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Project summary:

Vendors in three emerging regions (Ghana, Indonesia, Argentina) were engaged to evaluate table of contents (ToC) prototypes and sticky header (SH) elements/usability.

ToC: users provided feedback on a variety of supplemental/persistent prototypes to help determine the value of a constantly accessible ToC.

SH: users ranked tools/functionalities based on utility/salience and explored sticky header prototypes.
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Executive Summary

Wikimedia is seeking to improve the desktop user experience of its Wikipedia website. The suggested improvements are to the Table of Contents (ToC) and the Headers Elements on the desktop pages. In line with this, Wikimedia commissioned a usability test research in Ghana to evaluate user preferences among five prototype designs for the ToC and different header elements.

A usability test was conducted in Ghana between 02 February to 16 February 2021 with seven participants. The participants recruited were tested on a series of tasks that involved interacting with the prototypes. The tasks helped unearth user preferences and opinions about the suggested desktop improvements.

The key findings from the research reveal that:

- There is an overwhelming preference for a ToC that is always visually available on a Wikipedia page, irrespective of which section of the page the user is browsing.
- A strong preference for Prototype 5 (Persistent Prototype). Unlike the other prototypes, which are designed to supplement the main ToC and only triggered after the user scrolls past the main ToC at the top of the page, users prefer the design of Prototype 5, which is always available on the page right from the start and does not require any trigger action from the user.
- For logged-out users: Searching Wikipedia, Article Title and Section Titles were the first, second, and third most useful header elements they would always like to have readily accessible.
- Among logged-in users (mostly Editors): Searching Wikipedia, Edit Article, and Article Title rank the most useful header elements that should always be visibly accessible.
- Except for the “Talk Icon”, “Watchlist Icon”, “Profile Icon” and “Notifications Icon” the rest of the header icons were not considered intuitively representative of the icon’s use.
- Participants tested in the study also preferred the header to be permanently affixed and always visually available at the top of the Wikipedia page, irrespective of which section of the page the user is on. Participants do not want to have to trigger the header either through scrolling back up, hovering the cursor at the top of the page, or switching between opened tabs.
RESEARCH APPROACH
Research Goal

Wikimedia is considering making design and functionality improvements to the Table of Contents (ToC) and Header Elements of its Wikipedia desktop website. URIKA Insights tested in a user experience study in Ghana for Wikimedia, five prototype designs of the ToC and a streamlined design of the header elements. The usability tests were designed to present the Wikimedia team on this desktop improvement project information on how various Wikipedia users view these changes. The key research questions this study attempted to answer were anchored around the ToC and the Header Elements.

**Table of Contents**

1. How reliant are users on the ToC?
2. What is the purpose of the ToC to users?
3. Besides ToC, how else do users navigate Wikipedia articles to find the information?
4. Do users face any challenges when looking for information within a Wikipedia article.
5. What are the user preferences for the features of the five prototypes tested?

**Header Elements**

1. Rank the header elements on their usefulness?
2. Should header elements be always shown or not?
3. Are header icons self-explanatory?
4. Are there other ways users would prefer the header elements to be triggered?

6. Is there a preference for ToC that is always visually available?
7. What is the preference for supplemental versus persistent ToC. For an always visually available ToC, do users want it as supplemental, i.e., triggered after scrolling past the main ToC embedded at the top, or want it as persistent?
8. What is the user preference for depth (number of levels for headers and sub-headers)?
9. User preference for look and feel?
Methodology

The study method used a qualitative approach that involved a user-centered methodology that evaluated the design improvements to the Wikipedia desktop website with representative users. Participants were asked to complete a set of four tasks while the research team watched, listened and took notes.

Participants had the option of coming to a testing center or conducting the interviews remotely via video call. Six out of the seven participants opted to come to the testing center. One participant conducted the usability test remotely via Zoom. The testing center had a laptop with internet connectivity set up, which participants can use during the interviews. Participants were also provided the option to use their laptops. All testing sessions were video recorded with express consent from the participants.

3.1 Participants

In the Ghana sessions, seven users participated in the usability testing. The participants span three user profiles which included:

1. Newcomers: rarely use, or new Wikipedia users who have read Wikipedia articles approximately less than 20 times.
2. Causal Readers: occasionally read Wikipedia articles and have visited the Wikipedia website more than 20 times.
3. Editors: frequent users of Wikipedia who also edit Wikipedia articles and have a log-in account.

Participant 1
- Casual Reader
- Female
- 18 – 25 years
- Smartphone

Participant 2
- Editor
- Male
- 18 – 25 years
- Desktop
Aggregated Summary of Demographic and User Characteristics of Participants

**Age:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-25 years</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-35 years</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36-45 years</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gender:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender Description</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender Male/man</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cisgender Female/woman</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Highest Level of Education:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Description</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior High School (A-levels/SSS/SHS)</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tertiary (Diploma/Degree/Masters/PhD)</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Personal monthly income:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income Range</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than $83</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$84 - $167</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$168 - $250</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$500 - $583</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than $833</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 7

### How long have you been reading Wikipedia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Range</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between 1-3 years</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 3-5 years</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For more than 5 years</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 7

### How many times have you accessed Wikipedia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Access Times</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fewer than 20 times</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 21-50 times</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 50 times</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 7

### How often do you read Wikipedia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Several times a day</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times in a week</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Several times in a month</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 7

### Do you edit Wikipedia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Edit Status</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 7

### Do you have a login account with Wikimedia:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Login Status</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 7

### Device mostly used for accessing the internet:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device Type</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Via Smartphone</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Via Desk/Laptop</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Totals:** 7
3.2 Tasks Tested

To elicit user preferences and opinions on the proposed desktop improvements, participants were tested on four tasks. Each task was designed to generate insights into a specific user experience context. The first three tasks were focused on the ToC and the fourth task on the Header Elements.

