

Students' Perception of Wikipedia as an Academic Information Source

Ahmed Shafkat Sunvy^{1*}, Raiyan Bin Reza^{2*} 

^{1,2}. Graduate Student, Department of Information Science and Library Management, University of Dhaka

*Corresponding author: Shafkatsunvy@gmail.com

Abstrak

Wikipedia telah menjadi bagian integral dari pendidikan belakangan ini. Namun kredibilitas dan kemampuannya untuk berfungsi sebagai sumber daya akademik yang efisien masih menjadi perhatian. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengevaluasi persepsi mahasiswa Bangladesh terhadap Wikipedia sebagai sumber informasi. Untuk penelitian kuantitatif ini, penulis menggunakan kuesioner terstruktur dengan pertanyaan tertutup untuk mengumpulkan data. Sebanyak 336 siswa dari beberapa institusi Bangladesh yang dipilih dengan menggunakan metode random sampling menjadi populasi penelitian ini. Data yang terkumpul dianalisis dengan menggunakan IBM SPSS Statistics 25. Uji Kruskal Wallis dan Mann-Whitney U digunakan untuk menguji hipotesis. Studi ini menemukan bahwa siswa secara teratur menggunakan Wikipedia untuk tugas akademik dan tugas kelas mereka. Sebagian besar siswa (N=296, 88,1%) menganggap Wikipedia pantas digunakan dalam konteks studi universitas. Studi ini adalah upaya pertama di Bangladesh untuk menyelidiki seberapa sering dan mengapa mahasiswa menggunakan Wikipedia dalam karya akademis mereka dan apakah mereka menganggap Wikipedia kredibel, akurat, dan relevan dengan pendidikan mereka. Penelitian ekstensif oleh penulis telah menunjukkan bahwa ada banyak aspek Wikipedia yang membuatnya cocok untuk proses belajar-mengajar, yang membuatnya menjadi topik yang bermanfaat untuk dipelajari lebih lanjut.

Kata kunci: Wikipedia, Bangladesh, Mahasiswa, Akademisi.

Abstract

Wikipedia has become an integral part of education in recent times. But its credibility and its ability to serve as an efficient academic resource is still a matter of concern. This study aims to evaluate Bangladeshi students' perception of Wikipedia as an information resource. For this quantitative research, the authors used a structured questionnaires with close ended questions to collect data. A total of 336 students from several Bangladeshi institutions chosen using random sampling method were the population for this study. The collected data were analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 25. Kruskal Wallis and Mann-Whitney U tests were used to test the hypothesis. The study found that students regularly used Wikipedia for their academic work and classroom assignments. A majority of the students (N=296, 88.1%) deemed it appropriate to use Wikipedia in the context of university studies. This study is the first attempt in Bangladesh to investigate how frequently and why university students use Wikipedia in their academic work and whether they deem Wikipedia credible, accurate and relevant to their education. Extensive research by the authors has shown that there are many aspects of Wikipedia that make it suitable for the learning-teaching process, which makes it a fruitful topic for further study.

Keywords: Wikipedia, Bangladesh, University Students, Academia.

History:

Received : January 19, 2022

Revised : January 20, 2022

Accepted : April 06, 2023

Published : April 25, 2023

Publisher: Undiksha Press

Licensed: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 License



1. INTRODUCTION

Regardless of how easy it is to incorporate digital technologies in the educational setting, there are some arguments over using Web-based applications and materials for educational use, for example Wikipedia. Wikipedia, co-founded by Larry Sanger and Jimmy Wales in early 2001, is a non-profit, multidisciplinary, online encyclopedia that is completely created by volunteers. Wales has earlier launched Nupedia, a similar venture. It was an encyclopedia that was accessible over the internet with submissions prepared by professionals that was open-source, implying that anybody can utilize, share, duplicate, and change it. Wikipedia, which is more than twenty-one years old, already has 55 million articles in 309 languages, including more than 6.4 million in English (Druck & Miklan, 2008; Flanagan & Metzger, 2011; Garrison, 2018). Wikipedia identifies itself as a wiki-based,

