

An aerial photograph of a public space where the floor is decorated with large, overlapping, semi-transparent circles in various colors including blue, purple, yellow, green, and pink. Several people are seen from above, walking across the space. The overall scene suggests a community or public gathering.

**AMY S.
BRUCKMAN**

Should You Believe Wikipedia?

Online Communities
and the Construction of
Knowledge

SHOULD YOU BELIEVE WIKIPEDIA?

As we interact online we are creating new kinds of knowledge and community. How are these communities formed? How do we know whether to trust them as sources of information? In other words, should we believe Wikipedia? This book explores what community is, what knowledge is, how the internet facilitates new kinds of community, and how knowledge is shaped through online collaboration and conversation. Along the way the author tackles issues such as how we represent ourselves online and how this shapes how we interact, why there is so much bad behavior online, and what we can do about it. And the most important question of all: What can we as internet users and designers do to help the internet to bring out the best in us all?

AMY S. BRUCKMAN is Regents' Professor and Senior Associate Chair in the School of Interactive Computing at the Georgia Institute of Technology, where she studies online communities. Bruckman received her PhD from the MIT Media Lab in 1997. She is a Fellow of the ACM and a member of the SIGCHI Academy. She founded her first online community in 1993, and has been teaching the class "Design of Online Communities" at Georgia Tech since 1998. She currently helps moderate a number of large online communities.

SHOULD YOU BELIEVE

WIKIPEDIA?

Online Communities and the
Construction of Knowledge

AMY S. BRUCKMAN



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

One Liberty Plaza, 20th Floor, New York, NY 10006, USA

477 Williamstown Road, Port Melbourne, VIC 3207, Australia

314–321, 3rd Floor, Plot 3, Splendor Forum, Jasola District Centre,
New Delhi – 110025, India

103 Penang Road, #05–06/07, Visioncrest Commercial, Singapore 238467

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org

Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781108490320

DOI: [10.1017/9781108780704](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108780704)

© Amy S. Bruckman 2022

This publication is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements, no reproduction of any part may take place without the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2022

Printed in the United Kingdom by TJ Books Limited, Padstow Cornwall

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

NAMES: Bruckman, Amy, author.

TITLE: Should you believe Wikipedia? : online communities and the construction of knowledge / Amy S. Bruckman, Georgia Institute of Technology.

DESCRIPTION: Cambridge, United Kingdom ; New York, NY : Cambridge University Press, 2022. | Includes bibliographical references and index.

IDENTIFIERS: LCCN 2021031711 (print) | LCCN 2021031712 (ebook) | ISBN 9781108490320 (hardback) | ISBN 9781108748407 (paperback) | ISBN 9781108780704 (epub)

SUBJECTS: LCSH: Online social networks. | Internet–Social aspects. | Internet–Psychological aspects. | Internet users–Psychology. | Knowledge, Theory of

CLASSIFICATION: LCC HM742 .B78 2022 (print) | LCC HM742 (ebook) | DDC 302.23/1–dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021031711>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2021031712>

ISBN 978-1-108-49032-0 Hardback

ISBN 978-1-108-74840-7 Paperback

Cambridge University Press has no responsibility for the persistence or accuracy of URLs for external or third-party internet websites referred to in this publication and does not guarantee that any content on such websites is, or will remain, accurate or appropriate.

For Pete, Noah, and Evan

CONTENTS

Acknowledgments page xi

Introduction: Design and Social Behavior 1

- 1 Are Online “Communities” Really
Communities? 8
 - What Is a “Community”? 9
 - Social Capital 12
 - Strong and Weak Ties 13
 - Persistent and Pervasive Community 16
 - Third Places 18
 - Online Third Places 21
 - Social Roles 24
 - Social Norms 27
 - Theoretical Summary 29
 - Practical Applications 31

- 2 What Can Online Collaboration Accomplish? 32
 - From the *World Book* to Wikipedia 33
 - Citizen Science 36
 - Motivation in Citizen Science 40
 - Peer Production and Intellectual Challenge: The
Polymath Project 43
 - Understanding Online Collaboration as a Mode
of Production 45
 - The Structure of Wikipedia 49
 - Open-Source Software: The Cathedral and
the Bazaar 52

