INSIGHTS ON SCHOLARLY PRIMITIVES FROM DIGITAL HUMANITIES RESEARCH IN SPAIN

CONTEXT AND OBJECTIVES

In order to provide the global community of scholars working in this field with a greater understanding of the current Spanish scenario, LINHD has recently promoted a research on the evolution of Digital Humanities in Spain in the last 25 years, a timeframe comparable with Unsworth’s first formulation of scholarly primitives.

More than 1,000 records have been mapped, distributed as follows: 577 researchers; 368 projects; 88 resources; 9 post-graduate courses; and 8 specialized journals. Digital resources (i.e. repositories of documents, collections of artefacts, crowdsourcing platforms, dictionaries, databases, etc.), which are the object of this poster, have been produced, mostly of the time, with the aim to publish a service to improve the basic of day-to-day research workflow in the Humanities.

Eighty-eight resources have been conceived and developed in the context of research projects; others have been more institutional initiatives. In both cases, we can:

- to classify and describe the digital resources mapped according with the classical and new scholarly primitives, in order to highlight presence, absence and recurring associations of these categories;
- To visualise the relationships between scholarly primitives and other dimensions in our data, like discipline and typology.
- to identify how the introduction of digital tools and methods has affected the basic functions of research in the Humanities in Spain over time.

DATA ANALYSED

Scholarly primitives involved in the implementation of different kinds of digital resources. It stands out that almost all primitives can be involved, at different stages, in the design and implementation of these artefacts. Some association is obvious, such as databases with data modelling digital libraries with collecting portal with referring. Others are less, such as the collaborative dimensions of many of them or the vast usage of data curation (annotating). Type of resources that, in percentage, seems to require a larger variety of primitives are crowdsourcing platforms, databases and portals (10–15 each) those with less are maps and mobile apps (4–5 each).

scholarly primitives exploitable from different kinds of digital resources for DH in Spain. We can observe that the range of primitives that digital resources are built for is much narrower than those involved and needed for their design and development and some of them are not present at all. An interesting comparison can be made between Searching and Discovery. Searching is the traditional way of interacting with digital resources such as databases, repositories or digital library. Discovery imply a different interaction process, where content is dynamically presented to the user in a proactive manner. It is a much more recent tendency, way less consolidated, but already spread out across almost the full range of categories.

METHODOLOGY

To perform this analysis, the digital resources collected in our database has been classified and described according to the following Scholarly Primitives (SP):

- Additional SP: Software usage, Software Development (Coding), Data Modelling, Crowdsourcing.

Most of the digital resources analyses have been conceived and developed in the context of research projects; others have been more institutional initiatives. In both cases, we analyses which primitives were involved in the design and development of the resource (i.e. what type of research activities have been necessary to generate them) and then for what scholarly primitives each artefact has been conceived for (i.e. what type of research activity the resource is endorsed for, how can be exploited). The vast majority of the resources have been classified based on the public evidence, since we can only speculate about the strategies adopted in those projects. Others, where we have been involved in the development phase, have been described based on hands-on evidence.
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