CHAPTER 26.

RHETORICAL INTERVENTIONS: A PROJECT DESIGN FOR COMPOSING AND EDITING WIKIPEDIA ARTICLES

Julie D. Nelson

North Carolina Central University

While some scholars have claimed the neutral, unbiased style of Wikipedia writing might be at odds with feminist pedagogies that support experiential knowledge and personal narrative, this project design presents Wikipedia writing to students as a rhetorical challenge. Employing Royster and Kirsch's (2012) four terms of critical engagement from Feminist Rhetorical Practices, this project narrative describes a sequence of assignments that encourages students to 1) consider how knowledge emerges and is culturally situated; 2) analyze the rhetorical motives and limits of Wikipedia as a community; and 3) practice feminist interventions through the composing and editing of Wikipedia articles.

When my fall 2015 ENG: 3130 Writing for Social Change class looked at the Wikipedia page for our university chancellor, my students were stunned. Debra Saunders-White, who had an impressive career ranging from IBM to the U.S. Department of Education and who was the first female chancellor at our Historically Black University, had a Wikipedia page with three sentences. Saunders-White's page was scant in comparison with the pages of chancellors and presidents at other local and similarly-sized schools. My students knew her accomplishments rivaled theirs, so why, they asked, was her page so meager? Unfortunately, it is no surprise that an African American woman's Wikipedia page is undeveloped compared to her mostly white and male colleagues' pages, given Wikipedia's well-documented gender gap and its self-acknowledged "systemic bias."

Race and gender disparities in Wikipedia coverage and authorship are disheartening, but they also offer students and teachers valuable opportunities to rectify disparities, by writing for Wikipedia. Teaching wiki writing encourages

not just collaboration and complication of the writer-reader relationship (Lundin, 2008; Alexander, 2008; Cummings et al. 2008) but also reconsideration of knowledge production and revision (Cummings, 2009; Purdy, 2009, 2010). When students write and edit Wikipedia articles, they produce and revise knowledge, creating a prime opportunity for feminist intervention in Wikipedia (Vetter & Harrington, 2013; Vetter, 2013). However, some scholars suggest that Wikipedia is not conducive to feminist ways of knowing and writing. Cattapan (2012) and Gruwell (2015) argue that the methodologies valued in Wikipedia and its writing style (specifically the requirement to use a neutral point of view) prohibit students from contributing experiential, embodied, or narrative knowledge.

In this project design, I respond to these concerns and assert that when teachers present writing for Wikipedia as a rhetorical challenge, students learn to push the boundaries of acceptable Wikipedia style and content—making feminist and socially conscious interventions—in rhetorically appropriate ways (see appendices A and B for course and project descriptions). I describe a writing for Wikipedia project assigned in a course called Writing for Social Change, a writing-intensive course whose objective was to study and produce activist and socially-motivated texts. Students enrolled were mostly upper-level English and communication majors who identified as African American and female. While a lot of in-class time was dedicated to the project the first half of the semester, in the latter half, students worked independently on their articles, and class time was devoted to other readings and assignments. Through the stages of this project, students engaged in feminist inquiry and practice by questioning "truth" and who makes knowledge, looking for gaps or underrepresented perspectives, contributing their own knowledge, and writing for a public audience. Similar to Stephanie Bower's digital storytelling project (Chapter 24, this collection), writing for Wikipedia encourages students to engage in community-based research and writing in two important ways: 1) as students go into their communities to find local, valuable, and underrepresented knowledges and 2) as students produce those knowledges and stories to share with (and intervene in) the global Wikipedia community. After outlining some of the potential obstacles for feminist contributions to Wikipedia, I describe the project and its attempts to engage with and overcome these obstacles.

