

# Data coverage, richness, and quality of OpenStreetMap for special interest tags: wayside crosses – a case study.

Philipp Weigell\*

June 9, 2023

## Abstract

Volunteered Geographic Information projects like OpenStreetMap which allow accessing and using the raw data, are a treasure trove for investigations – e. g. cultural topics, urban planning, or accessibility of services. Among the concerns are the reliability and accurateness of the data. While it was found that for mainstream topics, like roads or museums, the data completeness and accuracy is very high, especially in the western world, this is not clear for niche topics. Furthermore, many of the analyses are almost one decade old in which the OpenStreetMap-database grew to over nine billion elements.

Based on OpenStreetMap-data of wayside crosses and other cross-like objects regional cultural differences and prevalence of the types within Europe, Germany and Bavaria are investigated. For Bavaria, internally and by comparing to an official dataset and other proxies the data completeness, logical consistency, positional, temporal, and thematic accuracy is assessed. Subsequently, the usability for the specific case and to generalize for the use of OpenStreetMap data for niche topics.

It is estimated that about one sixth to one third of the crosses located within Bavaria are recorded in the database and positional accuracy is better than 50 metres in most cases. In addition, linguistic features of the inscriptions, the usage of building materials, dates of erection and other details deducible from the dataset are discussed. It is found that data quality and coverage for niche topics exceeds expectations but varies strongly by region and should not be trusted without thorough dissection of the dataset.

## 1 Introduction

Volunteered Geographic Information (VGI) projects [1] like OpenStreetMap [2], which allow accessing and using the raw data under the Open Data Commons Open Database License [3], offer a treasure trove of data to investigate different topics. This includes, among others, cultural topics, urban planning tasks, or accessibility of services. Among the concerns are the reliability and accurateness of the data [4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. While it was found that for mainstream topics, like roads [9] or museums [10] the data completeness and accuracy is very high, especially in the western world, this is not clear for niche topics. Also many of the studies are one decade old in which the

database grew significantly to over nine billion mapped elements [11].

By design and its guidelines [12] OpenStreetMap is open for any geographical information, which is verifiable on the ground. This reaches from roads, to the colour of window frames in the third-floor of a building. However, as the data is contributed voluntarily and uncoordinated, especially niche topics will have a very inhomogeneous coverage. In addition, inherent biases have to be kept in mind. E.g. [13] found that information contributed by persons identifying as men is different from that contributed by persons identifying as women. The same can be expected by age, cultural background, education and furthermore.

All information is recorded in key=value pairs which are called tags on three types of objects:

---

\*arxiv@weigell.com

nodes, ways and relations. While nodes denote point-like objects, ways, which are composed of several nodes, describe extended objects like streets or rivers. If ways are closed they can also describe buildings or other two-dimensional objects. Finally, relations, which are composed out of ways and/or nodes, describe more complex objects, like for example a country boundary including enclaves. The object type or further details are organized in the tags, e.g. keys like `MATERIAL` and values like `WOOD` [14]. As each object may have several tags, information can be faceted and enable complex studies.

This study tries to understand for a niche topic, i.e. wayside crosses and other cross-like objects, how rich the information in the database actually is, how much it varies with regional or other factors and how far one can rely on it [15]. The main focus will be on the state of Bavaria in Germany, but first the global, the European, and the German situation will be discussed.

All data discussed was accessed on May 23<sup>rd</sup> 2023 via the overpass turbo API [16].

## 2 Global situation

On a global scale 170311 objects are mapped (i.e. stored in the database) as `historic=wayide_cross` (HWC). [17] The vast majority, 169511, of these are nodes. It can be assumed that most of the other objects, which are mapped more complex, i.e. as way or relation, are mapped incorrectly or are indeed other kinds of place to worship as for example a wayside shrine. This is also supported by the official documentation, which encourages only the use of nodes. As the non-adherence to the *correct* tagging is only 0.5%, this study will concentrate on nodes to ensure consistent data.

In addition, there are five other node-types available in the OpenStreetMap dataset which are related. First, `historic=wayside_shrine` (HWS, 103746 objects) [18]. Especially in the Western context these often refer to so called *Bildstöcke*, which depending on the strictness of definition can be counted as wayside cross as they serve a very similar purpose.

Second, there is the tag for crosses without historical value as seen by the person registering it to the database: `man_made=cross` (MMC, 21985




Figure 1: Absolute count (left) and per area count (right) of HWC, HWS, MMC, MC, MTC, and SMY nodes for the top-10 countries with the most HWC nodes.

objects) [19] and third summit crosses denoted by `summit:cross=yes` (SMY, 3285 objects) [20]. Last, there is `memorial=cross` (MC, 1075 objects) and `memorial:type=cross` (MTC, 59 objects). Both denote memorials for special events or persons with the latter even lacking a formal definition in the OpenStreetMap-Wiki. [21] As especially for the latter three object types the folksonomy seems not yet to be well defined, they tend to be combined in a few cases. Table 1 summarizes how often each tag is combined on node-objects with each other tag, normalized to the number of occurrences of the tag in question. As can be seen, when analysing HWC, contamination is only half a percent, and HWC and HWS are clearly distinct. As the focus will be on HWC in the following this contamination will be treated as negligible and thus disregarded.

As pointed out in [22] it is expected, that over time the specificity will increase. However, over a decade after [23] one of the main problems found there, still remains: data is not consistently tagged in the OpenStreetMap-database. This of course is also rooted in the fact, that a typical contributor will in many cases not be able to distinguish if a cross has a historic value or is "just" a memorial for example. Here the community, i.e. the active contributors, will need to find a less complex but more exact definition if tagging shall converge at one point.

