

Transcript for "On Epistemic Action, Research Ethics, and Community Driven Collaboration: An Interview with Roopika Risam." From *Doing Digital Visual Studies: One Image, Multiple Methodologies*. <https://www.ccdigitalpress.org/book/ddvs/chapters/risam.html>

Laurie Gries:

All right, Dr. Risam, thank you so much for being with us today. It means so much to the collection and you have so much expertise in so many diverse areas and we just so are looking forward to hearing your thoughts, not only about the project but just really about where DVS can go from here. I would like to begin with you just introducing yourself, if you don't mind, and explaining just the multiple areas of expertise and areas of research that you work in and then perhaps making some connections to visual studies, so that readers who are unfamiliar with your work can understand where you're coming to this project from.

Roopika Risam:

Absolutely, so I'm an Associate Professor of English and Education at Salem State University, and I broadly situate my research at the intersections of digital humanities and African diaspora and postcolonial studies. And so within that, the question that I've really been interested in is as we're thinking about the kinds of digital methodologies that we use for research, whether it's data visualization or data mining, how do we ensure that the methodologies that we're using for our research are ones that aren't simply reiterating the power dynamics that have shaped the canons of culture in the first place? Instead, what are the kinds of changes, what are the approaches we need to ensure that when we do this kind of work, that we're doing it in a way that actually calls attention to and sheds light on the voices and the stories that haven't been represented?

For my research, this is manifested a number of different ways. My first book *New Digital Worlds* is specifically about this. How do we rethink the work we do in digital humanities from actual methods of our projects to how we conceptualize our professional organizations to what we're doing in the classroom to actually help further this goal of more fully realizing the promises of the digital age, particularly in terms of access to knowledge?

So, this also plays out in the digital scholarship that I've done, and so some of my work is really focused on data visualization, like my work on the project *Torn Apart/Separados*, which is a series of data visualizations around immigrant detention in the U.S. And really the key relationship to DVS that I've seen in this work is really how we're thinking about the visual choices that we're making in the creation of data visualization. So in a map-based visualization, what does it mean to use a base map with topographical features that would show you the desert that migrants are crossing versus using a map with really solidly identified national borders which re-emphasizes a kind of transgression of national borders? These are the kinds of connections that I see.

Laurie Gries:

Tell us more about that project. I'm really curious because...in the afterward of the collection, one of the things that I call for are more projects just like the Torn Apart Project. What I love about what y'all did was come together really quickly. I was impressed with how quickly you came together, how you collaboratively were able to produce something that had meaning in the moment when this crisis is unfolding, and I find that so remarkable because when I – you know, I've been trying to do this research for a long time, but I've been going at it alone and it takes such a long time, so that by the time my work actually comes out, the crisis and the kairos of the moment almost has already passed. So for those readers and scholars who might want to take up the call to take— to enact more collaborative DVS projects that are responding to crises in the moment, help us understand how this project came together. Help us understand what the challenges were. Help us understand, you know, just give us some advice as we might move forward to follow y'all's lead because it's so remarkable and important.

Roopika Risam:

Absolutely. So, when I was working on Torn Apart/Separados, I was working with colleagues at the group for experimental methods in the humanities at Columbia University. And they've— and I've helped with this as well—put together the Nimble Tents toolkit, which is a series of almost recipes for how do you do projects that respond to any number of kinds of current events. So really, the first major project that they did was the Puerto Rico Mapathon, which was responding to Hurricane Maria by bringing together members of the community—people at Columbia—to rectify the open street maps that aid workers were using to reach people in Puerto Rico against current satellite imagery. So on an open street map, it might say, you know, here's a road that's a passage between two towns, but the satellite imagery might show that, in fact, the road is now impassible, and so they actually brought people together to correct the maps so that the aid workers had the right maps. And his was really the sort of ethos of we have these skills, how can we pull them together and respond to a crisis?

