

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

Good Communication and Edit Summaries -- Examples of good communication in Wikipedia

Like most writing, Wikipedia functions as a collective of contributors who must work together to produce quality content. However, its diffuse, digital, crowdsourced, nonhierarchical collaboration relies on a few forms of communication that are not immediately apparent. As part of this assignment, you will need to use these forms of communication to work with other contributors, past, present, and future.

Policy Pages

[WP:Talk page guidelines](#)

[WP:Communication is required](#)

Why communicate?

Communication on Wikipedia is necessary to:

- **Make it clear what you’ve done** -- it can sometimes be really difficult to see what past editors have done to a page. Good edit summaries and talk page posts (after a major edit) can make clear what you’ve done and help greatly with future editing.
- **Explain your edits** -- other editors need to know why you’ve made the changes you’ve made, particularly in bold edits.
- **Discuss issues and potential edits** - as we discuss in many of the other handouts (especially “the Problem for Wikipedia”), there can be complex conceptual and writing issues that arise in wikipedia. These need to be explicitly highlighted and discussed so that you leave space for other editors (whether they are around now or will find this page ten years from now) to also weigh in on these concerns.
- **Arbitrate disputes in edits** - Wikipedia’s policies on consensus mean that no one editor has the final say on any given article’s form or content. Therefore it is part of the normal process of editing to need to arbitrate disputes in edits. Rather than engaging in an edit war, use other locations to work out the issues!

If you don’t reach out, they will be much less likely to reach out to you. Sometimes, if you don’t reach out, they might reach out to you. [This happened in 2021!](#) It will be better if you’ve crafted a good post introducing yourself and explaining concretely what you’re doing

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

Where do you communicate on Wikipedia?

There are really two kinds of communication, each with its own tools and venues:

Direct communication

Often you will speak directly to other wikipedia users. In order of importance and priority from most to least important:

- **Talk pages** - the most important venue. These are specific for each page and are the primary location for working out any issues you want to propose to other editors.
- **User talk pages** - if you have an issue with or want to communicate with another user, do so on their user talk page first. These are still public but they are specifically oriented towards that user.
- **Direct messages** - use these rarely--only in the instance in which you have something to say to a user that does not need to be public knowledge.
- **Wikiproject pages** - For those who get involved in a particular topic or form in wikipedia, some particularly active wikiprojects can provide another venue for discussion.
- **Other forums and arbitration venues** -- you usually communicate here only once you have exhausted the other venues. These include deletion discussions, Conflict of interest resolutions, arbitrations of edit disputes, and discussions of wikipedia policy.
 - One location like this for newcomers is the [Teahouse](#). We shouldn't need to use this in this course (particularly since we're working with WikiEdu), but it is a useful resource if you keep editing wikipedia down the road.

Indirect communication (Communication via editing)

Editing is itself a form of communication on wikipedia. Be cognizant of how you work and leave traces on wikipedia to assist future editors in working with what you have left. There are four primary things you can do with an article that will communicate to editors **why you did what you've done** and **what still needs to be done**:

- **Edit summaries** - These are essential for explaining what you have done in any given edit and why. Before you hit “Publish changes” make sure that you insert an edit summary.
 - Make this concise but also useful--other users will probably check the edit summary to see what you've done and experienced users might scan the edit summaries to see how an article has evolved.
 - Don't be afraid to directly cite policies, e.g. “Deleted sentence due to WP:OR”
- **Sandboxes and other drafts** -- Sandboxes provide a place for you to propose major changes (especially for organization) so that others can have a say before you implement changes. - Go here for [information on using a sandbox](#)
- **Tags** -- these can be for the whole page, for a particular section, or for particular sentences (the “citation needed” tag). Use this to earmark for other editors work that needs to be done.

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

- **Removing tags** can tell other editors that changes have been resolved. If you’re confident that an issue has been resolved, you can remove tags yourself, but in some cases you might want to run this by the talk page first.
- **Your userpage** - often editors who are working on the page you’re working on will check your userpage and contributions list to gauge your level of experience and familiarity with Wikipedia. Sometimes fleshing out your userpage can help humanize you to other editors and provides the immediate indicator that you’re not a bot, troll, paid editor, or the like.

In general, Wikipedia attempts to have these conversations in public so that anyone can see what was discussed and potentially hop in, even if it is years from now.

