Improving Disability and Rehabilitation Research content within Wikipedia, the World's Largest Online Encyclopedia

Presenters:
Ariel Cetrone

Sponsored by AIR's Center on Knowledge Translation
Disability and Rehabilitation Research (KTDRR)
https://ktdrr.org/training/webcasts/webcast86/

Transcript for audio/video file on YouTube:
https://youtu.be/jSmwJLsqQMc

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Welcome, everyone. My name is Kathleen Murphy, and I direct the Center on Knowledge Translation for Disability and Rehabilitation Research, which is funded by the National Institute on Disability, Independent Living, and Rehabilitation Research. So thank you, NIDILRR, for your support. And thanks also to Shoshana, whom you just met, and Ashley Clark-Purnell, who leads our training and TA, and our intern, Haley Van Luven, who was very helpful in putting this event together.

I'm a white woman. And I'm wearing a light-green, sleeveless shirt that has a ruffle going down the middle and kind of Buddy-Holly-style blue reading glasses with little gold earrings. And my background is blurred.

So the event of the day, what you're all here to hear about-- not really me-- but is about improving disability and rehabilitation research content within Wikipedia, which you may be aware is the world's largest online encyclopedia. I'm sure everybody on this call has at one point googled something and looked at a Wikipedia entry.

So we're really privileged to have with us Ariel Cetrone from Wikimedia, which supports Wikipedia. And she is the institutional partnerships manager for Wikimedia DC, which is just one regional outreach affiliate for Wikipedia. And she'll talk a little bit about the other projects that the Wikimedia Foundation runs. And she's based in the DC area. So I will turn the baton to you, Ariel. Thank you so much.

ARIEL CETRONE: Thank you. Hi, everyone. My name is Ariel Cetrone. A physical description of me is that I have brown hair that is pulled back into a bun, and I'm wearing a pink shirt with a collar, and I am a white woman. And my background is unblurred, plain wall. I'm so glad you all are here.

My organization that I'm representing today with this work is called Wikimedia DC, as Kathleen said. We are the regional outreach organization for Wikipedia and other projects of the Wikimedia Foundation. Our mission is to promote participation in Wikimedia projects in Washington, DC, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Delaware, and throughout the United States.

One of the interesting things now, however, about living in a remote-work world is that we also partner with organizations around the world. So we do a lot of work globally as well. So what you can expect today is to learn a bit about Wikipedia-- some things, you may know. Some things may be new here to you today. We will talk about potential causes and solutions for closing disability-related content gaps within Wikipedia.

We will also talk about article structure. And when we say "article," we mean Wikipedia articles and not newspaper articles. So some people, when they're talking about a page in Wikipedia, will call it just that-- a page. But the technical term that you'll hear many Wikipedians use is "article." So every entry within Wikipedia is called an article.

We will also learn a bit about how to edit existing articles and create new ones. Now, today-- for this potential part one of what could become potentially a multiseries editing event when it comes to Wikipedia-- we will just do an entry. We'll dip our toes in and learn a bit about how editing of Wikipedia occurs and how you can engage with editing. If we were to do something in the future, we would be actually editing together-- specifically, articles related to our chosen theme.

So we're going to take a step back now to talk about Wikipedia itself. Now, Wikipedia is something that many of us use on a daily, weekly, monthly basis. It's something we could look at, get the information that we need, and close it. Sometimes we do a deeper dive to learn more about a particular topic. And sometimes we go down what we call Wikipedia rabbit holes, where we start to look at one article within Wikipedia and wind up somewhere completely different 10 clicks later.

So a good summary of Wikipedia itself-- and something to think about when you engage with it from this point on-- is that Wikipedia is a multilingual, web-based, free encyclopedia based on the model of openly-editable content. That's a fancy way of saying it's an online encyclopedia that anyone can use. It's the largest and most popular general reference work on the internet.

So there is nothing quite like it in size. Wikipedia is typically in the top 10 list of most-visited websites in the world. So this is where people come to find information. Now, we won't be talking too much about AI, about artificial intelligence. But just know that many AI tools that

we're seeing now when we google things or search things online-- many of them are incorporating Wikipedia content and vice versa.

So there are conversations within the Wikimedia and Wikipedia communities about what incorporating AI will look like. We will not be talking about that too much. But just know that sometimes when you do find a search result to a question on the internet, sometimes you are actually reading Wikipedia content.

Wikipedia itself contains articles that include information about notable subjects and topics. In English-language Wikipedia alone, there are over 8 million articles. You'll hear me say the words Wikipedia and Wikimedia quite a bit. So I want to pause a moment and explain the difference.

So Wikimedia we like to describe physically as the umbrella. So Wikimedia is the umbrella or the suite of projects beneath it. So under the Wikimedia umbrella is Wikipedia, which is the largest project under the umbrella. We also have Wikimedia Commons, which is a data repository of images, videos, and sounds. And we also have Wikidata, which is an online database.