And so this was the attitude that we all were bringing to Torn Apart when we saw the crisis unfolding at the U.S.-Mexico border and thinking about—is there anything we can do to help respond to? Or even to help out the social workers and lawyers who'd be working with the families who are being separated from their children? And so, funny enough, the story behind it actually starts several weeks before that week in June of 2018.

So in late May, there was this story that came out about the U.S. government having lost about 3 000 children that had been in custody and because the news around the family separation policy had just come out, people started conflating that incident with the family separation policy. And we didn't know that at the time. We thought, uh oh, the government is taking children and losing them; this is not very hard to believe, especially since that's actually what happened. But at the time, we thought, you know, let's look into this situation. Let's see what's actually happening. And what happened was that—we realized and learned—that this was essentially a feature of how the government was managing unaccompanied minors who arrived at the border. They arrived at the border, they were taken into custody by the office of refugee resettlement, then they found sponsors for them. Ninety percent of the sponsors were family

members, and then if the office of refugee resettlement called after 30 days and nobody picked up, they said the child is lost. Now we learned, because we were talking to social workers, that a lot of the sponsors who weren't family members were actually people reuniting children with undocumented family members who are afraid to come and claim them. And so we thought, okay, we've misjudged the situation. There's nothing to do here. Sometimes you want to stay lost because it's safer if you're trying to avoid deportation and that was it.

And then several weeks later, when the family separation policy really hit the news cycle and accelerated, we sort of came back to this question of what can we do? And so, we decided that we would try and find all the data we could on immigrant detention and see if we could find the locations of the shelters where children are being held because that data was not publicly released by the government.

And so, we essentially parked three days for data, and by three days, I do mean about 24 hours a day. There were seven of us: two of us were really doing the data work—I was one of them—and we were literally going through tax documents of people that the office of refugee resettlement had given block grants to to try and find out what property they owned and then verifying whether or not those were shelters by calling them. We eventually put together the only data set of where the children were, and so we were then able to put it on a map, and we used all our data for a series of other kinds of thinking about what kind of stories we could tell with data. Some more abstract really, then here's the math with data on it, and we were able to actually give the data to lawyers and social workers who were working with families, and so that was really a positive outcome because nobody really knew where the kids were.

Laurie Gries:

What were—what— Tell me about the different skillset that each of the members brought to the team because I think one of the biggest challenges for me is forming those connections with other scholars who one, have the time, two, have the energy and three, are willing to work on projects where they're not necessarily having any funding. I don't know if y'all had funding, but you know there's so many people who are in information science or even critical geography who are so fund-driven because they have to be for tenure and promotion or for whatever. So how did—tell me more about the different skillsets, and then, how, for those of us who are interested in doing this kind of work, how might go about forming our own collective networks?

Roopika Risam:

Absolutely, so we had – I want to say two of us were university faculty members, we had one digital scholarship librarian, we had someone who was in-between positions, and we had three graduate students. So, the different kinds of expertise: so I had expertise on media migration, I'm a very very good researcher and good with data management and data curation. Alex Gil is really good at project management. Mana Ahmed, who was working on the project, was sort of good at wild out-of-the-box thinking and dreaming. Two of the graduate students working on the project, Sylvia Fernández and Myra Álvarez, they're from the borderlands. They understand the region really well. They're also scholars of the borderlands, so they brought that expertise to the conversation as well. Moacir de Sá Pereira—he is an amazing coder, and so he really took

on a lot of that work for the first project. So it was really a very sort of fortuitous combination of—some of us were friends or some of us were mentors of some of the people that were involved, and it was just sort of one of those moments where we thought okay, if we were going to do a project like this, knowing that we actually didn't know what the end result was going to be, what do we need? We need a project manager, we need a data manager, we need a dreamer, we need people with the expertise of the geographical region, we need people with expertise of data visualizations of migration, and so that was how we ended up doing that. It was all through our personal networks and all through our personal relationships, and so really none of us were in a position where there was any inherent benefit to taking the time to do it; it was just that we wanted to do something in response to this sort of unfolding tragedy, and we were just gonna see if there's anything we could do.