Your initial talk page post

Assume the role of a real world editor. Your communication here should be to the point. State your goals for the article, questions you may have, mix in small amounts of encouragement to engage the community, and leave it at that.

Examples of successful communication

1. Edit arbitration using a Talk Page

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

Example: Western Massachusetts (Good example of consensus in the talk page) -- [before](#) and [after](#) + [Talk Page](#)

I agree with you both, @Donner60: and @Auberginandjuice:, that this information is of historical importance, but my concern is that this sub-section is overbearing and takes up more of the article than necessary. My goal in removing some of the information was to create more of an overview. There's so much information, almost written like an essay, that I almost think it could be its own article. Nellybelly19 (talk) 06:49, 23 March 2020 (UTC) [reply]

I understand your concerns but this is ultimately not helpful to readers who read the [Western Massachusetts](#) article and are interested in having a reasonably broad overview of the history of the region. I think that [WP:IMPROVEDONTREMOVE](#) applies here. I do see that you rephrased parts of the article which discussed politics and contemporary attitudes in Western Mass and that was definitely an improvement. However, it would probably be best to reinstate that info on native inhabitants, and probably also the info on the Colonial and early Federal period. This did not seem overly essay-like and if parts were they would be better rephrased than not present at all. If you and @Donner60: agree, we might go ahead and reinclude those sections. Auberginandjuice (talk) 22:42, 23 March 2020 (UTC) [reply]

@Auberginandjuice: I agree. Donner60 (talk) 03:14, 24 March 2020 (UTC) [reply]

Since we seem to have a consensus, I am going to restore the info deleted by NellyBelly19 to the sections on Native Inhabitants and Colonial and early Federal period, with maybe a few minor copyedits to help with tone/wikilinking/etc. Auberginandjuice (talk) 21:18, 24 March 2020 (UTC) [reply]

Example: Baba Yaga (good example of how a student should handle “don’t bite the newcomer” and it turned out as a positive experience) ([before](#) + [after](#) + [Talk Page](#))

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

Hello, Grace! Thank you for reaching out to me. So, the word "attestation" is used pretty commonly in these quarters to refer to the various places where a figure from the folklore record may appear. While this may seem like a hurdle for the general reader, I think they can get the concept down by way of context, if nothing else, and I am not sure what term would appropriately encompass what *attestation* does. For example, consider the construction "y is attested in x, x, and x". Use of "Appearance" is particularly an issue for local legends, where Wikipedia has often struggled to keep out the pseudoscience, as the figure isn't really *appearing* like a cast member might on, say, a TV show. When it comes to stuff like medieval Slavic folklore figures, we're dealing with a fragmented and complex corpus. To ensure accuracy, we must be wary of what we say and how we say it. Compare our most developed comparable articles, such as [valkyrie](#) and [Freyja](#).

My experience has been that people often devalue the importance of the place an entity holds in modern popular culture, and so I think we need a well-developed section that talks about these things. The problem is that we need secondary sources that establish notability. For figures like Baba Yaga, this may be easier to find than others. Then again, the Slavic corpus receives little attention in folklore studies nowadays. [:bloodofox](#) (talk) 22:18, 2 March 2020 (UTC) [reply]

[@Bloodofox](#): Thank you so much for responding to me! That makes sense; I wasn't aware of some of those things. Thank you for taking the time to answer my questions!

What would a secondary source that establishes notability look like for a folklore figure? I can perhaps work on finding those sources, and further developing the modern influence section. [Grace Rohan](#) (talk) 16:31, 4 March 2020 (UTC) [reply]

Hello, [@Grace Rohan](#):, sorry for the late response—the best sources for for establishing notability for mentions in popular culture will be academic studies. Some tertiary sources, such as handbooks, will contain sections discussing how a figure is represented in popular culture. Unfortunately, this practice isn't as common as it should be, but with

Example: Folk Rock (positive interaction between student and an active editor on the page) ([Before](#) + [After](#) + [Talk Page](#))

Welcome Luridshadow! I added a lot of the content present in this article and, as noted in the discussion above, I don't mind if some of the text/information I added is relocated, as long as attribution is maintained. However, I think we also need to be careful not to throw the baby out with the bath water and eliminate material that provides context within this article. For instance, the Beatles' adoption of folk/protest elements and how the band first encountered them in Bob Dylan's music, along with George Harrison's distinctive 12-string Rickenbacker sound and its influence on the Byrds and folk rock in general, are all just as relevant to this article as they might be to the [Cultural impact of the Beatles](#) one.