Table 1: Percentage of objects bearing the other key in relation to the total number objects with that object type.

	HWC	HWS	MMC	MC	MTC	SMY
HWC	-	0.0%	0.5%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
HWS	0.0%	-	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
MMC	3.6%	0.2%	-	0.2%	0.0%	2.0%
MC	2.4%	0.0%	3.2%	-	0.7%	0.4%
MTC	3.4%	0.0%	1.7%	13.6%	-	0.0%
SMY	2.2%	0.0%	13.1%	0.1%	0.0%	-

### 3 European situation

The top ten countries in terms of mapped HWC-nodes are all European, with in absolute terms the most nodes in Germany, France, and Poland. This is both to be expected as, first, Europe has a strong Christian tradition. Second, the data-completeness is high if roads are employed as a proxy [9] and third, the top three countries are among the larger ones in terms of area within Europe. A notable miss here is the predominantly protestant UK.

If additionally, wayside shrines are considered, which are assumed to be predominantly Christian in European countries, Austria and Italy are significantly closer to Poland. This reflects different cultural traditions which evolved in the medieval culture of Europe, like the preference for wayside shrines in Southern Tyrol [24, 25]. Although, many crosses are erected for mourning, e.g. after car accidents, with less focus on the religious aspect [26, 27, 28, 29], HWC-nodes are only found in France and all other tags are negligible.

Normalized to the area, the order changes. While Germany is still in the top-3 France drastically falls behind, even when disregarding the overseas territories. This could be rooted in the secular tradition in France [30] and/or incomplete data. As similarly the strongly Catholic Poland with a strong tradition in erecting crosses [31] and the likewise Catholic Spain, fall behind, the latter seems more likely or at least a strong factor. For a definite answer larger field studies would be needed. Smaller countries, with a strong Christian tradition like Czechia and Austria but also Belgium exhibit high densities, especially if we consider wayside shrines as well. Specifically, Belgium is noteworthy here, as its neighbour country The Netherlands have much




Figure 2: Absolute count (left) and per area count (right) of HWC, HWS, MMC, MC, MTC, and SMY nodes for German states with at least 50 mapped HWC nodes. State names are abbreviated by their ISO-3166-code.

lower numbers. As both countries can be assumed to have a similar data coverage [9] this probably stems from the fact that The Netherlands have a protestant tradition and that the cross symbol has significantly different importance, when compared to Belgium [32, 33, 28].

Still, while in all these European countries more than half of the population identifies as Christians [34], no clear correlation with the percentage of Christians nor Catholics, can be identified. While this to some extent reflects different cultural rites on national and regional scales, it also indicates missing data, as we show for Germany, an area with better coverage, the correlation is strong (cf. Figure 4).

In reverse, the concentration of the data in Europe, though expected given the Christian background, reflects the incompleteness of the OpenStreetMap-data in less wealthy regions of the world. As projects with the aim of improving map data in less wealthy regions, like Missing Maps by the red cross and red crescent organizations, focus on "mainstream topics" [35], this imbalance most likely will persist, till vital local communities emerge.

### 4 German situation

Next, we will focus on Germany, where "traditional" wayside crosses are predominant and more than one quarter of the wayside cross-objects




Figure 3: Count of HWC, HWS, MMC, MC, MTC, and SMY nodes by Latitude within Germany.

mapped worldwide are located. Within Germany almost half of the objects are concentrated in Bavaria (BY), followed by the second southern state of Baden-Württemberg (BW), see Figure 2 (left). North Rhine-Westphalia (NW) is the last state which has more than 5000 crosses recorded. This aggregation in the south is also reflected in a strong correlation of the number of HWC-nodes with increasing Latitude (see Figure 3). Roughly at the start of the North German Plain almost no nodes occur in the database. As the data quality within Germany can be assumed to be uncorrelated with the Latitude [36] this hints to a correlation with the predominant denominations in these regions. In combination with HWS a second maximum is around  $50^\circ$  North. We will discuss this further later when focusing on Bavaria.

Similar to the global and European scale, including the other four types, MMC, MC, MTC, and SMY, does not change the picture as their admixture is low in Germany; pointing to a better tag-definition or a stricter folksonomy within the German OpenStreetMap community. In addition to the decrease from south to north, the former division of Germany into West and East, with the secular doctrine in the Eastern part seems to be reflected in the data as no state of the former German Democratic Republic (GDR) reaches 1000 nodes, and four states not even cross the bar of 50 nodes.

Normalizing for the area (see Figure 2 (right)), Saarland (SL), a region with a particular strong French history and influence but also with the highest rate of Catholics among its population [37], yields the highest density. This is remarkable, as we have seen before for France the contrary is true. If this is rooted in different focus of the respective OpenStreetMap communities, the different rate of Catholics or in other different cultural rites can




Figure 4: Areal densities for the sum of all HWC, HWS, MMC, MC, MTC, and SMY nodes per county in Germany versus the share of Catholics within the counties population. Additionally, the least square fit of a logistic function ( $f(x) = a/(1 + e^{(-k*(x-x^0)})} + b$ ) is drawn as red line. Note the logarithmic scaling on the ordinate.

only be investigated by integrating additional, external data.

Furthermore, the two southern states Bavaria and Baden-Württemberg exhibit almost the same densities of nodes for the tags investigated in this paper.

