



## Open Humanities Methods Review Journal

Claudia Engelhardt, Claudio Leone, Nicolas Larrousse, Delphine Montoliu, Yoann Moranville, Pierre Mounier, Jenny Oltersdorf, Paulin Ribbe, Ulrike Wuttke

### ► To cite this version:

Claudia Engelhardt, Claudio Leone, Nicolas Larrousse, Delphine Montoliu, Yoann Moranville, et al.. Open Humanities Methods Review Journal. [Research Report] DARIAH; TGIR Huma-Num (UMS 3598); Göttingen State and University Library. 2017. hal-01685852

**HAL Id: hal-01685852**

**<https://hal.science/hal-01685852>**

Submitted on 16 Jan 2018

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



D8.2

Open Humanities Methods Review Journal

**HaS-DARIAH**

INFRADEV-3-2015-Individual implementation and operation of ESFRI projects  
Grant Agreement no.: 675570

Date: 22-12-2017

Version: 1.0



Project funded under the Horizon 2020 Programme

---

**HaS-DARIAH**

Horizon 2020 – Individual Implementation and operation of ESFRI projects  
Grant Agreement no.: 675570

The logo for 'HaS Humanities at Scale' features a stylized blue flower-like icon to the left of the text 'HaS' in a large, blue, sans-serif font. Below 'HaS', the words 'Humanities at Scale' are written in a smaller, black, sans-serif font.

Grant Agreement no.:	675570
Programme:	Horizon 2020
Project acronym:	HaS-DARIAH
Project full title:	Humanities at Scale: Evolving the DARIAH ERIC
Partners:	DIGITAL RESEARCH INFRASTRUCTURE FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES CENTRE NATIONAL DE LA RECHERCHE SCIENTIFIQUE KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN – KNAW GEORG-AUGUST-UNIVERSITAET GOETTINGEN STIFTUNG OEFFENTLICHEN RECHTS
Topic:	INFRADEV-3-2015
Project Start Date:	01-09-2015
Project Duration:	28 months
Title of the document:	D8.2 Open Humanities Methods Review Journal
Work Package title:	Open Methods Infrastructure
Estimated delivery date:	31.12.2017
Lead Beneficiary:	DARIAH
Author(s):	Claudia Engelhardt [claudia.engelhardt@sub.uni-goettingen.de] Claudio Leone [claudio.leone@sub.uni-goettingen.de] Nicolas Larrousse [nicolas.larrousse@huma-num.fr] Delphine Montoliu [delphine.montoliu@huma-num.fr] Yoann Moranville [yoann.moranville@dariah.eu] Pierre Mounier [pierre.mounier@openedition.fr] Jenny Oltersdorf [oltersdorf@fh-potsdam.de] Paulin Ribbe [paulin.ribbe@huma-num.fr] Ulrike Wuttke [wuttke@fh-potsdam.de]
Quality Assessor(s):	Marco Raciti [marco.raciti@dariah.eu]
Keywords:	open methods, open data, open humanities data platform, research tools, research service, research infrastructure, research registry

## Revision History

Version	Date	Author	Beneficiary	Description
0.1	25-10-2017	Claudia Engelhardt Yoann Moranville	UGOE DARIAH	Preparation of document with information from other sources
0.2	12-12-2017	Claudio Leone Nicolas Larrousse Yoann Moranville	UGOE CNRS DARIAH	Add various information from dissemination documents
0.3	18-12-2017	Claudia Engelhardt Claudio Leone	UGOE UGOE	Create and add information to subchapters of chapter 3
0.4	21-12-2017	All wp8.2 members	CNRS DARIAH UGOE	Finish up on the report
1.0	22-12-2017	Marco Raciti	DARIAH	Submission