Now, Wikipedia, of course, is the largest of the projects you'll see here within the list. There are some other ones that you are more than welcome to search for and find information about. There are Wiki libraries. There's Wikinews sources. There's Wikivoyage, which is a travel guide. They're all very interesting, but none are quite as large as Wikipedia.

A quick note about Wikimedia Commons-- Wikimedia Commons is the online photo repository, is where all the images that you find within Wikipedia articles live. So any image within a Wikipedia article must be uploaded to Wikimedia Commons first. That is how we address the copyright of the image. That is how we make sure that images that are copyright protected or are not in the public domain-- that's how we keep them off of Wikipedia. And we'll talk a bit in a moment about why it's important to do so by design within Wikipedia.

So Wikipedia was launched with the idea that the world should give free access to the sum of all human knowledge, and that information is crowdsourced. So we are crowdsourcing a free knowledge source, and that's what Wikipedia is. Editing and using Wikipedia is free. Reading Wikipedia is free. It's created and edited by volunteers.

There is no official process to become a Wikipedia volunteer, other than creating a username. So if this is something that you want to pursue or look into, you can always create a Wikipedia username by going to any Wikipedia article or just wikipedia.org, looking on the top right-hand side, and clicking on Create Account. Once you create that account and start working, you are

considered a volunteer editor. You do not have to ask for permission or go through an official vetting process.

Wikipedia is overseen by the nonprofit organization the Wikimedia Foundation. Now, my organization, Wikimedia DC, is separate from that. We are a nonprofit organization that is incorporated here in DC. The Wikimedia Foundation is a large organization incorporated in San Francisco, though many of their employees are based around the world.

The Wikimedia Foundation are the folks who collect money. If you've ever been on Wikipedia and they ask you for a donation, that money goes to the foundation. The foundation takes that money, and they use it to keep Wikimedia projects online. They then use that money to provide grants for organizations like mine. Because as an official regional affiliate of the foundation, we are independent, but we are recognized by the foundation as an outreach arm of their organization.

All edits within Wikipedia are recorded forever, so nothing is ever deleted. But it is possibility to revert an article back to an earlier state. Sometimes you'll see this if an article was vandalized, or if it turns out that something that was widely reported in a reliable source-- the news, for example-- was incorrect. Somebody can go in and easily revert an article to remove that information, in addition to just deleting it. But it is possibility of reverter articles back to an older state.

As I previously mentioned, there are 8-million-plus articles in English language Wikipedias, but there are Wikipedias in over 280 languages as well. All content within Wikipedia is freely licensed without restrictions. Now, what that means is, once you add text into a Wikipedia article, you are releasing that into the public domain. If somebody copies and pastes the text that you wrote and published in a Wikipedia article into their own publication, you have no legal recourse there.

We would hope that somebody wouldn't do that. It is not best practice. Ideally, they will quote it and note the source. But just note that if somebody did do that and copied and pasted the content that you added to an article, there is no legal recourse there. Because all content within Wikipedia is automatically released into the public domain, meaning there are no copyright claims on it.

That goes for most images uploaded to Wikimedia Commons first. There are few exceptions. So, for example, if we're writing an article about a company that has a logo, you can upload that logo with a special label that says, this is not in the public domain. This is a copywritten image. This is for informational purposes only. But if uploading an image that you took yourself, for example, you would upload it to Wikimedia Commons and release the rights.

Wikipedia basics, policies, and oversight-- so this is where we start to dig into, what can you put on Wikipedia? What's allowed and what's not? So we'll pause for a moment and say, what's a wiki? It's one of these things we also hear throughout the presentation, and we want to be clear that we know exactly what it is.

So a wiki is a website that anyone can edit. Edits are meant to be quick. All versions are remembered. As I previously mentioned, you can revert an article back to its older state, and this helps with that. Lastly, wikis hyperlink from one to another.

So if you are in that Wikipedia rabbit hole and you click on something and you're learning about it, and you start to click on other links-- so, for example, someone's hometown, or the university they went to, or a project they've worked on, or something about their research-- and you keep clicking through to learn more and more.

That's what we want to see within Wikipedia articles. The idea here is that we are creating a web of knowledge on the internet. So if you do edit in the future, please be sure to-- in addition to citing your sources, be sure that you link your article to other Wikipedia articles to help people get to that article and learn more about what you've written and the subject.

Wikipedia pillars-- so we have five pillars upon which Wikipedia is built. So we already learned-- we talked about Wikipedia being an encyclopedia. When we write an encyclopedia, we need to keep a neutral tone. So Wikipedia is written from a neutral point of view. Now, of course, we've all read a Wikipedia article and we said, you know what? That seems a little slanted. Or, I don't see both sides represented here. The goal is to give you as a potential editor the skills needed to fix that. So what we are looking for in the ideal Wikipedia article is that it is written from a neutral point of view.

All content within Wikipedia is freely usable to use, edit, distribute however the reader sees fit. Wikipedia editors should treat each other with respect and civility. Just be nice to each other when you're editing online. I will pause to say that Wikipedia is a social environment but is not a social media platform. So this is not a place that tolerates abuse, threatening behavior, or the like.

