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Abstract
Wikipedia and Wikidata are socio-technical systems driven by collaborative communities, open content, and open-source infrastructure. Some of the open-source software development around them involves code-sharing sites like GitHub. Analyzing GitHub for repositories related to Wikipedia and Wikidata can thus provide insights into multiple dimensions of the development of Wikipedia and Wikidata tools. We plan to do such an analysis, and in order to test our workflows for doing that, we ran a preliminary study based on a sample of 1000 GitHub repositories each for Wikidata and Wikipedia. We are preregistering our workflows here as a transparent basis for documenting and reporting on the full analysis later. The kinds of insights we expect based on the preliminary data about open-source GitHub repositories related to Wikidata and Wikipedia are as follows: (i) statistical information about these repositories; (ii) computational information, e.g. in terms of the programming languages used; (iii) demographic information about the contributors to such open-source projects; (iv) legal information about the choice of licenses; (v) linguistic information about the natural language used in the context of these repositories; (vi) trends over time. In the process of applying these preliminary workflows to studying the full dataset of GitHub repositories related to Wikipedia and Wikidata, we hope to gain some additional insights into the community dynamics at play in volunteer software development around Wikimedia projects, as well as into the process and merits of preregistrations for studies of this kind. We welcome community feedback on this approach as well as suggestions on additional aspects to include into the full study, and collaborations on the actual implementation.

Keywords
Wikipedia, Wikidata, Empirical Software Engineering, Wikimedia Developers, GitHub

© 2023 Copyright for this paper by its authors. Use permitted under Creative Commons License Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0).
1. Introduction

The field of Empirical Software Engineering has evolved around the idea and practice of studying how programmers work, e.g. how they address a particular issue or use a given resource to develop computer-based solutions [1]. With the age of Web 2.0, the creation of code repositories such as GitHub, GitLab, or Gitee has provided sufficient resources to study the behaviors of communities of computer programmers, particularly when they are contributing to collaborative projects [2]. As open-source projects have risen and provided successful outputs, the study of the characteristics of the communities behind them has grown significantly [3]. In this context, various patterns have been analyzed, ranging from the mechanisms behind the choice of topics [4], programming languages [5], and licenses [6] to the demographic distributions of communities [3, 7, 8]. Since the early days of the Wikimedia community, the development of open-source software has been one of the main pillars of the growth of Wikimedia projects, particularly Wikipedia and Wikidata. Open-source software within the realm of the Wikimedia community is diverse and involves, for instance, toolkits to process Wikipedia [9] and Wikidata [10], user scripts [11] and bots [12] to automate the editing and analysis of the two online databases [13], as well as tooling for visualizing Wikidata content [14], not to forget the software used to host Wikipedia and Wikidata, respectively – MediaWiki [15] and Wikibase [16].

This document represents a preregistration, outlining our approach to evaluating how programmers work on their development projects related to Wikipedia and Wikidata through the assessment of GitHub repositories about Wikidata and Wikipedia. Understanding the GitHub landscape of Wikipedia and Wikidata repositories is essential for optimizing collaboration, identifying programming trends, and ensuring the sustainability of these knowledge-sharing platforms. The primary research questions that guide our study include:

- How does the GitHub community interact with repositories related to Wikipedia and Wikidata?
- What are the predominant programming languages used in GitHub repositories related to Wikipedia and Wikidata?
- Who contributes the most to these GitHub repositories?
- What licenses are commonly associated with open-source projects related to Wikipedia and Wikidata?
- How is the number of repositories distributed by their year of creation and year of the last push?
- What are the most common topics of the repositories related to Wikipedia and Wikidata?

To address these questions, we will begin by explaining our approach to data collection and analysis based on a preliminary study using small-scale sample data and open-source code (Section 2). We will also highlight the importance of these research questions and their relevance in understanding the open-source landscape around Wikipedia and Wikidata. Following the data collection and analysis, we will provide preliminary results for this study based on the sample data and discuss them by contextualizing them with previous research findings on the matter (Section 3). Finally, we will draw conclusions on what the preliminary results mean for a larger-scale study and for potential future work targeting the open-source landscape.
around Wikipedia and Wikidata (Section 4). Each figure and table presented on the way will contain a brief comment on how we expect the methodology of the full study to compare to the preliminary methodology presented here, emphasizing the significance of addressing the research questions to contribute to the understanding of software development in the Wikimedia community.

