Finding a place for genealogy and family history in the digital humanities

Casey Daniel Hoeve
Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas, USA

Received 28 November 2017
Revised 28 February 2018
11 May 2018
Accepted 17 May 2018

Abstract

Purpose – Despite its growing popularity, there is a noticeable absence of references to the inclusion of genealogy and family history studies within the field of digital humanities. New forms of inclusiveness, particularly in production-coding and cultural analysis, closely align genealogy and family history with the core tenants practiced among humanities computing and digital humanities. This paper aims to prove that genealogy as family history should be formally recognized within this cohort, as it can serve as a valuable and innovative partner for advocacy and technological advancement of the field.

Design/methodology/approach – By examining the literature, genealogy will be defined according to its use in the digital humanities, as well as its use in family history studies. The core tenants of humanities computing and digital humanities will be identified and compared against the research methodology and technological tools used in genealogy and family history research. The comparison will determine how closely the fields align, and if genealogy defined as family history should be used, and included within the field of digital humanities.

Findings – The progression of genealogy and family history from production to cultural analysis corresponds with the transition of production and coding (influenced by humanities computing) to the inclusion of experimental cultural research adopted by the digital humanities. Genealogy's use of technological tools, such as databases, text encoding, data-text mining, graphic information systems and DNA mapping, demonstrates the use of coding and production. Cultural analysis through demographic study, crowdsourcing and establishing cultural connections illustrates new methods of scholarship, and connects coding and cultural criticism, serving as a bridge between digital humanities and the humanities at large. As genealogy continues to create new partnerships of a collaborative nature, it can, and will, continue to contribute to new areas of study within the field. As these practices continue to converge with the digital humanities, genealogy should be recognized as a partner and member in the digital humanities cohort.

Originality/value – Despite its growing popularity, there is a noticeable absence of references to the inclusion of genealogy and family history studies within the field of the digital humanities. The term genealogy resonates differently within the digital humanities, primarily articulating the history of the field over the study and research of family lineage. This study seeks to demonstrate how genealogy and family history can fit within the digital humanities, providing a new perspective that has not yet been articulated in the scholarly literature.

Keywords Libraries, Intersectionality, Cultural analysis humanities, Genetic ancestry, Historical societies, Humanities computing

Paper type Conceptual paper

Introduction

The organization of familial lineage originates through oral traditions and the written word. While antediluvian identities have been lost, known pedigrees exist from portions of fragmented records and surviving oral accounts, as well as official records and the emerging use of internet databases and DNA mapping. Recognizable genealogical records appear in such familiar sources as the *Bible*, Egyptian artifacts and the lineage of Confucius; until contact with Europeans, peoples of the Pacific Islands exclusively used oral genealogies,

Digital Library Perspectives
Vol. 34 No. 3, 2018
pp. 215-226

2059-5816
DOI 10.1108/DLP-11-2017-0044

passing cultural memory and sacred rites from generation to generation (Sperry, 2008). However notable and extensive, these accounts comprise only a small sample of the genealogical records available throughout human history. Serving as both hobby and professional historical scholarship, genealogy enables the discovery and confirmation of identity; charting chronology among groups belonging to the proximal and distant relatives around the world illustrate migratory patterns and answer biologically (but not, perhaps, metaphysically) how we exist, and why we live in our current location today.

Traditionally, genealogy has been practiced by excavating written documents and transcribed oral histories for corroborative evidence, requiring the laborious task of sifting through historical sites, family documents and artifacts or records kept by historical societies and government organizations. Within recent years, an abundance of historical records has been digitally reproduced, and is now available through databases and websites online. The popularity of these tools is enticing more users to take an interest in genealogy research, contributing to large pools of crowd-sourced data to be reused, or provide access to previously unavailable documents. This paper provides a discussion on how the tools and approaches of genealogical research can be situated within the context of digital humanities, with an intention of starting an ongoing conversation for future directions in this area of research and practice.

Literature review

Genealogy in the digital humanities

Genealogy can be easily misinterpreted when examining the literature in digital humanities, constituting two separate definitions within the field. The primary definition, as evidenced by the literature, relies upon the use of genealogy as construct of illustrating the history of the discipline. Applying chronological framework, academic genealogy is best reflected as an investigation that "provides context, history, and has the potential to predict future trends in a particular discipline in the field" (Russell and Sugimoto, 2009). The secondary, but peripheral definition is more recognizable to that outside the field, examining the history of family lineage. While the former term has been iterated in the digital humanities for nearly a decade, the latter use of genealogy has only appeared in the literature within recent years, potentially granting incipient recognition as a subsection of the field.

