

# Amplifying unheard voices in Digital Humanities: an OpenMethods edit-a-thon

## Tóth-Czifra, Erzsébet

erzsebet.toth-czifra@dariah.eu  
DARIAH ERIC, Germany

## Wuttke, Ulrike

ulrike.wuttke@fh-potsdam.de  
University of Applied Sciences Potsdam

## Horváth, Alíz

alيز.horvath06@gmail.com  
Eötvös Loránd University Budapest

## Nunn, Christopher

christopher.nunn@theologie.uni-heidelberg.de  
Ruprecht Karls Universität Heidelberg

## Introduction

In digital-native disciplines such as the Digital Humanities (DH), scholarly exchange is not restricted to peer-reviewed journals and academic book series. Instead, it is naturally occurring in blogs, Git repositories, pre-prints, video tutorials, podcasts, on social media or on other discourse spaces the web 2.0 and 3.0. offers. This is especially the case for sharing critical reflections and know-how on tools and methods.

Acknowledging the richness of such rapidly evolving born-digital scholarly discourse spaces, there is a need to establish filtering and trust building mechanisms towards the openly available content hidden in them (see also Eve 2020, Nyhan 2020, Fitzpatrick 2011). Leveraging on expert community curation, OpenMethods is a platform to establish such filtering and trust-building mechanisms.

In our workshop, we invite arts and humanities scholars at all career stages and from various disciplinary or geographical backgrounds to explore the OpenMethods metablog as an innovative publication forum and to strengthen the representation of traditionally underrepresented languages and actors in Digital Humanities (see e.g. Horvath 2021) - particularly non-Anglophone, under-resourced languages (such as languages with non-Latin scripts) or female tool-makers - on the platform in particular and in the Digital Humanities discourse in general.

Our aims are:

- To share know-how on innovative filtering, curation and publication methods for born-digital content (PressForward, TaDiRAH)
- To offer reproducible solutions to set up a content curation platform and workflow similar to OpenMethods
- To strengthen evaluation frameworks around born-digital scholarly output types such as methodological descriptions, tools, video tutorials

- To increase the representation of traditionally underrepresented languages and actors in Digital Humanities

## What is OpenMethods?

The OpenMethods metablog provides a platform to bring together all formats of Open Access content in different languages about methods and tools in DH to spread the knowledge and raise peer recognition for them. In addition to research papers and book chapters, this includes publications in the broadest possible sense, with inclusiveness on content types that remain invisible from formal research assessment, such as blogs and preprints, or multimedia content such as tutorials, videos or podcasts.

The metablog approach entails that members of the OpenMethods Editorial Team select already published content proposed by Community Volunteers and materials of their own choice to be highlighted on OpenMethods (see Engelhardt et al. 2017 for a more detailed description). Topics of interest are descriptions of methods and tools, tool and methods critique, as well as practical and theoretical reflections about how and why humanities research is conducted digitally and how the increasing influence of digital methods and tools changes scholarly attitudes and scientific practices of humanities research.

The OpenMethods platform is intentionally interdisciplinary and multilingual, aiming to showcase the richness of DH discourses as they take shape in different regional, national and language communities. The group of DH experts, known as the OpenMethods Editorial Team, currently comprises 30 editors from 14 countries who can cover almost 20 languages.

Content nomination is open to anyone (via Twitter or via the nomination tool on the OpenMethods platform) and external collaborators such as Digital Humanities students are welcome to be listed on the OpenMethods website as such. As a second step, Editorial Team members comment on, filter and curate the nominations and select them based on our criteria.<sup>1</sup> Successful entries are not only republished on the platform but also are categorized with the Taxonomy of Digital Research Activities in the Arts and Humanities (TaDiRAH) (Borek et al. 2016, Borek et al. 2021) and are complemented with a short introduction in English in which one of the Editorial Team members explains the value and relevance of the contribution.

## Description of the edit-a-thon (format and outline)

Structure:

1. Introduction to OpenMethods (concept, workflows, people, tools behind the platforms) - 30 minutes
2. Question and answer session - 10 minutes
3. Participants nominate content to be highlighted on OpenMethods using the OpenMethods nomination tool (key topical areas: non-English content and female toolmakers, see above) - 30 minutes

Break

1. Discussion on evaluation criteria for methodological and tool descriptions and documentation practices (and mapping the conclusions against Open Methods' evaluation guidelines) - 30 minutes

2. Commenting on the nominations (minimal review, using PressForward, either in small groups or individually) - 30 minutes
3. Deliberation (reflection on the comments) - 20 minutes

Break

1. Creation of publications and publication prototypes: writing introductions to the successful nominations and publishing them on the OpenMethods platform - 40 minutes
2. Wrap-up, takeaways, reflections - 10-15 minutes

In total: 4 hours, including breaks.

The resulting publications will be visible and citable through the GoTRIPLE, a multilingual discovery platform for the social sciences and humanities, too.

## Target audience

Digital Humanists all career stages, with all disciplinary backgrounds, from all geographical regions.

## Notes

1. <https://openmethods.dariah.eu/guidelines-for-editorial-team/>

## Bibliography

**Borek, Luise / Dombrowski, Quinn / Perkins, Jody / Schöch / Christof** (2016): "TaDiRAH: A Case Study in Pragmatic Classification" in: *DHQ* 10: 1 <http://www.digitalhumanities.org/dhq/vol/10/1/000235/000235.html>

**Borek, Luise / Hastik, Canan / Khramova, Vera / Illmayer, Klaus / Geiger, Jonathan D.** (2021): "TaDiRAH Revised, Formalized and FAIR", in: Thomas Schmidt, Christian Wolff (eds.): *Information between Data and Knowledge. Information Science and its Neighbors from Data Science to Digital Humanities - Proceedings of the 16th International Symposium of Information Science (ISI 2021) Regensburg, Germany, 8th - 10th March 2021* (=Schriften zur Informationswissenschaft 74). Glückstadt: Hülsbusch 321-332. <https://epub.uni-regensburg.de/44951/>

**Engelhardt, Claudia / Leone, Claudio / Larrousse, Nicolas / Montoliu, Delphine / Moranville, Yoann / Mounier, Pierre / Oltersdorf, Jenny / Ribbe, Paulin / Wuttke, Ulrike** (2017): *Open Humanities Methods Review Journal (Research Report)*. DARIAH; TGIR Huma-Num (UMS3598); Göttingen State and University Library. <https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01685852>

**Eve, Martin Paul** (2020): "Violins in the Subway: Scarcity Correlations, Evaluative Cultures, and Disciplinary Authority in the Digital Humanities", in: Jennifer Edmond (eds.): *Digital Technology and the Practices of Humanities Research*, Cambridge: Open Book Publishers 105-122. <https://doi.org/10.11647/OBP.0192.06>

**Fitzpatrick, Kathleen** (2011): *Planned Obsolescence: Publishing, Technology, and the Future of the Academy*. New York: New York University Press.

**Horvath, Alíz** (2021): Enhancing Language Inclusivity in Digital Humanities: Towards Sensitivity and Multilingualism: Includes interviews with Erzsébet Tóth-Czifra and Cosima Wagner. *Modern Languages Open*, (1), p.26. DOI: <http://doi.org/10.3828/mlo.v0i0.382>

**Nyhan, Julianne** (2020): '7. The Evaluation and Peer Review of Digital Scholarship in the Humanities: Experiences, Discussions, and Histories'. In *Digital Technology and the Practices of Humanities Research*, edited by Jennifer Edmond, 163–82. Open Book Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.11647/obp.0192.07>.