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A Study of Citations to Wikipedia in Scholarly Publications
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ABSTRACT
The debate on using Wikipedia as a credible academic information resource is dynamic and controversial. This study used the Web of Science (WoS) database and its “Cited Reference” and “Analyze Results” tools to identify and examine trends in the use of Wikipedia citations in scholarly, peer-reviewed publications for the years from 2002 to 2015. Results indicate that the use of Wikipedia citations in peer-reviewed journals has been increasing since 2002. Given that Wikipedia is considered a nonauthoritative source, it might be assumed that this resource is frequently being cited in open access (OA) journals, which are sometimes considered less rigorous when it comes to publication standards. Alternatively, it might be assumed that Wikipedia is being used by scholars from lesser-quality institutions or from developing countries, where access to authoritative information resources might be limited. This study examines these assumptions and describes the disciplines, research fields, and types of journals that are accepting Wikipedia as an authoritative reference source, thereby increasing its credibility. This research is intended to fuel informed debate on the issue, which will contribute to improvement in scholarly communication.
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Introduction
Wikipedia, launched in January 2001, is a free open access (OA) online encyclopedia that anyone can edit (Wikipedia n.d.b.). As of June 2016, Wikipedia contains over 5 million articles in English and over 28 million registered users (Wikipedia n.d.d.). Moreover, Google has optimized its searches such that Wikipedia articles are placed close to or at the top of search results, allowing for fast and easy access to information. As of March 2016, Wikipedia is the seventh-most-accessed website on the Internet (Wikipedia n.d.a.).

Many articles on Wikipedia have studied its coverage (Halavais and Lackaff 2008; Holloway, Bozicevic, and Börner 2007; Keegan, Gergle, and Contractor 2013; Schweitzer 2008), content validity (Heilman and West 2015; Rand 2010; Wallace and Fleet 2005), accuracy and completeness (Brown 2011; Clauson et al. 2008; Giles 2006; Hasty et al. 2014; Kupferberg and...

The debate on using Wikipedia as a credible academic information resource is still dynamic and controversial. Some educators (Waters 2007) have explicitly banned citations to Wikipedia in their classes, while other educators have co-opted the tool for classroom instruction (Munger 2012). According to Pressley and McCallum (2008, 39), “Some librarians hate it, arguing that since anyone can edit it, it can’t be trusted. Others love it, because it is fast, easy to use, and a good starting point for research.” A study by Lim employed a web survey to investigate how and why students use Wikipedia and went on to say that “educators and librarians need to provide better guidelines for using Wikipedia, rather than prohibiting Wikipedia use altogether” (Lim 2009, 2200). Head and Eisenberg (2010) used focus groups and a survey to find out how and why students use Wikipedia. They found that architecture, engineering, and science majors were more likely to use Wikipedia for course-related research than other majors and went on to say that “Wikipedia 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 today’s students” (Head and Eisenberg 2010). Dooley conducted a survey and content analysis to find out how Wikipedia was used by faculty and concluded that “some university faculty members depend on Wikipedia in their teaching and published research despite the fact that they often discourage their students from using it” (Dooley 2010, 2).

A study by Tohidinasab and Jamali (2013) examined the motivations for citation to Wikipedia in scientific papers by analyzing articles indexed in the Scopus database. They identified 20 motivations for citing Wikipedia. The most frequent of these reasons are providing general information and definitions, facts, and figures. It was stated that “In 2012, the largest percentage of citations appeared in the Introduction” section of papers (Tohidinasab and Jamali 2013, 235).

Although faculty, librarians, and students are using Wikipedia for research, personal use, and assisting other students (Snyder 2010, 2013), the decision to go the extra mile and cite it in a peer-reviewed article can often pose a dilemma. Luyt et al. (2010) interviewed 26 librarians on their perception of Wikipedia and found that a slight majority of fourteen
librarians would not cite Wikipedia because it is not an authoritative source, anyone can edit it, and there are concerns with information accuracy. It was also noted that those librarians willing to cite Wikipedia were still reluctant, stating that it would be a last resort, that they would never cite Wikipedia as the sole source or that they would only cite Wikipedia if they believed the references were good.

