Peer review form

BRIDGING HUMANITIES

Dear reviewer,

Thank you for considering to undertake a peer review for the Bridging Humanities journal (www.bridginghumanities.nl). The nature of the journal implies a peer review process in which aspects other than those known in traditional academic peer review processes to be taken into account.

The aim of the journal is to experiment with new forms of academic knowledge production in the digital age within the scope of *qualitative narrative research*. We do this by publishing *digital multimedia* projects that are carried out in *co-creation* with other knowledge producers outside the academic domain, such as artists or journalists. In the publications we connect the field Humanities to other academic and non-academic fields. This translates into new forms of publications in which the specific structure and design are seen as part of the content. The publications (for an example see the first published article Croquemort) are non-linear and visual designed web projects that are not primarily text based and that include interactive features that facilitate user experience. As a peer reviewer you are asked to take these aspects into account, and to view the originality of the project also in these terms.

Bridging Humanities projects are carried out in co-creation, and a reflection on this process should form an integral part of the publication. Research in co-creation implies a non-linear process, in which various knowledge sources next to cognitive knowledge (such as affective or embodied knowledge) are valued on equal terms. Research in co-creation is a creative enterprise with human experience at its core.

Projects should address new possibilities offered by digitalisation in doing science and reaching the public. This implies methodological developments in making use and producing new digital data but it can also touch upon epistemological questions (e.g. how people adopt digital technologies and which new hierarchies in knowledge sharing and production present themselves). We would see greater transparency of research processes and data archives as a necessity. Bridging Humanities offers not only a place for storing raw material but moreover for providing insight in how the research is build up from these data and earlier publications.

Bridging Humanities does not adhere to a maximum word count for its publications. Yet, while narrative text is an effective way for communicating ideas, we promote multimedia publications and want to avoid replicating print articles or monographs on the web in the form as we know it (mainly text based pdfs).

The review will follow the criteria for publication:

1. The study presents original research within the scope of the journal, i.e. qualitative narrative research that has been carried out in co-creation and makes use of digital methodologies.

2. The structure and visual design of the project support the arguments posed and allow for innovative presentation of academic knowledge production.

3. The research makes clear how it builds on previous work and adheres to appropriate reporting guidelines and community standards for data availability.

4. Conclusions are presented in an appropriate fashion and are supported by a reflective analysis of the co-creation process.

5. The article is presented in an intelligible fashion that avoids jargon and is written in standard English.

6. The research meets all applicable standards for the ethics of experimentation and research integrity.

Please note that reviewers are anonymous by default. In **section A**, you are asked to provide your information. Reviewers' identities are not revealed to authors or to other reviewers unless reviewers specifically request to be identified. If a submission is accepted, we will ask you to start the discussion with a wider public about the

submission with a first comment from your personal point of view, opening up for further comments, critical readings and links to other research.

In **section B** you are asked to evaluate the submission following the publication criteria mentioned above. We kindly ask you to present your review in a professional and constructive way, focussing on ways to improve the submission.

With regard to the language, Bridging Humanities publishes in English. Additional translations/languages may be chosen for certain articles. You are asked to review the main body of English text, and if possible to take into account the texts in the other languages as well. Spell-checking and copyediting is undertaken by the authors and the editorial board before submission, but if you have comments on the language use, please use section B.5 for that.

In **section C** you are asked to provide your main conclusions on the strengths and weaknesses of the submission, and your overall recommendation for publication.

Lastly, in **section D** you may share with us any confidential notes on the article, which you would prefer the author not to see. Also, we would appreciate if you could give us feedback on the set-up of the journal and the peer review process.

A. Details Reviewer

1. **Name and affiliation reviewer**

#1

2. **Title of the submission under review**

Dissenting Voices: Challenging the colonial system

3. Please fill in the **return date**, which should be within the time frame set by the editor.

7 June 2018

4. Would you like your **identity** to be revealed to the authors?

No

5. Please state any **relationship(s)/possible conflict of interest** you have with the authors and cocreators.

6. Please indicate which **area(s) of expertise** is/are relevant to this review and how confident you are in the respective area.