As an aside, I've worked very closely on [the Byrds](#) article and added a lot of material, bringing it up to Good Article status, and I can say with 100% certainty that there is nothing in this article that isn't already in the Byrds one. So, I would advise against relocating anything there. --[Kohoutek1138](#) (talk) 12:04, 27 February 2018 (UTC) [reply]

[Kohoutek1138](#), I'm considering separating/bringing out to focus the 12-string guitar section under the British Invasion section because I think that it is a pretty important instrument within Folk music. Any thoughts or suggestions for or against?

Thanks! [Luridshadow](#) (talk) 20:11, 9 March 2018 (UTC) [reply]

Go for it. **Be bold!** It's not my place to say "yay" or "nay", since it's the community's article. If I or another editor have a problem with your edits, they'll revert them and explain why in the edit summary. --[Kohoutek1138](#) (talk) 21:04, 12 March 2018 (UTC) [reply]

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

2. Helpful edit summaries

Make sure that your edit summaries are useful and clear for the other editors.

Example: Walt Disney Classics -- ([Before](#) + [After](#)) These are good edit summaries. You do not have much space for your summary, so uploading your edits piece by piece with attached summaries is helpful, as seen below.

- (cur | prev) 23:23, 18 March 2018 Skmatth (talk | contribs) . . (14,713 bytes) **(-22,419)** . . *(reconstructed information into a table format with the films in the Classics line. The table includes the release date and notes about the release for the Classics line.)* (undo | thank)
- (cur | prev) 19:21, 18 March 2018 Skmatth (talk | contribs) . . (37,132 bytes) (+13) . . *(Changed the heading "Prehistory" to "Background" and made adjustments to sentences to clarify and condense unnecessary information)* (undo | thank)
- (cur | prev) 17:52, 18 March 2018 Skmatth (talk | contribs) . . (37,119 bytes) (-232) . . *(copy edited first paragraph; adjusted sentences to clarify and modify encyclopedic tone)* (undo | thank)

3. Working with Live Editing using Edit summaries

Note how the examples below handle nearly simultaneous editing using edit summaries to help clarify what is being done by each contributor. Please don't be intimidated by this but rather work with the editing being done, reaching out as needed and collaborating as they are willing.

Example: Horrible Histories -- ([Before](#) + [After](#))

- (cur | prev) 17:02, 21 March 2018 Sewinginthepast (talk | contribs) . . (43,219 bytes) (+2) . . *(Moved a paragraph from the introduction into the Publication history section)* (undo | thank)
- (cur | prev) 00:32, 21 March 2018 Coin945 (talk | contribs) . . (43,217 bytes) **(-1,199)** . . *(This section always annoyed the heck out of me. I think this is a better system. Got rid of unsourced reviews, merged all Critical Reception content together, and created Controversy section.)* (undo | thank) (Tag: Visual edit)
- (cur | prev) 00:29, 21 March 2018 Coin945 (talk | contribs) . . (44,416 bytes) (+9) . . *(Changing "Approach" to the more specific "Educational goals". This is a common sub-heading in educational articles such as Sesame Street and Blues Clues.)* (undo | thank) (Tag: Visual edit)
- (cur | prev) 00:27, 21 March 2018 Sewinginthepast (talk | contribs) . . (44,407 bytes) (+96) . . *(→Press response: Spacing & added citation needed)* (undo | thank)
- (cur | prev) 00:08, 21 March 2018 Sewinginthepast (talk | contribs) . . (44,311 bytes) (+54) . . *(I have rearranged all of the major sections. The content is all still there, the organization has just changed. Similar topics are now grouped in a more cohesive manner.)* (undo | thank)

Example: Cinderella Story -- ([before](#) and [after](#))