Genealogy of digital humanities as an academic discipline

While Underwood (2017) astutely clarified that narrative approaches in the digital humanities extend before the advent of the internet, the progression in nomenclature from humanities computing to digital humanities has created a bisectional boundary, altering how the term genealogy is used within and outside the discipline. Establishing the identity of digital humanities made it necessary to develop a narrative that includes the historical similarities of the disciplines, the nuanced differences and future objectives, which may or may not coincide with humanities computing. Svensson (2009) evoked the important question underlying the identity crisis:

> A pertinent question is whether the discursive transition from Humanities Computing to Digital Humanities is mainly a matter of repackaging [Humanities Computing], or whether the new label also indicates an expanded scope, a new focus, or a different relation to traditional Humanities Computing work.

Svensson's observation identifies the desire for a distinct identity, but yet contests that separation anxiety remains, conflicting with the imbricating practices of both fields. The formation of the digital humanities genealogy attempts to reconstruct the narrative on a

granular evolution, expressing its shift from humanities computing, and whether the partition is salient enough to remain separate, but related fields.

Dalbello (2011) designated the genealogy of digital humanities in two systems:

> One focused on digital representations (including digitization), and the other, on electronic texts, reading, and writing in the digital realm as an integrated practice by which practitioners and the proponents of digital humanities have approached the development of digital collections and tools.

Exploring the notable achievements in the genealogy of digital humanities, such as early humanities computing projects like the *Index Thomisticus* (Busa, 2004) and the Perseus project (Crane, 2017), Dalbello (2011) recognized not only the need for a holistic approach, the identification of canonical authors and formative texts, computer science projects and databases and archives of origin, but also the need for scholarly interpretation.

Koh (2014) echoed the same genealogical concerns expressed by Svensson (2009) and Dalbello (2011), stating that the "the social contract of Digital Humanities has been imposed upon the field through the associations with its predecessor Humanities Computing." Suggesting that the digital humanities should move beyond the sole creation of resources as a core tenant of humanities computing, it can be expanded through a transition into the investigation of the content. Koh is skeptical of Bauer's (2011) belief that theoretical framework is completely contained within the production of the resource itself, as new media is divergent from humanities computing. In addition to the existence of the resource, Koh's progressive genealogy seeks to examine the humanistic aspects of cultural, social and political inquiry, as well as the changing roles of technology and social structure not addressed by humanities computing.

Koh further articulates that the separation of the digital humanities and humanities computing genealogies can be defined by the "hack/yak divide," of producing and coding resources, compared with integration of cultural inclusion and analysis. By advocating for two separate branches of digital humanities, the first described as DH1, relating to humanities computing practices, and DH2 that is "humanistic inquiry that relates to the digital for inclusion among potential gender, class, disability, and racial biases" (Koh, 2014), the digital humanities can eliminate the separation anxiety from humanities computing, as implied by Svensson (2009); the defining role of DH2 allows for the evolution of a new branch on the genealogical tree, establishing a distinct identity and objectives separate from humanities computing.

The work of Bordalejo (2016) diverges from that of previous scholars, characterizing genealogy in the digital humanities as neither a means of family lineage nor disciplinary narrative, but as applied stemmatology and research methodology. Bordalejo compared hand-drawn and digital humanities produced stemma of the manuscript tradition:

> Which takes into account not only the variation at the word level, but also data derived from annotations in the manuscript stating dates of copying, as well as occasionally, the names of scribes and the sources of the text.

Use of computer-generated stemma analyzes "how texts are transmitted and how variants are inherited," developing a genealogy of manuscript history and derivation. Genealogy in Bordalejo's scholarship is a seemingly sub-definition within the larger narrative of digital humanities; however, its residence within that category appears antithetical to previous scholars, as the sub-definition demonstrates a more holistic approach through production, use of resources and interpretation. The variation in use among these scholars presents a particular problem that continues to plague the discipline, limning an ambiguous identity that is difficult to trace and define.

Genealogy in digital humanities as family lineage

Genealogy as family lineage or family history is rarely mentioned in the digital humanities literature; however, the modicum of humanists and articles in recent years highlighting the historical value of digital humanities and genealogical records is showing promising results toward recognition within the field. A literature review by Van Leeuven and Zijdeman (2014) documenting the use of genealogical documents, such as electronic census records and vital registers by historians, contributed important insights about social, economic and labor history, such as the education, occupation and property of working women.