To check if the areal densities of mapped HWC and/or the sum of all studied objects depend on the rate of Christians and/or Catholics, these were determined for all German counties and a logistic function was fitted. As measure for the rate of Catholics and Protestant the official percentage of the most recent general census was used [37]. These two denominations are by far the most common in Germany and combined can be considered the rate of Christians. Analysing all three distributions it becomes obvious that the determining factor is the share of Catholics in a given county. Regardless if only HWC or the sum of all studied objects (see Figure 4) is used a threshold in the range between 30 % to 45 % is observed. Above this threshold a much higher rate of mapped nodes is recorded (note the logarithmic scale). While it is expected that targeted field research would lift the node densities in all regions it is assumed that the general trend would persist, as there are no indications of map-




Figure 5: Absolute count (left) and per area count (right) of HWC, HWS, MMC, MC, MTC, and SMY nodes for the seven Bavarian administrative districts, sorted by descending count of HWC nodes.

ping biases related to the rate of Catholics within Germany.

## 5 Bavarian Situation

When solely focusing on Bavaria, where about half of the German HWC-nodes (20393) are located, the North South trend remains (see Figure 5). Additionally, as the Alps are mostly located in the South of Oberbayern (Upper Bavaria) and partly in Schwaben (Swabia), SMY nodes are essentially all located here. Assuming there are no strong mapping biases towards certain tags, within Unterfranken a clear cultural difference is observed as this is the only administrative area with a higher count of HWS than HWC. Confer the peak of HWS around  $50^\circ$  N in Figure 3.

Next, we will discuss the data quality and then see which analyses are possible with the available data.

### 5.1 Data quality

Five measures to assess the quality of the data will be used. First, the age of the node, i.e. the time since its last change with respect to May 23<sup>rd</sup> 2023. Second, the version number of the node, i.e. the number of times it was changed. Third, the number of different contributing OSM-accounts in a given administrative district, which we will evaluate by calculating the respective Gini-coefficient [38]. Fourth, we assess the average number of tags




Figure 6: Data age distribution of HWC nodes in Bavaria by administrative district. The white dot denotes the media age, the box extends from the first quartile to the third quartile of the data. The whiskers extend no more than 1.5 times the interquartile range, ending at the farthest data point within that interval. The width of the violins indicate the relative number of entries.

present. And last, we estimate the completeness by comparing with an official data set.

Only HWC-nodes will be used for the quality assessment.

#### 5.1.1 Data age

For each of the seven administrative districts the distribution of the times since a node was last changed (confer Figure 6) is determined. Everywhere about 14.5 years ago, or five year after the start [39] of the OpenStreetMap-project, the first node was created. For comparison, the first post boxes appear at least four years earlier. This indicates that, as expected, the relative importance of wayside crosses is much lower than post boxes to the OpenStreetMap community. A wider study, including more tags would yield a relative importance of different aspects of culture and could also give interesting insights into differences among regions. The distribution is remarkably flat with several waves of addition over the last ten years. Also, in all administrative districts new data is added indicating, that the data in all districts is still incomplete. Over all, Mittelfranken (Middle Franconia) and the Oberpfalz (Upper Palatinate) have the




Figure 7: Percentage of HWC nodes with a given version number by administrative district in Bavaria. Version numbers  $\geq 4$  are summed in the the 4+ category.

oldest dataset with a median close to eight years. In contrast, Oberbayern has the newest data set with a median age of about 3 years. As the tag *amenity=post\_box* shows the same pattern it is also an indication that the contributing OSM community is more vital in Oberbayern than in the Oberpfalz.

### 5.1.2 Version count

Figure 7 summarizes the share of nodes with a given version by administrative area. Between 65% and 80% of the nodes were never changed since creation. Another 15% to 20% were changed twice, and 5% to 10% thrice, the remaining more frequently. Typically three factors are expected to contribute to the version count. First, the ease of determining the position. As wayside crosses are often placed at way-crossings this factor is assumed to contribute little and thus yield lower version numbers. The second factor is the amount of meta data which sensibly can be added to a node. As we will show most of the additional information is either easy to determine in the first creation or is maybe not determinable at all. Thus also here a low count is expected. Last, dynamic objects tend to have higher version numbers, e.g. post boxes with changing collecting times, have only 20% to 50% of the nodes with only one version in the different

Table 2: Number of different contributors per administrative district.

Admin. district	Unique contributors
Oberbayern	608
Schwaben	354
Oberpfalz	257
Niederbayern	249
Unterfranken	232
Oberfranken	144
Mittelfranken	117

administrative districts of Bavaria. As well, this is typically not the case for HWC-nodes. However, the rather low frequency of updates, points to the fact that HWC nodes are not the focus of mapping of the Bavarian OpenStreetMap community either.

### 5.1.3 Points of view

Data contributed by a single user tend to reflect a specific point of view, while different editors are expected to represent different facets. I.e. in the case of crosses, user1 might focus on the religious aspects, while user2 has a background in monument conservation. Anyhow, more users do not ensure different points of view, but make them more likely.

Although, in each administrative area contributions by more than a hundred individual users are recorded (see Table 2), there are only a handful that contributed the majority of the data in each area. Thus, all Gini coefficients are between 93% and 99%, i.e. in the regime of extreme inequality. Anyhow, this seems also to be characteristic for the OpenStreetMap-dataset as a whole, as a similar range (91%-97%) is found for post boxes. Still, in both cases the highest inequality is found in Oberfranken (Upper Franconia), while in comparison the most diverse distribution is found in Oberbayern. This again hints to a more vital community in Oberbayern.

