



A K E Y S T O N E P U B L I C A T I O N

---

# **The Guide to Successful Wikipedia Engagement**

*An Authoritative Handbook for Corporate Professionals*

---

W I K I B L U E P R I N T

*Advancing Open Knowledge*

[wikibluemprint.com](http://wikibluemprint.com) · [info@wikibluemprint.com](mailto:info@wikibluemprint.com)

## ABOUT THIS GUIDE

# Why we wrote it

---

Wikipedia is the most consulted reference work in human history, and increasingly it is the substrate from which AI assistants, search engines, and journalists draw their first impressions of any organization. For corporate professionals, that fact is consequential. What appears on a Wikipedia article shapes how the world understands a company long before its own marketing reaches the reader.

This handbook is the result of years of practice at the intersection of corporate communications and Wikipedia's editorial culture. It is written for in-house communicators, public affairs leaders, and the executives who advise them. Its purpose is not to teach you how to bend Wikipedia toward your interests. It is to teach you how to engage with Wikipedia on its own terms, ethically and effectively, so that the public record of your organization is accurate, well-sourced, and durable.

You will find a clear account of the principles that govern Wikipedia, a step-by-step protocol for proposing edits with disclosed conflicts of interest, a taxonomy of changes ranked by risk, and candid guidance on when a Wikipedia article is appropriate at all. The advice is conservative by design. The reputational cost of a mishandled engagement is far greater than the cost of patience.

Read it once for orientation. Return to it as a reference.

---

## The WikiBlueprint Team

*Santa Cruz, California*

## CONTENTS

# Table of Contents

---

**PART I** *Foundations***I Introduction***The opportunity and the obligation***II Benefits of Wikipedia Engagement***Seven reasons it matters***III Understanding Wikipedia's Key Principles***The rules behind the rules***PART II** *The Practice***IV A Step-by-Step Editing Protocol***Eight steps from research to maintenance***V Strategies for Minimizing Backlash***Eight ways to engage without inflaming***VI Arguing Well with a Conflict of Interest***Tone, posture, and what to avoid***VII Taxonomy of Changes***What is safe, what is fraught, what is forbidden***PART III** *Hard Questions***VIII Frequently Asked Questions***Fifteen questions clients ask most often***IX Why Your Company Probably Doesn't Qualify***An honest look at notability for corporations***X Why You Probably Don't Qualify for a Biography***An honest look at notability for individuals***PART IV** *Working with Help***XI Why You Shouldn't Hire a Wikipedia Consultant***And the reasons that don't hold up***XII Why You Should Hire WikiBlueprint***Where we fit***— Glossary***A working vocabulary for Wikipedia engagement*

P A R T

# I

## Foundations

*What Wikipedia is, why it matters, and the rules that govern it.*

---

*“Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia that anyone can edit, has become the most consulted reference work in human history.”*

S E C T I O N I

# Introduction

---

*The opportunity and the obligation.*

**W**ikipedia is the largest and most widely used reference site in the world, with millions of visitors every day. For corporate professionals, it represents both an opportunity and a challenge.

A well-written Wikipedia presence can bolster your company's online reputation, improve visibility, and ensure accurate representation. However, editing Wikipedia requires careful adherence to its core principles: neutrality, verifiability, and no original research.

This guide provides corporate communications teams with a step-by-step approach to making ethical, impactful contributions to Wikipedia, avoiding common pitfalls, and building long-term trust with the Wikipedia community.

#### HOW TO USE THIS GUIDE

Sections II through III explain why Wikipedia matters and what its principles require. Sections IV through VII give you the operational protocol: how to edit, how to handle pushback, and how to triage proposed changes by risk. Sections VIII through XI answer the questions most clients raise before they begin.

If you are pressed for time, read Sections III, IV, and VII first. They are the working core of the document.

• • •

S E C T I O N I I

# The Benefits of Wikipedia Engagement

---

*Seven reasons a thoughtful Wikipedia presence pays off.*

**E**ngaging with Wikipedia effectively offers durable advantages for any company that wants accurate, accessible information about its brand to reach a global audience. The benefits compound over time.

## 01 Improved Visibility

Wikipedia pages rank prominently in search results, often appearing on the first page of Google and other major search engines. As one of the most visited websites in the world, Wikipedia ensures high visibility for your company, products, and leadership. When potential clients, customers, or partners search for information about your company, they are likely to encounter your Wikipedia page early in their research. The rise of large language models also means that Wikipedia is now feeding an ever-evolving knowledge pipeline that powers AI tools.

## 02 Enhanced Credibility

Wikipedia is known for its emphasis on neutrality, accuracy, and sourcing from reliable third-party references. Being thoroughly described on Wikipedia signals that your company is noteworthy enough to be covered by reputable sources, lending credibility to your brand. A well-maintained article that reflects independent, unbiased information enhances public trust because it is, by design, free from overt marketing language or promotional bias.

## 03 Transparency and Accountability

An up-to-date Wikipedia page shows that your company is open to public scrutiny and committed to transparency. Including accurate information about both achievements and challenges demonstrates accountability and a willingness to engage with your public reputation. A balanced article, presenting both successes and controversies, can reflect positively on your company's commitment to honesty.

## 04 Public Representation

Wikipedia allows companies to take an active role in shaping how they are represented in the public domain. While you cannot control the content, contributing factual and well-sourced information ensures that your company's narrative is accurately reflected. If misinformation or outdated information exists, engaging with Wikipedia allows you to present verified updates that better align with your current initiatives. Even in challenging situations, your company can offer fact-based contributions that reflect its actions and resolutions.

## 05 Search Engine Optimization

A Wikipedia page can improve your company's online discoverability by contributing to stronger SEO. Because Wikipedia is widely trusted by search engines and frequently cited, your company's page can

drive significant traffic to your website and to other third-party content. Wikipedia pages also tend to dominate search results for related terms, helping your company stand out in a crowded digital landscape.

## 06 **Educating the Public**

A strong Wikipedia presence ensures that anyone searching for information about your company finds a balanced, comprehensive, and accurate portrayal. Whether you are a technology firm highlighting innovation, a nonprofit promoting social impact, or a retailer showcasing sustainability initiatives, Wikipedia offers a platform to communicate your core mission in a neutral tone.

## 07 **Long-Term Strategic Value**

Your company's Wikipedia page should never be treated as a marketing tool, but it can become an integral part of your digital strategy when used correctly. By consistently monitoring and updating your Wikipedia presence, you ensure that the public is always seeing the most current and accurate view of your company. This long-term commitment to factual transparency enhances visibility, trustworthiness, and relevance for years to come.

• • •

## S E C T I O N I I I

# Understanding Wikipedia's Key Principles

---

*The rules behind the rules. Learn them once, apply them always.*

**B**efore making any edits, it is essential to understand the policies that govern Wikipedia. These principles ensure that the platform maintains its reputation as a neutral, reliable, and verifiable source. For corporate professionals, adhering to them is not just a best practice. It is the precondition for being heard at all.

## 01 Neutral Point of View

Wikipedia operates under a strict neutral point of view (NPOV) policy. All content must be written without bias, and articles must not promote or defend any particular viewpoint. When engaging with a page about your company, your focus should be on presenting information as factually and objectively as possible, avoiding any promotional language.

For corporate editors, this principle can be particularly challenging because there is often an understandable mandate to highlight the positive. However, articles must reflect both the favorable and unfavorable information that is available in reliable, third-party sources. Wikipedia's neutrality does not mean equal space for all views. It means that all significant views, particularly those backed by credible sources, should be represented fairly.