openly modifiable online encyclopedia with stuff that is accessible for free. Users can write and edit articles, but only in certain circumstances can they alter them. Since its debut in 2001, it has established itself as a standard tool for formal and informal learning, as well as pleasure. The educational value of Wikipedia has just recently been acknowledged by academics, regardless of the fact that it has been operating since 2001. Previous study have written a thorough guide on how to use Wikipedia in higher education (Bayliss, 2013; Zou et al., 2020). This guide contains categories of potential tasks including critical analysis of current articles, expanding and improving current articles, and developing new entries, among other things. The popularity of Wikipedia among students may also be attributed to its abundance of the kind of background material required for the successful production of research. According to previous study Wikipedia's transparent and participatory character encourages readers to challenge the information they are reading in a manner that expert-driven, static reference materials do not (Kuhlthau, 2004). In recent years, the use of Wikipedia in education has been put into practice in a significant number of instances and has spread to become a widespread practice. Wikipedia is currently an incorporated perspective in the scholastic obligations of bachelor degree students in Australia (Evenstein Sigalov & Nachmias, 2017; Soler-Adillon et al., 2018). Undergrads use Wikipedia related to different pedigrees of information, and it fits their demands as far as inclusion, currency, comfort, and integrity. The authors came to the conclusion that these criteria outweighed the information's reliability (or lack thereof) (Head & Eisenberg, 2010; Selwyn & Gorard, 2016).

Students had a pleasant experience with Wikipedia, but were only to some degree content with the quality and precision of the substance. The Wikipedia content was contemporary, and the students used references and connections to find further information (Kim & Sin, 2011; Lim, 2009). Students assessed Wikipedia as a secondary source giving a prologue to the theme in an examination done by on their impressions of its usefulness. Students in higher education were discovered to use Wikipedia more frequently. There is a substantial corpus of research that looks into undergraduate students' behavior when completing research for class assignments. The dispute over institutions' roles in promoting Wikipedia can bring to light ideological and cultural goals that may or may not struggle with Wikipedia's lack of bias, as well as the foundation's own advancement and worldwide prominence (Hale, 2015; Lages et al., 2016; Miquel-Ribé & Laniado, 2016). The views of both the faculties they attend and their classmates affect how much students rely on Wikipedia. Despite the fact that Wikipedia's breadth and size continue to expand, instructors and school librarians remain concerned about students' usage of Wikipedia for research.

Previous study investigated how classroom instructors and librarians perceive the impact of students' usage of Wikipedia on the quality of their research projects, as well as the need for a school policy governing Wikipedia use (Polk et al., 2015). The findings clearly imply that education, rather than restricted access, is the key to properly interacting with Wikipedia. Since University students more often do research online, many professors who give research-focused homework in their classes have found that Wikipedia is their worst enemy. Numerous studies that looked at how and why students used Wikipedia also looked at the factors that influenced their decision. Although students utilized Wikipedia for a variety of purposes as previous study stated that the majority of respondents were drawn to it solely for its information utility (Head & Eisenberg, 2010). Wikipedia, on the one hand, gives a chance to teach pupils, but it also raises questions about its veracity and research (Garrison, 2018; Selwyn & Gorard, 2016). There are certain things that people don't recognize, such as the fact that Wikipedia has the same format as a blog and that the truth must be reviewed. Although Wikipedia's collaborative openness is one of the reasons for its success, it also serves as a source of vandalism, prejudice, and mistake, among other issues. Wikipedia has been vigorously scrutinized by scholastics. Some detractors interpreted it as proof that

mediocrity had triumphed over skill (Druck & Miklan, 2008; Lim, 2009). In Hong Kong in 2013, the usefulness and veracity of Wikipedia information were investigated. The relationship between data helpfulness and reception was completely intervened by trust, which assumed a critical part in impacting data reception. While many users believe that the presentation of content on many free websites is more accessible than private databases' thesaurus and field searches, the material may not be inspected to the same extent as their counterparts that have been modified or peer-reviewed. Wikipedia does not include original research, unlike academic journal articles (Shen et al., 2013; Xiao & Askin, 2014). That is why it is often regarded as an inferior or a dubious source.