When somebody receives a message or experiences some sort of altercation within Wikipedia, that should be reported right away, and it is taken seriously. I believe it was Wired magazine that recently said that Wikipedia is one of the safest spaces on the internet, which was great to hear. It's not perfect. Nothing on the internet is. But it is good to know that things like that are taken seriously.

I'm not saying this to scare you. Wikipedia is generally a friendly place. But just know that if something ever happened and you want to report it, there is a process for that.

And lastly, Wikipedia has no firm rules. It's always funny to say all the rules of Wikipedia and then say, there's no firm rules. But basically, what that means is, there are exceptions to things. This is a community-driven effort. So there are conversations that happen behind the scenes.

I do want to call attention to the bottom right of your screen here. You'll see a highlighted shortcut, so WP:Pillars. You'll see these shortcuts throughout the presentation. So when you are in Wikipedia, if you take this shortcut and put it into the search bar, it will bring you to the full breakdown of this entire Pillars page-- or, in the next page, the Policies page-- and so forth. So there are quick ways to find this within Wikipedia. And all you need to do is type these shortcuts into the search bar, and you should be able to find this information.

So, again, when writing Wikipedia, these are the things that we need you to keep in mind. So previous page was the pillars upon which Wikipedia is built. Next, we have the actual things we want you to remember as you were entering content.

So when you are writing, please be neutral. So an article should be written so that both sides can agree. Of course, you don't have to know both sides of an argument to have to start an article, but you should be able to present whatever side you're writing about with a neutral tone. Hopefully-- the idea here is that others will come along and add the missing side of the argument if it is that type of article.

Next is notability. This is one of the most important things to think about. And one of the most common questions we get about Wikipedia. So how do we know something is notable enough or important enough to have a Wikipedia article? This is what keeps Wikipedia from being a social media platform or a marketing tool where people can come along and promote themselves or their company.

So this is how we would like editors to think about it. If you can find at least three high-quality secondary sources-- so when we say "secondary," we mean newspaper articles, academic journals, print materials like books, reliable magazines-- online materials are OK. And we'll talk a bit more about what reliable sources are versus not in a moment.

But if you can find three of those that talk about your subject or topic's notability, about why they are important-- so if it's a person, it should be why they are important, what job do they hold-- if that's what makes them important. What events have they been involved in? What research do they do? So I know we were talking a lot with research today in the disability-related field. So if

you're writing about somebody who does that work and they are notable, you need to talk about what they did that makes them notable or important within their field.

So if you can find three sources that talk about that, you can go ahead and create the article. If you cannot find those sources-- even if you know the person is doing great work, if you cannot find those sources, the article should not be created. Now, it's not saying the article should never be created. But as a tertiary source, we need to make sure that secondary sources are available before we start writing a Wikipedia article.

Next is verifiability. So when adding new content and citing the sources where you got that information-- because as we know, when we read a Wikipedia article, ideally, every fact should have a corresponding citation that tells the world where you found that information-- you need to make sure that you're using reliable sources. These are things that are not untrustworthy, that are not controversial. And I'll talk a moment about that.

So next is no original research. This means that when you cite things within Wikipedia, you should be citing secondary materials. You shouldn't be writing things that are brand new. So you are not looking at primary documents to determine somebody's life story or the lifeline of a particular field as it developed.

You are looking at things that are already been published. You're not reinventing the wheel here, as we like to say. You are just rewriting in your own words things that people have already published, and you are citing those materials.

Next is, assume good faith. You want to make sure that when communicating with other editors, you have a congenial spirit. Just know that when other people contact you, typically, many of them are just trying to make the encyclopedia as accurate as possible. So once in a while, you might get a message. And you would just hope that they are kind and speak to you in a respectful manner. And, again, if that does not happen, please report that.

Next is conflicts of interest. I like to say love, blood, or money. It's the easy way to remember it. So when we're talking about editing or creating articles about people, you don't want to edit an article about yourself, someone you're closely related to, someone you're in a relationship with, your company-- a company that pays you or a person or a company that you pay for some sort of service.

So try to keep your distance. So just remember love, blood, or money. Now, we'll talk a bit more about how to write about something if you are an expert in that field. That is OK. That is not considered a conflict of interest unless, of course, you start writing about yourself.

I have a quick cheat sheet here that talks about the reliable versus unreliable sources. And as this recording will be uploaded-- is my understanding-- you'll be able to come back here and pause this and look at what these sources also look like. So we have reliable and unreliable sources. Again, you can come back and look at these.

One note before we move on from here-- I do want to say, when creating a Wikipedia article, please do not cite social media. So if you're writing about someone or their work, don't go to their LinkedIn page and cite that. It's not considered a reliable source-- same goes for a self-published website.

So now I want to talk a bit about citing yourself. So you do not want to overly site yourself. Let's say you're an expert in your field. You do not want to overly site yourself. Only do so where is appropriate. Do not put undue weight on your own work. And avoid promotional tone or intent.

