Open Knowledge for a Sustainable Future: Research, Ethics, and Wikipedia

Week 1 (Academic + Wiki) — Course Overview & Framing

Francis Bond (Academic)   Pavel Bednařík (Wiki)

Palacký University Olomouc | Wikimedia ČR

23 September 2025

Today

Roadmap

What This Course Is About

- Academic vs. encyclopedic writing (audience, voice, structure)
- Sustainable knowledge: FAIR / CARE, openness, ethics
- Practice both: (Academic) paper and (Wiki) article
- Learn transferrable skills: argument, evaluation, revision, collaboration

Two Tracks, One Goal

(Academic) Short paper (4-8 pp + refs)

- Argument-driven, thesis-focused
- Synthesis and analysis
- Scholarly voice & citation norms
- Writing part of a larger process

(Wiki) Wikipedia article

- NPOV, verifiability, no original research
- Clear structure; accessibility
- Community standards, consensus

- We **compare genres** to strengthen writing and judgment.

Academic vs. Encyclopedic Writing (Quick Contrast)

- **Audience**: specialists vs. general public
- **Purpose**: advance/argue vs. summarize established knowledge
- **Voice**: hedged, theory-aware vs. neutral, accessible
- **Evidence**: engage literature vs. cite reliable secondary sources
- **Structure**: IMRaD/thesis vs. lede + sections

Assessment Overview

- **Academic paper (Francis)**: 4-8 pages + references; peer review; revision memo
  - ▶ Review two articles
- **Wikipedia article (Pavel)**: sandbox draft; sourcing; feedback; mainspace
  - ▶ Comment on two articles
- **Participation**: discussion, reflections

Roadmap

Why It Matters

- It **helps thinking**: analysis, structure, precision
- It **builds knowledge**: claims + evidence + reasoning
- It **travels**: others can reuse, critique, extend
- It **signals credibility**: method, transparency, sources
- It **connects communities**: researchers, practitioners, public
- It **enables openness**: FAIR data and reusable prose

Write for your Audience

- **Discipline expectations**: terminology, typical arguments
- **Background knowledge**: what can be assumed?
  - ▶ Different disciplines are interested in different things (not always sensibly)
- **Background knowledge**: what can be assumed?
  - ▶ You can assume some shared knowledge
  - ▶ No need to explain everything
- **Motivation**: what problem are they trying to solve?
  - ▶ Are you writing for basic research? understanding
  - ▶ Applied research? better practice
  - ▶ Literary studies? better appreciation
  - ▶ Fine arts? engage an audience
  - ▶ …

Define Your Purpose

- Explain, evaluate, compare, propose, synthesize?
- Purpose drives selection of evidence and structure
- One paper should have, one clear purpose
  - ▶ **Specific**: a claim you can support in a short paper
  - ▶ **Contestable**: not a truism; invites argument
  - ▶ **Roadmap**: hints at reasons/structure to come

Roadmap

Common Structures

- Humanities: **thesis-driven essay**
- Social sciences: **IMRaD**
  Intro → Methods → Results → Discussion → Conclusion.
- Linguistics:
  Intro → Background → Data/Methods → Analysis → Discussion → Conclusion
- Computer Science:
  Intro → Related Work → Method → Data → Experiments/Results → Analysis → Conclusion
- Hybrids: literature review + case study; policy analysis + recommendations

Start and end well

- The Introduction sets the stage
  - ▶ Context → Problem → Question/Claim → Contribution → Roadmap
  - ▶ Avoid: history lessons without focus; claims with no stakes
- The Conclusion drives home the argument
  - ▶ Answer the question; synthesize findings
  - ▶ State implications, limits, next steps
  - ▶ **Avoid**: repeating the intro; new evidence in the last paragraph

Roadmap

How to choose evidence

- What can be trusted as evidence?
  - ▶ Peer-reviewed articles; scholarly books
  - ▶ Policy reports; official statistics; reputable NGOs
  - ▶ Data (quantitative/qualitative), corpora, case studies
- Evaluating Sources (Academic Lens)
  - ▶ **Authority**: who wrote it? venue? peer review?
  - ▶ **Recency/Relevance**: up-to-date, on-point
  - ▶ **Method/Transparency**: can you inspect or replicate?

