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Search Engine: Google Scholar
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Access Here: [PDF] from okoli.org

Annotated Bibliography

**Summary**

In this article the author discusses how and why wikipedia works, the reviews of wikipedia, how reliable wikipedia is and the editorial process of wikipedia. It also discusses the point of view who is for wikipedia and who is against using wikipedia for peer reviewed journals. The author thinks that wikipedia is a useful source of information for peer reviewed journals. The author Chitu Okoli thinks that the earliest peer-reviewed articles on wikipedia were more or less general introductory reviews, introducing readers to the novel idea of an encyclopedia that anyone can edit. More advanced studies began to dig deeper by investigating the motivations of Wikipedians to contribute, and studying the details of the process of developing articles. The author also points out that there are a number of studies have gone further to try to understand the details of how the editorial process of wikipedia operates to produce high quality encyclopedia articles. The author also discusses the reliability of wikipedia as variably expressed as trustworthiness, quality, and accurate. He also discusses people using wikipedia as their primary data source for research.

**Assess**

This article does a great job explaining studies how wikipedia has been used as a reliable source that was used in published peer reviewed journals. Also it does a great job explaining in detail
how and why wikipedia works, how reliable it’s information is according to different people opinions. Also I think it shows that people use it and believe it is a reliable source and use it as their primary source of information in their peer reviewed journals.

Reflect

This article helped me understand that studies show that wikipedia is a good source of information and that people cannot just post anything that they want. I think this article also gave me an idea of different peoples viewpoint are in using wikipedia as a reliable source.

______________________________________________

Andrew Coutts
Professor Culik
English 1190, Section C1603
March 14, 2013


Search Engine: Google Scholar
Search Words: Wikipedia + People’s Thoughts

Annotated Bibliography

Summary

This article studies the younger generations perceptions and usage of wikipedia. The article discusses and found that although Wikipedia is initially attractive for young people, it generally fails to become deeply integrated into the everyday lives of users, instead remaining an instrumental tool for the fulfillment of a narrow range of tasks. The article also discusses that over time respondents do become aware of the problems of accuracy that Wikipedia poses. The article also discusses that Wikipedia relies on the collaborative effort of volunteers, sourcing its content from more than 75,000 active contributors. The advantage this is that anyone who wants
to contribute may do so and articles are updated quickly, in fact, having the ability to change as events unfold. The disadvantage is that the same thing that fuels Wikipedia, the ability to be freely edited by anyone has been the source of issues and controversies regarding its accuracy and reliability. Fifteen respondents aged 13 to 24 were selected for the study. Their study discovered that many of the features and functions of Wikipedia appear in neither a positive nor negative light to the respondents, that is, they act neither as criteria for appropriation or dis-appropriation of the technology. Most respondents recalled that they first encountered Wikipedia through search engines results. Some pointed out that Wikipedia articles would almost always come out on top of the list of search results, making it quite difficult to miss.

Assess

I think this article has an interesting study that shows why young people use wikipedia and go to it for research. The study showed that most of the time why people use wikipedia is because it shows up at the top of the search engine result. And young people think the results at the topic are the better sources. Also the study showed that people use wikipedia because it has a built in discussion board and links to other articles and resource sites.

Reflect

This article really made me understand why young people like to use wikipedia and how people use it in a variety of different ways such as a primary source, or a general reference lookup. I also learned what some people’s perspectives are of how effective they think wikipedia and some of it’s resources are.

Andrew Coutts
Professor Culik
English 1190, Section C1603
March 13, 2013

Summary
This Article discusses what makes wikipedia so dangerous to some teachers and also makes the site a dynamic and authentic demonstration of the research process itself. If students use Wikipedia as just another reference source or their only source, then they will get no more from it than a traditional encyclopedia in their own school’s library. But if students can learn about how entries on Wikipedia change and how each change is debated in arguments open to anyone’s inspection, then Wikipedia can demonstrate to students the process, importance, and the excitement of real scholarship. Here is an authentic demonstration that knowledge isn’t settled, and that there are always more questions to ask and always different perspectives on the answers. Students can see that opinions and facts on wikipedia are not always easily differentiated and that uncontested facts can be used to support opposing conclusions. And the students can learn that no piece of knowledge can be understood separate from its connections to other topics in a multifaceted web, like on Wikipedia is accessible with a click of a mouse.

Assess
I think this article does a great job of explaining why teachers fear student using wikipedia for their primary research source. It is also discusses how wikipedia can be a useful lookup tool for understanding a topic you don't know but not for citing it and using it for research for an english paper or school related research projects.

Reflect
I think this article really explains in detail why teachers fear and tell students not to use wikipedia for information sources for assignments. I also think the article does a great job
explaining how some teachers collaborate on successful way to build Wikipedia Assignments into english classes.

Andrew Coutts
Professor Culik
English 1190, Section C1603
March 15, 2013

Search Engine: Google Scholar
Search Words: Wikipedia + Credible
Access Here: [PDF] from hku.hkhu.hk [PDF]

Annotated Bibliography

**Summary**

Wikipedia is an Internet-based user contributed encyclopedia that is collaboratively edited by a system called the Wiki Concept. Wiki Concept is the idea that any user on the Internet can change any page within the Web site. The wiki concept is somewhat counterintuitive because the technical implementation itself provides no gate keeping function to ensure quality material is being contributed. Unlike typical creative efforts, no proof of identity or qualifications is needed to participate and a reputation tracking system is not used within the community. Given the description of how a wiki works, visitors to Wikipedia are often surprised the site works at all. Wikipedia is a social open source of information because wikis provide the ability to track the status of articles, review individual changes, and discuss issues, they function as social software,
acting to foster communication and collaboration with other users. A wiki also tracks and stores every version of an article edited, so no operation is ever permanently destructive. In the article there was a study that was focusing on benchmarking articles with reputation of metadata. Though simple, this method of using information on edits and authors is immediately applicable to any of the 50 odd active language Wikipedia editions. The results indicate that there is a linkage between Wikipedia as a working draft of history and current news events. Many Internet users will visit Wikipedia and contribute to it on their own volition, but the study points to clear cases where the citation in the press has driven traffic directly to articles and has improved them as a result. Open content projects such as Wikipedia received their inspiration from the earlier open source software community that emerged from online collaboration for developing software.

Assess
I think this article does a great job of investigating how experts test wikipedia for credibility and reliability. With the use of more “eyeballs”, meaning people investigating who edits or posts what information and determines if it is garbage or not. I think the use of eyeballs watching people may have to so with gatekeeping. Even though the article says Wikipedia provides no gate keeping function to ensure quality material is being contributed, I think there are some gatekeepers watching what is being posted or edit out. I think that because of the fact of when someone posts information and then in a few minutes it disappears off Wikipedia

Reflect
This article really made me really understand what the open concept of wikipedia is in a discourse and a social community. The article really explains the process of Wikipedia and how reliable it is according to a method of research.

Maximillian A. Cairo
English 1190
Professor Culik
03/12/13
Annotated Bibliographies on Wikipedia

Summary: Wikipedia is the world's largest edited source of encyclopedic knowledge. The wealth of numerical data is only available as plain text and thus cannot be processed by its actual meaning. Wikipedia has the chance to become a resource of semantic statements, regarding size, scope, openness, and internationalization.

Assess: Wikipedia seems to work by itself, having an algorithm based just for itself. This is the first website I had found decent information on. I still want to figure out the algorithm path, and what steps that are taken to find the sources it has. Wikipedia seems to gather information that is very important to the specific topic searched. It gives basic information on almost everything on the topic.

Reflect: From this website, I had gotten the information that Wikipedia works by itself to find the information. So they're must be a set algorithm to find these sources. My goal is to figure out what algorithm set is being used, then to figure out how the sources are chosen. Because if it is just by popularity of websites, they’re could be a loss of important information.

http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1135863

Search engine used: Scholar Google

Words used: “How Wikipedia provides information”

M. Cairo

#2

Summary: Wikipedia is an incredible thing. It's fact-encirclingly huge, and it's careful, messy, funny, shocking, and full of simmering controversies. It is also free and extremely fast.

Wikipedia is always near the top of search listings when something is searched in search engine’s like Google or Bing. It was constructed, in less than eight years, by strangers who disagreed about all kinds of things but who were drawn to a shared, not-for-profit purpose. They were drawn because for a work of reference Wikipedia seemed unusually humble. It asked for help, and when it did, it used a particularly affecting word: "stub." At the bottom of a short article about something, it would say, "This article about X is a stub. You can help Wikipedia by
expanding it." And you'd think: That poor sad stub: I will help. Not right now, because I'm writing a book, but someday, yes, I will try to help. And when people did help they were given a flattering name. They weren't called "Wikipedia's little helpers," they were called "editors." It was like a giant community leaf-raking project in which everyone was called a groundskeeper. Some brought very fancy professional metal rakes, or even back-mounted leaf-blowing systems, and some were just kids thrashing away with the sides of their feet or stuffing handfuls in the pockets of their sweatshirts, but all the leaves they brought to the pile were appreciated. And the pile grew and everyone jumped up and down in it having a wonderful time. And it grew some more, and it became the biggest leaf pile anyone had ever seen anywhere, a world wonder. And then self-promoted leaf-pile guards appeared, doubters and deprecators who would look askance at your proffered handful and shake their heads, saying that your leaves were too crumpled or too slimy or too common, throwing them to the side. And that was too bad. The people who guarded the leaf pile this way were called "deletionists."

Assessment: This source of information talked about Wikipedia from several different points in time. It talked about how Wikipedia was used when it was first started with how it could be edited if there was an “X” near information. These people called "deletionists." So instead of algorithms, Wikipedia seems to get its information from the users. If the information is not scholarly, they are removed by a selection of people.

Reflect: This website explained how Wikipedia is used in the easiest fashion possible. It is very clear that Wikipedia gets its information from a selection of people. Compared to the last Article I had read, this one seems a lot more realistic and easier to understand. This article made me want to search a little more on who the information is dealt by.

Search Engine: Scholarly Google
Search: “Why do people dislike Wikipedia?”
Summary: Wikipedia is constantly changing. Just like all other information. It may seem hard to understand or condensed sometimes because the editors read thousands and thousands of pages of information then, edit what they believe is most important which ends up on Wikipedia. Wikipedia did allow anybody to edit information at one point. They thought it would have been a good way to expand information but a big issue was that other things that were untrue were being posted. Wikipedia is free, which is a great and fast way to receive pretty decent knowledge on a specific topic.

Assessment: This article is from a couple years ago. I can tell this not only because the publishing date but also how Wikipedia used to work. Anybody used to be able to edit or change information on their website. Whenever they’re used to be an “X” somebody could fill in their information as they please. I remember in 9th grade my friend was studying The former president Lincoln for a project, he had shown me under Abe’s kids was my name and also his name. My friend switched the original information with something ridiculous to be funny. But the information actually was put there for the day. Im not sure if later that evening it was edited or the next time somebody had realized it was wrong information. But this is how Wikipedia used to be used. Open to anybody. And free to use.

Reflect: Ever since I have been writing for teachers, they have never wanted me to source information from Wikipedia. Is this because the information is being misplaced or just overall not receiving the correct information for that specific topic? There are some other problems that I am still confused with. I want to figure out when and how the way of adding information was changed. And for what reason, was it because of random people posting ignorant information just to add something. Overall I am very glad I found this web link, the information is very organized
and put into sections, also it helped me realize what Wikipedia used to do back when it could’ve been edited by anybody.


Search: “ How Wiki Works”
Used Google Scholarly

Cairo

#4

Summary: A Wiki Is an internet web-based tool for sharing and editing of a set of web pages. The reason wikipedia specifically is so popular is because of their simplicity and availability. Traditionally, these databases have employed small teams of expert curators, usually based at one (or maybe a few sites), to write the scientific content regarding the entries in the database. This is the more recent ways of Wikipedia working. Ward Cunningham, developer of the first wiki software, described it as being ‘the simplest online database that could possibly work’ (see http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Wiki&oldid=457195237).

Assessment: This web-page was an extremely good example of the latest edition on how Wikipedia gathers its information. Unlike the older version of wikipedia, the user could edit the web pages to whatever they like. In today’s Wikipedia, there is a group of editors who are assigned to one or generally few web-pages that they are experts in.

Reflect: This was the best and most recent article I had found. It explains the new way of how Wikipedia gets its information very well and easy to understand. If there are experts constantly updating the page doesn’t there have to be missing information still? I am going to continue searching and reading more articles online so that I can understand the topic even a little bit better.
Rachel Wyne
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1603
March 12, 2013
Scholarly Articles
Search engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: hate + Wikipedia
Annotated Bibliography #1


Summary: This article takes the perspective of two individuals and talks about their experiences with Wikipedia. Not only on a personal level, but also talk about the impact that Wikipedia has on our culture. Instead of looking at Wikipedia one sided, the time was taken to look at why it is loved and why it is hated. It is recognized to be apart of our culture and starting to expand into the classroom setting.

