

You Are Where You Edit: Locating Wikipedia Contributors Through Edit Histories*

Michael D. Lieberman

Center for Automation Research
Institute for Advanced Computer Studies
Department of Computer Science
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742 USA
codepoet@cs.umd.edu

Jimmy Lin

College of Information Studies
The iSchool
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742 USA
jimmylin@umd.edu

Abstract

Whether knowingly or otherwise, Wikipedia contributors reveal their interests and expertise through their contribution patterns. An analysis of Wikipedia edit histories shows that it is often possible to associate contributors with relatively small geographic regions, usually corresponding to where they were born or where they presently live. For many contributors, the geographic coordinates of pages they have edited are tightly clustered. Results suggest that a wealth of information about contributors can be gleaned from edit histories. This illustrates the efficacy of data mining on large, publicly-available datasets and raises potential privacy concerns.

Introduction

Collaboration, end-user involvement, and openness with data are among today's most prevalent Web trends. Web 2.0-style websites such as Facebook, del.icio.us, and a plethora of extant Wiki projects including Wikipedia all rely on significant contributions from their users that are then shared with the world to achieve a collective user experience unattainable with traditional development methods. In particular, Wikipedia is a collaborative online encyclopedia that grows from article contributions made by its readers. As the quality of Wikipedia articles rivals those of traditional encyclopedias (Giles 2005), it is perhaps unsurprising that users of Wikipedia tend to contribute information about which they have interest or expertise. Wikipedia has special pages that recognize contributors with particularly high-quality or large numbers of page edits, providing an important reward for contributing content (Forte and Bruckman 2005). All page edits are logged and publicly viewable in *edit histories*, which provide a treasure trove of information about the interests and expertise of the contributors themselves.

Wikipedia contributors have the option to create personalized user pages that detail information about themselves, such as where they were born, where they live, and their interests. However, even without such pages, contributors characterize themselves by the number and type of edits

they make. Whether knowingly or otherwise, contributors reveal their interests and expertise through their edit histories. For example, we might infer that a contributor with many edits to pages about mountains and mountaineering has a significant interest in that sport. Likewise, someone who contributes significant text to pages about tightly clustered geographic locations, such as College Park, Laurel, and Beltsville (all locales in Prince George's County, Maryland, USA) could be "located" in that general area. This work demonstrates that by analyzing Wikipedia edit histories, it is often possible to associate contributors with relatively small geographic regions, usually the areas where those individuals were born or presently live.

Geography is of special interest because it pervades Wikipedia, as evidenced by Figure 1, a rendering of English Wikipedia's geographic coverage, where each point corresponds to a Wikipedia page with geographic coordinates. Even though pages on Wikipedia might not nominally concern specific geographic locations, often pages contain implicit geography that can be used to characterize contributors. For example, edits to pages about radio stations in the vicinity of College Park, such as WMUC, WAMU, and WTOP could serve equally well to place the contributor near College Park. Pages concerning schools, universities, airports, landmarks, and other notable areas can also serve as markers to associate contributors with their implicit geographic locations. We refer to pages marked with geographic coordinates as *geopages*. Furthermore, we term the minimum region encompassing a contributor's edits to geopages as the contributor's *edit area*, which can be computed by taking the convex hull of the geopage coordinates. A small edit area might indicate a general familiarity with the geographic area in question, due to the individual being born there, living there, or having an interest in the region.

In this work, we collect a variety of statistics about Wikipedia as it relates to geography. In particular, we examine the geographic coverage of Wikipedia, both in terms of which geographic areas receive the most "attention" and the prevalence of contributions to geopages. We also investigate edit patterns and the sizes of edit areas for geopage contributors. Our analysis shows that a significant percentage of contributors have relatively small edit areas. We identify reasons for this by manually examining contributors' personal pages, and also find that many contributors tend to fo-

*In partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master's Degree in Computer Science.
Copyright © 2009, Association for the Advancement of Artificial Intelligence (www.aaai.org). All rights reserved.

cus their attention on a particular “pet” geopage. Results show that edit histories provide a wealth of evidence for associating Wikipedia contributors with geographic regions.

Data mining from edit histories has a variety of applications, such as psychographic and geographic market segmentation (Lesser and Hughes 1986). It also raises privacy concerns, as contributors might not intend or want to reveal this information about themselves. Further concern is warranted when this information is joined with data gleaned from other online sources to assemble accurate, multi-faceted profiles of users. This work illustrates the efficacy of data mining on large publicly-available datasets, and highlights the extent to which private information may be inferred from seemingly-innocuous digital footprints.