### 2. Methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full name</td>
<td>The full name of the repository</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>The short description of the repository</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home Page</td>
<td>The URL of the development project</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>Main Programming Language of the repository</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of forks</td>
<td>Number of forks from the repository</td>
<td>int64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of stars</td>
<td>Number of stars received by the repository</td>
<td>int64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License</td>
<td>License of the repository</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User</td>
<td>GitHub Username of the Creator</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of files</td>
<td>Number of files in the repository</td>
<td>int64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hasURL</td>
<td>Repository having a URL for the development project</td>
<td>bool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year created</td>
<td>Year of the creation of the repository</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of last push</td>
<td>Year of the last update of the repository</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Wikimedia Project related to the repository</td>
<td>object</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the initial study, we focus on GitHub, querying its search API via the dedicated Python library PyGitHub [17].\(^1\) On April 20, 2023 we thus found 36.2k GitHub repositories related to Wikipedia\(^2\) (Automatically assigned “Wikipedia” as a category) and 2.9k GitHub repositories related to Wikidata (Automatically assigned “Wikidata” as a category).\(^3\) These ca. The GitHub repositories initially included in both “Wikipedia” and “Wikidata” categories at once are attributed “Wiki” as a category. 40k repositories are the target of our full study aimed at analyzing the status of open-source software development related to the two Wikimedia Projects. In order to test our workflows, we retrieved – on the same day and still via PyGitHub – the metadata of the first 1,000 search results (that is the limit of the public search API) of the two search queries based on the Best Match sorting option (for the full study, we will retrieve the full dataset using date-based batches of 1000 or less).

---

\(^1\)Code and data for our preliminary study are available via https://github.com/csisc/WikiGitHub.
\(^2\)https://github.com/search?q=wikipedia&type=repositories
\(^3\)https://github.com/search?q=wikidata&type=repositories
2.1. Structure of the data

The retrieved data involves multiple variables about the characteristics of repositories and their activity, as shown in Table 1. We stored the dataset as an Excel spreadsheet using Pandas, a Python Library for data analytics [18]. Later, we used Matplotlib and Seaborn [19], two Python Libraries for data visualization, to generate plots to visualize the statistical features of the variables. None of the retrieved data except the Description field (see Section 3.6 for details) and the License field (see Section 3.4 for details) have been pre-processed before data analysis.

![Figure 1: Boxplot for the number of stars, forks, and files for Wikidata and Wikipedia repositories.](image)

For the full study, we expect several effects to be relevant. (A) The number of repositories included in the graph will grow to about 3-fold for Wikidata and about 37-fold for Wikipedia. We expect this to lead to smaller variances and that this effect should be much more pronounced for the Wikipedia data. (B) As existing repositories age, the values along the three dimensions plotted here are expected to all rise as a consequence. (C) New repositories will be created, which will lower those values.

3. Preliminary results and discussion

3.1. Statistical information about the repositories

Of the 2000 GitHub repositories retrieved in total, some (18 for Wikipedia and 6 for Wikidata) were empty. Since that does not provide information about software development, we eliminated them in favour of a more meaningful analysis, leaving 1,976 non-blank GitHub repositories related to either or both of Wikipedia or Wikidata. 982 of them are exclusively related to Wikipedia, while 994 are related to Wikidata⁴. This distribution allows a fair comparison

⁴Wikidata-related repositories include 35 generic repositories also linked to Wikipedia. We disregard this fact for the purpose of our preliminary study. For the full study, we expect this number to be higher, and plan to explore the connections.
between the patterns in which Wikipedia and Wikidata are used in computer programming, whereas the full study will mean a comparison based on unequal numbers (somewhat higher than the 36.2k for Wikipedia versus 2.9k for Wikidata that were reported above). 78.3% of the Wikidata-related repositories and 68.6% of the Wikipedia-related ones returned a value for the Home Page URL, so presumably have a project website. This can be interpreted to mean that the Wikidata-related repositories and to a lesser extent the Wikipedia-related repositories are developed for practical use in deploying web tools and services [20].

When assessing the popularity and volume of the GitHub repositories, we found that the average number of stars and forks for Wikipedia-related repositories significantly exceeds the ones for Wikidata-related repositories, as shown in Figure 1. This is mainly due to the higher popularity and longer age of Wikipedia. Wikipedia has been created in 2001, so it is 11 years older than Wikidata [10]. In terms of audience, Wikipedia is used by millions of people across the world for information seeking in various contexts, making it one of the most visited websites for years [21]. By contrast, despite being multilingual, the direct readership of Wikidata is only equal to 2% of that of the English Wikipedia, as of June 2023 (277 million vs. 10 billion pageviews)\(^5\). Thanks to their openly licensed content, both projects are used indirectly too, e.g. on other websites, in search engines, or in research projects. Here, we are not aware of comparative data, but we suspect that such indirect uses would see Wikidata at least not far behind Wikipedia, and possibly ahead of it.