Although Wikipedia could be applied in numerous ways to aid students in developing their analytical and academic writing abilities (Konieczny, 2016; Wallace & Van Fleet, 2005). Teachers and school librarians continue to be concerned about kids using Wikipedia for research despite the site's continued expansion in terms of both scope and scale. There are several elements of Wikipedia that make it a worthwhile subject for future study, according to extensive current research in the area. However, there hasn't been any research into the phenomenon of using Wikipedia for academic purposes in Bangladesh. As Wikipedia is so intimately related to academic pursuits, more research is required to determine its benefits, flaws, and academic potential as well as students' perceptions of its value as a source of academic information. The purpose of this research was to analyze students favored Wikipedia and if they trusted it.

2. METHODS

The study is quantitative in nature and thus paper employed questionnaire survey method to acquire the information regarding student's perception and experience with Wikipedia. The target population were the students from various universities of Bangladesh, with the majority of the students from University of Dhaka. To gather information from the students, a standardized questionnaire was employed, which was designed using Google forms incorporating 15 close ended questions. Five-point Likert scale and Seven-point Likert scale questions were included to gather responses from the students. All of the questions were self-developed by the investigators. The questionnaire was divided into three sections. Through the first section, demographic and academic data of the students were collected; the second section included questions on students' perception of Wikipedia as an academic resource; and the third part of the questionnaire contained questions about students' affiliation with Wikipedia. The students were given the questionnaire through various social media channels, such as Facebook, Messenger, WhatsApp and Gmail. The questionnaire was pilot tested before starting the original survey.

The data collection process took a period of one month, from the last week of December 2021 to the last week of January 2022. During this time, 336 responses were collected and analyzed using IBM SPSS Statistics 25. A random sampling method was used to collect the data. To measure students' agreement with the perceptions of Wikipedia's credibility among students, they were asked to rate each item on a seven-point Likert scale ranging from Strongly disagree to Strongly agree. To obtain descriptive measures, the authors performed frequency counts and percentages. To examine the influence of students' gender on their preference and usage of Wikipedia, separate Mann-Whitney U and Kruskal-Wallis nonparametric tests were performed.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This survey had 336 respondents in total. Amidst them, 227 were males and 109 were females. The largest group of participants had bachelor's degree 301, followed by those with postgraduate degree 35. The respondents' demographic profile is show in [Table 1](#).

Table 1. The Respondents' Demographic Profile

Demographic/personal characteristics	Frequency (N=336)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	227	67.6
Female	109	32.4
Education	----	----
Undergraduate	301	89.6
Graduate	35	10.4
Wikipedia Usage	----	----
Sometimes	146	43.5
Frequently	98	29.2
Always	42	12.5
Rarely	45	12.4
Never	5	1.5
Academic Use of Wikipedia	----	----
Yes	296	88.1
No	40	10.9
Experience with Wikipedia	----	----
Very satisfied	25	7.4
Satisfied	200	59.5
Neutral	98	29.2
Dissatisfied	11	3.3
Very dissatisfied	2	0.6
Recommending Wikipedia	----	----
Extremely likely	27	8
Likely	160	47.6
Neutral	99	29.5
Unlikely	44	13.1
Extremely unlikely	6	1.8

Base on [Table 1](#), the frequency and percentage of participants' Wikipedia use in their academic work was measured. The highest number of participants reported that they sometimes use Wikipedia in their academic work. But there is a few respondents said that they never use Wikipedia in their academic work. The frequency and percentage of participants' opinion on whether the consideration of Wikipedia is correct in the context of University studies was also measured. The highest number of participants 296 (88.1%) reported in the affirmative, while only 40 (11.9%) participants stated that they thought Wikipedia was not appropriate in the context of University studies. The highest number of participants 200 (59.5%) reported that they were satisfied with Wikipedia, while 98 (29.2%) respondents were neutral in their opinions. 25 (7.4%) students admitted to being very satisfied, while 11 (3.3%) students stated that they were dissatisfied with Wikipedia as an academic resource. But 2 (0.6) respondents said that they were very dissatisfied with

Wikipedia as an academic resource Respondents were asked in what stage of their assignment/classwork they turned to Wikipedia. The result is show in [Table 2](#).