### EXAMPLE

*Instead of: "XYZ Corporation is a global leader in sustainability."*

*Write: "In 2023, XYZ Corporation was recognized by [reputable source] for its sustainability efforts."*

## 02 Verifiability

Wikipedia's verifiability policy is essential to ensuring that the information on the site can be trusted. Every fact or statement added to a Wikipedia page must be supported by reliable, independent sources that can be verified by other editors. For corporate professionals, this means avoiding self-published content such as your company's website or press releases unless they are corroborated by established third-party publications.

Verifiable sources must be independent of the subject. Reputable news outlets, academic publications, and industry reports are generally acceptable. Information that cannot be verified by independent sources is likely to be removed by other editors, particularly if it appears promotional.

### EXAMPLE

*When updating revenue figures or CEO changes, cite a third-party financial news outlet or an official SEC filing rather than linking only to a company press release.*

### 03 No Original Research

Wikipedia is not a platform for original research. Editors cannot add their own interpretations, analyses, or unpublished facts to articles. All content must be based on previously published information from reputable sources. This rule is what keeps Wikipedia an encyclopedic reference rather than a venue for new claims.

For corporate professionals, this can be challenging if your company holds proprietary knowledge or unique insights that have not yet been covered by independent sources. Until those insights are published in a reputable third-party medium, they cannot appear on Wikipedia. Avoid the temptation to inject opinions or promotional narratives into articles, even when they are well-supported internally.

#### EXAMPLE

*Instead of citing an unpublished internal report on market trends, look for independent reports from well-known industry analysts that can be cited.*

---

*“Wikipedia’s neutrality is not a constraint to work around. It is the discipline that gives the encyclopedia its credibility, and yours.”*

---

### 04 Conflict of Interest

Wikipedia’s conflict of interest (COI) guidelines are designed to ensure that editors do not use the platform to promote personal or financial interests. A conflict of interest arises when someone has a vested interest in the subject of the article they are editing, such as a corporate professional editing their own company’s page. While COI does not automatically disqualify someone from engaging, it does mean that editors must tread carefully and follow Wikipedia’s guidelines to avoid bias.

Transparency is the heart of the matter. If you are editing an article about your company, you are required to disclose your role on both your user page and the article’s Talk page. Failure to disclose a COI is considered unethical and can lead to serious consequences, including the removal of your edits or a ban

from the platform. To stay safely on the right side of the policy, corporate professionals should use Talk pages to propose edits rather than editing articles directly.

#### EXAMPLE

*A corporate editor might propose: "I work in corporate communications for XYZ Corporation and would like to suggest updating our revenue figures using this third-party source [reputable financial publication]."*

## 05 No Advocacy

Wikipedia is not a platform for advocacy or promotion, even when the advocacy aligns with a worthy cause or the mission of the company. This principle is particularly important for corporate professionals, as the line between neutral contribution and self-promotion is thin. Wikipedia is an encyclopedia, not a marketing tool, and all content must reflect that distinction.

Advocacy can take many forms: overemphasizing positive aspects of the company, downplaying or omitting controversies, or using promotional language that presents the company in an overly favorable light. To ensure that your contributions remain neutral, stick to presenting factual information backed by reliable sources, and be mindful of balance, word choice, and tone. Wikipedia's community is highly vigilant about corporate advocacy.

#### EXAMPLE

*Instead of: "XYZ Corporation is at the forefront of technological innovation."*

*Write: "In 2022, XYZ Corporation introduced a new product line, covered by independent technology publications such as TechCrunch and Forbes."*

## 06 Transparency and Collaboration

Wikipedia thrives on collaboration. The platform is built by volunteers and editors who work together to maintain accuracy, neutrality, and verifiability across millions of articles. As a corporate professional, your role is to contribute in a way that respects this collaborative ethos. Be open about your COI, propose changes rather than making direct edits where COI exists, and engage respectfully with other editors.

Transparency builds trust and helps prevent backlash from the community. Always explain the reasons behind your proposed changes on the Talk page, especially when your suggestion may be seen as controversial.

**EXAMPLE**

*If you are seeking to update information about a company's recent restructuring, you might write: "I am suggesting these updates to better reflect the current status of the company's leadership structure, using this reliable, third-party source [Business Insider]."*

By understanding and adhering to these principles, corporate professionals can engage with Wikipedia in a way that complies with community standards, avoids conflicts of interest, and supports accurate, well-sourced information. Following these guidelines is essential to maintaining your credibility and to ensuring that your contributions are respected within the Wikipedia community.

• • •

P A R T

# II

## The Practice

*How to engage. The protocol, the strategies, the tone, the taxonomy.*

---

*“The work is not to convince Wikipedia of anything. The work is to bring Wikipedia material that meets its own standard.”*

## SECTION IV

# A Step-by-Step Editing Protocol

---

*Eight steps from research to maintenance. Follow them in order.*

Wikipedia is a powerful tool for keeping your company's public information accurate, well-researched, and neutral. Because of its emphasis on neutrality, verifiability, and conflict of interest disclosure, corporate professionals must approach editing carefully and strategically. The eight steps that follow form a complete protocol.

### Step 1 **Research Your Company's Wikipedia Presence**

Before making any edits, assess the current state of your company's Wikipedia page. Evaluate the content for factual inaccuracies, outdated information, and missing details. Look for sections that need updates, such as leadership changes, revenue updates, or new product launches. Analyze the tone: does the page maintain neutrality, or does it lean for or against your company? Look for gaps in coverage of key milestones, achievements, or events. Begin gathering reliable, independent sources that can back any future edits.

#### IN PRACTICE

*You might find that the Wikipedia page for your company lacks updated financial information from your latest annual report. Identify reputable financial publications that have covered these figures and note them for later use.*

### Step 2 **Create an Account and Disclose Your Conflict of Interest**

If you have not already, create a Wikipedia account. While you can edit anonymously, a registered account is strongly recommended for transparency, especially when editing articles where you have a potential conflict of interest. Complete your user profile and disclose your affiliation with the company you are editing. This transparency builds trust with the Wikipedia community and helps prevent accusations of biased or unethical editing. Disclose your COI on the Talk page before making any edits.

#### IN PRACTICE

*"I work for XYZ Corporation in the communications department, and I would like to propose updates to this article to reflect recent changes in our leadership. All proposed updates will be based on third-party sources."*

### Step 3 **Use Talk Pages to Propose Changes**

Wikipedia encourages discussion before major edits, especially when there is a potential conflict of interest. Each Wikipedia article has an associated Talk page where editors can discuss proposed changes

and collaborate on improvements. Propose changes there rather than editing the article directly. Always include independent, verifiable sources to back up your suggestions. Be patient and collaborative; editors may not respond immediately, so allow time for review and feedback.

#### IN PRACTICE

*"I suggest updating the section on XYZ Corporation's 2022 revenue. According to Bloomberg, the company reported a revenue of \$2 billion. Here is a link to the article."*

### Step 4 **Gather and Use Reliable, Independent Sources**

When making any change to a Wikipedia page, every fact must be backed by reliable, third-party sources. Wikipedia's verifiability policy emphasizes the importance of sources that are independent of the subject. Avoid using corporate websites or press releases as the sole source of information. These are often viewed as biased and may be flagged for removal. Look instead for reputable news outlets, industry analysts, and academic publications. Ensure balanced representation: if your company has faced challenges, controversies, or criticisms, those should also be reflected.