Digital Humanities Quarterly's recognition of electronic genealogy databases, including production and modification of databases, and users of digital genealogy resources (Crymble, 2016) are showing slow but positive inroads toward acceptance in the field. Discussion of browsing behavior, navigation, searching and metadata expands the view of digital resources beyond historians, and provides clear examples of how genealogy can fit within the heterogeneous field and serve as an important source of academic scholarship.

Arizona State University's Institute for Humanities Research (ASU Institute for the Digital Humanities, 2017) Facebook post, "Genetic Testing is Recreating Bonds Broken by Slavery" (Yong, 2017), serves as another example of newly recognized Digital Humanities tools; combining scientific research in collaborative partnerships coalesces with Koh (2014) and Dalbello's (2011) advocacy of expanding into cultural analysis. The capabilities of historical research, cultural analysis and scientific analysis through genealogy present digital humanities with extensive capacity for novel research in new media and intersectionality. Even in their similarities, however, further context is required to demonstrate how genealogy aligns with the practices and core tenants of the digital humanities.

Where does genealogy fit within the digital humanities?

Genealogy, like many other disciplines associated with the digital humanities, has found it difficult to find a receptive niche within the field. Although Ramsay (2011a) was highly criticized for remarks addressing the necessities to become a digital humanist, reconsideration of the earlier statement (Ramsay, 2011b) reflects an honest assessment of how the digital humanities field could and should be defined. In an examination of the skills generally regarded as acceptable by the digital humanities cohort, such as coding and building things, it was carefully recognized that [disciplines] "can really destroy themselves through over precise definition" (2011a). Consideration beyond software building, hacking social networks and creating visualization gives credence to digital humanities scholars who skillfully balance resource production and new media studies, giving some concessions to the counter-arguments of cultural analysis scholars.

Edwards (2012) extended beyond the debated requisite skill set, delving into the users of digital humanities tools. As many digital humanities centers are informationally siloed, competing for grants and prestige, Edwards pointed out a need for more inclusiveness for users to contribute and aid in the development of digital tools. Svensson (2012) concurred with this point in addressing the concept of "Big Tent Humanities," stressing that the digital humanities are "dynamic and, to some extent, [an] indeterminate field." It is within the larger scope, as being realized by continued assessment of the field, that there is room to accommodate new users and disciplines with the cohort. Schreibman (2012) succinctly summarized this transition, asserting that:

> [Digital Humanities] will have to reflect immense shifts: not simply a reshaping from a predominantly textual focus, but wholly new methodological practices, new theories, a plethora of new technologies, devices, and business practices, and publication models.

Digital humanities redress of past mistakes and determination to broaden inclusiveness provide avenues for practices, such as genealogy, to merge with the traditional, conceptual framework of digital humanities (and humanities computing). But does genealogy possess a formulated identity to integrate within the digital humanities cohort? By using the framework of the aforementioned scholars, it can be argued that it not only meets the criteria but also possessed the ability to advance the field through novel areas of contribution in cultural analysis and scientific technological research.

In long-established academic circles, genealogy has often been devalued and relegated to the status of an amateur pursuit, and generally not regarded as having any significant impact upon institutional programs. This antiquated identity often stems from the wide range of participants engaging in the activity, both of whom are professional and amateur. Fulton (2009) described genealogy "as a serious leisure, an amateur or voluntary activity in which the hobby forms a central life interest, with participants actively acquiring and expressing special skills, knowledge, and experience." In many ways, ageism also plays a significant role in this definition. Over 50 per cent of those engaging in genealogy are retired (Fulton, 2009), but as Moss (2007) acknowledged, with time, persistent genealogists can become records experts. While genealogy can, and often does, lead to open ended questions, this problem can be easily attributed to any formal discipline, such as history. These questions serve a vital and reciprocal role in scholarship, as historian Samuel Hayes insisted that "the concerns of historians can add a wider dimension to genealogy, and [. . .] the work of genealogists can provide crucial evidence for social history" (Taylor, 1980). It is in this context that genealogy can assume a more serious role in scholarly endeavors, and integrate itself within the digital humanities.

There is a rather striking similitude in the evolution of genealogy that runs parallel with humanities computing and digital humanities. Bianco (2012) asserted, "we are not required to choose between the philosophical, cultural, and computational; we are required to integrate and to experiment." It is with this perspective in mind that genealogy should, at least, comply with basic concepts identified by digital humanities scholars. In addition to the acceptance of production and coding, and the advocacy of cultural analysis and user studies, Dalbello (2011) outlined the formulation of the digital humanities, and a system for comparison in three stages: monumenta of digital humanities, maturation and institutionalization and humanist laboratories in the age of digital reproduction. Genealogy not only incorporates the elements provided among the suggested prerequisites but also in certain instances, may have been more progressive in adopting technologies, and presently offers new areas of experimentation to make novel contributions to the field.