### 5.1.4 Data richness

To assess the information content of the data, for each administrative district the mean number of additional descriptive tags is determined (see Figure 8). These are all tags which are neither the main tag HWC nor one of the meta keys like VERSION or ID.



This analysis indicates, that the datasets of Ober- and Unterfranken (Upper and Lower Franconia) are on a relative scale the most feature rich with about 1.2 additional, descriptive tag on average. The most frequent key is RELIGION which, e.g in Unterfranken, is recorded for about 25% of the nodes. Here also for almost the same rate the DENOMINATION-key is present. However, the religion is not set for almost three quarters of the crosses. This most likely stems from two reasons: First, the contributor was not aware of the possibility of adding this information or regarded it as superfluous. The latter e.g. happens if the person entering the data assumes that crosses are by definition a sign of Christian religion. Second, the ground truth principle of OpenStreetMap, which prohibits entering information that is not verifiable on the ground. In this case the omission conveys, that it was not clear to the contributor if the cross had a religious or just a cultural meaning. This thought is very valid as was found e.g. in [27]. While we expect the first reason to be the predominant reason for the RELIGION-key, we expect a variant of the second reason to be causing the lower rate of the denomination tag; i.e. most contributors could not judge from the cross itself if it is e.g. ROMAN\_CATHOLIC or PROTESTANT. Looking into the actual value we find that all crosses which exhibit a RELIGION-key, are denoted as CHRISTIAN, and except for 14 nodes, all are tagged as CATHOLIC or ROMAN\_CATHOLIC and one of the 14 was a misspelled ROMAN\_CATHOLIC. This indicates a clear foundation of the rite within the roman catholic tradition and thus might explain the lower number of crosses in the protestant areas shown in Figure 4.

Unfortunately, the MATERIAL-key, denoting the main material of which the cross is made of, is only present to a larger extent in Oberbayern and Oberfranken. Thus, we can not differentiate the material distribution between the administrative districts in a sensible manner.

The fourth most used key is NAME, which denotes a popular or official name of the cross. We will discuss the names together with the INSCRIPTION-key below in more detail.

The key START\_DATE, contains the date when the cross was erected. It may contain accurate dates, to coarse estimates like “18th century”. While the data is sparse, and might be error prone




Figure 8: Mean number of additional descriptive tags for HWC nodes by administrative district in Bavaria. Each colour indicates a different tag but only the top 10 of Bavaria are explicitly named in the legend.

as inscribed dates might not be the actual erection/scarification date, it still is indicative. With few exceptions, all dates are younger than 1850 and seem to form two eras. The first stretching from 1850 to the beginnings of the first world war, the second starting in the 1960s extending to today. Definitely more data would be needed to substantiate this.

The tag cluster HERITAGE, REF:BLfD, and HERITAGE:OPERATOR all refer to official listings in heritage registers. In Bavaria this is in all cases the Bayerische Landesamt für Denkmalpflege (BLfD).

Last in the top-10-key is DESCRIPTION, indicating a further description of the object. These might be used by the community to enhance data richness.

**Comparison with official dataset** While all prior indicators relied solely on the data itself, the last indicator uses an external, official dataset to measure the completeness: a list of the BLfD of the crosses registered as heritage in Bavaria [40]. Even though, most crosses don’t qualify as heritage, many crosses are listed. Also it is expected that listed crosses are in some aspects remarkable and thus might be recorded with a higher frequency in the OpenStreetMap-dataset. Thus, it is assumed that using listed crosses will yield a conservative and maybe slightly biased estimate of the data com-




Figure 9: Percentage of matchable objects within a given search radius by administrative district in Bavaria

pleteness. In the BLfD-dataset there are 4025 cross like objects, out of which 4022 carry a location, and of which 3459 are clearly some kind of cross, another 516 are not clearly marked, and another 50 would most likely be identified as something else, as the cross is only part of a church for example. Furthermore, in the BLfD-dataset all objects are recorded as small extended geometries. For the matching, for each of the 4022 geometries, the centroid was determined and the closest HWC, HWS, MMC, MC, or SMY node in the database was determined. In a second step the smallest distance is selected as the matched object. The result is summarized in Figure 9 up to a distance of 500 m. Nodes farther away than this are considered not matched.

For Bavaria about 40% of the matchable objects are matched within a couple of meters, for larger matching-radii an almost linear increase is found. Using the same matching radii as [10] of 30 m, 50 m, and 150 m for comparability (see Table 3) shows similar matching efficiencies on the 30 m scale, but significant lower efficiencies on larger scales. This is expected as on the one side the position of crosses is typically well defined as discussed before and on the other hand museums are by far more extended objects. In contrary this also indicates that the completeness of the Bavarian cross data set in OpenStreetMap is by far less complete than the set of Italian museums. Still, about a third of the crosses,

Table 3: Comparison of the matching efficiencies for cross objects in Bavaria with [10] for museums in Italy by matching distance.

Matching radius	Italian museums	BLfD crosses
$r \leq 30 m$	31.8 %	38.2 %
$> 30 m \wedge r \leq 50 m$	14.8 %	1.4 %
$> 50 m \wedge r \leq 150 m$	31.1 %	5.2 %
$150 m \leq r$	22.2 %	55.2 %

which at the same time also is less than 10% of the complete data set also indicates that the dataset can be considered representative.