Table 2. Stage of Using Wikipedia

Query	Response	Frequency (N=336)	(%)
In what stage of your classwork/assignment do you usually turn to Wikipedia?	I use Wikipedia to get a preliminary idea of my assignment	175	52.1
	I use Wikipedia to make up for the lack of material in traditional resources	71	21.1
	I use Wikipedia to find the current data on that specific topic	81	24.1
	I rely on Wikipedia to find citations for my work	9	2.7

Base on [Table 2](#) more than half of the respondents 175 (52.1%) said that they use Wikipedia to get a preliminary idea of their assignment. 81 (24.1%) participants reported that they use Wikipedia to find the current data on that specific topic, while 71 (21.1%) respondents reported that they used Wikipedia to make up for the lack of material in traditional resources. Only 9 (2.7%) participants admitted to relying on Wikipedia to find citations for their work.

Using a five-point Likert scale, the study evaluated the frequency and percentage of respondents' confidence about their ability to search an unknown topic in Wikipedia documents was also measured. The result of measured is show in [Table 3](#).

Table 3. Confidence in Wikipedia

Query	Response	Frequency (N=336)	(%)
How confident do you feel about researching a completely unknown topic in Wikipedia?	Not very confident	78	23.2
	Confident	164	48.8
	Very confident	33	9.8
	Not at all confident	23	6.8
	Not sure	38	11.3

Base on [Table 3](#), almost half of the respondents 164 (48.5%) stated that they were confident about their ability to search an unknown topic in Wikipedia. But 78(23.2%) participants admitted to being not very confident, Again 38(11.3%) students admitted to being not sure, Some (23 ,6.8%) admitted to being not at all confident, while 33 (9.8%) participants said they felt very confident in identifying bias in Wikipedia documents. A seven-point Likert scale was used to measure the frequency and percentage of participants' agreement on factors like Overall information in Wikipedia is verifiable elsewhere. The result is show in [Table 4](#).

Table 4. Credibility of Wikipedia Among Student

Statements	Strongly agree Freq. (%)	Agree Freq. (%)	More or less agree Freq. (%)	Undecided Freq. (%)	More or less disagree Freq. (%)	Disagree Freq. (%)	Strongly disagree Freq. (%)
The vast majority of Wikipedia's content can be verified elsewhere	44 (13.1)	178 (53)	68 (20.2)	31 (9.2)	11 (3.3)	3 (0.9)	1 (0.3)
Overall information in Wikipedia is reliable	28 (8.3)	177 (52.7)	86 (25.6)	21 (6.2)	15 (4.5)	7 (2.1)	2 (0.6)
Wikipedia articles provide key information about a subject	42 (12.5)	190 (56.5)	64 (19)	29 (8.6)	5 (1.5)	4 (1.2)	2 (0.6)
Wikipedia articles offer viewpoints objectively and without prejudice	30 (8.9)	139 (41.3)	86 (25.6)	43 (12.8)	17 (5.1)	13 (3.9)	8 (2.4)
Overall Wikipedia articles are trustworthy	33 (9.8)	166 (49.4)	83 (24.7)	23 (6.8)	13 (3.9)	15 (4.5)	3 (0.9)
Overall Wikipedia articles are believable	32 (9.5)	174 (51.8)	78 (23.2)	30 (8.9)	10 (2.9)	11 (3.3)	1 (0.3)

Base on [Table 4](#), overall Wikipedia articles include major facts about the topic and Overall Wikipedia articles are trustworthy. Then Kruskal-Wallis test was applied to determine the connection between various factors and users' frequency of Wikipedia use in their academic work. In agreement with the test, Wikipedia's appearance on first pages during search results has a significant impact on how regularly users use Wikipedia in their academic work ($p=.408$). There is also a relationship between a plethora of information being available in Wikipedia and users' regularity in using Wikipedia for their academic work ($p=.149$). A connection can also be established between students' frequency of Wikipedia use in their academic work and their perception of Wikipedia as a way of getting background

information on a particular subject ($p=.159$). But no such relationship can be found between students' regularity in Wikipedia use and factors like Wikipedia's dynamic nature ($p=.043$), Wikipedia's suitability for university students ($p=.000$), the majority of teachers approving students' use of Wikipedia for academic assignments ($p=.042$), teachers' consideration of Wikipedia to be a reliable source of knowledge ($p=.020$) and authenticity of overall Wikipedia content ($p=.050$). A remarkable influence of Wikipedia being a reputable source of information can be found on how often students use Wikipedia in their academic work ($p=.411$). The full result is show in [Table 5](#).