Studying Wikipedia as a reference source in peer-reviewed and refereed journals via a quantitative examination of who, what, why, and where will provide a greater understanding of the impact of this resource in terms of its popularity and use, researchers’ judgments on the quality of information, and implied endorsement by scholarly publications.

Literature review

Although there have been studies examining Wikipedia from content to user groups analysis, few studies have examined the degree of Wikipedia referencing in peer-reviewed publications. A Web of Science (WoS) Core Collection search for “Citing Wikipedia” under the “Topic” field yielded thirty-five documents in June 2016.

Noruzi (2009) used WoS to find the number of citations to Wikipedia and discovered that the yearly distribution of Wikipedia citations increased from 2004 to 2007, while a decrease was observed from 2007 to 2009.

Brazzeal (2011) studied citations to Wikipedia in chemistry journals using publishers’ websites by searching for the term “Wikipedia.” Brazzeal (2011) concluded that, “while only a small percentage of all articles contained a citation to Wikipedia, it is in fact being cited as a credible information source in articles in major chemistry journals.”

Another study by Park (2011) used WoS and Scopus databases to analyze both research publications about Wikipedia and citations to Wikipedia. The study found 3,679 Wikipedia citations and concluded that the rate of Wikipedia citation has been increasing and that academic institutions cite Wikipedia most frequently. Countries with highest Wikipedia citation numbers were the United States, the United Kingdom, Germany, and China, and researchers in computer science, information science, and social sciences tended to cite Wikipedia in their publications. Park (2011) also stated that citations to Wikipedia occurred most frequently in journal articles and further goes on to say that “Wikipedia’s impact on scholarly communications appears to be stronger through citations to it rather than through publications about it” (Park 2011). Huggett (2012) replicated Park’s study by searching for “Wikipedia” in titles, keywords, or abstracts of scholarly papers using the Scopus database and noted a large increase of papers using Wikipedia as a source. Okoli et al. (2012) further stated that the “vast majority of such articles do not actually treat Wikipedia; they only cite it or mention it in passing.”
Marashi et al. (2013) searched for the word “Wikipedia” in the source title using the Scopus database to discover that the number of publications citing Wikipedia has been increasing from 2004 to 2010.

Bould et al. (2014) examined 1,433 health science articles that cited Wikipedia by placing the articles into thirteen different categories. They determined that only eighty-two citations (4 percent) were most appropriate, and these citations came from two of their assigned categories (i.e., citations about Wikipedia and citations where Wikipedia was used in methods). It was concluded that, “The apparent increase in the frequency of citations of Wikipedia may suggest a lack of understanding by authors, reviewers, or editors of the mechanisms by which Wikipedia evolves” (Bould et al. 2014, 4). Rasberry (2014, 6) went on further to say, “citing of Wikipedia not only shows a lack of recognition that Wikipedia is not a good source for citation but also signals a greater concern that some readers are failing to apply critical thinking to judge the quality of information they encounter.”

The Web of Science™ Core Collection is a part of ISI Web of Science produced by Thomson Reuters. This database indexes over 12,000 journals published worldwide, including OA journals. The database incorporates three major citation indexes—Science Citation Index (over 8,500 journals across 150 disciplines), Social Sciences Citation Index (over 3,000 journals across fifty-five social science disciplines), and Arts & Humanities Citation Index (over 1,700 journals) (Thomson Reuters n.d.a.). The object of this study is to use the Web of Science™ Core Collection to identify disciplines, research fields, and scholarly journals that have accepted Wikipedia as an authoritative reference. To our knowledge no studies have separated and compared Wikipedia citations from each of the three citation indexes in WoS. Patterns of publication in OA and non-OA journals were examined. Finally, patterns of publication by scholars’ institution and country of origin were examined. This research will provide insight into how the use of Wikipedia citations is evolving in scholarly literature.

