



UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

This is a repository copy of *Negotiating digital public spaces: context, purpose and audiences*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:

<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/191881/>

Version: Accepted Version

Article:

Bettavia, RS and Stainforth, E (2022) Negotiating digital public spaces: context, purpose and audiences. *Journal of Documentation*. ISSN 0022-0418

<https://doi.org/10.1108/jd-04-2022-0079>

© 2022, Emerald Publishing Limited. This is an author produced version of an article published in *Journal of Documentation*. Uploaded in accordance with the publisher's self-archiving policy.

Reuse

Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>



**Negotiating Digital Public Spaces: Context, Purpose,
Audiences**

Journal:	<i>Journal of Documentation</i>
Manuscript ID	JD-04-2022-0079.R1
Manuscript Type:	Article
Keywords:	Public Libraries, Digital libraries, Digital Public Space, Public Space, Audiences, Digital Public Library of America, Public Goods

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Title: Negotiating Digital Public Spaces: Context, Purpose, Audiences

Structured Abstract

Design/Method/Approach

The article investigates tensions arising from the conjuncture of public spaces and digital culture through the lens of the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA). This research uses qualitative content analysis of a range of data sources including semi-structured interviews, primary texts, and secondary texts.

Purpose

The purpose is to investigate the logic of digital public spaces and their relationship to both ideas of nationhood, and to physical public institutions and their audiences.

Findings

The construction of the public library space as a digital entity does not attract anticipated audiences. Additionally, the national framing of the DPLA is not compatible with how audiences engage with digital public spaces.

Originality/Value

Drawing on original, qualitative data, this article engages with the prevalent but undertheorized concept of digital public spaces. The article addresses unreflexive uses of the digital public and the assumptions connected to the imagined audiences for platforms like the DPLA.

Introduction

In July 2018, *Forbes* published an editorial by Long Island University economist Panos Mourdoukoutas, titled 'Amazon Should Replace Local Libraries to Save Taxpayers Money'. The core message was that 'Amazon has provided something better than a local library without the tax fees', with its new initiative *Amazon Go* combining 'a library with a Starbucks' (Mourdoukoutas, 2018). Within hours, the piece received over 200,000 views, and was met with backlash on the news site and on Twitter, prompting a retraction from *Forbes*. The responses on Twitter are telling. Many people referred to their usage of public libraries and

1
2
3 their experiences as personal beneficiaries of these spaces. A number of respondents also
4 stressed the value of libraries, in terms of the community and cultural life they engender, as a
5 worthwhile tax expenditure. Finally, social media comments emphasized free access and the
6 democratic principles of libraries, as opposed to monopolistic for-profit corporations like
7 Amazon (see Nadler and Cicillinie, 2020).
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 The outpouring of support following the publication of the editorial is revealing of the values
19 and agendas inscribed in public library discourse, particularly in the context of the US. As
20 Shannon Mattern comments, 'One key misperception of those who proclaim the library's
21 obsolescence is that its function as a knowledge institution can be reduced to its technical
22 services and information offerings' (2014). In contrast, Twitter comments foregrounded
23 benefits which are harder to quantify, notably libraries' contributions to community,
24 democracy, and the equitable distribution of knowledge and resources (e.g. music and ebooks).
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35 The fact that they provide free Internet usage, enabling online participation in services relating
36 to health care access, housing, voting, and job searching, also highlight the significant role of
37 libraries as a public good.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The *Forbes* controversy raises larger questions about the role of non-governmental public
46 entities in digital spaces and how these are constructed and used by digital and analog publics.
47
48
49
50 Part of this conversation centers on digital cultural content and access to digital holdings, which
51 are increasingly important and inform the 'public' framing of non-commercial online initiatives
52 during the last ten years, including the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA), the Internet
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Archive (IA), and the Wikimedia Foundation. However, the privatized infrastructure of the
4
5 Internet mediates engagement with these holdings and signals the simultaneous restructuring
6
7 of audience relationships with public culture (Usher, 2021; Noble, 2020; Yeo, 2020). Making
8
9 sense of what a digital public space might look like has renewed and urgent significance in the
10
11 wake of the COVID-19 pandemic, when many public institutions, including libraries, have been
12
13 pushed to expand their online access and provisions, while facing funding cuts. This article
14
15 investigates tensions arising from the conjuncture of public spaces and digital culture through
16
17 the lens of the Digital Public Library of America (DPLA). We undertake qualitative content
18
19 analysis of a range of data sources including semi-structured interviews, primary texts, and
20
21 secondary texts. Attention is given to the ambivalence surrounding the DPLA's uptake of the
22
23 'public library' mantle, and the shifting conception of its role and the resources a digital public
24
25 space might be expected to provide for audiences. To explore the issues arising from the
26
27 attempt to demarcate a national digital public space, we ask:
28
29
30
31
32
33

34
35
36
37 **R1** What is the relationship between (digital) public spaces and (digital) public libraries?
38

39
40 **R2** What type of audience and community find ready expression in digital interpretations of
41
42 traditionally physical public spaces?
43

44
45 **R3** Who are the digital public?
46
47
48

49
50 The DPLA serves as a vehicle to interrogate these larger theoretical and conceptual concerns.

51
52 The DPLA's focus on a 'national', 'public' audience sits uneasily alongside its practical
53
54 implementation online. We argue that unclear assumptions about audiences and online
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 engagement have hindered the DPLA's service model and its desire to provide a platform for a
4
5 digital public.
6
7
8
9

10 **Libraries, the Public Sphere and (Digital) Public Spaces**

11
12 Understandings of public spaces like the library have historically been framed through the
13
14 concept of the public sphere (Habermas, 1989), in which libraries materially embody a forum
15
16 for free and equal speech or access (Buschman and Leckie, 2007; D'Angelo, 2006; Webster,
17
18 2010). In the US library tradition, the public sphere discourse has found expression in the idea
19
20 of the 'informed citizen', whose access to information enables their participation in the rational
21
22 and democratic discussion of public matters (Seale, 2016). This ethos was embedded in the first
23
24 public libraries, founded in the 1850s, and consolidated in the creation of the American Library
25
26 Association (ALA) in 1876 (Harris, 1999). Such foundational beliefs persist in contemporary
27
28 assumptions about the value of libraries, in conjunction with the more recent view that publicly
29
30 funded and maintained institutions represent a defense against the widespread privatization
31
32 and marketization of core services. These debates have also invoked the notion of libraries as a
33
34 public good, as sites of free knowledge provision and a bulwark against the commodification of
35
36 information (ALA, 2004; Kerslake and Kinnell, 1998; Pawley and Robbins, 2013). Here, the wider
37
38 social purpose of the library starts to become visible, as a place that stands for a system of
39
40 values beyond the fiscal (Smith, 2012).
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The original public sphere concept is based on fundamental inequalities and exclusions, largely
53
54 on the grounds of race, gender, class and sexuality, which translate into uneven access to public
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 fora (Fraser, 1990; Bourdieu, 1996). For some commentators, the aspirations of the public
4
5 sphere are useful, but limited, demanding a more nuanced understanding of how universal or
6
7 democratic claims work in practice (Fung, 2003; Tsing, 2005; Widdersheim and Koizumi, 2015).
8
9