The other piece of it though is that that meant that we were not going into it knowing that we were actually going to do anything, that there would necessarily be an end result, and certainly not an end result that—I mean, I don't think anybody thought we were going to get an end result that would have received as much international media attention as it did because that wasn't the goal. But it really was about how do you think about the relationships that you build and we actually—what Alex Gil actually did was kind of extrapolate from the Nimble Tents toolkit, which you can link to. Here's what we did and how you could do it, if that's something that you want to do, but part of it is also knowing that you have to be doing it because you really want to do this. You really want to try and address an issue or try and make some kind of intervention, not because there's necessarily going to be some kind of inducement in terms of faculty rewards or scholarly rewards at the end of it.

Laurie Gries:

Right. And I love that you all went into it not knowing what the end result was going to be and being still willing to do that. I mean, part of what I try to get to in the afterword of the collection is just the need for us to do more to embrace experimentation in the face of failure, right. Taking those risks to really push ourselves to push our students and actually to create room for it within graduate education—to say “Hey, okay, I don't know what the end result is going to be; we don't know if it's going to be wildly successful.” Unless we keep, I think, moving forward and pressing in these moments to do—to try to do something different and to try to do something important, I fear that we're just going to stay stuck in these really traditional projects, even in a DH sense.

Roopika Risam:

Hmmm. Well, here's the irony: this sort of implied failure iteration redirection, this is what we do in more traditional genres of research as well.

Laurie Gries:

Well, that's true.

Roopika Risam:

People don't want to think about it like that or admit it, but I mean, how many times have I been writing something, and then I sort of get to a point I think, "Oh no. Time to pivot, try to rethink this," or something went wrong, "I gotta backtrack, I gotta reimagine that." It happens all the time. It's just part of my writing process. And so, it's interesting to me to think that that it's not that different, except the difference is that, particularly if we're thinking about a faculty reward system, you know that there's a reward for a monograph, you know there's a reward for a journal article. You don't know if there's a reward for a digital project. And it really depends on a lot of circumstances, like who's reading your file or how does your department feel about it. And so there is that end result that's a problem, but also who knows if there's really going to be tenured professors left anyway, so why would we let that be what's stopping us from doing this?

Laurie Gries:

Right, right. I love those points. Let me switch perspective just a little bit because you've done such amazing work, and I really appreciate this work you've done to work hard to push for critical race, postcolonial, and decolonial perspectives in DH. Could you speak more into what responsibilities that entails and how that might be enacted as we move forward with DVS in more responsible and ethical ways?

Roopika Risam:

Absolutely. You know, something that stood out to me when I read the collection was sort of the framing of open data, and I think this is a really crucial area that's not cut and dry or black and white. Because when we think about the predisposition towards open access or openness that's so big in the Global North==this idea that information just wants to be free, this is not a universally held value. It's spoken of like it is. But it's actually not. We think about indigenous communities and how there are different protocols over who should have access to what kinds of knowledge. When we think about people who are undocumented for whom it may not be safe to have certain knowledge be open. I think there's a real challenge there—of how do we balance between taking advantage of the open data, in terms of what we can achieve. And, I feel like I saw this in several of the essays in the collection, but then at the same time, think about what stories are we not hearing precisely because open access is not the preferred cultural protocol or may not be safe for people.

I think that for me is the question that's at the heart of what you're asking, which is how are we thinking about our relationships to data, how are we framing it in ways that don't assume that openness is inherently positive. It's actually really complicated, and I think along with that, and this I think comes up in a number of the essays, at least two of the essays in the collection, as well as sort of the issue of black boxing and the use of third-party providers for the research methodologies. And this is such a tough one because, for me at least, between using Twitter..between using even an out-of-the-box tool like Tableau to analyze data. I know I'm personally so reliant on third-party technologies, and, in the case of something like Twitter, third-party technology that functions to make money. And so, I really loved that one of the essays—I think it was the Mining Hope essay—made it clear that there was no way to

extrapolate that the data set was public opinion precisely because it comes from a third-party provider. I think how—thinking through those ethics of how we work with data from third parties is really also crucial.