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

- (cur | prev) ○ 21:13, 2 March 2020 Maddiemac800 (talk | contribs) . . (12,044 bytes) (+32) . . (*First pass at editing the film summary, still a lot of room for improvement.* WP:MOVIEPLOTS) (undo) (Tag: Visual edit)
 - (cur | prev) ○ 01:25, 27 February 2020 Acalamari (talk | contribs) m . . (12,012 bytes) (+16) . . (*→Subsequent Adaptations: Tidying*) (undo)
 - (cur | prev) ○ 01:24, 27 February 2020 Acalamari (talk | contribs) m . . (11,996 bytes) (-1) . . (*→Soundtrack: Removed an excess gap*) (undo)
 - (cur | prev) ○ 23:32, 24 February 2020 67.81.48.110 (talk) . . (11,997 bytes) (+24) . . (undo) (Tags: Mobile edit, Mobile web edit)
 - (cur | prev) ○ 02:55, 21 February 2020 Millahhna (talk | contribs) . . (11,973 bytes) (-4,576) . . (*→Plot: tracking a chronic plot bloater, cleanest version I can find before they touched it + some polish, needs more*) (undo)
 - (cur | prev) ○ 18:46, 19 February 2020 Maddiemac800 (talk | contribs) . . (16,549 bytes) (+16) . . (*changed the misleading description "sequels"*) (undo) (Tag: Visual edit)
 - (cur | prev) ○ 18:21, 19 February 2020 Maddiemac800 (talk | contribs) . . (16,533 bytes) (+216) . . (*→Subsequent Adaptations: organized subsequent film adaptations into table format*) (undo)
 - (cur | prev) ○ 17:03, 19 February 2020 Maddiemac800 (talk | contribs) . . (16,317 bytes) (+19) . . (*→Sequels: I do not believe that sequels is the appropriate term to describe the independent film iterations of the cinderella story and thus reworded the heading & text.*) (undo)
-

Example: It (novel) -- [Before](#) + [After](#)

- (cur | prev) ○ 04:07, 19 March 2018 Lwriter18 (talk | contribs) . . (46,690 bytes) (-804) . . (*edits to Bowers Gang character bios*) (undo)
- (cur | prev) ○ 03:04, 19 March 2018 General lization (talk | contribs) . . (47,494 bytes) (+1,564) . . (*Undid revision 831163427 by Lwriter18 (talk) Rv unexplained content removal*) (undo) (Tag: Undo)
- (cur | prev) ○ 02:59, 19 March 2018 Lwriter18 (talk | contribs) . . (45,930 bytes) (-1,564) . . (*Removed last two paragraphs of Pennywise bio*) (undo)
- (cur | prev) ○ 02:39, 19 March 2018 Lwriter18 (talk | contribs) . . (47,494 bytes) (-22) . . (*Minor sentence adjustment to Stan's bio*) (undo)

4. Using talk pages to engage the community

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

A good talk page post will naturally leave space for other editors and hopefully highlight and focus on particular questions of interest. A generic talk page post is not usually useful. Try to engage as *if you were a community member* rather than a student.

Example: Coconut Milk -- ([Before](#) + [After](#) + [Talk Page](#)) The student politely requests a user who removed their edits to justify their removal.

Food Section

The last paragraph where it talks about Venezuela's cuisine is confusing. It needs some rewording to let the reader know what exactly it's referring to. [Abbeyhayford \(talk\) 14:20, 6 March 2017 \(UTC\)](#)[Abbeyhayford](#) [reply]

@Zefr: I noticed you deleted a lot of information in the "Food" section and made it more concise: making each country's cuisine in one paragraph. I was planning of doing the same thing for the "Drink" section. [Abbeyhayford \(talk\) 15:57, 6 March 2017 \(UTC\)](#)[Abbeyhayford](#) [reply]

Introduction Paragraph

@Zefr: Is there a reason you deleted a lot of information from this section? I had a reference for differentiating between coconut milk and coconut water, and I believe this is important to include in this article. Even though this article isn't about coconut water, many people do not know the difference between the two, so this short addition of information is needed for the understanding of coconut milk. It can be added to the definition section, but I would like to have this information in the article. Also, the reference I found explains how coconut milk comes to be after being prepared, which is fitting for the article about coconut milk. [Abbeyhayford \(talk\) 19:03, 6 March 2017 \(UTC\)](#)[Abbeyhayford](#) [reply]

Having the Definition section helps with this, as do wikilinks to differentiate milk from water and cream. Getting into how to differentiate among the various liquids is not good lede material, per [MOS:LEAD](#). I felt the reference you added, [this](#), was not a clear description nor a good [WP:RS](#) source. --[Zefr \(talk\) 19:11, 6 March 2017 \(UTC\)](#) [reply]

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

Example: Health information on the Internet ([Before](#) + [after](#) + [Talk Page](#)) **States clear objectives**

In terms of the overall organization, a lot of the sections need a bit more content within them, as it pertains to the main purpose of the article (which is to provide a broad overview of health-based online information).