Related Work

Recently, Wikipedia has become an active area of research in many fields. Researchers have examined general trends in Wikipedia’s growth, in terms of number of users and contributions, e.g., (Voss 2005). Roth, Taraborelli, and Gilbert (2008) looked for correlations between administrative policies and growth rates for a variety of Wiki projects including Wikipedia. Almeida, Mozafari, and Cho (2007) characterized Wikipedia’s evolution over time in terms of contributor behavior. They also identified a behavior where contributors focus their attention on editing a single Wikipedia page. We show that this “pet” page phenomenon holds true for geopages as well.

Several studies have highlighted the social qualities of Wikipedia and its contributors. In interviews, Forte and Bruckman (2005) found that most Wikipedia contributors are motivated by recognition and acknowledgment by their peers. Wikipedia edit histories have also provided a data source for examining how individuals collaborate and resolve conflict in a distributed fashion (Kittur et al. 2007b); visualizations have been helpful in this respect as well (Viégas, Wattenberg, and Dave 2004; Suh et al. 2007). Analysis of different “classes” of Wikipedia contributors includes work by Kittur et al. (2007a), Ortega and Gonzalez-Barahona (2007), and Burke and Kraut (2008).

A number of researchers have focused specifically on geopages in Wikipedia as a source of volunteered geographic information (Goodchild 2007), and automated methods of using Wikipedia’s geographic content to various ends. Toral and Munoz (2006) examined the utility of Wikipedia pages in creating *gazetteers*, or databases of geographic locations and associated metadata (Hill 2000), for named-entity recognition (Borthwick 1999); cf. (Buscaldi, Rosso, and García 2006; Popescu, Grefenstette, and Moëllic 2008). In a similar vein, Lim et al. (2006) integrated content mined from Wikipedia geopages into an online digital library. To aid tourists and educators, Hecht et al. (2007) designed a visualization for mobile devices that dynamically places Wikipedia content on a map. The work most related to ours is that of Hardy (2008), wherein he collects statistics related to Wikipedia geopages. He classified contributors as registered, anonymous, or robot, and described the relative amount of work done by each group. While Hardy examined

the notion of locality, he did not fully explore the meaning of his locality measure or its implications.

Data Sources

The main data source used in our analysis is the English Wikipedia XML dump.¹ The dumps are updated every few months, and are available in several forms for different purposes. In addition to complete page content, all previous versions of pages are also available, along with complete page edit histories. For each edit made to a page, the contributor that made the edit and the edit’s timestamp are recorded. In Wikipedia, contributors have the option of either logging in with a username and password to make edits, or editing anonymously. For contributors who have logged in to edit, their usernames are stored in the edit history. Anonymous users have their IP addresses recorded in the edit history. We used the English Wikipedia page history dump of 8 Oct 2008, which totals 61.7GB of data.

When saving an edit, named (i.e., non-anonymous) contributors have the option of marking their edits as “minor”. The minor flag is intended to distinguish between true contributions to a page’s content and simple changes, such as spelling or grammar correction, or formatting changes. In addition, a number of robots used to make mass changes to a large collection of pages also use the minor flag. From these observations, we made the simplifying assumption in our analysis that a minor edit to a geopage did not serve as evidence that the individual making the edit was in any way related to that geographic location. We therefore excluded minor edits from the analysis, as they would tend to skew correlations between contributors with legitimate contributions and page geography. Note that it is entirely subjective whether to mark an edit as minor. In practice, we found that most geopages tend to have many edits that were marked as minor, with only a few contributors making significant contributions to a given page. The minor flag thus served as a useful indicator of true knowledge or experience with a geopage and its corresponding geographic location.

We excluded anonymous edits from our analysis for several reasons. While IP addresses serve as a valuable source of location information (Padmanabhan and Subramanian 2001), several problems deter a meaningful analysis of anonymous edits. For example, when editing Wikipedia, anonymous contributors do not have the option to mark page edits as minor, due to the potential for abuse. Therefore, it would be difficult to distinguish significant page edits from typos and spelling corrections. Also, several informal studies² show that anonymous contributors are responsible for the majority of Wikipedia article vandalism, which should not be considered legitimate evidence of geographic locality. Another problem when using IP addresses is the inherent inability to correlate a single IP address to a single human, since they might be assigned to Internet users dynamically. Furthermore, a single IP address might be used by several users simultaneously, as in the case of proxy servers for local area networks.

