



WIKIPEDIA EDITORS STUDY

RESULTS FROM THE EDITOR SURVEY, APRIL 2011

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

With approximately 81,000 active editors¹ in a month², Wikipedia is one of the most successful examples in online collaboration in the history of the Internet. But precious little is known about Wikipedia editors. Who are they? What motivates them? What are their experiences with contributing to Wikipedia? To answer some of these questions, we conducted the first ever semi-annual survey of Wikipedia editors in April 2011. The survey was conducted on Wikipedia and presented to logged-in users. The study focused on the following key research areas as linked to our [strategic plan](#):

EDITING ACTIVITIES

- 1. Contribution for sharing knowledge freely WITH every single person on the planet:** The Wikimedia movement, since the very beginning, has been grounded in the mission of sharing free knowledge with every single human being. The survey shows that our editing community is highly aligned with the core mission of the movement. Editors pointed out that volunteerism to share knowledge is the number one reason for contributing to Wikipedia. This demonstrates that the community, even through all of the growth and changes over the years, continues to share the fundamental *raison d'être* of Wikipedia. This is really important as we seek to take new steps and overcome new challenges toward realizing the mission for everyone on the planet.
- 2. Editing Tools & Infrastructure Improvements:** Over the years, Wikipedia editors have created many tools and policies both for editing and performing the day-to-day administrative tasks required to manage huge knowledge resources and activities on the world's fifth largest website. The survey found that there is a general agreement that both the community and

¹ An active editor makes 5 or more edits in a month

² As of Jun 2011: <http://stats.wikimedia.org/EN/TablesWikipediaZZ.htm#activitylevels>

69%

Of Editors started to contribute to Wikipedia because they liked the idea of volunteering to share knowledge.

60%

Of Editors continue to contribute because they think Editing is Fun!

WMF can – and should – improve our technology infrastructure and develop new features to make editing and administration easier,. WMF has already started work on improvements and will accelerate work alongside the community in the coming months. WMF is also undertaking research work that will help the editor community assess opportunities for improvement of tools and practices. As the survey indicates, interactions among editors are key drivers for a better editing experience. To this end, features like WikiLove provide an easy tool to make the editing experience fun.

PROFILE

- 1. Demographic characteristics of Editors:** Since we haven't had good demographic data about Wikipedia editors, a caricatured profile of Wikipedia editors has emerged over time: a male graduate student who programs, supports open source, plays massively multiplayer online games, and lives in US or Europe. The data in the survey didn't support the caricature (or the caricature is out of date) . According to the data, if there is a typical Wikipedia editor, he has a college degree, is 30-years-old, is computer savvy but not necessarily a programmer, doesn't actually spend much time playing games, and lives in US or Europe. However, the data allows us to see that “typical” doesn't tell the whole story. Our community comes from a widely varied set of backgrounds, and requires thoughtful and sensitive interactions within the community – because the person behind the username is quite likely different from you. As we seek to grow the community further, we will add an even greater amount of diversity to the mix. We'll need to become more sensitive to gender, geography, culture, communication styles and other differences.

WOMEN EDITORS

- 1. Increasing Gender Diversity:** Our editing community continues to suffer from a lack of women editors. The survey provided an even starker view of this than previous studies (only 8.5% of editors are women). It is a strategic priority to address this imbalance. The survey did find that the total percent of women Wikipedia editors has increased somewhat in the last few years, but we still have a lot of ground to cover. We can attract women editors partly by introducing tools and features that make editing simple for everyone, though

91%

Of Editors are male

8.5%

**Average Annual
growth rate of Women
Editors over the past
2 years**

**COMPLIMENTS
FROM FELLOW
EDITORS AND
BARNSTARS**

**The two most
important
determinants of Editor
satisfaction**

especially for women, since our women editors are less likely to code and program. We have also seen great successes in the participation of women via our Wikipedia in the classroom initiatives. These efforts that are expanding around the world tend to bring in a more representative proportion of men and women contributors. Our survey found that positive feedback is a driver for overall editor satisfaction, and so is the nature of the interactions they have with the community.

- 2. Harassment:** Contrary to the perception of some, our data shows that very few women editors feel like they have been harassed, and very few feel Wikipedia is a sexualized environment. That said, we as a community should ensure that all female Wikipedians have positive interactions, and that no one is harassed due to their gender, sexuality, ethnicity or nationality.

WIKIPEDIA COMMUNITY

- 1. Editor Decline & Community:** The Wikimedia movement has made increasing its editor base to 200,000 by 2015 a major priority. But the recently concluded [Editor Trends Study](#) discovered an alarming trend of flattening participation across all language projects. Looking closely at English Wikipedia, the study found significant decline in editors with more than 10 edits. It has been hypothesized that edit wars, reverts and acrimony among editors is a contributor to this decline. We found that, overall, editors have a very positive opinion of their peers, but many reported experiencing negative interactions and harassment by others. In addition, negative interactions reduce the likelihood of editing in the future. On the other hand, positive interactions, like helping others in editing and peer recognition, not only make editors have a more positive opinion of the community, but also increase the likelihood of editing in the future.
- 2. Positive Reinforcement:** Acknowledging the effort of editors is important to reverse the editor decline. It is a commonly held view that editors just want to see their articles improve and read by lots of people and they don't care about the opinion of their peers. This is false. The survey finds that acknowledgement of peers via a nice note or a barnstar (or kitten) is valued even more highly than achieving featured article status. To sustain and grow our community, we need to provide each other with positive feedback, and we should create tools to make it easy to do so.

US (20%)

GERMANY (12%)

RUSSIA (7%)

UK (6%)

ITALY (4%)

INDIA (3%)

FRANCE (3%)

POLAND (3%)

SPAIN (3%)

CANADA (3%)

**Top 10 Countries of
Residence**

3. Negative & positive interactions: It is also important to encourage new mechanisms for celebrating and rewarding excellent editor contributions within the community. Clearly, maintaining a positive environment on wikis through positive feedback loops is essential both for supporting current editors and attracting new ones. The Wikimedia movement will continue to support current editors through experimental tools like WikiLove that provide a channel for positive and fun interactions within the community. The movement will also support the recruitment and acculturation of new editors by encouraging a welcoming environment on Wikimedia projects. But we would also like to call upon our community to provide positive feedback to others. Negative experiences matter. Editors don't have hearts made of stone. Reverts without an explanation can negatively define an editor's experience on Wikipedia and make them less likely to continue editing. However, editors are here to learn and improve. A revert with an explanation has no negative impact on an editor's desire to continue contributing and is, in fact, seen as a positive interaction. We need to find ways to reduce negative experiences and refine our automated tools to do a better job of differentiating a good faith edit from vandalism.

LOCATION & LANGUAGES

- 1. Increasing Geographic Diversity:** The data from the survey shows that the majority of Wikipedians hail from North America or Europe, and to meet our strategic goal of increasing diversity – specifically, attracting more editors from the Global South – we will continue in our efforts to expand Wikipedia's global footprint. We have a growing number of chapters around the world and WMF has set up an office in India and hired staff to support growth in India. Similar efforts are also beginning in Brazil. Our goal is to support the growth of the editing community with accelerated growth in areas where we are not yet strong.
- 2. Mobile and the Global South:** In some of these regions, like India and Africa, desktop Internet has yet to see broader penetration, though mobile Internet is expanding rapidly, and it is no surprise that the mobile phone is the most popular device among editors. WMF has made it our priority to increase mobile page views, and we are currently revamping our mobile platform to provide better and faster access to smartphones as well as feature phones that don't typically have apps or can't

76 %

Of Editors make edits to English Wikipedia

7 %

Of Editors use their mobile devices to edit Wikipedia

by synced with computers. The new platform will have in-built editing functionalities that would allow for paragraph edits, sentence edits and picture uploads to Wikimedia Commons. Lastly, we are looking to establish partnerships with network providers in key strategic geographies like India and Brazil to provide access to Wikipedia at zero or near zero cost. This would help us increase our reach and bring free knowledge to those who can't afford to pay for data access.

- 3. Language diversity:** Survey respondents edit Wikipedia in over 100 languages. Interestingly, only 38% edit primarily in English, but 76% of all editors edit English Wikipedia. This is quite shocking and points to the fact that our editor community does not reach far into non-English proficient communities. This poses a challenge for us as we seek to move into new geographies and segments of the population where English literacy is not prevalent. As we work towards increasing our global footprint we are committed to supporting less mature language projects and ensuring quality articles in native languages, especially in the Global South. We believe global partnerships with universities, cultural institutions and other groups who are aligned with our mission will help us create quality content in native languages. In India, as part of the Global Education Program, while most of the students are working on English Wikipedia, some of the newly appointed campus ambassadors are focused on Marathi (the native language in the state of Maharashtra) Wikipedia.

TECHNOLOGY & NETWORKING

- 1. Social networking:** Our data shows that Wikipedia editors use social networking technologies, like Facebook, frequently. The Wikimedia movement has not systematically utilized social networking platforms as a means of communication, and there has been resistance on philosophical grounds to integration with social networks. The fact that most editors regularly use Facebook, and a significant minority use Twitter, is notable. We also know that women tend to be more active in social networks than men³ and social networks are growing rapidly in priority countries such as India and Brazil⁴. These facts raise the question of how these pervasive tools might support editor interaction and communications within the movement. The

³ Women spend 30% more time on social web than men

http://socialtimes.com/women-more-on-social-web-than-men_b18934

⁴ BCG report: The Internet's New Billion

<http://www.slideshare.net/agarwalvaibhav/bcg-internet-report>

34 %

**Of Editors read
Wikipedia on their
mobile phones**

76 %

**Of Editors make
edits to English
Wikipedia**

68 %

**Of Editors use
Social Networking
websites like
Facebook**

case for leveraging social networking may be important to the growth of the Wikimedia movement.