10 The spatial metaphors through which publicness has been circumscribed - including the
11
12 imaginary of the public library - expose the exclusions of such liberal democratic ideals (Barnett,
13
14 2008; Newman, 2007; Warner, 2002). Many US-based practitioners and researchers are
15
16 increasingly confronting these issues and recognizing them as foundational to library practice
17
18 (Honma, 2005; Bourg, 2014; Hathcock, 2015; Drake and Bielefield, 2017; Gibson et al, 2017a;
19
20 Gibson et al, 2017b; Crooks, 2019; Polebaum-Freeman, 2019; Gibson et al, 2020). Libraries are
21
22 bound tightly with shifting notions of who and what are implicated in publicness and how
23
24 democratic engagement can be enacted.
25
26
27
28
29
30

31
32 In the digital realm, the idea of the public sphere has come under pressure regarding its
33
34 applicability to online environments. Manuel Castells notes the ways in which some large tech
35
36 organizations shunt the interests of the public to the margins of the networked society (2008).
37
38 We see this playing out in the increasing dominance of private actors on the web: for example,
39
40 the Wikimedia foundation stands out as the lone non-profit in the top traffic web properties
41
42 against competitors like Google, Meta, Microsoft and Amazon. Zizi Papacharissi (2003) suggests
43
44 that *digital public spaces* should not be conflated with *digital public spheres* and that political
45
46 debate online must be distinguished from past experiences of public discourse. Jodie Dean
47
48 (2009) goes further, arguing that the Internet is made up of contestatory neodemocratic
49
50 networks and cannot be understood within a political architecture of the public sphere. These
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 writers show how digital technologies shape and are shaped by existing social formations, and
4
5 stress that the emergence of publics and constituencies of interest must be rooted in analysis of
6
7 socio-technical relations. They foreground the contingency of public formation and the role of
8
9 technology as part of a network of relations that can be reconfigured to create radically
10
11 different publics (Cody, 2011). This body of work productively unsettles the link to older notions
12
13 of the public sphere as a forum that assumes a particular public or audience in advance. Such
14
15 approaches also contend with the ways the privatized infrastructure of the Internet reorganizes
16
17 dimensions of public culture (Andrejevic, 2007; Chun, 2016; Crooks, 2019; Noble, 2020; Yeo,
18
19 2020). Building on these insights, we use the term *digital public space* in this article to refer to a
20
21 platform that provides a space of engagement for digital public audiences.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 Ongoing research into digital public spaces in the cultural sector has attempted to navigate the
31
32 diverse spatial configurations of public institutions and hybrid physical-digital spaces (Audunson
33
34 et al, 2017; Hemment et al, 2013). Efforts which focus on libraries at the intersection of physical
35
36 and digital space have emphasized the socially and technically mediated aspects of publicness
37
38 (Borgman, 2000; 2003; Niegaard, 2011; Mattern, 2014). In the UK, Hartley (2015) has examined
39
40 place-based publics and looked at strategies for making digital collections more public-centered
41
42 online. Hartley's work foregrounds the connection between the platforms and their audiences:
43
44 providing digital collections alone is not sufficient to create a space of engagement. Rather, an
45
46 attendance to shared interests and values is necessary to draw audiences to use platforms
47
48 (Hartley, 2015; Castells, 2008). The DPLA has highlighted comparable priorities, in negotiating
49
50 between its value proposition as a provider of digital services and its public purpose.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methodology

The article addresses unreflexive uses of the digital public and the assumptions connected to the imagined audiences for digital public spaces. The DPLA is the site of focus for this investigation. We conducted a qualitative content analysis of a range of data sources, including interviews; the DPLA's public-facing website; DPLA strategy and policy documentation; DPLA event documentation; and secondary literature documenting the history of the DPLA.

As part of a larger study on digital heritage platforms, we interviewed 7 current and former employees of the DPLA in 2018 and 2019. Interview subjects were intentionally chosen to represent the DPLA's history and myriad projects, ranging from a former director to a participant who worked in a state hub. We followed recommendations from interviewees regarding future interviews in relation to particular topics such as the infrastructural design process and the development of ethical technology practices. Our interview protocol was semi-structured and we incorporated additional questions at the suggestion of interviewees.

The research corpus also includes materials generated by the organization. We examined news updates, policy documents, and strategic planning statements released by the DPLA via email and its website. We also included secondary literature, which was predominantly written by former and current staff of the DPLA. Using the Internet Archive's Wayback Machine, we viewed the DPLA's public web presence at annual intervals from 2011 to the time of writing, with additional crawled content around the official launch period. Finally, we included

1
2
3 recordings of plenary events from the DPLA's annual conference, DPLAFest, along with
4
5
6 webinars presenting new projects and partnerships in 2019 and 2020.
7

8 **Table 1**

9
10 **[see additional file submission]**

11
12 Both researchers engaged in qualitative coding of the materials, attending to emerging themes
13
14 suggested by interview participants. Recurrent codes include:
15

- 16 ● the name/naming process of DPLA;
- 17
- 18 ● appeals to "nation"/being "of America";
- 19
- 20 ● the relationship between libraries and books;
- 21
- 22 ● the rationale for metadata aggregation.
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28
- 29

30 Using this data, we identified the challenges that stem from the DPLA's self-identification with
31
32 the public library tradition versus its current status as an online-only resource.
33
34

35 36 37 **The Digital Public Library of America: What's in a Name?**

38
39 The DPLA is a digital, non-profit initiative, which has received funding from a mixture of US
40
41 government grant agencies and private research foundations throughout its lifespan. Its stated
42
43 goal is to provide free access to collections from cultural institutions across the US, via an online
44
45 platform (<https://dp.la/>). It aggregates metadata about these collections, making it searchable
46
47 in a centralized location. It also has an online exhibitions feature which draws together content
48
49
50 from different contributing institutions. Beyond these functions, the DPLA has been
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 characterized by a grander purpose, that of providing a digital public space for users, in much
4
5 the same way that physical libraries have been imagined as a form of public space.
6
7

8 **Image 1**

9
10 *Screenshot of dp.la landing page taken 2022-04-08 [see additional file submission]*
11
12