Asses: I liked this article, very much actually. I feel it is well written and easy to read. Wikipedia is not the most exciting topic to research about, but this article made it very easy to be interested in. I also liked that the authors related their discussion of Wikipedia back to an important issue, the impact it has had on our culture. That I find very interesting and like how it relates to how it is used daily.
Reflect: I would use this article for my paper defiantly. This article uses good resources which makes me consider it scholarly. The part I feel will really make an impact on my paper is the fact that it takes about how it affects our culture. Wikipedia has a bigger impact than just being an online encyclopedia it has become involved in the classroom environment and in our culture.

Rachel Wyne
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1603
March 12, 2013
Scholarly Articles
Search engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: culture + Wikipedia

Annotated Bibliography #2
Summary: This article talks about the basics of what there is to know about Wikipedia. It starts off be discussing when it was created and what its intention was created for. It continues on discussing previous studies and research found on Wikipedia. What I found interest in was how it talked about the affect Wikipedia was having on our culture. Not only one specific way it has been affecting us in various ways I had not thought of before.
Asses: I liked this article. I found it very insightful to understanding what Wikipedia was about and the background information about the online encyclopedia. Besides it helping me build a foundation on the subject, it gave me different point to think about. It talked about different ways Wikipedia has had an impact on our culture and the theories behind it.
Reflect: I plan on using this article for my paper. It has given me the basic information I need to be able to talk about the topic and know what I am talking about. I also feel there is a lot of point that were discussed about the impact on our culture that I can build a claim on. This website was a building block leading me to uncharted ideas.

Rachel Wyne
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1603
March 12, 2013
Scholarly Articles
Search engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: hate + Wikipedia

Annotated Bibliography #1

Summary: This article takes the perspective of two individuals and talks about their experiences with Wikipedia. Not only on a personal level, but also talk about the impact that Wikipedia has on our culture. Instead of looking at Wikipedia one sided, the time was taken to look at why it is loved and why it is hated. It is recognized to be apart of our culture and starting to expand into the classroom setting.

Asses: I liked this article, very much actually. I feel it is well written and easy to read. Wikipedia is not the most exciting topic to research about, but this article made it very easy to be interested in. I also liked that the authors related their discussion of Wikipedia back to an important issue, the impact it has had on our culture. That I find very interesting and like how it relates to how it is used daily.
Reflect: I would use this article for my paper defiantly. This article uses good resources which makes me consider it scholarly. The part I feel will really make an impact on my paper is the fact that it takes about how it affects our culture. Wikipedia has a bigger impact than just being an online encyclopedia it has become involved in the classroom environment and in our culture.

_____________________________________________________

Rachel Wyne
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1603
March 12, 2013
Scholarly Articles
Search engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: hate + Wikipedia

Annotated Bibliography #1


Summary: This article takes the perspective of two individuals and talks about their experiences with Wikipedia. Not only on a personal level, but also talk about the impact that Wikipedia has on our culture. Instead of looking at Wikipedia one sided, the time was taken to look at why it is loved and why it is hated. It is recognized to be apart of our culture and starting to expand into the classroom setting.

Asses: I liked this article, very much actually. I feel it is well written and easy to read. Wikipedia is not the most exciting topic to research about, but this article made it very easy to be interested in. I also liked that the authors related their discussion of Wikipedia back to an important issue, the impact it has had on our culture. That I find very interesting and like how it relates to how it is used daily.
Reflect: I would use this article for my paper defiantly. This article uses good resources which makes me consider it scholarly. The part I feel will really make an impact on my paper is the fact that it takes about how it affects our culture. Wikipedia has a bigger impact than just being an online encyclopedia it has become involved in the classroom environment and in our culture.

Rachel Wyne
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C1603
March 13, 2013
Scholarly Articles
Search engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: hate + Wikipedia
Annotated Bibliography # 3
Priedhorsky, Reid. "Creating, Destroying, and Restoring Value in Wikipedia."


Summary: This article talks a lot about what exactly Wikipedia is and the many different views on the topic. The main point it covers is who is contributing to the popularity of Wikipedia, the dangers it can cause, and the many outcomes that can result from it. The article also contained research done comparing and contrasting it to a traditional encyclopedia.

Asses: I liked this article I feel I can take some valuable information from it. It may not be my favorite article just because it is lengthy and difficult to read. However, it does help give me a better understanding of Wikipedia and why it is so disliked.

Reflect: I personally would use this article to help build up my paper. It helps give me a solid foundation for what exactly Wikipedia is about. Also I am able to use the perspective of a traditional encyclopedia versus just Wikipedia.
Head, Alison. "How today’s college students use Wikipedia for course-related research." 

Summary: This article mainly talks about how Wikipedia is used in the daily lives of six different students in college. They discuss the background of Wikipedia and the use of it in these students’ college careers. From there they talk about the results they have found from these students and their use of Wikipedia. Overall the question of “why Wikipedia?” is talked about. They discuss why it is used over other online encyclopedias.

Asses: I liked this article. It defiantly talked about the interview and survey process that were involved with talking to these students, which was not the most entertaining thing to read. Overall though I feel I can use a lot of information from this article to talk about different uses of Wikipedia.

Reflect: I would use some information from this article. I really like that it talks about the use of it in the daily lives of college students. I feel I can use this to talk about instead of it being so hated it should be accepted to be apart of todays education system.
Annotated Bibliography # 5

http://firstmonday.org/htbin/cgiwrap/bin/ojs/index.php/fm/article/view/2115/2027


Summary: This article talks about Wikipedia and all of the false assumptions about it. It starts off giving a small amount of background information on what exactly Wikipedia is about. From there it talks about all the reasons why Wikipedia is disliked and in reality a lot of these reasons were proven to not even be true.

Asses: I really liked this article. I felt it was easy to read and it gave a lot of information about Wikipedia and how it is really given a bad name because of false facts. The information in this paper will be able to help me try to answer the question “why is Wikipedia so disliked?”

Reflect: I plan on using information from this article in my paper. I feel it will help build the fact that Wikipedia is not as bad as it is made out to be. It proves that individuals are not taking the time to really know what Wikipedia is about and make false assumptions on it.
Brett Anderson
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190
12 March 2013
Dissemination of Misinformation in Wikipedia


Summary: This article starts of explaining how Wikipedia is getting more popular in academic settings, and many college professors have discouraged students from using the website. The dissemination of misinformation means that there is a debate on the fact that Wikipedia is not a useful tool, and can lead to misleading information. It has been argued that students need to be taught to find quality information, and not just look for convenience through Wikipedia.

According to the article, even though Wikipedia is not recommended, it is at least encouraged that student’s double check the information found on Wikipedia to make sure that it is scholarly. Roy Rosenzweig, a scholar at George Mason University, did an experiment on Wikipedia and found that in almost every instance Wikipedia was accurate or more accurate than regular encyclopedias.

Assessment: I found this article to be extremely helpful. I found that Wikipedia is looked highly upon, and it’s also looked down upon. There are many people who feel that Wikipedia is just a place to go to if you are lazy, and don’t want to search for scholarly sources; however, then there are others who feel that Wikipedia is more accurate than any encyclopedias.

Reflection: This article helped me to understand that there really isn’t a right or wrong answer if Wikipedia is a good source or not. There are answers all over the board, and I think that some of these answers will help me to come up with what I feel about Wikipedia, and how I can relate it to gatekeeping and peer review.
Summary: This article starts of explaining how a man named John Seigenthaler Sr., who was a writer for a newspaper in Nashville, had a biography written on him on Wikipedia. About half of the information was correct, and it stayed on the website like this for about four months. Seigenthaler noticed this, and wanted to make people more aware of some of the information that is being displayed on Wikipedia. He was even considering taking Wikipedia to court. However, he decided against it when he talked to Jimmy Wales, the creator of Wikipedia. Wales responded to Seigenthaler’s complaint, and told him that there are many people that abuse their website every day, and fixed his biography.

Assessment: This article was helpful. It showed that in certain aspects you can’t trust what is put on Wikipedia. In the case of Seigenthaler, it really reveals this. It’s not to say that everything on Wikipedia is wrong, but the article seems to express the fact that there are people who will abuse it, and it might not always be reliable information.

Reflection: This article helped me to understand that certain things on Wikipedia may not be the most reliable. Personally, I think this article is a small issue. I think that overall, Wikipedia is a good source to information. This was just a small case, it’s not like it was on someone or something that is well known, or gets researched a lot. I don’t think too many people really researched a man who was a writer for a newspaper in Nashville.
New Users using Wikipedia


**Summary:** This article, according to Wikipedia, is about new users using Wikipedia. Up to 60% of new users never make an edit after their first 24 hours on the website. Wikipedia is created by “outsiders,” as Wikipedia call them, which are users with low editing counts. The “insiders,” are the people with high editing counts. The insiders consist of a select group of established users.

**Assessment:** In this section of the article, I found it to be helpful. I found that many people, who are new to Wikipedia, are almost limited to what you can do. Wikipedia is more apt to believe the insiders, rather than the outsiders, when information is being posted.

**Reflection:** I found this article to be helpful in the aspect that up to 60% of the new users never makes another edit. To me, this means that those 60% of people are people that just want to vandalize Wikipedia, and put useless information on it. Whenever something inappropriate, or uneducational, etc., is put on Wikipedia from vandals, Wikipedia gets rid of it almost immediately.

________________________________________
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Brett Anderson  
Professor Hugh Culik  
English 1190  
12 March 2013  
Traditional Knowledge in Wikipedia


**Summary:** This article starts off explaining how a professor, Neil Waters, found that students were putting the wrong information in some of their reports and essays. Apparently, the students had cited their information from Wikipedia. The college had not banned the use of Wikipedia, however, they did ban them from citing anything from Wikipedia in their work. Waters wanted to ban it completely. However, another professor said that he thinks the use of Wikipedia is fine, he just doesn’t think that you should cite an encyclopedia in the first place. Jason Mittell, a student, who is pro-Wikipedia said, “The message that is being sent is that ultimately they see it as a threat to traditional knowledge” (Cohen 1). This is what Mittell thinks the professors at the college think of Wikipedia.

**Assessment:** I feel that this article was very helpful. I feel that it really covered the point as to why some of these scholars feel the way that they do towards Wikipedia. They feel that it is trying to take away from traditional knowledge, and they feel that even though it’s available, students shouldn’t cite it at all.

**Reflection:** This article helped me immensely. I had a hard time trying to figure out some of the reasons as to why scholars don’t want others to use Wikipedia, and I believe that this is one of the bigger explanations. It seems like you always hear, “don’t use Wikipedia,” and there is no reason as to why you can’t. I believe that this article will defiantly help me to write my paper.
Website: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Deletion_policy
Words searched/ Search engine: Google; “how Wikipedia deletes an article”

**Summary**: This article summarizes the deletion process on Wikipedia. Along with how the process works, it also explains reasons for deletion, including advertising, spam, information not regarding the article, etc.

**Assessment**: The article does it's job by explaining all the reasons articles are deleted and how the process happens. Since the article is on Wikipedia it should explain the process thoroughly, which it does.

**Reflection**: This can help me if I ever see an article on Wikipedia with anything that doesn’t relate to an article, I can report the page and hopefully some of the content will be deleted.

Nick Averill
Mr. Culik
English 1190
3/12/13

Annotated Bibliography

Website: http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia:Editing_policy
Words searched/ Search engine: Google; “how does Wikipedia provide information”
Summary: This article is about the editing policy on Wikipedia, and how some articles can start out poor, and become great. Along with explaining the process it tells us that if we aren’t capable of editing inappropriate content to just flag or report it so they can remove it.

Assessment: I believe that this article did a great job in explaining the editing process on their website. It was a very informational article, and if I were to be an editor on Wikipedia this would be the article I would want to read.

Reflection: This article will help me in my work because it gives me a larger idea on how Wikipedia works, and how they actually do watch their website for articles that aren’t informational. If there ever is an article that isn’t informational it will be flagged or reported then deleted from the website.

Annotated Bibliography

Citation: Huvila, Isto. "Where does the information come from? Information source use patterns in Wikipedia." (2010). Print
Website: http://informationr.net/ir/15-3/paper433.html#author

Words/Search Engine: Google; “how does Wikipedia provide information”

Summary: This piece is about how Wikipedia provides us with information from other sources and how some articles on the website don’t have any citations at all. With a lack of citations should the information on their website be trusted at all? Also the article talks about the quality of the information and the users of the website, if they contribute to the reliability at all.
Assessment: I found this article to be too lengthy and wordy. The author does a good job explaining his points but he definitely could have left a lot of the random information out, instead of going into detail more than needed.