Laurie Gries:

Yeah, I was speaking with Lahui Whitebear—I don't know if you know her work—but she was speaking about Indigenous sovereignty around data, right. And then I was speaking with Keon Pettiway, who comes from a critical Black Studies perspective, and we got into that conversation about how the ethics of doing this kind of research...there's so many multiple issues from thinking about data: okay, whose data? Who has a right to data? How do we respect data? How do we respect the privacy of data? To the issues that you just spoke about, to the issues of even the digital technologies that were using and their connections to environmental racism and oppressions of certain cultures. I mean its just ethical responsibilities all the way down, really, and it feels to me very daunting to live up to all of those different responsibilities. So if you're offering advice for people who want to move forward with this kind of work, I mean, how do we negotiate those responsibilities? How do we acknowledge, and how we enact them? I think it's theoretically one thing to acknowledge the responsibilities but then to enact them, things get really really complicated, right.

Roopika Risam:

Yeah, they really do. I think one of the answers actually goes back to what you're asking earlier—about the team because it was really the perspectives and the knowledge that all the team members brought to the conversation that allowed us to make ethical decisions with the project.

So, the primary ethical issue that we contended with was whether or not to make the data that located the shelters publicly available because usually when people go to a map-based data visualization, they expect to click on a dot, and they expect to get a little pop-up that gives them information. And I kept saying we don't want to give out this information to anyone who shows up at the website. My feeling on that was that we had already been seeing people holding protests at the airports where children were being transited and these children have been taken away from their parents, most of them don't speak English, and there's just a bunch of adults shouting at them essentially. ...I kept raising this issue being concerned about people who don't really have experience working with migrant children showing up at these locations being really well-meaning but then also inviting state violence into that space. And I think most of the team thought, maybe, I was making the issue like overblown. But I really felt like you just have to really think about how you ethically respond to what you have and to that responsibility of what to do with it.

And so what we ended up doing was during the height of the media attention to the family separation crisis, we only gave out the data to people who contacted us. That was actually a satisfactory way of doing it. So for example, the Washington Post wanted our data, and so we had a conversation with them and they agreed with our values around sharing the data, and so we gave it to them for their data visualization. ProPublica wanted to just make a map with

everything with a pop-up and an address, and so we didn't give it to them because we didn't feel like that met our ethical standards. And, ultimately, once the media interest the topic had passed, we put everything in an open data repository anyway because people really just weren't paying attention anymore, which is its own problem. But really throughout all of this, in addition to working with our team that we had assembled, we were also talking to, as much as we could without really getting in their way, to social workers and lawyers who were working with migrant children and trying to understand better what their perspectives were and what would be best for the children. So, I think that's where the idea of you need the right perspectives, you need to know who you're accountable to, and then make decisions based on your accountability to those people. It doesn't really work well when you have one person doing a project by themselves. It actually works a lot better when you have people coming at it from all different angles because actually some of the best conversations we had were the conversations about what do we do with this data.

Laurie Gries:

Right. And that would bleed into another question I had. I know you've been doing some good work about you know the ethics of knowledge production in relation to humanities, in relation to the university, in relation to the community, and I'm wondering if you could speak more into that. That's another conversation that Lahui Whitebear and I got in—you know, what is the responsibility that we have to the communities that we're working with and what are some methodological imperatives that you think we really need to keep in mind as we move forward?

Roopika Risam:

So the primary issue is that when we think about the relationships that universities have cultivated with communities, it's often very extractive. It's often about what kind of PR can the university get? What kind of data can university get from these people, without much regard up to what a university is giving back to the people they are taking from.