	Innovation and Leadership in Online Collaboration	57
	When Good Will Fails: Boaty McBoatface	61
	Theoretical Summary	62
	Practical Implications	63
3	Should You Believe Wikipedia?	64
	How Do You Know?	64
	Metaphysics: Internal Realism	68
	Epistemology	70
	Social Construction of Knowledge	73
	Peer Review	76
	The Reality of Review	77
	Should You Believe Wikipedia?	79
	Theoretical Summary	86
	Practical Implications	87
4	How Does the Internet Change How We Think?	91
	Becoming Part of a Knowledge-Building Community	93
	Knowledge Building as a Socio-technical System Across Distance	97
	Echo Chambers	98
	Threats to Knowledge Building	99
	Threats to Knowledge Building	103
	Is the Internet Encouraging Belief in Conspiracies?	107
	Enter the Trolls	110
	Quality of the Product	114
	Theoretical Summary	115
	Practical Implications	116
5	How Do People Express Identity Online, and Why Is This Important for Online Interaction?	118
	The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life	118
	Expressions Given and Expressions Given Off	122

CONTENTS

- Fronts and Roles 124
- Identity Online: Usernames 125
- Elements of Online Identity 128
- Gender Online 129
- Identity Workshop 135
- Identity Deception 137
- Age and Race 139
- Identity and Communities Focused on a
Specific Demographic 140
- Subgroup Conversation in a Public Space:
Black Twitter 143
- Privacy 144
- Social Networks and Privacy 147
- From Anonymous to Identified 149
- Why We Need Pseudonymity 152
- Anonymity and Accountability 154
- The Future of Online Identity 156
- Theoretical Summary 158
- Practical Implications 159

- 6 What Is Bad Online Behavior, and What Can We
Do About It? 160
 - What Regulates Behavior? 163
 - Laws 163
 - How Could Laws About Speech be Improved? 167
 - Rules and Social Norms 171
 - Online Groups, Civility, and Radicalization 173
 - Technology 176
 - Enacting Moderation: Software, Volunteers,
and Staff 180
 - An Ounce of Prevention 182
 - Online Public Shaming 184
 - Computer-Generated Content 185

CONTENTS

	Exit, Voice, and Loyalty	188
	Value Judgments	190
	Theoretical Summary	191
	Practical Implications	192
7	How Do Business Models Shape Online Communities?	194
	Markets as a Regulator	195
	The Cost of Customer Service	198
	The Evolution of Business Models for Online Communities	201
	Business Models as Regulation	202
	What New Business Models Are Possible?	207
	Theoretical Summary	211
	Practical Implications	212
8	How Can We Help the Internet to Bring Out the Best in Us All?	213
	Community	214
	Collaboration	217
	Truth and Knowledge	217
	Identity	221
	Living with and Managing Bad Behavior	223
	The Need for an Educated Citizenry	225
	Aspiration and Design	227
	<i>References</i>	231
	<i>Index</i>	253

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I had so much fun writing this book – I’m actually sad that it’s done. First and foremost, I’d like to thank my husband Pete Weimann and my sons Noah and Evan Weimann, who listened to me ramble about the book over dinner and on long hikes for years. Evan, thanks for figuring out where to stick the privacy content that needed a place, and I’m sorry there are two anecdotes about your brother and none about you.

I’d like to thank my mother, Cynthia Zucker, for the *World Book Encyclopedia*, and my stepfather, Bernie Zucker, for teaching me about free speech starting at age nine. You are the best parents a person could hope for. I wish my father Robert Bruckman was here to see the finished book – he would be proud.

I found starting this project intimidating. Sherry Turkle gave me excellent advice on the book proposal process, and also told me that my draft chapter was actually good. Coming from Sherry, that meant a lot. I took one class from Sherry in grad school and worked as her research assistant for half a summer, but how I see people’s relationship to computing was profoundly shaped by what I learned from her.