Reflection: I don’t think this article will help me at all because I already found an article that explains basically the same things, but it’s just a lot shorter and more to the point.

Nick Averill
Mr. Culik
English 1190
3/12/13

Annotated Bibliography

Citation: Silverthorne, Sean. "HBS Cases: How Wikipedia Works (or Doesn't)." *HBS* (2007). Print.
Website: [http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/5605.html](http://hbswk.hbs.edu/item/5605.html)
words searched/search engine used: Google; “how Wikipedia works”

Summary: This article is about how Wikipedia works and how articles are deleted and put onto the website. The author explains the processes thoroughly. Also throughout the article the author talks about the average mistakes per article and how other online encyclopedias also make mistakes.
**Assessment:** The author does a really good job of explaining how articles are added and removed, yet he could go into greater detail. He basically just gives you an overview, but it's still very clear.

**Reflection:** This article helps me with my work by explaining how Wikipedia works and explaining it's flaws. Also it helps me by explaining how Wikipedia can be used by anyone, but those anyone's submissions must be approved and accurate.

Joey Rice  
Professor Culik  
English  
1190-C1603  
March 15, 2013  
Annotated Bibliography  
[http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3234032/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3234032/)  

**Summarize:** Wikipedia acts as a knowledgeable encyclopedia for the World Wide Web. Most scientific disciplines are displayed on the site that has been peer reviewed. From sources that the articles have been incorrect in moments, also poor peer review. “If the renowned experts that acted as peer reviewers in the *Nature* study on Wikipedia actively contributed their knowledge to the wiki, the quality of the encyclopedia would be greatly increased” (R. Warden). Experts acknowledging the truth.

**Access:** Wikipedia does have issues with the peer viewers that illustrate mostly all the information that’s displayed on the website. This may the reason why there is anger that circles Wikipedia about the present knowledge and the constructive knowledge of the communities. I think that problematically this will never change unless the peer reviewers put more effort in correcting there problems. Wikipedia is scientific knowledge that does depend on collaboration of experts.
Reflect: Wikipedia has two different categories of a utopian and conservative, one is a deep suspicion and the other is opposed of the conservative. But critiquing the new knowledge. Could Wikipedia be the teachings of new knowledge?

Joey Rice
Professor Culik
English
1190-C1603
March 15, 2013
Annotated Bibliography
http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1321476

Summarize: The anger that communities has for Wikipedia has always been the same. A point of view from the public Wikipedia provides information, is a filter system, and shows the way information is collected. On the other hand, anything can be published from online volunteers, anyone can edit, also often not a “valid” source of information.

Access: The non-experts and inexperienced volunteers have majorly put their part on the online encyclopedia. The sharing of the knowledge has increased by many, making Wikipedia one of the biggest online encyclopedias. The anger that comes from other experts and non-experts has not given their approval on what Wikipedia showcases as in information. The quality of the articles has communities criticizing on that anyone can edit. Some may not proclaim that it is true but Wikipedia does have fact.

Reflect: Wikipedia has become one of the biggest sources of knowledge and communication but doesn’t mean that the information is credible. The general public has a reason to have so much anger towards Wikipedia, because of the quality of information that’s provided. Why don’t credible experts fix Wikipedia? It’s already open to the public. If Wikipedia was to be improved, the name will be better for it to grow.
Summarize: Wikipedia filters material that is clicked on. The filter bubble is the same. Wikipedia is a complex assemblage that has filters that also keeps out what the user doesn’t have control of. Having control, power, and knowledge is Wikipedia’s focus. Wikipedia is a self-regulating to where their algorithms use other references but wiki itself. “Personalization is damaging the tools of democracy” (Praiser).

Access: I think that Peer Review and Wikipedia sources that has filter bubbles such as Google should take more advantage of publishing or having information out so the communities decide on what is acceptable. “personalization is posing a danger society as it is increasingly placing people into their own bubble and making an end to shared experiences”(Nefkens2). Wikipedia having less control over the algorithms over their users, letting their users having the choice of what should be seen. With the bad naming of teachers, researchers, scholars, authors, etc. Maybe having less control is for the best.

Reflect: Having less control over the users may give Wikipedia a better chance of having a better reputation. If so Wikipedia may have higher results. Can Wikipedia change?
Annotated Bibliography


Summarize: Wikipedia is a big online encyclopedia but it’s also complex. The many articles that were created for the Wikipedia can be edited by the users. On the article there is a link where the reader can change the article. Mostly all the information in the articles is set up is available for the reader to use. Edit histories and document versions make up Wikipedia containing links to different edited articles. Wikipedia is categorized of many articles, like mostly all encyclopedias.

Access: From the different that is displayed of the page content of Wikipedia may cause confusion, making teachers, authors, researchers, and others that bad name Wikipedia may be the problem. That makes the readers of Wikipedia may cause anger. Wikipedia should have data or knowledge where is has articles where it’s never been seen or read about. Wikipedia should take a chance on having information that’s raw. Nothing should be hidden from the reader.

Reflect: Wikipedia helps the making knowledge, helping understand knowledge better. Who controls Wikipedia? Is Wikipedia the best online encyclopedia? Is the process of Wikipedia of how it was created the cause of confusion or not knowing, cause anger towards it? Wikipedia should make adjustments helping by not letting anything be published, or anyone editing articles unless they were true experts.
Annotated Bibliography

Summary: Wikipedia compared to encyclopedias and other great sources are assessed in different ways. They are categorized by the pattern of the history, strengths and weaknesses inherent in the editing of the process of Wikipedia. Articles and researchers states that they have come close to accuracy with the use the Wikipedia but still find many errors throughout the source of Wikipedia. Wikipedia is open to anonymous and editing, so there issue is if they think they information is falsie identified or if it’s a true statement. They examine the reliability of the information being shared and it can be identified quickly if it’s false information. But my concern if they can identify the information being false so quickly, what happens if the information is false and they didn’t catch the false information? Such as some false information has been put on Wikipedia and it was on there for a long time. How does Wikipedia know if the information is true or false.

Assess: I feel that this argument on if Wikipedia is very good argument due to no one knows if the information on Wikipedia is going to true or false. So looking into on if the information is true is a good way to learn more about Wikipedia. Wikipedia can easily change just by a click of the edit button, I feel that no one knows if the information is going to be reliable, yes there is a tool that can tell if the information is good for the website but what happens if the system glitches and false information gets put on the web for all the users to see. I personally was told to never use Wikipedia as a source of information… why is that teacher telling their students to not use Wikipedia?
Reflect: This article on if Wikipedia is reliable will be good for my paper, because it argues back and forth in which if the information on the web is being reliable enough to be shared with the rest of the users of the web.

Rachel Blissett
Professor Culik
English 1190-c1608
14 March 2013
Wikipedia: How Accurate is it? By: Jeremy Hsu
Search Engine: Google
Search Terms: Is Wikipedia Accurate?

Annotated Bibliography
Summary: Wikipedia is said to be one of the most used encyclopedias being used for looking up information online. But some of the crowd-sourced presents that some of the information that is being placed on Wikipedia are coming across as false information. An example of a mistake that was on Wikipedia is about baseball during the World Series, because they were vandalizing Wikipedia by using the edited area to put false information on the page. What Wikipedia is trying to do is fix the way users are allowed to edit the page, they are trying to restrict anonymous users to not be able to edit the page. This will help to not have false information on the web so no one would freak out on behalf of the information that is being posted on the web.

Assess: This article helps me get a good feel that Wikipedia is not a reliable source and the example that it shares proves my theory right. Because what happens if the information is false and Wikipedia misses that mistake and it gets posted. I feel that Wikipedia doesn’t catch all the false information being put on the web, they just say it does.

Reflect: This will work with my paper due to I don’t like using Wikipedia and it helps declare my thoughts on Wikipedia more thoroughly.
Annotated Bibliography

Summary: Wikipedia is the earliest but yet best known encyclopedia that is being used in today’s ways of getting information on the web. A crowd-source is a collection of mass data that has recently become a wide-spread phenomenon. A good advantage of crowd-based data sourcing is the ability to reach and engage a better feel of the intelligent internet use. Crowd-based sourcing is still being well-achieved and it manages great change such as volume of data, users of questionable, ever changing, quality, and reliability.

Assess: Crowd-based sourcing I feel is what created Wikipedia, without crowd-based sourcing I think Wikipedia wouldn’t be in use as much as it is right now. I think it will help out my paper because I didn’t know anything about crowd-sourcing and now I kind of do.

Reflect: it fits in my research because for this paper I’m trying to prove that Wikipedia is not a good source to find information on the web. This gives me a good example to how internet users might think Wikipedia is reliable, but also helps with my argument.
“Wikitrust: Content-Driven Reputation for the Wikipedia” By: B. Thomas Adler
Search Engine: Google.Scholar.com

Annotated Bibliography

Summary: Wikipedia was made for promoting writers before submitting their work to a peer review process. The criticism most widely was against Wikipedia in the lack of accountability for the authors and possibly might misinform readers. They are worried that there is no initial author on Wikipedia due to the fact that there is an option of editing the page. Just like peer review, there is no initial author is a group of discourse community that is working together to get the information on the web. They are trying to find a way to stop the editing source that way the authors reputation of the information is not ruined by the public trying to advertise the false information.

Assess: This will be a great use in my paper due to it does share about peer review and talks about how peer review and Wikipedia are kind of the same… due to have no initial author for the work. It seems like Wikipedia is like a discourse community that is on the web for other people to share information on.

Reflect: I like this article and feel it helps me get a good grip on what Wikipedia really is… and give me good example via through peer review, which is the assignment from the start. I feel this will help me out a lot.

_____________________________________________

Rashel Amanuel
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190-C 1608
3/15/13


Search words: is Wikipedia useful?
Search engine: scholar.google.com

Annotated bibliography

Summary: with internet, it became very easy for student to excess information online. Wikipedia is one of the popular sources that students use to fins information. Many of the university students rely on Wikipedia to work on their assignments and projects. A study was done to find out the effects of truth and the usefulness of information adoption from Wikipedia. The study showed how trust has a major effect on determining information adoption. Educational institutions shouldn’t prohibit the use of Wikipedia, but instead, they should work on the digital literacy.

Assessment: this article is accurate because it was published in an educational journal and a study was done to prove a point. The article is talking about an important thing which is trust. Student should have more ideas about online publications and how to use the information they read. Many educated people such as professors prohibit the use of Wikipedia. Instead of doing that, people should work on constructing knowledge.

Reflect: this article made me realize that many educated people are using Wikipedia which is making me think about the credibility and reliability of Wikipedia and why some people don’t like to use Wikipedia. All these things make me thing of how people’s beliefs differ and they reflect the construction of knowledge.

________________________________________________________

Rashel Amanuel

Professor Hugh Culik

Search words: Wikipedia and expertise
Search engine: scholar.google.com

**Annotated Bibliography**

**Summary:** A recent survey that was done showed that women use Wikipedia less. This gap grabbed the researchers’ attention. Gender can also have an effect on how people think and what they use online. The three factors for this gap might be 1) the level of conflict in some discussions. 2) The dislike of the critical environment. 3) Lack of evidence that would affect the editing. The study is going to search more about the gaps and how other factors can have an effect on this gap.

**Assessment:** This article mentioned something that is a big problem these days. Gender and its effects on how people think and act is a problem. Conflicts can be caused that might be the reason why less women use Wikipedia.

**Reflect:** This article brought back to me the idea of gender and how it can cause conflicts on many different ways. It also made me think that it might be possible that some educated women don’t like to use Wikipedia for couple reasons that belong to the gender. No matter what the education of the person is gender always plays a role.

---

Rashel Amanuel
Professor Hugh Culik
Annotated Bibliography

Summary: This article talks about some advantages of Wikipedia and how it can be used efficiently. Wikipedia might be used to publish peer reviewed articles just like how Scholar. Google is used for that. Unlike the publication in journals, Wikipedia is cheaper, quicker, many people use it, and it can offer a variety of articles. But the academic community might have some concerns about the reliability and credibility of Wikipedia. Wikipedia can be a useful source to publish scholarly articles.

Assessment: This article is interesting because it tries to find a good way to use Wikipedia. Publishing peer reviewed process articles on Wikipedia might cause many concerns and many people might reject the idea. Other people might agree with it because they use Wikipedia a lot more often.

Reflect: This article made me look at Wikipedia in a different way. It can be used to publish peer reviewed articles which might be very useful. This move might also increase the credibility and reliability of Wikipedia and more people might start using it.

Rashel Amanuel
Professor Hugh Culik
Annotated Bibliography

Summary: translation of articles in Wikipedia is increasing the quality of different languages on Wikipedia. Many contributors talk on the discussion pages as a community and share things from all over the world. A report was done to highlight some problems. The translation to many different languages requires an interaction with the community to learn more about it. The Wikipedia translation actives are trying to focus on the translation problems. The mechanical translation of words and sentences might now be a good idea.