### 3.2. Computational information

![Diagram showing programming languages used in Wikidata and Wikipedia repositories](image)

**Figure 2:** Wikidata and Wikipedia GitHub repositories by main programming language. "None" refers to repositories that primarily hold data rather than code. For the full study, we expect a similar picture, perhaps with a higher visibility of currently popular languages.

When examining the main programming language for GitHub repositories related to Wikidata and Wikipedia, we found a similar profile about the choice of programming languages to process Wikidata and Wikipedia, as shown in Figure 2, despite the fact that Wikipedia is semi-structured, while Wikidata is a fully-structured open knowledge graph [10]. In both cases, we found the distribution of GitHub repositories per main programming language to follow a Lotka-like law (i.e., an inverse power law) [22]. This is concordant with previous research findings on the matter [23]. Overall, Python was clearly the most popular language in the repositories we explored (it was used in 282 Wikidata-related repositories and 304 Wikipedia-related repositories). This preponderance of Python is a pattern common to research-oriented GitHub repositories [23]. It is not, however, a general characteristic of GitHub repositories, where JavaScript, a web programming language, is leading the worldwide open-source development movement [24, 25]. The prominence of Python can be explained not only by the general popularity of this language [26] but also (somewhat relatedly) by the better availability of robust Python libraries that are customized to process Wikimedia projects. These include Pywikibot (https://pypi.org/project/pywikibot/), Wikibase Integrator (https://pypi.org/project/wikibaseintegrator/), WPTools (https://pypi.org/project/wptools/), and Wikipedia (https://pypi.org/project/wikipedia/). That being said, web programming languages such as JavaScript, CSS, PHP, and HTML are also popular in Wikidata and Wikipedia open-source development projects. This is mainly due to the fact that Wikidata and Wikipedia are web-hosted projects [10]. Java appeared among the most used programming languages too. This can be understood in terms of the common use of this object-oriented programming language for open-source development projects [24, 25] and Java’s popularity amongst researchers [27] as well as for mobile app development [28]. Jupyter notebooks were also popular, and while we did not analyze the language they were written in, other analyses suggest that they are mostly written in Python, though increasingly in other languages too, like R, Julia, and Scala [29].

3.3. Demographic information

When retrieving the GitHub usernames of the accounts behind the repositories, we found the repositories to be distributed among developers in a way that follows Lotka’s law [22], as shown in Figure 3. This fits with the overall patterns of the distribution of GitHub repositories per author [23]. Most prominent in the data is the Wikimedia Foundation Development Team (17 Wikipedia-related repositories and 14 Wikidata-related ones). Although their GitHub repositories are generally mirrors of the development happening on Wikimedia servers, this team’s prominence in our results highlights its role in maintaining the software behind Wikimedia projects, particularly MediaWiki and Pywikibot [30]. Wikimedia Deutschland, the Wikimedia chapter in Germany, created the largest number of GitHub repositories related to Wikidata (17). This confirms the central position of Wikimedia Deutschland in advocating for, promoting, and developing Wikidata as a project that can bring other Wikimedia projects to the next stage [31]. The analysis of the other main contributors to Wikidata and Wikipedia GitHub repositories revealed that most of the contributions of Wikipedia-related repositories are either tech giants like Google, startups and open-source communities like hatnote, Kiwix, learn-co-students, and Wikifox, or research scientists (e.g. Ed Summers [Stanford University, United States of America] and Brian C. Keegan [University of Colorado Boulder, United States of America]) and projects
We identified no developer who started more than three Wikipedia-related repositories.

The situation is different for Wikidata, where we observed Wikimedia volunteers who had established more than three relevant repositories, including Tiago Lubiana (lubianat) and Maxime Lathuilière (maxlath) at 13 and 12, respectively. Wikimedia researchers having a close relationship with the Wikimedia Community are also visibly engaged in Wikidata open-source development (e.g., Egon Willighagen [egonw], Andrew I. Su [sulab], and Jakob Voß [nichtich]). The higher involvement of the Wikimedia Community in developing Wikidata-related projects can be explained in part by the more standardized format of Wikidata in the form of triples, which makes it easier than Wikipedia to process automatically [10]. Other factors likely contributing to the effect include the fact that Wikidata tools can to some extent build on Wikipedia ones, and the considerable efforts that Wikimedia Deutschland is investing in the disseminating of technical aspects of Wikidata, particularly inside the community [31].