## Table of Content

<b>Executive Summary .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>1. Introduction.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>2. Background.....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3. OpenMethods: Highlighting Digital Humanities Methods and Tools .....</b>	<b>7</b>
3.1 The Editorial Team .....	8
3.2 The Volunteer Editors.....	8
3.3 DH-Community.....	8
3.4 The Chief Editor .....	8
3.5 The Management Team .....	9
3.6 Community Editors: nomination, selection and curation of content.....	9
<b>Annex 1 - Workflow Anonymous Content.....</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Annex 2 - Workflow Volunteer Editors Content .....</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Annex 3 - Guidelines for Editorial Team.....</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Annex 4 - Guidelines for nominating content by Volunteer Editors .....</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Annex 5 - Guidelines for Chief Editor and Deputy Chief Editors .....</b>	<b>22</b>
<b>Annex 6 – Screenshots of various posts in different languages.....</b>	<b>23</b>

## Executive Summary

The goal of HaS task 8.2 “Open Methods Reviews” according to the description of work was to develop a “Open Humanities Methods Review Journal” in which methods and tools used in Digital Humanities Research would be reviewed. In order to achieve this, we have launched a metablog called OpenMethods<sup>1</sup>. It is a tool which aims at republishing already published content dealing with the use of methods and tools in Digital Humanities (DH) research. The selection is done by an Editorial Team of renowned DH experts. The Editorial Team is coordinated by the Chief Editor and supported by a Management Team.

About the nature of this document: This deliverable is the second and last one of work package 8 “Open Methods Infrastructure”. It is a short description of the work done within this work package and its result: the OpenMethods metablog<sup>2</sup>.

Nature of the deliverable		
	R	Document, report
	DEM	Demonstrator, pilot, prototype
✓	DEC	Websites, patent fillings, videos, etc.
	OTHER	
Dissemination level		
✓	P	Public
	CO	Confidential only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)
	EU-RES	Classified Information: RESTREINT UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)
	EU-CON	Classified Information: CONFIDENTIEL UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)
	EU-SEC	Classified Information: SECRET UE (Commission Decision 2005/444/EC)

## Disclaimer

The Humanities at Scale is project funded by the European Commission under the Horizon 2020 programme. This publication reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein.

<sup>1</sup> <https://openmethods.dariah.eu/>

<sup>2</sup> See ibid

## 1. Introduction

Humanities at Scale (HaS) is an offspring project closely related to DARIAH-EU as it is set up to improve DARIAH in fostering new and sustaining knowledge in digitally enabled research in the arts and humanities. Therefore, Humanities at Scale seeks to grow the DARIAH community, to develop open access core services and inform the research community. Work Package (WP) 8 “Open Methods Infrastructure” focuses on the investigation of open digital methods for humanities research and has developed standards and services to embed descriptions of open methods in community resources based on existing method ontologies. Furthermore WP 8 is contributing to the sustainability of arts and humanities methods resources by providing an Open Methods Review Platform for their open and distributed publication.

The work of WP 8 has been realised within two main tasks:

- developing a metadata application profile and a decentralised registry for DH tools, this was undertaken in task 8.1. The respective deliverable 8.1<sup>3</sup> was provided to the European Commission by month 26 (end of October 2017);
- setting up and organising a publication platform that focuses on publications that deal with the application, usage, development, discussion, analysis or introduction of methods in the field of digital humanities.

This document deals only with the second task. To realise it, we set up a metablog to republish all formats of publications in different languages about methods in digital humanities in order to spread the knowledge about these and raise peer recognition for research methods.

The metablog aims at a wide range of publication formats. It is not limited to classical research publications only. Project reports, deliverables, blog posts and all sorts of material referred to as “grey literature” is welcome to the metablog as long as its main topic is related to methods in DH. Also videos, presentations or podcasts are welcome when they are relevant.

## 2. Background

The aim of the activities in task 8.2 was to trigger the community to describe methods in more detail and to foster discussion about that important area that is currently underrepresented in the DH peer-reviewed literature especially, but not exclusively, from a European perspective. Highlighting research publications, blog posts and other content that deal with the application, usage, development, discussion, analysis or introduction of

---

<sup>3</sup> Engelhardt, Claudia; Leone, Claudio; Moranville, Yoann: Distributed Metadata Schema and Demonstrator for Open Humanities Methods. 2017. [Research Report] Göttingen State and University Library; DARIAH. 2017. <[hal-01637051](#)>

methods in the field of Digital Humanities was behind the idea of OpenMethods. Another aspect of importance is the issue of multilingualism. It has been made clear that OpenMethods would contain content in more languages than just English.