Table 5. Kruskal Wallis Test on Preference of Using Wikipedia

Statements	Never Mean Rank	Rarely Mean Rank	Sometime s Mean Rank	Frequentl y Mean Rank	Always Mean Rank	Test Statisti c	p- valu e
Compared to printed materials, Wikipedia is more dynamic	119.70	196.26	170.39	166.23	143.31	9.871	0.043
Information about a plethora of subjects is probably available in Wikipedia	187.00	179.70	169.40	173.89	138.61	6.760	0.149
University students believe that Wikipedia is appropriate for them	138.50	198.59	174.39	168.04	120.43	20.120	0.000
Young users have a great deal of faith in Wikipedia and see it as a seal of legitimacy and authority since it often appears on the first page of search engine results	125.90	171.0	170.05	175.76	148.48	3.988	0.408
Students	159.40	189.22	167.45	171.71	143.52	6.593	0.15

Statements	Never Mean Rank	Rarely Mean Rank	Sometime s Mean Rank	Frequentl y Mean Rank	Always Mean Rank	Test Statisti c	p- valu e
consider Wikipedia as a resource for obtaining background information on a particular subject							9
The majority of my teachers approve my use of Wikipedia for academic assignments	145.10	196.99	162.36	177.05	142.17	9.931	0.04 2
Many of my teachers consider Wikipedia to be a reliable source of knowledge	132.40	194.82	161.48	181.32	139.08	11.713	0.02 0
The vast majority of Wikipedia's content can be verified elsewhere	91.50	192.76	169.07	169.56	147.24	9.496	0.05 0
Wikipedia is a reputable source of information	169.60	183.59	167.07	172.76	147.26	3.963	0.41 1
Wikipedia articles provide key information about a subject	114.30	200.83	163.39	174.12	144.94	12.035	0.01 7
Wikipedia articles offer viewpoints objectively	110.60	199.52	166.72	169.99	144.87	9.813	0.04 4

Statements	Never Mean Rank	Rarely Mean Rank	Sometime s Mean Rank	Frequentl y Mean Rank	Always Mean Rank	Test Statisti c	p- valu e
and without prejudice							
The majority of Wikipedia articles are reliable	193.90	193.29	168.05	170.32	136.21	9.212	0.056
Most entries on Wikipedia are trustworthy	178.20	199.24	166.50	172.02	133.15	12.171	0.016
What would you say about Wikipedia as a source for academic purposes?	185.10	232.10	160.51	160.69	144.39	30.955	0.000
How likely are you to suggest Wikipedia as a source of knowledge to your friends or coworkers?	137.50	133.46	172.51	170.48	191.18	10.356	0.035

Then data is process with Mann Whitney U test for measuring the role of gender in using Wikipedia. The result found significant differences between gender and Wikipedia's dynamic nature, significant differences between gender and Wikipedia providing information about a plethora of subjects were found. There are significant differences between gender and university students' belief that Wikipedia is appropriate for them. It was also found significant differences between gender and the appearance of Wikipedia in the first page of search results exist. The full result is show in [Table 6](#).

Table 6. Mann Whitney U Test

Statements	Mann- Whitney U	Wilcox on W	Test Statistic	Standar d Error	Standardi zed Test Statistic	p- valu e
Compared to printed materials, Wikipedia is more dynamic	12,100.500	37,978.500	12,100.500	744.275	-0.364	0.716
Information about a plethora of subjects is	11,373.000	37,251.000	11,373.000	721.989	-1.383	0.167

