

## Section I - The IDEO Article

Original - <https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=IDEO&diff=801718785&oldid=798274903>

The original article was very sparse in information, and had very little detail within sections that actually existed. The original structure is follows:

- Introduction
- History
  - The Deep Dive
- Organizational culture
- Gallery of products

We can see that the article has a minimal amount of topics. Each topic is also covered with very little depth, considering that there are also very few subsections.

Viewing each of the sections in more detailed, we saw that the chosen sections were also very awkward. The introduction gives a very brief overview of the company, describing the work of the company, how the company has grown, and gives other basic information. This is a good way to start the article, but subsequent sections don't seem to follow a continuous flow. 'History' gives a rather erratic story about the founders which frequently gives sudden off-topic statements, including a statement about how one of the founder wrote a book and another statement on the date of passing of one of the founders. The subsection 'Deep Dive' within 'History' gives a good summary of IDEO's appearance in *Nightline*, but is seemingly out-of-place. The subsection would belong better off in a 'Media Appearances' or similar section. 'Organizational Culture' is a one sentence comment, and 'Product Gallery' consists of three images. We speculated that the majority of the existing content was added ad hoc for a similar past assignment, but ended up contributing to the awkward structure.

### *Planning and Brainstorming*

After our review of the original article, we looked over some of the past edits of the article to see if there was any useful content that was added/removed over recent time. Most major

revisions were simply revisions of resources. Other recent revisions included the addition of the 'Deep Dive' section and the addition of the off-topic statements into pre-existing sections. The fact that the statements were added afterwards explains why they seemingly interrupt the flow of the rest of their respective sections. Some older revisions included removal of content, such as media appearances and product descriptions, that were removed on the basis of bias and promotion. After reviewal of that content, we determined that the majority of the content was actually insightful and deserved re-addition to article as long as it was rewritten in an appropriate way. This step of our process segwayed into our content brainstorming.

We initially developed a lengthy list of possible edits. The majority of the ideas came from evaluating other major company articles and determining what the most prominent or useful sections were. Our first point would be to develop appropriate and insightful sections and subsections. A list of relevant sections topics is as follows:

- History
  - Media Appearances
    - Deep Dive
  - Acquisitions and partnerships
- Products and Services
  - OpenIDEO
  - IDEO U
  - Educational Design Resources
- Human-centered Design Research

These planned changes also incorporated a change to the original awkward structure by adding relevant subsections and exploring topics in more depth. Additionally, these planned sections would be able to more seamlessly incorporate some of the off-topic statements added by previous revisions.

*Developing the Current Article - [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/IDEO#Design\\_Education](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/IDEO#Design_Education)*

There were a lot challenges when working with the IDEO article. Our biggest challenge was finding relevant sources which were neither published by IDEO by themselves nor for the sake of promotion/from a biased point-of-view. Although IDEO is a relatively popular design company, it still has rather few external covering its activities and releases. This had a significant impact on developing certain sections such as 'Human-centered Design Research' and 'Media Appearances'. More realistically, the only section that had a highly sufficient amount of coverage was 'Products and Services'.

Our final structure is as follows:

- Introduction
- History
  - Deep Dive
  - Acquisitions and Partnerships
- Organizational Culture
- Products and Services
  - Products overview
  - OpenIDEO
  - Design Education

Our main contribution could be classified as a major restructuring/organization of previously included information. By adding more sections and subsections, we were able to move around previous information to more appropriate places in the article, and next to relevant knowledge. This greatly improved the readability and information flow of the article. Additionally, our other main contribution was a more in-depth look at the 'Products and Services' of IDEO. Since the output of IDEO is what most followers and general users are concerned with, we were able to find many more sources and improve an area of knowledge that would likely be considered more insightful by readers.

## **Section II - Wikipedia**

*What kind of interaction did you have with the Wikipedia infrastructure (e.g., policies and guidelines) or with members of the community?*

Initially, since we were all new to the Wikipedia community and infrastructure, we were able to go through WikiEdu and learn about the community standards and guidelines through the modules, which also included helpful videos and guides covering actual logistics and techniques for editing. Within the period of training and initial learning, we were able to join a group call with other beginner editors, and learn and go through exercises for editing together. This was a good experience in interacting with people who we didn't actually know and normally interact with, and gave a good sense of what it would be like to work on an actual Wikipedia article with other strangers. In addition to other editors from other schools or occupations, we were also able to interact with our own peers from the class and give and receive helpful comments and suggestions on our article.

