

# Video StoryBoard and Script

Mason Laney

Working Title of Project: Wikipedia: An Unlikely Hero

	What's on screen?	Script <i>A rough draft of the narration</i>	Time
1	A user accessing the main Wikipedia portal and clicking onto the homepage	Is it possible to amass the entire collective human knowledge into a single source? Well, that's what Wikipedia is trying to do. Wikipedia is a free, open-collaboration encyclopedia, where anyone can access, edit, and submit articles in hundreds of languages. The site is extraordinarily popular, consistently ranking among the most-visited websites worldwide. But how did this influential internet institution come to be?	15s
2	Pictures of Wales and Sanger	It all started in early 2000, when thirty-year-old options trader Jimmy Wales decided to embark on an ambitious project that had been much discussed but never fully realized: a free online encyclopedia. Wales reached out to thirty-one-year-old Ph.D. student Larry Sanger and recruited him to be the editor-in-chief of the project.	15s
3	Old website layout of Nupedia	In March, the two launched Nupedia, an online encyclopedia in which articles written by experts and carefully vetted and reviewed by professionals. Because of the extensive submission process, Nupedia only managed to produce twenty or so articles during its first year and a half of being online. Thus, inspired by WikiWikiWeb, a software allowing for easy, user-friendly editing of web pages, Sanger created Wikipedia to serve as a feeder site that would produce informal articles that Nupedia editors could build upon and revise.	30s
4	Screenshots of Wikipedia's homepage and layout at different points in time, charts showing the exponential growth of the site	Quickly after its launch in January of 2001, Wikipedia began to grow exponentially. Within the first month, the site was home to over 1,000 articles; within the first two years—100,000. With Sanger's departure from the project in early 2003 and Nupedia's closure in September of the same year, Wikipedia's popularity only continued to grow. As the decade went on, the site kept hitting milestone after milestone. A hundred languages. A million articles. Five million editor accounts. Ten million articles. Two billion words. A billion user edits. At its peak in 2007, Wikipedia was home to over 50,000 active editors per day.	45s
5	Sequential screenshots of the homepage of each site as it is listed	After seeing the tremendous success of Wikipedia, Wales decided to create the Wikimedia Foundation in order to incorporate all of his projects under one roof and fund them through nonprofit means. Aside from Wikipedia, Wikimedia became home to a myriad of other ventures: a dictionary and thesaurus, a quotation collection, a textbook hub, a digital library, a media hosting site, a travel guide, a taxonomy catalog, a news site, a collection of guides and online courses, a data science knowledge base, as well as several other coordination and infrastructure sites. The organization even holds an annual international conference, dubbed Wikimania, to discuss the site's impact and upcoming initiatives.	1m
6	More charts, screenshots of different language versions of Wikipedia	While the expansion of Wikipedia has slowed since its peak in the mid-2000s, the site continues to experience steady growth. In 2014, it was reported that Wikipedia consistently amassed over 18 billion page views per month, coming from nearly half a billion unique visitors. In 2018, Wikipedia was the fifth most popular website in the world, behind only Google, YouTube, Facebook, and Baidu. As of 2020, Wikipedia is available in 309 different languages, 16 of which feature over a million articles. In total, these 309 language versions comprise over 50 million different articles, with thousands more being added every day.	45s
7	Pictures / visual representations of such incidents, headlines, stock	It is no stretch to say that Wikipedia has had extraordinary cultural and societal impact. Yet, despite the site's popularity, Wikipedia has garnered significant amounts of criticism, especially from educators and other academics. Anyone who has grown up in the past two decades can tell you about the widespread animosity towards Wikipedia in the classroom.	1m