Methodology

The WoS database was used to extract, classify, and compare publications that cite (i.e., reference) Wikipedia in the scholarly literature. Using the “Cited Reference Search” tool, the term “Wikipedia*” was used to search the “Cited Work” field within each of the indexes—Science Citation Index (1970–), Social Sciences Citation Index (1900–), and the Arts & Humanities Citation Index (1975–), between the years 2002 to 2015 inclusive. For purposes of this research, scholarly, peer-reviewed journal articles were separated from other document types. For comparison purposes, citations to Encyclopedia Britannica were also identified using the search string “Ency* Britannica*.”
The scholarly articles were classified as OA or non-OA articles using the OA refine feature, which identifies journals registered in the Directory of OA Access Journals (DOAJ). The citations were further studied using various WoS “Analyze Results” tools to identify research areas and scholars’ university affiliations and native country. All searches were conducted in June 2016.

Findings and discussion

Wikipedia citations

For the study period from 2002–2015, citations in approximately 16.6 million peer-reviewed articles across the three WoS citation indexes were searched. This research identified a total of 1,551 citations to Wikipedia (Table 1). (Since some journals are included in more than one citation index, approximately ten citations may be double-counted in this total). For the sake of expedient analysis, the authors assume one Wikipedia citation per article relationship. This suggests that approximately 0.0099% of scholarly articles contain a citation to Wikipedia. Statistically speaking, this is certainly not significant. However, a closer review of the raw data reveals some noteworthy trends.

The use of Wikipedia citations in scholarly journal articles has steadily increased in recent years. The total annual count of Wikipedia and Encyclopedia Britannica citations in articles indexed in the WoS is illustrated in Figure 1. During this period of time, Encyclopedia Britannica was cited more than Wikipedia. These findings are not unexpected since Encyclopedia

| Table 1. Research Areas with Highest Incidence of Wikipedia Citations, 2002–2015. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Research areas | # articles | Research areas | # articles | Research areas | # articles |
| Sciences | Social Sciences | Arts & Humanities |
| Computer Science | 209 | Information Science & Library Science | 106 | Literature | 78 |
| Engineering | 149 | Computer Science | 77 | Arts, Humanities & Other Topics | 31 |
| Chemistry | 49 | Psychology | 74 | Linguistics | 29 |
| Physics | 48 | Government Law | 57 | Philosophy | 19 |
| Mathematics | 43 | Education & Educational Research | 55 | Cultural studies | 17 |
| Science Technology & Other Topics | 34 | Business Economics | 46 | History | 16 |
| Telecommunications | 32 | Communication | 43 | Film, Radio & Television | 10 |
| Materials Science | 29 | Social Sciences & Other Topics | 40 | Asian Studies | 8 |
| Education & Educational Research | 23 | Sociology | 29 | Communication | 8 |
| Public Environmental & Occupational Health | 22 | Linguistics | 28 | Religion | 8 |
Britannica, first published in 1768, is a 246-year-old recognized authoritative source. However, the use of Wikipedia, a thirteen-year-old nonauthoritative source, has been increasing in frequency since 2002. These findings are consistent with previously published research (Huggett 2012; Marashi et al. 2013; Noruzi 2009; Park 2011). In fact, the total number of citations to Wikipedia has surpassed Encyclopedia Britannica in the last few years. Studies have shown that Wikipedia is cited more frequently than other free encyclopedias (Huggett 2012).

**Academic field**

Patterns in the use of Wikipedia citations were studied further by examining the frequency of citations in each of the three WoS indices—Sciences, Social Sciences, and Arts & Humanities. The Science Citation Index has the highest number of Wikipedia citations (764 articles), followed by the Social Sciences Citation Index (563 articles), while the Arts & Humanities Citation Index had the lowest number of Wikipedia citations (224 articles). While the rate of increase in citations to Wikipedia is most notable in the Sciences, it is clear from Figure 2 that all academic fields are using this resource with more frequency.