#### IN PRACTICE

*Instead of citing your company's internal press release to announce a new product, cite an article from TechCrunch or Forbes that independently discusses the launch.*

### Step 5 **Start with Small, Low-Risk Edits**

For corporate professionals with a conflict of interest, begin with small, low-risk edits. Correct factual errors, update leadership information, or add well-sourced information about recent awards or achievements. Avoid making sweeping changes all at once, especially in areas that are controversial or might be perceived as self-serving. Spacing edits out gives the community time to review each change individually and helps prevent the appearance of bias.

#### IN PRACTICE

*Begin by updating the company's leadership section with third-party citations, such as a news article covering the recent appointment of a new CEO. Once that is accepted, move on to more complex edits like updating the company's product portfolio.*

### Step 6 **Monitor Feedback and Engage with Editors**

Once your edits are made or proposed, monitor the page for feedback or further changes. Other editors may revise or revert your edits, especially if they perceive bias. If your changes are reverted, do not immediately re-edit the article. Reach out to the editor on the Talk page to discuss why the change was reverted and how it might be improved. Engage respectfully and be open to compromise. Wikipedia thrives on consensus-building.

#### IN PRACTICE

*Always remain professional and courteous in discussions. Personal attacks or defensive behavior will draw further scrutiny to your edits.*

### Step 7 Take a Gradual Approach to Controversial Topics

If your company's Wikipedia page covers controversial subjects such as legal issues, layoffs, or scandals, approach those areas with care. Rather than recommending the deletion or significant alteration of these sections, gradually propose well-sourced updates that provide context or describe how the issue was addressed. Removing criticism is widely viewed as whitewashing and reliably triggers backlash. Focus instead on accuracy and neutrality.

#### IN PRACTICE

*If your company was involved in a lawsuit, do not suggest deleting the section. Propose: "In 2022, XYZ Corporation reached a settlement, as reported by [independent news source]. The company has since implemented new compliance measures."*

### Step 8 Maintain and Monitor the Page

Editing a Wikipedia page is not a one-time activity. Regularly monitor your company's page for accuracy. Set a watchlist on Wikipedia to be notified of changes. Watch for vandalism or misinformation, and use the Talk page to request corrections, always providing reliable sources. Avoid frequent or unnecessary edits. Excessive changes, especially to positive sections, raise red flags and attract scrutiny.

#### IN PRACTICE

*By following this protocol, corporate professionals can navigate Wikipedia's complex policies while ensuring that their company's presence is neutral, accurate, and well-sourced.*

Transparency, collaboration, and patience are the keys to successful Wikipedia engagement. Following this protocol allows you to build trust with the community while ensuring that your company's public information is factual and balanced.

• • •

## S E C T I O N V

# Strategies for Minimizing Backlash

---

*Eight ways to engage without inflaming the community.*

**B**acklash on Wikipedia is rarely about the content of your edit. It is almost always about how the edit was made: with or without disclosure, with or without consultation, with or without humility. The eight strategies below address the how.

## 01 Prioritize Transparency

### Why it Matters

Transparency is the most direct way to avoid backlash. Wikipedia has strict conflict of interest guidelines, and undisclosed COI edits are viewed with deep suspicion. Openly acknowledging your affiliation builds trust and shows you are engaging in good faith.

### How to Implement

- Declare conflicts of interest. Disclose your COI on your user page and on the article's Talk page.
- Use the Talk page for sensitive proposals before making direct edits.
- Disclose paid contributions. If your editing is part of your job, Wikipedia's Terms of Use require you to say so.

#### EXAMPLE

*"I am a corporate communications representative for XYZ Corp. Our CEO was recently replaced by Jane Doe. I would like to propose updating this information, using this article from the Wall Street Journal as a source."*

## 02 Use Neutral, Third-Party Sources

### Why it Matters

Wikipedia places a high value on independent sourcing. Edits based only on company materials are likely to be reverted as biased or promotional.

### How to Implement

- Reference reputable news outlets, industry reports, or government databases.
- Balance positive and negative information. If your company has been involved in controversies, acknowledge them while citing efforts to address or resolve the issues.

**EXAMPLE**

*If you are adding information about a new product launch, do not rely on your company's press release alone. Find coverage in industry publications such as TechCrunch or Forbes that provide a third-party perspective.*

**03 Engage with the Community****Why it Matters**

Wikipedia is a community-driven platform, and editors are protective of the site's neutrality. Engaging before making significant changes signals respect for that culture and reduces pushback.

**How to Implement**

- Discuss substantial edits on the Talk page before acting.
- Request edits rather than make them yourself when COI is present.

**EXAMPLE**

*"I would like to suggest rewording this section to reflect that the layoffs were part of a restructuring, as covered by Business Insider. Does this wording seem more neutral?"*

**04 Focus on Factual, Not Promotional, Edits****Why it Matters**

Wikipedia is an encyclopedia, not a marketing tool. Even when content is being improved, promotional language or overly favorable framing will attract scrutiny and reversion.

**How to Implement**

- Avoid marketing jargon. Words like "leading," "innovative," and "cutting-edge" are flagged as promotional.
- Present balanced information. Even when highlighting achievements, maintain a measured tone. This makes your contribution more credible.

**EXAMPLE**

Instead of: “XYZ Corporation is an industry leader in technological innovation.” Write: “In 2023, XYZ Corporation released a new product line, covered by Forbes and TechCrunch for its features in AI integration.”

---

*“How an edit is made matters more than what the edit says. Disclosure, patience, and tone are what carry it through.”*

---

**05 Take a Gradual Approach to Controversial Edits****Why it Matters**

Controversial or high-risk edits, such as those touching scandals, layoffs, or lawsuits, are most likely to attract scrutiny. Sudden, sweeping changes in these areas regularly provoke backlash, especially if they appear designed to remove negative information.

**How to Implement**

- Add context rather than deleting content. Acknowledge the issue and describe how it was addressed.
- Propose incremental changes. If a section needs major revision, break it into smaller, manageable edits.

**EXAMPLE**

*“Following the 2022 recall, XYZ Corporation implemented stricter quality control measures, as reported by Bloomberg.”*

**06 Anticipate and Address Potential Criticism**

## Why it Matters

Editors are wary of corporate edits, especially on legal disputes, controversies, or financial issues. Anticipating these concerns lets you address them before they escalate.

## How to Implement

- Acknowledge your COI early and explain how you have ensured neutrality through independent sources.
- Reference Wikipedia's guidelines explicitly when proposing changes. This shows you are familiar with the platform's rules.

### EXAMPLE

*"I understand this is a sensitive topic. I am proposing context on the resolution of the case, as covered by Reuters. All changes adhere to Wikipedia's NPOV and Verifiability policies."*

07

## Avoid Multiple Simultaneous Suggestions

### Why it Matters

Several requests at once, especially favorable ones, can look like an attempt to overhaul the article without community input. This invites reversions and heightened scrutiny.

### How to Implement

- Space out edits. Spread changes over time so the community can review each one.
- Start with less controversial edits, then build trust before moving to more substantive proposals.

### EXAMPLE

*Update leadership first. Once that change is accepted, propose product line edits, then move to the legal section.*

08

## Avoid Discussion Wars

### Why it Matters

If another editor declines a change, fighting their decision without careful engagement leads to intractable disputes. This damages your credibility and can result in your account being blocked.