CHAPTERS, BOARD, FOUNDATION

- 1. Raising awareness:** Most editors are not knowledgeable about chapters or board elections. Since the Wikimedia movement is decentralized, the voices and opinions of community members are pertinent, and WMF will continue to experiment with new ways of soliciting participation from editors in board elections. There is also a need for chapters to perform outreach within their countries to inform and involve community members in chapter work.
- 2. Support for work of WMF & Other Volunteers:** While editors were humble in their assessment of their own activities, they valued the work of their peers in the movement as well as the efforts of the Wikimedia Foundation. WMF was glad to see that editors who sought information about us were generally satisfied, though we continue to find ways to improve.

45 %

Of Editors have never heard of Wikimedia Board of Trustee elections

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	9
SECTION 1: EDITING ACTIVITIES: Strong support for volunteerism	11
1.1 Most editors cite “the idea of volunteering to share knowledge” as the number one reason for contributing to Wikipedia	11
1.2 Many editors start editing by chance	11
1.3 Younger editors are more likely to start contributing to demonstrate knowledge or learn new skills, older editors because they know a lot about a subject.....	12
1.4 School age editors are more likely to edit Wikipedia for fun.....	12
1.5 Volunteerism, belief in free information drives editors to continue to contribute	13
1.6 Editing and researching are the most common editor activities	13
1.7 Most editors believe tools make editing easier	14
1.8 Time constraint is the most likely reason for contributing less to Wikipedia	15
1.9 Editors believe WMF should spend more than half of its money on technical related costs	17
SECTION 2: PROFILES: No one single profile of Wikipedians	18
2.1 Majority of Wikipedia editors have a college degree	18
2.2 Two-thirds of Wikipedia editors are not programmers.....	18
2.3 Wikipedia editors are older than they are believed to be.....	19
2.4 The more prolific editors are a lot older than the others	19
SECTION 3: WOMEN EDITORS: Editors are predominantly men	21
3.1 Wikipedia editors are predominantly male	21
3.2 Women editors are growing in number	21
3.3 A small minority of female Wikipedians report having unpleasant experiences.....	22
3.4 A small minority of male and female editors believe that userspace is sexualized	23
3.5 Women make much fewer edits in general	23
SECTION 4: WIKIPEDIA COMMUNITY: Positive assessment of each other	24
4.1 Positive assessment of fellow editors	24
4.2 Interactions with other editors are a mix of positive & negative, with positive outweighing negative by a thin margin.....	25
4.3 Positive reinforcement works.....	25
4.4 Reverts don’t hurt as much if there is an explanation for reversal.....	27
4.5 24% reported being harassed by other editors on Wikipedia	27
4.6 The Wikipedia Editor Satisfaction Index	27
Key Findings.....	28

SECTION 5: LOCATION & LANGUAGE: Wikipedia is still very Western-centric.....	30
5.1 More editors live in the US than any other country, and English is the most popular language...	30
5.2 Editors from other language projects contribute to English Wikipedia.....	31
5.3 Majority of editors contribute to, and read more than one language	33
SECTION 6: TECHNOLOGY AND NETWORKING: Social media is popular	35
6.1 The mobile phone is extremely popular, but not everyone has a smart phone.....	35
6.2 Desktops and laptops are devices of choice for reading Wikipedia, although one-third read it on mobile phones.....	35
6.3 Access to email is more important than editing Wikipedia	36
6.4 Facebook is the most popular social media tool amongst editors	36
6.5 Female Wikipedians are more likely to use social media	37
6.6 Searching for information and reading Wikipedia are the two most popular activities on mobile devices.....	38
6.7 Ability to save offline ranks highest amongst desired features for the mobile website.....	38
SECTION 7: WIKIMEDIA FOUNDATION AND CHAPTERS: Low Interaction & Low Awareness	40
7.1 Majority doesn't participate in foundation or board activities	40
7.2 Editors give top ratings to other volunteers and the foundation.....	40
APPENDIX A: Survey Methodology	42
Appendix B: WESI Linear Regression Summary.....	43
Appendix C: Survey Results Summary	45

INTRODUCTION

In January 2001, Wikipedia founder Jimmy Wales typed “hello,” and the first free, online encyclopedia that anyone could edit was founded. In the last ten years, Wikipedia has grown to become the most popular and premier destination for information and knowledge on the web in over 250 languages. With about 400 million unique visitors every month¹, Wikipedia is the fifth most popular web property, only behind Internet stalwarts like Google, Facebook, Microsoft and Yahoo.

But what sets Wikipedia apart from the other Internet giants is that volunteers have contributed every word and millions of articles: editors across the world who spend hours contributing to Wikipedia for free. However, despite the enormous contribution of editors to Wikipedia, no comprehensive or longitudinal survey research has been done to understand: why editors contribute; their demographic composition; their technology ecology; how editors interact with each other.

The Editor Survey, April 2011, is one of the first semi-annual surveys that the Wikimedia Foundation is conducting to track the editing community. This survey differs significantly in its methodology from the UNU-Merit study of Wikipedia editors conducted in 2008 because the survey was available only to logged in users of Wikipedia. In addition, each user saw the banner invitation to the survey only once to counter the sample skewing towards more frequent editors. Moving forward, the WMF foundation will be using the April 2011 survey as a baseline for trending data on Wikipedia editors.

The April 2011 survey, following the UNU-Merit Editor survey, explored: what drives editors to edit Wikipedia; what editing activities they participate in; what interactions among editors look like; the technology ecology of editors; how editors assess the work of the foundation and its chapters. The specific research areas that we focused upon are:

- **Editing Activities:** What drives editors to edit Wikipedia? What are the different types of editing activities? How do the editors assess the different tools that are available to them?
- **Demographics:** What is the educational background of editors? What is the gender and age distribution of editors? What are the differences and similarities among different groups of editors?
- **Women editors:** What are the experiences of women editors? Do women editors have different experiences compared to male editors? Can women editors be segmented into different groups?
- **Editing community:** What kinds of interactions do editors have with each other? What kinds of interactions are conducive to editing and what are deterrents to future editing?
- **Location and Language:** Where do editors live? How many language Wikipedias do editors edit? Which language Wikipedia gets the maximum attention?
- **Technology and Networking:** What kinds of technological devices do editors own or have access to? What devices do they use for editing and reading Wikipedia? Do editors use social media tools? How?

1. Wikipedia Report Card: <http://stats.wikimedia.org/reportcard/>

- **Foundation, chapters and board:** What is the assessment of the foundation, chapters and the Wikimedia movement? Do editors participate in board elections? How would the editors like the foundation to allocate resources?

SECTION 1: EDITING ACTIVITIES: STRONG SUPPORT FOR VOLUNTEERISM


Wikipedia editors are strong supporters of Wikipedia’s underlying philosophy of providing every human being in the world free access to the sum of all knowledge through volunteerism. The strong support among editors for volunteerism to share knowledge draws them to Wikipedia to make their first edit, and drives them further to continue editing. Many volunteers’ first editing experiences come by accident when they stumble upon errors that need fixing, or subjects of personal interest that don’t have an entry in Wikipedia. They continue to edit, though, because they believe it’s fun.

1.1 Most editors cite “the idea of volunteering to share knowledge” as the number one reason for contributing to Wikipedia

The idea of volunteering to share knowledge drives editors to start contributing to Wikipedia as well as to continue contributing. Among those surveyed, 69% of editors said they started editing Wikipedia because they like the idea of volunteering to share knowledge. Fittingly, 71% of editors then said they continue contributing to Wikipedia because they like the idea of volunteering to share knowledge.

1.2 Many editors start editing by chance

While belief in volunteerism is the number one driving force among editors, many editors in the survey pointed out that they started their editing journey almost by accident when they saw an error or found an article missing. 64% of those surveyed pointed out that they started to contribute because they saw an error and wanted to fix it. Similarly, 27% of respondents started contributing when they saw a red link or found that an article about a subject was missing.



Q5a. Percent who started contributing to Wikipedia due to the following reasons. (n= 4,930)


1.3 Younger editors are more likely to start contributing to demonstrate knowledge or learn new skills, older editors because they know a lot about a subject

While younger editors are more likely to point out that they started contributing because they wanted either to demonstrate their knowledge to a wider public or community or to learn a new skill, older editors are more likely to start contributing because they know a lot about a subject that is poorly covered. So we clearly see that age makes a big difference in what drives editors to edit. While older editors edit who might have accumulated knowledge over the years want to share their knowledge with others, younger editors are more driven by demonstration of knowledge and the desire to learn new skills.

36% of 12-17 year-old editors and 34% of 18-21 year olds started contributing because they wanted to share their knowledge with a larger community or wider public, compared to 27% of 30-39 year-old editors and 25% of those 40 and older. Similarly, 36% of 12-17 year olds and 31% of 18-21 year-old editors wanted to learn new skills, versus only 23% of 30-39 year olds and 24% of those editors who are 40 and older. Conversely, more than half of older editors (52% of 30-39 year olds, and 55% of those 40 and older) started contributing because they knew a lot about a subject that was poorly covered, in comparison to 36% of those aged 12-17 and 34% of those who are 18-21 years old.

1.4 School age editors are more likely to edit Wikipedia for fun

Even in today's fast-paced world of online and console gaming, Wikipedians believe editing is fun. The fun aspect of editing Wikipedia particularly appeals to editors in the 12-17 age group over any other. A full 70% of school-age editors surveyed edit Wikipedia for fun, compared to 61% of editors aged 18-21, 59% of those who are 22-29 years old, 56% of those 30-39 years old, and 60% of editors aged 40 and older.




Q5a: Percent who say continuing to edit Wikipedia is fun (by age group) (n= 4,930)

1.5 Volunteerism, belief in free information drives editors to continue to contribute

Among those surveyed, 71% continue to contribute because they like the idea of volunteering to share knowledge. In addition, 69% of respondents believe information should be freely available, and 63% pointed out that contributing is fun. A small minority (7%) edits Wikipedia for professional reasons.

We did not find any significant differences based on gender as to why editors either start or continue contributing to Wikipedia.



Q5b. Percent who continue contributing to Wikipedia for the listed reasons. (n= 4,930)

1.6 Editing and researching are the most common editor activities

Among editors surveyed, 66% pointed out they had very often/often edited existing articles in the last month, and 42% had researched articles very often/often throughout the last 30 days. Many editors in the sample also reported working often/very often on the following activities: writing new articles (23%); patrolling for copyright violations, vandalism, etc. (23%); participation in discussion about articles (22%). Just 15% of editors reported working often/very often on translation work and deletion process, and a very small minority of editors reported participating often/very often in technical work, such as maintaining servers or software (2%) or organizing help-events, meet ups, workshops or the annual Wikimania conference (2%).