Monumenta of digital humanities (searchable corpora and textual databases)

Traditionally, the process of genealogy simply consisted of the documentation of family histories. Collection of those documents was initiated by historians and/or librarians, such as Ruben Gold Thwaites and Daniel Durrie (heads of the Wisconsin Historical Society), who, respectively, believed that "all history was implicitly local history," and that "family and local history were the foundations underpinning the rest of the nation's history" (Edmonds, 2013). The practice of genealogical research, according to Boonstruck (1983), took root in the 1840s, with the creation of genealogy bibliographies and associations, such as the New England Historic Genealogical Society (1845), the Sons of the Revolution (1876), Daughters of the American Revolution (1890) and the Mayflower Descendants (1897).

Hatch (2006) demystified the modern misconception of document storage and genealogical research. While acknowledging that traditional practices are still applied, the transition of the field can now be considered a "collaboration of hybridized physical libraries

with digital collections." Comparing the dynamic changes in genealogy and humanities computing/digital humanities, it is evident that concurrent evolutions of technological adoptions were readily accepted by both fields of study. Closer examination of Roberto Busa's *Index Thomisticus* (Busa, 2004), which began with the investigation of technology produced by IBM in the 1940s, and later the development of the Perseus Project from 1987-1995 (Perseus Project, 2017) coincide with genealogical libraries' operations, who had similarly been experimenting with new and digital technologies.

The Genealogical Society of Utah was one of the first institutions to acquire a microfilm camera in 1938, and within two years had produced more than 2,000 rolls. In 1961, the society purchased a computer, and "hired an expert to organize records and process information" (Hatch, 2006). In the 1990s, the Family History Library of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (LDS) began partnering with several organizations to produce automated projects such as Freedman's Banks of Records (1990), the Ellis Island Genealogy Database (1993) and Familysearch.org (1999), which averages more than 15,000 visitors per day, and contains more than one billion names across the world. Such information as the International Genealogical Index, Ancestral File, Pedigree Resource File, USA Social Security Records and Death Index, Census and the Vital Records Index (Hatch, 2006) are invaluable resources for scholars conducting research on local, social, family and labor history.

Contemporary digitization efforts by commercial vendors, public and academic libraries, government organizations and academic institutions are helping merge genealogy and the digital humanities. In 1999, the Denver Public Library's Genealogy Department released a Web edition of 60,000 photographs (Denver Public Library, 1999), whereas the USA National Archives and Records Administration worked with the Genealogical Society of Utah to digitize and index applications of war widows from the Civil War (Bain, 2017). Academic institutions, such as the University of North Texas, received a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) to "develop a user-centered design process that digital libraries with humanities collections can implement to improve usability and effectiveness of the collections for targeted user groups, such as genealogists" (US Fed News Service, 2007). Stanford University launched *Kindred Britain* on their digital humanities website (Targeted News Service, 2013), and the IMLS and the University of North Carolina at Greensborough partnered to create the Digital Library on American Slavery (Bethany, 2010). In addition, vendors such as Gale have created projects like *Gale Genealogy Connect*, and ProQuest has supported awards for contributions to "the field of genealogical and local history librarianship" (Targeted News Service, 2016).

Despite these partnerships and the excellent contributions of professional and amateur genealogists, an academic framework is still necessary to provide scholarly guidance and increased professionalism to correspond with academicized digital humanities. Beginning in the 1970s, the Newberry Library:

> Lead a large scale program training historians at the doctoral and postdoctoral level, emphasizing the statistical and analytic methods necessary for the successful exploitation of large masses of local and family history materials (Ashton, 1977).

Although genealogy education is typically offered by genealogical institutes and organizations, collegiate institutions are starting to offer degrees in genealogy and family history research. Such institutions and programs include (Legacy Tree, 2017):

- BYU: Family History Program – Bachelor and Minor in Family History/Genealogy, and a Bachelor of General Studies with a History/Family History Emphasis;
- BYU-Idaho: Associate degree and certificate in Family History Research;

- University of Strathclyde – MSc in Genealogical, Paleographic, and Heraldic Studies;
- Boston University – Genealogical Research Certificate Program;
- Salt Lake City Community College – Certificate in Genealogy Research and Writing; and
- National Institute for Genealogical Studies-certificate.