Assessment: this article mentioned something really important and it is languages. Languages from all over the world are very different. Translation of words might now be very essay due to the different grammars those languages have. The mechanical translation might not be a good idea because mistakes might occur.

Reflect: this article reminded me of the different languages we have in this world and how hard it is to translate from language to another. Sometimes something can’t be translated from a language to another due to the different grammars and rules each language has. This might be a big deal form Wikipedia because if mistakes are made the credibility and reliability of it might decrease.

Tierno 1

Annotated Bibliographies
Summary:

Dean Walker's article talks about Wikipedia and whether it is a reliable source or not. Dean states how Wikipedia actually might have some value and that value is leading students to other citable sources for citation. Wikipedia is like an encyclopedia and encyclopedias are the starting points in searches which then leads us students to citable sources for papers.

Assessment:

I think this article is great because it talks about Wikipedia and how it is in question for being a reliable source or not. This article shows examples and reasons on Wikipedia and how it is more a "starting point" for students when searching on a topic. Being a starting point it helps leads students to actual reliable sources and citations which lead to other sources and so on.

Reflect:

After reading this article it helped me realize exactly what Wikipedia is because I have never used it before as a source for a paper. This article showed me not only what Wikipedia is, but what this source does and can do and what it actually is in place of. Wikipedia is actually an encyclopedia on the Internet and when searching for topics, Wikipedia actually can lead to other sources on that subject which are more reliable and can be used for citations. This will help me with my paper because it really showed me all of the points and questions I had on Wikipedia and now I will be able to use this in my paper.
**Summary:**

This article is about Wikipedia and how it is not a reliable source for searches. This article brought up a similar topic on people who argued that if information is on Google, then it is valid information. This topics is very similar to students who insist Wikipedia is a reliable source for research. Also this article also talks about another search engine called Wikis which is associated with Wikipedia and in the Wikimedia Foundation which is also not regarded as a reliable source.

**Assessment:**

I think this article is great because it also talks about Wikipedia and how it is not reliable source for students to use as a search engine. It also talks about Wikis and brings up the Wikimedia Foundation which I never heard of before. This is very helpful because it shows where all of this information begins at.

**Reflect:**

After reading this article it helped me realize more on Wikipedia. When using the example of Google and how people argued that if it is on Google then the information has to be valid. This example really helped me relate it to Wikipedia and how some argue that it may be reliable or not. This is going to be very useful in my paper.
Matthew Ashman's article is more a student debate on the value of Wikipedia as being a reliable source. This article provides much information on Wikipedia such as; since 2001 Wikipedia has grown to host more than 19 million articles with 82,000 contributors in more than 270 languages. Also how Wikipedia has 400 million unique viewers each month as of March 2011. This article also shows that about 30 percent of students took a survey which had said they always go to Wikipedia at some point during research.

I think this article is great because it talks about Wikipedia and provides many bits of information on Wikipedia which shows you how many people really do use Wikipedia when needing information on a specific topic. In this article where it had said "since 2001 Wikipedia has grown to host more than 19 million articles with 82,000 contributors in more than 270 languages" this really made me think of how many reliable sources are on Wikipedia and these 82,000 contributors are the reason students find sources once on Wikipedia. This is why Wikipedia is the "starting point" of research for many people.

After reading this article it helped me realize how many people really do use Wikipedia and how many think it is a reliable source when searching on the Internet. Studies showed that 30 percent students surveyed Wikipedia is a reliable source for them and this was done at the University of Washington's Project Information Literacy in 2010. This will help me greatly with my paper because it provides information that I never knew on Wikipedia and it also showed
students point of view on Wikipedia and how many actually think it is a reliable source on the Internet.

Summary:

Rainie Lee's article talks about Wikipedia and how it can be popular amount college students. This article states that more than 36 percent of adults use the Wikipedia encyclopedia on the Internet when searching for information, and on a typical day 8 percent of Americans consult to Wikipedia. This article talks a lot about the reliability of Wikipedia and also provides percentages on the ages who use Wikipedia as well as Men (39%) and Women (34%) using Wikipedia. The use of Wikipedia is more popular on a typical day than some of the more prominent activities traced by the Pew Internet and American Life Project.

Assessment:

I really received a lot of useful information on this article by Lee Rainie. This article was like information overload on Wikipedia and this is exactly what I needed to see. The percentages on age ranges, the different schools that use Wikipedia and even people was so greatly helpful. Also showing that more that 36% of Americans use Wikipedia on a daily basis was very shocking to me. This article also provides the use of traffic between Wikipedia and other search engines on the Internet such as Yahoo Answers, Dictionary.com and many more. Wikipedia was marked 24.33% above all of these users

Reflect:

After reading this article it provided me with loads of information that is going to be very useful for my paper. From the percentage's to the differences in websites people use and
Wikipedia coming out on top which surprised me greatly. Seeing that this article is based off of college students and the use of Wikipedia helped a lot because it is easier for me to understand this article being that I am a college student as well.

__________________________________________________
Bianca Vulcu
Professor Culik
English 1190
3/16/13

Annotated Bibliography

Summary: This article starts off by basically giving a brief explanation on what Wikipedia is. It points out that Wikipedia if a free online encyclopedia that anyone can add content to or edit existing content. The whole basic idea behind Wikipedia is to allow the general public to add in their two sense and knowledge. The article touches on how the popularity of Wikipedia has never been questioned, however, the authority of it is a different story. It also claims that after doing experiments on Wikipedia, the credibility is high. However, Wikipedia should not be looked at as a reliable source considering mistakes found in articles during the experiment.

Assess: I really liked this article and how it was set up. It briefly gave me the definition and function of Wikipedia which I can use in my paper. I find this source to be reliable and useful. This article experimented with Wikipedia which allows me to see problems within Wikipedia. Overall, this article will be very helpful when writing my paper.

Reflect: This article was very helpful to me. I can definitely work in some of the findings on Wikipedia into my paper. The article makes me question how reliable Wikipedia is when using it for academic use. I was always told that Wikipedia was not a good source to use for research but if its good enough for personal knowledge then why not for academic use? This is something I have to think more about in order to have a successful paper.
Bianca Vulcu  
Professor Culik  
English 1190  
03/16/13  

**Annotated Bibliography**

**Summary:** This article opens up by stating that Wikipedia has challenged the traditional roles of experts in the Internet age. One of the problems this article found is that if Wikipedia could be shown by an excellent survey of experts to be reliable, then experts would not need to be granted the position of special authority. This article questions the role of experts and how Wikipedia might take over the role of an expert. Another problem with Wikipedia is that some editing done on articles may be done by aggressive people who drive off individuals who are more knowledgeable than themselves.

**Assess:** I found this article to be very informative. It allowed me to see a lot of the downfalls of Wikipedia and not just the glory of it. The source was useful and reliable. The article included experiments and surveys on Wikipedia which is helpful with my paper. With the facts given within the article, I can definitely use some of it to better my paper.

**Reflect:** I found this article to be helpful to what I needed to learn about Wikipedia. I was able to understand some defects with Wikipedia and the uses of it. This article will help point out specific flaws and problems with Wikipedia which will give my paper more dynamic. Overall, This article gives me a good foundation to begin my paper.

Summary: This article opens up by explaining how Wikipedia differs from traditional media. An entry assessed today might be completely different and reworked tomorrow. This article explains a study that aims to see how effective Wikipedia users are at responding quickly to false claims that are added. This article basically shows how the user themselves has to determine what claims are false and which are useful.

Assess: I found this article to be informative and useful. This article was a little different then the others I have read because it touched on how the users react to Wikipedia and false claims. The experiments used in this article are mainly focused on users and how they respond to others claims and determining what’s right and what’s wrong. The information given in this article are helpful and will be in great use for my paper.

Reflect: This article will fit in to my paper efficiently. With the users being a main focus with Wikipedia allows for a more dynamic view on Wikipedia and the function of it. I found this source to be very helpful. With the information given, I can now relate the users to Wikipedia in my paper. This article changed the way I looked at my topic because I forces me to think about how the users themselves determine what is useful and what is not.
Summary: The article gives an in depth summary of the origins and history of Wikipedia. It goes on to explain how Wikipedia is a community edited and regulated encyclopedia. The article claims the Wikipedia community tries to work together to create a neutral stance when conveying information. Wikipedia is a self-regulated website with some administration and bot policing, but for the most part, it is a website edited and created by users. The founder of Wikipedia started the website after his initial website Nupedia failed. Nupedia was a strictly controlled PHD edited platform of Wikipedia, basically same idea as Wikipedia but only PHD holders could edit. The final result of Nupedia was a few hundred articles, and then the website ran out of money and resources. The article is 30 pages long and very detailed containing copious amounts of information about the bots of Wikipedia and the information they can generate from input.

Assess: The article is very helpful in developing a deeper understanding about Wikipedia, and the way it functions. The article provides many credible sources and can defiantly be used as a tool for developing the next paper. The author does a good job on clearly laying out the paper and using graphs and information to convey his information. The article is a must read if one is looking to develop a strong background on Wikipedia, before beginning the paper.

Reflect: The article has definitely helped develop a grasp around the concept of Wikipedia. The article seems to be a great source for information during the process of writing the paper. The article broke down Wikipedia and its history in a clear way that will surely be helpful.
Summary: The article offers a very in depth look into the editing patterns and functions of Wiki. The article also covers the topic of the coordination in the Wikipedia editing and contributing process. The article goes into the fact that information on Wiki may be a ground for malicious info editing, but then says the website shows a strong resilience to that type of editing behavior. The article covers how Wiki could turn into an anarchy type of system, but then shows how much emphasis is put on coordination and group editing, that currently Wiki shows no threat of an anarchy type system.

Assess: The article lays out a clear and detailed description of the editing process of Wikipedia. The article is very detailed and helps create an understanding of Wikipedia, its background and functions. The article is a must read to help grasp the editing process of Wikipedia.

Reflect: The article has helped me gather more information on the expansive topic of Wikipedia. The information provided from this article will help me develop my claim, and will be a vital resource in helping me compose my paper.
Christopher Koehler  
Professor Culik  
English 1190, Section C1603  
February 14, 2013  
Search Engine: Google Scholar  
(Aniket Kittur, Harnessing the Wisdom of Crowds in Wikipedia: Quality through Coordination, Jan 08)  
http://repository.cmu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1098&context=hcii&sei-redir=1&referer=http%3A%2F%2Fscholar.google.com%2Fscholar%3Fstart%3D10%26q%3Dwikipedia%22%2C72%22%2D%22%22

Summary: The article gives a brief summary of Wikipedia, and its history. The article attributes Wikipedia’s success to the large number of users of the website. The article’s main topic is the 2 type of coordination process: Implicit and Explicit. The article explains the 2 process and states that they both work better under different conditions. Implicit coordination through concentrating the work was more helpful when many editors contributed, but explicit coordination through communication was not.

Assess: The article does a good job of breaking down the coordination process of Wikipedia. The article explains how it integrates into editing, and how the website edits articles and forms articles. The article is very clear and organized. The article goes into a great deal of depth in the coordination process compared to other articles I have read. The article is a must read, to help develop concepts crucial to the paper.

Reflect: The article was crucial in my perspective, to developing a much deeper understanding of Wikipedia and how it works. The article has helped me begin formulating an idea of a claim, and will be crucial to the assignment.
Summary: The article opens with a summary on the process of how Wikipedia works. The article then says that the way Wikipedia works is an unanswered question, because of all the vast components. The article then goes onto say that a number of frequent editors are mostly in control of what information is presented. The article continues to say that the chance of malicious material being posted is minimal, but the chances are increasing. False information that is posted is usually fixed immediately, before it can be viewed by others. The article says Wikipedia gets its value from the few editors who edit thousands of articles, opposed to the thousands of editors that edit few articles. The article proposes that there is an automated false information flagger to alert editors of possible false information.

Assess: The article is very well written and clear. The article covers the topic of damaging information on Wikipedia very well. The article helps visualize a reason behind the possible notion of Wikipedia not being reliable. The article does not say Wikipedia is not reliable, it actually says that it is valuable tool for the discourse community.

Reflect: The article has helped me finally see what some may view as a problem in Wikipedia, the problem being the publishing false information. Although this is a misleading problem
because the article disproves the notion that false information adding can damage the websites value, I feel I will be able to use this notion to assess some issues in my paper.

Zaklina Mladenovski
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
16 March 2013

Summary: This article starts off by giving insight about Wikipedia and seems to be very biased about their opinions about the source. Statistics are brought up, but it mainly discusses how Wikipedia is a huge concern when thinking about credibility due to the fact that basically anyone can edit information and that the process is not transparent in its editors, authors, etc. The fact that this is not transparent seems to be an issue because there is no connection between the significance of knowledge and credibility. This article does however mention how Wikipedia is extremely beneficial in the fact that it is updated a lot unlike other sources.

