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Motivation

“[Wikipedia] is not the bottom layer of authority, nor the top, but in fact the highest layer without formal vetting. In this unique role, it therefore serves as an ideal bridge between the validated and unvalidated Web.”

Casper Grathwohl (Wikipedia Comes of Age)

“What I wonder is why professors don’t curate [pages on] Wikipedia and add course materials and open access sections of textbooks, much of which they post online anyways.”

David Lipman (Amy Maxmen, Science networking gets serious)
Expert niches in Wikipedia

Why ornithologists should embrace and contribute to Wikipedia
ALEXANDER L. BOND

The Curation of Almost 5000 Structures on Wikipedia

Wikipedia: A Key Tool for Global Public Health Promotion

James M Hellman1,2, MD CCP(EM); Eckhard Kemmann3, MD FACOG; Michael Bonert4, MD MASc; Anwesh Chatterjee5, MRCP; Brent Ragard6, MD; Graham M Beards7, DSc; David J Ibern8; Matthew Harvey9,10, BMed; Brendan Thomas11, MD; Wouter Stomp12, MD; Michael F Martone13; Daniel J Lodge14, MD; Andrea Vondracek15, PhD; Jacob F de Wolff16, MRCP; Casimir Libe17,18, MBBS FRANZCP; Samir C Grover19, MD; MED FRCP; Tim J Vickers20, PhD; Bertalan Meskó21, MD; Michael R Laurent22, MD
From a FriendFeed thread to a survey

Turning anecdotes about expert participation into data
Wikipedia wants more contributions from academics
Wikipedia is surveying academics to find out why many seem reluctant to donate their expertise

Subject recruitment

Blog posts
Nature blogs, Wellcome Trust, OKFN

Social media
Twitter, Reddit, Slashdot

Banners on scholarly publishers
Springer, PLoS, BioMedCentral

Press
The Guardian, CBS News

Wiktionary

Mailing lists
Expert participation survey: Design

Demographics and expertise

Perception of Wikipedia participation among peers

- Authorship
- Social interaction
- Quality of information
- Wiki literacy
- Expert contribution

Personal motivation to contribute

Attitude towards openness and open scientific collaboration
Expert participation survey: Overview

Total responses 2605
Complete 1618
Contributors (C) 935 (57.8%)
Non contributors (NC) 641 (39.6%)

Available for follow-up interviews
704 C
470 NC
43.5% 66.7%
234 33.3%

Respondents by field

- Humanities 347
- Social Sciences 386
- Natural Sciences 618
- Formal Sciences 363
- Applied Sciences 600
- Other 65
- No answer 217

Respondents by country

- US 465
- UK 353
- Germany 149
- Canada 60
- Australia 45
Demographics: Areas of contribution

Areas of contribution

- Exp only: 721
- Non Exp only: 529
- Both: 259
Demographics: Gender

Respondents by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Contributors</th>
<th>Non contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female (F)</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>288</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (M)</td>
<td>748</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>80.0%</td>
<td>52.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Demographics: Age and Professional status

Respondents by age

Respondents by professional status
Responses by user category

Mode

Standard deviation
Wikipedia is a reliable source for research purposes in my field.
Wikipedia is a reliable source for **educational** purposes in my field.
Researchers are not allowed to write about their own research in WP
Would you consider helping rate/review wiki articles in your field of expertise?

Yes   1120   69.22%
No    320    19.78%
No answer 178  11.00%
Contribution and support of Open Access

Percentage of OA publications

- None: 0.92
- 1–50: 0.74
- 50–99: 1.23
- All: 1.81
- Not sure: 0.94

C/NC (Normalized)
## Comments: word frequency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contributors</th>
<th>Non contributors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>articles</td>
<td>information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research</td>
<td>work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>field</td>
<td>research</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>people</td>
<td>articles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177 (+20.4%)</td>
<td>132 (+144.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>147</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>115</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>107</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>104</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comments: topic modeling

algorithmic identification of words characterizing emerging topics

Topic #7 experts editors expert level knowledge rules edits number high amateur problems amateurs opinions contributions times contributor expertise found explicitly

Topics significantly associated with not contributing

#9 **time and effort** involved in contributing to WP

#13 criticism of WP's **reliability**, how WP is used or cited by students

#23 **lack of recognition** for scholars who contribute to WP, fit with scholarly workflow.
Summary

Lack of areas of major disagreement between contributors and non-contributors

Main **barriers** to expert contributions: effort and time allocation

Opportunities:

- Potential for review/quality assessment
- Potential for collaboration with OA community

*An open data/open access policy for Wikimedia*

**Saturday 9-10.30am**

More on this survey

Follow the data and results from the survey at:

Get in touch: expert_barriers@nitens.org