Andrew Wang, Alice Zhang

Prof. Kraut

Organizational Communication

10 December 2017

<div align="center">Wikipedia Self Reflection</div>

<div align="center">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Self-monitoring</div>

Part I

We chose Self-Monitoring as a topic due to several areas that we thought could be improved upon. These areas mainly focused on presentation, content-flow, and content-relevancy. The article previously had no clear hierarchy of content, and as a result, relied on the user to sift through the information to find what they needed. There was also no direct flow of content, with the article simply regurgitating information about the topic without any clear direction. Most importantly though was the issue of content-relevancy as several of the headlines weren't directly related to self-monitoring (e.g. competing theories and social psychology theory). Our goal was to fix these issues to better represent the content as a whole and deliver a more catered and less confusing experience to the readers.

Previously the article was presented with a very flat hierarchy. Headings had no subheadings, and each content topic had one heading where it was discussed as a whole. In order to create a better layout, we decided to split up several sections into smaller subsections such as for Scale and the different types of self-monitors within that

scale. In addition we combined several previously relevant sections together under an Individualistic differences heading. These include factors such as job performance, social performance, and relationship performance for self-monitors and how different self-monitors are affected differently in each of these aspects.

We also looked to address the problem of content-flow by grouping together much of the similar content that was presented, most noticeable in how there were previously several headings that could be condensed together into one section in Scale. By doing so we hoped to be able to allow the users to better navigate through the page and understand that due to the way that these headings were grouped together, each heading was relevant to each other. In doing so we were also able to expand on each section knowing that a context is given where we can compare and contrast information to neighboring subheadings. This way we were able to connect the subheadings even further, and give the readers a better understanding of their similarities and differences.

Content-relevancy was one of the biggest issues we dealt with while editing this article. Many headings didn't deal directly with self-monitoring but rather were either talking about its effects on other theories or talking about similar theories instead. Instead of taking those headings out, we tried to refactor them to bring in knowledge about other competing or similar theories but with the focus still on self-monitoring. Instead of expanding about the other theories, links were provided if the reader is interested, and a short comparison was made. This way we can still provide the readers with knowledge about related theories but not draw attention away from the main article.

We also sought to patch up missing content by expanding and creating new sections that covered them. The article previously was missing in depth detail about how self-monitoring affected personal life, and a clear historical understanding of the theory. While a big part of the improvements we did involved reorganizing the information that was already present, another was adding content in order to make the reorganized information flow better. In addition we added new sections and made corrections whenever possible.

Part II

From this assignment, we learned about the trends and collaborative effort of individuals who work on specific pages and how decisions are made. Within the talk page, there is commentary on what can be improved or changed, and many times there will be an individual asking about whether or not something can be verified or not if they become confused about a certain aspect. Despite the fact that editing an article is a volunteer based effort, there are still individuals who will actively read through and check to see if parts of the article make sense or not. We discovered that even a topic as seldomly browsed as Self-Monitoring will have users come to check through the new details and provide feedback.

We initially began learning about interacting on Wikipedia via WikiEdu, a site that allows students like us to explore and work through different modules to run through how edits on Wikipedia are made. There were several opportunities to practice making edits from the descriptions used in the modules along with the how and why some edits

are made and what goes behind the decisions of an edit. The modules that we used to learn about Wikipedia were particularly helpful in determining good sources of information to draw from and writing with a tone that fits the nature of a collaborative site. The guidelines and policies also served as a good baseline of how the nature of collaborative work should be and are useful in future group papers we may write in the future.

Aside from the end of the semester commentary from the two student editors assigned to our article, we only had one individual comment on the talk page regarding an edit that we made. We did take her comment into consideration when completing the wikipedia article - it was a comment on the wording as it seemed too similar to something the commenter had read. This was taken into account for the edits made. The student comments also included ideas pertaining to how to word titles to fit the encyclopedic nature of the site as well as clarifying some information so that an individual who has little knowledge on the topic can easily pick it up. Asides from some minor changes in grammar and punctuation styles, there weren't significant changes made to the article in the time that we spent working on it.

From our experience, Wikipedia was not difficult to work with. Neither of us have truly edited a Wikipedia article before, and given that this topic may be one of the lesser known topics related to organizational communication we might not have had the commentary that more popular pages may face. Wikipedia at its core will still have higher standards regarding copyright in comparison to the school papers that we are

accustomed to, as our work on the page impacts more people than just the writers. In order to be credible authors, we spent time looking at the structure and language of other similar articles in order to maintain a high level of professionalism so that others can have a clear and concise idea of the topic simply from looking at our additions and edits.

Joining the site and beginning to edit pages is easy to do, but hard to do well. Reading other pages, making edits over time, and receiving feedback from users seems to be the cycle that most editors use to learn the nuances of being a credible editor. However as Wikipedia wants quality work so that we are able to properly learn from one another, it definitely can be hard for newcomers to participate and see where edits can be made. Popular pages are lengthy as those topics are more common, thus leaving little room for additions or changes to be made. Lesser-known articles may not see as many edits due to the nature of the topic - this was certainly the case for us. In order for newcomers to get experience, they may need to tackle lesser-known articles, meaning that they have a smaller chance of receiving feedback from others. It is definitely easier for individuals like us to have this sort of assignment through WikiEdu to get comfortable in writing. Additionally, as this is a partner project, we are able to speak to one another in how to proceed and have some discussion before posing edits.

In order for Wikipedia to effectively take advantage of volunteers, they could expand WikiEdu to schools across the nation. As more and more classrooms adapt technology into their curriculum, students can benefit from learning how to use

Wikipedia and in return contribute to pages. We didn't know that WikiEdu was a resource to be used before this class - from our previous knowledge of Wikipedia, it was just a space individuals can make changes as they see fit. By having a mentor system when veteran editors are paired with newcomers, Wikipedia can help create a less intimidating and more hands-on introduction to the site. Wikipedia also has incentives in the forms of badges - these are given based on the contributions that an editor has made and are a way to motivate editors to contribute quality material to the pages that they edit.