We did not find any statistically significant differences among editors in editor activities based on age, tenure, or number of edits or education.

Editor Activities




Q4a/4b: Percent who participated in the listed activities very often/often in last 30 days (n= 4,930)

1.7 Most editors believe tools make editing easier

With the aim of increasing contributions, we have been researching how most people contribute online. It is no surprise that most people use platforms like Twitter, Facebook and blogs for sharing and contributing. Our qualitative research has shown that Facebook and Twitter have set the benchmark for an ideal platform for contribution, and many find Wiki markup language intimidating. Most Wikipedia editors who use existing editing tools believe tools make editing easier, rather than harder. Among editors, wide support exists for help pages, policies & guidelines, editing interface, wiki markup, and community forums/discussions. A small minority of editors, however, believe that policies & guidelines and wiki markup make editing harder.

Tools make editing easier




Q6: Percent who believe the listed tools make editing easier/harder (n= 4,930)

1.8 Time constraint is the most likely reason for contributing less to Wikipedia

Within the Wikimedia movement, we have debated and discussed the recent trend in the decline of active editors. We have also done studies in the past to understand why editors stopped contributing to Wikipedia. In a survey of former contributors, we found that most editors said they had become less active on Wikipedia because they had less time. In this survey, we also found that even 37% of editors pointed out that they might become less active in Wikipedia in the next six months, as they think they will have less time. Despite the rise of social media and varied means of contribution (blogging, tweeting, etc.), only 7% said they might spend more time on other online activities.

Reasons to become less active



Q7c: Percent who believe they might become less active due to the listed reasons (n= 4,930)

1.9 Editors believe WMF should spend more than half of its money on technical related costs

When asked how they would allocate money if they had \$100 to spend, editors said they would give \$55 to technology enhancements on operations/infrastructure and features that support both new and experienced editors. Within technology expenditure, editors allocated maximum dollars to technical operations. There was also support for community work for attracting and supporting new editors, both globally (\$11) and restricted to the global south (\$8). Editors also believe that some funds should be allocated to support chapters (\$7) and grants to chapters, individuals, etc. (\$7).

Spending on technology believed to be important




D21 How would you like the foundation to allocate funds for the following (out of \$100) (n=5,073)

SECTION 2: PROFILES: NO ONE SINGLE PROFILE OF WIKIPEDIANS

Many myths about Wikipedia editors have been perpetuated over the years that were not supported by data. We found that editors are more educated and older than what we believed. In addition, not every Wikipedia editor is a programmer or familiar with open source.

2.1 Majority of Wikipedia editors have a college degree

Contrary to the popular perception that most Wikipedians are high school students, the survey found a majority of editors have finished college. 61% of Wikipedia editors who took part in the survey have a bachelors, associate or higher/graduate degree. Within this group, 35% have a bachelor's, associate degree or diploma, 18% have a master's degree, and 8% have a doctorate degree. It is interesting to note that over a quarter (26%) of Wikipedia editors have a post-graduate degree. 9% of Wikipedians have only a primary degree, i.e. they have completed elementary or middle school, and 30% have finished secondary school, i.e. high school. In addition, 43% of respondents said that they worked full-time, 15% worked part-time, and 42% were not currently employed.



D3a. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (n=5,073)

2.2 Two-thirds of Wikipedia editors are not programmers


92% of editors who participated in the study are proficient in computers: they are able to download and set up files and applications and programs (56%) and create their own applications (36%). But only 36% of Wikipedians can be classified as techies, i.e. able to program & create applications. Female Wikipedia editors are less technologically savvy, with only 18% of female editors stating they can program and create their own applications, compared to 39% of male editors. As a corollary, women editors (72%) are more comfortable downloading, setting up files & applications, and not programming compared to male editors (54%) .

Level of proficiency	Total	Men	Women
Program & create my own applications	36%	39%	18%
Download & set up files, applications	56%	54%	72%
Use computer to read email, browse Internet, word processor	7%	6%	9%
Not comfortable using a computer	1%	1%	1%

D12. Describe your level of proficiency with computers and computer applications (n= 4,996)

2.3 Wikipedia editors are older than believed

The popular image of a Wikipedia editor is a high school or college/university student (late teens or early 20s) working at night to edit Wikipedia. But contrary to popular perception, Wikipedia editors are much older, with an average age of 32, and half of them are younger than 28. In fact, the largest age cohort of editors is 40 and older. More than a quarter (28%) of Wikipedia editors are 40 or older.




D2. Wikipedia editor age distribution (n = 4,930)

2.4 The more prolific editors are a lot older than the others

The age distribution gets even more extreme when we look at the edit counts. By contrasting the self-reported ages with the actual edit count data, we found that the percentage of young editors (ages 12-25) drops drastically with edit count. For instance, young editors make up 48% of the population with less than 100 lifetime edits, but this drops to 29% when we look at those with 10,000 or more lifetime edits. Those in the 40+ age segment, on the other hand, make up 36% of those with 10,000 or more edits.

To counter for the fact that some of the Editors might have been around for much longer, we looked at the data from the last 12 months. These figures favored the younger editors: they now accounted for

34% of the population with 10,000 or more edits. Editors in the 40+ age group still stood for 35% of the population in this segment.




Distribution of Editor ages by edit levels (n = 4,766)

SECTION 3: WOMEN EDITORS: EDITORS ARE PREDOMINANTLY MEN

Wikimedia aims to increase diversity within its editing community by growing the percentage of female editors to 25%. But our editors continue to be predominantly male (91%). Male editors also edit more than female editors with far more total lifetime edits compared to female editors. But our common perception of female editors facing a hostile environment in Wikipedia was not found to be true. The survey data showed that the majority of female editors are not harassed and do not believe that Wikipedia is highly sexualized.

3.1 Wikipedia editors are predominantly male

Increasing diversity in our editor base is one of our strategic goals, but Wikipedia editors continue to be predominantly male. Among those surveyed, an overwhelming majority of Wikipedia editors identified themselves as male (91%, with females at around 9%). Fewer than 1% of editors self-identified as transsexual or transgender.




D10. Gender distribution (n= 4,930)

3.2 Women editors are growing in number

While the small number of women editors active on Wikipedia is a concern, the good news is that their numbers are growing. Not only has the overall strength of women Wikipedians grown since it first began, but the rate at which new women editors are added annually and continue to edit has also been steadily rising.

Women editors: The numbers are growing!




Cross-tabulated women vs. Wikipedia joining years (n =434)

3.3 A small minority of female Wikipedians report having unpleasant experiences

There is a common perception within the Wikimedia movement that women editors who are in a small minority have unpleasant interactions in Wikipedia, which is predominantly male. But the majority of female Wikipedia editors (78%) stated that they have not had any unpleasant experiences within the community. Only 7% reported receiving inappropriate messages or comments either in their userspace or elsewhere in Wikipedia. Just 4% of women editors in the sample said that they had been stalked online, and 5% said that someone had tried to flirt with them.

Small minority of female editors reported being harassed




Q25. Percent of female editors who reported experiencing the listed harassment (n= 434)

3.4 A small minority of male and female editors believe that userspace is sexualized

Within the Wikimedia movement we often hear that Wikipedia is not able to attract women editors since userspace in Wikipedia is highly sexualized, and often sexual innuendos drive women editors away from Wikipedia. But we did not find large-scale evidence of sexualization of userspace. Only a very small minority of editors surveyed (6%) said that userspace (user and discussion pages) in Wikipedia are sexualized (i.e. contain sexual talks, innuendos, images, etc.). The percentages of men and women who believed that userspace was sexualized were at a matching 6%.

3.5 Women make much fewer edits in general

Even as we strategize about how to attract new women editors, we also need to work on increasing the velocity of current female editors to have more women-centric content. A recent study conducted by a team of researchers at the University of Minnesota found that content on female-centric topics tends to be featured less in Wikipedia.² An analysis of self-reported edits by gender shows significant differences at both ends of the spectrum. While women are more likely than men to make only between 1-50 lifetime edits, men are more likely than women to make more than 10,000+ edits.



D1b. Total Self-reported edits by gender (n= 4,930)

² <http://www.grouplens.org/node/466>

SECTION 4: WIKIPEDIA COMMUNITY: POSITIVE ASSESSMENT OF EACH OTHER

As stated earlier, we have found that the number of active editors has been stagnant and even declined in English Wikipedia. It has been hypothesized that acrimony and rancor among community members is driving editors away from Wikipedia. Although the Wikipedia community is not perfectly harmonious, the data clearly shows that editors primarily do have a positive assessment of each other. Interactions with other editors are a mix of positive and negative, with a slight bend towards positive. More important, positive interactions – like awarding barnstars or adding content to another editor’s article – make editors want to edit Wikipedia more.

Although much has been posited about reverts and their role in declining participation in Wikipedia, the survey research shows that most editors believe reverts with explanation don’t decrease their likelihood of editing in the future, though the same does not hold true for reverts without an explanation.


4.1 Positive assessment of fellow editors



Q17: Top two words that editors would use to describe their peers (n= 4,930)

When asked to pick two words that describe fellow editors, the majority of editors selected positive adjectives in favor of negative adjectives. A full 48% of editors described other editors as collaborative, 38% as intelligent, 35% as helpful, and 31% as friendly. But 24% described fellow editors as arrogant. A small minority even described fellow editors as rude (8%) and dumb (5%).

4.2 Interactions with other editors are a mix of positive & negative, with positive outweighing negative by a thin margin.



Q18. Percent who have experienced the listed interactions (n= 4,930) Positive interactions are highlighted in red and negative in grey.