Also, for the individual administrative districts most objects are matched within a few metres. Still, the matching efficiencies differ significantly. While in the Oberfranken within 30 metres 45.6% can be matched, in Niederbayern (Lower Bavaria) this rate is only 15.2%. Comparing the results with the additional tags discussed in the previous section, it is striking that Unterfranken and Oberfranken show a high rate of the HERITAGE, REF:BLfD, and the HERITAGE:OPERATOR tag, this is not true for the Oberpfalz – again indicating a lower data quality in this administrative district.

So in summary all data quality indicators suggest that the data in the Oberpfalz and Niederbayern have the lowest confidence, while that of Oberbayern and Unterfranken are the ones with the best foundation.

## 5.2 Analyses

Based on our basic understanding of the data quality we will now first derive an absolute count of crosses for Bavaria. Second, we will discuss the linguistic characteristics of the NAME and INSCRIPTION key values. Third, we discuss the used materials.

### 5.2.1 Absolute count

For Oberbayern, the author tried to estimate the completeness of the data by conducting field research by car, by bike and by foot. It was found that, with the exception of the county Emmerting, it was easy to add several crosses in every county. On the other end, it was found, that finding more than about 0.3 crosses/km<sup>2</sup> was only






Figure 10: Mapped HWC nodes per km<sup>2</sup> per county in Oberbayern.

possible with extensive research in most counties. More extensive research yielded densities of at least 0.8 crosses/km<sup>2</sup>. Acrabic research, which was conducted in Schäftlarn, Baierbrunn and Icking, yielded up to 1.7 crosses/km<sup>2</sup> (see also Figure 10). Averaging all counties in Oberbayern a value of  $(0.5 \pm 0.3)$  crosses/km<sup>2</sup> is found. As it is assumed from the observations before, that data is incomplete the actual average is assumed to be above 0.8 but below 1.8 crosses/km<sup>2</sup>. Thus it is estimated that there are 14000 to 32000 crosses in Oberbayern and that about one third to one sixth of them are mapped.

As no field research was conducted in the other administrative districts the findings will be extrapolated for the other administrative districts using the matching efficiencies found for the BLfD-dataset. Here we will employ the efficiency at 50 m as upper bound and the one at 150 m as lower bound, yielding between 60000 and 75000 crosses in Bavaria out of which one fourth to about one third is mapped. As another proxy for comparison, the number of farms in Bavaria was about 83100 in 2019 [41]. Historically many farms in Bavaria had a cross and during the field trips this was found to be still true especially for smaller farms. Given the size structure, it is estimated that about one fourth to one third of the farms should have a cross. This would give a lower limit of about 20000 to 25000 crosses. As besides farms there are many other crosses, the number of 60000 to 75000 crosses estimated above seems to be a good estimate.




Figure 11: Top 10 most frequent lemmas, omitting punctuation, in the NAME (left) and INSCRIPTION (right) key-value

### 5.3 Analysis of the name and inscriptions

Two data fields, the NAME and the INSCRIPTION-key, contain text. The former an official name of the cross and the latter anything, which is written on the cross itself. All data contained in these two keys of HWC nodes in Bavaria was classified using nltk [42] and HanTa [43] to identify words, lemmas and parts of speech (PoS). In eleven cases the inscriptions were longer than the maximum field length of 255 or were recorded with additional detail, e.g. facing south. In the first cases several mitigation strategies are used. One is to introduce new tags like INSCRIPTION\_1. Still, for this analysis these extensions were discarded and only the 1431 standard inscriptions were used.

Out of the 1555 names recorded, by definition many are unique referring to persons or events connected to the cross. Anyhow, lot of the data contained in the NAME field (see Figure 11 (left)) is just a German repetition of the tag HWC, i.e. *Kreuz*, *Wegkreuz*, *Marterl*, *Feldkreuz*, or *Steinkreuz*. While *Steinkreuz* (stone cross) and the less frequent *Holzkreuz* (wooden cross) might be considered carrying some additional information, which should be listed in the material key, most of these keys likely should simply be deleted as they are not the actual NAME of the cross. The value *Jesus* seems to hint to a Jesus affixed to the cross. Here the cross can be considered Christian. Anyhow, the corresponding RELIGION-key is very sparsely found. This hints to potential for improvement of the data. Another name denotes that the




Figure 12: Share of values of given length in the values of INSCRIPTION-keys

object is part of a way of crosses (*Station*). Leaving only one entry in the top-10, which contains actual information: *Neunerkreuz*<sup>1</sup> These are crosses erected in commemoration of the battle on the 24<sup>th</sup> April 1809 in Neumarkt-St. Veit, which are also called *9er-Kreuz* [44]. As expected, all of these crosses are located near Neumarkt-St. Veit. They also account for all the *Nr.* (number) entries.

Two distinct classes characterize the INSCRIPTION key (see Figure 12). In the larger class the crosses carry only the four letter acronym INRI (Iesus Nazarenus Rex Iudaeorum), some add a year and/or name in addition. The second class bare a longer text. This often is a poem or proverb praising God, Jesus, Marry, or another Saint but sometimes also a text describing the situation why the cross was erected. Still, the texts are very diverse which is reflected by the fact that besides God and Jesus none of the deities praised are found within the top-10 - even Jesus is only on rank 10. Still at least two words, "unser" (our) and "hier" (here), indicate that the text on the cross speaks about something related to the erecting entity or the place where the cross was erected.