WIKIPEDIA AS A SITE FOR FEMINIST INTERVENTION

Wikipedia, like many encyclopedias, privileges white male, western histories and epistemologies. Sources vary, but most suggest that women make up only 8-16% of editors, and topics more interesting to female audiences are often

undeveloped or absent (Wikimedia Foundation, 2011; Lam et al., 2011; Cohen, 2011). According to Lam et al. (2011), the average female editor makes half the number of edits of the average male editor, female editors tend to leave Wikipedia sooner, and articles with mostly female contributors are often more regulated and contentious. While there are no solid statistics on the race and ethnicity of editors, the dearth of articles related to marginalized histories and cultures, in addition to the demographics of the average user, suggests a serious disparity (Smith, 2015). The Wikimedia Foundation, which runs Wikipedia, acknowledges this "systemic bias" and reports that the average user is a young white educated man with internet access ("Wikipedia: Systemic Bias," 2015).

Given these biases, it is no wonder why college instructors assign writing for Wikipedia in their courses, yet some instructors suggest the assignment may work against feminist goals and pedagogies. For example, women's studies professor Alana Cattapan (2012) asked her students to contribute articles related to the women's movement in Canada. While the assignment was largely successful, she lamented, "Students cannot write in their own voices in Wikipedia, and must conform to a model of writing that might not be true to their understanding of an issue, or reflective of their perspectives" (p. 128). Wikipedia articles are required to use a neutral point of view (NPOV), "which means representing fairly, proportionately, and, as far as possible, without bias, all of the significant views that have been published by reliable sources on a topic" ("Wikipedia: Neutral point of view," 2015). This policy prevents students from writing first-person narratives, reflecting on their embodied social positions, or explicitly sharing their perspectives—common feminist values. Leigh Gruwell (2015) echoes these concerns in her study of female Wikipedia editors, suggesting that the "objective" and "encyclopedic" writing style discourages women from contributing. The results of her study suggest "the values of the male-dominated discourse community discount feminist ways of knowing, thus alienating and silencing alternative epistemologies and subjectivities" (p. 120). Many of the practices feminist teachers include in their courses conflict with Wikipedia's guidelines.

However, in addition to these practices, feminist rhetorical scholars encourage using creativity and flexibility to work around/in potentially exclusionary discourses and communities. While NPOV poses some obstacles for making feminist interventions, NPOV and one's own voice are not mutually exclusive. Beyond the inability to use first-person, there are other ways to express one's perspective, for example, through construction of a page (e.g., organization, content, images, and links) and through references (e.g., referencing sources, quotes, and statistics that express one's perspective). Although original research is not an acceptable reference in Wikipedia, finding published texts that support students' perspectives is still a valuable task. Writing in NPOV does not require disregarding or betraying one's

beliefs; rather, it may just take more rhetorical work to find ways to express those beliefs. Feminist ways of knowing and writing are expressed in more than just style; publishing a page on a marginalized historical person or revising a page to express an underrepresented point of view is also a feminist intervention.

Cattapan and Gruwell are right that Wikipedia restricts feminist writers in some ways, but we should not overlook other kinds of intervention in the processes preceding publication and writing strategies that push Wikipedia's guidelines in rhetorically appropriate ways. I define feminist interventions on Wikipedia broadly, as revisions or additions of missing or underrepresented knowledge or perspectives, not necessarily written by or about females or explicitly using "feminist." While a final draft of an article may not explicitly reflect feminist views, the process of students analyzing, writing, and contributing to Wikipedia is still valuable feminist rhetorical work. I draw my understanding of this work from Royster and Kirsch's *Feminist Rhetorical Practices* (2012) which identifies four central terms of engagement in feminist rhetoric and composition: strategic contemplation, critical imagination, social circulation, and globalization. The assignments that I designed for this project urge students to engage with these particular terms and practices.

From the very first week of class, students engaged in "strategic contemplation," which Royster and Kirsch explain involves entering into a dialogue with texts, considering multiple perspectives, dealing with contradictions, and recognizing that lived, bodily experiences shape the way we research. After digesting articles and statistics about the biases and gaps on Wikipedia, students began to look for the silences and absences in the Wikipedia articles they read. I asked students to complete an analysis of controversial topic pages to identify the rhetorical strategies used to hold multiple points of view in one place (Appendix C). Through this assignment, students saw how editors inserted their perspectives in articles and identified rhetorical strategies that reflected marginalized perspectives. "Critical imagination" pushes students to find those marginalized perspectives. According to Royster and Kirsch, it is an inquiry tool that urges researchers to look for untold stories, question notions of "truth," and recover important events and stories from the past. To do this work, I took my students to our university's archives to look for potential article topics (Appendix D). This assignment physically immersed students in the research process and challenged them to find ways to share their findings, carefully and ethically. Relatedly, Royster and Kirsch's third term "social circulation" emphasizes the social nature of rhetoric, specifically how language moves, changes, and relates—and how power dynamics are reflected in those relations. To employ this term, my students analyzed the systemic biases of Wikipedia articles that were similar to the ones they were writing and then addressed those biases in their own writing (Appendix E). Finally, "globalization," Royster and Kirsch's fourth term, is at the heart of the