The increasing number of programs illustrate a maturing process in genealogy that provides a pathway for creating a formalized connection with academia and professional and amateur genealogists. Added measures, such as FamilySearch's quality checking through indexing training (FamilySearch, 2017), and arbitrators that finalize records (after having indexed at least 4,000 records or 200 batches from a variety of products and skill levels) build additional levels of confidence in the accuracy of the transcribed records for historical research.

Humanist laboratories in the age of digital reproduction

Dalbello (2011) examined the purpose of digital humanities and the research that can be produced from the contents therein. Rather than looking at the archive as a traditional collection with specified focus, the Humanist Laboratory encourages using these materials to be critically evaluated for new connections and interpretations antipodal to conventional thought, or rather avant-garde expressions of hypotheses that engender manifold possibilities for testing nascent ideas:

> [The Humanist Laboratory] is a sort of "preliminary experiment" (note roots in scientific epistemology, congenial to the idea of "laboratory"), by which a scholar employs combinatory search results to find whether a particular connection is promising for further study. In this and other explorations of how deep reading fits the interpretive and historical (contextual) reading at the root of the humanistic endeavor, the purpose of the new humanities scholarship can be seen as cross-text-exegesis – heuristics through re-interpreting and re-imaging the archive.

Genealogy, at its core, is a process of continually testing cross-cultural connections, in an attempt to establish or refute relationships on the microscale and macroscale level. Analogous to digital humanities centers and institutes (ITHAKA S + R, 2014), genealogy laboratories, such as the Midwest Genealogy Center, The Allen County Public Library Genealogy Center and the Family History Library (FHL) exist as hybridized spaces for the use of print resources, microfilm and electronic databases. The FHL alone contains 1.4 million rolls of microfilm, 600,000 books, serials and maps and access to 550 internet accessible computers. They also employ 45 full- and part-time staff, and 550 full time volunteers (FamilySearch, 2017) to assist patrons make connections to their past, and develop new perspectives of their personal and familial identities. As Yakel (2004) stated, "family history is more appropriately viewed as a continuous process of seeking meaning." In alignment with Van Leeuven and Zijdeman (2014) and Koh (2014), genealogy can serve as a laboratory for exploring social criticism, even at the personal level, challenging preconceived notions of nationality, gender, occupation, ethnicity and cultural heritage.

These centers also provide space for research consultation, social interaction and discussion on the process and developments of genealogy (ILA Reporter, 2012). On the local level, historical societies connect local practitioners to develop a community for the exchange of ideas.

Ridge (2013) defined crowdsourcing as "projects tending to fall into common groups: the collection, description, transcription, or specialist digitization of material culture, natural history, and historic documents." Genealogy is a highly interactive scholarly network, where sharing and consultation is encouraged (Fulton, 2009), and where crowdsourcing

(Ridge, 2013) serves as a particularly important component for genealogists. Message boards are a frequent source of connecting users, such as the Rootsweb Community (Rootsweb, 2017), offering advice on searching strategies, shared family histories and opportunities for volunteers to investigate local archives for remote genealogists. Find a Grave is another important crowdsourcing tool, linking users to the gravesites (and gravestones) of relatives, yielding such information as birth and death dates, and potential relatives who are buried in family plots (Find a Grave, 2017).

These activities coincide with the methods of digital humanities, in which teams require trust and harmonization between individual and group goals (Siemens, 2009). Particularly within galleries, libraries, archives and museums (Roued-Cunliffe, 2017), crowdsourcing is also used to complete projects, such as the World War I *Operation War Diary* (Terras, 2016), and the National Archives Crowdsourcing Pilot Project (Kemp, 2013), a project that is useful for genealogists and historians alike.

Within any laboratory, technology is an essential component, and an ever-evolving set of tools that shape and reshape our perceptions of reality. Genealogy and digital humanities overlap in many of the ways they use technological tools for research methodologies and scholarly output, including areas of graphic information systems (GIS), metadata, text-data mining and data visualizations.

Kemp (2013) explained that GIS within context of digital humanities can be used for "collection, modeling, management, display, and interpretation of geographic information." As an alternative approach to GIS, Bodenhamer (2010) expanded into the yak divide of digital humanities, illustrating that class, capital, gender and race, among other concepts can be used by GIS as "intellectual framework for understanding power and society in times near and distant." Genealogy advantageously makes use of both interpretations through the examination of maps and tract books, demonstrating a heterogeneous approach of assimilating within the digital humanities. The Bureau of Land Management (USA Department of Interior, 2017) provides precise, detailed coordinates, showing property ownership and chronological migratory patterns. In addition, Platt Books, Sanborn Maps and Tract Books can provide a wealth of genealogical information exploring cultural history and analysis, examining such details as family members' ages, land use, place of birth, literacy and economic status.