Within the three indexes, citations to Wikipedia are dispersed throughout various subject-specific disciplines and related scholarly journals (Table 1). In the Science Citation Index, the 764 citations to Wikipedia were found in 121 research areas. The highest numbers of Wikipedia citations were found in the Computer Science and Engineering disciplines, although the disciplines of Chemistry, Physics, Mathematics, and Information Science also made notable use of Wikipedia.
In the Social Sciences Citation Index, the 563 citations to Wikipedia were found in seventy-five research areas. The highest numbers of Wikipedia citations were found in the research areas of Information Science & Library Science, Computer Science, Psychology, Government Law, and Education. It is interesting to note that Library Science articles have a relatively high incidence of Wikipedia citations, given that information science professionals are among those most opposed to promoting Wikipedia as a reliable and authoritative source.

In the Arts & Humanities Citation Index, the 224 citations to Wikipedia were found in 39 research areas. The highest numbers of Wikipedia citations were found in the research areas of Literature, Linguistics, and Philosophy. These findings are consistent with previous studies (Huggett 2012; Park 2011; Tohidinasab and Jamali 2013).

Open access journals

One hypothesis for the increase in citations to Wikipedia is the increased publication of OA journals. Since many scholars view OA journals as little more than vanity press rather than quality, peer-reviewed publications (Tomaszewski, Poulin, and MacDonald 2013), an increase in citations to Wikipedia might be expected in these “lesser-quality” publications.

This study does not support this hypothesis. While the incidence of citations to Wikipedia in OA journal articles has steadily increased from zero articles in 2002 to a high of twenty-nine articles in 2012, the number of Wikipedia citations in non-OA journal articles also increased, from zero articles in 2002 to 252 articles in 2012 (Figure 3). It is clear that the greatest number of citations to Wikipedia are to be found in non-OA journals.
The practice of publishing citations to Wikipedia appears to be a fairly widespread phenomenon. As previously mentioned, the WoS database indexes over 12,000 journals worldwide. To be included in the indexes, journals must meet and maintain standards regarding peer-review, timeliness, and format of publication, ethical publishing practices, editorial content and citation impact, or impact factor (Thomson Reuters n.d.b.).

Each WoS index included several journals with one or more citations to Wikipedia. For some journals, multiple citations to Wikipedia were found for the thirteen-year period covered in this study. One or more citations to Wikipedia were found in 503 (approximately 4.2 percent) journals included in the Science Citation Index during the period of this study. Fifteen journals had five or more citations to Wikipedia. These journals included: *PLOS ONE* (sixteen articles), *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (thirteen articles), *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* (eleven articles), *Journal of Medical Internet Research* (eight articles), and *Microwave and Optical Technology Letters* (eight articles).

One or more citations to Wikipedia were found in 399 journals, or 4.5 percent of all journals included the Social Sciences Citation Index. Eleven journals had five or more citations to Wikipedia. These journals included: *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* (thirteen articles), *Computers in Human Behavior* (eight articles), *Information Communication Society* (eight articles), and *Information Research: An International Electronic Journal* (eight articles).
The Arts & Humanities Citation Index includes 170 journals, or 3.4 percent of the indexed journals, that allowed citations to Wikipedia. Three journals had five or more Wikipedia citations: *Episteme: A Journal of Individual and Social Epistemology* (six articles), *Biography: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly* (five articles), and *PMLA: Publications of The Modern Language Association of America* (five articles).

Table 2 lists the journals, along with associated impact factors, with the most citations to Wikipedia for each citation index. The fact that the editors and reviewers of these journals are publishing articles with these citations seems to imply that they have accepted Wikipedia as a credible source of information.

**Institutional affiliation**

The majority of Wikipedia citations are in articles written by authors affiliated with academic institutions, many of which are notable universities from around the world. Table 3 lists the institutions where scholars have generated the highest incidence of Wikipedia citations. This list includes such respected institutions as New York University, Harvard, Northwestern, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Ohio State, and Purdue, among others.