History of Indonesia, role of visual media in academia.

B. Evaluation of the submission *(please include possible improvements)*

Peer review form

1. Does the submission present **an original contribution** to the field? Please take into particular account whether the process of co-creation and the use of digital sources/methodologies have presented new knowledge and insights. The work should not duplicate work of others.

> Yes, contributions to this article re based on original research.

2. Does the **structure and visual design** of the project support the arguments posed and allow for an innovative academic publication?

   With regard to recommendations, possible suggestions for improvement may consider topics like visual/multimedia design or interactive features (navigation through the article, facilitation of user experience).

> Yes this article has *the potential* to represent an important step forward towards new ways of presenting image, sound and text in the humanities, but the present format is a bit disappointing because visual media are still underrepresented while text still dominates. Why are the written texts not combined with many more images and sounds? *Bridging Humanities* should engage in new forms of 'writing' that foreground image and sound. I miss that ambition in this article. Images are to a large extent (good) illustrations to a text. But if *Bridging Humanities* wants to be innovative as it claims to be, it should demand that images and sound are no longer the supporting act of the text, but are part of a new interplay of image and sound, resulting in new ways of writing. I also miss more dynamic internal references. Now the contributions stand on their own without cross-referencing to other parts of the article. As a result the article is rather fragmented.

3. Does the research makes clear **how it builds on previous work** and adheres to appropriate reporting guidelines and community standards for data availability?

> Yes, references to ongoing academic and public discussions are adequately dealt with. References to sources etc are ok.

4. Are the **conclusions** are presented in an appropriate fashion and supported by a reflective analysis of the co-creation process?

> I could not find real conclusions because the articles does not ask questions. Instead it makes a statement that (1) histories should have multiple perspectives, and (2) that dissenting, and for that matter often marginalized voices are important for a better understanding of colonial history. It is hard to disagree with these statements which are neither new nor very innovative. So the article basically demonstrates that the statements are true. It does not analyse a problem.
>
> Talking about perspectives: the article does indeed include a few Indonesian voices, but they are primarily framed in a Dutch public discussion about Dutch colonial history. Apart from a brief reference to prof Bambang Purwanto from Yogyakarta, the article does not pay attention to Indonesian discussions on this topic. Are there no such discussions? Are they perhaps very differently phrased? Could a comparison between Indonesian and Dutch discourses perhaps raise more interesting questions?

> To put it in more provocative terms: this article is to a large extent restricted to a liberal minded Dutch colonial perspective in which some Indonesian voices are included. It by and large excludes the agency of Indonesian historians. Why?

5. Is the submission presented in an **intelligible fashion** that avoids jargon and written in standard English? Is the publication attractive and easily understandable to a wider public beyond academia?

> The article is very accessible, jargon is avoided, but it needs a native English language editor.

6. Does the research meet ethical and legal **standards for** research integrity and publication. Ethical or legal concerns may arise from the practice with human or other animal subjects, the use of property or copyright or any other issue that you may find relevant. Please also note if the work is offensive in any way.

> I don't see any problems here.

C. Conclusions & Recommendation

1. Please give your overall **conclusions** on this submission highlighting **strengths and weaknesses**. List revisions that should be requested and indicate if you deem them to be essential or merely desirable.

> 1) Try to formulate a more challenging question at the start of the article which goes beyond multiple perspectives and dissenting voices by including Indonesian perspectives more firmly in the discussion.
> 2) Try include more image and sound into the written parts.

2. Please provide your **recommendation** on whether you think the submission should be considered for publication

A. The submission should be rejected.
B. The submission should be rejected in its current state.
C. The submission should be accepted after some reworking. **X**
D. The submission should be accepted.

D. Message to the Editorial Board

1. If you have any confidential message to the editorial board on the **content of the submission**, please provide it here.

2. We would appreciate **feedback on the procedure**. Please indicate how you experience writing a review for Bridging Humanities and how we can improve our review process.