And so one of the areas that's interested me, and I've done a lot of work in terms of faculty professional development on this, is how do we reframe our community-engaged research and community-engaged teaching in ways that de-center the university as the site and arbiter of knowledge and expertise and instead rethink those power dynamics? And so, the primary way to do this is actually to recognize that the community partners you have are actually your collaborators. They have expertise, they have knowledge, and so at every stage of this research life cycle— from identifying a problem to identifying your research questions to designing methods for tackling the problem to implementation to assessment—all of these pieces have to be done in collaboration, in partnership with the community partners, and it really involves, as somebody who works at a university, ceding your relationship to knowledge that you're socialized to have, right. You're socialized as, I am the expert, they are not the expert. But if it's actually saying, no, no. They are the expert, and you're working together on a team and their expertise is as integral to every part of the research process, that's what you're bringing. And also, I feel like, for me, the gauge of “is this being done right?” for me is do I feel like the community partners are getting more of a benefit from it than I am?

Laurie Gries:

So, tell me some ways in which you feel that has played out for you in scholarship in addition to the Torn Apart project.

Roopika Risam:

So, this has largely happened through small scale projects that I've done with various community groups and community members. One was actually a project that I ran with the Salem State archivist Susan Edwards and a teacher Denise Granniss at Salem Academy charter school. What had happened was Susan and I had this whole idea that we wanted to figure out how do we increase the number of Black and Latinx high school students who are interested in digital humanities. We applied for a grant from Mass Humanities. We got the grant but Mass Humanities said we could not be reverse-racist and could not only give the programming to students of color, so what we ended up doing was actually going to one of the local schools, Salem Academy, and saying to them, we have this money for a project, do you have any interest in being engaged?

And so, when we did that, you know, essentially involved putting aside our original plans for the project and then we're sitting in the principal's office, which was, as you know, scary as you can imagine, sitting in the principal's office with the principal and the English teacher Denise Granniss and thinking through what are their needs. Now, in their case, their needs were they had a group of high school seniors who they were really worried weren't going to graduate. This was about the fall of 2018, I believe. And so they're concerned they weren't going to graduate, and the teacher's like "I need to do something that's going to engage them, that's going to still have a relationship with the standards, but something that is going to grab them." So when I had just reached out to the principal, he had turned up, and talking to the teacher about needing something to grab these students, and so we came into that. And so they were really laying the groundwork for what they needed and then we were engaging with them about here's what we were thinking, how does this work with what you're doing?

And so one of the pieces was they wanted to make them to feel more engaged in the possibility of college. That worked out well for us because we wanted to bring them to campus and take them to the archives and teach them about working with archival materials and how do you tell stories with materials from the archive, particularly images. So we ended up doing that. We were bringing them to campus, and we brought in experts from the local cultural heritage industry to help connect them to the histories behind the images they were finding and what they ended up doing was a website called Salem Then and Now, in which they found an image from mostly late-19th early-20th century Salem. They learned about the history of that particular location. They went to the location today and took a picture. And then they used that to construct these sort of web pages where they were talking about Salem then and now and where do they fit as young people of color in the history of Salem and a history that's very much about Nathaniel Hawthorne and the Salem witch trials, and so it was really wonderful, really successful. The parents—we had a reception—and the parents were saying I've never seen my kids so excited about English class. At the beginning class—of the semester, none of them wanted to come to Salem State. At the end of it, seven of them came to Salem State.

Laurie Gries:
That's great.

Roopika Risam:
So, it was like a really successful project.

Laurie Gries:
Absolutely.

Roopika Risam:
Yeah, because we just said, you know what, we have money and here's what we know and you tell us what you know, what you need, and you know what you need and then we will work together on this. It was a really wonderful experience.

