My name is Barbara Fischer and I work as curator for cultural partnerships at Wikimedia Deutschland. I would like to thank You for giving me the opportunity to share my thoughts with You.

Eve's message from remote times: KNOWLEDGE COMES THROUGH SHARING. The story goes that knowledge is risky, but let's take that risk.

Before we start: Wikimedia Deutschland is not identical to the Wikimedia Foundation. There might be other questions in San Francisco than those in Berlin. Some of the questions presented in this talk might not be new and even research might have been done. I do apologize before hand for my ignorance. But please correct in case I am wrong, but is Your research you have presented in this workshop published under open access conditions? I would like to invite You to publish Your slides and Your tools and take advantage of the potentials of the Wikimedia universe.

Let me introduce to you some of the question we have in Berlin. I have grouped them in 5 clusters: the Wikipedia itself, other Wikimedia projects, the Wikipedian, other external contributors and the reader. The talk is rather a snapshot on what we would like to know.
We can even listen to Wikipedia.

http://listen.hatnote.com/

We know a lot on Wikipedia.
We know the swarm achieves the Wikipedia.

Wikipedia is a product of intelligent community sourcing.
We know the Wikipedia is growing. Yet in our days a huge share of the growth is thanks to bots.
Jimmy Wales defined the average Wikipedia editor is a **male computer tech geek**. This clearly does have an impact on the variety of topics represented within the Wikipedia.

We know the hottest Wikipedia topics ...

... but what and why is it missing in the bulk?

One self might see what ought to be done within ones own field of interest, but needs advice what exactly is relevant beyond the own scope. Example: Humanities and even digital humanities are under represented in the Wikipedia. How much impact has the paradigma of mass relevance on the variety of the represented knowlege? Mass relevance leads to that You do find the most recent sequence of a HBO production but hardly on an ill unknown but high quality poet. You'll find the enterprise of raspberry pi device but nothing on the last trumpet maker in Germany. What kind of knowledge is not or little reflected, maybe due to old fashioned conceptions of what is knowledge and Diderot‘s 18th century ideas of what is an encyclopedia. How does the swarm limit the project? Is the project tolerant enough to inclose diverse knowledge beyond Enlightment taylored frames of knowledge?
Second cluster: There is much research done on Wikipedia. But what do we know about other important Wikimedia projects, such as Wikimedia Commons? And there are more: Wikidata, Wikisource, Wiktionary, Wikinews ...
Who is actually using the CC BY SA files? There are pictures, presentations, videos, audio files and more. But they are hard to find. Could this be improved on the running horse within a collaborative project? What technical solutions are there to search the meta data of the files? Datamining within the Wikimedia universe. Technical possible? Economical interesting? What are the business models based on the Wikimedia–Projects? Is there a dynamic economic growth based on Free Knowledge? How many Euros are made through Wikimedia?
The Wikipedian, a studied species yet full of secrets

Ulysses used the pseudonym ‘nobody‘ to remain unknown to the cyclop.

Third cluster: Most research on Wikipedians is done on the English writing editors. The quantitative samples are often based in Europe or US America. How about English contributors elsewhere? How about the Hindi Wikipedian or the Dutch Wikipedian? How does the Sorbian Wikipedia affect the development of Sorbian language, to name one „minor“ language.
The editors of the Wikipedia are mainly registered. But what do we know about them?

A third of the top 10,000 stand for 3000 and more edits.

More questions: what is driving the editors? How does the social network character of Wikimedia universe affect editing? What resilience powers are in action within the active Wikipedians?
Plenty of statistics on Wikipedians, still not enough on diversity and quality issues.

screen shot by http://stats.wikimedia.org/DE/ChartsWikipediaDE.htm

We are looking forward to learn more on the German Wikipedian. Is he – dreadfully there are fewer women – just the same as his American buddy? How about his life cycle? Can we identify certain characters that are easier to „wikify“ than others? Some say you need a special gene, maybe not, but a certain resilience could help. The trend to become more and more exclusive is that trend a nature law in mass sociology inmoveable and threatening to bury the project in a long run?
Who has a Wikipedia strategy?

The fourth cluster: Wikipedia articles are ranked high in search machines. The chance that somebody will receive his first impression on You through Wikipedia is high. It is not only a matter of PR if an institution or a person aims to alter its Wikipedia article. Misinformation, false information, inaccurate information or lack of information could be harmful to anybody. So what kind of strategy do they opt for?
Do culture and science institutions have a strategy to enhance the dissemination of free knowledge?

What is the part of Wikimedia projects in that strategy?

Reflecting the EU directive on Public Sector Information (PSI) stretched on the GLAM sector this year: Public financed museums will have to secure open access to their collections within the coming two years. It is part of their educational mission and digital technologies pose new challenges, but does that change their mentality? Do they conceive Wikimedia as an interesting partner? What barriers do we encounter?
Meanwhile some smart people are fishing for clients among corporations.

And we all know that PR professionals try to manipulate Wikipedia articles on behalf of their paying clients.
Actually the problem is not so much the fact of being paid, but the conflict of interest that might harm one of the basic rules of Wikipedia itself: The Neutral Point of View. The question is vivid and furiously debated. But beyond opinions, fears and hopes: Is there a scientific way to estimate the impact of paid editing to the project that is driven and financed by volunteers?
And the last fifth cluster: The reader.
Taking in account the mayor trends within the digital world: such are personalization – linking up – visualization

What does it mean to our project? One idea: Are there approved ways of change management within volunteer projects? Like furthering the acceptance of marketing guided decisions in a rather conservative community? Just reflect the heavy discussions that arose when the visual editor was introduced into the Wikipedia community.
What expectations do our readers have? Do they want to have more video files and a hipper layout? Would they prefer information snippets as an option? How to cluster different types of readers? How are these varied groups bonded to the Wikipedia and other Wikimedia projects? Why do 15,000 people participate in the world largest photo contest Wiki loves monuments, but only once and than hardly again? What are the mechanics to enhance participation? How do you become part of the Wikimedia Universe?
We do have some questions. How about You?

Please get in touch.

Right here or by Barbara.Fischer@wikimedia.de or +49 30 219 158 26 0

Thank you!

Each picture in this presentation apart from the screen shots is available through the Wikimedia Commons link in the caption. Feel free to use them.

picture: 1896 telephone [Public domain], via Wikimedia Commons

On my table You will find printed material on our activities. Please help Yourself. Thanks a lot for Your attention and do not hesitate to let me know Your ideas.