## How to Implement

- Engage with the editor. Ask why your suggestion was reverted and explain your rationale.
- Be willing to compromise. Wikipedia is a consensus-building platform, and flexibility in wording or structure is often what gets edits accepted.

### EXAMPLE

*Be open to feedback and compromise on wording or structure. If your edit is seen as too promotional, work with other editors to find a more neutral phrasing.*

## SECTION VI

# Arguing Well with a Conflict of Interest

---

*Tone, posture, and what to avoid.*

**E**ngaging on Wikipedia when you have a COI requires a delicate balance of transparency, professionalism, and patience. Wikipedia editors are highly vigilant about bias and promotional content, so your approach matters as much as your sources. The principles below describe a posture that consistently earns trust.

## Six Principles for Productive Engagement

---

### 01 Be Calm and Patient

Approach all discussions with composure, even if your edits are challenged or reverted. Emotional or defensive responses escalate tensions and decrease the likelihood of collaboration. Editors are far more likely to work with you if you stay measured and open to dialogue.

### 02 Be Clear, Polite, and Deferential

Use clear, concise language to explain your intentions and proposals. Politeness goes a long way. Acknowledging the expertise and contributions of other editors helps build rapport. You are not arguing to win. You are working to improve the article collaboratively.

### 03 Be Inquisitive and Helpful

If your edits are rejected, ask questions. Be inquisitive about why they were denied, and invite feedback. A willingness to understand and learn from experienced editors signals good faith and positions you as someone trying to improve Wikipedia, not just trying to win one edit.

### 04 Be Prepared and Transparent

Always come ready with reliable, independent sources, and disclose your COI fully. Transparency about your role and intentions builds credibility, and undisclosed conflicts are flagged quickly and result in reverted edits or worse.

### 05 Be Direct but Diplomatic

When proposing changes, be direct but diplomatic. Acknowledge the sensitivity of certain topics and make clear that you are seeking accuracy, not the removal of criticism. Frame your suggestions as the addition of factual context rather than as the subtraction of unflattering material.

### 06 Avoid Humor, Especially Sarcasm

Humor, particularly sarcasm, is easily misinterpreted in text. It can read as unprofessional, demeaning, or even aggressive. Sarcasm in particular tends to read as condescending or passive-aggressive. In a COI engagement, keep all interactions straightforward, respectful, and free of humor.

# Patterns That Inflame and Are Best Avoided

---

Editors notice tone before they notice substance. The patterns below reliably escalate conflict and reduce the chance that your proposals will be accepted.

## Arrogance or Dismissiveness

Coming across as superior to other editors instantly alienates the community. Wikipedia thrives on a culture of respect. A tone that suggests you regard others' efforts as less informed will trigger immediate resistance.

## Overconfidence in Your Expertise

Assuming that your subject expertise outweighs the community's grasp of Wikipedia's principles is off-putting. Editors value humility and adherence to guidelines over claims to authority.

## Aggressive Rebuttals

Pushing back hard against criticism signals that you are more interested in winning than collaborating. Confrontation reliably produces defensive reactions and rejections.

## Excessively Formal or Corporate Tone

A polished corporate voice can feel cold or manipulative to volunteer editors. It reads as PR rather than as thoughtful contribution and raises immediate suspicion about motive.

## Apologetic or Meek Affect

Excessive apology can read as disingenuous or unsure. It invites others to question the strength of your sourcing. Respect and firmness are not opposites.

## Inflexibility

A tone suggesting you will not consider alternatives alienates editors and entrenches opposition.

# Approaches That Build Trust

---

By contrast, the following postures consistently earn goodwill and lead to more effective engagements over time.

## Conversational and Collaborative Tone

Treat every interaction as a conversation. Phrases like “I wonder if we could consider...” or “I would love your thoughts on...” create an open, inviting environment.

## Respectful Curiosity

Ask why content is structured a certain way or why an edit was reverted. Curiosity defuses tension and signals respect for other perspectives.

## Balanced Confidence

Be informed and prepared without being dismissive. Calm self-assurance combined with openness to feedback signals thoughtful contribution.

## Empathy and Validation

Editors often feel protective of articles they have built. Phrases like “I see how much work has gone into this” ease tension and open productive dialogue.

## Informal but Professional

The Wikipedia community appreciates a relaxed, genuine voice. Avoid corporate-speak and formal advocacy. Be approachable and human while remaining professional.

## Thoughtful and Deliberate

A measured tone that reflects on the broader impact of your suggestions reads as genuine investment in improving Wikipedia, not as advancing private interests.

By paying close attention to your tone and style, you can build a much more trusting and effective relationship with Wikipedia editors. This will not only help your proposed changes be taken seriously but will also foster goodwill and collaboration that pays off in every future engagement.

• • •

## S E C T I O N V I I

# Taxonomy of Changes

---

*What is safe, what is fraught, what is forbidden. A field guide for triage.*

Not every edit carries the same weight. Some are routine maintenance and rarely contested. Others touch sensitive ground and require care. The taxonomy below sorts the most common categories of corporate edits into three risk tiers, with the argument that tends to land and the kinds of sources that support it.

## Tier 1 · Innocuous

Routine, low-risk updates. These edits typically pass with minimal scrutiny when properly sourced.

CHANGE TYPE	EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT	RELIABLE SOURCES
<b>Updating office locations</b>	<i>"This reflects verifiable public information."</i>	Company press release or reputable news articles announcing the new office.
<b>Correcting outdated logos</b>	<i>"The logo has changed as part of a rebranding effort and should be updated for accuracy."</i>	Official branding guidelines or third-party coverage of the rebranding.
<b>Adding awards or recognitions</b>	<i>"The award is notable and covered by third-party reliable sources."</i>	Industry publications or mainstream media articles reporting the award.
<b>Updating founder biography</b>	<i>"This adds verifiable new achievements."</i>	News coverage or event summaries from independent sources.
<b>Clarifying corporate mission</b>	<i>"This reflects updates in the company's official strategy without promotional language."</i>	Published strategic plans alongside independent analysis from reputable industry analysts.
<b>Adding a CSR initiative</b>	<i>"This adds verifiable public information about the company's social efforts."</i>	Coverage from reputable environmental or social responsibility watchdogs.
<b>Expanding product range</b>	<i>"This new product is notable and has been reported in independent media."</i>	News articles or product reviews from respected industry sources.
<b>Correcting revenue figures</b>	<i>"This reflects publicly available and accurate revenue data from a neutral source."</i>	Annual reports, SEC filings, or coverage in reputable financial publications.

CHANGE TYPE	EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT	RELIABLE SOURCES
<b>Documenting a partnership</b>	<i>"This partnership is public and widely reported."</i>	News articles from reputable business publications.
<b>Clarifying industry terminology</b>	<i>"This improves understanding of technical language for general readers."</i>	Third-party industry glossaries or respected educational materials.

## Tier 2 · Substantive

Material updates that warrant careful sourcing. Expect scrutiny and engage proactively on the Talk page.