probably available in Wikipedia							
University students believe that Wikipedia is appropriate for them	12,258.500	38,136.500	12,258.500	734.454	-0.154	0.878	
Young users have a great deal of faith in Wikipedia and see it as a seal of legitimacy and authority since it often appears on the first page of search engine results	11,544.000	37,422.000	11,544.000	765.343	-1.081	0.280	
Students consider Wikipedia as a resource for obtaining background information on a particular subject	12,289.000	38,167.000	12,289.000	725.418	-0.114	0.909	
The majority of my teachers approve my use of Wikipedia for academic assignments	12,089.500	37,967.500	12,089.500	775.213	-0.364	0.716	
Many of my teachers consider Wikipedia to be a reliable source of knowledge	12,012.500	37,890.500	12,012.500	782.326	-0.459	0.646	
The vast majority of Wikipedia's content can be verified elsewhere	11,787.000	37,665.000	11,787.000	763.983	-0.765	0.444	
Wikipedia is a reputable source of information	11,596.000	37,474.000	11,596.000	762.234	-1.017	0.309	
Wikipedia articles provide key information about a subject	12,163.000	38,041.000	12,163.000	750.078	-0.278	0.781	
Wikipedia articles offer viewpoints objectively and without prejudice	11,341.500	37,219.500	11,341.500	794.943	-1.296	0.195	
The majority of Wikipedia articles are reliable	11,352.000	37,230.000	11,352.000	774.352	-1.317	0.188	
Most entries on Wikipedia are	10,924.000	36,802.000	10,924.000	767.163	-1.887	0.059	

trustworthy						
What would you say about Wikipedia as a source for academic purposes?	11,050.500	36,928.500	11,050.500	728.542	-1.813	0.070
How likely are you to suggest Wikipedia as a source of knowledge to your friends or coworkers?	12,385.000	38,263.000	12,385.000	774.688	0.017	0.986

Discussion

Academic librarians have been able to supply users with an ever-expanding range of capabilities and depth of high-quality data thanks to the growing adoption of electronic formats for information resources. Some professors have taken on the role of author by generating and revising sections in their disciplines, additionally allotting students to deal with Wikipedia pages (Chao & Lo, 2011; Soules, 2015). Developing digital competencies, in particular Data Literacy, Communication and Alliance capacities, Electronic Content Design, and intrinsic drive to study, are among the most intriguing. From this final perspective, students have announced a serious level of inspiration in various literary investigations, both to finish the task and to learn more about the themes in question. They also appreciate the effort significantly more than some other composed exercise or task since they see themselves as not only Wikipedia clients, but also top notch data suppliers, knowing that the encyclopedia pages are public and might be viewed by thousands of people. This understanding may be extremely powerful for learning processes that are based on innate drive (Jemielniak & Aibar, 2016; Rafaeli, S., & Ariel, 2008).

Wikipedia's key distinguishing feature, its open nature, has boosted its popularity while also raising suspicions about its legitimacy as a source of perspective asset. Since anybody might compose or alter a Wikipedia page, the site's main analysis is on its authority and impartiality of the data's sources and creators. Previous study examined Wikipedia using Bill Katz's reference source evaluation standards and confirmed that to make the site a trustworthy reference source, they actually have quite far to go (Wallace & Van Fleet, 2005). While some believe that Wikipedia is more accurate than other encyclopedias, others have raised concerns about its use in the academic curriculum. Multiple research looked into how people assess the reliability of internet information (Giles, 2005). The phrases "validity," "faith," and "authority" were regularly used in the indicated examinations. The three thoughts of authority, validity, and faith are all multi-faceted, convoluted, and acknowledged in an unexpected way (Kelton et al., 2008; Okoli et al., 2014). The level of trust in Wikipedia and different reference books, for example, Britannica has been explored. Britannica articles were deemed more credible than those of Wikipedia (Flanagin & Metzger, 2011; Kubiszewski et al., 2011). These analyses uncover that it isn't owing to the articles' characteristic quality. The source's notoriety impacted the clients. Britannica take advantage of its extensive history of credit and acknowledgment from academic organizations, whereas Wikipedia's advancement philosophy is considered to be less ameliorating. These benefits include its position as a showcase for student authors to the wider public as state by previous study (Purdy, 2009). Wikipedia editing assignments used to be mostly reserved for professors who operate in the realms of science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM), but lately, the extent of these initiatives has grown to encompass social sciences and humanities. According to previous study a 2016 Australian survey, 87.5 percent of students used Wikipedia on a

regular basis as a part of their university education, as well as their perceptions of its value improved as their degree of education increased (LaFrance & Calhoun, 2012). Information Literacy, decisive reasoning, media education, cooperation, online correspondence, composing, and basic advanced proficiency abilities are all encouraged through this active and collaborative instructional approach (Barry & Schamber, 1998; Calkins & Kelley, 2009; Maglaughlin & Sonnenwald, 2002).

