

CALL FOR PECE PEER REVIEWERS

The PECE Design Team is soliciting Peer Reviewers for work done on the Platform of Experimental Collaborative Ethnography (PECE), an open source (Drupal-based) virtual research environment that allows for archiving, collaborative analysis and creative expression of ethnographic data expansively conceived. Reviewers will be asked to comment on how PECE's affordances are mobilized to support different kinds of projects and publications, including journal articles and books. Reviews will be open (with the identities of authors and reviewers disclosed), building on a model proven effective in various Open Science communities. Open Peer Review is especially appropriate for PECE given the newness of digitally enriched scholarly communications.

PECE provides a space for researchers to engage across projects, enables collaborative analyses, supports data visualizations, and activates researchers' engagement with public problems and diverse audiences. As a place to archive and share primary data generated by scholars in the empirical humanities and social sciences, PECE facilitates analytic collaboration, and encourages experimentation with diverse modes of publication. PECE also enables experimentation with new forms of peer review for humanities and social science research. In this vein, we are establishing a database of PECE reviewers who can play an integral part in shaping discussions about the design of functionality, aesthetics, theory and content of/on PECE platforms.

We approach peer review as an open practice (where both the reviewer and author/creator are known to each other during the peer review process) with the aim of generating new lines of inquiry and areas of elaboration rather than as a disciplining mechanism of defining what counts or does not count. The aim of a PECE peer review is to provide feedback to authors that advance the work in ways that relate to the author's stated goals and the project's needs. This may include feedback that helps refine visual presentation (making it more accessible, for example) and helps make stronger connections between data visualizations and theory.

Details

The difference between the two types of reviews outlined below are largely in scope, time commitment, and analytic lens through which each role is looking at these materials. The "Essay" level reviewers are primarily focused on a single essay (perhaps with 5 - 10 artifacts embedded) and are reading for flow, content, analytic value, alignment between form and content. The "design reviewer" is willing to take on larger and perhaps more complex projects such as a book manuscript published in PECE or reviewing an entire project on PECE. This could include reviewing / discussing the conceptualization behind a new or recently deployed PECE instance, a new genre form or creative use of PECE.

Design Reviewer

Design reviewers will engage with the intertwined theory and practice of PECE, drawing out the theory behind the design of form and content. These reviews may focus analytically at the level of the platform or project. On rare occasions, a design review might be requested at the level of

the essay or artifact if a customization has been undertaken to expand PECE in a conceptually innovative way. Design reviewers do not need to necessarily have content expertise on the project topic but should have extensive experience and familiarity with the PECE platform itself and should have knowledge about the various functionalities and use cases of PECE. Design Reviewers should become familiar with PECE design logics and committed to the PECE values statement and code of conduct. Designer reviewers will approach content with questions such as:

- How does this instance (uniquely) implement and leverage PECE functionalities (essay, artifact, analytics, annotations)?
- What insights emerge based on the configuration of the materials?
- Further questions can be found in this analytic set ("[Reading PECE Platforms/Projects](#)")

Essay Reviewers

Essay Reviewers will review PECE looking for the effectiveness of argument in the interplay between form and content. Essay Reviewers have content expertise on the essay's topic and some experience creating, reviewing, or teaching multimedia publications. Essay Reviewers will approach content with questions such as:

- How has the author articulated ties across the artifacts? Is there an explicit meta-commentary or meta-narrative?
- How has the author foregrounded the concepts and associated literatures relevant for the associated project/essay?
- How does the configuration of the materials lend to engagement with the argument?
- How has the author leveraged the analytic structure and annotation functionality of PECE?
- At what layer does the “analytic voice” intervene (e.g. Does the essay foreground the artifacts; analytic questions; annotations; etc.)?

Expectations:

For both kinds of reviews, you will be assigned to “read” the essay or platform including a one page cover letter written by the creator that outlines the kind of feedback being sought. This may include multiple nested layers of content. As the reviewer, you will then respond to a set of analytic questions provoking your thoughts. These questions may look like [this](#), for example. The time commitment varies but once a request for review has been accepted by you (the reviewer), we would expect to receive the analytic question responses within a 4 week period. Members of the PECE Design Team will be available to answer any questions or difficulties that might arise in the course of your review.

To Apply:

If you are interested in volunteering as a PECE Peer Reviewer, please complete [this form](#) by Friday, April 9, 2021. Please indicate which kind of review type you would like to sign up for (or both). We circulate a quarterly call for reviewers so if the deadline has passed, you can apply next quarter. Should you have any questions, please email outreach@worldpece.org. We appreciate your interest and look forward to hearing from you.