whole project, as students contributed their own, often local and underrepresented, knowledge to a global (English-speaking) community.

OVERVIEW OF WRITING FOR WIKIPEDIA PROJECT

I assigned this project in an upper-level writing course at a mid-sized, public Historically Black University. Because of the lack of African American historical and cultural articles on Wikipedia (Smith, 2015), I encouraged students to find projects to fill the gap. The final assignment required students to write a new 500-700-word article or expand an existing Wikipedia article by 500-700 words. Because student success with new media projects is often tied to how central and embedded the project is in the course (Sura, 2015), I introduced the project the first week of class and spent the first half of the semester focusing much of our class time on the development of the project. The following describes its five stages, which may be expanded or condensed to meet the demands of various courses.

STAGE ONE: RECOGNIZING THE FEMINIST RHETORICAL CHALLENGE

Because writing for Wikipedia is unlike most other kinds of writing students have done, analyzing Wikipedia is useful for familiarizing students with its style and content guidelines. In some early class discussions, I asked students to identify different kinds of topics/articles (e.g., person, place, event, theory, etc.) and analyze the organization and rhetorical strategies commonly used in each kind. To introduce students to the technical aspects of Wikipedia, students completed a Wikipedia Training ("Wikipedia: Training/For students," 2015) and The Wikipedia Adventure ("Wikipedia: The Wikipedia Adventure," 2015) during this first stage. While the former introduces students generally to the purpose and policies of Wikipedia, The Wikipedia Adventure asks students to complete seven "missions," including starting an account, editing articles, and using talk pages. These interactive assignments help students who are overwhelmed by using wiki markup (the language or code used in Wikipedia) and other technical aspects of the project.

In this first stage, I presented the project as a rhetorical challenge. While I acknowledged that Wikipedia is a community that discourages certain kinds of feminist writing and points of view, I also pointed out opportunities for making meaningful contributions or revisions. This is when we began discussing NPOV and its restrictions—a conversation which I couched in a larger discussion of how dominant and feminist epistemologies manifest in encyclopedias. I asked students to analyze controversial pages on Wikipedia to identify some of the strategies they saw used to present varying, unorthodox, and radical opinions

in conventionally appropriate ways (Appendix C). Some of the strategies my students identified were word choice; number of facts and statistics; amount of contextual information and content; cultural points of view included and excluded; organization; direct quotes from the subject or from parties directly involved; links to other pages (making conceptual connections to other people, events, or ideas); and visual arguments (e.g., photos, videos, tables, and graphs). I suggested students use these same rhetorical strategies in the composing of their articles, to find ways to include their critical or feminist perspectives in rhetorically acceptable ways for Wikipedia.

STAGE TWO: FINDING A GAP OR DISPARITY

The main goal in this stage is to help students find a topic. I took my class to our university archives where students looked through artifacts related to the history of our university and city. Students completed a two-part assignment (Appendix D) that asked them to immerse themselves in the archives, to seek out intriguing stories, and to find a corresponding gap on Wikipedia. As students discovered accounts of the significant events, people, and organizations that built our community, they often found stories they felt compelled to share and developed a sense of responsibility to the community to present their research ethically. The archive trip encouraged personal connections to community research yet challenged students to determine how to express that investment in Wikipedia. For students who did not find a topic in the archives, I shared the WikiProject Directory which lists groups dedicated to developing articles in particular areas, e.g., African diaspora and women's history. At the end of this stage, I asked students to write a proposal for an article, and I held one-on-one conferences with them to address their individual questions and concerns.