CHANGE TYPE	EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT	RELIABLE SOURCES
<b>Notable leadership changes</b>	<i>"This is a significant leadership change with reliable, independent coverage."</i>	Reputable business news outlets covering the new leadership.
<b>Historical acquisitions</b>	<i>"This adds key historical information with verifiable sources."</i>	Business news archives or reputable M&A reporting.
<b>Employee statistics update</b>	<i>"This reflects publicly reported workforce data."</i>	Company reports, independent HR surveys, or labor organization data.
<b>Highlighting environmental impact</b>	<i>"This provides neutral, verifiable information about environmental efforts."</i>	Independent environmental watchdog reports or reputable media coverage.
<b>Expanding company history</b>	<i>"This adds well-sourced, historically relevant details."</i>	Business history books or reputable articles analyzing the company's growth.
<b>Improving citation quality</b>	<i>"This removes unsourced claims and replaces them with properly cited information."</i>	Reliable third-party sources, such as news articles or academic publications.
<b>Correcting misinformation</b>	<i>"This correction is based on verifiable third-party information."</i>	Reputable fact-checking organizations or industry reports.

CHANGE TYPE	EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT	RELIABLE SOURCES
<b>Adding market position information</b>	<i>“This market share data is notable and based on third-party reports.”</i>	Market research from firms like Gartner or Statista.
<b>Global expansion details</b>	<i>“This expansion has been covered in reliable media outlets.”</i>	Global business news or industry analysis articles.
<b>Employee satisfaction rankings</b>	<i>“This ranking is notable and reported by third-party sources.”</i>	Reputable workplace rankings such as Glassdoor or recognized HR surveys.

## Tier 3 · Controversial

High-risk territory. Propose only on the Talk page, with multiple high-quality independent sources, and never delete: contextualize.

CHANGE TYPE	EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT	RELIABLE SOURCES
<b>Removing negative reviews</b>	<i>“This information is outdated or irrelevant, as shown by newer, more balanced sources.”</i>	Well-rounded reviews or independent consumer watchdog reports.
<b>Contextualizing legal disputes</b>	<i>“This adds context to legal disputes without minimizing or whitewashing facts.”</i>	Legal analysis from reputable law journalism or neutral business media.
<b>Competitor comparisons</b>	<i>“This adds verifiable, third-party market comparisons, ensuring neutrality.”</i>	Independent market reports or analysis from respected industry analysts.
<b>Toning down criticism</b>	<i>“This preserves criticism but contextualizes it with additional independent sources.”</i>	Balanced, third-party news coverage that presents multiple viewpoints.
<b>Reframing layoffs</b>	<i>“This reframes layoffs as part of verifiable corporate restructuring.”</i>	Business news articles that cover the restructuring process in detail.
<b>Addressing CEO controversy</b>	<i>“This controversy is relevant, but must include resolution or response from credible sources.”</i>	Reputable media coverage focusing on both the controversy and any resolutions.

CHANGE TYPE	EFFECTIVE ARGUMENT	RELIABLE SOURCES
<b>Updating negative media coverage</b>	<i>“This provides a balanced update covering both the issue and any corrective actions.”</i>	Media outlets that reported both the issue and its resolution.
<b>Modifying allegations of misconduct</b>	<i>“This adds factual context without diminishing the gravity of the allegations.”</i>	Investigative journalism or legal findings from reputable independent sources.
<b>Discussing financial losses</b>	<i>“This rephrasing acknowledges financial challenges while providing third-party context.”</i>	Financial analysis from sources like Bloomberg or The Wall Street Journal.
<b>Updating references to scandals</b>	<i>“This reflects that certain details are no longer relevant, while retaining accurate, sourced information.”</i>	Reliable third-party media coverage that clarifies or updates the controversy.

• • •

P A R T

# III

## Hard Questions

*When this isn't going to work, and why honesty matters more than enthusiasm.*

---

*"Wikipedia's rules exist to keep articles neutral, accurate, and verifiable. The bar is high by design."*

S E C T I O N V I I I

# Frequently Asked Questions

---

*Fifteen questions clients ask most often.*

These are the questions we hear most often from corporate communications leads, public affairs professionals, and executives navigating Wikipedia for the first time. The answers are short by design. Each links back to a longer treatment elsewhere in this guide.

### **Q1. Can I remove negative information about my company?**

No. Wikipedia frowns on the removal of negative information, especially when it is well sourced. Deleting critical content is widely viewed as a violation of the neutrality policy. Instead, add context or updates using reliable, third-party sources. If the negative content relates to a past controversy or legal case, provide neutral, sourced updates on how the issue was resolved or addressed.

### **Q2. How do I deal with inaccurate or outdated information?**

Propose corrections on the article's Talk page first. Include reliable sources to back your proposed changes and explain why the current information is incorrect or outdated. If you have a conflict of interest, avoid editing directly. Use the Talk page to collaborate with neutral editors who can review and make the changes.

### **Q3. How long does it take for changes to be approved?**

It varies. Minor, uncontroversial edits may be accepted quickly. Major or controversial changes can take days, weeks, or months. Engaging with editors on the Talk page and providing strong, reliable sources can speed up the process.

### **Q4. Do I need to disclose my role in the company when making edits?**

Yes. Wikipedia requires transparency, especially when there is a conflict of interest. Always disclose your connection to the company on your user page and whenever you make or propose edits. This builds trust and ensures that your contributions are viewed as transparent and in good faith.

### **Q5. Can I use my company's press releases as sources?**

Press releases can sometimes be used for straightforward factual information such as launch dates or leadership changes, but Wikipedia strongly prefers independent, third-party sources. Press releases are self-published and often read as promotional, so they should be supplemented with coverage from reputable news outlets or industry publications.

### **Q6. What types of sources are considered reliable for Wikipedia?**

Reliable sources generally include reputable news organizations, academic journals, industry reports, and government publications. Corporate websites, marketing materials, and press releases are viewed with skepticism and should be used sparingly. Aim for independent, neutral third-party sources with no vested interest in your company.

### **Q7. Can I create a Wikipedia page for my company if it does not already exist?**

Possibly, but the page must meet Wikipedia's notability guidelines. Your company must have received significant coverage from reliable, independent sources in multiple publications. If your company does not yet meet these guidelines, creating a page prematurely can lead to its deletion. Wait until there is sufficient independent media coverage, or consult with an experienced Wikipedia editor.

### **Q8. What should I do if an edit war starts?**

Avoid it. If another editor reverts your changes and a cycle of edits begins, take the discussion to the article's Talk page. Engage diplomatically and try to build consensus on the content. Edit wars can lead to blocks or bans. Focus on collaboration, not confrontation.

### **Q9. What should I do if someone accuses me of editing with bias?**

Respond calmly and transparently. Acknowledge any potential conflicts of interest and emphasize your adherence to neutrality and verifiability. Provide reliable sources and invite the community to review your contributions. Engaging in good faith and demonstrating willingness to collaborate is the most effective defense.

### **Q10. How can I avoid being flagged for promotional content?**

Stick to neutral, fact-based language and avoid marketing jargon. Words like "innovative," "leading," and "cutting-edge" are red flags. Ensure your edits are balanced, including both positive and negative information when relevant. Always cite independent third-party sources, and avoid edits that solely promote achievements.

### **Q11. What happens if my edits are denied?**

Do not panic and do not immediately re-edit the page. Go to the Talk page and ask the editor who reverted your changes to explain why. This opens a conversation and creates an opportunity for consensus. You can clarify your intentions and provide additional sources or explanations that may have been overlooked.

### **Q12. Should I hire a professional Wikipedia consultant?**

It can be valuable, especially if you are unfamiliar with Wikipedia's policies. Consultants with experience in Wikipedia editing can help navigate conflict of interest rules, propose neutral edits, and

ensure compliance with community standards. Choose a consultant who adheres to Wikipedia's ethical guidelines and focuses on transparency.