With that in mind, it is OK as a subject matter expert-- if you are published in reliable sources-- to cite yourself. So I know that we may have some individuals who are published here on the Zoom. If you have published on something on a topic or subject, feel free to cite yourself.

Just do it where it's appropriate. Cite your published material. Do so where it's appropriate. Don't do it too much. Because basically, what that does is tell people are spamming articles, or they will think you are spamming articles. Also, don't put any undue weight on your own work, meaning, let it exist within the field the way it does naturally. So try not to make it seem that it is the end-all, be-all for that topic.

Just insert it where it is appropriate. Cite your work where appropriate. And, again, avoid promoting your own work by using it too much. That said, it is OK to cite things that you have published. And you'll look at the bottom right here. I have a shortcut if you want to learn more about what you can and cannot do when it comes to that.

Quick note about plagiarism-- I wish I didn't have to add this to presentations. But I've noticed in the last few events that we have had, we have had some plagiarism. So I put this back in, just to make sure that we keep that in mind when editing articles, If it comes to that and you choose that this is something that you would like to do as a hobby or otherwise.

Some events that we do are followed by about an hour and a half of editing, which is why I originally included this slide. But it's also good just to know, even if we are not going to be editing today. So when you are adding content to a Wikipedia article, please do not copy text from the source that you are citing and paste it verbatim, word for word, into a Wikipedia article, even if you are citing your original source as the place where you found that information.

This is pretty basic stuff. What we need you to do-- I always tell people, pretend you're writing a research paper, like you did in college, a basic research paper that a professor could flag potentially for plagiarism. What we need you to do instead is find something-- a fact or facts about what you want to write about. We want you to write that in your own words into the Wikipedia article and cite the source where you found the information-- basic plagiarism avoidance here.

But please don't copy things from the internet and paste them into Wikipedia articles. It happens probably at every event that I do, even with this warning. So we always have this in there. Some think it's OK when going specifically to government websites, where that content is already in the public domain.

I've had that happen a lot. You'll go to a website that's owned and operated by the government, US government. They'll copy the content and put it in and say, I thought this was OK because it was already in the public domain. No. Please cite that source. We already talked about conflict of interest, but this is, again, a good cheat sheet here for what you can and cannot do.

And a brief note about the article deletion process-- so let's say you've created a Wikipedia article from scratch. And you think that it's OK, and you go ahead and publish it. Articles do get deleted within Wikipedia, which is why we like you to know the rules. Again, the rules are, it should be a notable topic. You should be citing really good sources. You should have hyperlinks. And it doesn't have to be long, but it should be a good-quality source of information for people reading the article.

If another editor comes along and decides that that is not the case, they can nominate the article for deletion. Now, there are a couple of different things here. I won't spend too much time on that. But just know that if you do create an article, please don't be discouraged. It happens to the best of us. It happens to me all the time.

There is a way to argue for your case if you choose to do so. If you create an article and it is nominated for deletion through the articles or deletion process, what happens is, the article is nominated for deletion. And the community-- being other editors, including yourself-- have a chance to vote for keep or delete. You can also comment to say why you think the artist should be deleted or kept within Wikipedia.

That is a process that ends once an administrator of Wikipedia, which is also a volunteer, comes along and decides the end result. It's usually based on the votes. But in many cases, it's based on the comments, the quality of the comments for or against. Next is speedy deletion. If you create a Wikipedia article and it's very clear that it's not notable, it can be deleted right away. That is really only done when it's very clear that the person is not notable.

And proposed deletion is a process somewhere in between. You don't see these very often, but somebody will nominate it for deletion. And a full discussion with comments is not necessarily needed, but they'll put it up for deletion for seven days. And if nobody objects, it is taken down. One of the things we can combat, as I said before, is once you write your article-- make sure you are writing in your own words, citing the sources where you found the information, and keeping a neutral tone.

Wikipedia articles are rated for quality. So this chart is read from the top to the bottom. If you look on the left side, we have a colored chart, starting with the blue. So we have FA, which stands for Featured Article. If you look all the way to the far side of that row, however, you'll see that only 8,500 articles within Wikipedia have been rated FA, or featured article. What that means is they are good enough to be featured on Wikipedia's homepage. So this is a small drop in the bucket compared to the 8 million articles that we have.

Now, if you look back at the rainbow-colored list on the left-hand side and take your eye all the way down to the Stub row, you'll see that the stubs have 3.8 million articles out of the 8 million articles. And a stub is what we consider a short article. It is the shortest type of article within Wikipedia.

Now, this may seem like a bad thing. This may seem like, oh, why aren't our articles longer than this? Just note that it is OK to publish a stub article. I love stub articles, especially for new editors. It's a great way to get started.

I always tell people at events that actually include an editing session after the training-- is that if we can leave at the end of that day having created stub articles with three to five sentences each that talk about a subject or topic's notability-- if it has some really good sources, if it has some really good hyperlinks-- that's all we can really ask for. So what we will do is publish that article so that other editors within Wikipedia can go ahead and work on it as well.