STAGE THREE: BECOMING THE EXPERT

During this stage, students gathered all of the sources and content for their articles and began organizing it. In class, we developed outlines, organized information, and practiced paraphrasing sources. Another useful in-class activity was expanding an undeveloped university-related page together; this allows the class to walk through the process of finding and evaluating sources according to Wikipedia's guidelines, organizing the writing based on analysis of similar pages, paraphrasing sources, and drafting, revising, and writing together. Through this process, students negotiated together how to communicate their investments and values in the campus community to the global Wikipedia community. Once the class had a working draft, I showed students how to move it into a Wikipedia

Sandbox (a test-run space in which writers experiment with wiki markup) where we could practice making section headings, adding references and footnotes, and linking to other pages. Finally, I published our contribution during class so students could see that process.

STAGE FOUR: RECONCILING FEMINIST AND NEUTRAL POINT OF VIEWS

Through workshops and peer review, students continued to develop and revise their articles. In class, we reviewed NPOV, since adhering to it is necessary for successful publication. To think more about the purpose and limitations of NPOV, students completed an exercise about systemic bias on Wikipedia (Appendix E). Going over systemic bias at this point helps students figure out how they might respond to or counteract those biases in their own articles, making more or less explicitly feminist interventions in the Wikipedia community. Additionally, reflective assignments during this stage are valuable supplements that offer students opportunities to write about their experiences in first-person; these exercises also spur discussions about if/how some of that writing could be revised using NPOV and included in their drafts. At the end of this stage, I held a second round of one-on-one conferences with students to address their individual questions about their articles and publication.

STAGE FIVE: CONNECTING COMMUNITIES

Finally, students moved their articles into sandboxes so they could practice using wiki markup and adding headings, references, footnotes, links, etc. I recommend asking students to publish their articles with at least a few weeks remaining in the semester so teachers may work with students whose articles may be flagged or removed. To recognize and celebrate students' addition of locally significant stories to Wikipedia, I asked students to share their contributions in a final class period.

REFLECTIONS

The results of this project were mostly impressive: students published or expanded articles on valuable topics like notable university alumni/ae, local Civil Rights movements, African American politicians, and the effects of urban renewal on our city. However, my dual goals of wanting students to engage in feminist analysis and produce a text in wiki markup proved to be frustrating for some students. While students' work throughout the semester certainly showed critical analysis of the purpose and limits of Wikipedia, when it came to writing their own articles, students were often more concerned about meeting the guidelines

for publication rather than finding ways for rhetorical feminist intervention. Some students included images, design, or quotes to put forth their perspective on a topic, but many students seemed to feel uncomfortable pushing the boundaries. I designed assignments to encourage students to question what it means to create knowledge and to work against dominant, masculine discourses, but it was hard to sustain that work when students felt the mounting pressures of choosing a topic, researching, and writing. Students' concerns about the logistics of the assignment often eclipsed my plans for critical discussions and analyses of dominant epistemologies and methodologies. This tension is somewhat unavoidable, but starting the project early in the semester allows some flexibility in the schedule to address particular concerns as they arise. This extra time is especially important for students to acclimate to the unique conventions of Wikipedia. Also, focusing more on editing existing articles and adding marginalized perspectives might help students focus their energy less on finding a topic and more on developing feminist and critical intervention in existing pages.

Despite offering many possibilities for feminist intervention, writing for Wikipedia is a challenging project for students and teachers. Both my students and I had our writing on Wikipedia changed, reverted, or flagged. Recognizing the difficulty of entering a self-regulating, internet-savvy community like this is important to take into account when assessing this project. Because students need to simultaneously use their technical, research, and writing skills, I found it constructive to include in-class and take-home assignments that strengthen these three skills in tandem. I suggest grading the project holistically based on all of the assignments and drafts leading up to publication and not weighing the results of publication too heavily. Explaining to students how the project will be assessed alleviates some of the pressure of publishing. The stakes are understandably high for students—what they spent a whole semester writing could be reverted in an hour. Still, this project provides opportunities for feminist critique of dominant discourses and openings for feminist, local interventions in the Wikipedia community. Writing for a global public audience is a challenge but also a call to contribute knowledges and perspectives that need to be shared.