Two-thirds of editors surveyed reported that other editors added content to articles they'd started. Regarding reverts, more editors reported their edits were reverted with an explanation, at 59%, in comparison to 43% who said that their edits were reverted without any explanation. An equal number of editors (56%) reported that another editor had added content/photos to their work, as those who reported arguing with fellow editors. On the positive side, 15% pointed out that their article was selected as a feature article, and 21% said that their article made it to the front page. However, 28% also believed they were looked down upon by experienced editors. An equal number reported receiving a barnstar as those who initiated an article that was ultimately deleted (31%). Since interactions are key to establishing the likelihood of editing in the future, it is important to ensure that more interactions on Wikipedia among editors are positive than negative.


4.3 Positive reinforcement works

A majority of editors pointed out that positive interactions – like receiving compliments and Barnstars from fellow editors – and positive experiences – like an article making it to the front page – made them more likely to edit Wikipedia. 78% of those editors who received compliments from other Wikipedians said that such interaction increased their likelihood to edit. Similarly, other positive interactions that increased the likelihood of editing include: having an article selected as a feature article (76%); having an article make the front page (72%); having a self-provided picture used in an article (71%); receiving a Barnstar.(70%).

While positive interactions work, negative interactions reduce the likelihood of editing. 69% of editors who believed that other editors looked down on them said the feeling decreased their likelihood to edit.


Similarly, 60% of those whose edits had been reverted without an explanation and 59% of those whose articles had been deleted, pointed out that such feedback decreased their likelihood to edit.

Positive feedback loops work



Q19. Percent who believe the listed interactions make them more likely to edit (n= 4,930)

And negative feedback loops don't




Q19. Percent who believe the listed interactions make them less likely to edit (n= 4,930)

4.4 Reverts don't hurt as much if there is an explanation for reversal

60% of editors whose edits had been reverted without any explanation said that this made them less likely to edit, while only 9% of editors whose edits had been reverted with explanation felt less inclined to edit. An overwhelming majority of editors, 83%, believe feedback from other editors has helped better their own skills, in comparison to only 17% who said that feedback from other editors through reverts, discussions, etc. has been a bad experience.

4.5 24% reported being harassed by other editors on Wikipedia

24% of editors in the survey said other editors on Wikipedia had harassed them, while 5% reported being harassed outside of Wikipedia (via phone calls, Facebook, through other websites, etc.). We did not find any statistical differences based on gender, although older editors are more likely to point out that they have been harassed. It is interesting to note that despite almost a quarter of editors claiming harassment and other negative experiences in Wikipedia, most editors provided a positive assessment of the community.




Q23: Percent who said that they have been harassed outside Wikipedia (n= 4,930).

4.6 The Wikipedia Editor Satisfaction Index

To better quantify the Wikipedia editors' experiences, we defined the Wikipedia Editor Satisfaction Index (WESI) using their responses to two questions in the survey. Firstly, we looked at the two words editors chose to describe the fellow editing community (Q17). Secondly, we tried to incorporate their perception of the usefulness of the feedback they receive from the community (Q20).

Next, we assigned weights to their responses: for Q17, each positive adjective used to describe a fellow editor (*Collaborative, Intelligent, Helpful, and Friendly*) was assigned a +1, and each negative adjective (*Arrogant, Unfriendly, Rude and Dumb*) was assigned a -1. Q20 asked editors to choose one of the two statements – whether feedback through other editors had helped them become a better editor or not; this was weighted at +2 for a positive response (*The feedback from other editors through reverts, discussions, etc. has helped me become a better editor*) and -2 for a negative response (*The*

feedback from other editors through reverts, discussions, etc. has been a bad experience for me). The resulting range of scores was -4 to +4. While preserving the ratio of differences, we normalized the range to a 10-point scale, which would be easier to interpret.



Distribution of WESI scores across all Wikipedia editors

The overall distribution of scores was definitely positive, with an average WESI score of 7.65 across all respondents, out of a maximum score of 10. In fact, as many as 47% of the respondents scored a perfect 10 on the WESI. This means that most of the editing community is very satisfied with their experiences on Wikipedia – and holds the community in a positive light. Next, we wanted to understand how specific interactions shaped an editor’s experience. This required analyzing the effect of each of the 17 interactions/experiences listed in Q18 on the WESI score. Also, we wanted to understand how these scores vary across different demographics. Hence, we included age (D1b), number of edits (D2_1), education (D3a) and gender.

We performed a linear regression on the WESI score with a set of independent variables.

KEY FINDINGS

- 1. Editors really appreciate help:** Having another editor add content in the form of text and/or photos has a positive effect on the editor’s overall satisfaction. This is true both for articles they created, and articles they might have added to. Editors who received contributions from their peers on articles they started were much more likely to have high WESI scores. The seemingly insignificant task of editing and fixing grammatical errors is also greatly appreciated by fellow editors.
- 2. Peer Recognition is important, and much more important than other forms of recognition:** Barnstars and rewards from fellow editors are very important to the community. Receiving compliments is another motivator. Editors value the appreciation of their peers much more than other perceived achievements, such as having their articles selected as featured articles, or making it to the front page.
- 3. When edits are reverted or deleted, an explanation is key:** When an edit is reverted, some sort of explanation to the cause is important to editors. There is a high significance associated

with both the presence and absence of an explanation. Editors who receive an explanation are likely to be more satisfied overall. Also, not receiving an explanation has a strong negative impact on an editor's experience on Wikipedia.

4. **Unpleasant interactions with community members affect satisfaction; otherwise, editors are rather resilient:** Experiences such as having articles deleted, arguing with other editors, having other editors push their view, and being looked down upon by more experienced editors all have a significant negative impact on the WESI score. On the other hand, having inaccurate and/or offensive material added to articles they started and/or worked on did not affect their experiences much.
5. **Women are less satisfied with the community:** In general, women scored lower on the WESI, and hence their interactions with the community are less pleasant.
6. **Editors with more advanced degrees are less satisfied compared to those with lesser education:** Editors that hold Master's or more advanced degrees score lower on the WESI compared to those with Bachelor's degrees. Similarly, those with A-levels or lower level of education are more satisfied with the community, and are also the most satisfied of the lot.


For more detailed results, please see Appendix B.

SECTION 5: LOCATION & LANGUAGE: WIKIPEDIA IS STILL VERY WESTERN-CENTRIC

The foundation recognizes that large segments of the world population, especially those living in the Global South, don't edit Wikipedia. Increasing the diversity of Wikipedia contributors is the priority of the foundation, and the data from the survey clearly shows that Wikipedia editors are disproportionately from countries in the Global North. In addition, English Wikipedia draws editors from other projects, sometimes at the expense of less mature projects.

5.1 More editors live in the US than any other country, and English is the most popular language


We have considerable ground to cover to meet our strategic goal of increasing diversity in our editor base. Most of our editors still reside in Europe and North America. According to the survey, 20% of Wikipedia editors live in the US, making it the number one country of residence of Wikipedia editors, followed by: Germany (12%); Russia (7%); UK (6%); and Italy (4%). The only country from the Global South among the top 10 is India, with 3% of survey participants listing India as their country of residence.



D7b. Percent who live in the following countries (n= 4,930)

The majority of Wikipedia editors surveyed chose English as their primary language (52%), followed by: German (18%); Russian (10%); Spanish (10%); and French (9%). The only two native languages from the Global South in the top ten list are traditional and simplified Chinese (2% and 3%, respectively), and Hindi (2%).

Primary Languages



D. Percent whose primary language(s) are listed (n= 4,930)

5.2 Editors from other language projects contribute to English


Wikipedia

An overwhelming majority of Wikipedia editors read and edit English Wikipedia – which also has the largest and most diverse pool of editors, as editors from other projects contribute regularly. In total, 76% of Wikipedia editors contribute to English Wikipedia, although only 40% primarily contribute to English Wikipedia. In other words, in addition to the 40% of editors who primarily edit English Wikipedia, 36% of editors from other language projects contribute to English Wikipedia.

An impressive 93% of Wikipedia editors read English Wikipedia, and about half of them (49%) primarily read English Wikipedia. We can clearly see that editors who work mainly in other language projects help English Wikipedia grow.

Editing Languages

■ All ■ Primary




Q1a. Percent who contribute to the listed language Wikipedia (n= 4,930)

Q1b. Percent who primarily contribute to the listed language Wikipedia (n= 4,930)

Reading Languages

■ All ■ Primary




Q2a. Percent who read the listed language Wikipedia (n= 4,930)

Q2b. Percent who primarily read the listed language Wikipedia (n= 4,930)

It's no surprise that German (which is the second largest language Wikipedia after English) is the second most popular Wikipedia, both for reading (30% of editors read German Wikipedia) and editing (20% have edited German Wikipedia). There remains, however, a wide gap between editing and reading activity on English and German Wikipedia, with English Wikipedia far ahead of German Wikipedia in editor activity.


5.3 Majority of editors contribute to, and read more than one, language

More bilingual and multilingual individuals populate the world than do monolingual, and the global community of Wikipedia editors is no exception. Over half of Wikipedia editors contribute to more than one language Wikipedia, and an overwhelming majority (72%) read Wikipedia in more than one language.



Q2a. Number of Wikipedia languages read (n= 4,930)

Contribution languages




Q2a. Number of Wikipedia languages edited ($n= 4,930$)

SECTION 6: TECHNOLOGY AND NETWORKING: SOCIAL MEDIA IS POPULAR

Wikipedia was founded in the desktop era, and most editors continue to read it on full screen devices. However, we are now witnessing growth in readership on mobile devices among editors, and some editors are even editing Wikipedia on the phone (via desktop site) despite Wikipedia's mobile site not supporting editing. As we experiment and discuss new ways of social engagement in Wikipedia, the data shows that our editors are already using social media. The majority of editors also contribute to social media streams across different platforms: Facebook, blogs, Twitter, etc.

6.1 The mobile phone is extremely popular, but not everyone has a smart phone

The mobile phone is the most popular device among Wikipedia editors. Among those surveyed, 76% have a desktop and 74% have a laptop or netbook computer, and 84% of editors have a mobile phone. But among mobile phone owners, only 38% have a smart phone. The rising popularity of tablets is reflected in our data, with 8% of editors surveyed owning a tablet.