Laurie Gries:
Yeah, I love that, and I love thinking about—I've been working hard on developing a minor here for English that's a collaboration between the Program for Writing and Rhetoric and English where were—it's titled Writing and Public Engagement. And so I'm really trying to think about how many of the classes can be devoted to project-based work and community-based work. I love this idea, and I love this advice because you think you have an idea—even when you're planning a course design and you think you have the project in mind—but really what you're reminding me of is how do we create these broad parameters for the work where we can create the structure and identify what we can bring to the table but then actually go into the communities to let them decide everything, from the original research question to the methods to the outcome itself, just kind of all the way up. I love that.

Roopika Risam:
I'm actually writing with a wonderful group of collaborators a draft of the MLA's guidelines for evaluating public humanities scholarship. And so, we worked together all of last academic year reading together and thinking together. And so, what really was interesting about the document draft that we've now submitted to Paula Krebs, the executive director of the MLA, is that the first section is all about the ethics and the ethics are precisely this. It's precisely about what it means to work with publics, and that it's not about here I am. I put on a speaker series, or I put on an exhibit. It's really about how are you carefully engaging with the people around you. And I mean by around you, I also don't mean that community only is local. Community is also global.

Laurie Gries:
Right. So, I know—I don't want to take up too much of your time and I so appreciate your energy, but what kind of projects can you think about for those scholars who are interested in putting DVS into conversation with DH? What do you think are some of the most pressing projects we can be working on, in light of the conversation we had? And, I don't want to come from a top-down approach right understanding. We just had this really meaningful

conversation about letting communities decide, but in what directions, perhaps, might you push us based on your experience and your commitments?

Roopika Risam:

Yeah, I think one of the biggest challenges with digital humanities, and I'm not sure the extent to which this is true of DVS, you could tell me, but there's a tendency towards the canonical. There's a tendency toward—let's think about the same text and the same images. Let's think about the same data sets, the one the ones that exist because they're there. And sometimes...you're relying just on what you can find, you're relying on material that's already been mediated by the power dynamics that determine what's worth preserving and what's not worth preserving.

What I loved about, and I think is the absolute future that comes out of the DVS collection, is really this emphasis on how can we put together a dataset that's going to help shed light on a question in a new way. I think those are==that's the kind of work that we need to do because for us, when we're working in areas like say Black studies or ethnic studies, areas that are already struggling with their representation in the broader landscape of knowledge production. If we're just relying on what's there, we're not going to find a lot. We actually have to do almost double work of putting together the datasets, of doing the archival research to then digitize the materials that we then need to be able to do the digital analysis. That's really important that we start with that work, and we think about to the extent that it's consonant with cultural protocols, how we can make that that—those==materials available for other researchers as well.

Laurie Gries:

I mean, I'm thinking about just the time constraints that we usually work with on a given project. I'm just coming off a project where I've been tracking or I did track the uptick of swastikas that we saw landing on the streets of the United States during the Trump administration and that—it was a four-year process of collecting the data and then coding the data and then double-coding the data, right. And I'm just now to the point where I can say, okay, now what are the questions I can ask from the data? What are the ways that I can create reliable public dataset? But that that's four years into the project, right. And what's interesting to me about it is—and I think you're absolutely right—I keep getting this question over and over again when I'm talking to, say, information science scholars on campus or people who want to do DH-related work, but they don't necessarily have the dataset and they don't necessarily know how to ask those critical questions of the data in and of itself. So to me, the temporality of these kinds of projects is so different than how many of us are used to working, even though it might take us 10 years to work on a monograph or something.

There's the temporal issue and then there's also just the critical perspectives that humanities scholars need to bring. But I even find that it's difficult to bring that critical lens to data and even, say, data visualizations, when we're not used to working with that kind of data, if that makes sense. I love these ideas, and yet the challenges of them in terms of educating our students and working with students and creating the temporal structures to do this and the

community-related structures to do this work, it seems to me, like there needs to be, I don't know if you would say fundamental changes in how we teach, but I mean, what do you think needs to be opened up or changed about how we stereotypically do work in say English that creates rooms for all of these things that we've been talking about plus the ethical obligations and responsibilities?