REFERENCES

Alexander, J. (2008). Media convergence: Creating content, questioning relationships. *Computers and Composition, 25*, 1-8.

Cattapan, A. (2012). (Re)writing "feminism in Canada": Wikipedia in the feminist classroom. *Feminist Teacher, 22*(2), 125-36.

Cohen, N. (2011, Jan. 30). Wikipedia ponders its gender-skewed contributions. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/31/business/media/31link.html

Cummings, R. E. (2009). *Lazy virtues: Teaching writing in the age of Wikipedia*. Nashville: Vanderbilt UP.

Cummings, R. E., & Barton, M. (Eds.). (2008). *Wiki writing: Collaborative learning in the college classroom*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gruwell, L. (2015). Wikipedia's politics of exclusion: Gender, epistemology, and feminist rhetorical (in)action. *Computers and Composition, 37*, 117-31.

Lam, S., Uduwage, A., Dong, Z., Sen, S., Musicant, D., Terveen, L., & Riedl, J. (2011, Oct. 3-5). WP: Clubhouse? An exploration of Wikipedia's gender imbalance. Paper presented at WikiSym, Mountain View, CA.

Lundin, R. W. (2008). Teaching with wikis: Toward a networked pedagogy. *Computers and Composition, 25*, 432-48.

Purdy, J. P. (2009). When the tenets of composition go public: A study of writing in Wikipedia. *College Composition and Communication, 61*(2), 351-371.

Purdy, J. P. (2010). The changing space of research: Web 2.0 and the integration of research and writing environments. *Computers and Composition, 27*(1), 48-58.

Royster, J. J., & Kirsch, G.E. (2012). *Feminist rhetorical practices: new horizons for rhetoric, composition, and literacy studies*. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press.

Smith, J. F. (2015, Feb. 19). Howard University fills in Wikipedia's gaps in black history. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com/2015/02/20/us/at-howard-a-historically-black-university-filling-in-wikipedias-gaps-in-color.html?_r=0

Sura, T. (2015). Infrastructure and wiki pedagogy: A multi-case study. *Computers and Composition*, *37*, 14-30.

Vetter, M. (2013). "Composing with Wikipedia: A classroom study of online writing." *Computers and Composition Online*. Retrieved from http://candcblog.org/mvetter/public_html/composingwithwikipedia/

Vetter, M., & Harrington, S. (2013). Integrating special collections into the composition classroom: A case study of collaborative digital curriculum. *Research Library Issues, 283*, 16-20.

Wikimedia Foundation. (2011, April). Wikipedia editors study: Results from the editor survey. Retrieved from https://upload.wikimedia.org/wikipedia/commons/7/76/Editor_Survey_Report_-_April_2011.pdf

APPENDIX A: COURSE DESCRIPTION AND SLOS

ENG 3130: Writing for Social Change

Course Description

We often think of the writing that we do in college as a means to pass a course or earn a degree, but our writing also has social and political implications. This course explores how writing and rhetoric (traditionally conceived but also including oral, visual, auditory, digital, and bodily texts and discourses) works to effect

social change. One of the goals for this course is to expand the audiences for our writing beyond the classroom, to reach people in our campus community and the other communities that each of us is a part. Thus, we will begin by analyzing texts that inspire (or intend to inspire) social change to determine what kinds of rhetorical choices are available to us as we produce our own texts. Through the study of the purposes, contexts, audiences, and rhetorical choices attached to particular texts and social issues, we will develop a better understanding of how we might most effectively persuade in the development of our own projects. For the purpose of this course, writing or composing will be broadly defined. While I will ask you to produce more traditional kinds of academic writing that require scholarly analysis and research, I will also ask you to read and create a variety of texts across genre and media (e.g., personal narrative, digital texts, visual texts).

Student Learning Outcomes

- Given instruction in genre analysis strategies, students will apply the method to several documents to help them clarify the characteristic features of unfamiliar genres.
- Given instruction in rhetorical concepts (e.g., rhetorical situation, exigence, kairos, audience, purpose), students will rhetorically analyze their own and others' writing.
- In the process of composing their own civic writings, students will use the aforementioned methods to understand a given writing situation and make choices among approaches.