Integrating Sources

- **Summarize**: key point in your words, with citation
- **Paraphrase**: reframe to serve your argument
- **Quote**: sparingly, when wording is crucial
- Always connect source to **your** claim
- Multiple sources are best
  - ▶ Weave multiple sources to make a new point
  - ▶ Compare/contrast findings, methods, assumptions
  - ▶ Identify gaps, tensions, implications

Multilingual Source Literacy

- Often sources in other languages are ignored
- When English is not the richest source: local journals, government docs, linguistic data, …
- Beware translation bias; summarize fairly
- Cross-check facts across languages

Roadmap

Academic Integrity

- Cite all sources (including data, images)
  - ▶ Read what you cite, don't cite transitively (or acknowledge when you do)
  - ▶ Cite in detail — give page numbers (especially for books)
- Proper paraphrase: change structure and wording, cite anyway
- Avoid patchwriting; keep notes disciplined

Responsible Use of AI Tools

- AI can help brainstorm, outline, surface references
- **You** are responsible for accuracy, reasoning, and citation
- Disclose use where appropriate; never fabricate sources

Sustainable Knowledge (Why Open?)

This is more about data then writing, but still very important.

- **FAIR**: Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable Wilkinson et al. 2016
- **CARE**: Collective benefit, Authority, Responsibility, Ethics Carroll et al. 2020
- **Open Science** (UNESCO Recommendation) UNESCO 2021
- **Knowledge equity** (Wikimedia 2030) Wikimedia Foundation 2020

Roadmap

Writing is Revising

- Draft fast; revise for structure, then style
  - **Content is more important than presentation**
- Read aloud; reverse outline; get feedback early
- Track changes; keep a revision log

Peer Review is part of the process

- Helpful feedback
  - ▶ Focus on **claims, evidence, logic**, not just grammar
  - ▶ Ask: what is the thesis? is it supported? what is missing?
  - ▶ Offer specific, actionable suggestions
  - ▶ Don't be reviewer three
    Do not: Use a negative or dismissive tone; Ask for unreasonable revisions; Provide little or no constructive guidance; Let personal bias color the review.
- Responding to Feedback
  - ▶ Separate criticism into categories (structure, evidence, style)
  - ▶ Decide: change, clarify, or justify (with reasons)
  - ▶ Write a brief **revision memo**: what changed and why

Roadmap

Common Mistakes

- Topic Too Broad
  - ▶ Fix: narrow to a focused question you can answer with available evidence
- Claim Without Evidence
  - ▶ Fix: support with sources, data, or analysis; show how evidence bears on the claim
- Source Dump
  - ▶ Fix: synthesize; explain why each source matters *for your thesis*
- Structure Drift
  - ▶ Fix: reverse outline; re-order sections to match argumentative flow
- Jargon Overload
  - ▶ Fix: define key terms once; prefer plain English/Czech unless precision demands technical terms

Pre-Submission Checklist

- Clear thesis in the introduction
- Section headings reflect argumentative moves
- Each paragraph has a topic sentence and a purpose
- Claims are cited; sources are integrated (not just quoted)
- Figures/tables are labeled and discussed
- Proofread for clarity, concision, coherence
- What Good Work Looks Like
  - ▶ **Clarity**: readers always know the claim & why it matters
  - ▶ **Evidence**: claims anchored to credible sources
  - ▶ **Ethics**: accurate attribution; respectful tone; UCoC compliance
  - ▶ **Sustainability**: work that others can find, reuse, build upon

A Minimal Model Outline

- **Abstract** (150–200 words)
- **Introduction**: context, question, thesis, roadmap
- **Body**: 2–3 sections building your case
- **Conclusion**: answer, implications, limits
- **References**: consistent style

Roadmap

(Wiki) Ground Rules

- Wikipedia **Five pillars** Wikipedia contributors 2025
- **UCoC**: Universal Code of Conduct Wikimedia Foundation 2021
- **Programs & Events Dashboard** enrollment Wiki Education 2025
- Starter modules: editing basics, sourcing, plagiarism

References I

Carroll, Stephanie Russo et al. (2020). *The CARE Principles for Indigenous Data Governance*. Global Indigenous Data Alliance. URL: https://www.gida-global.org/care.

UNESCO (2021). *UNESCO Recommendation on Open Science*. Adopted 2021. URL: https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000379949.

Wiki Education (2025). *Programs & Events Dashboard*. Accessed 2025-09-21. URL: https://outreachdashboard.wmflabs.org/.

Wikimedia Foundation (2020). *Wikimedia Movement Strategy 2030: Recommendations (Knowledge Equity)*. Accessed 2025-09-21. URL: https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Strategy/Wikimedia_movement/2018-20/Recommendations.

– (2021). *Universal Code of Conduct*. Accessed 2025-09-21. URL: https://foundation.wikimedia.org/wiki/Universal_Code_of_Conduct.

References II

Wikipedia contributors (2025). *Wikipedia: Five pillars*. Accessed 2025-09-21. URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Five_pillars.

Wilkinson, Mark D. et al. (2016). "The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship". In: *Scientific Data* 3.160018. DOI: 10.1038/sdata.2016.18. URL: https://doi.org/10.1038/sdata.2016.18.