The lead section is a bit vague in regards to what the article actually encapsulates and needs further expansion as well.

The "Types" section is also a bit unclear on what exactly are the different types of information that are available to their respective audiences as there is no distinction among the categories (possibly make a bulleted list/bolded subheadings to help differentiate the types of information?).

In the "Major providers of health information on the Internet" section, there is room for improvement, specifically how each of these providers have a connection to how health information is available online.

The "Quality" section is also in need of needing more context and factual sources describing the relationship between quality and online health outlets of information.

Also, I have a rough outline of a possible introduction section here

User:[Rghx/sandbox/Health_Information_On_the_Internet_Sandbox_Flrst_Edit](#) that is in the progress if anyone wants to provide some feedback to it.

I welcome any editor who has experience in re-structuring the overall organization of medical-related articles in order to help improve the usability of this specific Wiki page as well as any ideas/suggestions that I may have overlooked. [Rghx \(talk\)](#) 21:39, 2 March 2020 (UTC) [reply]

[@Rghx](#): Yo yo thanks for having a go at it. **WP:Be bold** and make the edits you think are best. I looked at your idea and I think in your draft you deleted a citation. If possible, try to find a way to keep citations if the source seems good, even if you want to delete some text. For additional feedback request at [WP:WikiProject Medicine](#) which is where the community is.

Thanks. [Blue Raspberry \(talk\)](#) 21:46, 2 March 2020 (UTC) [reply]

Example: Basic life support -- ([Before](#) + [after](#) + [Talk Page](#)) → The outside editor came in just for a logistical tip, but the student capitalized on the editor’s responsiveness in order to prepare a better follow-up edit.

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

Hey Wikipedians. I'm focusing on this article to edit in my undergrad Technical and Professional editing course. Over the next couple weeks I plan on updating this page to follow Wikipedia's guidelines by

1. Minor copyediting
2. Rewriting the how-to/training sections into a more encyclopedic tone
3. Organizing the random subheadings (like "choking" and "drowning") into more general ones
4. Trying to incorporate more of the scope of BLS instead of just cardiac and respiratory emergencies, which seem to be the only ones mentioned here.

Once I get a draft in my sandbox going, I'll post it here. If there's anything you'd like me to know about this article going forward, let me know. [Astrokassie \(talk\)](#) 17:25, 19 February 2020 (UTC) [reply]

Realized that BLS is just the treatment of generally cardiac and respiratory emergencies, so disregard the part about incorporating more than that. [Astrokassie \(talk\)](#)

[Astrokassie](#). Be aware that making a single major edit to an established article runs the risk of getting everything reverted in a single major undo by someone who finds sufficient problems to not be prepared to fix them all. It is often less stressful to make one's initial edits on Wikipedia as small edits, fixing one thing at a time, and taking feedback from the regulars into account for subsequent edits. This gives a less precipitous learning curve. Cheers, · · · [Peter Southwood \(talk\)](#): 06:34, 2 March 2020 (UTC) [reply]

[Pbsouthwood](#) Thanks! I'm still trying to figure out what to even do with this article, given that it's mostly instructions. If you have any suggestions or want to work on this article with me, let me know. [Astrokassie \(talk\)](#)

[Astrokassie](#). For a start, you could try describing the procedures, possibly adding some explanation of what they are intended to achieve. Add background information where it looks like it may be make the procedure clearer to

Other examples of live editing:

- Horrible Histories: [Before](#) + [After](#) - This was a case of live editing. The student edited heavily alongside [Coin945](#)
- Ancient Music: ([before](#) and [after](#))

Collaborative editing via a Sandbox

A sandbox functions as a kind of communication. This is your space to freely work and having other editors coming in to collaborate with you here will improve your upload before it goes “live.”