**Country of origin**

Another hypothesis is that the ease of access to Wikipedia may be a determining factor for the increase in Wikipedia citations, particularly for scholars in developing countries where access to information is either restricted or unavailable due to lack of finance. To examine this hypothesis, the authors reviewed the data supplied by the WoS and identified the country of each author for all the articles that used a citation to Wikipedia.

This research found that articles with one or more citations to Wikipedia have been authored by scholars from virtually every country in the world. The greatest number of citations, however, have been generated by scholars from the United States and other economically advanced countries (Table 4).

**Limitations of the study and future studies**

The study was limited to journals indexed in the WoS database. Individual articles within the disciplines were not qualitatively studied. This study did not analyze other publication types such as book chapters, book reviews, editorials, letters, and proceedings papers. Further, the reasoning as to why researchers from different disciplines cite Wikipedia and why editors allow Wikipedia to be cited in their journals was not investigated and may be worthy of further study.
Table 2. Five-Year Impact Factor (IF) for Journals with Five or More Wikipedia Citations, 2002–2015*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sciences</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>Social Sciences</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Humanities</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>IF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sciences</strong></td>
<td>PLOS ONE</td>
<td>3.702</td>
<td>Journal of the American Society for</td>
<td>Information Science and Technology</td>
<td>2.302</td>
<td>Episteme: A Journal of Individual and</td>
<td>Social Epistemology</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology</td>
<td>2.302</td>
<td>Computers in Human Behavior</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biography: An Interdisciplinary Quarterly</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lecture Notes in Computer Science</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Information Communication Society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>PMLA: Publications of the Modern Language Association of America</td>
<td></td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Medical Internet Research</td>
<td>4.489</td>
<td>Information Research: An International Electronic Journal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Microwave and Optical Technology Letters</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>PLOS ONE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Energy Conversion and Management</td>
<td>4.512</td>
<td>International Journal of Human Computer Interaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Explore: The Journal of Science and Healing</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Journal of Information Science</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>International Journal of Human Computer Interaction</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Information Science</td>
<td>1.514</td>
<td>International Journal of Communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Journal of the Medical Library Association</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Computers Security</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Library Trends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expert Systems with Applications</td>
<td>2.571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Chemical Education</td>
<td>1.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Journal of Universal Computer Science</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Review of Hypermedia and Multimedia</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*N/A = Not applicable.
### Table 3. Organizations with Highest Incidence of Wikipedia Citations, 2002–2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Sciences # articles</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Social Sciences # articles</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Arts &amp; Humanities # articles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>NYU</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>CUNY</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Harvard University</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Karl Franzens University</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>National University of Singapore</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tsinghua University</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ohio State University</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of California, Irvine</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCL</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Oxford</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Amsterdam</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Maryland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of British Columbia</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Toronto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>University of Tennessee</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>City University of Hong Kong</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdue University</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>MIT</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Academy of Sciences</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>National University of Singapore</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical University of Denmark</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of California, Berkeley</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Texas at Austin</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>University of New South Wales</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Ottawa</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

In its own entry entitled “Citing Wikipedia,” the online encyclopedia states: “For many purposes, but particularly in academia, Wikipedia may not be an acceptable source” (Wikipedia n.d.c.). Despite this cautionary warning, citations to Wikipedia in scholarly publications have been increasing since 2002. This research indicates that the trend is universal. It cannot be attributed to any particular academic discipline; to OA publication; to research published in poor-quality journals, from poor-quality academic institutions, or from economically disadvantaged countries. Wikipedia citations can be found in high-impact journals and in articles produced by scholars from notable academic institutions. When these scholars cite Wikipedia, they affirm the credibility of the information; reviewers and journal editors who deem these citations credible for peer-reviewed publication implicitly endorse Wikipedia as an authoritative source. The authors feel this trend cannot be reversed. The use of Wikipedia in scholarly research will only increase.
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