

LibraryCrunch

Bringing You A "Library 2.0" Perspective, by Michael Casey

[« Talis and Library 2.0](#) | [Main](#) | [ALA TechSource Discussion with Michael Stephens](#) »

Peer review study compares Wikipedia and Britannica

The journal [Nature](#) takes a look at accuracy in [Wikipedia](#) and Britannica and comes up with some interesting findings.

The exercise revealed numerous errors in both encyclopaedias, but among 42 entries tested, the difference in accuracy was not particularly great: the average science entry in Wikipedia contained around four inaccuracies; Britannica, about three.

Only eight serious errors, such as misinterpretations of important concepts, were detected in the pairs of articles reviewed, four from each encyclopaedia. But reviewers also found many factual errors, omissions or misleading statements: 162 and 123 in Wikipedia and Britannica, respectively.

Posted by Michael on December 14, 2005 10:52 PM | [Permalink](#)

→ TrackBack

TrackBack URL for this entry:
<http://www.librarycrunch.com/mt/mt-tb.cgi/80>

→ Post a comment

Name:

Email Address:

URL:

☐ Remember personal info?

Comments:

Preview

Post