Q8a. Percent who own listed devices (n=5,073)

6.2 Desktops and laptops are devices of choice for reading Wikipedia, although one-third read it on mobile phones

Most editors read Wikipedia on their desktop (82%) or laptop (73%), and the majority edit Wikipedia on a desktop (78%) or laptop (66%). Notably, 34% read Wikipedia on the phone, and 7% reported editing Wikipedia on a phone despite Wikipedia's mobile site not supporting editing. Almost everyone who owns a tablet PC reads Wikipedia on a tablet.

Percent who edit/read Wikipedia on following devices



Q8c/8d. Percent who read/edit Wikipedia on the following devices (n=5,073)


6.3 Access to email is more important than editing Wikipedia

When asked how important are the following online activities, more editors rated email (60%) as more important than contributing to Wikipedia (32%). Following a general trend in the population – a shift in preference towards the use of social networks as a means of communication in the younger generation – we found that younger editors were less likely to rate email as important, and more likely to rate social networking websites as more important.

6.4 Facebook is the most popular social media tool amongst editors

The latter half of the last decade has seen the rise of the social web. Even among Wikipedia editors, Facebook is the dominant social tool with more than half of editors commenting on friends' status updates. A little less than half of editors surveyed stated that they regularly "liked" content on social networking sites, shared links or content on Facebook or Twitter, and posted status updates or pictures on social networking sites.

Facebook dominates social media usage




Q11: Percent who participate in the listed social media activities (n= 4,844)

6.5 Female Wikipedians are more likely to use social media

Social media surveys have shown that women contribute more to social media compared to men, especially in advance economies. Our survey also shows that female editors contribute to Facebook and blogs more than male editors. They are more likely to post status updates, comment on friends' posts, like content, etc.


Female editors use more social media



Q11: Percent of men and women who participate in the listed social media activities (n= 4,930)

6.6 Searching for information and reading Wikipedia are the two most popular activities on mobile devices

Although a majority of respondents don't own a smart phone, many still use the mobile Internet on their phone, demonstrating that Wikipedia editors go online on feature phones. Searching for information and reading Wikipedia are the two most popular mobile activities. In addition, 35% accessed Facebook and 10% Twitter on a phone. The trend that smart phones are increasingly becoming gaming devices is also reflected, with 39% of respondents playing games on their phones.



Q12. Percent who do the listed activity on any mobile device (n= 3,978)

6.7 Ability to save offline ranks highest amongst desired features for the mobile website

Since we are revamping our mobile platform to provide a better reading experience and add editing functionalities, we asked the editing community about features that they are likely to use. 38% of editors said that they were extremely/very likely to use a feature that would allow them to save articles for offline reading or editing use. We were surprised that the feature editors pointed out as the least likely to be used was uploading pictures to Wikimedia Commons (only 21% provided strong support), since uploading a photo requires fewer clicks than writing a paragraph. Despite mobile phones not being the best devices for entering text, 28% said they were extremely/very likely to use a feature allowing paragraph and sentence editing, and 22% expressed support for a feature that would even allow the creation of new articles.

Support for editing on mobile




Q13. Percent who are extremely/very likely to use the listed features (n=5,073)

SECTION 7: WIKIMEDIA FOUNDATION AND CHAPTERS: LOW INTERACTION & LOW AWARENESS

The Wikimedia movement has been intentionally decentralized since the beginning. While the foundation is responsible for day-to-day functioning of the website, chapters have played a crucial role in engagement at the local level. But the majority of editors are focused on editing, and don't interact with the foundation or chapters. The board of trustees manages the foundation, and the community elects three members to the board of trustees. But most editors don't take part in the board elections. In fact, most have never even heard about board elections. Despite such limited interaction, editors provide a good assessment of the foundation, and they do the same for volunteers.

7.1 Majority doesn't participate in foundation or board activities

The survey shows that the majority of editors neither interacts with the foundation nor participates in elections. A full 77% of editors have not sought or received information from the foundation, and among those who have, 82% were satisfied with the quality of information received. Similarly, 87% of editors have never voted in the Wikimedia board of trustee elections. And of that 87%, a full 45% did not vote because they had never heard of the elections. In addition, 84% of editors are not interested in running for the Wikimedia board of trustee elections.




QD17a: Percent who did not vote in elections because of the listed reasons: (n=4,426)

7.2 Editors give top ratings to other volunteers and the foundation

When asked to rate themselves, other volunteers, chapters, and the foundation, editors gave highest overall ratings to Wikimedia volunteers and the foundation. Wikimedia chapters got the least favorable ratings (6.15), and editors personally didn't rate their own performance very high. In addition, knowledge and involvement with chapters is low. 46% of respondents said that they didn't know if there was a chapter in their country, and 82% of those who knew about the chapter in their country were not members of the chapter.

Volunteers, foundation get top ratings



QD20: Ratings on a 0-10 scale (n varies for each of these ratings)

APPENDIX A: SURVEY METHODOLOGY

The survey was conducted online on all Wikipedia language sites in the last week of April. Using the help of the community, the survey was translated into 21 languages beyond English, including: Chinese (traditional, Hong Kong), Chinese (simplified), Serbian, Russian, Portuguese, Polish, Dutch, Macedonian, Italian, Hungarian, Croatian, Hebrew, French, Finnish, Spanish, German, Danish, Welsh, Catalan, Bulgarian and Arabic. The survey was conducted in native languages for which translations were available, and for the remainder of Wikipedia language projects the survey was available in English.

The survey was limited to registered Wikipedia users, and each user saw a link to the survey only once. This ensured that all users (editors) had an equal probability of participating in the survey, and the survey was not biased towards those editors who edit more frequently. We had to set a cookie within the Central Notice banner for the survey to guarantee that it would only show up once per user. The foundation used an open source survey tool, Lime Survey, to field the survey, and the survey was hosted by the foundation. Survey participants also had the option of saving the survey and taking it later.

The survey ran for seven days on the website, with a total of 31,699 views of the banner invitation. By the end of the week, we had collected a total of 8,193 responses to the survey. After data cleaning, which involved removing instances of vandalism, deleting unfinished surveys, etc., we had a total of 5,073 responses.

APPENDIX B: WESI LINEAR REGRESSION SUMMARY


As discussed in section 4.6, we performed a multi-linear regression on the WESI, to identify the key determinants of Editor Satisfaction.

The results are summarized below:

Variable	Estimate	t value	Pr(> t)	Significance
(Intercept)	7.957	69.891	< 2e-16	★★★★★
Total lifetime edits	0.000	1.673	0.09438	★★
Age	-0.005	-1.558	0.1192	★
Education: Master's and above	-0.296	-2.713	0.00669	★★★★
Education: Bachelor's	-0.251	-2.665	0.00772	★★★★
Education: A-levels or lower	-0.184	-1.765	0.00234	★★★★
Gender: Female	-0.380	-2.866	0.00418	★★★★
Another editor adding content to an article you're working on	0.439	4.671	3.08E-06	★★★★★
Having inaccurate material added to an article you started	-0.073	-0.745	0.45609	★
Getting a barnstar or similar award from another editor	0.430	4.313	1.64E-05	★★★★★
Have your article(s) selected as featured article(s)	0.050	0.395	0.69304	★
Having other editors fix grammatical errors in article(s) you started	0.556	6.104	1.12E-09	★★★★★
Having other editors add content to article(s) you started	0.403	4.006	6.27E-05	★★★★★
Having your picture(s) used in articles	0.163	1.819	0.06893	★★
Having your content reused	0.025	0.262	0.79347	★
Having others compliment you on your edits/articles	0.714	7.852	4.98E-15	★★★★★
Article(s) making it to the front page	0.133	1.146	0.25172	★
Having your edits reverted without any explanation	-0.776	-8.81	< 2e-16	★★★★★
Having your edits reverted, but with an explanation	0.475	5.364	8.54E-08	★★★★★
Having an article that you were working on deleted	-0.401	-4.728	2.33E-06	★★★★★
Being looked down on by more experienced editors	-1.268	-14.146	< 2e-16	★★★★★
Argument(s) with editors on discussion pages or elsewhere	-0.567	-6.056	1.50E-09	★★★★★
Other editors pushing their point of view	-0.937	-10.217	< 2e-16	★★★★★
Offensive/inaccurate material added to articles you were working on	-0.161	-1.696	0.08997	★★

For significance, a higher star rating is better: 0 ★★★★★ | 0.001 ★★★★★ | 0.01 ★★★★★ | 0.05 ★★ | 0.1 ★

The Normal Q-Q plot, which is a measure of how well our defined model works, is displayed below.



APPENDIX C: SURVEY RESULTS SUMMARY

This survey was completed by a total of 5,151 respondents. We excluded some of these respondents from the survey as part of our data cleaning process. The variables that were used as cleaning criteria are:

Age (Respondents younger than 12 and older than 82 were excluded)

Total number of edits made on Wikipedia (respondents who said 1 million+ were excluded)

Number of editors interacted with in the last 30 days (respondents who said 1 million+ were excluded)

After removing these respondents, we were left with a total of 5,073 respondents. These comprised a total of 4,930 true editors (those that were >0 at D1B or H3).

Some of the questions in this survey were not mandatory, which led to a variation of bases for particular questions. We have mentioned this along with the question, wherever applicable.

INTRODUCTORY QUESTIONS

D1b. Since you started editing Wikipedia, approximately how many edits have you made? (Please don't include changes made using bots.)

Base: All respondents (5,073)

3% 0
19% 1-50
18% 51-500
16% 501-2,000
24% 2,001-10,000
20% More than 10,000

Average: 8,537

D2. How old are you?