13
14
15 The DPLA was originally conceived as a public, non-commercial alternative to Google Books,
16
17 explicitly invoking the egalitarian principles of the US public library movement in the nineteenth
18
19 century: ‘The DPLA, we resolved, would be “an open, distributed network of comprehensive
20
21 online resources that would draw on the nation’s living heritage from libraries, universities,
22
23 archives, and museums in order to educate, inform, and empower everyone in the current and
24
25 future generations”’ (Darnton, 2013). The DPLA’s system was built on a distributed database
26
27 model, aggregating metadata and pointing to the institutional sites where digitized collections
28
29 were held. In November 2011, the DPLA debuted at a national gathering of library professionals
30
31 in Los Angeles aimed at mapping out a blueprint for library engagements in the digital era. It
32
33 was presented as a potential collaborative partner for libraries wanting to expand their digital
34
35 holdings, alongside the HathiTrust and the Internet Archive. Specifically, the project was
36
37 described as ‘an umbrella organization for those wanting to be involved in creating a national
38
39 digital library’ (De Rosa et al, 2012). This coincided with the construction of the DPLA’s beta
40
41 web platform, before the official launch in April 2013. When the website went live, the DPLA
42
43 had aggregated a substantial amount of digital content metadata, primarily from larger
44
45 partners such as Harvard University, the New York Public Library, and the Smithsonian. The
46
47 platform continues to expand, via its partners, smaller organizations, and by establishing state-
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 based 'Service Hubs' for the ingestion of metadata. At time of writing, the DPLA's website
4
5 provides access to over 41 million images, texts, videos, and audio files. However, in the years
6
7 since the project launch, there has been a strategic shift in priorities from amassing metadata
8
9 toward improving access to items such as ebooks, a move that will be examined in more detail
10
11 below.
12
13
14
15
16
17

18 The DPLA's association with public libraries is foundational to its ethos, but it has also been a
19
20 cause for concern from the project's early stages. The naming and the original framing of the
21
22 DPLA implies an historical through-line that situates it within a trajectory of unifying cultural
23
24 banners and political divestment in public resources. For example, the report from a working
25
26 group meeting in 2011 recorded that participants 'expressed concerns that a DPLA may
27
28 inadvertently take public funding away from existing public libraries, while others pointed out
29
30 that a DPLA could help drive attention to public libraries. Many participants emphasized that a
31
32 DPLA will support, not replace, existing public libraries' (DPLA, 2011: p. 4). As the extract
33
34 suggests, the DPLA and public libraries meet at the intersection of knowledge organization and
35
36 dissemination. However, the doubts raised about the DPLA are revealing of its entanglement in
37
38 debates about diminishing government funding for institutions like public libraries and state
39
40 museums. During its first years, the DPLA defined itself as 'a portal, platform, and public option
41
42 for access' (DPLA, 2013), and the project focused on supplementing public library services, with
43
44 activities including digitization, metadata creation and enhancement, hosting, and community
45
46 outreach programs. By 2015, the 'public' had been recast as 'a critical, open intellectual
47
48 landscape [...] in the face of increasingly restrictive digital options' (DPLA, 2015). Here, the DPLA
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 explicitly acknowledged the growing privatization of digital cultural content, the ongoing
4
5 challenges around the management of licensed ebooks, and the pervasiveness of paywalled
6
7 provisions. In this statement, it is possible to read both an attempt to position the DPLA in
8
9 opposition to such corporate entities and to define a public mission distinct from that of public
10
11 libraries to allay fears about possible competition for resources. The 2019-2022 Strategic Plan
12
13 continues to foreground the DPLA's supplementary role, insofar as it seeks to amplify 'the value
14
15 of libraries and cultural organizations as Americans' most trusted sources of shared knowledge'
16
17 (DPLA, 2019). Its ebooks initiative, which works to improve libraries' e-content experience, is
18
19 now given equal weighting to cultural heritage collections with regard to the DPLA's goal of
20
21 making digital content freely accessible to all.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 In interviews we conducted with current and former members of the DPLA's core service team,
31
32 the question of the project's relationship with libraries, and specifically public libraries, came up
33
34 several times. Interviewees held divergent views about the significance of the name and its
35
36 impact on perceptions of the DPLA. To some extent though, they all reflected on the potential
37
38 mismatch between audience expectations of a public library and the DPLA's services. Staff
39
40 positioned differently within the project conceded this mismatch to varying degrees. Dan
41
42 Cohen (former DPLA Director) stressed that it was the openness implied by 'public library' that
43
44 was important, stating:
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 Every single word in DPLA can be contested but that's a silly reason to attack it [...] I
53
54 think particularly the middle two words of 'public library' were really essential to the
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 project in that, while it did include research materials it was there for the public, it was
4
5 there for people who do not have the privilege of being at the research institution, that
6
7 might not have access to large-scale license collections and so the public library part was
8
9 important.
10
11
12
13
14

15 On the other hand, with the benefit of hindsight, Emily Gore (former DPLA Director for
16
17 Content), wished that the project 'didn't call out one specific type of institution because people
18
19 saw that very literally. [...] it was not meant to be very literal. It was meant to be like a public
20
21 library, like all are welcome, right?'. Or, as Michael Della Bitta (DPLA Director of Technology)
22
23 commented, 'I do run into complaints about some of the words, or how can you say you're a
24
25 library if you don't have any holdings?' These contrasting perspectives are expressive of the
26
27 conceptual versus the literal notion of the public library and its status in the DPLA.
28
29
30
31
32
33
34

35 The public library also informed perceptions of the DPLA's core work. Interviewees confirmed
36
37 the initial focus on building partnerships, establishing hubs, and setting up the technical
38
39 infrastructure for data aggregation, but suggested that this was not the end game of the DPLA.
40
41

42 Gretchen Gueguen (former DPLA Data Services Coordinator) remarked that 'the metadata
43
44 aggregation came about as a "we think it's a doable thing, like other people are doing this" [...] I
45
46 don't think it was always thought that that would be all it was'. Thoughts about the viability of
47
48 data aggregation were balanced by other priorities, particularly the aim to provide a library
49
50 platform for open and licensed ebooks. Kelcy Shepherd (former DPLA Network Manager) said, 'I
51
52 think that's where some of DPLA's ebooks work comes in, with this idea of it trying to carry that
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 role of the public library forward'. These interviews show how the imaginary of the public
4
5 library was delimiting both staff and user expectations, and ultimately played a significant role
6
7 in the DPLA's major strategic objectives.
8
9

10
11
12 The ambivalence surrounding the naming of the DPLA from the outset, as reflected above, has
13
14 been grounded in tensions arising from comparisons with physical public libraries. These
15
16 comparisons have plagued theorizations and practical implementations of digital libraries since
17
18 their emergence, as noted by a number of scholars (Borgman, 1999; Gooding and Terras, 2017).
19
20 In the case of the DPLA, there is a recognition that public library users and DPLA users comprise
21
22 different kinds of audiences, but its designation as a public entity is directed toward universal
23
24 openness, complicating its superficially national boundaries. In order to draw out the
25
26 relationship between abstract and more local expressions of publicness, it is necessary to
27
28 examine how the DPLA constructs and engages with its audiences.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 **Who Are the Digital Public?**

38
39 The discussion has so far focused on the political and conceptual purchase of the 'public
40
41 library', as a public good equally accessible to all, and the extent to which this can be
42
43 meaningfully translated into a digital public space. The matter of audiences, and who the DPLA
44
45 is for, is also crucial to consider in order to make sense of how engagement can happen in this
46
47 kind of non-governmental, non-commercial project. Here, we analyze how the DPLA is framed
48
49 and constrained by its projected audiences, which sit uneasily within national, local and state,
50
51 or institutional structures, and involve financial interests from both public and private sources.
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 We use the term 'audience', with its discursive baggage, intentionally. The DPLA offers a means
4
5 to explore the definition of audience in the digital age: rather than employ terms like user,
6
7 stakeholder, con-/prosumer, or receiver, we instead opt for audience to invoke both its
8
9 imaginary and its material potential (Bratich, 2005).
10
11