The title of the deliverable is “Open Humanities Methods Review Journal”, but Humanities at Scale work package 8 decided to experiment with a different approach by creating an Open Methods Metablog in order to encourage the involvement of actors from the DARIAH community (and even beyond), to collectively build a reference tool, to prefigure the DARIAH “network of expertise” and to offer a visible and valuable content selection service.

The Target Group of the OpenMethods Metablog are people wishing to check the scholarly methods in DH, people especially interested in training and education at several levels and last, but not least scholars as representatives for a particular method who can influence the debate and become visible as experts. Another expected target of the metablog could be journal editors. With the metablog, they are able to identify the use of new methods and get in contact with the authors to enrich and reorganize the content (i.e. blog post) in order to produce a publishable article.

Content indexing of all publications on the metablog is organised according to the TaDiRAH - Taxonomy of Digital Research Activities in the Humanities<sup>4</sup>. The process of categorising is supported by the PressForward<sup>5</sup> tool that is be used to structure the whole workflow of collecting, discussing and publishing content.

Experiences from the Digital Humanities Now project<sup>6</sup>, which served as an inspiring example for OpenMethods, show that there needs to be regularly paid staff to keep it up and together. There is a huge amount of experience and existing infrastructure that we built on. Digital Humanities Now (DHNOW) functions as an aggregator and covers all DH related topics that are published on the web. It is an “experimental, edited publication that highlights and distributes informally published digital humanities scholarship and resources from the open web.”<sup>7</sup> DHNOW aggregates potential content via RSS from a list of subscribed feeds. It covers sources where high-quality digital humanities scholarship is likely to appear, such as the personal websites of scholars, institutional sites, blogs, and other feeds. The aggregated material is reviewed, nominated, and discussed directly by the Editorial Team before it gets published, if it ever gets published. This process is

---

<sup>4</sup> <http://tadirah.dariah.eu/vocab/index.php> The taxonomy has been developed for use by community-driven sites and projects that aim to structure information relevant to digital humanities and make it more easily discoverable. The taxonomy is expected to be particularly useful to endeavors aiming to collect information on digital humanities tools, methods, projects, or readings.

<sup>5</sup> A Wordpress plugin providing an editorial workflow for content curation:

<https://github.com/PressForward/pressforward>

<sup>6</sup> An already existing blog to aggregate and republish DH relevant content. More information can be found below. See also <http://digitalhumanitiesnow.org/>

<sup>7</sup> <http://digitalhumanitiesnow.org/about/>

supported by the PressForward plugin. One main distinctive feature of the HaS metablog and DHNow is the inclusion of grey literature. The second important distinction is the aspect of multilingualism, as the metablog aims at gathering contributions from all European countries. Another one is the subject of the content we are looking for, hence only methods and tools within the Digital Humanities.

The success of platforms like Hypotheses.org raised awareness that blog posts can now be regarded as very important material, and it becomes obvious when it is being curated by a group of experts. The publication platform Hypotheses was founded in 2009. It hosts several thousand blogs, produced by a vast community from all areas of the humanities and social sciences. The platform receives over a million visits each month. All texts are open access. Hypotheses is part of a larger portal, OpenEdition, which is a comprehensive digital publishing infrastructure for the dissemination of humanities and social science publications. OpenEdition also includes a journals platform (<http://www.revues.org/>), a books platform (<http://books.openedition.org/?lang=en>). OpenEdition is run by the Centre for Open Electronic Publishing (<http://cleo.openedition.org/>), a public non-profit initiative supported by leading research and higher education institutions, whose main objective is to promote open access digital publishing.

At all stages, we continuously exchanged ideas with Pierre Mounier from OpenEdition and OPERAS<sup>8</sup>, who did a valuable contribution to the conceptual design of OpenMethods and provided ideas and guidance through the creation process.