APPENDIX B: PROJECT SYLLABUS FOR WRITING WIKIPEDIA ARTICLES

ENG 3130: Writing for Social Change

Assignment *Description*

One of your main projects in this course will be writing or expanding a Wikipedia article. Wikipedia, while a great advancement in democratizing who produces, edits, and accesses knowledge, still largely represents those who are already predominant in world history: western white males. The presence of women and minorities on Wikipedia—as writers and subjects of articles—is seriously lacking. In this project, you will add content to Wikipedia's global, digital body of knowledge. You will write a Wikipedia article that does not yet exist on a topic you deem important or expand an existing article. We will complete a sequence of assignments that will ask you to analyze Wikipedia as a knowledge-producing community; conduct research to find a topic for your article or expansion; study

Wikipedia's style and structure rhetorically; practice writing in NPOV style; and finally draft, revise, and publish your own writing on Wikipedia.

Goals for the Project

- (Re)consider how knowledges are created, shared, valued, and culturally situated
- Analyze the rhetorical motives and limits of Wikipedia as a community
- Use wiki markup (e.g., headers, links, images, references, etc.) to structure writing in rhetorically purposeful ways
- Practice writing for social change through adding missing or underrepresented knowledge to Wikipedia

Schedule Overview: In-Class Assignments

Stage One (weeks 1-2) Recognizing the Feminist Rhetorical Challenge	Introduce the project; Analyze articles to identify different kinds of pages and common rhetorical strategies; Discuss knowledge production and feminist epistemology; Introduce NPOV; Complete Analyzing Controversial Topic Pages assignment (Appendix C)	Complete Wikipedia training for students and the Wikipedia Adventure; Read "Wikipedia is Good for You" (James Purdy), excerpt from *Writing to Change the World*, (Mary Pipher), "The Transformation of Silence into Language and Action" (Audre Lorde)
Stage Two (weeks 3-4) Finding a Gap or Disparity	Take a trip to the university archives; Look at the Wikiproject Directory; Conference one-on-one about proposals	Complete Trip to the Archives assignment (Appendix D); Write a proposal for article/ expansion
Stage Three (weeks 5-6) Becoming the Expert	Take a trip to the library to find sources; Practice expanding a university-related article as a class and publish it; Practice paraphrasing sources and referencing in wiki markup	Write outline for article/ expansion, Contribute writing to the university-related article the class is expanding
Stage Four (weeks 7-9) Reconciling Feminist and Neutral Point of Views	Complete Systemic Bias assignment (Appendix E); Review NPOV; Peer review drafts; Conference one-on-one about final drafts and publishing	Write draft of article/ expansion; Return peer review feedback; Watch YouTube tutorials on making a Sandbox and publishing; Revise draft

Stage Five (weeks 10-11) Connecting Communities	Troubleshoot any issues with publishing	Move drafts to a Sandbox; Publish article/expansion
Post-Project (weeks 12+) Additional 2-3 weeks built in for students whose writing has been flagged or removed	Reflect on project; Meet one-on-one as needed	Present Wikipedia contribution

APPENDIX C: ANALYZING CONTROVERSIAL TOPIC PAGES ON WIKIPEDIA ASSIGNMENT

The goal of this assignment is to identify the rhetorical strategies used to express multiple, conflicting, or radical points of view in Wikipedia pages. These same strategies may be used in the composition of your Wikipedia articles.

Choose 1) a controversial social or political issue; 2) a controversial person; and 3) a controversial event.

Find the corresponding Wikipedia pages and answer the following:

1. How do the pages represent the various sides of the controversies?
2. Are these pages organized or designed differently than pages about less controversial topics? If so, how?
3. What kinds of sources do these pages use?
4. What kinds of words are used to describe what is controversial about the topics? List at least 10 for each page.
5. Imagine that you have a radical opinion about these topics. How could you include that opinion in ways that would be acceptable for Wikipedia's guidelines?