Most of the main contributors to GitHub repositories related to Wikidata and Wikipedia are from Europe and North America. This is mainly caused by the country distribution of the open-source development community [7] and fits with similar analyses of GitHub contributor demographics, including one that combined GitHub data about repositories with demographic data from Wikidata [8]. All of the active contributors we named above self-identify as male. Gender bias is a common feature of the GitHub open-source community [8], with various contributing factors [32, 33, 34]. Further efforts should be provided to promote diversity, equity, and inclusion inside the Wikimedia technical community. Works in this direction have already been provided to establish a more inclusive community of Wikidata contributors, enhancing the coverage of under-represented topics in the knowledge graph [35].

3.4. Legal information
Among the information that have been retrieved using the GitHub API, there was data about license attribution based on the first line of every license file. These first lines of license files are processed by hand to attribute the right license name for every repository. The analysis of the licenses assigned to the GitHub repositories related to Wikidata and Wikipedia finds both to have a similar profile of license attribution, as shown in Figure 4. The apparent dominance of All Rights Reserved might come as a surprise but has to be understood such that those repositories did not have any license declared, in which case full copyright protection has to be assumed by default. Further efforts should be aimed at raising awareness within the Wikimedia technical community around the importance of using – and properly declaring – permissive licenses to allow the reuse and upgrade of their source codes for the good of the Wikimedia projects.

The most popular open license in Wikimedia open-source development is the MIT License, followed by the GNU General Public License and the Apache License. These three licenses are the main ones that have been used for years in open-source development on GitHub [36, 37]. The only surprising fact is that the rate of GNU General Public License use is higher in Wikidata-related repositories in the same way as the rate of MIT License is higher in Wikipedia-related repositories. The reduced gap between GNU General Public License use and MIT License use in Wikidata-related repositories can perhaps be explained by the fact that Wikidata is released under the CC0 License [10] and that Wikipedia is released under the CC-BY-SA 4.0 License [38]. The GNU General Public License is more compatible with the CC0 License than the CC-BY-SA 4.0 License [39].

Figure 4: Wikidata and Wikipedia GitHub repositories by software license. “All Rights Reserved” essentially means the absence of a license declaration. For the full study, we expect this pattern to hold.
3.5. Trends

Changes over time are difficult to assess with the limited dataset that we have, since we suspect that the sort order we used to sample GitHub repositories is influenced by at least some parameters that correlate with repository age, e.g. the number of stars, forks, commits, committers, or traffic.

In particular, the sharp decline in recent years that is visible in Figure 5 might well be an artifact. This could have been introduced due to our sampling a limited amount of repositories in a non-random fashion, or it could be due to more subtle effects, such as the time that it takes before a GitHub-hosted repository is actually indexed by GitHub and included into its search index.

We thus refrain from interpreting the distribution given in Figure 5 based on the preliminary data, except for noting the existence of a few repositories that deal with Wikidata and that have been created before the inception of the Project in 2012. These projects are either preliminary sources for the initial development of Wikidata [31] or several Wikipedia-related development projects that have been adapted to support Wikidata as a resource like YAGO [40], an open knowledge graph initially derived from Wikipedia and WordNet [40].

Notwithstanding the suspected bias against new repositories, recent years feature strongly in terms of the year of last commit, and 2023 – despite being in its early stages at the time of sampling – came out on top. Once we have the full dataset, we expect the prominence of recent years in this plot to be even more pronounced, and comparisons to the temporal

---

**Figure 5:** GitHub repositories related to Wikidata and Wikipedia by creation year. This is hard to interpret other than that it likely reflects not only the underlying data but also some strong biases. While the low values for 2023 are an artifact of having queried early in the year, we believe that this figure contains further artifacts – some of which correlate with repository age – that were introduced by sampling only 1000 repositories each for both websites. For the full study, we expect the values for recent years to be higher relative to the maximum.
patterns of repository creation (as per Figure 5) might yield insights into community dynamics, sustainability and related matters. There could also be relationships between the license choice (cf. Figure 4) and commit trends, since more permissive licenses provide more avenues for engagement with a given repository [41].