To assess the content quantitatively the distribution of the most frequent PoS is compared with respect to the distribution found in two generic German corpora compiled by the Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache (DWDS) [45]. The first corpus spans the time period 1900 to 1999 [46], the second (DWDS21), the time period 2000 to 2010. In total, adding up all absolute differences between the PoS frequencies in the two different corpora and the name and inscription tag, it is found that the

<sup>1</sup>*am* is just a German preposition




Figure 13: Relative PoS distribution with respect to the corresponding corpus for all PoS which account for at least 1% of the PoS within the NAME or INSCRIPTION key. Study area is Bavaria.

two corpora only differ by about 0.1. This difference will also be employed to measure the uncertainty. With respect to the inscription tag, both reference corpora exhibit a difference of  $0.5 \pm 0.1$ . For the name tag the difference is  $1.1 \pm 0.1$  for the DWDS corpus and  $1.0 \pm 0.1$  for the DWDS21 corpus.

The large difference for the NAME key values is obvious as it mainly contains single words or fragments of sentences and thus is dominated by nouns, normal nouns (NN) and proper nouns (NE), while the other categories are very distinctively populated. The second most prominent PoS are inter-punctuations (\$, \$(, \$.) and cardinal numbers (CARD). The last two PoS found in notable number in the NAME key values are adjectives (ADJA and ADJD) as well as prepositions (APPR\*). In contrast, the INSCRIPTION-distribution is much closer to a typical distribution for German texts –  $0.5 \pm 0.1$  for the DWDS and DWDS21 corpus. Still there are notable differences. First, as many crosses were erected in commemoration of specific persons and the name INRI is very dominant, the rate of NE is about three times higher than in standard corpora. In addition, the number of cardinals is significantly higher as expected. And while articles (ART) are less frequent articles combined with prepositions (APPRART) are more frequent.




Figure 14: Count different values in the MATERIAL-key for HWC nodes in Bavaria

## 5.4 Used Building Materials

The MATERIAL-key “describes the main material of a physical feature” [47]. In total 18 different materials are used to describe the HWC in Bavaria. They can be clustered in three main groups: wood, stone, and metal. By far the majority of the crosses with recorded material are wooden, with no distinction between different wood types, as obviously the contributors are not able to distinguish weathered wood types. Among the stones, especially sandstone is called out explicitly. Metal crosses with an explicit tagging are mostly different forms of iron. Another 49 “materials” are present which are either describing combinations of materials or are simply german terms. While, the former should be solved by a better tagging scheme, the latter is incorrect according to the OSM-rules.

Although, only about 17% of the crosses are tagged with a material, it is assumed that the distribution is representative. The main bias is probably, that materials that are perceived uncommon would be registered more frequently. Both, stone and metal account for 10-20% each. A strong bias effect would result in an lower number in reality.

Further analyses of the material would need a better distributed data. In addition, due to the low statistics and reliability of the `start_date` key, it is not possible to infer changes of material over time reliably, as they are for example observed in Quebec, Canada [48].

## 6 Conclusion

When assessing data quality in the terminology of the ISO norms for geographic data quality ISO 19113 [49] and ISO 19157 [50] as documented in [4] we conclude: Exploiting the vast amounts of data found in the OpenStreetMap database for studies outside of cartographic mainstream still is not universally possible without due care. This has several reasons: First, the **completeness** of the data varies considerably between different countries and even within countries. In addition, also the richness of the data varies considerably. Third, due to the high concentration on certain contributors, the data might be biased considerably. Fourth, especially for non-mainstream KEY=VALUE combinations the folksonomy is sometimes not well defined yielding challenges for the **logical consistency** and the **thematic accuracy**.

Still, many of these challenges can be overcome for certain regions or subsets of the data reference points can be obtained, e.g. by field research, a reference dataset or other sources. Also the biases might be irrelevant, if the research goals are concisely chosen. For example a study on the distribution of diaper changing tables in restaurants will most likely be problematic, given the social composition of the OpenStreetMap-community, but a question on the average age of street\_lamps would most likely be unaffected by social biases if the data is present. Furthermore, the question of the folksonomy can be solved by understanding the different keys and tags used by using the standard OpenStreetMap-tools, like the wiki.

Furthermore the **positional accuracy** was found to be in general very good and also the **temporal accuracy** can be considered good, as the data is constantly updated. Taking these findings together the **usability** of the data is mostly only given, if a good understanding of the mechanism of its creation can be gained.

## Acknowledgements

Map data copyrighted OpenStreetMap contributors and available from <https://www.openstreetmap.org>. The Shapefile for the map of bavaria in Figure 10 is revision 01.08.2018 and copyrighted by Bayerische Ver-

messungsverwaltung – Verwaltungsgebiete under cc-by. The BLfD-list of crosses is in the revision of 31.03.2021 and is copyrighted by the BLfD.