Assess: This article seems to be pretty one-sided when talking about Wikipedia. Reading articles like this one opens my eyes to how biased people can be about certain subjects, and acknowledging this opens my eyes that you cannot always believe one-sided stories, they must relate it back to the opposing opinion. Although they do bring up how Wikipedia is beneficial in the fact that it is constantly updated, it seems as though Wikipedia has already been labeled as “bad.” Although I do not like reading biased articles, it does usually point out valid points to think about but also makes me realize I must be open minded for those who are not.

Reflect: Reading more about Wikipedia and how many questions arise concerning its credibility
is really allowing me to go in depth about the process, and its value. Whether the information I read is good or bad, it is useful to read up on because it gives a lot more insight and thought when I write my paper by looking at every angle. In order to create a good paper, I must be open minded, yet smart about the information I read.

Zaklina Mladenovski
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1608
16 March 2013


Summary: This article introduces Wikipedia in a professional manner, giving statistics about the source and mentions its success, but also mentions its failures. It talks about how many of the edits are constructive, yet there seems to be a percentage about vandalism which is an issue. About 7 percent of edits to Wikipedia are actually vandalism and perhaps this is what gives Wikipedia such a bad name. It people did not put up fabricated nonsense; Wikipedia would not have the reputation of being a non-credible source. Wikipedia has such potential to be a great source to use all around schools, but due to the fact that it contains vandalism is what makes Wikipedia a less popular source in credibility purposes.

Assess: I like this article because it does not seem to blame the credibility of Wikipedia, but instead it actually talks about how vandalism is the real issue that is raising questions of credibility. The fact that people can add information and sometimes people intentionally add fabricated nonsense is what gives Wikipedia such a bad reputation and aside from that, the source is actually very credible and useful. I did not think about how vandalism could be the
main cause or issue as to why there is such hype about how Wikipedia cannot be trusted and it makes sense that this would cause such accusations.

Reflect: This article is extremely useful to my paper because it allows me to realize that if it weren’t for people creating vandalism on Wikipedia, perhaps the source wouldn’t have such a negative reputation and that aside from vandalism, Wikipedia is actually a very useful source. This allows me to also realize that vandalism is usually easy to detect and that people need to acknowledge this and that it is actually easier than we think to detect credible information aside from fabricated information. This article is relevant and useful and will be considered when writing my paper.

_____________________________________________________________________

Trevor Reed
ENGL - 1190
Professor Culik
March 17th, 2013

Citation

Search Terms: Wikipedia + open editing

Summary: Lih writes about many aspects of Wikipedia, one being how open it is. Anyone can comment or change an article. "Because wikis provide the ability to track the status of articles, review individual changes, and discuss issues, they function as social software, acting to foster communication and collaboration" (4). Lih explains how Wikipedia can properly function using an open editing system.
Assessment: Wikipedia's vast system of open editing is surprisingly effective in that information submitted by anyone can still prove to be credible. Wikipedia, though determined a poor resource, shows many aspects of a very advanced system and accurate resource. Reflection: This article is older, and is not the most accurate, though it can help to show how far the editing systems and accuracy of articles in Wikipedia used to be. Through the years, Wikipedia has become even more strict on what can be published on articles and is therefore even more credible and becomes more so as the years pass.

Trevor Reed
ENGL - 1190
Professor Culik
March 17th, 2013

Citation

Summary: Wikimedia projects are collaboratively developed by anyone with internet access without even having to log in. Editors then create a published document, and a record of every change, deletion, and addition. This is public and editors can be identified and may be copied, quoted, reused, and adapted by third parties with few restrictions. Assessment: Wikipedia states that they use editors to filter out incorrect information and that people introducing false information may have their profile blocked from editing. Reflection: Wikipedia does go through steps to prevent from false information entering the system. They help to promote correct information.
Search terms: wikipedia + reliable

Summary: To begin, Epistemology is the philosophy concerned with the nature and scope of knowledge. This article targets key issues that people associate with Wikipedia. "According to several empirical studies, the reliability of Wikipedia compares favorably to the reliability of traditional encyclopedias."

Assessment: Fallis explains how Wikipedia is reliable (or credible). He talks about how philosophers should be trying to identify changes that may bring about better consequences in the future.

Reflection: Wikipedia is not only for the general public, but can also benefit people with more expertise. It is a site that is not only gaining in popularity every day, but also in credibility.

Search Terms: Wikipedia + reliable

Summary: Willinsky writes about a study that examined how much Wikipedia cites and whether that information is available for the general public. The results suggest that much more can be done to enrich and enhance this encyclopedia's representation of the current state.

Assessment: Wikipedia does a good job of stating their cites and resources, though at that time more could have been done. Wikipedia states resources that information is found from at the bottom of each page so it is easily accessible by anyone.

Reflection: Wikipedia can still be used as a resource if not a reliable source itself. The cites that were used in the article are identified and can be accessed via hyperlink from the Wikipedia page itself.

Christopher Koehler
Professor Culik
English 1190, Section C1603
February 14, 2013
Search Engine: Google Scholar


http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-3-540-73257-0_49?LI=true#page-1

Summary: The article covers how even though Wikipedia is a source created by thousands of contributors it still has a process despite its lack of structure. The contributors adhere to hundreds of rules and regulations. The article covers the topic of Featured Articles on Wikipedia. The process for featured articles is one of the most outlined one. The abstract states “this process
blends elements of traditional workflow with peer production. We conclude that rather than encouraging anarchy, many aspects of wiki technology lend themselves to the collective creation of formalized process and policy.” In the article you will find a very detailed description of the Featured Articles Process, attached is the link, it would be beneficial to read the description of the process.

Assess: The article does a good job of creating the idea that this is some sort of order and rule in Wikipedia. The article is very clear and does a good job of describing the FA process. The article does a good job verifying the idea that Wikipedia is credible.

Reflect: I found the article very helpful, because provide reason for the credibility of Wikipedia. The article helps prove that Wikipedia is in fact reliable and credible, because it does contain order and rule. I will defiantly find this article helpful in proving my claim in the paper

Tyler Schmittler
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190
March 17, 2013

Wikipedia: “Wikipedia is not a reliable source”

Summary- As you can see from the title the article is about why a teacher won’t allow her students to use Wikipedia in her class and why it is not a reliable source. She goes on to say what she found in her research of how the Wikipedia “ gods” say themselves to not take the information in faith and shouldn’t be used as a reference. Goes on to say how web forums and blogs in general is rarely used as a reliable source. She then says what you can take from Wikipedia , and that is the secondary used in the page, take the sources out from it.

Assessment- This is a good popular source, a teacher or professor stating why they don’t want their students taking information from wikipedias data base. It provides the huge main idea were looking at, when everyone thinks about Wikipedia they think of this issue, of whether or not they can use it as a reliable source.
Reflection- This article is a good reflection for giving me a background of why a teacher or professor may refuse to let their students use Wikipedia, I can pick stuff out to insert into my paper as well as the main idea, although it may not be my view it gives me insight into the other side of the argument.

Tyler Schmittler
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190
March 17, 2013

Here's why teachers who ban Wikipedia are misguided

Summary- This article starts off by explaining about a conference regarding the topic of how teachers who believe Wikipedia is not a reliable source are misguiding students. Then goes into why students should be able to use Wikipedia and what is should be used for, the fast changing topics. It then views how students are using the information wrong, and that is why teachers are misguided, the student can't be lazy and or only use Wikipedia as their only source.

Assessment- This article gives a good insight into the argument. It gives good examples of why students should be able to use Wikipedia as well as good ways of using it demonstrating how to search and input into their work. Giving the strong and negative attributes to a student using Wikipedia. The work does have many flaws but when you can pick out the valid information you can get good ideas or information.

Reflection- This article is great to get an idea for a claim for whether or not a student should be able to use Wikipedia, it says why the teachers are misguided, it comes in reflect of the lazy students work leading them to believe that they can’t trust Wikipedia’s’ work. I never thought of the students being the reason teachers don’t trust Wikipedia but it makes sense, when a lazy student doesn’t put the work in, it'll bring down any blog.
Wikipedia's New Review Process: Closing the Libeler’s Playground

Summary- This article is talking about the changes Wikipedia was discussing a few years ago, they were going to give more protection to the articles, flag and lock pages as well. They give examples of big information fraud, which was misled from anyone being able to edit the important pages. They then go into a more personal view of Wikipedia and describe that they feel the change is necessary but will change the whole idea of Wikipedia (Changing what it was meant for).

Assessment- This article is not in any way a scholarly source of information, it’s an opinion of the changing being made of Wikipedia, and they state the issue and give their argument. It brings out the issue of the editing process of Wikipedia and gives the idea that Wikipedia is trying to change its ways. This source doesn’t necessarily compare to other writers on the topic but he does bring out the same issues that need to be brought out to your attention.

Reflection- I can take information from this source, a few valid points were made as well as issues of their changes brought to my attention. It makes me think differently about the topic for the idea of this wasn’t the early intentions of Wikipedia and now their changing their ways. This article makes a quick reference to our last paper of Gate Keepers that I could further research to input in my paper.
How does Wikipedia work? By; Science Channel

Summary- This article gives insight on how Wikipedia works, it starts off by stating the obvious of how to get there and what it does as a website. Then it goes into the explanation of how the pages are formed and maintained by the users. It goes into what is good about the web page as biased information is taken out of the pictures because of the people editing, and then continues onto the view of the critics the consistency as well as the accuracy of the pages.

Assessment- This view gives me a good insight on the editorial process. It’s a good comparison of what others are saying goes on with the editorial process. It gives good information on both the plus and minus attributes of the Wikipedia process, the article is a strong

Reflection- I needed to gain insight on how the editorial process worked. I was able to gain information on how Wikipedia actually works, and how your peers can truly be trusted. When writing this paper I needed to gain this information or I could be stuck out in the middle of nowhere with no true idea of what’s going on.

Linda Gojcevic
English 1190
Professor Hugh Culik
17 March, 2013

Annotated Bibliography 1

Search Engine: Google
Search Terms: Reliability of Wikipedia

Summary: This article is about the reliability of the online encyclopedia Wikipedia. The author states that Wikipedia is a kind of collective brain, a repository of knowledge. Katharine notes
that anyone around the world who has access to a computer and Internet can share knowledge about a subject. Hundreds of thousands of people have written Wikipedia entries. The history of Wikipedia is discussed, how the whole nonprofit enterprise dates back to January 2001. Wikipedia is now the biggest encyclopedia in the history of the world. On average the encyclopedia was receiving 2.5 billion page views a month. Mr. Wales, the founder of Wikipedia, said that traffic doubles every four months. An example that was given in the article about reliability was about John Seigenthaler Sr. He recently read his biography about himself on Wikipedia and was shocked to learn that he "was thought to have been directly involved in the Kennedy assassinations of both John and his brother Bob." He found out that the false information had been on the website for several months and that an unknown number of people had read it. Mr. Seigenthaler's case triggered a debate on the Internet over the reliability of Wikipedia.

Assess: I thought this was an informative article. It gave an example as to not only why Wikipedia was considered unreliable but how much information the site had and how many people viewed it. The article also stated that the volume of new material coming in is so overwhelming that screeners cannot keep up with it. This statement goes back to our previous paper on the filter bubble and peer review.

Reflect: I found this article informative and helpful on giving me an idea of why people think Wikipedia is not a good source to use because of the unreliability and information overload.

Linda Gojcevic
English 1190
Professor Hugh Culik
17 March, 2013
Annotated Bibliography 2

Search Engine: Scholar Google
Search Terms: Articles about Wikipedia
http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/technology/4530930.stm

Summary: This article states that the free online resource Wikipedia is about as accurate on science as the Encyclopedia Britannica. Wikipedia is produced by volunteers, who add entries and edit any page. It has been criticized for the correctness of entries because of the biography of John Seigenthaler. His Wikipedia biography named him a suspect in the assassinations of president John F. Kennedy and his brother, Robert. Nature tested the reliability of Wikipedia by conducting a peer review of scientific entry and the Encyclopedia Britannica. Only eight serious errors were found such as misinterpretations of important concepts. The article also states the writing style and the reviewers found that Wikipedia entries were poorly structured and confusing.

Assess: I like this article because it explains the history of Wikipedia, how it is compared to the Encyclopedia Britannica and the peer review of scientific entries between the two encyclopedia's.

Reflect: This article is useful to my paper because of the history, data and comparison of Wikipedia and the Encyclopedia Britannica.