Figure 6: GitHub repositories related to Wikidata and Wikipedia by year of last public commit. For the full study, we expect the recent years to be even more prominent.

3.6. Linguistic information

The Description data obtained from GitHub for each repository (cf. Table 1 - Brief statements available for all the considered repositories) have been converted to lowercase, split by spaces, and stripped from stopwords and punctuation to identify the most common words provided to describe the GitHub repositories related to Wikidata and Wikipedia (cf. Fig. 7).

The analysis of the top words included in these descriptions revealed that the distribution of the words in the descriptions follows Zipf’s law [42].

Both sets of GitHub repositories mainly deal with applications for the processing of data of the two projects, as highlighted by the prominence of the word data in both. This involves the management of Wikipedia pages (articles, pages, text, article, and page) and Wikidata items and statements (knowledge, items, graph, and entities). This also includes the development of software (code), software libraries (library) – especially in python – for the development of Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) and dump processing methods (api, wikibase, mediawiki, dumps, and dump) and the creation of tools (tool and tools) and projects (project). This is mostly done in the context of promoting the systematic use of APIs and dumps for the automatic enrichment and processing of Wikidata and Wikipedia [43].

Beyond this, there are several specific applications that are only applicable to Wikidata or Wikipedia. Wikidata repositories emphasize projects related to the management of SPARQL
queries (sparql, queries, and query) or the creation of bots or scripts for the automatic enrichment of the knowledge graph. This is closely linked to ongoing research projects for Wikidata related to SPARQL query optimization and data augmentation based on external resources [13].

As for Wikipedia repositories, they show an interest in the development of methods for quicker and simpler data mining of the project (search and simple). This confirms that the development efforts around Wikipedia meet the long-term research efforts for the development of robust and more efficient data mining techniques for exploring Wikipedia [44].

4. Conclusion

This project lightly analyzed about 2000 repositories out of nearly 40,000 that exist on GitHub. Now that this project exists as a demonstration of how the analysis could work, we could gain higher precision in our findings and also expand to more easily identify exceptional cases if we continued to analyze all identified repositories. Furthermore, we could include GitLab or Codeberg repositories – which have a reputation among some Wikimedia developers for being more value-aligned than GitHub – or repositories from other platforms like Gitee that have other demographic biases. We could also take a look at the technical communication platforms of the Wikimedia Foundation such as Gerrit⁶ and Phabricator⁷ [45] to further examine how

---

⁶https://gerrit.wikimedia.org/r/
the Wikimedia technical community discusses the incremental development of collaborative projects, possibly including hardware-related ones like Internet-in-a-Box\(^8\).

This project explored which questions would be answerable with the data available in GitHub. More insights could be gained from matching external datasets to this data (e.g. as per [8]), including the disambiguation of contributors and institutions, matching repositories to scholarly publications [46, 47], and usage statistics in Wikimedia platforms.

The Wikimedia community is highly engaged in the governance of Wikimedia projects. This engagement plays out in various ways, but for example, community forums exist in the Wikimedia platform where developers and users meet to discuss user challenges and technical possibilities. While the Wikimedia community will discuss this paper as they routinely do for all such reports, some people will undoubtedly ask further questions, and others may want to interpret the preliminary results from this paper to inform ongoing or planned tool development.

We intended for this first analysis to be useful, but given the long-term budget planning of the Wikimedia Foundation for development, the global and large Wikimedia audience base, and the stakes of sustaining success as a nonprofit general information resource, scheduled reporting updates for development trends such as these would surely guide stakeholder decision making. One notable concern highlighted by our analysis is the prevalence of “All Rights Reserved” licenses in repositories. This finding underscores the importance of educating developers on open science best practices and encouraging them to declare a license for their projects, even if they are not open-source in nature. This step can contribute to a more open and collaborative development ecosystem within Wikimedia and similar communities. This preregistration is only an early step into characterizing the development landscape. Correct collection and interpretation of development statistics such as those we explored here – especially considering how much of this is volunteer-organized with little central planning – could have significant returns of community engagement on the investment.

While Wikipedia and Wikidata have been success stories in many respects – including some software-related ones –, we suspect that volunteer developers of software around Wikipedia, Wikidata and other Wikimedia projects would still benefit from insights into the social dynamics of software development (within Wikimedia contexts as well as more generally), and so we invite feedback from anyone who might be a potential user of the results of the full study.
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