	photos of school	In fact, from the way many teachers talk about it, you would think that it is the bane of their existence. Numerous school districts have completely banned access to Wikipedia on school computers, and it is rare to find a middle- or high school teacher that does not explicitly forbid their students from citing it as a source on a research paper. Some school officials have even launched campaigns discouraging their students from viewing the site, with initiatives like “Just Say ‘No’ to Wikipedia”.	
8	Screengrabs of critical headlines scrolling past on screen, images of Seigenthaler and his page	And it’s not just teachers—news agencies started going after the site too. It became commonplace to see headlines claiming that Wikipedia was causing significant harm to educated society. The reason most people are concerned is obvious: if anyone can create an account to edit an article, and users are anonymous, then how can we trust that anything on the site is credible or correct? And there have been concrete examples of this type of vandalism in the past, such as when an anonymous user edited the biography of John Seigenthaler to include unsubstantiated claims that he was a suspect in the assassination of President John F. Kennedy, an error which was present for four months until Jimmy Wales himself had to take it down.	45s
9	Screenshots of Wikipedia and related Guardian article	Wikipedia has also come under criticism for other reasons: gender bias (around 85 or 90 percent of editors are male), liberal bias, Western bias, racial bias... The list goes on and on. Many have also denounced the site for containing misleading omissions and inconsistencies in the amount of information present in different articles. For example, at one point, the entry on Hurricane Frances was more than five times longer than the one for Chinese art, and for a while, the listing of pornographic actresses was better organized than that of female writers.	30s
10	Screen recording of editing interface, show how you cannot edit a locked article, screenshot of Wikipedia code of conduct and editing guidelines	Still, while it may not be perfect, to write off Wikipedia as dangerous and useless would be a mistake. The commonly held idea that “anyone can edit any article” is somewhat of a misconception. Wikipedia administrators have the ability to place different levels of protection on articles, so pages which are popular, extensive, controversial, or prone to vandalism are frequently “locked” so that they cannot be edited without review from admins. Plus, many of the horror stories about inaccurate information and vandalism happened early in the site’s history (though unfortunately, the reputation has stuck). There are enough protections in place now that vandalism usually isn’t a big issue, and the sheer volume of users that patrol the site means that any bad edits will be corrected quickly.	1m
11	Screengrab of info from <i>Nature</i> study	Additionally, the information on the site is more reliable than many give it credit for. In 2005, <i>Nature</i> published a study analyzing popular science articles from Wikipedia and Encyclopædia Britannica. It found that across the 42 articles in question, Wikipedia’s level of scientific accuracy was only slightly below Britannica’s. While both sources contained numerous small inaccuracies and omissions, each encyclopedia presented only four serious errors, described as “misinterpretations of important concepts”. Thus, while the site may not have the technical precision and rigor of a peer-reviewed scientific journal, it is generally reliable as a reference work and just as accurate as many traditional sources of information.	45s
12	Screenshots from various articles that do a good job of explaining fairly complex math and science topics	Moreover, Wikipedia has the potential to be a useful pedagogical tool if the stigma against it is broken, especially in middle- and high school. Wikipedia excels at putting complex ideas into layman’s terms, and it is often the only source available to students that has this depth of knowledge expressed in an approachable, clear, and non-technical way. That’s not to say that students should take everything on Wikipedia as gospel—inaccuracies certainly still exist. However, as long as students are taught to think critically about the source of the information they are viewing and the biases it may contain—something students should be taught regardless—then Wikipedia may serve as a valuable resource.	45s
13	Additional screenshots of various Wikipedia pages across languages, headlines illustrating the positive impact the	The famous saying goes, “history is written by the victors.” But, in the case of Wikipedia, history can be written by everyone. Unlike any other traditional encyclopedia or reference work, Wikipedia enables users from all around the world to research and write about their side of history. It gives anyone, regardless of background, access to the wealth of collective human knowledge without requiring them to have deep technical expertise in a subject or access to expensive academic journals. It has helped facilitate the spread of science, history, philosophy, and every other field imaginable across the globe. It has	1m

	site has had	covered worldwide political, civil, and cultural movements as they continue to develop and unfold. And, perhaps most importantly, it has made free, adless access to online information the norm. Despite its faults, Wikipedia has impacted the world in tremendous ways. And, however you may feel about its appropriateness in the classroom, it is impossible to deny that the site's unwavering dedication to making knowledge freely available has helped make the world a better place.	
--	--------------	--	--

\*Note... to add additional rows, place your cursor anywhere in the last row > select the **Table** menu > click on **Insert Row Below**.