Base: All editors (4,930)

13% 12-17
14% 18-21
26% 22-29
19% 30-39
28% 40 or more

Average: 32

D3a. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

9% Primary education (elementary, primary, middle school or junior high school, etc.)
30% Secondary education (high school, A-levels, apprenticeship, etc.)
35% Tertiary education undergraduate (diploma, associate's degree, bachelor's degree)

- 18% Graduate education (master's)
- 8% Graduate education (doctorate)

D3b. Are you currently enrolled in school or university?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 43% Yes
- 57% No

D4. Are you employed?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 43% Yes, I am working full-time
- 15% Yes, I am working part-time
- 42% No, I am not currently employed

D5a. Are you married, do you have a partner, or are you single? (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (4,528)

- 28% I am married
- 17% I have a partner, but I am not married
- 55% I am single

D5b. Do you have children? (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (4,672)

- 24% Yes, I have children
- 76% No, I don't have children

D7b. In which country do you live?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 20% United States (us)
- 12% Deutschland (de)
- 7% Россия (ru)

- 6% United Kingdom (gb/uk)
- 4% France (fr)
- 4% Italia (it)
- 3% España (es)
- 3% Polska (pl)
- 3% Canada (ca)
- 3% India (in)

Showing top 10 | Values greater than 2%

D8. Is there a Wikimedia chapter in that country?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 48% Yes
- 5% No
- 46% I don't know

D8a. Are you a member of the local Wikimedia Chapter?

Base: 48% who said 'Yes' to D8 (2,450)

- 18% Yes
- 82% No

D9. What is/are your primary language(s)? Please choose all that apply.

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 52% English (en)
- 18% Deutsch (de)
- 10% Русский (ru)
- 10% Español (es)
- 9% Français (fr)
- 5% Italiano (it)
- 4% Polski (pl)
- 3% Português (pt)
- 3% 中文(简体) (zh-hans)

Showing top 9 | Values greater than 2%

D10. What is your gender?

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 91% Male
- 9% Female
- 1% Transsexual / Transgender

D11. In a typical day, how much time do you spend on your computer? (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (4,983)

- 22% 10 and more hours
- 16% 9-8 hours
- 18% 7-6 hours
- 22% 5-4 hours
- 17% 3-2 hours
- 4% About an hour
- 0% Less than an hour
- 1% Don't use my computer daily

D12. We are interested in learning about your proficiency with computers and computer applications. Below is a list of proficiency levels. Please choose one that describes you the best. (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (4,996)

- 1% I am not very comfortable using a computer.
- 7% I use my computer to read email, browse the Internet and use word processors.
- 56% I can download and set up files and applications on my computer.
- 36% I can program and create my own applications.

SECTION I: PARTICIPATION AND CONTRIBUTION

The next few questions are about your participation in Wikipedia.

Q1a. Which language versions of Wikipedia do you CONTRIBUTE to? Please choose all that apply.

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 76% English (en)
- 20% Deutsch (de)
- 13% Français (fr)
- 12% Español (es)
- 11% Русский (ru)
- 6% Italiano (it)
- 5% Polski (pl)
- 4% Português (pt)
- 4% Simple English (simple)
- 3% Nederlands (nl)
- 3% Українська (uk)
- 3% 中文(简体) (zh-hans)

Showing top 12 | Values greater than 2%

Q1b. Which language version of Wikipedia do you PRIMARILY CONTRIBUTE to? Please choose ONE.

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 40% English (en)
- 13% Deutsch (de)
- 9% Русский (ru)
- 6% Español (es)
- 5% Français (fr)
- 4% Italiano (it)
- 3% Polski (pl)
- 2% Português (pt)
- 2% 中文(简体) (zh-hans)

Showing top 9 | Values greater than 1%

Q2a. Which language versions of Wikipedia do you READ? Please choose all that apply.

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 93% English (en)
- 30% Deutsch (de)
- 23% Français (fr)
- 20% Español (es)
- 15% Русский (ru)
- 12% Italiano (it)
- 6% Polski (pl)
- 6% Português (pt)
- 5% Nederlands (nl)
- 5% Simple English (simple)
- 4% Українська (uk)
- 4% Svenska (sv)

Showing top 12 | Values greater than 3%

Q2b. Which language version of Wikipedia do you PRIMARILY READ? Please choose ONE.

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 49% English (en)
- 12% Deutsch (de)
- 8% Русский (ru)
- 6% Español (es)
- 4% Français (fr)
- 3% Italiano (it)
- 3% Polski (pl)
- 2% Português (pt)
- 2% 中文(简体) (zh-hans)

Showing top 9 | Values greater than 1%

Q3. What is your user access level? Please choose all that apply.

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 93% Registered user (basic account, with or without rollbacker, reviewer status, etc.)
- 11% Administrator
- 2% Bureaucrat
- 2% Checkuser

- 1% Overseer
- 0% Steward
- 2% Unregistered user (no account)

Q4a. We are interested in finding out more about your recent participation in Wikipedia and the Wikipedia community. For each activity, please indicate how often you have participated in the following activities in the last 30 days.

Base: All editors (4,930)

	<u>Very often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Average</u>
I edit existing articles	36%	29%	23%	9%	3%	3.87
I research articles	19%	23%	26%	17%	16%	3.13
I write new articles	12%	16%	26%	23%	23%	2.72
I participate in discussions about articles	6%	16%	31%	26%	21%	2.61
I patrol for copyright violations, vandalism or other problems	11%	12%	18%	20%	38%	2.38
I do translation work	7%	9%	18%	21%	45%	2.10
I answer readers' questions and complaints	4%	7%	16%	20%	54%	1.86
I do public outreach or advocacy outside the Wikipedia community	4%	6%	11%	15%	64%	1.69
I develop or maintain policies, guidelines and similar community processes	2%	4%	10%	16%	68%	1.57
I resolve disputes among volunteers (e.g. mediation, arbitration)	1%	2%	7%	16%	74%	1.40
I participate in chapter work	2%	2%	4%	6%	86%	1.28
I organize or help events, workshops, meet-ups, or annual Wikimania conferences	1%	1%	3%	4%	90%	1.19
I do technical work such as maintaining servers or software	1%	1%	1%	3%	93%	1.14

Q4b. Below is a similar list of activities. Please indicate how often you have participated in the following activities in the last 30 days.

Base: All editors (4,930)

	<u>Very often</u>	<u>Often</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Seldom</u>	<u>Not at all</u>	<u>Average</u>
I upload or edit media, images, maps, etc.	7%	10%	20%	23%	40%	2.20
I participate in deletion processes such as speedy deletion, proposed deletion and articles for deletion discussion.	7%	8%	15%	21%	49%	2.03
I conduct quality review and assess articles for featured-article selection.	3%	5%	11%	17%	65%	1.63
I work on the help desk or do other work to welcome new editors.	3%	4%	10%	15%	69%	1.56

Q5a. Below is a list of reasons that some editors START contributing to Wikipedia. For which of the following reasons did you START contributing to Wikipedia? Please select as many as apply.

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 69% I liked the idea of volunteering to share knowledge
- 64% I saw an error and wanted to fix it
- 50% I knew a lot about a subject that was poorly covered
- 29% I wanted to demonstrate my knowledge to a wider public or community
- 28% I saw a red link or noticed an article was missing, so I wrote it
- 27% I wanted to learn new skills
- 12% I wanted to see whether anyone could edit
- 10% I wanted to participate in a discussion on Wikipedia
- 4% My friends, family or colleagues contribute to Wikipedia
- 2% I was assigned to edit for a school project or work

Q5b. Below is a list of reasons why some editors CONTINUE to contribute to Wikipedia. For which of the following reasons do you CONTINUE to contribute to Wikipedia? Please select as many as apply.

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 71% I like the idea of volunteering to share knowledge
- 69% I believe that information should be freely available to everyone
- 63% I like to contribute to subject matters in which I have expertise
- 60% It's fun
- 59% I like Wikipedia's philosophy of openness and collaboration
- 57% I keep finding or looking for mistakes

- 53% I find articles that are incomplete or biased
- 44% I want to popularize topics I care about
- 29% I want to demonstrate my knowledge to a wider public or community
- 18% I want to gain a reputation within the Wikipedia community
- 7% I do it for professional reasons

Q6. Below is a list of tools available for editors. For each one, please tell us whether it makes it any difference when editing Wikipedia.

Base: All editors (4,930)

	<u>Not Aware</u>	<u>Makes it Easier</u>	<u>Makes No Difference</u>	<u>Makes it Harder</u>
Help pages	7%	74%	18%	2%
Policies and guidelines	8%	63%	19%	10%
Editing interface	12%	61%	21%	6%
Wiki markup or HTML-like language	17%	56%	20%	8%
Community forums and discussions	11%	56%	27%	6%
Bots	23%	47%	27%	3%
User-scripts and gadgets	32%	46%	20%	2%
Automated tools such as Twinkle, Huggle, AWB, etc.	51%	27%	19%	2%

Q7c. If you were to become less active on Wikipedia in the NEXT SIX months, what do you believe would be the most likely reason? Please choose ONE.

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 37% I think I will have less time
- 21% I expect to spend more time on other offline activities
- 7% I don't want to edit because of conflicts with other editors
- 6% I expect to spend more time on other online activities
- 6% The rules and guidelines for editing are becoming too complicated
- 4% I think I don't have enough expertise to contribute
- 3% It's a waste of my time since my edits will be reverted
- 3% I am happy to read, and I don't want to contribute
- 2% I don't want to spend my time editing

- 1% Other people are doing, so I don't want to do it
- 0% I don't want to edit the work of other editors
- 10% Others

SECTION II: TECHNOLOGY AND NETWORKING

The next few questions are about your use of different types of technological devices and Internet websites.

Q8a. Below is a list of electronic devices some people own. Which of the following do you own?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 84% A mobile or cellular phone
- 76% A desktop computer
- 74% A laptop computer or netbook
- 45% An MP3 player such as an iPod
- 8% A tablet device such as an iPad
- 0% None of the above

Q8b. Do you own a smart phone such as an iPhone, Android, or BlackBerry?

Base: 84% who own 'a mobile or cellular phone' in Q8a (4,238)

- 38% Yes
- 62% No

Q8c. Below is a similar list of electronic devices. Do you use any of these devices to EDIT Wikipedia. Please choose all that apply.

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 78% A desktop computer
- 66% A laptop computer or netbook
- 7% A mobile or cellular phone
- 3% A tablet device such as an iPad
- 2% An MP3 player such as an iPod

Q8d. Below is a similar list of electronic devices. Which of these do you use to READ Wikipedia? Please choose all that apply.