Regarding text-data mining, Hearst (2003) defined the practice as "the discovery by computer of new, previously unknown information by automatically extracting information from different written resources [. . .] to form new facts or new hypotheses to be explored by more conventional means of experimentation." Building upon Hearst's assertion, Franklin (2006) explored ways in which genealogists could use text-data mining to search through large corpora of texts and images through OCR recognition and metadata attributions. Although inconsistent in nature, Franklin acknowledged the time constraints and problems involved with converting PDF files to OCR, but valued text-data mining as an evolving process. Metadata standards have since improved through the adoption of the Text Encoding Initiative, which enhances the ability for digital humanists to process data by computerized applications (Pierazzo, 2016) through conformant data to markup texts (Flanders and Jannidis, 2016). Roued-Cunliffe (2017) noted that genealogists frequently collect and manage data in a digital repository, attaching information in the form of metadata (e.g. dates, places, and names), as well as transcribing texts and adding descriptions to photographs. Most genealogy databases allow users to search through metadata to locate names on personal family trees, as well as conduct searches from transcribed historical and government records. Fire and Elovici (2015) used data mining of

genealogical databases to reveal lifespan patterns, showing a strong correlation between the importance of data-text mining within genealogy and the digital humanities.

The visualization of data and modeling illustrates the equilibrium between production and critical analysis. Whether variants or strongly correlated data, hypotheses can be tested for further exploration (Hearst, 2003). Jockers (2014) and Russell (2011) demonstrated how visualization can be produced through the use of API's, mining existing databases and data files of social media and literature. In line with these practices, genealogists use existing database corpora (e.g. Ancestry.com, HeritageQuest and FamilySearch,) to create familial representations and establish relationships among personal family trees, or connect with distant relatives through a common identified ancestor. As Flanders and Jannidis (2016) modeled textual variants, genealogists can participate in constructing models on the micro- and macrolevels. New programs such as the Ancestry DNA, 23andMe and the National Geographic Genographic Project establish intersectional relationships with the sciences to map DNA relationships, ethnic composition and migration patterns, in addition to constructing biological provenance (at least to the extent that present scientific data can provide). These new partnerships in genealogy fit with the expanding role of digital humanities in seeking out collaborative partners and crowdsourcing, and can serve as an example of crossing borders and exploring new areas of scholarship.

The importance of genealogy in shaping cultural interpretation: who are we as humans?

The production and analysis of digital works ultimately call us to question: what does it mean to be human? Situated within the debate between instrumentalism and cultural analysis, Liu (2012) suggested that "the lack of cultural criticism blocks the digital humanities from becoming a full partner with the humanities." Genealogy can serve as this bridge, containing a heuristic element, enabling individuals and groups to learn about the commonalities and differences of our past, present and visions of the future. As the study of family history is subject to misuse (like any discipline or idea), with misguided ideologies (Scodari, 2013; Edmonds, 2013), genealogy can also edify the core tenants of the humanities, "which can be described as the study of how people process and document the human experience" (Stanford Humanities Center, 2017). In this sense, genealogy represents the true human experience, both our flaws and excellence on the micro- and macro-level. The progression of genealogy and family history from production to analysis corresponds with the transition of production and coding (influenced by humanities computing) to the inclusion of experimental, cultural research adopted by the digital humanities. Is there room for genealogy in the digital humanities? As genealogy continues to create new partnerships of a collaborative nature, it can, and will, continue to contribute to new areas of study within the field. As these practices continue to converge with the digital humanities, genealogy should be recognized as a partner and member in the digital humanities context.

References

Ashton, R.J. (1977), "Hobbyists, and historians: Ninety years of genealogy at the Newberry library", *The Library Quarterly: Information, Community Policy*, Vol. 47 No. 2, pp. 149-162.

ASU Institute for the Digital Humanities (2017), "The importance of genetic testing for African Americans", available at: www.facebook.com/IHR.ASU/ (accessed 2 September 2017).

Bain, B. (2017), "Nara to digitize 1 million civil war records", *Federal Computer Week*, Vol. 21 No. 35, p. 12.

Bauer, J. (2011), "Who you calling untheoretical?", *Journal of Digital Humanities*, Vol. 1 No. 1, available at: http://journalofdigitalhumanities.org/1-1/who-you-calling-untheoretical-by-jean-bauer/ (accessed 11 November 2017).

Bianco, J.S. (2012), "This digital humanities which is not one", in Gold, M.K. (Ed.), *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, University of MN Press, Minneapolis, MN, pp. 96-112.