### 3. OpenMethods: Highlighting Digital Humanities Methods and Tools

To set up the OpenMethods metablog several steps had to be realised. To start with this idea, we first needed a technical structure which was quickly achieved and pushed forward online. The second step was to create editorial workflows and guidelines and to hire a Chief Editor who coordinates the editorial workflow. Now, we needed experts, the ones that would curate the content and judge of its value and of its pertinence in the context of DH Methods and Tools. Important aspects for the selection of Editorial Team Members are fields of expertise and languages to be covered for the selection and curation of relevant content. Propositions of the HaS and DARIAH-EU community have been discussed within the Management Team. National coordinators of the DARIAH-EU member states have been asked to propose two DH experts for each country. The process of recruiting experts from the DARIAH-EU member states is still ongoing.

By implementing the organisational structure of the OpenMethods metablog a community of experts with different roles has been established, consisting of editors, volunteer editors and anonymous user (representing a vaster community).

---

<sup>8</sup> <http://operas.hypotheses.org/>



### 3.1 The Editorial Team

The Editorial Team consists of a core group of editors who have comment rights on each proposed article and publishing rights. They are renowned DH experts and select online content that is already published and available open access and nominate it to be republished on OpenMethods. They discuss and curate nominated content and categorise content that is being published using TaDIRAH. Nominated content is published when it has received approval by at least 3 experts of the Editorial Team.

### 3.2 The Volunteer Editors

Volunteer Editors were introduced in a second phase. They have the right to suggest articles for publishing. They are able to nominate content directly, which means that this content is already listed for evaluation and forwarded to the Editorial Team for curation. To recognize the merit of their work and to set an incentive for engagement, their name is associated to relevant content in DH methods by appearing in the introductory part of the publication. Volunteer Editors go through a registration process, which is checked and approved by the Chief Editor and the Management Team. They decide individually for how long they would like to be engaged in OpenMethods when they register. Relevant aspects for approval are how they are linked to the field of Digital Humanities. They don't need to be experts, but are supposed to be somehow active in relevant DH fields, which they have to indicate for registration as well as the language(s) they are able to read.

### 3.3 DH-Community

There is also a very broad category of users who can propose content via OpenMethods directly via a simple form. This content is called as Anonymous Content and it can be proposed by anyone. Proposing content is quite easy by using a submit link that is available on the platform. Users have only to provide their name, email address and the link to the respective publication. In addition, it is planned to offer the possibility to submit content to OpenMethods via a twitter hashtag.

### 3.4 The Chief Editor

PressForward is not an automatic aggregator, so we need a « conductor », the Chief Editor who guarantees the consistency of the editorial line on a daily basis by overseeing all publications and nominations and verifying categorisations of published content. The Chief Editor also manages the multilingual team of experts, reminds them of pending actions and organises regular meetings of the editorial team, which are currently held on a monthly basis. There is also the need to conduct and encourage discussions about the editorial process, the editorial line and the content which are also tasks done by the Chief Editor and the Management Team. Moreover, this person is also the link between the Editorial Team and the Management Team.

### 3.5 The Management Team

The Management Team was involved from the beginning in building up the metablog. Members of the team are mainly part of the Humanities at Scale project and engaged in the conceptual work and development of workflows and editorial guidelines. The Management Team supports the Chief Editor in all aspects of his/her work. Especially in the initial phase some workflows are in the progress of testing and enhancing according to feedback from the Editorial Team or Volunteer Editors. The Management Team participates at monthly editorial meetings and at internal meetings with the Chief Editor to discuss workflow issues and pending actions. Two members of the team are nominated as Deputy Chief Editors to take over tasks of the Chief Editor in case of absence. The Management Team will continue working after the end of the HaS project and take care of further developments, especially of extending the number of Editorial Team Members.