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 82% A desktop computer

- 73% A laptop computer or netbook
- 34% A mobile or cellular phone
- 8% A tablet device such as an iPad
- 6% An MP3 player such as an iPod

Q9. Below is a list of tech activities some people may do regularly. For each one, please mark how often, if at all, you do it on a typical DAY. (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (4,922)

	< 1 hour	1-2 hours	3-4 hours	5-6 hours	7-8 hours	> 8 hours	Don't do this online activity	Average
Reading Wikipedia	41%	40%	11%	3%	1%	2%	2%	1.61
Contributing to Wikipedia	43%	29%	14%	4%	1%	1%	7%	1.59
Email	53%	29%	9%	2%	1%	2%	4%	1.40
Staying in touch with friends and family on social networking websites such as Facebook	36%	19%	8%	3%	1%	2%	32%	1.09
Watching video on websites such as YouTube	60%	18%	5%	1%	1%	1%	15%	0.91
Instant messaging service such as MSN messenger and GTalk	27%	12%	5%	2%	1%	2%	50%	0.90
Bloggng or reading blogs	40%	16%	4%	1%	0%	1%	37%	0.74
Using Twitter or a similar micro-blogging website	19%	6%	2%	1%	0%	1%	70%	0.45
Downloading music from websites or using programs such as iTunes	34%	6%	2%	1%	0%	1%	57%	0.42
Online shopping	52%	3%	1%	0%	0%	0%	44%	0.37
Online multiplayer games such as World of Warcraft	8%	5%	3%	1%	0%	1%	82%	0.33
Contributing to open-source software	14%	5%	2%	1%	0%	1%	78%	0.32
Online games, such as Farmville and CityVille, on social networking websites	11%	4%	1%	1%	0%	0%	82%	0.25
Using location-aware technologies such as FourSquare and GoWalla	9%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	89%	0.12

Q10. Below is a similar, shorter list of things people do online. Please mark how important each of these is in YOUR everyday life. (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (varies between 4,700 and 4,900)

	<u>Extremely important</u>	<u>Very important</u>	<u>Somewhat important</u>	<u>Not too important</u>	<u>Not at all important</u>	<u>Average</u>
Email	25%	35%	27%	11%	2%	3.69
Contributing to Wikipedia	9%	23%	41%	23%	4%	3.09
Social networking on websites such as Facebook	5%	12%	23%	26%	34%	2.27
Online gaming	2%	3%	9%	17%	68%	1.52
Tweeting on platforms such as Twitter	2%	3%	8%	16%	71%	1.49

Q11. Many people are using online social media these days. Do you: (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (4,844)

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No, but I am aware of this activity</u>	<u>No, I don't know about this activity</u>
Comment on friends' status updates, photographs, etc. on websites such as Facebook	52%	42%	6%
"Like" content on SOCIAL NETWORKING WEBSITES such as Facebook	47%	45%	8%
Share online links on websites such as Twitter and Facebook	47%	45%	8%
Post status updates on social networking websites such as Facebook	46%	46%	8%
Post family or personal PICTURES online so that other people can see them	40%	54%	6%
"Like" content on BLOGS, NEWSPAPERS, etc.	35%	56%	9%
Have a personal blog	29%	64%	7%
Regularly post comments or pictures to a blog	25%	68%	8%
Tweet using Twitter or similar micro-blogging platforms	22%	65%	13%
Interact with other Twitter users through direct messages, replies and retweets	20%	66%	14%
Create media such as an audio broadcast or video, and podcast it or put it online on a website such as YouTube so it can be accessed by anyone	16%	75%	8%
Post family or personal VIDEOS online so that other people can see them	14%	78%	8%

Write reviews for restaurants and products on websites such as Yelp and Amazon.	13%	67%	20%
Answer, post or rate questions in online communities such as Quora and Fluther	12%	46%	42%
Share your location information with friends on websites such as FourSquare, Twitter, etc.	11%	73%	16%

Q12. Below is a list of features available on some mobile devices, such as cell phones and MP3 players. Please indicate the features you USE on any of your mobile devices. (Not Mandatory)

Base: Respondents who own a mobile phone or an MP3 player (3,978)

- 51% A feature/app that allows you to search for information
- 47% A feature/app that allows you to read Wikipedia
- 39% A feature/app that allows you to play games
- 37% A feature/app that allows you to share/see photos
- 35% A feature/app that allows you to access your social networking profile
- 33% A feature/app that allows you to share/watch videos
- 33% A feature/app that allows you to find information relevant to your location
- 19% A feature/app that allows you to access Twitter
- 14% A feature/app that allows you to “check in” at places
- 10% A feature/app that allows you to blog

Q13a. If Wikipedia were to launch features that were BUILT INTO Wikipedia’s mobile site, how likely would you be to use the following features to edit Wikipedia?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

	Extremely likely	Very likely	Somewhat likely	Not too likely	Not at all likely	Average
A feature that allows you to save articles to read or edit offline	17%	16%	19%	20%	28%	2.73
A feature that allows editors to do block edits like paragraphs and sentences	13%	15%	19%	22%	30%	2.59
A feature that allows you to rate Wikipedia articles on a scale	13%	14%	20%	21%	32%	2.56
A feature that allows you to create new articles	11%	11%	17%	26%	35%	2.39
A feature that allows you to upload pictures from a mobile device to Commons	10%	11%	18%	24%	36%	2.36
A feature that allows you to check for vandalism on your phone	11%	11%	17%	24%	37%	2.35

Q14a. If you had to choose, which one of the following would you choose? (Not Mandatory)

Base: All editors (4,388)

- 92% I believe editing Wikipedia is more rewarding than other online activities such as tweeting, social networking, etc.
- 8% I believe contributing on Facebook, Twitter or similar sites is more rewarding than editing Wikipedia.

Q14b. If you had to choose, which one of the following would you rather do? (Not Mandatory)

Base: All editors (4,374)

- 91% Spend my time editing Wikipedia so I can contribute to world knowledge.
- 9% Spend my time blogging so I can get recognition for my writing.

SECTION III: WIKIPEDIA COMMUNITY

These next questions are about your interactions with other Wikipedia editors and your experiences as a member of the Wikipedia community.

Q15. In the last month, how many editors do you think you have interacted with (online, by telephone, or face-to-face)?

Base: All editors (4,930)

Mean: 104.6

Median: 3

Q16. Below is a list of tools you can use to communicate with other editors. Which of the following tools, if any, have you used in the PAST MONTH to communicate with other editors? (Please choose all that apply.)

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 60% User-page discussions
- 30% Email
- 20% Village pump
- 12% Social networking websites such as Facebook
- 11% IRC
- 9% Instant Messaging services such as GTalk and Yahoo Messenger
- 6% Foundation-I and similar mailing lists
- 4% Micro-blogging websites such as Twitter
- 2% Wikimedia Foundation blog
- 1% Planet Wikimedia blog
- 29% None of the above

Q17. We are interested in finding out how you would describe fellow editors. Below is a list of words to describe editors within the Wikipedia community. Please choose the TOP TWO words that describe Wikipedia editors. Please select two.

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 48% Collaborative
- 38% Intelligent
- 35% Helpful
- 31% Friendly
- 24% Arrogant

- 12% Unfriendly
- 8% Rude
- 5% Dumb

Q18. Below is a list of interactions/experiences editors may have with others within the Wikipedia community. For each one, please tell us if you have had this interaction/experience.

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 66% Having other editors add content to article(s) you started
- 59% Having your edits reverted, but with an explanation
- 56% Another editor adding content/photos to an article you are working on
- 56% Argument(s) with editors on discussion pages or elsewhere
- 55% Having other editors fix grammatical errors in article(s) you started
- 52% Having others compliment you on your edits/articles
- 49% Other editors pushing their point of view
- 43% Having your edits reverted without any explanation
- 39% Having inaccurate material added to an article you started
- 38% Having your picture(s) used in articles
- 37% Having offensive or inaccurate material added to articles you were working on
- 32% Having your content reused
- 31% Getting a barnstar or similar award from another editor
- 31% Having an article that you were working on deleted
- 28% Being looked down on by more experienced editors
- 21% Article(s) making it to the front page
- 15% Having your article(s) selected as featured article(s)

Q19. Below is a shorter list of interactions you have had within Wikipedia community. For each one, please tell us the degree to which it affects your overall experience editing Wikipedia.

Base: Varies based on Q18

	Makes me less likely	Does not affect	Makes me more likely
Having others compliment you on your edits/articles	2%	20%	78%
Having your article(s) selected as featured article(s)	3%	22%	76%
Article(s) making it to the front page	2%	26%	72%
Having your picture(s) used in articles	2%	28%	71%

Getting a barnstar or similar award from another editor	1%	29%	70%
Having other editors add content to article(s) you started	1%	35%	64%
Another editor adding content/photos to an article you are working on	1%	40%	59%
Having your content reused	4%	40%	56%
Having other editors fix grammatical errors in article(s) you started	1%	48%	51%
Having your edits reverted, but with an explanation	9%	73%	18%
Having inaccurate material added to an article you started	24%	59%	16%
Argument(s) with editors on discussion pages or elsewhere	36%	51%	14%
Having offensive or inaccurate material added to articles you were working on	28%	58%	14%
Other editors pushing their point of view	56%	36%	8%
Being looked down on by more experienced editors	69%	26%	6%
Having your edits reverted without any explanation	60%	35%	4%
Having an article that you were working on deleted	59%	37%	4%

Q20. If you had to choose, which of these would you agree with: (Not Mandatory)

Base: All editors (3,984)

- 83% The feedback from other editors through reverts, discussions, etc. has helped me become a better editor.
- 17% The feedback from other editors through reverts, discussions, etc. has been a bad experience for me.

Q21. From your perspective, what is the best way to gain a reputation within the Wikipedia community? Please rank the following choices in descending order of importance. (Not Mandatory)

Base: All editors (varies between 4,380 and 4,492)

- 4.5 Writing new articles
- 4.3 Editing or fixing existing articles
- 3.4 Helping others resolve conflicts such as mediation or arbitration

- 3.1 Helping with administrative tasks such as deleting, blocking, etc.
- 3.0 Commenting on talk pages
- 2.9 Providing support to other users such as mailing-list moderation or technical help

Average score shown: High score refers to high rank

Q22. When comparing yourself to other editors in the language you primarily edit Wikipedia (i.e., your home Wikipedia), in which of the following ways do you believe you are different from them? (Please select all that apply.)