So Wikipedia's content gaps-- we have gaps within content, but also, we have some gaps in participation. So the average Wikipedian and the average volunteer Wikipedia editor is white, male, technically inclined, formally educated, an English speaker from 15 to 49 in a Christian country. They are also most likely to be what we consider a white-collar worker or enrolled as a student.

We know that-- the most recent data we have with an official survey says that about 10% of Wikipedia editors identify as female. This is rather an old study. It came out sometime between 2008 and 2011. There were a few different surveys that were making the rounds. But just know that we've made a little bit of progress. The more recent estimates when it comes to women editors are closer to 12% to 15%.

So I know we're not specifically at a gender-focused event here today, but it's something to think about when choosing to edit Wikipedia yourself. You can help to close this gap. You can let other women know that Wikipedia is something that might be of interest to them if you think that it is, if you have any one specific in mind. Please know that every time we recruit a woman editor, we are helping to close the gap in participation.

Now, that ultimately translates to-- about 19.86% of articles in English-language Wikipedia-- and I should say biography articles-- are about women. So this is one of our most documented gaps within Wikipedia. And I know this is not, as I said, a gender-focused event. But it's something to keep in mind, that we do have a lot of information about this gap.

There are other gaps, however, that we don't know as much about, but we can make an educated guess on what they are like. I know that we are planning to talk about disability-content gaps. So how can we necessarily talk about a gap when it's not a project that's tracked as well as the gender-related content gaps? We're going to do our best to theorize why some of these gaps may exist and talk about that a bit.

So to give you some background, there is currently no major Wikipedia project like the gender-focused project that we call Women in Red-- there is no equivalent project in the disability field that tracks gaps within content. There is something called a Wikiproject, which is a group of people who work together to create and edit articles about related to disability, but it's not particularly active.

Editathons, which are large editing and content drives, do take place regularly but are not part of larger initiatives. The percentage of disability-related articles may be harder to determine, as there are more subcategories and research is ongoing.

Now, because when we talk about the gender gap, we can look at biographies and very clearly say we're just looking at biographies about women, but when talking about disability related fields, there are subfields and sub-categories-- so it is harder to track.

There are some gaps, however, that are more likely to be seen more easily, which some of those exist in Wikimedia Commons, which that's our photo repository. So if looking for photos related to disability research or a particular disability itself to go into the article about it, one of the great things that we can do to address those gaps, knowing that many of those photos don't exist, is to take them and upload them into Wikimedia Commons.

So now it's started to be a bit of a bummer to say that we don't have this specific data here about what we know when it comes to content gaps. But just know that this is not unique to this

field. There aren't as many gaps that are tracked outside of gender within Wikipedia. But we do know that if they do exist, they mirror any gaps that we see in secondary publications.

So, again, it's important to remember that Wikipedia as a tertiary source is a direct reflection of available secondary sources. So we always tell people, even if we are not tracking the gap, just know, if there is a gap of content about a certain field or subfield within secondary sources, it can be argued that that gap also exists within Wikipedia.

Because if we don't have the secondary sources to cite, we cannot grow the tertiary source. So if you, as experts in the field or multiple fields in this area, if you know that there are content gaps in certain secondary sources or similar, just assume that those gaps do exist in Wikipedia.

One of the other things that makes it harder to write disability-related content that we can assume is that many secondary sources may behind may be behind paywalls. So if I'm sitting at home and I want to cite a journal article and I don't have JSTOR, I'm not on a university campus, or I don't have access to something via my library-- whatever it may be-- if paywalls are there, it's impossible to access that material.

So it's something to think about-- if you have a publication out there-- to make it more accessible and remove it from behind a paywall is something that is great for Wikipedia editors and can help to grow the content within the encyclopedia. Lastly, one of the things that we can do to close this content that we're assuming does exist within Wikipedia is that we can train new editors, experts in the field, which is what we're trying to do here today.

So it is important that, in order to edit Wikipedia, you really know what you're doing. It's not one of these things that's too particularly difficult, but you must know how to do it before you start. So doing things like this, training people who are interested in this field or related fields, is a great way to ensure that we are adding content into Wikipedia.

So I touched on some of these already, but just operate under the assumption that these gaps exist, especially if they align in the secondary-source area, that there are gaps in there. We can do more work by continuing to plan events and editathons. We can also highlight this work. So if you decide to host an editathon or go to an editathon, please share it widely in your circles. And we can also encourage scholars to make their secondary source publications as accessible as possible.

So these are some of the things-- in the last 15 minutes or so-- that we will share. We will not be actually editing Wikipedia today. But these are some things that, if you were choosing to edit Wikipedia in the future-- whether we do a part 2 or we have people edit Wikipedia, or you want

to go ahead and try to do this on your own, which many people do-- these are the things that we'd like you to keep in mind.