This study is the first of its kind to look at the frequency with which university students employ Wikipedia and if they find this approach helpful. The implication of this study provide overview related to students' perceptions of Wikipedia's legitimacy based on the context of the issue and the findings of prior study, which emphasized Wikipedia's rise as a vital component in higher education. The analysis also provides circumstantial evidence for instructors' perceptions of Wikipedia as a scholarly data resource. The authors of this study believe that it will serve as a foundation for further inquiry into how Wikipedia is used in academic settings and how it impacts learning.

4. CONCLUSION

Open article approach of Wikipedia and it's far and wide use on university grounds, habitually instead of rigorous study. Several examinations show that Wikipedia has acquired prevalence as a scholarly asset. Students, teachers, scientists are utilizing Wikipedia generally. Wikipedia is by and large utilized for getting data on familiar subjects and not so much for new and intriguing issues. At the university levels, it is intriguing to take note of the differentiation between a higher recurrence of purpose of Wikipedia and a low pace of reference of this source. The positive encounters youngsters amass while involving themselves in Wikipedia have not yet raised it to social acknowledgment in the instructive circle. According to this viewpoint, the cooperative reference book has not, yet, arrived at the degree of information establishment.

5. REFERENCES

- Barry, C. L., & Schamber, L. (1998). Users' criteria for relevance evaluation: A cross-situational comparison. *Information Processing & Management*, 34(2), 219–236. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4573\(97\)00078-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0306-4573(97)00078-2).
- Bayliss, G. (2013). Exploring the cautionary attitude toward Wikipedia in higher education: Implications for higher education institutions. *New Review of Academic Librarianship*, 19(1), 36–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13614533.2012.740439>.
- Calkins, S., & Kelley, M. R. (2009). Who Writes the Past? Student Perceptions of Wikipedia Knowledge and Credibility in a World History Classroom. *Journal on Excellence in College Teaching*, 20(3), 123–143. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ883735>.
- Chao, Y. C. J., & Lo, H. C. (2011). Students' perceptions of Wiki-based collaborative writing for learners of English as a foreign language. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 19(4), 395–411. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10494820903298662>.
- Druck, G., & Miklan, L. (2008). Learning to predict the quality of contributions to wikipedia. *Wiki*, 8, 7–12. <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Learning-to-Predict-the-Quality-of-Contributions-to-Druck-Miklau/029c4971f7edd68c667baf15de392dbf104072f7>.
- Evenstein Sigalov, S., & Nachmias, R. (2017). Wikipedia as a platform for impactful learning: A new course model in higher education. *Education and Information Technologies*, 22, 2959–2979. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-016-9564-z>.
- Flanagin, A. J., & Metzger, M. J. (2011). FROM ENCYCLOPÆDIA BRITANNICA TO