12
13
14
15 First, it is important to note the multiplicity of the DPLA's audiences (Matusiak, 2017) and to
16
17 recognize that these have not always been clearly distinguished in planning and strategy
18
19 documents. An emphasis on 'access' and empowering 'the public', which has been reiterated in
20
21 the DPLA's strategic plans, contributes to this vagueness. As Cohen suggests, 'Open access has
22
23 often operated under the assumption that digitizing and putting materials online will be action
24
25 enough. It does not conceive of much interactivity or permeability between the digital library
26
27 and the public' (2020: p. 27). There are also barriers to defining users of digital content on
28
29 cultural heritage platforms, where general terms like 'visitor' cannot be easily translated into
30
31 online activities, which are more targeted (Hamma, 2004). Darren Peacock and Jonny Brownbill
32
33 make the stronger claim that, 'There is no "audience" for Web sites, simply people who use the
34
35 Web for their own purposes. The audience framework obscures this fact and sidesteps the
36
37 question of what those purposes are' (2007). The solution they propose is to develop metrics
38
39 geared toward finding out user motivations, a more difficult task when access is often assumed
40
41 as the *sine qua non* of web-based resources. Furthermore, website usage metrics are of limited
42
43 value for capturing user motivations. As Della Bitta (Director of Technology) voiced, '[Success]
44
45 can be hard to measure, because it's just based on clicks, and that one metric doesn't
46
47 necessarily tell you anything'.
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6 An important factor influencing the DPLA's engagement with audiences is its network of hubs
7
8 and its partnerships with libraries and museums. These constitute a fundamental, if non-
9
10 conventional, audience, which has been increasingly recognized in the DPLA's policy statements
11
12 as it works toward a sustainable, non-grant based, funding structure. One interviewee
13
14 reinforced this view, saying: '...DPLA does have this responsibility to its contributing institutions.
15
16 You know, in some ways I would say they're the primary stakeholder'. However, as well as
17
18 providing the partners with a service, the DPLA is also reliant on their collections content to
19
20 feed its database and website. This complex relationship throws into doubt the scenarios of use
21
22 envisaged for other kinds of audiences and implies a service defined more around the
23
24 infrastructure of the DPLA than around the needs of different groups. In essence, the DPLA's
25
26 projected audiences become a functional mirror of the project itself (Bettavia and Stainforth,
27
28 2017). A former member of the DPLA's team identified a similar issue, suggesting that, 'A lot of
29
30 times the multiple audiences were at odds with one another. In part, because we thought we
31
32 could serve everybody, or we thought we could serve everybody equally and it's clear that you
33
34 have to make hard choices'.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 The challenge the DPLA faces in defining its audiences is bound together with that of
46
47 establishing a sustainable funding model. The DPLA has historically been funded by grants. Early
48
49 large-scale grants for building infrastructure came from public monies from federal agencies
50
51 like the Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) and the National Endowment for the
52
53 Humanities (NEH). In recent years, funding has been more project based, coming from private
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 agencies including the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, the Whiting Foundation, and
4
5 anonymous donors. The DPLA lists its current funders as Knight, Mellon, Pivotal Ventures, and
6
7 Sloan, all private money organizations (DPLA, 2020a). Concurrent with the shift from public to
8
9 private funds, the DPLA has been creating a fee structure for its hub members. This
10
11 development further complicates the stakeholder/audience nexus, and potentially makes the
12
13 DPLA more reliant on the hubs as it formalizes the service provider relationship through fees.
14
15 These hubs are now bread and butter to the DPLA, both in the content that feeds its aggregator
16
17 and in the funding which feeds its operations.
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 The history of the DPLA's funding in part accounts for the national framing of its services. For
26
27 example, in 2014, the DPLA received an IMLS National Digital Platform initiative grant in order
28
29 to expand its service hub network (Gore et al, 2017). However, Lucy Bernholz suggests that,
30
31 while the DPLA was originally conceived as a public resource, it was not necessarily intended to
32
33 be rooted in government; rather, it was 'influenced by the possibilities engendered by digital
34
35 assets, the culture of open-source software, and the norms of libraries. The hope was to build a
36
37 governance structure that shared some of the characteristics of the technology it was designed
38
39 to manage' (2016: p. 195). Similar sentiments toward openness and inclusion were reflected in
40
41 the DPLA's Technology Team Core Values statement, a document which was finalized in 2016
42
43 (DPLA, 2016). One interviewee described the process of creating the statement as part of 'a
44
45 conscious effort to get on the same page about how we wanted to work together,' while
46
47 another noted that the tech values became foundational to the ethos of the whole
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60 organization.

1
2
3
4
5
6 The characterization of the DPLA as a national project *not* grounded in government raises
7
8 questions about who and what purpose 'nation' serves in the project. The idea of the 'well-
9
10 informed citizen' emerging from the US public library tradition was heavily implicated in a
11
12 government project of nation-building. Yet the DPLA's emphasis on being 'open, global and
13
14 distributed' (Darnton, 2020) does not assume a self-identifying national audience in the same
15
16 way. This further obscures the matter of who the digital public are, and how far the national is
17
18 compatible with local structures, social arrangements and technologies (Bowker et al, 2010).
19
20
21
22 The DPLA makes an appeal to the concept of nation in its designation of being 'of America'.
23
24 Simultaneously, work with regional organizations and some of its grant projects focus on access
25
26 to hidden collections built on relationships with smaller, localized communities (Cohen, 2020).
27
28
29 While there is not a simple dichotomy between nation and community (Bettavia and Stainforth,
30
31 2019), commonplace uses of these terms prompt consideration of how far the nation is
32
33 compatible with communities in digital public spaces. Community is often embraced as a more
34
35 authentic site for creating and valuing cultural heritage materials, but it can also have the effect
36
37 of othering people, placing them in opposition to homogenized imaginaries of national identity
38
39 (Hall, 1996; Anderson, 2006; Manguel, 2020). Furthermore, some communities have voiced
40
41 concerns about affiliation with national collecting institutions and the potential loss of
42
43 autonomy and control over important cultural materials (Caswell et al, 2017).
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 The community values of sites such as libraries are also embodied in their physical space. As
53
54 Mattern puts it, 'The library has always been a place where informational and social
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 infrastructures intersect within a physical infrastructure that (ideally) supports that program'
4
5 (2014). US public libraries provide a venue for the creation and sustenance of a variety of self-
6
7
8 selected community affiliations, from participation in maker spaces, to health and movement
9
10 initiatives for the elderly, to toddler story hours. They anchor communities, providing social
11
12 gathering places, shelter, and access to public and government services, often by providing
13
14 access to high-speed Internet. These functions have been thrown into relief by closures
15
16 associated with the COVID-19 pandemic: in the US, libraries have faced pressure to reopen
17
18 while librarians and library staff have not typically been prioritized for vaccination schemes.
19
20
21 Many libraries have expanded access to ebook titles, digital license numbers, or undertaken
22
23 partnerships in endeavors such as the Internet Archive's pandemic project to lend digital
24
25 versions of textbooks to at-home students (Freeland, 2020; Jæger and Blaabæk, 2020; Vieira,
26
27 2020; Wang and Lund, 2020). The clamor for libraries to reopen in-person services highlights
28
29 the importance of their physical presence.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36