At this point, we'll talk about how to create a username and how to use that to edit. So if you choose to create a username in Wikipedia, what you need to do is go to Wikipedia. If you're using English Wikipedia, you can just go to wikipedia.org and click on the English option. You can also go directly to en.wikipedia.org.

On the top right, you'll see the option to create an account or log in. If you do not have a username slash account, you go ahead and click on Create Account and create one. It takes a few minutes. It's very quick. You are asked for your email. You do not have to give it. But just know that that is the only way to get your password, recover your password if you lose it. So I advise sharing your email. All usernames are public. So anybody can see your username. You do not have to use your real name.

When you create a username within Wikipedia, you have a chance to add to something called the User page. Now, this is a publicly-facing page where people can add information about themselves. So feel free to say who you are. You do not have to add your real name here. You'll see that I do because that is my professional page. But you can write what you're interested in. You could just say, hi, happy to be here.

I do want to note that this page is not mandatory. You do not have to use this page. You can ignore it completely. But just know that if you ever want to share information about yourself or your interests with other editors, what you do is log into Wikipedia using your newly-created username, click on your username at the top right of the screen, and it brings you to a blank page where you can share information about yourself.

When you create a Wikipedia username, you are given a Talk page. This is the page where messages that are sent to you by other editors-- this is the page where those will go. You can reply to people on that page directly.

There are two types of editors in Wikipedia. There's VisualEditor, which is a "what you see is what you get" editing system. So you'll open up a Wikipedia article, you'll click the Edit button, and the article will open up and look very similar to the way it did before. At that point, your cursor will start to flash, and you can type within the article as if you were typing in a Word document or another word-processing system. So that is the easier-to-use editing system.

You can also edit Wikipedia using what we call Wikicode. So if you know code from editing websites or whatever it may be, you can edit Wikipedia using code. But if you are new or you're more comfortable using VisualEditor, feel free to do so when the time comes if you choose to

edit. So, again, VisualEditor is a way to edit Wikipedia where you open the Wikipedia article, you click on the Edit button, your cursor will start to flash, and you just type like you're in a Word document.

Now, a quick note-- I don't want to spend too much time on this-- but if you choose to edit on your own, I always recommend setting a preference that I'm about to demonstrate. This preference will allow you to see both editing systems when you have the article open on your screen.

So when I have an article open on my screen and I look on the top right, I see two options after I set this preference. The options will be Edit, which is VisualEditor, and Edit Source, which is code editing. In order to see both of those options in a more accessible manner, I need you to set these preferences when you start editing.

So what you would do is log in. You would click on the Person icon on the top right and select Preferences. On the following page, you would select the Editing tab. On the page after that, you would scroll down to the Editing Mode dropdown menu, open that up, and select show me both editor tabs. And I should say, you should save it. Don't forget to save it.

What that does is, when you open up an article, you'll be able to see Edit, which is VisualEditor, and Edit Source, which is source editor. Sometimes if you don't do this, all you will see is the source option. And I don't want anyone to think that they're missing the VisualEditor option.

So, again, what you would do is you would go to a page within Wikipedia, click on Preferences, select Editor, select the editing dropdown menu, and show me both editor tabs. Again, great thing about this being recorded is that you can go back to this point-- if you choose to try to do that-- and pause it.

So I'm going to talk about article anatomy. What do we see when we look at a Wikipedia article before we actually edit an existing article? So I have a sample article here today, and it's on mobility aids. So you'll see here the article starts with a few paragraphs and then goes into the actual content. This is typical of what we see in a Wikipedia article.

What you may not have looked at before is, when you have a Wikipedia article open, there is a Talk tab on the left-hand side. Like every user gets a Talk tab, every article has a Talk tab. So if you are ever within Wikipedia and looking at an article, feel free to explore it. Click on the Talk tab on the left side of that article, and it will show you any behind-the-scenes discussions that have been had about that article.

If you look at an article, you'll also see a tab called View History. You'll be able to see every edit that was made to that article in a long log of edits that were published. So if you go to an article and click on View History, you'll see a list that looked like this. Now, if I were to click on a date, what it would do is show me what the article looked like at that particular time.

This is a great way to see how an article was built out. This is also a great way to revert an article back to an older state. So if you had the article itself and you noticed vandalism or wanted to change something, what you would do is go to the View History tab, click on the page with the date that you want to revert to. You would select Edit and then Publish, and the article would go back to the way that it used to look.

Wikipedia articles start with what we call a lead paragraph. So this is a summary of what is important about the topic. You'll notice that the first word or the first time the name of the article appears in the text is always emboldened. So when writing a new article, make sure that you have that in bold.

You then will make a statement. So, for example, "a mobility aid is a device that helps" and then so forth. You'd finish your statement there. Then you would go on to talk about-- not every detail about it, but you would make your case for notability. So why is this important? What is it? Why is it important? And so forth.