¹<http://download.wikimedia.org/enwiki/>

²<http://wikipedia.org/wiki/WP:WPVS>




Figure 1: Geographic coverage of English Wikipedia. Each point represents a latitude/longitude pair found on a geopage. The coverage is uneven, with most geopages placed in the United States and various countries in Europe.

Identifying Geography

Finding Wikipedia pages tagged with geographic coordinates, while seemingly simple, can be difficult for several reasons. In general, geopages have the relevant geographic coordinates present somewhere in their content. However, pages are written in a constantly evolving Wiki markup language, which makes it difficult to parse. The problem is exacerbated by the large number of ways that contributors express geographic coordinates within page content. Contributors often create parameterized templates that can be reused on many pages, to avoid duplicate work and allow for uniformity across pages. However, the templates themselves constantly evolve, and templates follow trends of use and disuse. At this time there exist at least 20 distinct forms of template parameters, all of which serve the same basic purpose of annotating a Wikipedia page with geographic coordinates. For example, separate template parameter sets exist depending on the type of annotated object, such as country, administrative division, city, or spot feature. Various forms of geographic coordinates can be used as well, e.g., degrees-minutes-seconds (DMS) and decimal degrees (Clarke 1995), and it is generally left to the contributor to decide which form is most appropriate.

To avoid the messy task of extracting geographic coordinates from raw Wiki markup, we integrated data from DBpedia (Auer et al. 2007), a community project that aims to extract semantic relationships mined from Wikipedia. Along with many other types of semantic information, DBpedia features a table of geographic coordinates mined from Wikipedia's many geographic coordinate templates. This table amounts to a primitive gazetteer. The DBpedia gazetteer thus provides links between Wikipedia pages and

geographic coordinates.

Another complication that an analysis of Wikipedia geography entails is accounting for the geography of features with significant extent (Clarke 1995), such as regions (e.g., countries, administrative divisions, lakes) and linear features (e.g., roads, rivers, canals). In Wikipedia, all geographic features, including those with extent, are annotated with a single point, chosen based on the type of feature. For example, political regions like countries and administrative divisions (e.g., states, counties, boroughs) are tagged with the geographic coordinates of their capital or home office, while linear features are generally tagged with their midpoint or an end point (e.g., for rivers, the mouth or source of the river). Ideally, features with extent would be tagged in a distinct manner from point features, but for the moment, geographic tagging projects in Wikipedia favor uniformity over representational accuracy. Incorporating the tagged coordinates of features with extent is problematic because geographic coordinates can only capture distance relationships between points, but not other spatial relationships such as overlap and containment, which might reveal additional connections between page edits. For example, a contributor with several edits to College Park, Laurel, and Beltsville, as well as Maryland, would indicate a strong association with the three initial localities, since they are all in Maryland and are geographically proximate. However, examining the coordinates of the corresponding Wikipedia pages might indicate otherwise, because Maryland would be tagged with the coordinates of its capital city, Annapolis, which is relatively far from the other localities.

However, in Wikipedia, the precision of tagged geographic coordinates serves as a hint of the feature's size,




Figure 2: A variety of edit patterns in the USA that lead to distinct edit areas. Each letter refers to a different contributor, and each point corresponds to an edit to a geopage tagged with those coordinates. Notice that in many cases, a contributor’s edits to geopages are tightly clustered (e.g., A), but might have one or several edits that are geographically distant (e.g., B, E).

which in turn reveals whether the location in question has significant extent. For example, the Maryland Wikipedia page is tagged with decimal coordinates (39, -76.7), which is in fact the coordinates of its capital, Annapolis (38.972945, -76.501157) but expressed with less precision. In contrast, the College Park, Maryland article is tagged with coordinates (38.99656, -76.927509) which indicates a much higher degree of precision, and hence smaller extent. We therefore marked those pages with fewer than 2 digits in the fractional part of the decimal coordinates as being features with extent.

Like all of Wikipedia’s content, the precision of tagged geographic coordinates is subject to human error. For some geopages, we found that tagged coordinates were entered with too little or too much precision, especially for those pages that received little attention from contributors. However, we found that geopages corresponding to features with extent were in general correctly tagged, as they tended to have multiple revisions by different contributors. In our analysis, we tested the effects of both including and excluding features with extent on edit area sizes.