______________________________________________

Linda Gojcevic
English 1190
Professor Hugh Culik
17 March, 2013
Search Engine: Google
Search Terms: Wikipedia and academia

http://digitalscholarship.wordpress.com/2008/09/01/is-wikipedia-becoming-a-respectable-academic-source/

Summary: This article is discussing whether or not Wikipedia is a good source for academic work. The unknown author of this article conducted an experiment to view how many people use Wikipedia and how many cite. It also compared Wikipedia and the Encyclopedia Britannica. It described the four main criticisms of Wikipedia: 1) Research projects shouldn't rely upon encyclopedias 2) Since Wikipedia is constantly undergoing revisions, it is too unstable to cite 3) You can't trust Wikipedia because anyone-including folks with no expertise, strong biases, or malicious intent- can contribute to it anonymously 4) Wikipedia entries lack authority because there's no peer review.

Assess: I found this article informative but also wordy. The four main criticism of Wikipedia is what I found helpful for my paper. The experiment and the data he conducted was interesting.

Reflect: This article was helpful for my paper because of the main criticisms and the data about how many people cite Wikipedia. It also talks about how Wikipedia is not peer reviewed and the information overload.

___________________________________________

Linda Gojcevic
English 1190
Professor Hugh Culik
Annotated Bibliography 4

Search Engine: Scholar Google
Search Terms: Wikipedia vs. Scholarly articles
http://www.georgefox.edu/offices/murdock/Tutorials/scholarvswiki.html

Summary: This article compares scholarly articles and Wikipedia. Some examples that were noted in the article were Scholarly articles are written by acknowledged experts and scholars in a specific field where anyone who has an interest in a topic can alter the information on Wikipedia. Scholarly articles are peer reviewed and Wikipedia almost anyone can author or edit an article, citations can be unreliable.

Assess: I found this article to be interesting because it went straight to the point. It compared scholarly articles and Wikipedia. The article favored scholarly articles.

Reflect: The comparison between scholarly articles and Wikipedia is useful for my paper. Although it favored scholarly articles, I believe both scholarly articles and Wikipedia have flaws.

Stephanie Maurizio
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190 C1608
February 13, 2013
Scholarly Source
Annotated Bibliography

Summary: This is an article that starts off talking about IQ and how it is in various systems to deliver knowledge. It then goes on to mention how wikipedia contains knowledge of various subjects on it. Also how it is open to the public and easy to access. The main point to is to figure out the quality of the work. The point of this article is to study this work and see how its IQ is of the subjects it talks about.

Assessment: I think this a great article. The points it makes about wikipedia are true. I think it gives me insight on how the subjects that wikipedia talks about are given in full and good detail. I feel as if other writers may disagree with this and say that some knowledge shouldn't be accessible to all. I’m not really sure what is the right way but this gave me good information.

Reflection: This article gave me good insight into how other are trying to figure out if the information on this website is good. This is rally helpful and useful for my paper. I think it gives the positive side of wikipedia.

Stephanie Maurizio
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190 C1608
February 13, 2013

Scholarly Source


Search engine: scholar.google.com
Search term: “Wikipedia” good resource

Annotated Bibliography

Summary: This article talks all about wikipedia and what it does. It mentions how it all stared and why it started. How it is knocking out the competition because of it fast articles and editing results. In this article an experiment was done to see how it vastly changing. How things on wikipedia are searched and why. What is most viewed by the public, also how it also how it has come to be what it is today.

Assessment: I think this article is extremely helpful. It had a ton of statistical data and points made. All of what we talked about in class was in here and elaborated on more. I think other writers will agree with the data. It was research that was done and facts that were calculated. The points and facts given were very clear and helpful.

Reflection: I will use this article in my paper because of them many points. It really gave me a lot of information. I really like how it was clear about everything. The data they found was good too. I was surprised to see what the most searched things were. Also I didn't realize how long it tasks other journals to change or add new articles.

Stephanie Maurizio
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190 C1608
February 13, 2013

Scholarly Source

Search engine: scholar.google.com
Search term: Wikipedia editing

Annotated Bibliography
Summary: This article focusses on gender differences and their role in wikipedia editing. It look at who edits the most. It came out that women contribute more. They then went on and created a study themselves. They found that more active women contribute more but more men contribute in general.

Assessment: This information is very good. I didn't realize there was a difference between men and women editors. I think this can have great value to my project because it gives me another topic to talk about. I now have something else to say and mention.

Reflection: This will really help me when it comes to writing my paper. Since editing is a big factor in why others don't support wikipedia, I'm glad i found an article on it. Also it helps me see a new argument on the topic. The study that they did is helpful too.

__________________________________________________________

Stephanie Maurizio
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190 C1608
February 13, 2013

Popular Source

Annotated Bibliography

Summary: This is an article of how students think about wikipedia. They were given a task to figure out who really edits it. They were amazed to see that even they can. So the main point of this article is telling the misconception of wikipedia. How it is good for students and they should use it.

Assessment: I think this article was very accurate on how students think. I before my research and discussions in class had the same perceptions as those students. I think other writers would
agree that wikipedia is helpful and should be used. Their comments will give me insight to what
the general public thinks.

Reflection: I think this article will be very useful because how it mentions what student think.
That is a big part of our topic. Not a lot of people, myself included until recently, are not
educated on what really happens on wikipedia. It helps me look at what others say and expect.
Also it really tries to make it important that students continue to use it.

Christine Gillespie
March 17, 2013
English 1190 C1603
Professor Hugh Culik

One great source -- if you can trust it

By Hiawatha Bray, Globe Staff | July 12, 2004

Summarize: The article discusses how popular Wikipedia is and how much it has grown. It
stresses it is one of the largest encyclopedias and that it’s free which is why everyone uses it.
The one thing it doesn’t have is accountability as stated in this article. “Old-school reference
books hire expert scholars to write their articles, and employ skilled editors to check and double-
check their work. Wikipedia's articles are written by anyone who fancies himself an expert.”
Hiawatha Bray. Defining in the article what wiki means; primarily is a type of internet that
allows viewers access to make changes to things posted on Wikipedia. Wikipedia has about
1,200 volunteers checking all of the results that people add or change to something posted on
Wikipedia. Everything is peer reviewed and changed if there are errors or false information as
stated in the article. “But we don't know the reviewers or their qualifications, just as we don't
know the authors. That's not to say that Wikipedia is worthless -- just that you wouldn't want to
stake your life or your mid-term grades on the information here.” Hiawatha Bray. Wikipedia
uses the open source approach and we wonder how reliable the info is because it lacks regular editorial processes.

Access: This source was very accurate in quoting so many different authors and experts opinion on Wikipedia’s editorial process. It explained what Wiki actually means and how people are able to access this site and add there feedback. It thoroughly explained that Wikipedia does have an editorial process and info that is constantly being added by random people is also being looked over by volunteers.

Reflect: I enjoyed reading this article because it showed so many different views on authors and people who are for or are not for Wikipedia’s editorial process. It makes me think of every possible negative and positive thing about Wikipedia in my final decision to know if I, myself, am for or against its editorial process.

____________________________________________________

Sidorela Arapi
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190
3, 17 , 2013

http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1135863

Search Engine: scholar.google.com
Search Words: Wikipedia

Annotated Bibliography

Summarize: Wikipedia is the largest collaboratively edited sources of encyclopaedic knowledge in the world. It is structural knowledge about how concepts are interrelated. Wikipedia can neither be formally started nor automatically processed. It provides an extension to be integrated in Wikipedia, it also allows the typing of links between articles and the specification of typed data inside the articles in an easy to use manner. It enables casual users to participate in the creation of an open semantic knowledge base, Wikipedia has the chance to become a resource of semantic statements, hitherto unknown regarding size, scope, openness, and internationalization.
Wikipedia is a wide range of external applications, that is able to use it as a background knowledge base.

Assess: This article focuses a lot on the history of wikipedia. It gives us facts on how it is the largest edited source in the world. It tells us who is able to edit information in there and what goes on in the actual cite. It also gives us information on what knowledge has to do with Wikipedia and how it is connected.

Reflection: I like this article because it relates knowledge to wikipedia. That is the kind of information that I am looking for to connected to peer reviewing and filter bubble. It also helps me understand how it all started and how it actually works.

Sidorela Arapi
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190
3, 17, 2013


Search Engine: scholar.google.com
Search Words: Wikipedia and knowledge

Annotated Bibliography

Summarize: Humans approach the task of text categorization, they interpret the specific wording of the document in the much larger context of their background knowledge and experience. Algorithms put a lot of work into Wikipedia also. The propose to enrich document representation through automatic use of a vast compendium of human knowledge. We apply machine techniques to Wikipedia, the largest en cyclopaedias to date world knowledge. Each Wikipedia article represents a concept, and documents to be relevant to Wikipedia concepts. Empirical results confirm that this knowledge-intensive representation brings text categorization to a qualitatively new level of performance across a diverse collection of data sets.
Assess: this article explains how information is applied to Wikipedia. It also tells us how algorithms take part in this process. It shows us what kind of knowledge is put into this cite and where it comes from.

Reflection: The reason why I like this article is because it gives me a lot of information that is useful to use in the process of writing my paper. I like the fact that it mentions the word algorithm in it and explains what job it does. It relates to the last paper we wrote on algorithms and filter bubble.

_____________________________________________

Sidorela Arapi
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190
3, 17, 2013

http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1216309

Search Engine: scholar.google.com
Search Words: Wikipedia and knowledge

Annotated Bibliography

Summarize: Member-maintained communities ask their users to perform tasks the community needs. Groups with diverse interest create artifacts of lasting value that provide information for others. Social theory suggest that reducing the cost and increasing the personal value of contribution would motivate members to participate more. They came up with a software that performs intelligent task routing in Wikipedia. It uses broadly applicable strategies of text analysis, collaborative filtering, and hyperlink following to recommend tasks. This helps sharing out experience with Wikipedia, which offers both challenges and opportunities for research.

Assess: This article talks about creating a new way to make the research on Wikipedia easier to find. They want to do this by reducing the cost and getting more viewers to participate.

Reflection: The reason why I found this article interesting is because it is letting us know that there is other ways we can change the way Wikipedia works. It tells us that more people should get involved in the usage of Wikipedia.
Sidorela Arapi  
Professor Hugh Culik  
English 1190  
3, 17, 2013  
Search Engine: scholar.google.com  
Search Words: Wikipedia and knowledge

Annotated Bibliography

Summarize: Wikipedia is used by a lot of people, the number one group of people that use it are college students. The students use Wikipedia for background information, but less often than they used other common resources, such as course readings and Google. Experts in different fields are more likely to use Wikipedia for course-related. Wikipedia is used in combination with other information resources. It meets the needs of college students because it offers a mixture of coverage, currency, convenience, and comprehensibility in a world where credibility is less of a given or an expectation from students today.

Assess: Wikipedia is all about the research that the people make. This articles tell us who are the main people that use Wikipedia to make research. It is stating that college student use it a lot to find research on different topics. It also says that a lot of experts in different fields rely on it to find information that they need.

Reflection: The reason why I like this article is because is it stating some true facts. As a college student I do use Wikipedia to make my research. I also like the fact that it says that experts rely on it also. It makes me feel a lot better to know that if experts rely on it then it means that it is a reliable source.
Annotated Bibliography

Summarize: Wikipedia's brilliance and curse is that any user can edit any of the encyclopedia entries. It introduces the notion of the impact of an edit, measured by the number of times the edited version is viewed. Using several data sets, including recent logs of all article views, it shows that an overwhelming majority of the viewed words were written by frequent editors and that this majority is increasing. Similarly, using the same impact measure, it also shows that the probability of a typical article view being damaged is small but increasing, and presents empirically grounded classes of damage. It makes policy recommendations for Wikipedia and other wikis in light of these findings.

Assess: A lot of people argue that the information that is being put on Wikipedia is not the correct information. This article is telling us that the majority of the time the articles being written in there are most likely coming from an editor.

Reflection: I like this article because it is making me understand and feel better about relying on Wikipedia for my research. The fact that this article is telling us that the information being put in that cite is coming from an expert it makes me feel better about using it.

----------------------------------------
Steve Gavrilovski
Professor Culik
English 1190
3/16/13

Search Engine: Scholar Google
Search Terms: Reaction to Wikipedia

Annotated Bibliography

Summary: This article is about how the authors get judged. It speaks about how they use Wikipedia to judge their writers. If the writer can edit or post something on Wikipedia and the BOTS let it stay on their or how they said if the info is “Long-lived” their reputation goes up, if the bots immediately erase there edit or post, their reputation goes down.

Reflect: The reason why I believe this article is important and will help me with my paper is because it shows that not everyone is skeptical about using Wikipedia for info, this paper actually tells you that it uses Wikipedia to judge its writers. Which means that if their edit or post is good then it stays on. Therefore showing that the information on Wikipedia isn’t always bad to use.

