

Should we trust Wikipedia?

MAYBE.

Isn't "maybe" the answer for whether we should trust any source of information?

Wikipedia is one of the best starting points for research, but don't let it be the ending point for research. Treat Wikipedia with a critical eye to sift the good from the bad.

High Quality

- Lead section of an article has an accurate overview
- Coverage is neutral and balanced
- Cites reliable sources
- Edited by multiple, diverse users
- High article rating on [Talk] page

Low Quality

- Presence of warning banners and messages in the article
- Absence of blue colored links, inline citations and references
- [Talk] page has contentious dialogue and unresolved issues
- Contains promotional language

Warning templates

Hatnotes and templates warn of problems or shortcomings in articles. Look for inline warnings such as [citation needed] or [original research?] in the main body of text.



This article **does not cite any references or sources**. Please help [improve this article](#) by [adding citations to reliable sources](#). Unsourced material may be challenged and [removed](#).
(December 2009)



This article's **tone or style may not reflect the encyclopedic tone used on Wikipedia**. See Wikipedia's [guide to writing better articles](#) for suggestions. (January 2010)

Once the taxes were eliminated, trading volumes returned and grew substantially in the 1990s.^{[[citation needed](#)]}

WikiProject quality assessments

WikiProjects are groups of articles in a topic area. Assessment efforts help identify high quality featured articles (FA) and good articles (GA) by assigning a rating. See the [Talk] page of an article to see if it has been graded.

Article edit history page

The "View history" button shows the complete list of revisions for an article. Examine the time stamps and summaries to determine if the article is stable or up to date. Use the "diff" feature to compare any two versions of an article.

| Amphibian and reptile articles by quality and importance | | | | | | | |
|--|------------|------|-----|-------|----|-------|-------|
| Quality | Importance | | | | | | Total |
| | Top | High | Mid | Low | NA | ??? | |
| ★ FA | 3 | 6 | 5 | 28 | | | 42 |
| ★ FL | 1 | | 2 | 4 | | | 7 |
| ⊕ GA | 1 | 15 | 17 | 6 | | | 39 |
| B | 3 | 30 | 42 | 45 | | | 120 |
| C | 10 | 27 | 76 | 221 | | | 334 |
| Start | 3 | 57 | 354 | 2,025 | | | 2,439 |
| Stub | | 6 | 205 | 4,297 | | 5,376 | 9,884 |

(cur | prev) 09:00, 30 January 2015 Nick-D (talk | contribs) . . (221,554 bytes) (-166) . . (Undid revision 644820418 by Charles01 (talk) that wasn't good grammar: the 'also' can be omitted. Tweaked para to remove duplication)
 (cur | prev) 08:47, 30 January 2015 Charles01 (talk | contribs) . . (221,720 bytes) (0) . . (The Germans had invaded Poland from the west. Not the east. Resequencing accordingly.)
 (cur | prev) 08:03, 30 January 2015 Sterndmitri (talk | contribs) . . (221,720 bytes) (0)
 (cur | prev) 19:11, 18 January 2015 HoustonJackson (talk | contribs) . . (221,720 bytes) (-35)
 (cur | prev) 11:23, 17 January 2015 Gadget850 (talk | contribs) . . (221,755 bytes) (-11) . . (→References: rem nowrap: bre columns)
 (cur | prev) 22:00, 16 January 2015 Carlotm (talk | contribs) m . . (221,766 bytes) (-109) . . (→(Sister project)) | +{{Subject t
 (cur | prev) 09:55, 11 January 2015 JEMASCOLA (talk | contribs) m . . (221,875 bytes) (+27) . . (→Axis advance stalls (1943): Provided a link to Operation Sledgehammer.)
 (cur | prev) 02:50, 11 January 2015 MaxEnt (talk | contribs) . . (221,848 bytes) (+33) . . (I think it's good practice to offer up quick link to the root of a counting system (note: the world war page is a tiring eyeballful with all the meta-craft on top))

"It's great for [the National Archives] because it takes our goals of transparency, public participation, and collaboration to a new level."

– David Ferriero, Archivist of the United States

FOR MORE INFO

WEB: <http://enwp.org/WP:RESEARCH>