37 In the creation of digital publics, libraries leverage their physical infrastructure for digital
38
39 engagement. Libraries are recognized as inherently hybrid. The DPLA cannot rely on physical
40
41 infrastructure for audience and community-building, which is one of several obstacles that
42
43 work against its ability to have local reach. As Shepherd (former DPLA Network Manager)
44
45 commented, 'I think [the DPLA] could certainly do more close work with user communities, but
46
47 I think part of the challenge there is being national, you don't have that like "we are part of the
48
49 community", you know, we're not. In that way, I think it is hard to be a national public library
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 [...] [E]ven state libraries maybe don't have as much of a challenge finding and tapping into their
4
5 community in terms of users'.
6
7
8
9

10
11 Alongside absent communities, the DPLA exemplifies the issues thrown up around technical
12
13 infrastructures, which are framed as national, or universal, expressions of publicness. The DPLA
14
15 has regional hubs and presents curated, geographically-specific collections. At the same time,
16
17 the scale implied by the DPLA's website is big, national, and aimed at universality, which is also
18
19 reflected in their metadata aggregation model. In practice though, designing for a universal
20
21 audience generates exclusive categories: the universal tech subject defaults to being a
22
23 representation of the designers, often cis-male, hetero, white, college-educated, and socio-
24
25 economically privileged (see Akrich, 1995; Oudshoorn et al., 2004). Likewise, while universal or
26
27 global reach is assumed to be technologically embedded in the Internet, via narratives of
28
29 access, connectedness and borderless communications, the impact of structural inequalities,
30
31 regional differences, web personalization and capital accumulation make the reality of the
32
33 Internet a far more fragmented experience (Rogers, 2013; Schiller, 1999; Srinivasan, 2017;
34
35 Sunstein, 2009). This digital marketplace has a distorting influence on the universal message of
36
37 the DPLA, which is not compatible, in many ways, with how digital infrastructure works or how
38
39 audiences operate online.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 **Reconstituting Digital Public Space?**

51
52 If physical public libraries are one embodiment of a Habermasian public sphere, scholars like
53
54 Papacharissi, Dean, Castells, and others make it clear that a digital library is not necessarily a
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 digital public sphere. In this article, we have used the concept of a digital public space, which
4
5 we have defined as a platform that provides a forum for the digital public. The question, then, is
6
7 whether the DPLA and other non-commercial, non-governmental projects like it provide a
8
9 digital public space in ways that mirror the physical spaces provided by institutions like libraries.
10
11 The history of the DPLA demonstrates that such questions cannot be answered without
12
13 reference to a platform's audience: to talk about digital public spaces is to talk about the digital
14
15 public. Castells quotes Melville Dewey's comment that the public "is what is common to a given
16
17 social organization that transcends the private... the public is the domain of shared interests
18
19 and values" (Castells, 2008, p 91). Physical public libraries create hybrid digital/physical publics,
20
21 audiences with shared interests and values that transcend the private. The DPLA has many
22
23 audiences: which of them, if any, are the digital public?
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 To some extent, the DPLA bears out the myth of the digital sublime (Mosco, 2005), wherein
33
34 faith that technology will solve social issues proves both unfounded and illustrative of liberatory
35
36 and limiting possibilities. The DPLA's evocation of the imagined community of the nation
37
38 (Anderson, 2006) has been shown to be at odds with strategies for inclusion and the work of
39
40 decentering so-called universal knowledge. The politics of statehood, nation, empire and
41
42 assimilation, framed rhetorically as 'public', are in tension with a dawning recognition of new
43
44 types of audiences and public responsibility. The DPLA's 2019-2022 Strategic Plan concludes:
45
46
47
48
49
50
51

52 American democracy is in turmoil. We know that we, and the libraries, archives, and
53
54 museums with whom we work, are vital assets for this moment in time. DPLA envisions
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 a future in which digital technology serves to spread knowledge and unleash creativity
4
5 so that all of our stories are told. (DPLA, 2019)
6
7
8
9

10 This language marks a shift from the DPLA's first strategy and a move from encompassing the
11 'full range of human expression' (DPLA, 2015, p. 10) to 'spreading knowledge, unleashing
12 creativity'. Yet the underlying ethos for the DPLA is still concerned with comprehensive reach.
13
14 Its historical shifts have represented moves to qualify that reach, but the focus remains on the
15 universal, despite the fact that events like the COVID-19 pandemic have highlighted the limits
16 of the universal in exclusively digital spaces.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 This insight connects to another finding of the article: that the construction of the public library
28 space as a digital entity does not attract anticipated audiences. At the outset, we noted the
29 relationship between public spaces and public libraries, and sought to analyze what happens
30 when they transition from being physical entities to digital ones. We found that the imagined
31 audiences for such spaces, who correspond with traditional library communities, do not exist in
32 the absence of physical infrastructure. Many public library patrons rely on libraries for Internet
33 access, so cannot participate in digital spaces without access to a physical building. There
34 remains a dominant techno-determinist discourse that posits that web technologies will bring
35 everyone together. We have explored why that does not happen in practice when publics are
36 declared rather than built, clearly defined, or materially identified.
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 If the universal digital platform does not have the reach envisaged by the generalized imaginary
4
5 of the digital public, what type of audience and community finds ready expression in digital
6
7 spaces? The findings of this work serve as part of ongoing and future research into the
8
9 possibilities of non-commercial digital platforms (Noble, 2020; Pickard, 2022). Private
10
11 companies like Reddit and Facebook (Meta), among others, foster spaces for geographically-
12
13 dispersed communities with shared interests. A difference between the physical community of
14
15 a public library and these digital communities is not simply geography, but also common
16
17 interests and the assumed anonymity of digital space. We find that when people form
18
19 communities of shared values at scale, in essence a form of digital public, they often do so
20
21 around an affinity. Physical co-location has long served as one of the strongest affinities in
22
23 traditional analog environments; in digital space, affinities can also be built around shared
24
25 needs and interests (Fiesler and Dym, 2020). Digital public spaces that do not have the physical
26
27 infrastructure of a traditional library or the promise of anonymous togetherness struggle to
28
29 make a productive impact on the realm of digital community-making.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40 The DPLA defined itself in its earliest iterations as 'a portal, platform, and public option for
41
42 access' (DPLA, 2013). But the project begs the question: who are the digital public for such a
43
44 platform? Interview participants suggested that the library moniker was used operationally, as
45
46 a means to express that 'all are welcome'. We ask: just because *all* are welcome, will *all* come?
47
48
49 If the digital public manifests as a form of engagement on a digital platform, which is expressive
50
51 of shared values that operate beyond the realms of government and the private sector,
52
53 questions still remain about whether shared interests and values are embodied in the DPLA's
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 offerings in any material way. Building the infrastructure before finding this digital public
4
5 audience has led to a mismatch between the project's goals and audience expectations.
6
7 Multiple interviewees expressed the difficulty of quantifying the success of the DPLA; part of
8
9 the challenge arises from the related problem of defining success for a platform providing
10
11 ebooks, exhibits, and cultural heritage metadata. Cohen's (2020) acknowledgement that the
12
13 principles of open access have not always accorded with audience uptake is relevant here: the
14
15 digital public space might get built, and no one might come. Does it matter if they don't? One
16
17 interview participant stated that the DPLA's work is important, whether or not anyone uses its
18
19 materials: in effect, the DPLA is a form of public good and the resources must be there to
20
21 provide benefit, even if the direct beneficiaries are elusive. Whether or not the digital public
22
23 comes, the DPLA is there for them.
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31