Typical Edit Patterns

To clarify the preceding discussion, we present several examples of real contributor edit areas from English Wikipedia. Figure 2 shows six contributors whose edit areas lie mostly in the United States. Each letter corresponds to a Wikipedia contributor. The outlined region at the extreme right containing contributor A’s edits is an enlargement of

New York City and surrounding counties. These contributors were selected because they had a sizable number of geopage edits, and they exhibited a wide range of edit area sizes. In addition, while one contributor posted biographical information on a Wikipedia user page, the rest did not, and thus might be surprised that information about their geographic origins and interests could be gleaned from their edit histories. We also found these edit patterns to be representative of a large portion of Wikipedia geopage contributors.

In the figure, contributors with small edit areas include A, who edited many geopages in New York City, New York, and B, with many edits in Douglas County, Kansas. These individuals have minimal edit areas of under 1 deg^2 . The collection of geopages edited by A include the page about New York City, as well as a number of smaller pages about subway stops in New York City’s various boroughs. As a result, the edits are tightly clustered, with no geographic outliers. It would be safe to say that contributor A is familiar with New York City, and likely lives there. It might even be possible to pin contributor A to a specific neighborhood by examining which subway stops were edited most. Similarly, contributor B’s edits include many small townships in Douglas County, in the northeastern part of Kansas, and other nearby cities. B’s edits include one outlier on the border of Kansas and Colorado. In our analysis, we discounted a small percentage of geographic outliers in determining contributors’ edit areas to account for such cases (see next section).

Medium-sized edit areas can be attributed to contributors

Stat	Type	Class	Total	Geo	Geo%
pages			14915993	328393	2.2%
contributes	both		16235895	2011828	12.4%
	anon		13795118	1655135	12.0%
	named		2440777	356693	14.6%
edits	both		224473397	15341937	6.8%
	anon		55571407	4519807	8.1%
	named	both	168901990	10822130	6.4%
		non-minor	114844836	6357558	5.5%
	minor	54057154	4464572	8.3%	

Table 1: Wikipedia/DBpedia dump statistics. A considerable number of pages are tagged with geographic coordinates, and most edits are marked as non-minor edits.

C, D, and E, with edit area sizes ranging between about 3 deg^2 (C) and 71 deg^2 (E). Most of contributor C’s edits are to geopages about various populated places in North Carolina. However, one of these geopages is actually that of a local television station which was tagged with the geographic coordinates of its transmission antenna. In a similar vein, contributor D’s edit area includes several different types of geographic features in Washington State and Oregon, including villages, glacier sites, rivers, and mountains, as well as a number of outlier edits. These contributors demonstrate that articles about many types of geographic features can assist in characterizing a contributor’s edit area. Contributor E’s edit area is somewhat larger, mainly focused on large cities and counties in Texas, but also included edits to articles with coordinates in nearby states. Again, we account for these outliers in our analysis (see discussion in the next section).

Finally, the largest edit area belongs to contributor F, with a total area encompassing over 1000 deg^2 , and includes edits to geopages situated all across the United States, with a sizable number of edits in New York State. The types of geopages edited by contributor F are greatly varied, including the usual populated places, but also bridges, hotels, and the sites of several plane crashes. Several edits are to geopages placed outside the United States and are not shown.

Analysis

We first present basic statistics about the Wikipedia and DBpedia dumps used in our analysis (Table 1). The `Total` column indicates the total number of objects in the dump, while the `Geo` and `Geo%` columns give the number and percentage of objects that contain geographic information. The statistics show that a considerable number of pages are geopages and are marked with geographic coordinates. Also, while anonymous contributors with edits outnumber named contributors by about 5 to 1, named contributors are responsible for 2–3 times as many edits as anonymous ones. Finally, a nontrivial number of named contributors (14.6%) have made at least one non-minor edit to a geospace, and most (58.7%) edits to geopages are non-minor edits.

Table 2 contains the top ten page counts, aggregated by country. These page counts were determined by assigning

Country	Count	Country	Count
United States	83971	Russia	10964
France	37730	Canada	8970
United Kingdom	26651	Italy	8772
Poland	16050	Spain	6603
Germany	15939	India	5683

Table 2: Top page counts, aggregated by country. As might be expected for English Wikipedia, the majority of geopages edited lie in the United States and countries in Europe.

each page’s coordinates to the country that contains it, thus determining the countries containing the largest number of pages. As can be seen in the table and Figure 1, the vast majority of Wikipedia’s geographic coverage lies in the United States and countries in Europe. This uneven coverage reflects the geographic distribution of contributors to English Wikipedia. If we were to examine Wikipedia dumps of other languages, different biases would surely be encountered.