I’d like to thank Nancy Baym for her words of wisdom on why writing a book can be an emotional roller coaster. That helped me throughout this process. Warm

thanks to everyone who gave helpful comments on the book proposal, including Gilda Bruckman, Joseph Calamia, Scott Counts, Eric Gilbert, Mark Guzdial, and Barry Wellman.

I'd like to thank the people I asked about climate change for the intro to [Chapter 3](#): Eshwar Chandrasekharan, Michaelanne Dye, J. Alex Godwin, Beki Grinter, Jochen Rick, and Eva Sharma.

Andrea Wiggins Grover helped me with the section on citizen science. Keith Hampton gave invaluable comments on the chapter on community. I couldn't have written [Chapter 8](#) without the brilliant comments I received from David Karger. Wikipedia regular WereSpielChequers gave helpful comments on the Wikipedia chapter.

It was a great pleasure to locate my undergraduate professor for history of physics, Gerald Holton, and tell him that I still remember his class fondly. Thank you Professor Holton for your comments on the philosophy of science content in [Chapter 3](#).

I'm grateful to all the students who gave comments on draft chapters assigned in class, especially Beatriz Palacios Abad, Suood Alroomi, D. Scott Appling, Stephanie Baione, Jennifer Guzdial, Hannah Tam, and Jordan Taylor. Thanks also to former student Vanessa Rood Weatherly and Sijia Xiao. Big thanks to PhD student Daniel Nkemelu for letting me put your homework in the book.

I am not trained as an epistemologist. I am grateful to the real epistemologists on the Facebook group Social Epistemology Network who provided helpful references. I would be lost without your help.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My Reddit moderator friends have tolerated my rambling about this book project almost as much as my family. Thanks especially to Elizabeth Crocker, Adrian de Novato, Joshua Landman, Benjamin Lippi, Claudia Lutz, Thorbjörn Sievert, and Colin Sullender.

Thanks to Georgia Tech for being a great place to work. Ayanna Howard's time as chair of the School of Interactive Computing matched the time I was writing this book almost exactly, start to finish. I am grateful for all her support – I can't imagine a more supportive boss. My colleague Colin Potts has encouraged me throughout this process, and is my role model for computer scientists who spend too much time reading philosophy.

I have worked with so many wonderful students at Georgia Tech. Everything in this book has evolved through conversations with my graduate students and students in my classes. Thanks especially to my current and former PhD students Julia Deeb-Swihart, Jill Dimond, Betsy DiSalvo, Michaelanne Dye, Jason Elliott, Jason Ellis, Casey Fiesler, Andrea Forte, Sucheta Ghoshal, Shagun Jhaver, Camille Harris, Jim Hudson, Kurt Luther, Sarita Schoenebeck, and José Zagal, and to my advisors when I was a graduate student, Glorianna Davenport and Mitchel Resnick.

I was fortunate to work with Lauren Cowles at Cambridge University Press. Her hard work and ninja editing skills made this a much better book, and I am grateful.

INTRODUCTION Design and Social Behavior

In 2004, my son Noah was turning one year old and I had a problem: How do I make him a birthday cake? He was seriously allergic to dairy, soy, and egg. A mis-read food label or a bite snuck from another child's plate at daycare could send us to the emergency room. But he was turning one – I wanted him to have birthday cake. I found a website called kidswithfoodallergies.org, and asked on the forum there: Did anyone have a dairy-, soy- and egg-free cake recipe? In response to my query, I got a flurry of warm welcomes from parents on the site. They shared an excellent safe cake recipe, and provided a host of other support. Parents on the site helped me figure out how to make a clear and effective allergy-awareness sheet for his daycare teachers. They shared tips for how to safely order food in a restaurant. Their experience was invaluable, and they also were emotionally supportive in a way no one else could be. Parenting an allergic toddler is stressful, and they understood completely.

After a few months on the site, I started welcoming new members and answering their questions. I became a local expert on a few topics. Together, the community of parents *built up a body of shared knowledge*. Online communities are good at constructing knowledge. As we'll see in [Chapter 3](#), the more you learn about the social nature of knowledge, the more you can see why social media is good at

helping create it. Noah was lucky enough to outgrow his food allergies by the time he turned five. When I posted a picture of him eating his first piece of real pizza, other parents said it brought tears to their eyes.