32 The final finding is that, in the case of the DPLA, the term 'public library' is a decoy; it is the
33
34 wrong starting point for understanding public engagement in non-commercial digital spaces.
35
36 The public library designation alerts us to the distortions of the digital public, but it is not
37
38 ultimately a frame of reference that can do substantial work in helping us understand what the
39
40 DPLA can accomplish or who its audiences are. The multistakeholder system of the
41
42 commercialized Internet (Grosse, 2020) leaves public institutions at the mercy of private
43
44 funding, while philanthropy is often connected to private sector and marketplace deliverables.
45
46 This is typified in calls to replace libraries with an Amazon/Starbucks hybrid to save the
47
48 taxpayer money. The DPLA wants to collaborate and supplement public libraries without its
49
50 own public funding, an inescapable contradiction, given its large-scale employment changes
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 and evolving financial model. What remains to be considered in greater depth is the role of the
4
5 nation and the public in digital spaces, particularly within a US context where public resources
6
7 are frequently not rooted in government. Safiya Noble, in her investigation of algorithmic bias
8
9 and redlining, calls for regulation, restoration and reparation from Big Tech: 'We need new
10
11 paradigms, not more new tech. We need fair and equitable implementations of public policy
12
13 that bolster our collective good. We need to center the most vulnerable among us - the working
14
15 poor and the disabled, those who live under racial and religious tyranny, the discriminated
16
17 against and the oppressed' (2020). Future research should foreground these priorities. The
18
19 work of scholars like Victor Pickard and Dan Schiller offers one potential avenue for exploration:
20
21 proposing the regulation of digital public spaces as public utilities, taking inspiration from
22
23 government organizations such as the US Post Office and Government Printing Office (Schiller,
24
25 2020; Pickard, 2022). This article highlights the parallel concern to define a purpose for digital,
26
27 national, non-governmental structures as part of a move towards new technology paradigms
28
29 that can redeem public goods in the digital realm.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

Akrich, M. (1995), "User representation: Practices, methods, and sociology," In: A. Rip, T.J. Misa, and J. Schot, *Managing technology in society: the approach of constructive technology assessment*, eds. Pinter Publishers, pp. 167-184.

ALA (American Library Association) (2004), "Core values of librarianship," Retrieved from <http://www.ala.org/advocacy/intfreedom/statementspols/corevalues>

Anderson, B. (2006), *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. Verso Books.

Andrejevic, M. (2007), "Surveillance in the digital enclosure," *The Communication review*, volume 10, pp. 295-317.

Audunson, R., Aabø, S., Andersen, J., Evjen, S., Jochumsen, H., Koizumi, M., Rasmussen, C.H. & Widdersheim, M.M. (2017), "Libraries as an infrastructure for a sustainable public sphere in a digital age," *proceedings of iConference 2017* . pp. 928-931.

Barnett, C. (2008), "Convening publics: The parasitical spaces of public action", *Open Research Online*. <http://oro.open.ac.uk/id/eprint/20193>, pp. 2-30

Bernholz, L. (2016), "Creating digital civil society: The digital public library of america." In: R. Reich, C. Cordelli, and L. Bernholz (editors). *Philanthropy in democratic societies: History, institutions, values*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, pp. 107-206.

Bettvia, R. and Stainforth, E. (2017), "All and each: A socio-technical review of the europeana project," *DHQ: Digital Humanities Quarterly*, volume 11 number 3 at <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/11/3/000318/000318.html#andrejevic2007>

Bettvia, R. and Stainforth, E. (2019), "The dynamics of scale in digital heritage cultures". In: T. Lähdesmäki, S. Thomas and Y. Zhu (editors). *Politics of scale: New directions in critical heritage studies*, Berghahn Books, pp. 50-62.

Borgman, C.L. (1999), "What are digital libraries? Competing visions," *Information processing & management*, volume 35 number 3, pp. 227-243.

1
2
3 Borgman, C.L. (2000), "Digital libraries and the continuum of scholarly communication," *Journal*
4 *of documentation*, volume 56 number 4, pp. 412-430.

6
7 Borgman, C.L. (2003), "The invisible library: Paradox of the global information infrastructure,"
8 *Library Trends*, volume 51 number 4, pp. 652-674.

10
11 Bourdieu, P. (1996), *The State Nobility*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

12
13 Bourg, C. (2014), "The unbearable whiteness of librarianship," *Feral librarian* at
14 <https://chrisbourg.wordpress.com/2014/03/03/the-unbearable-whiteness-of-librarianship/>
15

16
17 Bowker, G.C., Baker, K., Millerand, F. & Ribes, D. (2010), "Toward information infrastructure
18 studies: Ways of knowing in a networked environment," In: J. Hunsinger, et al. Dordrecht:
19 Springer (editors). *International Handbook of internet research*, pp. 97-117.

20
21 Bratich, J. (2005), "Amassing the multitude: Revisiting early audience studies," *Communication*
22 *theory*, volume 15 number 3, pp. 242-265.

23
24 Buschman, J. and Leckie, G. (editors) (2007), *The library as place: History, community, and*
25 *culture*. Westport, Ct.: Libraries Unlimited, pp. 135-160.

26
27 Castells, M. (2008), "The new public sphere: Global civil society, communication networks, and
28 global governance," *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, volume
29 616 number 1, pp. 78-93.

30
31 Caswell, M., Harter, C. & Jules, B. (2017), "Diversifying the digital historical record: Integrating
32 community archives in national strategies for access to digital cultural heritage," *DLib*
33 *Magazine*, volume 23 number 5/6.

34
35 Chun, W. (2016), *Updating to Remain the Same*. Cambridge Ma.: MIT Press.

36
37 Cody, F. (2011), "Publics and politics," *Annual review of anthropology*, volume 40 number 1, pp.
38 37-52.

39
40 Cohen, D. (2020), "From Open Access to Maximal Access," In: S. Mizruchi (editor). *Libraries and*
41 *archives in the digital age*. Palgrave MacMillan.

42
43 Crooks, R. (2019), "Accesso libre: Equity of access to information through the lens of neoliberal
44 responsabilization," In M. Cifor and J.A. Lee (editors). "Evidences, implications, and critical
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 interrogations of neoliberalism in information studies," *Journal of Critical Library and*
4 *Information Studies*, volume 2 number 1.