### 3.6 Community Editors: nomination, selection and curation of content

The whole workflow already described allows a curation and additional enrichment of preselected valuable open access publications in the field of Open Methods and Tools in the Digital Humanities. A main point of the workflow is the involvement of the interested community itself into the processes of nomination, selection and curation of content at different levels. The following schema illustrates and summarises the basic elements of the workflow in this perspective:




Image 1: Summary of the workflow, see also the OpenMethods Poster on HAL<sup>9</sup>

The content of the metablog has been multilingual right from the beginning, meaning that articles in Croatian, Czech, Dutch, English, French, German, Greek, Italian, Polish, Portuguese, Russian, Serbian, Slovak, Spanish and Swedish can already be published on OpenMethods since the actual pool of members forming the Editorial Team can read material in those languages. In the future we might think about expanding this list of languages. The content is also enriched by the Editorial Team and the Chief Editor using the TaDiRAH categorization that makes it easier for the community to find what might be

<sup>9</sup> Paulin Ribbe, Claudia Engelhardt, Nicolas Larrousse, Claudio Leone, Delphine Montoliu, et al.. OpenMethods - Collaborative platform for highlighting Open Access content about DH methods and tools. DARIAH Innovation Forum 2017, Nov 2017, Aarhus, Denmark. <[hal-01628029](https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01628029)>

interesting for them. Further options to be regularly informed about special fields of interests are subscriptions to RSS-feeds, here the TaDiRAH categories and/or a certain language can be preselected. Additionally, the community via OpenMethods has access to TERESAH<sup>10</sup>, the Tools E-Registry for E-Social science, Arts and Humanities - originally developed by the DASISH project and also adapted within HaS WP8, see HaS deliverable 8.1<sup>11</sup>.


For those of the community interested in an active participation on OpenMethods continuously reevaluated guidelines have been prepared as a quick start guide. They are added in the Annex of this document and give more explanatory insight into the functioning of OpenMethods.

---


<sup>10</sup> <http://teresah.dariah.eu/>

<sup>11</sup> Engelhardt, Claudia; Leone, Claudio; Moranville, Yoann: Distributed Metadata Schema and Demonstrator for Open Humanities Methods. 2017. [Research Report] Göttingen State and University Library; DARIAH. 2017. <[hal-01637051](https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01637051)>

## Annex 1 - Workflow Anonymous Content



## Annex 2 - Workflow Volunteer Editors Content




## Annex 3 - Guidelines for Editorial Team

### Getting Started as an Editor

As OpenMethods Editor, you have received an invitation from WordPress for logging in. You can get to the login page by clicking the button above, or choosing “Login” on the homepage.

If you have forgotten your username or password, just follow the prompts on the login page. In case of other technical problems related to OpenMethods, please [contact us](#).

After logging in, you see directly the OpenMethods Dashboard: you can see the OpenMethods homepage by clicking on OpenMethods > visit the site.



### Nominating Content

Reminder:

- OpenMethods highlights **already published content**: you cannot publish an original contribution on OpenMethods. All selected content has to be already published elsewhere. It can be blog posts, reports, presentations, working papers, data papers, articles or book chapters. **It is not a problem if a content is already highlighted on another platform.** Content with persistent identifiers (uri, handle, doi) are of course more than welcome.
- You have to select only **Open Access** content/data.



Once you have logged in, you can use your dashboard to select the PressForward menu in the WordPress left sidebar.

### Instructions for nominating, editing and publishing Content

You can download [this video](#) which explains step by step how to work with content.

1. For editing and working on draft posts, first you have to put the tool “Nominate this” on your toolbar:

- go to the Dashboard (on the top left of your screen, click on OpenMethods > Dashboard), on the left column go to PressForward > All content
- click on “Nominate this”, hold it and move it to your toolbar
- you have your tool for nominating!




2. Now, you have to go to the blog/website from which you want to publish a post.

3. Don't click on “Nominate this” immediately. **Select a paragraph** you think is very interesting to appear on the OpenMethods homepage in order to induce OpenMethods users to click on the source link afterwards.

So select and click on “Nominate this”. A new page opens: to work on your post, click on “Send to draft”. After closing that page as required, you can go back to OpenMethods dashboard in order to work on your selection.

4. Go to PressForward > Nominated. If you can not see your selection, then it means this content has already been published on OpenMethods. You can see your selection: Click on the icon “Draft” on the right.





5. Then go to Posts > All Posts: now you can click on “edit” under the title post and work on your draft for publication.