This book is about the design of online communities, with an emphasis on how online communities can build (or fail to build) knowledge. To truly understand how the internet is creating knowledge, we need to understand other critical aspects of designing online groups – community, collaboration, identity, management of bad behavior, and the influence of market forces.

Online communities take many forms. I am part of a Facebook group of friends I've known since graduate school who like video games, and a subreddit of people (who I've never met) who are fans of my favorite television show. I'm part of groups for academic parents, people who volunteer to moderate a subreddit, and alumni of my elementary school, high school, college, and graduate school. I find each of these groups to be supportive in different ways.

In each group, I share different details about who I am, and I behave differently. Amy the professor, Amy the mom, and Amy the *Grey's Anatomy* fan are quite different. Norms of self-presentation are formed by a combination of software affordances and learned behavior, and those norms change group dynamics.

Each of these groups also shapes my understanding of the world. My knowledge and beliefs about how to approach safety for kids with food allergies were shaped by conversations on the food allergy group, and my opinion of the writing in *Grey's Anatomy* season seventeen has been

shaped through conversation with my fellow fans. Online conversation constructs new understandings.

The internet creates new ways for us to interact, understand the world, and share our understanding with others. These processes are supported and shaped by systems that are designed by humans. This book is about the interaction between design and social behavior – all the ways that the design of the internet shapes the human behavior and knowledge that emerge as a result.

One of the most powerful affordances of the internet is its ability to create community. Before the industrial revolution in the nineteenth century, “community” was a geographically bounded concept (Hampton and Wellman 2018). Travel was slow and hence rare, and people looked to others nearby for social support and fellowship. These patterns evolved significantly with the introduction of the automobile. With the introduction of internet communication, it’s possible to find community based on shared interests and values, independent of geography. The parents on the food allergy group are located all over the world, but the internet brought us together.

What is a “community”? Is a group of people interacting on a Facebook group or subreddit a “community”? In [Chapter 1](#), I’ll use ideas from the prototype theory of categories to define what a “community” is. Eleanor Rosch showed that categories in the mind are based on “prototypes” or “best examples” – a robin is a better example of a bird than an emu or a penguin. Similarly, we understand the idea of “community” in relation to prototypical communities in our minds, like small towns or church groups.

Ray Oldenburg’s work on “third places” shows us why we need places that are neither work nor home, and how these supportive communities are designed. I’ll show how the detailed design features of online spaces can help them serve as third places. Finally, sociological research sheds light on how online communication has reshaped the kinds of community and strong and weak ties we all rely on in our lives.

A second core contribution of the internet is its support for collaboration. In [Chapter 2](#), I’ll introduce some powerful examples of constructive uses of online collaboration – like Wikipedia and citizen science. Why do people spend hundreds of volunteer hours writing encyclopedia articles or counting birds? I’ll explain the incentive structure in peer production, and what kinds of things are possible using peer production methods. I’ll explore citizen science in some detail, and then introduce Yochai Benkler’s theory of why peer production is important, and what factors are important for a peer production project to succeed.

Yes, people can create things together online – but are they any good? In [Chapter 3](#), I’ll answer the question of whether you should believe Wikipedia. Building on ideas from epistemology, metaphysics, and social construction of knowledge, I’ll explore what it means to “know” something, and how good a job Wikipedia does at building knowledge. I will argue that “truth” exists (even if we only have indirect and unsure access to it) and knowledge is socially constructed. Social consensus is our best metric for what “is true,” but sometimes that consensus can be wrong.

[Chapter 4](#) is about “knowledge-building communities,” and how the internet *changes how we think*. People increasingly

come to learn things not alone but as part of a group – what everyone else around you believes shapes what you believe. The internet is a catalyst for this process. When a group of people work together to accomplish a task, they form what is called a “community of practice.” Collaboratively constructing knowledge online is a process that takes place in a community of practice. I’ll explain how communities of practice operate through the work of Jean Lave and Etienne Wenger. The knowledge-building process is strongly supported by elements of the software environment as well as the people working together. This is a kind of “distributed cognition,” and work by Edwin Hutchins can help us understand it better.