### **Q13. What is the best way to ensure my edits are not seen as self-serving?**

Be transparent about your role, propose edits rather than make them directly, and always cite independent third-party sources. Balance positive information with relevant challenges or controversies, and avoid marketing language. Collaborating with the community and seeking feedback on the Talk page reinforces that your contributions align with Wikipedia's principles.

### **Q14. How often should I monitor my company's Wikipedia page?**

Regularly. Depending on the visibility of your company, a weekly or monthly check is reasonable. Set up a watchlist to be notified of changes. Monitor passively and propose edits only when necessary. Frequent self-edits raise red flags.

### **Q15. Can Wikipedia articles be removed or deleted?**

Yes. Articles can be deleted if they do not meet notability or verifiability guidelines, or if they are deemed entirely promotional. If an article is flagged for deletion, review the reasons and engage in the discussion calmly. Provide arguments and sources in favor of keeping it. If the page is deleted, wait until more independent sources cover your company before attempting to recreate the article.

Corporate engagement with Wikipedia requires careful strategy, transparency, and a commitment to the platform's core values. Following the guidelines in this handbook will allow your company to be accurately and ethically represented, building trust both within the Wikipedia community and with the public at large.

• • •

S E C T I O N I X

# Why Your Company Probably Doesn't Qualify for a Wikipedia Article

---

*An honest look at notability.*

Whether you are a small business owner or a marketing leader at a mid-sized company, you may wonder why your company, despite its success, does not have a Wikipedia article. You have put in countless hours, earned industry recognition, and perhaps even generated meaningful media coverage. So why are you not on one of the world's most visited websites?

The answer lies in Wikipedia's strict standard for notability, which prioritizes independent verification over self-promotion. It is not enough to be important. Your company must meet Wikipedia's notability criteria to qualify for inclusion. This is where many companies fall short.

## 01 Notability: Wikipedia's Gatekeeper

One of the most misunderstood aspects of Wikipedia is the concept of notability. It is not a measure of how important or successful your company is. Notability, as Wikipedia defines it, refers to the presence of significant coverage from reliable, independent, secondary sources. This is the primary criterion for determining whether any topic, whether a business, a person, or an event, is worthy of a standalone article.

Put simply, if there is not sufficient coverage of your company in those kinds of sources, it will not qualify, regardless of how valuable or well regarded it is within your industry.

## 02 The General Notability Guideline

The General Notability Guideline (GNG) is the overarching rule for deciding whether any subject deserves a Wikipedia article. According to the GNG, a topic is considered notable if it has been covered significantly in reliable, independent, secondary sources. Each of these terms carries weight.

- **Significant coverage.** In-depth articles or analyses about your company. Passing mentions, short blurbs, or directory listings do not count. Coverage must provide substantial information, not just name your company.
- **Independent sources.** Outlets that are not connected to your company. No company blogs, press releases, or marketing materials. Even articles that simply republish your interviews are generally not considered independent.
- **Reliable sources.** Publications with established reputations for fact-checking and editorial oversight. Major newspapers, respected industry journals, and academic publications qualify. Social media posts, personal blogs, and self-published content do not.
- **Secondary sources.** Sources that offer analysis or commentary about your company. A journalist's review or analysis of your company's performance qualifies. An interview with your founder is a primary source and does not count toward establishing notability.

To qualify for a Wikipedia article, your company must have significant coverage from multiple reliable, independent, and secondary sources. Many companies, particularly those that are still growing or niche-focused, may not yet meet that standard.

### 03 An Even Higher Bar for Companies

Beyond the General Notability Guideline, Wikipedia applies extra scrutiny to organizations and businesses. The Notability for Organizations and Companies sub-guideline requires multiple references that are independent, secondary, and reliable, all with significant coverage.

- **Multiple references.** Far more than one or two articles. The community typically expects a substantial number of sources. Ten or even twenty is not unusual.
- **Significant coverage.** Whole paragraphs or entire articles devoted to your company and its offerings.
- **Truly independent sources.** Niche trade publications affiliated with your industry are often not considered independent enough. A specialized trade journal that caters directly to your field may be discounted entirely.
- **Reliable coverage.** Reputable media outlets with recognized fact-checking. Industry blogs do not meet the standard.
- **Secondary coverage.** Independent third-party analysis. Articles that simply interview your founder or promote a product launch do not suffice.

For many mid-sized and regional companies, this presents a significant challenge. You may have been featured in a few trade publications or local outlets, but Wikipedia's standard requires high-quality coverage across multiple independent, reliable, and secondary sources. Without that, your company is unlikely to qualify.

### 04 The Pitfalls of Hiring Unethical Editors

Faced with these requirements, some companies turn to paid Wikipedia editors who promise quick results. These editors often work in secret, creating or editing articles without disclosing their conflicts of interest, in clear violation of Wikipedia's guidelines. While it can seem convenient, the risks are real.

- **Wasted money.** Wikipedia's community is vigilant about rooting out undisclosed paid editing, which can result in your article being flagged, deleted, or scrutinized. The end result is that you have spent money on an effort that produces no lasting outcome.
- **Reputation risk.** If it becomes public that your company engaged in unethical editing practices, the fallout can be severe. Editors regularly report undisclosed paid edits, and these efforts have been exposed in major outlets.

- **No guarantees.** Even if a paid editor publishes the article, there is no guarantee it will remain. Wikipedia articles are continually reviewed, and pages that fail notability standards are eventually deleted.

05

## The Ethical Alternative

If your company genuinely qualifies, there is a better path.

- **Build the source base first.** Before considering an article, gather independent, secondary sources that provide significant coverage. Feature articles in respected industry publications, national media coverage, and mentions in academic papers all help.
- **Submit for community review.** Use Wikipedia's Articles for Creation process. Disclose your conflict of interest. The community will review the sources and determine whether your company meets the notability standard.
- **Hire ethical consultants, not paid editors.** If you need help, hire a consultant who operates transparently. Ethical consultants follow disclosure rules. They cannot guarantee an article, but they can tell you honestly whether your company is ready.

Securing a Wikipedia article is not a transaction. It is the recognition of a body of independent coverage that your company has already earned. If that body of work is not yet there, focus on building it through media engagement, thought leadership, and genuine industry contribution. When the coverage exists, the article can follow.

In Wikipedia, shortcuts do not work. The path that does is patience, transparency, and a foundation of verifiable, independent information.

• • •

## S E C T I O N X

# Why You Probably Don't Qualify for a Wikipedia Biography

---

*An honest look at notability for individuals.*

**M**ost people, even very accomplished and widely respected people, do not qualify for a Wikipedia biography. That is not a judgment on your work or your worth. It reflects the nature of Wikipedia itself. The site is not a résumé platform, not a directory of professionals, and not a place for self-promotion. It is an encyclopedia, and encyclopedias only include subjects with significant, independent, reliable, secondary coverage.

This requirement sits at the heart of Wikipedia's biography guideline, WP:NBIO, which applies equally to artists, founders, academics, influencers, scientists, CEOs, organizers, and musicians. The core question is the same for all of them: has this person been written about deeply, repeatedly, and independently by reputable publications? If the answer is no, then even if you are extraordinary, Wikipedia is not yet the right venue.

## 01 The People Who Most Often Fall Short

A large number of highly successful individuals do not meet Wikipedia's biography bar. The shortfall is rarely about the quality of their work. It is almost always about the nature of the documentation that exists. The patterns below describe the most common reasons accomplished people are turned away.