6. You have to manage many sections:

- **Title:** it is automatically generated when you “nominate” the post but you can change it if necessary. For a better readability:
  - keep only the title of the content.
  - cancel the site/journal name at the end of the title: do not worry, it appears in the source link below the post.
- **Text** (tab “Visual”, not “Text”): your selection is a quote so there is an orange left sidebar. For a better readability:
  - cancel any footnote references in the text because the links do not exist in the post on OpenMethods.
  - respect initial paragraph form.
  - write **an introduction in English** (limit of 500 characters) for presenting every post. This introduction must begin with “Introduction by OpenMethods Editor (your name): (text of introduction)”. Because it is not a quote, you have to click off the “ (blockquotes) on the toolbar to cancel the orange left sidebar for your introduction.
- **Pictures.** Go at the end of your page, on your right, and remove some involuntary/automatically selected picture.
- **Source link.** If you wish to change the title of your source link, for example because it is too generic, it is simple, contra-intuitive maybe, but simple. There are of course other ways to do this, that’s just one way. You would need to go to the end of the link title and type your own text, you will see that the text is being written in orange, that’s because it means it will also contain the link. Once you finish adding your own text, you can simply delete the beginning of the sentence (the old source title). You can now save your post.
- **Select Categories** for your post.
  - First the language(s) of the post and also the one(s) of the attached podcast or video.
  - Then, DH categories: TaDiRAH document or [website](#) can help you. You have to categorize your post reading it at the same time and, after reading it, take a look on [TaDiRAH document](#) to verify your categorization.
    - First, please do not uncheck the parent category “languages”.
    - Second, do not forget to choose several TADIRAH categories, particularly when they match important words in the content you selected. For example, if the word “encoding” is in the text, you can choose the category “encoding” in the Research Techniques.
    - When you choose a category, you have to choose also its parent category. It is not a problem if a post seems to have too many categories: you have to think how the users will do their researches on OpenMethods. For example, if you only categorize your post with the category “data recognition”, the user who will search

some post on the Research Activity parent category “capture” could not find it.

- Don’t worry, the OpenMethods Chief Editor will recheck your categorization.
- **HomePage introduction.** In order to propose to users a first shorter introduction than the post one, you have to paste your full introduction in the little page named “**excerpt**” under your text with this form: “Introduction: (text of your introduction)”. Please note that if “**excerpt**” is not visible, you will have to click on the top right of your screen “**Screen options**” and then select “**excerpt**”, it will then be available right below the post text itself.

7. Finally, click on “**Publish**”. Your post is published on OpenMethods and you must check it on the homepage and on its main page: if you forgot something or made a mistake, you can go back to your post in Posts > All Posts > Edit your post and update it.

## FAQs

1. Scope. We understand that we focus on methods. For instance, do we include a post which reports research undertaken with certain method, but does not exactly focus on the method itself? What kind of content we’re NOT including?

=> Only if it includes an extensive description of the methods and/or tools itself. If the methods and/or tools are only mentioned but not described, this should not be included on OpenMethods.

2. Types. Do we accept all types of content (providing it is relevant) or exclude some types or genres, for instance reviews (though they actually are helpful), conference reports, PPT/Prezi presentations, video lectures, databases (e.g. NeDiMAH directory of projects)?

=> Providing it is relevant, we definitely can accept any (or almost) types of content. But not databases because OpenMethods is not aiming at being a registry, however a description, review, ... of said databases would be welcome.

3. Older content. Do we set any time-boundaries concerning the content we want to feature?

=> We believe that having “old” content is not an issue for OpenMethods. We wouldn’t like to put a limit or a ratio on the number of old/recent content neither. If the content is still relevant today, it is welcome on OpenMethods.

4. Self-nomination. Since we are a group of experts we also produce content of relevance for OpenMethods, esp. in our national languages. What is the policy on featuring editors’ own content?

=> We asked editors to join as experts so it is normal they already published on the topic. It is ok to use OpenMethods to republish their own content in a “fair” limit.

