

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY—WESTERN WASHINGTON UNIVERSITY

HIST 490/507: Digital Methods in History

Digital Exhibit Worksheet

Student Name:

Wiki Article Link:

Article Selection:

Why did you choose this article for review? (50–100 words)

Article History:

Review the editing history of the article (using the “View History” tab). Are there many editors / changes made over the life of the article? Are there any topics of disagreement or debate among the editors (you can see the discourse about the article using the “Talk” tab)? (100–200 words)

Article Metadata:

Are there multiple languages available for the page? How many times has the article been viewed (use the [Wiki Page View tool](#)—make sure for the dates to select “All Time”)? Are there any spikes in viewership, and if so, is there a reason you suspect for this? (50–100 words)

Article Reflection:

How effective is this article in presenting historical information for a public audience? Are there any issues or shortcomings? Compare this source to any other online website

(museums, encyclopedias, YouTube, Reddit, etc.)—how does the information and the presentation compare? Be sure to include the link to the second source in the response. (200–400 words)

Article Review:

Your review will be organized into five sections with comments made on each aspect (based on the [Wikipedia Evaluation Guidelines](#)):

1. **The Lead Section** – will state the most important information, give good overview of the rest of the article. It will be concise but avoid repeating the article content.
 - Do I feel satisfied that I know the importance of the topic?
 - Looking at the lead again after reading the rest of the article, does the lead reflect the most important information?
 - Does it give more weight to certain parts of the article over others? Is anything missing? Is anything redundant?

2. **Clarity of Article Structure** – each important aspect of the article should have its own clear and distinct section
 - Are the sections organized well, in a sensible order? Would they make more sense presented some other way (chronologically, for example)?

3. **Coverage Balance** – the article should be a balanced summary of existing resources without a dominant viewpoint
 - Is each section's length equal to its importance to the article's subject? Are there sections in the article that seem unnecessary? Is anything off-topic?
 - Does the article reflect all the perspectives represented in the published literature? Are any significant viewpoints left out or missing?
 - Does the article draw conclusions or try to convince the reader to accept one particular point of view?

4. **Content Neutrality** – the article should not try to persuade the reader of a specific idea or view
 - Do you think you could guess the perspective of the author by reading the article?
 - Are there any words or phrases that don't feel neutral? For example, "the best idea," "most people," or negative associations, such as "While it's obvious that x, some insist that y."
 - Does the article make claims on behalf of unnamed groups or people? For example, "some people say..."
 - Does the article focus too much on negative or positive information? Remember, neutral doesn't mean "the best positive light" or "the worst, most critical light." It means a clear reflection of various aspects of a topic.

5. **Sources** – article content should be supported by good and reliable sources
 - Are most statements in the article connected to a reliable source, such as textbooks and journal articles? Or do they rely on blogs or self-published authors?
 - Are there a lot of statements attributed to one or two sources? If so, it may lead to an unbalanced article, or one that leans too heavily into a single point of view.
 - Are there any unsourced statements in the article, or statements that you can't find stated in the references? Just because there is a source listed, doesn't mean it's presented accurately!