- **Interview-driven media presence.** Coverage consists mostly of interviews or PR-driven pieces in which the subject's own framing dominates the story.
- **Local or niche-only press.** Coverage is confined to local outlets or industry publications that do not carry the editorial weight required for notability.
- **Pitched or paid placements.** Most articles resulted from active pitching, contributed columns, or paid placements rather than independent journalistic interest.
- **Audience without analysis.** A strong online following exists, but little serious journalistic reporting has examined the work itself.
- **Achievements without third-party study.** Real accomplishments exist, but no independent reporter, scholar, or critic has profiled or analyzed them in depth.

None of this is an insult. It simply reflects the difference between personal success and encyclopedic documentation. Wikipedia is a record of how the world has chosen to write about someone, not a record of what they have done.

## 02 What Significant Coverage Really Means

Many people assume that any media mention is enough. It is not. A name-drop or a brief line in an article does not establish notability. Significant coverage is something more specific.

- **Articles substantially about you.** Pieces in which you are the subject of the reporting, not a quoted source for someone else's story.

- **Reporting that explores your work in depth.** Coverage that examines your career, contributions, or impact rather than gesturing at them in passing.
- **Multiple pieces across multiple outlets.** A single profile is rarely enough. Notability is established through a body of independent coverage, not a single hit.

A profile, a longform feature, a critical review, a reported analysis: these are the kinds of sources that form a defensible Wikipedia biography. By contrast, mentions in event writeups, listicles, newsletters, alumni magazines, or brief quotes do not meet the bar. Those are signals of activity, not documentation of notability.

### 03 **Reliable, Independent, Secondary: All Three**

WP:NBIO requires sources that are reliable, independent, and secondary. The three conditions must be satisfied together, not chosen between.

#### **Reliable**

Reliable sources are publications with established reputations for fact-checking and editorial oversight. Major newspapers, reputable magazines, established media outlets with editorial review, and academic journals or scholarly books all qualify. These are vetted, fact-checked, and professionally edited. Personal websites, social media, Medium or Substack posts, company blogs, self-published books, sponsored content, press releases, and interviews you gave do not establish notability, even if their portrayal of you is accurate.

#### **Independent**

Independent coverage cannot come from you, your organization, your PR team, your clients, your collaborators, or anyone else with a vested interest in your reputation. Wikipedia depends on outsiders documenting your impact. If a piece exists because you or someone close to you arranged for it, it does not count toward notability, regardless of where it was published.

#### **Secondary**

Wikipedia needs reporting about you rather than your own statements or primary documents. Interviews, press releases, and first-person essays may support specific facts within an article, but they cannot demonstrate that you belong in the encyclopedia. Secondary coverage means a journalist, scholar, or critic has analyzed your work on their own terms.

---

*“A Wikipedia article should never be the goal. It is the byproduct of work the world has decided, on its own, to document.”*

---

## 04 Who Does Qualify

This question often reveals a gap between personal achievement and encyclopedic notability. Truly notable subjects tend to share a common pattern: their work has been deemed important enough that others have documented it at length without their involvement.

- **Multiple in-depth profiles.** Substantial pieces in major or respected media that take the subject seriously as a topic.
- **Significant awards with press coverage.** National or internationally recognized honors that prompted meaningful third-party reporting.
- **A body of work analyzed by others.** Contributions that critics, scholars, or journalists have engaged with independently.
- **A central role in reported events.** Material involvement in events that received broad and serious coverage on the strength of their own newsworthiness.
- **Sustained third-party discussion.** Publications, performances, or discoveries that have prompted continuing analysis beyond the initial moment.

## 05 Why the Bar Is So High

Wikipedia’s rules exist to keep articles neutral, accurate, and verifiable. Without substantial independent coverage, an article risks relying on promotional material, unverifiable claims, self-published content, or framing supplied by the subject. That is why Wikipedia does not accept a posture of “trust me, I have done great things.” It requires reliable documentation from others.

This is not gatekeeping for its own sake. It is the discipline that allows a global reference work to remain trustworthy. A Wikipedia article should never be the goal. It should be the result: the byproduct of real-world impact that others have chosen to document.

**T H E P A T H F O R W A R D**

The clearest path is to continue doing substantive, public-facing work that draws independent attention on its own merits. Over time, journalists will write about you because the work warrants it. Coverage will accumulate naturally and organically. A solid, policy-compliant base of sources may eventually emerge.

**At that point, a Wikipedia biography becomes achievable, not because it was pursued, but because it simply reflects the public record.**

If you are unsure whether you, or someone you represent, meet Wikipedia’s biography standards, we are glad to help. WikiBlueprint specializes in ethical, professional notability evaluations. We analyze existing sourcing, compare it against WP:NBIO, and provide candid guidance on whether a draft is viable now or what would need to change for it to become viable in the future. We operate transparently and in full alignment with Wikipedia’s conflict-of-interest and neutrality policies.

• • •

P A R T

# IV

## Working with Help

*How to evaluate a Wikipedia consultant, and what a thoughtful engagement looks like.*

---

*“On something as public and as scrutinized as Wikipedia, shortcuts often lead to greater harm than the savings warrant.”*

## SECTION XI

# Why You Shouldn't Hire a Wikipedia Consultant

---

*And the reasons that don't hold up.*

**W**hen we started WikiBlueprint, the goal was simple: help organizations and individuals navigate Wikipedia ethically, professionally, and effectively. But Wikipedia looks easy. It is free, user-generated, and open to everyone. So why hire a specialized consultancy at all?

Below are the six objections we hear most often, paired with the realities they tend to overlook. We share them not to argue, but because the cost of getting Wikipedia wrong is one of the few PR problems that has no quick fix once it goes public.

## 01 **“We can do it cheaper.”**

### **Hidden Costs of Cheap Options**

There is no shortage of freelancers and agencies offering cut-rate prices to create or edit Wikipedia pages. As with most things, you get what you pay for. Cheaper options carry hidden costs: errors that take time and effort to fix, articles that fail to comply with Wikipedia’s guidelines, and, in the worst case, pages deleted because they were created improperly. When that happens, you are back at the start, with lost time and a damaged credibility line at the platform.

## 02 **“We can do it ourselves.”**

### **The DIY Reality**

Anyone can edit Wikipedia, but that does not mean everyone should. Wikipedia’s editorial guidelines around notability, verifiability, and neutrality are unforgiving. In-house teams routinely run into issues they did not anticipate: edits flagged, reverted, or deleted by the community. Articles built with good intentions but the wrong sourcing or tone draw negative attention. The DIY route can end up costing more time fixing damage than it would have cost to engage a professional in the first place.

## 03 **“We don’t care about ethics.”**

### **The Risk of Unethical Practices**

Some clients do not care how a Wikipedia article gets created, as long as it gets published. On Wikipedia, that posture backfires. Undisclosed paid editing and promotional content lead not only to article deletion but to a kind of platform blacklisting that is hard to unwind. In the worst cases, exposure of these practices triggers a public relations crisis that does more damage than the absence of an article ever would. Wikipedia’s community is vigilant. The point is not just to publish. It is to remain published.

## 04 **“It doesn’t look that hard.”**

## The Complexity of Wikipedia Editing

Wikipedia looks simple. The editing interface is approachable. But editing well requires far more than knowing how to type. Articles must meet notability standards, content must be verifiable in reliable sources, and the writing has to clear a high neutrality bar. The learning curve is steep, and without the right expertise, navigating Wikipedia's community dynamics is an exercise in frustration. Established editors have built reputations over years, and new contributors face challenges they did not anticipate.

