Project Management

Notabilia: Article for deletion

Ricardo García Fernández

February 1, 2013

1 Questions

Notabilia (`http://notabilia.net/`) is a project aimed at visualizing the 100 longest article for deletion discussions in the English Wikipedia.

Choose 3 of these discussions at random and answer the following questions:

- In general, do you think that participants follow standard netiquette guidelines?

- Can you find any specific guidelines in the Wikipedia project concerning this matter?

- Do you think it is easy to follow these discussions only by using indentation? Can you offer any suggestions to improve the interface to debate with other editors?

2 Answers

2.1 Articles selected

I selected these three articles that represent each type in Notabilia classification:

- **Controversial**: `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Articles_for_deletion/Zeitgeist_the_Movie`

- **Unanimous**: `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Articles_for_deletion/Israeli_Terrorism_against_the_United_States`

- **Swinging**: `http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Articles_for_deletion/Republic_of_Ireland_vs_France_(2010_FIFA_World_Cup_Play-Off)`

In the three articles selected are displayed reviews for each 'vote'. The majority describes an argument supporting your choice. Respect among users is reflected in the discussions. There are also issues that contribute only vote, with nothing to support it, that is, without argument. It is understood that not influence the final decision of the administrator.

As a curiously, I've noticed that in the article on Zeitgeist, abound entries marked as *comment*. The arguments are very respectable between each person.

2.2 Wikiquette

Wikipedia has a netiquette guide, we can call it 'Wikiquette'. The article is called: *Policies and guides*[1] Wikipedias behavioral guideline. Through this article, we stare to *Polling is not a substitute for discussion*[2].

---

[1]`http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Policies_and_guidelines`
[2]`http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Polling_is_not_a_substitute_for_discussion`

Wikipedia, focuses on the consensus of the solution, not just a numerical result. So advocates consensus against the use of the polls. Because if you're really quem involved, make an argument for or against, shows an interest in the article. Unlike surveys, that only with a click, you get one vote, or otherwise, the solution may not be available for selection, so that participation could not provide a new argument. It would be a biased decision.

Deletion discussions[3] guide refers to our main question. Discussions by the removal, or not, of an article in Wikipedia.

This guide refers to our main question. Discussions by the removal, or not, of an article in Wikipedia. Provides the basis for proposing an article for deletion and guidelines for discussions deletion.

With a list of rules regarding Wikipedia respect, discussion and users:

- Pages in user space

- Please do not take it personally

- Please be tolerant of others

- Sockpuppeting is not to be tolerated

- You may edit the article During the discussion

We offers a template to start the discussion on deleting or not an article[4].

It is above all, the following text in bold **should not be calculated solely by the balance of votes**.

By rough consensus administrators impartial judges must be the final decision on the item, which can result in three states:

- keep

- delete

- no consensus

As a last point, we propose that if you still disagree with the result, you can re-propose the change in the selected item. Create a new article, but always having read the result of the above discussion and considering whether it can become a new eternal discussion without new arguments. Taking account of the process of reopening deleted article[5].

---

[3]`http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Deletion_discussions`
[4]`http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Templates_for_discussion`
[5]`http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Guide_to_deletion#If_you_disagree_with_the_`
  `consensus`

2.3 Improvements

The focus on improving the visuals, as the main change. Notabilia provides a view from the distance counting the votes, positive and negative, over time. This view helps us to see the process from the outside but not to make decisions.

The important thing, as Wikipedia guide highlights, is the argument. Therefore it should facilitate access:

- Reading the arguments of each voting over time.

- Divided by opinions, keep and delete.

- Divided by discussions.

In this way we obtain a more accurate comparison of opinions on the same side, watching the discussions in context and temporal evolution (though this part should be timeless, as mandated by the Wikipedia guide to writing an article). This could qualify better the opinions and monitor the discussions with more agility.

References

[1] RFC Netiquette Guidelines,
   http://www.ietf.org/rfc/rfc1855.txt