[Chapter 5](#) is about identity. As people interact in online venues, they need to represent who they are to others. The details of how we do this matter. Sociologist Erving Goffman explains how, in the face-to-face world, we are always performing roles. These elements of identity translate into the online world. One of the key questions for online activity is the role of anonymity. I’ll explain the advantages and disadvantages of anonymous interaction. In fact, we’re all really some degree of “pseudonymous” (between anonymous and identified) most of the time anyway. How identity is represented turns out to be one of the most powerful design decisions that you make in creating an online communications environment.

As most internet users are increasingly aware, interacting online is not all cute kittens and heartwarming stories. The internet can be *nasty*. In [Chapter 6](#), I’ll explore the ways we can regulate online behavior. Larry Lessig divides regulation into laws, social norms, markets, and technology.

As we'll see, ideas about "free speech" vary around the world, and laws about hate speech are quite different in the United States compared to other nations. Where we draw the line between free speech and illegal speech is the most hotly contested issue about the internet. What is at stake is not just what we all read or watch, but *who we are*. At its worst, the internet can make insane and hateful ideas seem normal, and make it easy for new people to be radicalized. On the other hand, if some speech is not allowed, who decides where to draw the line? How do we make balanced decisions about what content to allow?

How online platforms are financially supported shapes them in fundamental ways. In [Chapter 7](#), I address how market issues shape what online sites exist and what they become. This is particularly relevant for how sites manage inappropriate content and bad behavior. What kind of behavior management takes place depends on what a site can afford. I argue that today's commercial sites can't deliver what is healthy for people or for society, because making key decisions steered by the profit motive doesn't magically make the right thing happen. We need more public investment in non-profit platforms driven by values.

Finally, in [Chapter 8](#), I explore what we can do to make the internet better. I revisit the previous topics (community, collaboration, knowledge building, identity, behavior management, and market forces) and explore what constructive steps are possible for members of online sites, and for designers of those sites. Education is another important missing ingredient. To understand the internet,

people need a more nuanced understanding of the nature of knowledge, free speech, and more.

This book is based on what I have learned iteratively over the course of more than twenty years teaching the class “Design of Online Communities” to undergraduate and graduate students at Georgia Tech. In addition to explaining online interaction, I hope you’ll find the theories I introduce useful, and pick the most relevant and go read the originals.

1 Are Online “Communities” Really Communities?

In 2009, then-Georgia Tech master’s student Vanessa Rood Weatherly and I interviewed members of the “brand community” website for owners of Mini Cooper cars. This quote from one of our research subjects has always stuck with me:

I had a grandson who was born premature and died and everybody was just really supportive and everybody was there for me. I couldn’t talk to anybody else about it on a daily basis. But I could talk [on the Mini Cooper website]. So I’d check in every day . . . They were actually the first people I told when the doctor said he wasn’t going to make it. That’s the first place I went. I couldn’t wake anybody else up at 3 in the morning. When it’s like that, intense and close, it’s easier to reach out to other people sometimes through the website and say it . . . They weren’t so close that they were that involved, so they could listen and give me advice better . . . My daughter got a kick out of the fact that when she was sent to the hospital in Denver, I think she got 12 packages, cards, or flowers from people from the Mini site before she got anything from friends or family. They responded so fast. Overwhelmed by them before she ever even got anything from people who actually knew her. So like I said, it’s a lot of support. (Rood and Bruckman 2009)

If it is 3 a.m. and you are facing devastating news, who would you turn to for support? It seems counterintuitive

that this bereaved grandmother would turn to a website for fans of a car brand. But for her, the site was a supportive community. The site was not a substitute for friends and family she knows face-to-face, but a powerful supplement.

Humans do better when we support one another – when we form supportive communities. The discipline of sociology is focused on studying all the ways that groups of people can be organized, and how that shapes the mutual support that emerges as a result. Internet communication reshapes social support in complicated ways. In this chapter, I will explain the ways that the internet has changed the forms that community takes. But first, we need to step back and define “community.”