Steve Gavrilovski
Professor Culik
English 1190
3/16/13

Search engine: Scholar Google
Search terms: Wikipedia is a source

Annotated bibliography

**Summary:** This article talks about how one professor in Japan banned Wikipedia from being sourced in papers in his class. He did this because one day his students took a test and over a dozen of his students all had the same wrong answer, then when he realized that they used Wikipedia in order to cram for his exam and that’s where they got the false info.

**Reflect:** I really like this because it shows the other side of my opinion, for example my opinion is that Wikipedia should be able to be used as a source, but this papers shows an example of how it can mess you up by giving you false info and how its not always trustworthy.

____________________________

Steve Gavrilovski
Professor Culik
English 1190
3/15/13


Search Engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: Anxiety of using Wikipedia

Annotated Bibliography

**Summary:** This is a chapter in a book, this chapter talks about how to and how not to use Wikipedia. It offers two ways to use how you should use it and some other ways how not to use Wikipedia in your paper. Ways to use it: Using Wikipedia as a source, Using Wikipedia as a process guide.

**Reflect:** The reason I think this will help me in my paper is because it gives you specific ways to use it and how it will help your paper, it is very detailed. As detailed it is in how to use Wikipedia in your paper, it is also that detailed on how not to use Wikipedia in your paper.

____________________________

Kelty, Christopher M.
Dept. of Anthropology, Rice Univ., Houston, TX
Burrus, C Sidney; Baraniuk, Richard C.
Search Engine : Google Scholar

Wikipedia

Summary: The way the internet is today is enabled with new modes of authorship, which means on some websites anyone can type what they want on them. For example Wikipedia is one of those websites. The way peer review is affected through this is measurements of trust issues due to assurance of information. That is by far one of the biggest problems with these kind of websites, their is some information being generated that is false. Which in the end affects what we put in our essays on our work logs or any other thing we are using for information.
Asses: This will be a great topic in my paper because i was thinking about arguing that false information can be very un useful and there shouldn’t be un useful information on an encyclopedia like Wikipedia.
Reflect: I liked this article because i felt like this gave good inside in what is really going on when i go on wikipedia.
Wikipedia

Summary: The internet has become an important resource for patients and the general public, Wikipedia has become the dominant online reference when it comes to this kind of search. In 2004, members of the Wikiproject Medicine, wrote a paper discussing Wikipedia’s health information displayed on their site. The paper discussed the strengths and weaknesses of Wikipedia as a source of Health information and compares it with other medical Wikis. As of now Wikipedias health information is not that strong but Medical professionals can help strengthen the information and are showing great enthusiasm to do so.

Assess: This article is a very good source of information because it is focused on one topic and how wikipedia affects the topic and what steps are being taken to improve.

Reflect: This can help me on my paper incase i need an example of how Wikipedia is used and there is nothing better than medical entries.
Summary: Wikipedia was launched in 2001 by Jimmy Wales and Larry Sangers. This site includes the most popular reference work on the Internet. Google has helped Wikipedia with traffic making it the sixth most popular website in the world. Wikipedia contains millions of articles and they can be edited by the user of the site. This raised a lot of criticism because information would be invalid sometimes and not dependable according to teachers. Wikipedia has raised the bar and only the knowledgeable users can edit the information added. They simply give their opinion and Wikipedia makes the decision to publish this information.

Assessment: This source is very valid. It provides information on when Wikipedia was created and the purpose of the site. Additional information includes criticism that Wikipedia receives. Other websites I searched had too much information included and this source was on point. It included understandable information.

Reflect: This source will affect my paper because it provides background information about Wikipedia and that will help me start my research. It only provides important information that is up to date. Also it provides quick points that only knowledgeable can add and change information which I find true.

http://www.mariettatimes.com/page/blogs.detail/display/327/Wikipedia-has-changed-the-way-we-research.html
Summary: Wikipedia is recognized for providing creditable collaborative content. Managing this success is going to be touch because the site constantly has to find valid information from reliable sources and pass this information into the their site for all types of readers. The option which allows Wikipedia to edit information by the user is the step to the right direction because information will maybe change in the present day and that will provide the readers with the latest and valid explanation of their questions. Wikipedia provides the sources they user at the end of the page so the reader can judge if the sites used are valid and up to date. Teachers seem to not be as harsh with students when they use Wikipedia because the sources used are the same sources the teachers are looking for students to find.

Assessment: I found this article up to date and valid. It provided the process of how Wikipedia collects information and how it provides it to the user. Wikipedia also uses up to date information because it might not be valid anymore and a better understanding of the topic was created. Other sites stated that Wikipedia lists the sources but it does not use them.

Reflect: I found this published article to be very helpful and valid because it shows the process on how information is collected in Wikipedia and provided to the user. This will help me with my argument when I write my paper because I believe that Wikipedia is one of the most reliable sites today.

Summary: This article that I recently read does prove that sometimes Wikipedia does not provide the right information and that can be very extreme. Brandon Knight of Detroit Pistons got dunked by La Clippers DeAndre Jordan on March 10, 2013 and the commentaries believed that was the best dunk in NBA’s history. I have seen the video and DeAndre humiliated Brandon. One of the Wikipedia users took this opportunity to change information on Brandon Knight personal life on Wikipedia by saying Brandon died on March 10, 2013. The course of death was determined to be DeAndre Jordan. It’s very interesting that Wikipedia allowed this edit to take place which does proof that sometimes it cannot be reliable.

Assessment: This source is very accurate and it does raise another argument on Wikipedia’s reliability. It does proof that Wikipedia allows user to write wrong facts which will be part of my argument when writing this assignment. The info about Brandon Knight was taken down by Wikipedia when I checked today. Proof of pictures was provided to me when I researched more about the topic that was indeed written. Wikipedia fixed the issue but there shouldn’t have to deal with this process in the first place.

Reflect: This article will help me raise another argument in my paper about teachers being right sometimes about Wikipedia about not having the most reliable information. I believed that Wikipedia was and is the most useful information about a topic users can find but after reading this article it questions if I will use Wikipedia in the future.

http://www.complex.com/sports/2013/03/brandon-knights-wikipedia-page-was-desecrated-after-he-got-dunked-on-by-deandre-jordan-last-night
Annotated Bibliography


Summary: Many academic experts say that Wikipedia isn’t a site you can trust, because the articles are written and edited by volunteers. Research argues that the information on Wikipedia is accurate. The Wikipedia’s community has evolved and has set policies and procedures to cancel out the untruths in the articles. How do they decide what’s true and what’s not? They make sure that there is another reliable source on the internet that has stated that fact. One of Wikipedia’s policies is writing on your own basis of research. You always need a third party backing up your information now that they changed their policy allowing anyone to edit on an article.

Assess: The purpose of this article was to make us aware of some policies Wikipedia has. Also, it talks about the history of the policies from when they were introduced and when they were changed.

Reflect: This would help with providing evidence for my paper. Pulling out what the researchers say and the policies of Wikipedia. The only thing that I question is why hasn’t anyone been able to come up with the exact answer if Wikipedia is reliable? Why are there so many opinions and no hard evidence?
Annotated Bibliography


Summary: In defense of Wikipedia how is a site supposed to stay flawless? It doesn’t make any sense. Things are changing every day and things that are flawed today are flawless tomorrow, because of the errors made. Also, there is going to be error with such a large based website. Entries varying from 50,000 to a million each day, which doesn’t give more than a day for the Wikipedia volunteers to put a handle on and get correct information in by the end of the day. The attitudes towards Wikipedia are polar opposites; either people love the idea or hate it. Users need to be aware of quality over quantity.

Assess: The goal of this article is to show people that we should figure out ways to find what system works and is reliable. We need to learn that error is made to only be fixed. Not everything on Wikipedia is perfect, but volunteers there have a pretty good handle on the information going through the site.

Reflect: I learned from this article that people are learning everyday new things, so why does that exclude Wikipedia as a learning base. Humans are the ones who put the information on and fix it. Not a computer. Why don’t people know that and have such a stuck mind on one way of Wikipedia, which it is unreliable. Does that mean humans are unreliable then?
Annotated Bibliography


Summary: Wikipedia is an Encyclopedia that is always updating itself. Like the Dictionary it has thousands of volunteers correcting and adding in to the facts. Since it’s so hard to update information like that constantly was hard for the dictionary to keep adding onto, so they never accepted new ideas. On the other hand, Wikipedia is there to update constantly and get new information regardless of how much they already have; they’re always looking for more.

Assess: With this evidence provided who says that Wikipedia isn’t reliable if anything it’s probably more recent and more reliable than any source. Having all those people come in and join in on articles is good. That brings Wikipedia new ways of thinking and other opinions or ways to look at things.

Reflect: Wikipedia has the same structure as a thesaurus, only it’s online. Why are people still misleading one another and saying it’s an untruthful and unreliable source, and people believe it. Why don’t they research things for themselves and make a change rather than conforming to what everyone is saying? Maybe it’s because that whole “the internet has all the answers” theory.
Annotated Bibliography

http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007%2F978-3-540-73257-0_49?LI=true

Summary: The procedural part of Wikipedia is being examined. Throughout the examination lack of structure was found in Wikipedia. The study found that the Featured Article process is the best procedure throughout the Wikipedia website. This process involves a traditional feel of peer production. In the end Wikipedia has a decent process and policy when taking in information.

Assess: The procedure of Wikipedia has never really been founded. This article explains it and helps people understand it.

Reflect: This article gives information that helps me get evidence that there is an underlying procedure to Wikipedia’s filtering. Not just information I put on there without anyone filtering through what is right and wrong.

Annotated Bibliography


Summary: Wikipedia’s pages are easy to change and pen to improvement. There’s an “Edit this page” button that allows any random/ anonymous person to delete or add the information onto that page. But pages are visited by thousands and are always being corrected of their information. The whole concept of Wikipedia holds no gate keeping function to ensure quality in the work being produced by the contributors. Many people are surprised without gatekeeping that the site is still working. But Wikipedia is able to track the article down that the information
was attached with, and track individual changes produce the social software. With Wikipedia it takes much time to vandalize a page rather than turning it back to its’ original state. Unlike other sources that were on a 6 month to a yearly publishing cycle, Wikipedia is a t a constant change. Assess: The point of this article was to give readers more information and history behind Wikipedia’s process and goals. Not just stating an opinion, but giving hard facts that are useful. Reflect: This will definitely be something that I’ll be using in my paper. This brings out all of the things that people have been hiding. It makes Wikipedia easier to understand and makes sense. This community they talk about in this article what made them think about having a community on giving information regardless of who you are? Is there a connection with all sources, that there’s a sense of community regardless of where you get information?

_______________________________________________

Roman Vasilik
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190
18 March 2013

http://www.peterpirolli.com/Professional/About_Me_files/1116-pirolli.pdf


Search Engine: scholar.google.com
Key Terms: Wikipedia + Judgments

Annotated Bibliography #4

Summary: The article talked about a study done that showed how credibility judgments about Wikipedia are affected by providing users with an interactive visualization such as WikiDashboard of article and author editing history. What the study found was that users who
self-reported higher use of Internet information and higher rates of Wikipedia usage tended to produce lower credibility. So the results suggested that increased exposure to the editing or authoring histories of Wikipedia increases credibility judgments. It also mentioned that Wikipedia has been the target of skepticism about the quality of its content and contributors because of its short history.

Assessment: The article made a point when it talked about a study that was done to compare two articles from two different and popular sources such as Wikipedia and Encyclopedia Britannia, and the study found that little substantial difference in accuracy between the two sources, and this ran counter to the conventional wisdom of what makes for superior quality reference information.

Reflection: I believe that the article has given a lot of information about how the views of Wikipedia reflect its credibility and the quality of its content and contributors and also its comparison to other popular sources.

Roman Vasilik
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190
18 March 2013


Search Engine: scholar.google.com

Key Terms: Wikipedia + Arguments

Annotated Bibliography #3

Summary: The article talked about how Wikipedia is one of the most widely used repositories of
human knowledge today, contributed mostly by a few hundred thousand regular editors. It also talked about how Wikipedia handles controversy by allowing editors to manually tag entire articles as controversial, therefore informing both editors and readers about the disputed reliability of such articles.

Assessment: The article focused on identifying the most controversial points in a Wikipedia article to allow both readers and editors judge the article and its existing opinions better.

Reflection: I believe that the article has given me a fair amount of information on what controversial issues exist within a single Wikipedia article.

Roman Vasilik
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190
18 March 2013


Search Engine: scholar.google.com
Key Terms: Wikipedia

Annotated Bibliography #2

Summary: The article talked about how there are not so many domain independent knowledge bases available which provide a large amount of information on named entities and that contain continuously updated knowledge for processing. From there it went and talked about a problem that from a novel perspective by making use of a wide coverage online encyclopedia, namely Wikipedia which the author points out that anyone can edit it.
Assessment: The article for the most part focused on what Wikipedia does and how Wikipedia derived semantic relatedness correlates well with human judgments by making comparison. Reflection: I believe that the article has given me some view as to how Wikipedia compares to other knowledge sources to provide information.