Now, when writing biographies-- I always find that it's easier to do with biographies because you can say who the person is and what they did. When writing about other topics, I highly suggest finding a similar article and looking how the lead paragraph is organized, to match yours to that if it looks to be a high-quality one. So, again, the lead paragraph is a place to say what you're writing about and talk about why it's important. It's also, in some cases, a place to summarize the content below. But just know that a lead paragraph is relatively short.

Everything below the lead paragraph is split into sections. So we have our sections here that go into detail about in certain areas. Now, again, with biographies, it's a bit easier to explain because we write the lead paragraphs and then we break the person's life down chronologically-- so, for example, early life and education, career, legacy, and so forth.

Now, when writing about other things, it's always good to, again, take a look at similar articles and see what headers they have for their individual sections that live below the lead paragraph. So a good tip also is to go to what we call the Wikipedia Manual of Style for recommendations on what those certain sections should be called. If you go to Wikipedia and enter WP:Manual of Style, you can find some options there. But one of the tried-and-true ways, as I said multiple times, is to go to a similar article and see how the sections within that article that live below the lead paragraph are labeled.

Wikipedia articles have basic inline citations. So when somebody adds a fact, they'll cite their source. It'll generate a citation number here, as you can see. And the reference will automatically be added to the bottom of the page. You do not have to worry about reorganizing things numerically. It will go where it needs to go within the References section.

Wikipedia articles have hyperlinks. So we always say you only need to hyperlink from Wikipedia to Wikipedia within the body of the article. So any time you see a blue link, that's taking you from Wikipedia to Wikipedia. So, for example, if assistive canes appeared 10 times within this article, you only have to hyperlink to it the first time it appears.

Wikipedia articles at the bottom sometimes have additional sections below references. So sometimes you'll see external links. Sometimes you'll see sections that have related fields, for example. And then, in all cases, you'll see Categories at the bottom. So if you click on Categories, the categories available here, you'll see other articles that are related to that article that you are currently reading. Now, these things are a little more advanced for new editors. But just know that any article, if you scroll down, you'll typically see these sections.

So a brief couple of slides about what to do if you actually want to start editing-- so let's say you have an existing article on your screen and you notice something is missing, or you found a typo, or you found a really interesting study that's not represented here and you want to add some information from it. You would go to the article. You would click the Edit button on the top right.

Now, again, remember, Edit equals VisualEditor and Edit Source is code. If for some reason, you don't see the Edit button and you have set that preference that we demoed a few minutes ago, you can click on the Pencil icon and switch to visual editing. Once that's done, the page will reopen and look very similar to the way it did before. But now you will have Formatting buttons on the top of the screen.

Now, when it comes to actually adding content, all you need to do is place your cursor where it needs to go and write. It's as simple as that. Just act as if you are in a Word document. Now, when it comes time to citing the source that you need to cite, place your cursor where you want your citation number to go. You go up to the top of the page and click the Cite button.

You'll get a pop-up menu where you can click on Automatic. So if it's a URL, all you need to do is paste the URL where it needs to go. If you want to get a little more detailed, you can click on Manual and enter the type of source you're citing and then fill out the fields that appear there.

It's one of the things where you can do it and get used to it. You can even practice in an existing article, even if you are not ready to edit that article. You can just close it before you save it if you

don't want to make any changes to the article. But just note, when you need to cite your sources, you place your cursor where your citation needs to go.

And select Automatic if you're adding a URL. You can also add a ISBN there from a book, a DOI from a journal, that sort of thing. If you want to do it manually, you can click the Manual option and select what you're citing and fill in the fields. You don't have to worry about how you format your citation. It doesn't have to say-- oh, is it MLA? Is it Chicago format? Whatever it may be-- Wikipedia does that for you. You don't have to remember how to format the citation.

Creating a link within a Wikipedia article is the same as doing it in an email or something else. You highlight the word you want to link from-- highlight it, go up to the formatting bar, and click the link button. And automatically, the Wikipedia article-- if one exists-- will appear in a list below, and you click on it. Once you click on it, the hyperlink is created.

Next is adding sections. So, remember, we talked about adding sections after the lead paragraph. How you do that is place your cursor where you want the header to go, the heading for that section. You type the name of the header. You go up to the top and change the font from Paragraph to Heading. That's all you need to do. Once you click Enter or Return, it will default back to the regular text.

Next, we talk about images. So all images within Wikipedia articles must be in Wikimedia Commons first. But you do not have to leave Wikipedia to look for images within Wikimedia Commons. Instead, what you can do is place your cursor where you want the image to go. Click on Insert Images and Media.

You'll then get to a page that looks like this. You can type in what you're looking for. If you find an image that you would like to insert into that article, you select it. On the following page, you can caption it. You can enter alternative text. And then insert, and your image will go directly into your Wikipedia article.

And the last thing I'll mention when it comes to this is publishing. When editing Wikipedia articles, especially existing ones, be sure to publish often. And then you can always click on Edit and keep working.

Now, the last thing I want to mention for those of you that are potentially interested in creating new articles as new editors-- what you would need to do is start articles as drafts. This is one way. You can go to the Wikipedia search bar, type in draft and the name of your article. Once a red link comes up-- red links on Wikipedia means that articles don't exist-- you would click on that red link, and you will get a blank page.

