



Wikipedia: Friend or Foe?

Objectives:

- To make participants reflect on their opinion on Wikipedia and make them reexamine it
- To make participants analyze the reliability of Wikipedia articles
- To make participants understand primary, secondary and tertiary sources of information

Pre-workshop tasks:

- [Prepare Miro board](#)

Note: To use Miro in the workshop, the facilitators will have to create a Miro board similar to the board linked above. [This video](#) provides a guide to using Miro for workshops.

- Get the [slides](#) ready
- Get the activity sheets ready for reference
 - [Differentiating sources](#)
 - [Tug-of-war](#)
 - [Checking quality of Wikipedia articles](#)
 - [I used to think and I now think](#)
 - [Story of our names](#)

Facilitator Notes:

- *If you are using a whiteboard tool such as Miro, make sure that the participants are familiar with it. You can do a brief 20-30 minutes session on Miro at the beginning of the workshop, and then proceed with the workshop's flow.*
- *In case it's not possible for you to use such tools, you can adapt all the uses of Miro in the lesson with the use of Sticky notes and newspaper papers in a physical workshop.*
- *Delivering this workshop requires a certain level of content related knowledge from the facilitator's side. Please refer to the relevant resources under "**theme 1: Finding and Consuming Digital Contents**" of the toolkit to learn the stuff you find unfamiliar in this guide.*



Tools used:

- [Miro](#)

Flow:

Topic	Objectives	Description
Energizer 15/15 mins	Get participants to connect with their group members through sharing of personal stories	<p>Introduce the facilitator and provide a brief overview of the workshop.</p> <p>Inform participants about the activity Story of our names. View the activity sheet to learn more about it.</p> <p>Present the related slide to make it clear to the participants. Distribute them in groups of 4-5 and give them 5 minutes for the activity.</p>
Introduction to Wikipedia 35/50 mins	<p>Make participants reflect on their opinions on Wikipedia</p> <p>Get participants to evaluate the pros and cons of Wikipedia</p>	<p>Inform participants that we'll together do an activity called Tug-of-war where we reflect on our opinion and experience with wikipedia.</p> <p>Read the activity sheet to learn more about the activity.</p> <p>Distribute participants into groups of 4-5 each. As a practice for the main activity, conduct a tug-of-war on the topic of "our school experiences" where participants post the positives and negatives of their experiences in school. Before starting the activity, show them the Miro frame, give a brief demonstration and share the link to the respective frame.</p> <p>Give them 3 minutes with the activity on School experiences. Once they are done, show the groups their respective frames on the board. Give a short demo of the discussion from the school experience board with the help of a volunteer or a co-facilitator. During the demo, emphasize on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Cluster similar ideas together• Question their ratings• Debate and reach common conclusion for each (cluster of) idea(s)



		<p>Present screen and show the Miro frame for the main activity. Share the respective link. Inform the participants that they have 15 minutes.</p> <p>Once they are done, ask participants to take 2 minutes to have a look at the frames of other participants. Then ask a few people to share their experiences from this activity. Driving questions to aid in thinking:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Did your opinion of Wikipedia change? What do you think is the reason? <p>Provide a closure by summing up the pros and cons listed in the boards and inform them that we'll be focusing on a key issue in this workshop - the reliability of Wikipedia articles</p>
<p>Reliability of Wikipedia articles</p> <p>25/75 mins</p>	<p>Get participants to analyze and evaluate wikipedia articles</p>	<p>Inform participants that this is also going to be a group activity where each group will be given two Wikipedia articles to study - one of them is an example of a reliable article, another one is questionable regarding its reliability.</p> <p><i>Facilitator notes: Refer to this activity sheet to learn more about this activity.</i></p> <p>Show the participants the links of wikipedia articles assigned to groups.(Each group gets one good quality and one bad quality article). Show the Miro frame for each group and emphasize on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Discuss about why they find a particular article to be of good quality (reliable) or not (unreliable)• Try to reach a common judgement as a team<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ If there's a difference in opinion, have a healthy debate to convince your peers• In the space under the article's link, post the reasons you find it to be reliable or unreliable <p>Share the respective link to the Miro frame. Inform participants that they will have 12 minutes for this activity.</p> <p>Once they are done, ask them to have a look at the work of the other groups. Then ask a member from each group to briefly explain how they performed the task and reflections from the activity.</p> <p>Sum up the ideas presented by the participants and discuss other ways to test reliability:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Language<ul style="list-style-type: none">◦ Grammar



		<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Voice○ Opinion or fact?● Bias?● Sources of information <p>Ask if anyone knows what references in wikipedia are. Get someone to share their knowledge. Then introduce the types of references to the participants: primary, secondary and tertiary.</p> <p>Present slides and explain briefly about those sources.</p>
References 25/100 mins	Get participants to reflect on the reliability of sources Get them to understand why secondary sources are usually most reliable, and why primary are least reliable	<p>Inform participants that having learnt about the different categories of sources, we'll now do an activity to apply our new knowledge. Participants will categorize various sources of information as primary, secondary and tertiary.</p> <p>Present screen and show participants the Miro frame where the groups are to do the activity. Emphasize on the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● Drag the notes into appropriate category● Discuss with group members about the categories each note belongs to● Reach a common decision as a group <p>Provide a brief demo of the activity. Share the link to the frame and inform participants that they have 10 minutes for the activity.</p> <p><i>Facilitator notes: Refer to this activity sheet to learn more about this activity.</i></p> <p>Once participants are done, ask them to have a look at the work of other groups. Ask a few to volunteer and share their experiences from the activity.</p> <p>Sum up the key ideas from the activity, clearing out confusions you observed in the discussions and on the boards.</p> <p>Ask - Which source - primary, secondary, or tertiary - is the most reliable reference for an article?</p> <p>Facilitator - Now let's see what Wikipedia considers as a reliable source.</p>



		Present screen and speak briefly on the reliability of various sources. Emphasize on why secondary sources are considered as more reliable.
Reflection 10/110 mins	Get participants to reflect on their learning from the workshop	Finish the session with a reflection using the thinking routine I used to think... And I now think... <i>Facilitator note: Refer to this activity sheet to learn about it in detail.</i> Provide closure with an emphasis on the need for a new set of skills to effectively search and consume information on the internet. Introduce the idea of digital citizenship and why it's important for digital citizens to know how to find and consume information effectively.