Figure 3 shows the distributions of edits to geopages across contributors and pages. Both distributions follow a general power-law curve. That is, a tiny number of contributors and geopages have very large edit counts, and the number of edits rapidly falls as the number of contributors and pages increase.

To determine whether contributors might be surprised by the information revealed through their edits, we checked what percentage of geospace contributors also have user pages. If a contributor has a user page, we assume that he or she is willing to share at least some information about himself or herself, and is more heavily involved in Wikipedia. Of 356693 contributors with at least one edit to a geospace, only 102271 (28.7%) have user pages. Also, for the 93195 contributors with at least five edits to geopages, only 47623 (51.1%) have user pages.

Locality of Edit Areas

We next analyzed the tightness of contributors’ edit areas. For each contributor, we computed the convex hull of the geographic coordinates of the pages edited, and then computed the area of the polygon defined by the convex hull. A smaller edit area thus indicates more geographically clustered edits. However, this simple computation does not adequately account for geographic outliers. A single edit to a page with coordinates located very far from a tight cluster of edit locations would expand the convex hull’s area greatly, even though most locations are tightly clustered. To account for these outliers and to ensure a more meaningful analysis, we removed a fraction (5% and 20%) of problematic edits from each contributor’s set of edits and computed edit area based on the remaining points. The points chosen for removal were determined by sorting geospace points by distance from each point in turn and removing the farthest fraction. The remaining points with minimum-area convex hull were retained for the analysis. Furthermore, we only considered those contributors with at least three edits. As an example, in Figure 2, removing 20% of contributor E’s 18 edits leaves only the tight cluster of edits in southeast Texas.




Figure 3: Distributions of geographic edits across (a) contributors and (b) pages. The number of edits and contributors follow power-law distributions.




Figure 4: Geographic locality of edit areas with features with extent (a) included and (b) excluded. A large number of contributors—approximately 30–35% of all contributors with edits to geopages—have edit areas smaller than 1 deg^2 , indicated by the dashed vertical line. Using a smaller fraction of edits shifts edit areas significantly across the 1 deg^2 boundary.

Figure 4a shows the number of contributors with a given edit area, in deg^2 , using 95% and 80% of edited geopages for each contributor. Of 67638 contributors plotted, 20737 (30.7%) and 23544 (34.8%) of edit areas cover less than a 1 deg^2 region with 95% and 80% confidence, respectively. An area of 1 deg^2 approximately corresponds to a $100 \times 100 \text{ km}$ region, or the size of a typical metropolitan region. Furthermore, of contributors with less than 5 edited geopages, which account for 37820 of the total number of contributors, 17813 (47.1%) and 19633 (51.9%) have edit areas constrained to a 1 deg^2 region with 95% and 80% confidence. Using 80% rather than 95% as the threshold significantly shifts edit areas toward smaller values, especially across the 1 deg^2 boundary. These figures and statistics indicate that a significant portion of contributors’ edits are restricted to relatively small geographic areas.

We also identified geopages that correspond to regions with extent, and investigated the effects of their removal on edit areas. Figure 4b shows our results. Of 60045 contributors, 18917 (31.5%) and 21531 (35.9%) of edit areas are

smaller than 1 deg^2 using 95% and 80% of edited geopages. Also, of the 33385 contributors with less than 5 edited geopages, 16094 (48.2%) and 17809 (53.3%) have edit areas smaller than 1 deg^2 . Excluding regions with extent thus results in about a 1% drop in edit area sizes across the 1 deg^2 boundary. The main effects were on contributors with initially large edit areas when taking 95% of edits to geopages, which are shown in the extreme right of the graphs. This indicates that few contributors make many edits to geopages corresponding to large geographic features. Instead, edits mostly focus on relatively small features, which better aid in tying contributors to specific geographic areas.

Pet Geopages

We next looked for contributors keeping “pet” geopages—those who concentrate their edits on one or two geopages. For each contributor u , we checked the number of edits to each geopage edited by u and determined u ’s most-edited geopages. Figures 5a and 5b show our results for contributors with 5–20 and over 20 edits to geopages, respectively.