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 22% I am younger than most of the editors in my home Wikipedia.
- 17% I am older than most of the editors in my home Wikipedia.
- 17% I live in a different country from most of the editors who edit my home Wikipedia.
- 13% My nationality is different from most of the editors who edit my home Wikipedia.
- 7% My ethnicity is different from most of the editors who edit my home Wikipedia.
- 6% I am female, while most editors are male.
- 5% My sexual orientation is different from most of the editors who edit my home Wikipedia.
- 43% None of the above

Q23. Have you EVER been harassed by other editors?

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 24% Yes, I have been harassed ON Wikipedia (i.e. user page, discussion pages, etc.)
- 5% Yes, I have been harassed OUTSIDE Wikipedia (i.e. phone calls, Facebook, other websites, etc.)
- 75% No, I have never been harassed by other editors.

Q24a. Thinking about the last SIX MONTHS, do you remember an instance when you believe your edit was reverted or deleted because of any of the following?

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 5% Your nationality
- 3% Your age
- 3% Your ethnicity
- 1% Your gender
- 1% Your sexual orientation

Q24b. Thinking about the last SIX MONTHS, do you remember an instance when you believe you lost an editorial dispute because of any of the following?

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 3% Your nationality
- 3% Your age
- 2% Your ethnicity
- 1% Your gender
- 1% Your sexual orientation

Q24c. Thinking about the last SIX MONTHS, do you remember an instance when you believe you were stereotyped because of any of the following?

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 7% Your nationality
- 6% Your age
- 4% Your ethnicity
- 3% Your gender
- 2% Your sexual orientation

Q24d. Thinking about the last SIX MONTHS, do you remember an instance when you believe other editors undervalued your contribution, including edits, participation in discussion pages, listservs etc. because of any of the following?

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 5% Your age
- 5% Your nationality
- 3% Your ethnicity
- 2% Your gender
- 1% Your sexual orientation

Q24e. Thinking about the last SIX MONTHS, do you remember an instance when you believe other editors looked down on you because of any of the following?

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 6% Your age
- 5% Your nationality
- 3% Your ethnicity

- 2% Your gender
- 1% Your sexual orientation

Q24f. Thinking about the last SIX MONTHS, do you remember an instance when you believe other editors were unwelcoming because of any of the following?

Base: All editors (4,930)

- 5% Your nationality
- 4% Your age
- 3% Your ethnicity
- 2% Your gender
- 1% Your sexual orientation

Q25. We are interested in the interactions that women have within the Wikipedia community. Below is a list of unpleasant experiences some female editors might have had. Please mark if you have PERSONALLY had any of these experiences. Please choose all that apply.

Base: All female editors (434)

- 7% Someone left inappropriate messages for me, or comments about me, in userspace or elsewhere on Wikipedia
- 6% Someone tried to contact me unnecessarily outside Wikipedia
- 5% Someone tried to flirt with me
- 4% I have received too much attention
- 4% I was stalked online
- 4% Someone tried to meet me in person
- 1% Someone used my image without my permission
- 8% Other
- 78% None of the above

Q26. We are interested in finding out what kind of personal information you have made available for everyone to view in Wikipedia. Have you made the following personal information available in your profile in Wikipedia? Please choose all that apply.

Base: All editors (4,930)

	Choice of user <u>name</u>	User <u>page</u>	<u>Both</u>	<u>No</u>
Gender	16%	30%	14%	40%
Nationality	4%	47%	8%	42%

Age	3%	26%	5%	66%
Ethnicity	3%	22%	5%	70%
Sexual orientation	1%	8%	3%	87%

Q27. Do you find the userspace (user, discussion pages etc.) in Wikipedia to be inappropriately sexualized (i.e. sexual talks, innuendos, images etc.)?

Base: All editors (4,930)

6% Yes
94% No

SECTION IV: WIKIPEDIA READERSHIP AND DONATIONS

The next few questions are about your Wikipedia reading habits, and your participation with the Wikimedia Foundation that runs Wikipedia.

D13. For what purpose do you mostly read Wikipedia? Please choose all that apply. (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (5,042)

- 97% To find information
- 27% For school or university research, but not to be cited
- 23% For work
- 15% For school or university research as a reference I can cite

D14. Do you know whether the Wikimedia Foundation that runs Wikipedia is a non-profit or for-profit organization? Please choose one.

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 97% It is a non-profit organization
- 3% It is a for-profit organization

D15a. Have you ever donated money to the Wikimedia Foundation that runs Wikipedia?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 19% Yes
- 81% No

D15b. How often have you donated money to the Wikimedia Foundation that runs Wikipedia?

Base: 19% who said 'Yes' in D15a (984)

- 51% Once
- 39% 2-3 times
- 5% 4-5 times
- 5% More than 5 times

D15b2. Is your donation to the Wikimedia Foundation tax-deductible?

Base: 19% who said 'Yes' in D15a (984)

- 33% Yes
- 31% No
- 36% I don't know

D15c. Why have you never donated to the Wikimedia Foundation that runs Wikipedia? Please choose all that apply.

Base: 81% who said 'No' in D15a (4,089)

- 69% I donate my time instead of money
- 48% I can't afford to make a donation
- 20% It seems that enough people are making donations to keep the projects running
- 13% I never donate to charities
- 9% I think my donation might not be used wisely
- 8% I was never asked or don't know how to donate to the Wikimedia Foundation
- 6% Donations to the Wikimedia Foundation are not tax-deductible where I live
- 4% I disagree with Wikipedia's policies and practices
- 2% I didn't know Wikipedia is supported by a non-profit organization

D16. Have you ever sought or received information from the Wikimedia Foundation?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 23% Yes
- 77% No

D16a. Are you happy with the quality of information you received from the Wikimedia Foundation?

Base: 23% who said 'Yes' in D16 (1,159)

- 82% Yes
- 18% No

D17. Have you ever voted in the Wikimedia Foundation Board of Trustees elections?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

13% Yes
87% No

D17a. Why have you never voted in the elections for the Wikimedia Foundation Board of Trustees? Please choose all that apply.

Base: 87% who said 'No' in D17 (4,426)

45% I have never heard of these elections
34% I was not interested
29% I felt I didn't have enough information about the candidates to make a good decision
23% I felt I didn't have enough information about the Wikimedia Foundation to make a good decision
5% I wanted to vote but was not eligible
3% I missed the deadline

D18a. Now that you know about the elections for the Wikimedia Board of Trustees, would you be interested in voting in these elections in future?

Base: 45% who said 'I have never heard of these elections' in D17a (2,000)

54% Yes
46% No

D19. Have you ever run, or would you like to run, for the Wikimedia Foundation Board of Trustees?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

9% Yes
84% No
8% No, I was not eligible to vote in the elections

D20a. On a 1-10 scale with 1 being NOT AT ALL GOOD and 10 being EXTREMELY GOOD, how would you rate your own performance, in contributing to the Wikimedia movement? (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (4,721)

5%	10	EXTREMELY GOOD
9%	9	
21%	8	
19%	7	
12%	6	
11%	5	
7%	4	
7%	3	
5%	2	
4%	1	NOT AT ALL GOOD

Average: 6.23

D20b. On a 1-10 scale with 1 being NOT AT ALL GOOD and 10 being EXTREMELY GOOD, how would you rate the performance of Wikimedia volunteers overall, in contributing to the Wikimedia movement? (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (4,555)

10%	10	EXTREMELY GOOD
18%	9	
27%	8	
20%	7	
10%	6	
9%	5	
2%	4	
2%	3	
1%	2	
1%	1	NOT AT ALL GOOD

Average: 7.40

D20c. On a 1-10 scale with 1 being NOT AT ALL GOOD and 10 being EXTREMELY GOOD, how would you rate the performance of the Wikimedia Foundation, in contributing to the Wikimedia movement? (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (3,993)

15%	10	EXTREMELY GOOD
19%	9	
21%	8	

16% 7
9% 6
10% 5
3% 4
2% 3
2% 2
2% 1 NOT AT ALL GOOD

Average: 7.33

D20d. On a 1-10 scale with 1 being NOT AT ALL GOOD and 10 being EXTREMELY GOOD, how would you rate the performance of the Wikimedia chapters, in contributing to the Wikimedia movement? (Not Mandatory)

Base: All respondents (3,311)

8% 10 EXTREMELY GOOD
10% 9
16% 8
15% 7
11% 6
19% 5
6% 4
5% 3
3% 2
7% 1 NOT AT ALL GOOD

Average: 6.15

D21. We are interested in your opinion on how the Wikimedia Foundation should spend money. If you donated 100 dollars to the Foundation, how would you like the foundation to allocate the money for the following? (Please ensure that all the responses add up to \$100.)

Base: All respondents (5,073)

- 28 Technical operations (more operations staff, new caching servers, performance metrics, uptime)
- 15 Technical features development aimed at supporting new editors
- 12 Community work aimed at supporting a healthy editing culture
- 12 Technical features development aimed at supporting experienced editors

- 11 Community work aimed at attracting/supporting new editors globally
- 8 Community work aimed at attracting/supporting new editors specifically in the Global South
- 7 Grantmaking to chapters, individuals and similar organizations for priority projects
- 7 Support for chapters (e.g., communications, monitoring compliance with agreements, fundraising, organizational development)

Means represented

D22a. We will be conducting similar surveys in the future to track the Wikipedia community. Would you be willing to participate in future surveys?

Base: All respondents (5,073)

73% Yes

27% No

WIKIPEDIA EDITORS STUDY: RESULTS FROM *THE EDITOR SURVEY, APRIL 2011*



Photo: Sage Ross, CC-BY-SA 3.0

Source:

http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Advanced_editing_workshop_at_Wikipedia_in_Higher_Education_Summit,_2011-07-09.jpg

For more information about the survey and data, please contact Mani Pande, Head of Global Development Research, at mpande@wikimedia.org.