## References

- [1] Michael F. Goodchild. “Citizens as sensors: the world of volunteered geography”. In: *GeoJournal* 69.4 (2007), pp. 211–221. DOI: 10.1007/s10708-007-9111-y.
- [2] OpenStreetMap contributors. 2017. URL: <https://www.openstreetmap.org>.
- [3] Open Data Commons. *Open data commons open database license (ODbL)*. 2009. URL: <http://opendatacommons.org/licenses/odbl/1.0>.
- [4] V. Antoniou and A. Skopeliti. “Measures and indicators of VGI quality: an overview”. In: *ISPRS Annals of Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information Sciences II-3/W5* (2015), pp. 345–351. DOI: 10.5194/isprsannals-ii-3-w5-345-2015.
- [5] Pascal Neis, Dennis Zielstra, and Alexander Zipf. “Comparison of Volunteered Geographic Information Data Contributions and Community Development for Selected World Regions”. In: *Future Internet* 5.2 (2013), pp. 282–300. DOI: 10.3390/fi5020282.
- [6] Steven Jackson et al. “Assessing Completeness and Spatial Error of Features in Volunteered Geographic Information”. In: *ISPRS International Journal of Geo-Information* 2.2 (2013), pp. 507–530. DOI: 10.3390/ijgi2020507.
- [7] Peter Mooney, Pdraig Corcoran, and Adam Winstanley. “A study of data representation of natural features in openstreetmap”. In: *Proceedings of GIScience*. Vol. 150. 2010, pp. 150–156.
- [8] Mordechai Haklay. “How good is volunteered geographical information? A comparative study of OpenStreetMap and Ordnance Survey datasets”. In: *Environment and planning B: Planning and design* 37.4 (2010), pp. 682–703.
- [9] Christopher Barrington-Leigh and Adam Millard-Ball. “The world’s user-generated road map is more than 80complete”. In: *PLOS ONE* 12.8 (Aug. 2017), pp. 1–20. DOI: 10.1371/journal.pone.0180698.
- [10] Francesco Balducci. “Is OpenStreetMap a good source of information for cultural statistics? The case of Italian museums”. In: *Environment and Planning B: Urban Analytics and City Science* 48.3 (2021), pp. 503–520. DOI: 10.1177/2399808319876949.
- [11] OSMWiki. *OpenStreetMap Wiki: Stats*. Accessed 2021-07-13. July 2021. URL: [wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Stats&oldid=2172694](http://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Stats&oldid=2172694).
- [12] OSMWiki. *Contribute map data*. Accessed 2021-06-08. Apr. 2021. URL: [wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Contribute\\_map\\_data&oldid=2146588](http://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Contribute_map_data&oldid=2146588).
- [13] Z. Gardner et al. “Quantifying gendered participation in OpenStreetMap: responding to theories of female (under) representation in crowdsourced mapping”. In: *GeoJournal* 85.6 (2019), pp. 1603–1620. DOI: 10.1007/s10708-019-10035-z.
- [14] OSMWiki. *Elements*. Accessed 2021-06-08. May 2021. URL: [wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Elements&oldid=2157322](http://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Elements&oldid=2157322).
- [15] Jacob Thebault-Spieker, Brent Hecht, and Loren Terveen. “Geographic Biases Are ‘Born, Not Made’: Exploring Contributors’ Spatiotemporal Behavior in OpenStreetMap”. In: *Proceedings of the 2018 ACM Conference on Supporting Groupwork*. GROUP ’18. Sanibel Island, Florida, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2018, 71–82. ISBN: 9781450355629. DOI: 10.1145/3148330.3148350.
- [16] Martin Raifer. “overpass turbo – Einfache Analyse von OpenStreetMap Daten”. In: *Anwenderkonferenz für Freie und Open Source Software für Geoinformationssysteme*. FOSS-GIS e.V. 2013, pp. 105–108. URL: <https://overpass-turbo.eu/>.

- [17] OSMWiki. *OpenStreetMap Wiki: historic=wayside\_cross*. Accessed 2021-06-08. Dec. 2020. URL: [https://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Tag:historic=wayside\\_cross&oldid=2079050](https://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Tag:historic=wayside_cross&oldid=2079050).
- [18] OSMWiki. *OpenStreetMap Wiki: historic=wayside\_shrine*. Accessed 2021-06-08. Feb. 2021. URL: [https://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Tag:historic=wayside\\_shrine&oldid=2115476](https://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Tag:historic=wayside_shrine&oldid=2115476).
- [19] OSMWiki. *OpenStreetMap Wiki: man\_made=cross*. Accessed 2021-06-08. Sept. 2020. URL: [https://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Tag:man\\_made=cross&oldid=2028900](https://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Tag:man_made=cross&oldid=2028900).
- [20] OSMWiki. *OpenStreetMap Wiki: summit:cross=yes*. Accessed 2021-06-08. Mar. 2021. URL: <https://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Tag:memorial=cross&oldid=2132176>.
- [21] OSMWiki. *OpenStreetMap Wiki: memorial=cross*. Accessed 2021-06-08. Feb. 2021. URL: <https://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Tag:summit:cross=yes&oldid=2118512>.
- [22] Franz-Benjamin Mocnik, Alexander Zipf, and Martin Raifer. “The OpenStreetMap folksonomy and its evolution”. In: *Geo-spatial Information Science* 20.3 (2017), pp. 219–230. DOI: 10.1080/10095020.2017.1368193.
- [23] Peter Mooney and Pdraig Corcoran. “The Annotation Process in OpenStreetMap”. In: *Transactions in GIS* 16.4 (2012), pp. 561–579. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9671.2012.01306.x.
- [24] Achim Timmermann. “Highways to Heaven (and Hell): Wayside Crosses and the Making of Late Medieval Landscape”. In: *The Authority of the Word*. BRILL, 2012, pp. 385–441. DOI: 10.1163/9789004226432\_013.
- [25] Heather A. King. “Irish wayside and churchyard crosses 1600–1700”. In: *Post-Medieval Archaeology* 19.1 (1985), pp. 13–33. DOI: 10.1179/pma.1985.002.
- [26] C. Aka. *Unfallkreuze: Trauerorte am Straßenrand*. Vol. 109. Beiträge zur Volkskultur in Nordwestdeutschland. Waxmann Verlag GmbH, 2007. ISBN: 9783830967903.
- [27] Lucyna Przybylska. “Are Roadside Crosses in Poland a Religious or Cultural Expression?” In: *Religions* 12.1 (2021). ISSN: 2077-1444. DOI: 10.3390/rel12010008. URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/2077-1444/12/1/8>.
- [28] Mirjam Klaassens, Peter D. Groote, and Frank M. Vanclay. “Expressions of Private Mourning in Public Space: The Evolving Structure of Spontaneous and Permanent Roadside Memorials in the Netherlands”. In: *Death Studies* 37.2 (2013), pp. 145–171. DOI: 10.1080/07481187.2011.641137.
- [29] Olga Nešporová and Irina Stahl. “Roadside memorials in the Czech Republic and Romania: memory versus religion in two European post-communist countries”. In: *Mortality* 19.1 (2013), pp. 22–40. DOI: 10.1080/13576275.2013.870543.
- [30] Jean-Paul WILLAIME. “Religious and Secular France Between Northern and Southern Europe”. In: *Social Compass* 45.1 (1998), pp. 155–174. DOI: 10.1177/003776898045001013.
- [31] Lucyna Przybylska. “Roadside memorial crosses in Poland: a form of sacralization of public spaces”. In: *Siedlungsforschung. Archäologie – Geschichte – Geographie* 33 (Jan. 2016), pp. 245–264.
- [32] Una MacConville and Regina McQuillan. “Potent Reminders: An Examination of Responses to Roadside Memorials in Ireland”. In: *The Matter of Death*. Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2010, pp. 195–207. DOI: 10.1057/9780230283060\_13.
- [33] Lucyna Przybylska and Małgorzata Flaga. “The anonymity of roadside memorials in Poland”. In: *Mortality* 25.2 (2020), pp. 208–219. DOI: 10.1080/13576275.2019.1588240.
- [34] CIA. “Field Listing Religions”. In: *The World Factbook 2020*. Washington, DC: Central Intelligence Agency, 2020. URL: <https://www.cia.gov/the-world-factbook/field/religions/>.