5
6
7 D'Angelo, E. (2006), *Barbarians at the gates of the public library: How postmodern consumer*
8 *capitalism threatens democracy, civil education and the public good*. Duluth, Minn.: Library
9 Juice Press.

10
11
12
13 Darnton, R. (2013), "The national digital public library is launched!" *The New York review of*
14 *books*. Retrieved from [http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2013/04/25/national-digital-public-](http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2013/04/25/national-digital-public-library-launched/)
15 [library-launched/](http://www.nybooks.com/articles/2013/04/25/national-digital-public-library-launched/)

16
17
18
19 Darnton, R. (2020), "Libraries, books, and the digital future," In: S. Mizruchi (editor). *Libraries*
20 *and Archives in the Digital Age*. Palgrave MacMillan.

21
22
23 De Rosa, C., Hill, C., Havens, A., Morgan, K. & Erway, R. (2012), "America's digital future:
24 Advancing a shared strategy for digital public libraries," OCLC. Retrieved from
25 <https://www.oclc.org/content/dam/campaign-landing-pages/en/ndpl-report.pdf>

26
27
28
29 Dean, J. (2009), *Democracy and other neoliberal fantasies: Communicative capitalism and left*
30 *politics*. Duke University Press.

31
32
33 DPLA (2011), "Digital Public Library of America Working Group Meeting," Retrieved from
34 [https://www.infodocket.com/2011/05/24/video-short-interviews-recorded-at-the-digital-](https://www.infodocket.com/2011/05/24/video-short-interviews-recorded-at-the-digital-public-library-of-america-working-group-meeting/)
35 [public-library-of-america-working-group-meeting/](https://www.infodocket.com/2011/05/24/video-short-interviews-recorded-at-the-digital-public-library-of-america-working-group-meeting/)

36
37
38
39 DPLA (2013), "Welcome to the Digital Public Library of America," Retrieved from
40 <https://dp.la/news/message-from-the-executive-director/>

41
42
43 DPLA (2015), "Strategic Plan," 2015 through 2017. Retrieved from
44 [https://dpla.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/DPLA-StrategicPlan_2015-2017-](https://dpla.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/DPLA-StrategicPlan_2015-2017-Jan7.pdf)
45 [Jan7.pdf](https://dpla.wpengine.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/01/DPLA-StrategicPlan_2015-2017-Jan7.pdf)

46
47
48
49 DPLA (2016), "How We Work: The DPLA Technology Team Core Values," Retrieved from
50 <https://dp.la/news/dpla-tech-team-core-values>

51
52
53 DPLA (2019), "Strategic Roadmap," 2019-2022. Retrieved from [https://pro.dp.la/about-dpla-](https://pro.dp.la/about-dpla-pro/strategic-plan)
54 [pro/strategic-plan](https://pro.dp.la/about-dpla-pro/strategic-plan)

1
2
3 DPLA (2020), "About Us > Funders," Retrieved from <https://dp.la/about/funders>

4
5
6 DPLA (2020), "A statement from the DPLA Board of Directors," dp.la Announcements. Retrieved
7 from <https://dp.la/news/a-statement-from-the-dpla-board-of-directors>

8
9
10 Drake, A. and Bielefield, A. (2017), "Equitable access: Information seeking behavior, information
11 needs, and necessary library accommodations for transgender patrons," *Library and*
12 *Information Science Research*, pp. 39.

13
14
15 Fiesler, C. and Dym, B. (2020), "Moving Across Lands: Online Platform Migration in Fandom
16 Communities," *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, volume 4 number
17 CSCW1, pp. 1-25.

18
19
20 Fraser, N. (1990), "Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually
21 existing democracy," *Social Text*, number 25/26, pp. 56-80.

22
23
24
25 Freeland, C. (2020), March 24. "Announcing a National Emergency Library to Provide Digitized
26 Books to Students and the Public," Retrieved from
27 [https://blog.archive.org/2020/03/24/announcing-a-national-emergency-library-to-provide-](https://blog.archive.org/2020/03/24/announcing-a-national-emergency-library-to-provide-digitized-books-to-students-and-the-public/)
28 [digitized-books-to-students-and-the-public/](https://blog.archive.org/2020/03/24/announcing-a-national-emergency-library-to-provide-digitized-books-to-students-and-the-public/)

29
30
31 Fung, A. (2003), "Recipes for public spheres: Eight institutional design choices and their
32 consequences," *Journal of Political Philosophy*, volume 11 number 3, pp. 338-367.

33
34
35
36 Gibson, A.N., Chancellor, R.L., Cooke, N.A., Park Dahlen, S., Lee, S.A. & Shorish, Y.L. (2017),
37 "Libraries on the frontlines: neutrality and social justice," *Equality, diversity and inclusion:*
38 *An international journal*, pp. 36, 751-766. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EDI-11-2016-0100>

39
40
41
42 Gibson A.N. and Hughes-Hassell, S. (2017), "We will not be silent: Amplifying marginalized
43 voices in LIS education and research," *The library quarterly*, pp. 87, 317-329.

44
45
46
47 Gibson, A.N., Chancellor, R., Cooke, N.A., Park Dahlen, S., & Patin, B. (2020), Preprint.
48 "Struggling to breathe: Covid-19, protest, and the LIS response," *Equality, diversity and*
49 *inclusion*.

50
51
52 Gooding, P. and Terras, M. (2017), "Inheriting library cards to Babel and Alexandria:
53 contemporary metaphors for the digital library," *International journal on digital libraries*, pp.
54 18, 207-222.
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Gore, E., Della Bitta, M., & Cohen, D. (2017), "The Digital public library of America and the
6 national digital platform," *D-Lib magazine*, volume 23 number 5/6.
7

8
9 Grosse, M. (2020), "Laying the foundation for a commercialized internet: international internet
10 governance in the 1990s," *Internet histories*, volume 4 number 3, pp. 271-286.
11

12
13 Habermas, J. (1989), *The public sphere: An inquiry into a category of Bourgeois society*. Polity
14 Press.
15

16
17 Hall, S. (1999), "Un-settling 'the heritage', re-imagining the post-nation. Whose heritage?" *Third*
18 *Text*, volume 13 number 49, pp. 3-13.
19

20
21 Hamma, K. (2004), "The role of museums in online teaching, learning, and research," *First*
22 *Monday*, volume 9 number 5.
23

24
25 Harris, M. (1999), "Modern American libraries," In *History of libraries in the Western World* (4th
26 edition). Scarecrow Press, pp. 241-297.
27

28
29 Harris, E. (2020), "Publishers sue Internet Archive over free E-Books," *New York Times*.
30 Retrieved from [https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/01/books/internet-archive-emergency-](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/01/books/internet-archive-emergency-library-coronavirus.html)
31 [library-coronavirus.html](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/06/01/books/internet-archive-emergency-library-coronavirus.html)
32
33

34
35 Hartley, J. (2015), *Museums and the digital public space: researching digital engagement*
36 *practice at the Whitworth Art Gallery*. University of Manchester (PhD thesis).
37

38
39 Hathcock, A. (2015), "White librarianship in blackface: Diversity initiatives in LIS," *In the Library*
40 *with the lead pipe*. Retrieved from [https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/lis-](https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/lis-diversity/)
41 [diversity/](https://www.inthelibrarywiththeleadpipe.org/2015/lis-diversity/)
42
43

44
45 Hemment, D., Thompson, B., de Vicente, J.L., & Cooper, R. (2013), *Digital public spaces*.
46 FutureEverything. Retrieved from [http://futureeverything.org/wp-](http://futureeverything.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DPS.pdf)
47 [content/uploads/2014/03/DPS.pdf](http://futureeverything.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/DPS.pdf)
48
49

50
51 Honma, T. (2005), *Trippin' Over the Color Line: The Invisibility of Race in Library and*
52 *Information Studies*. InterActions: UCLA Journal of Education and Information Studies.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Jæger, M. and Blaabæk, E. (2020), "Inequality in learning opportunities during Covid-19:
4 Evidence from library takeout," *Research in social stratification and mobility*, pp. 68, 100524.