At that point, you write your lead paragraph, you create a References section, and you start citing your sources. Once you hit publish, your article will go live within Wikipedia as a draft. You can then move the article from draft format to regular Wikipedia, which is a little more of an involved process.

And I will be happy to help anyone if they get to this point and choose to move forward before a more official editing workshop. If you want to learn how to move an article from draft to mainspace Wikipedia, I can help you with that. You can email me directly or share the article, and I will be happy to look at it. With that, I believe we have about five minutes left, and we wanted to leave some time for questions. So I'm going to stop my share and see if we have any questions.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Absolutely. Thank you so much, Ariel-- such practical information. I'm excited about it. Yes, there are a few questions. Kathleen Klinich is wondering-- I know you discussed this, but she wants to confirm whether or not it's OK to reference journal articles if they aren't publicly available. Should we link directly to the article or to the abstract in pubmed.gov? So would that abstract be enough?

ARIEL CETRONE: Even if it's behind a paywall, you can link to the full article. Yeah. So if you have access to it and you have found information in it, please link to the full article. Even if the reader of the Wikipedia article cannot access the whole thing, it's best that they know that at least exists and that others can access that article. So please feel free to link to the full article.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Thank you, Ariel. And Jess Chaikin is here with us from the NIDILRR-funded National Rehabilitation Information Center. And I know you've already worked with her. And she's highlighting an event there in the chat about the Wikiproject on disability. And, Jess, I wonder, do you want to unmute and ask your own question or chime in here?

JESS CHAIKIN: Sure, sure. So I did have the awesome experience of participating in a Wiki Editathon. And I hope everybody who's on this call, when one of these comes up, you jump in with both feet. Because it's interesting, it's super nerdy, and it's a lot of fun. But I did have a question about reading level. Is there a reading level that we should aim for when we're writing? Some of these topics can be really technical. Some of them are not. Is the goal to make something really technical not as technical? What do you suggest?

ARIEL CETRONE: I would say write it-- how do I explain this? Because I don't think I've ever gotten this question before, but it's something I have thought about. I would say, don't worry about being technical. And I'm thinking about all of the work that we did with editing around COVID and vaccine research. We worked a lot with the World Health Organization to improve

articles about the COVID-19 vaccine and related articles. We encouraged doctors to write them as best they could with the information that they had.

So the goal here is to just make it as accurate as possible and not necessarily worried about readability, but keep that in mind. There is a website called simple Wikipedia that breaks down articles to be less technical. It is not well-known, so most people don't go there. But just write about how it should be written, and don't so much worry about making it more readable.

JESS CHAIKIN: And is Simple Wikipedia part of the Wikipedia organization--

ARIEL CETRONE: Yes.

JESS CHAIKIN: --or is it-- OK, interesting. Thanks.

ARIEL CETRONE: Sure.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: We do have a few more minutes, if anybody wants to put something in the chat or unmute themselves. And while you're mulling that over, pretty soon, we'll be putting a link to this event evaluation in the chat. Shoshana, I think you can go ahead and do that.

And if you-- it would be helpful when you do the evaluation, which we hope you do. If you could put in the comment field at the end of it if you're interested in any kind of follow-up, we can reach out to you and connect you to Ariel or maybe have one of these events where we can move forward in building out the disability content on Wikipedia. The evaluation is anonymous though. So if you want a direct follow-up, you would have to put your email with the comment that you're making there.

I think, Jess, you want to say something?

JESS CHAIKIN: Yeah, Kathleen. So, Ariel, I was looking at the Wikiproject and the disability project. I myself am not a person with a disability. Certainly, I work with a lot of people who have disabilities. I have an entire library of disability and rehabilitation research.

Is there an etiquette for joining something like this, where maybe you are not representative of the group? But you're knowledgeable about it. You're supportive of it-- I guess the question is about being an ally versus an advocate or a representative.

ARIEL CETRONE: So I really don't think that there is anything like that within any of these Wikiprojects. The only way to engage is sign up as an editor within it. And because everybody is quite anonymous within Wikipedia, I've never seen any sort of self-identification or requirements when it comes to that. But it is an interesting question.

If anyone is interested in learning more about Wikiprojects, you can search for Wikiproject Disability within Wikipedia and see some of the work that's been done there and how it's represented. But as far as I am aware, there's really no such thing like that. I will say about that project, though, it doesn't look to be particularly active. But that said, because anybody can join it, if anyone is interested in helping to energize the project, I'd be happy to help you walk you through that process.

KATHLEEN MURPHY: Perfect. Thank you so much, Ariel. So speaking of disability etiquette, we do want to end on time for the purposes of our wonderful ASL interpreters. Thank you so much. Thank you, Ariel. And thank you, Jess, for your participation as well. This webcast will be archived on the ktdrr.org home page. Thank you.

ARIEL CETRONE: Thank you.