**05** **“Wikipedia isn’t that important for our business.”**

### Why Wikipedia Matters

It is easy to underestimate Wikipedia. The reality is that Wikipedia ranks consistently high on search engines like Google and is now a primary training source for AI systems. A well-maintained Wikipedia page is often the first thing potential clients, partners, and journalists encounter when researching your organization. The platform's perceived neutrality lends a credibility that few other channels can match. Unlike most channels, Wikipedia is not under your control. That makes the accuracy and quality of what is there matter more, not less.

**06** **“Other shops are bigger.”**

### The Myth of the Big PR Agency

Bigger is not better when it comes to Wikipedia. Large PR agencies often hand off Wikipedia work to junior staff who may be capable but lack the specific expertise the platform demands. You may believe you are buying senior counsel and end up with a second-year associate still learning Wikipedia's policies and norms. What matters here is not headcount or breadth of services. It is depth of experience inside Wikipedia's community and an unbroken record of working within its rules.

• • •

S E C T I O N X I I

# Why You Should Hire WikiBlueprint

---

*Where we fit, and how we work.*

**A**t WikiBlueprint, we understand the nuances of Wikipedia’s editorial standards, and we work to a horizon of years rather than months. We help our clients build a Wikipedia presence that is factual, verifiable, and durable. A one-time investment in real expertise saves far more in the long run than repeatedly paying to fix avoidable mistakes.

## 01 Experience inside the community

We have spent years navigating Wikipedia’s editorial culture. We know how the rules apply in practice, where the soft edges are, and how to introduce changes in a way that stands up to scrutiny. Every article we work on adheres to the platform’s standards, which means the work we deliver is built to last.

## 02 Transparency and ethics, by default

We work entirely within Wikipedia’s guidelines. Disclosed conflicts. Independent sourcing. Neutral language. The work is designed to serve the public record first, which is what makes it durable for our clients. This is not a quick win. It is the building of a sustainable presence on one of the world’s most trusted platforms.

## 03 A senior team, every engagement

You will not be handed off to a junior. Our team has been in the trenches for years, has developed working relationships within the Wikipedia community, and knows how to create content that endures. We treat every engagement as a long-term partnership, because the public record is a long-term concern.

## 04 Peace of mind

We offer more than Wikipedia editing. We offer the assurance that your content is built on a foundation of ethical practice, professional expertise, and long-term thinking. We believe in doing it right the first time, so that you do not have to worry about the risks, the complexities, or the consequences down the line.

## I N C L O S I N G

*Wikipedia is an essential part of your brand's digital footprint, and it is worth investing in getting it right. You could try to do it cheaper, do it yourself, or cut corners. But on something as public and as scrutinized as Wikipedia, those shortcuts often lead to greater harm than the savings warrant.*

***If you want to build a credible, ethical, and enduring presence on Wikipedia, we would be glad to help.***

## G E T I N T O U C H

**WikiBlueprint**

[info@wikiblueprint.com](mailto:info@wikiblueprint.com) · [wikiblueprint.com](http://wikiblueprint.com)

*Advancing Open Knowledge*

R E F E R E N C E

# Glossary

---

*A working vocabulary for Wikipedia engagement.*

The terms below appear throughout this handbook and are central to Wikipedia’s editorial culture. Many are policy abbreviations (the “WP:” prefix signals a Wikipedia policy or guideline). Familiarity with this vocabulary is the difference between proposing changes that get accepted and proposing changes that get reverted.

## Articles for Creation (AfC)

A Wikipedia process where new article drafts are submitted for community review before being published in the main encyclopedia. Recommended for editors with a conflict of interest.

## Conflict of Interest (COI)

A relationship between an editor and the subject of an article that creates incentive for biased editing. Wikipedia requires editors with a COI to disclose it openly and to propose changes on the article’s Talk page rather than editing directly.

## Edit War

A pattern of repeated reversion between editors who disagree about content. Edit warring is a serious violation of Wikipedia’s collaborative norms and can result in editor blocks. The remedy is discussion on the Talk page, not further reversion.

## General Notability Guideline (GNG)

Wikipedia’s overarching rule for whether any subject deserves a standalone article. Requires significant coverage in reliable, independent, secondary sources.

## Independent Source

A source not connected to the subject of the article. Excludes the subject’s own publications, press releases, paid placements, and content produced by collaborators or those with vested interest. Independence is a precondition for establishing notability.

## Notability

The standard a subject must meet to qualify for a Wikipedia article. Notability is established by significant coverage in reliable, independent, secondary sources, not by the subject’s importance, success, or self-assessment.

## Neutral Point of View (NPOV)

Wikipedia’s core editorial policy. All content must be presented fairly, proportionately, and without editorial bias. NPOV does not mean equal weight for all views; it means representing significant viewpoints in proportion to their coverage in reliable sources.

## No Original Research (NOR)

A Wikipedia policy prohibiting the addition of unpublished facts, interpretations, or analyses. All content must be attributable to previously published reliable sources. Editors cannot synthesize new claims, even from valid sources.

## Paid Editing

Editing Wikipedia in exchange for compensation, whether direct (consultant fees) or indirect (employment by the subject). Wikipedia's Terms of Use require disclosure of all paid editing. Undisclosed paid editing is a serious violation that can result in editor bans and article deletion.

## Primary Source

A source produced by the subject of an article or by direct participants in events. Includes interviews, press releases, official statements, and self-published materials. Primary sources can support specific facts but cannot establish notability.

## Reliable Source

A publication with a reputation for accuracy, fact-checking, and editorial oversight. Includes major newspapers, peer-reviewed journals, established magazines, and respected industry publications. Excludes personal blogs, social media, self-published works, and paid placements.

## Secondary Source

A source that analyzes, evaluates, or interprets primary materials. Independent journalism, scholarly analysis, and critical reviews are secondary sources. Notability is established primarily through secondary coverage.

## Significant Coverage

Substantive treatment of a subject in a source — articles substantially about the subject, not passing mentions or brief quotes. Significant coverage explores the subject's work, career, or impact in depth.

## Talk Page

A discussion page associated with every Wikipedia article where editors can propose changes, raise concerns, and build consensus. Editors with a conflict of interest are expected to use Talk pages rather than editing articles directly.

## Verifiability (WP:V)

The Wikipedia policy that all content must be supported by reliable published sources that other editors can check. Verifiability is the threshold for inclusion, not truth: even accurate information can be removed if it cannot be verified in published sources.

## WP:NBIO

Wikipedia's notability guideline for biographies. Requires that an individual has been the subject of significant coverage in reliable, independent, secondary sources, separate from any coverage of their work or organization.

## WP:NCORP

Wikipedia's notability guideline for organizations and companies. Applies stricter standards than the general notability guideline, requiring multiple independent, in-depth sources with editorial independence from the subject.

## Watchlist

A personal Wikipedia feature that notifies an editor of changes to articles they are tracking. Useful for monitoring articles about your own organization to catch inaccuracies, vandalism, or significant changes.



. . .

C O L O P H O N

## About this Edition

Designed and produced by WikiBlueprint in Santa Cruz, California.

Set in Georgia for headings and Calibri for text.

First published 2026.

W I K I B L U E P R I N T

*Advancing Open Knowledge*

. . .