6
7 Kerslake, E. and Kinnell, M. (1998), "Public libraries, public interest and the information society:
8 Theoretical issues in the social impact of public libraries," *Journal of Librarianship and*
9 *Information Science*, volume 30 number 3, pp. 159-167.

11
12
13 Manguel, A. (2020), "A National library in the digital age," In: S. Mizruchi (editor). *Libraries and*
14 *archives in the digital age*. Palgrave MacMillan.

16
17 Mattern, S. (2014), "Library as infrastructure," *Places Journal*. Retrieved from
18 <https://placesjournal.org/article/library-as-infrastructure/>

20
21 Matusiak, K. (2017), "User navigation in large-scale distributed digital libraries: The Case of the
22 digital public library of America," *Journal of Web librarianship*, volume 11 number 3-4, pp. 157-
23 171.

25
26
27 Mosco, V. (2005), *The digital sublime: Myth, power, and cyberspace*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

28
29
30 Mourdoukoutas, P. (2018), "Amazon should replace local libraries to save taxpayers money,"
31 Forbes.com (Retraction July 22, 2018).

32
33
34 Nadler, J. and Cicillinie, D. (2020), "Investigation of competition in digital markets: Majority staff
35 reports and recommendation," Subcommittee on Antitrust, Commercial and Administrative
36 Law of the Committee on the Judiciary. US House of Representatives.

37
38
39 Newman, J. (2007), "Re-Mapping the public," *Cultural studies*, volume 21 number 6, pp. 887-
40 909.

41
42
43 Niegaard, H. (2011), "Library space and digital challenges," *Library trends*, volume 60 number 1,
44 pp. 174-189.

45
46
47 Noble, S. (2020), "The loss of public goods to big tech," *Noema Magazine*. Retrieved from
48 <https://www.noemamag.com/the-loss-of-public-goods-to-big-tech/>

49
50
51
52 Oudshoorn, N., Rommes, E., & Stienstra, M. (2004), "Configuring the user as everybody: Gender
53 and design cultures in information and communication technologies," *Science, technology, &*
54 *human values*, volume 29 number 1, pp. 30-63.

1
2
3
4
5 Papacharissi, Z. (2003), "The virtual sphere: The internet as public sphere," *New media &*
6 *society*, volume 4 number 1, pp. 9-27.
7

8
9 Pawley, C. and Robbins, L. (2013), *Libraries and the reading public in twentieth-century America*.
10 University of Wisconsin Press.
11

12
13 Peacock, D. and Brownbill, J. (2007), "Audiences, visitors, users: Reconceptualising users of
14 museum on-line content and services," *Museums and the Web*. Retrieved from
15 [https://www.museumsandtheweb.com/biblio/audiences_visitors_and_users_reconceptualising](https://www.museumsandtheweb.com/biblio/audiences_visitors_and_users_reconceptualising_users_.html)
16 [_users_.html](https://www.museumsandtheweb.com/biblio/audiences_visitors_and_users_reconceptualising_users_.html)
17
18

19
20 Pickard, V. (2022), "Democratizing the platforms: Promises and perils of public utility
21 regulation," *Media Development*.
22

23
24 Polebaum-Freeman, H. (2019), "Violent Cis-tems: Identifying transphobia in Library of Congress
25 name authority records. In: Jane Sandberg (editor) *Ethical Questions in Name Authority Control*.
26 Sacramento, CA: Library Juice Press.
27

28
29
30 Rogers, R. (2013), *Digital methods*. Cambridge MA: MIT Press.
31

32
33 Schiller, D. (2020), "Reconstructing Public Utility Networks: A Program for Action," *International*
34 *Journal of Communication*, 14, pp. 4989-5000.
35

36
37 Seale, M (2016), "Compliant trust: The public good and democracy in the ALA's 'Core values of
38 librarianship,'" *Library trends*, volume 64 number 3, pp. 585-603.
39

40
41 Smith, Z (2012), "The North West London blues," *New York review of books blog*. Retrieved
42 from <https://www.nybooks.com/daily/2012/06/02/north-west-london-blues/>
43
44

45
46 Srinivasan, R. (2017), *Whose global village? Rethinking how technology shapes our world*. NYU
47 Press.
48

49
50 Sunstein, C (2009), *Republic.com 2.0*. Princeton University Press.
51

52
53 Tsing, A. (2005), *Friction: An Ethnography of Global Connection*. Princeton University Press.
54

55
56 Usher, N. (2021), *News for the Rich, White, and Blue*. Columbia University Press.
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Vieira, S. (2020), "Conversations: The open libraries project—Interview with Chris Freeland,"
6 *Serials Review*, volume 46 number 3, pp. 224-226.
7

8
9 Wang, T. and Lund, B. (2020), "Announcement information provided by United States' public
10 libraries during the 2020 COVID-19 Pandemic," *Public library quarterly*, volume 39 number 4,
11 pp. 1-12.
12

13
14 Warner, M. (2002), "Publics and counterpublics (abbreviated version)," *Quarterly journal of*
15 *speech*, volume 88 number 4, pp. 413-425.
16

17
18 Webster, F. (2010), *Theories of the information society*. Abingdon; New York: Routledge.
19

20
21 Widdersheim, MM. and Koizumi, M. (2015), "Signal architectures of US public libraries:
22 resolving legitimacy between public and private spheres," *Proceedings of the 78th ASIS&T*
23 *Annual Meeting: Information Science with Impact: Research in and for the Community*, pp. 25,
24 1-13.
25
26

27
28 Yeo, S. (2020), "Access now, but for whom and at what cost?" *Information, communication &*
29 *society*, volume 23 number 4, pp. 588-604.
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

<i>Data Source</i>
Semi-structured Interviews
Website (Live and Historical Crawls)
Policy and Strategy Documentation
Secondary Sources
Events (Live and Web)

Journal of Documentation

<i>Quantity of Sources</i>
7 participants
13 samples ranging from 2011-2020
15 documents
6 academic articles; 6 news articles; 2 books; 1 national report
3 live events; 2 webinars

Journal of Documentation

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



Screenshot of dp.la landing page taken 2022-04-08

462x213mm (144 x 144 DPI)