Example: Ice Circles -- ([Before](#) + [After](#) + [Sandbox](#)) – user: [UnfoldingWords](#) is the student on this list if you follow the Sandbox link. Observe how other editors were able to come in to help when given a free space to do so. Typically, you will leave a link on the article's talk page so other users can access your sandbox.

5. Userpage Interaction

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

Occasionally, interaction will move onto userpages. Here are a few examples:

Example: Western Massachusetts -- [user talk page](#). Here, the student went to an active editor’s talk page in order to further communicate with them about their work on an article.

Reverting Changes to [Western Massachusetts](#) [edit source]

Hi there! I'm a student editor currently working to apply edits to [Western Massachusetts](#) for a college course. I recently made some significant edits to multiple sections on the page, which you reverted. Most of those edits were in an effort to remove the tags at the top of the page, such as removing unnecessary information and working towards an encyclopedic tone. I'm still new to this, so if you don't mind, what problems did you see with the edits? Thanks, [Nellybelly19 \(talk\)](#) 02:45, 23 March 2020 (UTC)
[reply]

My mistake @[NellyBelly](#)! I was going through recent edits rather quickly and your revisions looked like unsourced deletion. After reviewing them more closely I can see how your edits were constructive. I'm going to reply on the talk page for [Western Masschusetts](#) in support of you reverting to the version you edited.[Auberginandjuice \(talk\)](#) 05:12, 23 March 2020 (UTC) [reply]

--

Example: Lightwater Valley -- [IP address talk page](#). Here, an editor left the article’s page in order to address what appeared to be a misinformed new editor. The experienced editor left tips and backed them up with Wiki Policy in hopes to resolve the argument that had been ensuing on the article’s page.

Welcome! [edit source]

Hello and **welcome to Wikipedia!** Thank you for your contributions.

I noticed that one of the first articles you edited was [Lightwater Valley](#), which appears to be dealing with a topic with which you may have a **conflict of interest**. In other words, you may find it difficult to write about that topic in a **neutral** and objective way, because you are, work for, or represent, the subject of that article. Your recent contributions may have already been undone for this very reason.

To reduce the chances of your contributions being undone, you might like to draft your revised article before submission, and then ask me or another editor to proofread it. See our [help page on userspace drafts](#) for more details. If the page you created has already been deleted from Wikipedia, but you want to save the content from it to use for that draft, don't hesitate to ask [anyone from this list](#) and they will [copy it to your user page](#).

One rule we do have in connection with conflicts of interest is that accounts used by more than one person will unfortunately be **blocked from editing**. Wikipedia generally does not allow editors to have **usernames which imply that the account belongs to a company or corporation**. If you have a username like this, you should [request a change of username](#) or create a new account. (A name that identifies the user as an individual within a given organization may be OK.)

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

This is scary! What if there is an issue? -- Positioning your communication

1. Don't bite the newcomer

While communication on Wikipedia might be intimidating for some, know that you are protected by the behavioral guideline known as “[Don't bite the newcomer](#)”. The summary: wikipedia needs new editors and therefore all experienced editors should go out of their way to be accommodating for new editors.

Example: Baba Yaga page ([before](#) and [after](#)) – Sometimes, an initial interaction might appear more direct and negative than intended. See these edit summaries below:

- (cur | prev) ○ 22:36, 1 March 2020 Bloodofox (talk | contribs) . . (17,779 bytes) **(-2,829)** . . (→Appearances in media: None of this sourced and none of this establishes notability by way of secondary sources—this section is a total mess) (undo | thank)
- (cur | prev) ○ 22:34, 1 March 2020 Bloodofox (talk | contribs) . . (20,608 bytes) **(+512)** . . (The Lubki depictions are a type of folklore and these minute subsections are not helpful, converting a section to a bullet list is not an improvement—and what is this phobia fo the words "attestation" and "analogues"? (undo | thank)

While this was intimidating, once the student reached out to Boodofox, they were quite nice and collaborated to greatly improve the article.

2. Your status as a student

However, don't expect different treatment just because you are a student! While it is fine to say that you're a student (you'll be tagged as such in your userpage and on the talk pages you are assigned via the WikiEdu dashboard), it is very frustrating to other editors if you invoke your status as a student to try to speed things along or otherwise force your edits through. Most definitely do not invoke your instructor as inherently more authoritative than community editors!

The goal here is to *engage* with the community, not barrel them over for the sake of the assignment.

