research funding.

[2] Within the Canadian context, a college is a primarily undergraduate teaching institution with a focus on applied skills, certificates and diplomas. A college does not generally award undergraduate degrees.

[3] Since the number of respondents was less than 1%, the administrator and retired roles have been eliminated from the analysis when only the role is considered statistically significant.

[4] This survey was conducted before Twitter became popular within the DH community. The results may be different if the survey was repeated in 2011.

[5] SSHRC discontinued this program in 2010 and instituted a broader funding program focused on the Digital Economy.

[6] English Translation: "Programs that allow longer term funding to finance the hiring of technical personnel; programs to establish digital humanities centres (which accept a hybrid of service and research)"

[7] English Translation: "The renewal comes from the generation of students, not of the professors."
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