Roman Vasilik
Professor Hugh Culik
English 1190
18 March 2013


Search Engine: scholar.google.com
Key Terms: Wikipedia + Judgments

Annotated Bibliography #1

Summary: The article mainly talked about the popularity of Wikipedia and then it went in a different approach to talk about why so many people, especially academic experts, have argued that Wikipedia's articles can't be trusted, because they are written and edited by volunteers who have never been vetted. It also talked about how Wikipedia has evolved a radically different set of epistemological standards, standards that aren't especially surprising given that the site is rooted in a Web-based community.

Assessment: The article for the most part focused on giving different approaches on Wikipedia and why some people are against its reliability and truth.

Reflection: I believe that the article has given me a fair amount of information about how there are different views on Wikipedia as a whole and also making a point as to how some believe that
there was no way for Wikipedia, as a community, to know whether the person revising the article about Jaron Lanier was really Jaron Lanier or a vandal.

Bridget Prohaszka

Source: www.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,1924492,00.html#ixzz2Njv84qiP

Summary: About 3 million articles are on Wikipedia as of August 2009 making Wikipedia the largest collection of general knowledge (according to its entry on itself). Then users slowly stopped in early 2007. Wikipedia was not seen by as many editors in this time. Volunteers continuously try to improve Wikipedia’s trustworthiness. Then a major chance was mad saying only articles on high profile such as Barack Obama were protected from anonymous revisions.

Assessment: “Few articles on Wikipedia are more important than those that are about people who are actually walking the earth” says Jay Walsh, a spokesman for the Wikimedia Foundations. Research suggests that the encyclopedia thrives on chaos so if it is more free willing it attracts more committed people to do the editing process in a way.

Reflect: Wikipedia has come to obtain so much knowledge that it is overfull and there is nowhere else to go. There is so much knowledge that not everything can be edited by such volunteers and information is always changing and it is hard to keep up with what is accurate and what is not.

Bridget Prohaszka


Summary: Wikipedia provides its users with a broad array of topics with different viewpoints and always comes up on your search engine. But the reliability is not acceptable in schools as
most teachers do not accept citing from Wikipedia. Most of the time on Wikipedia information is false and not accurate. Everyone makes mistakes even scholarly journals and that is closely regulated whereas Wikipedia is not.

Assessment: how can anyone rely on Wikipedia if they may not know who wrote what articles. Most of the articles on Wikipedia do not use accurate names or provide any. Many things are made up by authors and eventually find their way into information therefore resulting in others to cite false information. People come from all over and have different viewpoints so if volunteers editing on Wikipedia do not agree with something they are able to change it or delete it.

Reflect: The contributors to Wikipedia are being revised at a stricter rate than before. Now high level editors have a lot more control of Wikipedia. This makes it more difficult for contributors to participate and put their “knowledge in”. It seems to becoming a lot more accurate and problems are being solved.

________________________________________________________________________

Bridget Prohaszka

Source: www.theatlantic.com/technology/archive/2012/02/does-wikipedia-have-an-accuracy-problem/253216/

Summary: Researcher Messer-Kruse researched the Haymarket affair and is an expert on the topic, and when he went to Wikipedia to update information he found his changes were reversed as soon as he made them. He established the problem was “undue weight” policy which states “articles should ot give minority views as much or as detailed a description as more popular views”. It is all judgement and based on the popular vote.

Assessment: This is not very accurate then is it? How can Wikipedia tell when the minority is right and majority is wrong. It seems to be controlled by the people editing and making changes
as they wish or believe to be so. The original incorrect claim has appeared in college level text books he was actually teaching to his class and “scholars have been publishing the same ideas about the Haymarket case for more than a century”. This should be carefully monitored and it makes you think what else is out there that is completely inaccurate that I have learned.

Reflect: Wikipedia is not reliable at all, it seems to just be everyone’s opinions and whatever the popular view is goes. If someone has accurate information but the majority of views is more than that information will be difficult to edit. Wikipedia is weighting non expert volunteers to the edits of minority views.

Loreta Pepaj
Engl 1190-C1603
3/8/13
A Stand against Wikipedia,
http://judaism.about.com/od/americanjewry/a/amjewcost.htm
Key words: Wikipedia, academic world

Annotated bibliography #1

Summary: This article gives us a view on how academics feel about using Wikipedia as a source in scholarly papers. Most academics argue that Wikipedia should not be cited in academic papers as a source, because Wikipedia is considered an online encyclopedia. Students are not allowed to use encyclopedia in their scholarly papers, and this is why they are not allowed to use Wikipedia either. Wikipedia can misinform students and other people who read it because it can be edited at any time. Some of the information found in Wikipedia is not trustworthy, and people cannot rely on it.

Assessment: This is an article that helps us understand how the academic world works and why we as students are not allowed to use Wikipedia as a reliable source in most of our scholarly papers. It is true that sometimes the information found in Wikipedia is valid and trustworthy, but
in the mean time the information found can be not valid. It is our duty to read other articles about the same topic, and then to evaluate if the article presented in Wikipedia is valid or not.

Reflection: This article does help students in understanding why they are not allowed to use Wikipedia, but on the other hand it is really confusing. Professors say that some information found in Wikipedia is valid and some other is not, but they don’t give an explanation of how are we supposed to know the “fake”, from the “truth”.

Loreta Pepaj
Engl 1190-C1603
3/8/13
How today’s College Students Use Wikipedia for a Course Related Research, Alison J Head and Michael B Eisenberg.
Annotated bibliography #2
Summary: A study on how much Wikipedia is used by students during their academic research was conducted on 6 campuses in U.S during spring 2009. The result showed that 82% of the students used Wikipedia on a regularly basis. Even though Wikipedia was not cited as a source of information in the papers the students handed in, most of them used this source of information mostly to create an idea of what the topic was about. The majority of the students who used Wikipedia were majoring in science. Only 38% of the students that used Wikipedia used it for Literature reviews.

Assessment: By reading this article we understand that the usage of Wikipedia is necessary to know the summary or the meaning of something. Although students are told to exclude Wikipedia as a source from their papers, Wikipedia really helps in creating the first idea or impression about a specific word, person, or situation.
Reflection: When talking about the usage of Wikipedia most of us can agree that we use it because we can access information in a fast time. Wikipedia gives people the answers they need to know, and I think this article is helpful in understanding why and how people use it. In my opinion many people use Wikipedia to get more familiar with a specific topic, and a lot of other research needs to be done in order to know more about the topic.

Loreta Pepaj
Engl 1190-C1603
3/8/13
Bias, Sabotage haunts Wikipedia's Free World, David Mehegan, Boston Globe Staff.
bias_sabotage_haunt_wikipedias_free_world/

Annotated bibliography #3
Summary: Wikipedia is considered the place where anyone can get information for free but the most concerning thing about this encyclopedia is that anyone can edit the information found in it. Since there are many people with different ideas and opinions in the world, many of them can have bias and express racism in the information they edit. The editing can be done by all people and their identity is not needed to edit the information. The unknown identity makes bias and vandalism be present of the Wikipedia information. An example of vandalism is the biography of John Seigenthaler Sr., 78, in which some people wrote that he was involved in the Kennedy assassination, but this was not true.

Assessment: The author of this article thinks that Wikipedia has a good and a bad side. On one hand Wikipedia is the place where anyone can access information for free, and it works really well even though people do not get paid to publish information. On the other hand the author gives example on how Wikipedia can be used by vandals who transform information and misinform people.
Reflection: Since this article is full of examples of how different people have found on Wikipedia fake information about themselves or their biography, it helps in understanding that Wikipedia is not a safe place to find information. We have previously discussed the bias in the peer review process and in the filter bubble. People can find this type of bias expressed in Wikipedia, too, and since no identity of the people who edit the information in Wikipedia is known, the bias can be even bigger that the bias in the peer review process or the filter bubble.

Loreta Pepaj
Engl 1190-C1603
3/8/13
Wikipedia: Starting an article
Annotated bibilography #4
Summary: This article explains what people should do when trying to publish information in Wikipedia. In order to publish the information, people should be registered in the Wikipedia web page. Before submitting any type of information all the people should know that Wikipedia is considered an encyclopedia, and no one is allowed to write about themselves or their peers. Every material presented in Wikipedia should have the right sources, or it will never be published. There is a research done before publishing the information and the research should be based on facts given by the proper sources. Insults, plagiarism, and vandalisms will be detected and erased by the website.

Assessment: Wikipedia is the place where you can find different types of information. Most people say that Wikipedia is not accepted in the academic world, but the information found in this page comes from academic resources, or otherwise the information cannot be published. The sources help people in understanding the reliability and validity of an article, and most of the articles in Wikipedia can be considered valid as long as they have the proper sources mentioned.
Reflection: This article helps me a lot in understanding how the information in Wikipedia is published. There are a lot of misconceptions about Wikipedia, but I think that if the article has the right sources it can be trustworthy. In the papers we write in school we can be credible by mentioning and writing down the right sources. Why should we rely on other articles and not in Wikipedia if some articles have the same sources? This information found is very interesting, and I also learned that even when you publish something that is not trustworthy the information you have published will be deleted.

Cheri Tebeau
Professor Culik
English 1190-C1603
March 17, 2013

Wikipedia: Annotated Bibliography 1


Search Engine: Google Scholar
Search Terms: Nature + Wikipedia
Summary: This article discusses the growth of the much used, but controversial online encyclopaedia, Wikipedia. It summarizes the investigation by Nature comparing scientific coverage by Wikipedia and Britannica. Their investigation revealed that although there were errors in Wikipedia, the errors were not particularly more numerous than those in Britannica. In addition, the investigation suggests that just because Britannica has paid editors, it may not have a great advantage over Wikipedia’s unpaid, multiple editors. Several reviewers cited readability of the articles as a bigger issue, commenting that the Wikipedia articles reviewed were poorly structured and confusing. Others pointed to undue prominence given to controversial scientific theories. However, proponents of Wikipedia say that, although it was not considered a factor in
Nature’s investigation, its strongest suit is the speed at which it can be updated. The article discusses Wikipedia’s growth to the 37th most visited website on the Internet, and discusses concerns raised by critics about the site’s influence. The article also discusses the issues associated with the low number of scientists that contribute articles to Wikipedia although many more are aware of its existence.

Assessment: This is a useful source, although I’d rather have the full Nature investigation in order to determine the validity of the methodology used to study the similarities and differences between Wikipedia and Brittanica encyclopaedias. It’s a quick summary of the findings of that investigation, and a few insights and questions of concern from the author. I’d always rather have the original research so I can assure I am not reading someone else’s bias toward the findings.

Reflection: This article provides a summary of the findings from the Nature investigation, which is helpful. Rather than sifting through the entire list of outcomes, it’s helpful to have the details summarized. I think the results of this investigation begin to lay the foundation to understand the social and collaborative nature of creating knowledge, as opposed to providing information. I think that is a fundamental, underlying issue regarding this topic.

_________________________________________________________________

Cheri Tebeau

Professor Culik

English 1190-C1603

March 17, 2013

Wikipedia: Annotated Bibliography 2

Search Engine: Scholar.Google.com
Search terms: teach + wikipedia + knowledge

Summary: This article discusses a shift in the very definition of knowledge. It lays out what the author calls a Classical perspective of knowledge. This includes accurate interrelationships among facts, based on unbiased research that produces compelling evidence about systemic causes. He discusses how this definition of knowledge is changing due to Web 2.0 tools such as Wikipedia which help large numbers of people build online communities for creativity, collaboration, and sharing. This collaboration changes the Web 2.0 definition of knowledge to a collective agreement about a description that may combine facts with other dimensions of human experience, such as opinions, values, and spiritual beliefs. The shift in how knowledge is defined impacts teaching and the construction of knowledge. The author compares the Web 2.0 collaboration efforts to different types of governments, insinuating that it are similar to what we have in the U.S. – a representative democracy. The author looks to this example hoping that some similar synthesis about the nature of education can bridge Classical and Web 2.0 views of knowledge, expertise and learning.

Assessment: I think this is a very useful source. It is well cited, with 64 cites. The author articulated a very complex concept in very easy to understand way. Reading this article just clarified this entire assignment for me. It is really well written and discusses precisely the concepts that we are to evaluate in this assignment.

Reflection: This article addresses the construction of knowledge and the fact that it is changing. I really understood for the first time what this is all about. This shift in how knowledge is being constructed is threatening to those holding a classical view of knowledge, teaching and education. And while it is hard to imagine that this shift can be stopped, educators seem to be doing their best to slow it down. I like the author’s suggestion, that perhaps there is a way to
synthesize the two points of view to bridge the Classical and the Web 2.0 views of knowledge, expertise and learning to create a new point of view that maximizes the strengths and minimizes the problems of both.