We don't want this happening (from the One Tree Hill article's [talk page](#)):

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

[KaitTip](#), give me some time (like a few days) to look over your content and comment on it. [Joeyconnick](#) might also want to comment. On a side note: Since this page is on my watchlist, I prefer to not be [WP:Pinged](#) to it. [Flyer22 Reborn](#) (talk) 13:00, 8 March 2019 (UTC) [reply]

Thanks for the shoutout, Flyer. [KaitTip](#), I haven't really had a chance to do more than glance at your proposed changes but I would recommend you (if you haven't already) take a look at [MOS:TV](#). These are the conventions on article structure and style for TV-related topics, especially series articles, and I'm thinking your reorder may not match these guidelines, in which case you will very likely be reverted as some of the editors who work in this area are pretty committed to them. I'll try to take a closer look this weekend but no promises as I'm pretty busy of late. 😊 — [Joeyconnick](#) (talk) 00:46, 9 March 2019 (UTC) [reply]

Flyer, I'm not sure if you've had a chance to look at the edits I made or not, **but I need to implement them soon to make a deadline**. If you want to comment on the edits, I won't be making them to the actual article until Thursday. 😊 Also, thank you for taking the time to do this! [KaitTip](#) (talk) 20:49, 19 March 2019 (UTC) [reply]

[KaitTip](#), did you look at [MOS:TV](#), like [Joeyconnick](#) suggested? The "Series overview" section should come first. I'm not sure about separating basketball and romance from the "Production" section. But I'm okay with them being separated from that section since [MOS:TV](#) shows "Background and production" coming before "Themes and analysis." In the article, the "Episode format" aspect is also an aspect of "Production," and I feel that we should keep it that way in the article. "Episodes" does not need its own section. You can see from [Wikipedia:Manual of Style/Television#Plot](#) section, that we usually keep the plot and episodes material together. [Wikipedia:Manual of Style/Television#Parent, season, and episode article structure](#) states that "if said section contains plot or episode summaries, it should ideally be as high up the page as possible, since Wikipedia uses plot information as context for understanding the real world information to follow in the article." This is why the "Series overview" section is first and we simply include a link to the [List of One Tree Hill episodes](#) article in that section. Also, the "Episodes" section in [your version](#) is pretty much just the "Episode format" section with material about crossovers, which aren't really *One Tree Hill* episodes.

As for your deadline, have you read [WP:Student assignments](#)? Students' edits are not always going to be accepted, especially not in their entirety. You could implement the "Themes" split, but I'm not sold on all of your other proposed changes. [Flyer22 Reborn](#) (talk) 01:12, 22

This kind of interaction doesn't help your case, looks bad for educational uses of wikipedia, and builds frustration about students on Wikipedia!

3. What if someone is not nice or something goes wrong?

First, take a deep breath. What might read initially as threatening might not be so threatening when you look at it more closely. Then:

- If your edits were deleted/undone without explanation, it may be just a hasty action by editors who are combing through edits by new users.
- Check to see if they left you any indication in the talk page, edit summaries, or your user talk page about the edits.
- You can approach them in the talk page for the article or at their user talk page.
- DO NOT edit war.
- Consider if there were things that you may have done that warrants any suspicion or undoing. Were your edits appropriately crafted? Did you make changes that needed to be run by the community first? Are there particular issues about this page that might have made other editors a bit more suspicious (for example, see the article on [Fruitarianism](#) or [Vampire Lifestyle](#) discussed in the “[WP:FRINGE](#)” handout)

This is supplementary material for the webtext “Wikipedia as Editorial Microcosm” by Joshua DiCaglio et al., published in *Kairos: A Journal of Rhetoric, Technology, and Pedagogy*, 29(1), available at <http://kairos.technorhetoric.net/29.1/topoi/dicaglio-et-al/index.html>.

- Remember that “Don’t bite the newcomer” puts the larger wikipedia community on your side. If others don’t play nice and explain themselves after you make an attempt to do the same, then you can ask for help.
 - Your instructor can come to your aid *but only on equal ground as another editor not as your instructor*.
 - The WikiEd assistant can do likewise
- Ultimately, problems can be resolved more formally using Wikipedia’s Dispute resolution channels. [WP:Dispute resolution](#)
 - **However, I have yet to have anything even approaching needing this level of intervention.**