Bodenhamer, D.J. (2010), "The potential of spatial humanities", in Bodenhamer, D.J., Corrigan, J. and Harris T.M. (Eds), *The Spatial Humanities: GIS and the Future of Humanities Scholarship*, IN University Press, Bloomington, IN, pp. 14-31.

Boonstruck, L.D. (1983), "Four centuries of genealogy: a historical overview", *RQ*, Vol. 23 No. 2, pp. 162-170.

Bordalejo, B. (2016), "The genealogy of texts: Manuscript traditions and textual traditions", *Digital Scholarship in the Humanities*, Vol. 31 No. 3, pp. 563-577.

Busa, R.A. (2004), "Foreword: Perspectives on the digital humanities", in Schreibman, S., Siemens, R. and Unsworth, J. (Eds), *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 16-21.

Crane, G.R. (2017), "Background: Perseus digital library", available at: www.perseus.tufts.edu/hopper/about (accessed 11 November 2017).

Crymble, A. (2016), "Digital library search preferences amongst historians and genealogists: British history online user survey", *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, Vol. 10 No. 4, available at: www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/10/4/000270/000270.html (accessed 10 October 2017).

Dalbello, M. (2011), "A genealogy of the digital humanities", *Journal of Documentation*, Vol. 67 No. 3, pp. 480-506.

Denver Public Library (1999), "Denver public library releases Western history photographic digitization project on the web", *Information Intelligence Online Libraries and Microcomputers*, Vol. 17 No. 1, pp. 5-7.

Edmonds, M. (2013), "The roots of the Wisconsin genealogical society", *Museum Anthropology*, Vol. 38 No. 1, pp. 38-49.

Edwards, C. (2012), "The digital humanities and its users", in Gold, M.K. (Ed.), *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, University of MN Press, Minneapolis, MN, pp. 213-332.

FamilySearch (2017), "About us", available at: www.familysearch.org/locations/saltlakecity-library/ (accessed 12 November 2017).

Find A Grave (2017), "Find a grave", available at: www.findagrave.com/ (accessed 13 November 2017).

Fire, M. and Elovici, Y. (2015), "Data mining of online genealogy datasets for revealing lifespan patterns in human population", *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, Vol. 6 No. 2, pp. 1-21.

Flanders, J. and Jannidis, F. (2016), "Data modeling", in Schreibman, S., Siemens, R. and Unsworth, J. (Eds), *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 229-237.

Fulton, C. (2009), "Quid pro quo: Information sharing in leisure activities", *Library Trends*, Vol. 57 No. 4, pp. 753-768.

Franklin, B. (2006), "Genealogical data mining", available at: www.rootsweb.ancestry.com/~ncacgs/images/DataMiningSep2006.pdf (accessed 4 November 2017).

Hatch, G. (2006), "Family history library of the church of Jesus Christ of latter-day saints", *Serials Review*, Vol. 32 No. 2, pp. 137-142.

Hearst, M. (2003), "What is text mining?", available at: http://people.ischool.berkeley.edu/~hearst/text-mining.html (accessed 20 November 2017).

ILA Reporter (2012), "It's social, not just technological", June.

ITHAKA S+R (2014), "Sustaining the digital humanities: host institution support beyond the start-up phase", available at: www.sr.ithaka.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/08/SR_Supporting_Digital_Humanities_20140618f.pdf (accessed 15 October 2017).

Jockers, M.L. (2014), *Text Analysis with R for Students of Literature*, Springer, New York, NY.

Koh, A. (2014), "Niceness, building, and opening the genealogy of the digital humanities: beyond the social contract of humanities computing", *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, Vol. 25 No. 1, pp. 94-105.

Kemp, T.J. (2013), "National archives launches crowdsourcing site for transcription", available at: https://blog.genealogybank.com/national-archives-launches-crowdsourcing-site-for-transcription.html (accessed 11 November 2017).

Legacy Tree (2017), "There's a degree in that? Genealogical education opportunities", available at: www.legacytree.com/blog/theres-degree-genealogical-education-opportunities (accessed 10 October 2017).

Liu, A. (2012), "Where is cultural criticism in the digital humanities?", in Gold, M.K. (Ed.), *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, University of MN Press, Minneapolis, MN, pp. 490-509.

Moss, M. (2007), "Choreographed encounter: the archive and public history", *Archives*, Vol. 32 No. 116, pp. 41-57.

Pierazzo, R. (2016), "Textual scholarship and text encoding", in Schreibman, S., Siemens, R. and Unsworth John (Eds), *A Companion to Digital Humanities, Blackwell*, Oxford, pp. 306-321.