### Publishing Volunteers' contributions (see picture)

- Publication depends on three positive comments by Editors.
- Who publishes Volunteers' content: the Chief Editor chooses an Editor if there is no volunteer in the Editorial Team.
- Veto power: you can oppose your veto for an inappropriate content. It is an extreme action that every editor must explain in a comment (PressForward > Nominated). All the Editorial Team must approve your veto: if there is not a consensus, the Chief Editor will refer to the Management Team for decision.

## Annex 4 - Guidelines for nominating content by Volunteer Editors

### Managing Your Account

You can manage and edit your profile in your WordPress User Profile at the top right of the screen or within your Dashboard Users -> Your profile.

You can also edit your personal information, add additional contact information, or update your biography from this page.

Be sure to save your settings by clicking the “Update Profile” button before leaving this page.


If you have questions or comments about the registration process or about selecting content, please [contact us](#).

### Getting Started as a Volunteer Editor

As OpenMethods Volunteer Editor, you have received an invitation from WordPress for logging in. You can get to the login page by choosing “Log in” on the homepage.

If you have forgotten your username or password, just follow the prompts on the login page. In case of other technical problems related to OpenMethods connection problems, please [contact us](#).

After logging in, you see directly the OpenMethods Dashboard: you can see the OpenMethods homepage website by clicking on OpenMethods > visit the site.



### Instructions for Nominating Content


Reminder:

- OpenMethods highlights **already published content**: we do not publish original contributions on OpenMethods. All selected content has to be already published

elsewhere. It can be blog posts, reports, presentations, working papers, data papers, articles or book chapters. **It is not a problem if a content is already highlighted on another platform.** Content with persistent identifiers (uri, handle, doi) are of course more than welcome.

- You have to select only **Open Access** content/data.

1. For nominating posts, first you have to put the tool “Nominate this” on your toolbar:
  - go to the Dashboard (on the top left of your screen, click on OpenMethods > Dashboard), on the left column go to PressForward > All content
  - click on “Nominate this” and move it to your toolbar
  - you have your tool for nominating!



# OPENMETHODS

HIGHLIGHTING DIGITAL HUMANITIES METHODS AND TOOLS

[HOME](#) [ABOUT](#) [WHO WE ARE](#) [JOIN US](#) [SUBMIT A CONTENT](#) [LOG IN](#)

2. Now, you have to go to the blog/website from which you want to nominate a post.
3. Don't click on “Nominate this” immediately. **Select a paragraph** you think is very interesting to appear on the OpenMethods homepage in order to induce OpenMethods users to click on the source link afterwards.  
So select and click on “Nominate this”. A new page opens: write **an introduction in English** (500 characters max) before the content, and sign it with your name.  
Ex.: “Introduction by Volunteer Editor (name): text.”
4. Finally click on “Nominate”. An OpenMethods Editor will highlight your selection on the metablog soon.

You can also submit content without registration as Volunteer Editor by going to the page: [Submit a content](#).

## FAQs

1. Scope. We understand that we focus on methods. For instance, do we include a post which reports research undertaken with certain method, but does not exactly focus on the method itself? What kind of content we're NOT including?  
=> Only if it includes an extensive description of the methods and/or tools itself. If the methods and/or tools are only mentioned but not described, this should not be included on OpenMethods.

**2. Types.** Do we accept all types of content (providing it is relevant) or exclude some types or genres, for instance reviews (though they actually are helpful), conference reports, PPT/Prezi presentations, video lectures, databases (e.g. NeDiMAH directory of projects)?

=> Providing it is relevant, we definitely can accept any (or almost) types of content. But not databases because OpenMethods is not aiming at being a registry, however a description, review, ... of said databases would be welcome.

**3. Older content.** Do we set any time-boundaries concerning the content we want to feature?

=> We believe that having “old” content is not an issue for OpenMethods. We wouldn’t like to put a limit or a ratio on the number of old/recent content neither. If the content is still relevant today, it is welcome on OpenMethods.

**4. Self-nomination.** Since we are a group of experts we also produce content of relevance for OpenMethods, esp. in our national languages. What is the policy on featuring editors’ own content?

=> We asked editors to join as experts so it is normal they already published on the topic. It is ok to use OpenMethods to republish their own content in a “fair” limit.