APPENDIX D: TRIP TO THE ARCHIVES ASSIGNMENT

Today we will take a trip to our university's archives to look for potential article topics.

Goals for this assignment

- Find some artifacts that reflect an underrepresented history that you

think is worth sharing with the global Wikipedia community.

- Practice reading and analyzing different kinds of texts to determine what information would be most interesting/important to contribute.
- Following research in Wikipedia, identify ways to interject that information in socially conscious ways.

Part One: Collecting Data

For the first part of this assignment, you will record the artifacts that you find in the archives.

Make a list of the various topics you encounter in the archives (e.g., people, places, monuments, ideas, theories, things, organizations, events, etc.). What stories did you find? What kinds of social issues were highlighted? What was most surprising about what you found?

Part Two: Finding the Knowledge Gaps on Wikipedia (after class)

Now that you've had a chance to sift through the archives, do some research in Wikipedia to see what and how the topics you found in the archives are represented. Write a few paragraphs describing the gaps you found and how you might fill them with the research that you did in the archives. Consider whether the sources you found in the archives would be acceptable to use on Wikipedia.

APPENDIX E: SYSTEMIC BIAS ON WIKIPEDIA ASSIGNMENT

The goal of this assignment is to identify different kinds of systemic biases in Wikipedia articles and to consider how you can counteract systemic biases in composing your own article.

According to Wikipedia's page on "Systemic Bias," the average Wikipedian is

> (1) a male, (2) technically inclined, (3) formally educated, (4) an English speaker (native or non-native), (5) aged 15-49, (6) from a majority-Christian country, (7) from a developed nation, (8) from the Northern Hemisphere, and (9) likely employed as a white-collar worker or enrolled as a student rather than being employed as a blue-collar worker.

English Wikipedia acknowledges the following systemic biases, present both in number of articles and/or in perspective:

1. Social class bias (e.g., because access to the internet requires a certain amount of privilege, topics relating to the less privileged are often neglected)
2. Reference/source bias (e.g., many of the most cited references are for-profit news corporations)

3. Perspective bias (e.g., universal topics, like "lunch," are written from the perspective of those in industrialized countries instead of developing countries)

4. Geographical bias (e.g., there are many more pages on Anglophone/European topics than Chinese or Indian, despite China and India having most of the world's population)

5. Popular culture bias (e.g., media produced in the US, UK, and Japan are more widely covered than media produced in other countries)

6. Language bias (e.g., native English speakers tend to rely on sources written in English, perhaps overlooking important texts in other languages)

7. Publication bias (e.g., because it is easier to find sources online, print or hard to find sources may be neglected)

8. Cultural impact bias (e.g., tragedies in developed countries are portrayed as more important than in developing countries)

9. Historical bias (e.g., in descriptions of historical events, some accounts are valued over others)

10. Religious bias (e.g., articles that include a "Religious Views" section often include only Christian, Islamic, or Jewish perspectives but not other religions)

11. "Controversial fringe topic" bias (e.g., controversial topics receive more attention than non-controversial ones)

12. Marketing or corporate bias (e.g., people or organizations may use articles as marketing tools)

13. Length bias (e.g., articles interesting to English-speaking audiences are longer than those written for audiences who speak other languages)

14. Name bias (e.g., a search for an article whose name has several meanings defaults to what is most popular to the average Wikipedian)

15. Timing bias (e.g., current events in English-speaking nations are covered and edited more frequently than others)

16. Hemisphere bias (e.g., more articles are written from a Northern Hemisphere perspective, which is especially significant for science-related topics)

17. Image bias (e.g., it may be harder to find images that adhere to Wikipedia's guidelines for profiles of people in developing countries)

[These examples are paraphrased from the "Systemic Bias" page in 2015.]

Responding to Systemic Biases

Look at several articles that are related to or similar to the one you will be writing/expanding and consider the following questions:

1. What kinds of biases (see list above) do you see in those articles?
2. How are these biases present (e.g., in content, style, organization, images, references, etc.)?
3. How can you respond to existing biases in your proposed article or expansion?
4. Finally, what kinds of bias do you have, given your location, experiences, beliefs, identities, etc.? How might you work against them in composing your article/expansion?