Ramsay, S. (2011a), "Who's in and who's out", *MLA Annual Convention*, 7 January, Los Angeles, CA.

Ramsay, S. (2011b), "On building", available at: http://stephenramsay.net/text/2011/01/11/on-building/ (accessed 2 November 2017).

Ridge, M. (2013), "From tagging to theorizing: deepening engagement with cultural heritage through crowdsourcing", *Curator: The Museum Journal*, Vol. 56 No. 4, pp. 1-16.

Rootsweb (2017), "Message boards", available at: http://boards.rootsweb.com/?o_iid=33216&o_lid=33216&o_sch=Web+Property (accessed 1 November 2017).

Roued-Cunliffe, H. (2017), "Collection building amongst heritage amateurs", *Collection Building*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 96-107.

Russell, M.A. (2011), *Mining the Social Web*, O"Reily, Sebastopol, CA.

Russell, T.G. and Sugimoto, C.R. (2009), "IMPACT family trees: quantifying academic genealogy in library and information science", *Journal of Education for Library and Information Science*, Vol. 50 No. 4, pp. 248-262.

Scodari, C. (2013), "Roots, representation, and resistance? Family history media and culture through a critical lens", *The Journal of American Culture*, Vol. 36 No. 3, pp. 206-220.

Schreibman, S. (2012), "Digital humanities: centres and peripheries", *Historical Social Research*, Vol. 37 No. 3, pp. 46-57.

Siemens, L. (2009), "It's a team if you use 'reply all': An exploration of research teams in digital humanities environments", *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, Vol. 24 No. 2, pp. 225-233.

Sperry, K., (2008), "Oral genealogies in the pacific islands", in Neilson, R.L., Harper, S.C., Manscill, C.K. and Mary, J.W. (Eds), *Regional Studies in Latter-Day Saint Church History: The Pacific Isles*, Brigham Young University Press, Provo, UT, pp. 75-92.

Stanford Humanities Center (2017), "What are the humanities?", available at: http://shc.stanford.edu/what-are-the-humanities (accessed 20 November 2017).

Svensson, P. (2009), "Humanities computing as digital humanities", *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, Vol. 3 No. 3, available at: www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/3/3/000065/000065.html (accessed 3 November 2017).

Svensson, P. (2012), "Beyond the big tent", in Gold, M.K. (Ed.), *Debates in the Digital Humanities*, University of MN Press, Minneapolis, MN, pp. 36-49.

Targeted News Service (2013), "New Stanford website takes a digital approach to an ancient topic: families", 26 August.

Targeted News Service (2016), "Padilla, McNabb named award winners for historical, genealogical research, achievements", 3 March.

Taylor, R.M. Jr (1980), "The genealogical information base in family history research", in Raben, J. and Marks, G.. (Eds), *Databases in the Humanities and Social Sciences*, Elsevier, pp. 131-135.

Terras, M. (2016), "Crowdsourcing in the digital humanities", in Schreibman, S., Siemens, R. and Unsworth John (Eds), *A Companion to Digital Humanities*, Blackwell, Oxford, pp. 421-438.

Underwood, T. (2017), "A genealogy of distant reading", *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, Vol. 11 No. 2, available at: www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/11/2/000317/000317.html (accessed 15 November 2017).

US Fed News Service (2007), "University of North Texas libraries receive grant to assist genealogical researchers", 5 October.

Van Leeuven, M.H.D. and Zijdeman, R.L. (2014), "Digital humanities and the history of working women: a Cascade", *The History of the Family*, Vol. 19 No. 4, pp. 411-425.

Yakel, E. (2004), "Seeking information, seeking connections, seeking meaning: genealogists and family historians", *Informed Research*, Vol. 10 No. 1, available at: www.informationr.net/ir/10-1/paper205.html (accessed 10 November 2017).

Yong, E. (2017), "How African Americans use DNA testing to connect with their past", The Atlantic, 21 June, available at: www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2017/06/how-african-americans-use-dna-testing-to-connect-with-their-past/531834/ (accessed 2 September 2017).

Further reading

Latham, B. (2010), "Eye on the net: new and notable", *Reference Reviews; Harlow*, Vol. 24 No. 2, p. 5.

US Department of Interior (2017), "Bureau of land management: general land office records", available at: https://glorecords.blm.gov/details/patent/default.aspx?accession=MI1950.461&docClass=STA&sid=kk0vgcxf.dfu (accessed 5 November 2017).

Corresponding author

Casey Daniel Hoeve can be contacted at: achoeve@ksu.edu