- [35] Stefan Scholz et al. *Volunteered Geographic Information for Disaster Risk Reduction—The Missing Maps Approach and Its Potential within the Red Cross and Red Crescent Movement*. 2018. DOI: 10 . 3390 / rs10081239.
- [36] Ina Ludwig, Angi Voss, and Maike Krause-Traudes. “A Comparison of the Street Networks of Navteq and OSM in Germany”. In: *Lecture Notes in Geoinformation and Cartography*. Ed. by Stan Geertman, Wolfgang Reinhardt, and Fred Toppen. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011, pp. 65–84. ISBN: 978-3-642-19789-5. DOI: 10 . 1007/978-3-642-19789-5\_4.
- [37] Statistische Ämter des Bundes und der Länder. “Personen nach Religion (ausführlich)”. In: *Zensus 2011*. Statistisches Bundesamt, 2014.
- [38] Corrado Gini. “Variabilità e mutabilità”. In: *Reprinted in Memorie di metodologica statistica* (1912), pp. 211–382.
- [39] OSMWiki. *History of OpenStreetMap*. Accessed 2021-06-04. Apr. 2021. URL: [wiki . osm . org / w / index . php ? title = History \\_ of \\_ OpenStreetMap & oldid = 2142980](https://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=History_of_OpenStreetMap&oldid=2142980).
- [40] Detlef Knipping and Roland Wanninger. “Denkmaldaten Kreuze BLfD”. Version 31.03.2021. Mar. 2021.
- [41] StMELF. “Bayerischer Agrarbericht 2020”. In: Bayerisches Staatsministerium für Ernährung, Landwirtschaft und Forsten, 2020. Chap. Tabelle 8: Landwirtschaftliche Betriebe in Bayern nach Größenklassen.
- [42] Steven Bird, Ewan Klein, and Edward Loper. *Natural Language Processing with Python*. 1st. O’Reilly Media, Inc., 2009. ISBN: 0596516495.
- [43] Christian Wartena. “A Probabilistic Morphology Model for German Lemmatization”. en. In: *Proceedings of the 15th Conference on Natural Language Processing (KONVENS 2019)*. Hochschule Hannover, 2019. DOI: 10 . 25968/opus-1527.
- [44] Franz-Josef Gruber. *Die Schlacht von Neumarkt an der Rott, 1809 und 9er-Kreuze um Neumarkt- Sankt Veit*. Neumarkt-Sankt Veit: Krieger- und Soldatenkameradschaft Neumarkt-Sankt Veit, 2019.
- [45] Wolfgang Klein and Alexander Geyken. “DWDS – Digitales Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache”. In: *Lexicographica* 26.2010 (2010), pp. 79–96. DOI: 10 . 1515 / 9783110223231 . 1 . 79.
- [46] Alexander Geyken. “The DWDS corpus: A reference corpus for the German language of the 20th century”. In: *Collocations and idioms: Linguistic, lexicographic, and computational aspects* 23 (2007), p. 41.
- [47] OSMWiki. *OpenStreetMap Wiki: material*. Accessed 2021-05-23. May 2021. URL: [https : // wiki . osm . org / w / index . php ? title = Key : material & oldid = 2147779](https://wiki.osm.org/w/index.php?title=Key:material&oldid=2147779).
- [48] Hillary Kaell. “Quebec’s wayside crosses and the creation of contemporary devotionism”. In: *The Long Shadow of Vatican II: Living Faith and Negotiating Authority since the Second Vatican Council* (2015), pp. 102–127.
- [49] ISO. “ISO 19113, Geographic Information — Quality Principles”. In: *The International Organization for Standardisation* (2005).
- [50] ISO. “ISO 19157, Geographic information — Data quality”. In: *The International Organization for Standardisation* (2013).