*What does Wikipedia do to make it easy or hard for newcomers to participate?*

How Wikipedia made it hard:

Because Wikipedia has so many strict guidelines, it is able to maintain a high quality of articles that contain little to no bias or copyrighted material. But, because of this high standard of rules and expectations and large amounts of article quality control, it can be a little hard to contribute to specific articles. A problem we had run into was when we first started adding things to the article, we had noticed the community of editors contributing to the IDEO article had recently deemed a very large section of the article as biased and had removed it only a few months ago. To our dismay, that large section of information was information we had thought the article lacked, and had planned to add in. After reading through the comments and trying to understand why the editor had taken it out, it was easier to understand what the community

deemed suitable and acceptable. Even though eventually it was easier to understand why certain information was and was not allowed, it was very intimidating at first. An issue we commonly ran into was that there was not as many acceptable sources regarding IDEO as we had thought. Much of the content we had originally wanted to include was deemed to have too much bias, or self interest, since it would have been coming from an IDEO related website or article. Because of this, we ended up throwing out a lot of what we had originally planned to add, and ended up focusing more on the information we were able to find through unbiased scholarly articles. Also, depending on the community, it may be discouraging to new editors to go and try to improve an article when a large amount of the article was previously removed.

Besides the intimidation of adding to an article with many moderators and people passionate about the topic, we had some trouble navigating the Wikipedia interface. Sometimes it was confusing as to what was supposed to be placed in the user sandbox, user page, user sandbox talk page, user talk page, or article talk page. In addition to all these user and editor specific pages, there was also the edit history page, and the compare edit history page which sometimes could get overwhelming. The learning curve on Wikipedia was definitely a bit higher than we had expected, but once we got the hang of it, it was okay.

How Wikipedia made it easy:

The WikiEDU modules and introductory crash course made the entry into thinking like a Wikipedian simple and interesting. Along with the quiz questions at the end of each section, it was easy to pick up the general gist of what is and is not acceptable as well as the actual how to of Wikipedia editing. In addition to the modules, the video call sessions for live online learning were a bit frustrating at first because a lot of people were 15+ minutes late to the session, and a good amount of time was wasted by waiting for other editors to do the exercises together.

However, the experience of getting to know other people in the community was enjoyable, and the actual learning itself was much easier when there were people working with you on the same thing at the same time, and the group could figure out and tackle problems together.

*How could Wikipedia more effectively take advantage of motivated volunteers like you?*

Wikipedia definitely has a great platform for collaboration, but there is definitely room for improvement. Though because it is volunteer based and dependant on donations, what they can add to and improve (realistically) is somewhat limited, but there are many things that given more volunteers and funding can be improved upon.

First of all, actually knowing another editor would be helpful in that communicating with them is much easier than relying on an editor over the Internet. This could be in the form of having someone in person to ask for help and have a more guided first time experience vs. the fully self learn experience it currently is. Additionally, the interface could have a large improvement. If there was an easier interface to keep the conversation going about articles or a clearer way to discuss the article with peers, articles could be improved and worked on at a much faster rate. We found that often times, it was easy to come up with a ton of ideas, but hard to decide whether or not it was suitable or an actual good idea that the community would also agree upon. Related to this idea, is to have a volunteer point of contact for articles, so there is always a person to contact first whenever an editor has a question about the article, or needs help reviewing their changes. This would also save new editors the trouble of wondering whether or not their changes have been seen or whether or not their changes are actually approved by the current community.

Some more far out ideas for incorporating Wikipedia into other forms of education and improving Wikipedia editing process include having WikiEdu in high school and also involving AI and natural language processing in the editing process. It would be valuable to have WikiEdu in high school, since that is where many student learn about using credible sources and citing their work, and that way in college, the foundation is built, and is much easier seeing and using these types of online community tools for communication and peer reviewing. Another interesting idea is the potential use of artificial intelligence and natural language processing to have an automated check, or cross-check with scholarly articles. This can be to check for whether or not an edit seems outright “wrong” or biased. This way, wrong information doesn’t stay on less popular wikipedia articles for long, and also doesn’t rely on another human to manually go check and edit it.

Wikipedia is a great tool to learn about working with an online community, keeping a neutral look on information/viewing information with an eye for bias, and also getting the experience of adding to a topic that you find interesting and knowing you helped improve the article that millions of other people read.