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LIB100: Information Fluency in the Digital Age

- Research Skills
- Critical Thinking
- Computing
Piloted Spring 2012:
Students contribute 1000 words to a Wikipedia article
Authentic Audience?

Photo detail from Life Magazine, 1952
Authentic Audience

• Other than teacher

• In conjunction with task that fills genuine need

• Examples from our Faculty Learning Community:
  – Economics: Election debate
  – Engineering: Designing & building solar charger
Public Policy Initiative

Fall 2010

22 to 42 institutions per semester

2011-2012

Spring 2013

23 institutions, 40 courses

Wikipedia Education Program

United States
Tramp trade (before)

Tramp trade

Tramp trade is a type of ship engaged in the tramp trade. This is a trade in which a ship does not have a fixed schedule or published ports of call. The term comes from the British meaning of 'tramp' as itinerant beggar or vagrant. In this context it was first documented in the 1880s, along with the term 'ocean tramp' (at the time many sailing vessels engaged in irregular trade as well).
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External links

- Internet Guide to Freighter Travel.ca - traveling by tramp freighters

Who Uses Wikipedia?

• Project Information Literacy:
  
  75% of college students use Wikipedia at least occasionally for school assignments (2010)

• Pew Research Center:
  
  69% of Internet users with a college degree (2011)
Wikipedia Part Of The ‘Information Ecosystem’ Of Academia

Chronicle of Higher Education op-ed, 2011
Wikipedia = Uncredentialed Authors (often anonymous)
WIKI = “QUICK” IN HAWAIIAN
Peer Review = Not Quick
Common Value: Reliable, cited sources

Traditional Scholarship
- Scholarly, primary sources
- Citations

Wikipedia
- Books, news (secondary sources)
- Citations
Common Value: Peer Review

- Traditional Scholarship
  - Credentialed reviewers

- Wikipedia
  - Amateur reviewers
Extreme Transparency
Core Content Policies

1. Wikipedia:Verifiability
2. Wikipedia:Neutral point of view
3. Wikipedia:No original research
Wikipedia: Verifiability

Sources should be:

- Reliable: fact checking, editorial oversight
- Third-party: unaffiliated with subject
- Published: archived copy must exist
Third-Party vs. Self-published
Wikipedia Under the Hood
Tour Summary

- History = contributors, pub dates
- Talk page = “the scholarly conversation”
- Categories = semi-controlled vocabulary
- WikiProjects = amateur peer review
- Article Ratings
- User Page = author CV
- Sandbox = personal workspace
Article Ratings

• Featured Article (FA): <.1%
• Good Article (GA)
• B
• C
• Start
• Stub

These need the most work
WikiProject “To-Do/Brag” List

- Found on most WikiProject pages
- Organizes articles by quality and importance
- Follow number links to find stub articles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Energy articles by quality and importance</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td>Top</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★ FA</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>★ FL</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+ GA</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Start</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stub</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>List</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disambig</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Template</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessed</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unassessed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Identifying your Wikipedia Project

Stub- or Start-Class Articles

Good coverage in third-party reliable sources
Student Reflection: Original Perspective of Wikipedia
New Perspective

- Contribution
- Wikipedia
- Search Terms
- General Information
- Internet Search
- Research
- Article
- My Brain
- Topic
Yacht racing

Fails Wikipedia’s copyright policy
Assessing the 2012 pilot
Project Information Literacy
A large-scale study about early adults and their research habits

Day after Graduation Study (2012)
“Going Deeper” with research

Persistence reflected by:

– Variety of sources

– Iterative process
Assessment Data for pilot

• Research practices

• Citation analysis

• Student survey
Most Inconvenient Library Service?

Percent of LIB100 class using Interlibrary Loan
n=147 total students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring 2010</th>
<th>Spring 2011</th>
<th>Spring 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ILL requests per student

ILL Requests per registered LIB100 student
n=147 total students

- Spring 2010: 0
- Spring 2011: 0.18
- Spring 2012: 0.47
Average variety = 3 source types per article

64% of student sources for Wikipedia articles were books
Student Survey

How did researching and writing for public Wikipedia audience impact the quality of your work?

Was researching/writing for a public audience enjoyable? Uncomfortable? Something else?
Student Survey

- Positive affect or impact: 52%
- Negative affect or impact: 26%
- No impact on quality of work done: 35%
- Other: 9%
Pitfalls/Challenges

• Public audience may be intimidating

• Finding a stub can be frustrating

• Encyclopedic style ≠ typical college paper

• Notability a tough requirement (esp. for small companies, new technologies)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Editing on Wikipedia</th>
<th>ACRL Information Literacy Standard</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Identifying articles that need work</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Locating reliable secondary sources and news</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distinguishing between third party and self-published sources</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Synthesis and summary of multiple sources</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Documenting sources using in-line citations and consistent citation style; locating public domain and Creative Commons-licensed images</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Smaller Assignments

• Recommend and summarize potential sources on Talk pages of underdeveloped articles

• Compare and evaluate Wikipedia articles with subject-specific encyclopedia

• Create graphics/images for Wikimedia Commons
QUESTIONS?
Sources