Figure 5: Frequency statistics revealing the prevalence of pet geopages among contributors with (a) 5–20 and (b) over 20 edits to geopages. Significant numbers of contributors have a large percentage of their edits confined to one or two geopages.

Interest	Count	Interest	Count
Living there	56	General	5
Unknown	24	Local schools	5
Born there	19	Local businesses	3
Local railways	9	Local history	1

Table 3: Reasons for contributors having especially small edit areas (under 1 deg²), determined by voluntary information gleaned from user pages.

In the figures, F1 and F2 refer to the frequencies of the most- and second-most edited geopage. Of the 93195 contributors with 5–20 edits to geopages, 32899 (35.3%) have at least 80% of their edits confined to a single geopage, and 48969 (52.5%) have over 80% of their edits confined to two geopages. Also, for the 28475 contributors with over 20 edits to geopages, 4689 (16.5%) and 7186 (25.2%) have at least 80% edits constrained to one and two geopages, respectively. Pet geopages thus are a common occurrence, for both casual and regular contributors.

Reasons for Small Edit Areas

As a final analysis, we attempted to better explain *why* many contributors have small edit areas, using public information on user pages. We randomly selected 100 contributors with at least 10 edited geopages, having edit area sizes of less than 1 deg², and having user pages. Then, for each contributor u , we concurrently viewed u 's user page and the set of geopages edited to determine possible reasons. Table 3 lists our findings. As expected, contributors with small edit areas tend to either be born in or living in the region defined by their edit areas, with over half of contributors stating so explicitly. The remaining contributors did not state a geographic interest, or expressed general or special interest for some local features of their edit areas, such as local businesses, schools, and railways. Note that only reasons stated explicitly were cataloged and included in our counts, but it is reasonable to assume certain relationships with edit areas even if they were not explicitly stated. For example, contrib-

utors with interests in local schools most likely were born in or live in the area as well.

Future Work

We have shown that a significant group of Wikipedia contributors exhibits selectivity and geographic locality in the geopages that they edit. However, more Wikipedia information could be used to identify edit areas for a larger portion of Wikipedia contributors. For example, we used the presence or absence of a minor edit flag to determine edit importance, but the flag is manually set at the time of editing, and in some cases might not accurately reflect the content of the edits. Alternative measures can serve as more accurate indicators of the importance of individual edits, such as the page size difference before and after the edit, whether the page was reverted to an earlier version by another contributor, or the time and frequency of edits. Also, rather than ignoring minor edits, they might be used as an additional source of evidence for determining edit areas. A large number of minor edits to geopages in a small geographic area could indicate interest in that area, even if few significant contributions were made to those pages.

Alternatively, more extensive data mining can be performed using other freely available data sources to enhance the gazetteer. Instead of using the limited DBpedia gazetteer, another gazetteer, such as the GNIS/GNS³ or GeoNames⁴, could be used to aid analysis. Doing so would allow other gazetteer features, such as population, hierarchy or containment relationships, and feature classes, to aid in identifying features with extent and generally enhancing relationships between geopages in contributors' edit areas. For example, it might be of interest to examine correlations between geographic location, population, and the number of edits to the corresponding Wikipedia geopage. Our methods might also be applied to other user-contributed datasets such as geotagged Flickr photos.

³<http://geonames.usgs.gov/>

⁴<http://geonames.org/>

Conclusion

This work provides a case study on the efficacy of data mining on large, publicly-available data sets. Active contributors of projects like Wikipedia should be aware that their contributions can increasingly be exploited to find information about them that they might not want revealed. Furthermore, for Wikipedia, edit histories permanently associate contributors with the pages they edit, including non-geopages and future contributions. Additional concern is warranted when multiple datasets are joined to construct accurate multi-faceted user profiles. As the Internet advances toward more interactive and open applications, users should become more savvy in their decisions on making personal information public. However, as we have shown, these are very difficult decisions, considering the wealth of information that can be gleaned from seemingly-innocuous digital footprints.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the US National Science Foundation under grants CCF-05-15241, IIS-0705832, IIS-0713501, IIS-0812377, and IIS-0836560 as well as Microsoft Research, Google, and NVIDIA. The second author wishes to thank Esther and Kiri for their kind support.