## Annex 5 - Guidelines for Chief Editor and Deputy Chief Editors

To manage :

- publications of the current week
  - homepage
  - dashboard > all posts > post > edit > manage language, form and TADIRAH categories reading the whole original article
- nominations
  - nominate or trash a content received by email notification
  - save in an external file the texts of every nomination (selection and VE introduction) in case of technical problem.
  - archive a published nomination in the Dashboard
  - manage the number of comments
  - if 3 positive comments, write to an editor asking him to publish it
  - send weekly reminder for commenting
- OpenMethods technical updates (WordPress notifications in the Dashboard)
  - update **only** the plug-ins except:
    - PressForward (Really important to never update unless Technical coordinator has checked the new version)
    - If Menu
    - User Role Editor
- new VE
  - create new accounts (Dashboard > Users > Add new > Contributor)
  - manage if they nominate or not content during their calendar of availabilities: if not, write them to ask if they have some problems with the guidelines.
  - update the calendar in the form “Register” adding dates.
  - write to them if there is something wrong with their nomination (also after ET meeting), and if it will (not) be published.
- Editorial Team
  - send the agenda through the mailing list a few days before the monthly meeting
  - send the minutes and the doodle (framadata) for the next meeting a few days after the monthly meeting, through the mailing list
  - send a reminder two weeks before the monthly meeting to complete the doodle until the end of the current week.
  - meetings: news, discussions on problematic content, on technical and formal workflow, etc.

## Annex 6 – Screenshots of various posts in different languages

DECEMBER 12, 2017

### Zur Epistemologie digitaler Methoden in den Geisteswissenschaften

Introduction by OpenMethods Editor (Joris van Zundert): What is the precise impact of digital humanities on the humanities in general? That this influence exists seems a given, but how the digital humanities impact humanities methodology en epistemology is still an open question. This article delves deeper into this problem of epistemology and presents a model of five 'polarities' along which these influences can be positioned.

“ *In einer grö ßeren Reflexionsschleife mü sste man aber fragen, ob diese multidisziplinä re Ausrichtung so unidirektional sein muss. Es ist schließlich gleichfalls denkbar, dass methodische Aspekte der Geisteswissenschaften ü ber die Digital Humanities auf die Erkenntnisagenda der Informatik und auf die Wissensordnungskonzepte der Bibliotheks- und Informationswissenschaft zurü ckwirken.*

Original publication date: 28/04/2016.

Source: [Zur Epistemologie digitaler Methoden in den Geisteswissenschaften](#) | [Zenodo](#)

Image 2: Example of content published in German



NOVEMBER 15, 2017

## European survey on scholarly practices and digital needs in the arts and humanities

Introduction by OpenMethods Editor (Maciej Maryl): This report (available in English, French, German, Polish and Spanish) summarizes the findings of a web-based survey conducted in 2014/2015 by the Digital Methods and Practices Observatory (DiMPO), a DARIAH working group. The survey was dedicated to the use of digital methods and tools in the humanities research.

*“In order to provide an evidence-based, up-to-date, and meaningful account of the emerging information practices, needs and attitudes of arts and humanities researchers in the evolving European digital scholarly environment, the web survey involved a transnational team of researchers from more than a dozen countries, and addressed digitally-enabled research practices, attitudes and needs in all areas of Europe and across different arts and humanities disciplines and contexts.*

Source:

ENGLISH VERSION: [European survey on scholarly practices and digital needs in the arts and humanities – Highlights Report](#)

FRENCH VERSION: [Enquête européenne sur les pratiques académiques et les besoins numériques en sciences humaines. Résultats principaux de l'enquête](#)

GERMAN VERSION: [Europäische Erhebung zum Umgang mit digitalen Methoden in den Geisteswissenschaften – Ergebnisse der Erhebung](#)

POLISH VERSION: [Europejski sondaż praktyk cyfrowych w humanistyce i naukach o sztuce. Najważniejsze wyniki](#)

SPANISH VERSION: [Encuesta europea sobre prácticas académicas y necesidades digitales en las artes y las humanidades](#)

Image 3: Example of multilingual published content