What Is a “Community”?

What is your idealized notion of a “community”? Are the subscribers of a subreddit a community? What about people who follow a hashtag on Instagram? What really is a “community”?

Cognitive science can help answer the question. I will argue that the word “community” refers to a *category* of associations of groups of people. To understand “community,” it helps to have a more nuanced view of a “category.” Eleanor Rosch found that categories in the mind are not organized by simple rules of inclusion and exclusion, but by *prototypes*. Each category has one or more best or “focal” members. For example, a robin or sparrow is a better example of a bird than an ostrich or penguin (Rosch 1999). These best members are the prototypes for the category, and we understand other members in relation to the best members.

Within a category, each item has a degree of membership. The degree of membership of an item in a category depends on its similarities to and differences from the focal members (Lakoff 1987). Rosch notes, however, that talking about “the focal members” of a category is a linguistic convenience. It would be better instead to refer to the “degree of prototypicality” of each member of the category. Some that have a high degree of prototypicality we may informally call the prototypes for the category.

Surprisingly, degree of prototypicality is objective – it can be measured with reaction-time studies. A person asked if a robin is a bird will respond more quickly than when asked if a penguin is a bird. The difference is a fraction of a second, but is measurable and repeatable. These results are generally consistent across individuals from a particular cultural background (Rosch 1999).

Categories can have either clear or fuzzy boundaries. For example, the categories “car” and “truck” have fuzzy boundaries, and sport-utility vehicles (SUVs) are members of both groups. However, SUVs are somewhat remote members of both the “car” and “truck” categories – a Ford Explorer is not an ideal example of either a car or a truck.

The prototype theory of categories answers lots of hard questions. Suppose you are in an art museum looking at a monochrome, painted canvas, and wondering whether this is “art.” The answer is: “Art” is a prototype-based category. Works of art with a high prototypicality for Western culture are things like the Mona Lisa by Leonardo da Vinci and paintings of water lilies by Claude Monet. A monochrome canvas “is art” in the same sense that a

Ford Explorer is a car – it’s a member of the category with significant differences from the most prototypical members.

Returning to the category “community,” in this light, asking whether something “is a community” is a poorly formed question unlikely to yield deep insights. The category “community” has fuzzy boundaries. Instead, we can ask how similar a particular group is to our ideal models of community. This is a more productive line of inquiry, because it challenges us to reflect on the nature of our prototypical models of community, and explore in detail their specific features and why each feature might or might not matter (Bruckman 2006).

The notion of “community” is culturally relative. For many Americans, our prototypical communities are small towns and religious congregations. These are groups of people who see one another regularly and have shared interests. Everyone understands the idea of community in relation to different prototypes, and people from other cultures have different ideal models.

Different sorts of community provide diverse kinds of value to their members. One value that our prototypical congregation or small town might provide is support in times of crisis. By that metric, the Mini Cooper online community was successful. The group provided the bereaved grandmother with someone to talk with (at any hour of night), and condolence cards and flowers that arrived before those from other friends. Howard Rheingold’s beautiful chapter “The Heart of the WELL” in his book *The Virtual Community* documents a host of ways that members of The WELL (an early and influential

bulletin board system) supported one another – like rallying around the parent of a child with leukemia, and researching how to arrange a medical evacuation for a member who became seriously ill in New Delhi (Rheingold 1993). Help in times of crisis is just one element of social support that is easy to identify. Nancy Baym writes that it is common “to find members of online communities and social networks providing one another with the sort of emotional support often found in close relationships” (Baym 2010).

Thinking about “community” and how it manifests online, key questions to ask are:

- What features of face-to-face communities provide meaningful support?
- How can we design online sites to provide those kinds of value to their members?
- In what ways can online interaction provide new forms of support that are not possible face-to-face?

For completeness, we must also ask:

- In what ways can face-to-face communities sometimes be oppressive, and how can we lessen the downsides when groups interact online?

Social Capital

In a famous paper, sociologist Robert Putnam collected data on how many Americans join civic associations, and found that the proportion of people who participate in such associations dropped dramatically from the 1960s to the 1990s.