References

- Almeida, R. B.; Mozafari, B.; and Cho, J. 2007. On the evolution of Wikipedia. In *Proc. of the 1st International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media*.
- Auer, S.; Bizer, C.; Kobilarov, G.; Lehmann, J.; Cyganiak, R.; and Ives, Z. 2007. DBpedia: A nucleus for a web of open data. In *Proc. of the 6th International Semantic Web Conference*.
- Borthwick, A. 1999. *A Maximum Entropy Approach to Named Entity Recognition*. Ph.D. Dissertation, New York University.
- Burke, M., and Kraut, R. 2008. Taking up the mop: Identifying future Wikipedia administrators. In *CHI'08 Extended Abstracts*.
- Buscaldi, D.; Rosso, P.; and García, P. P. 2006. Inferring geographical ontologies from multiple resources for geographical information retrieval. In *Proc. of the SIGIR'06 Workshop on Geographic Information Retrieval*.
- Clarke, K. C. 1995. *Analytical and Computer Cartography*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, second edition.
- Forte, A., and Bruckman, A. 2005. Why do people write for Wikipedia? Incentives to contribute to open-content publishing. In *Proc. of the GROUP'05 Workshop on Sustaining Community*.
- Giles, J. 2005. Internet encyclopaedias go head to head. *Nature* 438:900–901.
- Goodchild, M. F. 2007. Citizens as sensors: The world of volunteered geography. *GeoJournal* 69(4):211–221.
- Hardy, D. 2008. Discovering behavioral patterns in collective authorship of place-based information. In *Proc. of the 9th International Conference of the Association of Internet Researchers (Internet Research 9.0)*.
- Hecht, B.; Rohs, M.; Schöning, J.; and Krüger, A. 2007. WikEye — using magic lenses to explore georeferenced Wikipedia content. In *Proc. of the 3rd International Workshop on Pervasive Mobile Interaction Devices*.
- Hill, L. L. 2000. Core elements of digital gazetteers: Placenames, categories, and footprints. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 1923:280–290.
- Kittur, A.; Chi, E.; Pendleton, B. A.; Suh, B.; and Mytkowicz, T. 2007a. Power of the few vs. wisdom of the crowd: Wikipedia and the rise of the bourgeoisie. In *Proc. of Alt.CHI at CHI'07*.
- Kittur, A.; Suh, B.; Pendleton, B. A.; and Chi, E. H. 2007b. He says, she says: Conflict and coordination in Wikipedia. In *Proc. of the 2007 SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.
- Lesser, J. A., and Hughes, M. A. 1986. The generalizability of psychographic market segments across geographic locations. *Journal of Marketing* 50(1):18–27.
- Lim, E.-P.; Wang, Z.; Sadeli, D.; Li, Y.; Chang, C.-H.; Chatterjea, K.; Goh, D. H.-L.; Theng, Y.-L.; Zhang, J.; and Sun, A. 2006. Integration of Wikipedia and a geography digital library. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science* 4312:449–458.
- Ortega, F., and Gonzalez-Barahona, J. M. 2007. Quantitative analysis of the Wikipedia community of users. In *Proc. of the 2007 International Wiki Symposium*.
- Padmanabhan, V. N., and Subramanian, L. 2001. An investigation of geographic mapping techniques for internet hosts. In *Proc. of the 2001 Conference on Applications, Technologies, Architectures, and Protocols for Computer Communications*.
- Popescu, A.; Grefenstette, G.; and Moëllic, P.-A. 2008. Gazetiki: Automatic creation of a geographical gazetteer. In *Proc. of the 8th Conference on Digital Libraries*.
- Roth, C.; Taraborelli, D.; and Gilbert, N. 2008. Measuring wiki viability: An empirical assessment of the social dynamics of a large sample of wikis. In *Proc. of the 2008 International Wiki Symposium*.
- Suh, B.; Chi, E. H.; Pendleton, B. A.; and Kittur, A. 2007. Us vs. them: Understanding social dynamics in Wikipedia with revert graph visualizations. In *Proc. of the 2007 Symposium on Visual Analytics Science and Technology*.
- Toral, A., and Munoz, R. 2006. A proposal to automatically build and maintain gazetteers for named entity recognition by using Wikipedia. In *Proc. of the EACL'06 Workshop on New Text*.
- Viégas, F. B.; Wattenberg, M.; and Dave, K. 2004. Studying cooperation and conflict between authors with history flow visualizations. In *Proc. of the 2004 SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.
- Voss, J. 2005. Measuring Wikipedia. In *Proc. of the 10th International Conference of the International Society for Scientometrics and Informetrics*.