Roopika Risam:

So what I like to do actually is think very modularly about a larger project. And I think part of this comes from working at a regional comprehensive university with a high teaching load. If I am not thinking very modular building blocks about how I'm doing anything, then nothing's going to get done because otherwise I'll be waiting for four years until the project's done. I think about what is—let's say I have a 15-week semester. I'm not sure if you're in quarters, but maybe it's ten, maybe it's nine, but they have a 15-week semester. I like to think about how do I scope out a piece of a project that you can actually move the students through from data collection to some kind of end result in the space of a semester. Now the end result may not be the sort of generalizable—I mean, I have feelings about the idea of generalizability anyway, so put that aside—but it may not be the sort of “here we can extrapolate grand claims from this outcome or this data visualization” that my students have created, but it's walked them through the entire process. It's probably done some coding of data, for me. It's also helped me think about it in collaboration with other people, which is important as well. I think that's one piece of it, and so I've gotten better over time at how to break down a big picture project into something that can be an experience for students that's an authentic experience in the span of a short period of time.

The other piece of it is—and people have different levels of comfort with this—but I like being very public about my thinking, obviously. You probably know this, I use Twitter a lot, and I'm very much about if I have a thought, that's probably on the internet. I know a lot of people are concerned about doing that. A lot of people keep their research very close because they're worried and have had bad experiences with their research being stolen, and so I also fully respect their people who don't want to do that. But I've also had a lot of success and positive experiences with thinking about how to use social media as a way to think with other people.

Laurie Gries:

Right, right. Yeah, I think, you know, one of the things I've been thinking through a lot is I am a very goal driven person, and I think a typical kind of pedagogy pushes us to be really goal driven, and so we really think in terms of outcomes instead of the process. And the irony of that is that when we teach writing, we recognize that it's all about the process, it's not about the outcome, but then when it comes to time to designing some of these other digital projects, somehow again we get outcome-oriented rather than thinking about, okay let's think about that the value of this is really coming from the process and that we can work more slowly and across communities and temporalities and spaces in ways that we actually would benefit from if we just let go of some of those outcomes that we put pressure on ourselves and our students with.

Well, I know you don't have much time and I just—are there any other thoughts you want to share with us before we depart?

Roopika Risam:

I'm trying to look at my notes. I just wanted to say that I thought that the tracking of the methodologies, the different kinds of methodologies, through a single image was such an interesting heuristic for thinking about digital methodologies. I just really appreciated that about the volume because so much of what I read is here's my methodology for this dataset, here's my methodology for this dataset, and that's important and that's valuable, but to actually be able to think across these different methodologies because you start with the Hope image. I thought that that was absolutely exciting in my reading of the volume.

Laurie Gries:

Oh, thank you! I thought that'd be interesting to work with students in terms of a dataset, right. It's like we have a dataset that we can all work from, but we don't have to do—to bring the same kind of question. We don't have to bring the same kind of methodologies, and that seems to me that it opens up the potential where everyone, especially if we're working in a class where not everyone shares the exact same interests or even majors, people can bring their unique perspectives and their skillsets and their methodological experiences to the projects. But thank you for saying that. It really was an idea that, like I said, came to me in the middle of the night. I love that, you know, when you started out explaining what kind of research you do and what you're concerned with, you started out with digital methodologies because I too, I'm really interested in methodology and method and how we do research and different ways we can open up new questions by the kinds of research that we can do. So, we share that passion, so I really appreciate you saying that.

Thank you so much for being here. We so appreciate all of your experience and your contributions to so many different fields and just the advice that you gave us today. So, I can't thank you enough.

Roopika Risam:

Thank you. It's a lot of fun and just a wonderful collection.

Laurie Gries:

Oh great, thank you.