- WIKIPEDIA: Generational differences in the perceived credibility of online encyclopedia information. *Information, Communication & Society*, 14(3), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2010.542823>.
- Garrison, J. C. (2018). Instructor and peer influence on college student use and perceptions of Wikipedia. *The Electronic Library*, 36(2), 237–257. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EL-02-2017-0034>.
- Giles, J. (2005). Internet encyclopaedias go head to head. *Nature*, 438(70), 900–901. <https://doi.org/10.1038/438900a>.
- Hale, S. A. (2015). Cross-language wikipedia editing of okinawa, japan. *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 183–192. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702346>.
- Head, A. J., & Eisenberg, M. B. (2010). How today's college students use Wikipedia for course-related research. *First Monday*, 15(3). <https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v15i3.2830>.
- Jemielniak, D., & Aibar, E. (2016). Bridging the gap between wikipedia and academia. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(7), 1773–1776. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23691>.
- Kelton, K., Fleischmann, K. R., & Wallace, W. A. (2008). Trust in digital information. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 59(3), 363–374. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.20722>.
- Kim, K.-S., & Sin, S.-C. J. (2011). Selecting quality sources: Bridging the gap between the perception and use of information sources. *Journal of Information Science*, 37(2), 178–188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551511400958>.
- Konieczny, P. (2016). Teaching with Wikipedia in a 21 st -century classroom: Perceptions of Wikipedia and its educational benefits. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 67(7), 1523–1534. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23616>.
- Kubiszewski, I., Noordewier, T., & Costanza, R. (2011). Perceived credibility of Internet encyclopedias. *Computers & Education*, 56(3), 659–667. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2010.10.008>.
- Kuhlthau, C. C. (2004). *Seeking meaning: A process approach to library and information services*. CT: Libraries Unlimited.
- LaFrance, J., & Calhoun, D. W. (2012). Student Perceptions of Wikipedia as a Learning Tool for Educational Leaders. *International Journal of Educational Leadership Preparation*, 7(2). <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ973790>.
- Lages, J., Patt, A., & Shepelyansky, D. L. (2016). Wikipedia ranking of world universities. *The European Physical Journal*, 89(3), 69. <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjb/e2016-60922-0>.
- Lim, S. (2009). How and why do college students use Wikipedia? *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 60(11), 2189–2202. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.21142>.
- Maglaughlin, K. L., & Sonnenwald, D. H. (2002). User perspectives on relevance criteria: A comparison among relevant, partially relevant, and not-relevant judgments. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 53(5), 327–342. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.10049>.
- Miquel-Ribé, M., & Laniado, D. (2016). Cultural identities in wikipedias. *Proceedings of the 7th 2016 International Conference on Social Media & Society - SMSociety '16*, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2930971.2930996>.
- Okoli, C., Mehdi, M., Mesgari, M., Nielsen, F. Å., & Lanamäki, A. (2014). Wikipedia in the eyes of its beholders: A systematic review of scholarly research on Wikipedia readers and readership. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 65(12), 2381–2403. <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.23162>.

- Polk, T., Johnston, M. P., & Evers, S. (2015). Wikipedia use in research: Perceptions in secondary schools. *TechTrends*, 59(3), 92–102. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11528-015-0858-6>.
- Purdy, J. P. (2009). When the tenets of composition go public: A study of writing in Wikipedia. *College Composition and Communication*, 61(2). <https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/When-the-Tenets-of-Composition-Go-Public%3A-A-Study-Purdy/2b062d4bc59a10f051acad2bd2a0ed678812e625>.
- Rafaeli, S., & Ariel, Y. (2008). Online motivational factors: Incentives for participation and contribution in Wikipedia. *Psychological Aspects of Cyberspace: Theory, Research, Applications*, 2(8), 243–267. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511813740.012>.
- Selwyn, N., & Gorard, S. (2016). Students' use of Wikipedia as an academic resource—Patterns of use and perceptions of usefulness. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 28, 28–34. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2015.08.004>.
- Shen, X.-L., Cheung, C. M. K., & Lee, M. K. O. (2013). What leads students to adopt information from Wikipedia? An empirical investigation into the role of trust and information usefulness: Trust in students' information adoption from Wikipedia. *British Journal of Educational Technology*, 44(3), 502–517. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8535.2012.01335.x>.
- Soler-Adillon, J., Pavlovic, D., & Freixa, P. (2018). Wikipedia in higher education: Changes in perceived value through content contribution. *Comunicar. Media Education Research Journal*, 26(1). https://www.scipedia.com/public/Soler-Adillon_et_al_2018a.
- Soules, A. (2015). Faculty perception of Wikipedia in the California state university system. *New Library World*, 116(3), 213–226. <https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/NLW-08-2014-0096/full/html?journalCode=nlw>.
- Wallace, D. P., & Van Fleet, C. (2005). The democratization of information? Wikipedia as a reference resource. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 100–103. <https://link.gale.com/apps/doc/A142636342/AONE?u=googlescholar&sid=googleScholar&xid=0149c9f7>.
- Xiao, L., & Askin, N. (2014). Academic opinions of wikipedia and open access publishing. *Online Information Review*, 38(3), 332–347. <https://doi.org/10.1108/OIR-04-2013-0062>.
- Zou, D., Xie, H., Wang, F. L., & Kwan, R. (2020). Flipped learning with Wikipedia in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education*, 45(5), 1026–1045. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03075079.2020.1750195>.