**TASK 1**
Access a topic of interest on Wikipedia and find answers to a question.

**TASK 2**
Explore three Wikipedia articles of varying lengths.

**TASK 3**
Explore the five prototypes.

**TASK 4**
Explore sticky header and rank elements.
KEY FINDINGS
Participants were asked to complete TASK 1 and TASK 2, which provided key insights to the questions below.

1. How users use the current ToC? Are they light, moderate, heavy users?
2. What is the ToC used for?
3. Besides ToC, how else do users navigate within Wikipedia articles to find information they are looking for?
4. Do users face any challenges when looking for information within a Wikipedia article?
As participants completed Task 1 and 2, it was observed that most users do not use the ToC as was expected. The majority barely clicked on the ToC nor took their cursor near the ToC. No participant repeatedly clicked on the ToC to navigate within a Wikipedia article, irrespective of the length of the article.

Based on the participants' behavior, the casual readers could be described as light users of the ToC because they rarely clicked on the ToC to navigate within the article when looking for information. Editors can be described as moderate users as they sometimes directed their cursors towards the ToC and clicked on subtitles in the ToC to navigate within the page. None of the participants can be described as heavy users of the ToC.

All participants primarily relied on scrolling up and down the page of an article to find information as a substitute for using the ToC. A few newcomers and casual users (2 out of 7 participants) relied on the "Search Bar" or Ctrl + F to find information within the article.

The study identified five keyways that participants use the ToC. Below from left to right is a ranking of how participants said the commonly used ToC.

1. The ToC is used to get an overview of the article as well as to get a sense of the length of the article
2. When user wants to read further on a topic, they use the ToC to know what to expect in the article
3. Users use ToC to determine if they are interested in reading on the topic further or not
4. Use it to navigate to a specific section of an article
5. ToC introduces users to new areas of a topic that they may not have been looking for
Participants were asked to complete TASK 3, which involved the evaluation of the features of five ToC prototypes. Each prototype was evaluated on five key usability metrics:

- **Noticeability**
- **Design Functionality** Does the design work and help users meet their needs
- **Aesthetics**
- **Depth** Header and sub-header levels
- **Overall Preference**

The users' experiences gathered from this task provided answers to the questions below.

1. User preferences for the features of the five prototypes.
2. Is there a preference for ToC that is always visually available?
3. Preference for supplemental versus persistent ToC. Do consumers want a supplemental ToC, i.e., a ToC that is triggered after you scroll past the main ToC at the top of the Wikipedia article, or would they prefer a persistent ToC this is always visually available, without the need to trigger it.
4. User preference for depth, i.e., number of levels for headers and sub-headers)
5. User preference for look and feel of the ToC
# PROTOTYPE 1

Once you scroll past the main ToC, a floating secondary ToC appears in the bottom-right corner. Shows all headers, highlights user's current section, needs a click to expand.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noticeability</th>
<th>Poor noticeability - when is unexpanded, it is easy to miss it because of the location. It also somewhat blends with the text of the article, making it difficult to notice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Functionality</td>
<td>Sometimes can not see the icon for expanding collapsed or expanded version obstructs article text expandable double scrollbar very close to each other. Scroll bar of expanded ToC + scrollbar of article page at the right can make using either scrollbar challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Background highlight of active sections italicizing of sub-sections clearly distinguishes section titles from sub-sections bold section titles un-numbered section-titles and sub-section is a clean look double scrollbar very close to each other is tacky.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Preferred that all levels section-titles and sub-sections are present preferred that sub-sections show by default without need to expand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Preference</td>
<td>Not chosen by any participant as a preferred prototype</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**When expanded obstructs article text**

**Sometimes cannot see icon for expanding ToC**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noticeability</th>
<th>Least noticeable position among the five prototypes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Functionality</td>
<td>Expandable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Obstructs article text when expanded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Clean cut, minimalist, simple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Background highlight of active sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Italicizing of subheading clearly distinguishes section headers from sub-headers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bold section-titles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Un-numbered section-titles and sub-section is a clean look</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Preference for all levels section-headers and sub-sections are showing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Preference that that sub-sections show by default without need to expand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Preference</td>
<td>Second most liked by participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PROTOTYPE 2**

Once you scroll past the main ToC, sticky header appears with access to a ToC dropdown, needs click to open, shows all headers, and highlights the user’s current section.

- **Noticeability**:
  - Least noticeable position among the five prototypes

- **Design Functionality**:
  - Expandable
  - Obstructs article text when expanded

- **Aesthetics**:
  - Clean cut, minimalist, simple
  - Background highlight of active sections
  - Italicizing of subheading clearly distinguishes section headers from sub-headers
  - Bold section-titles
  - Un-numbered section-titles and sub-section is a clean look

- **Depth**:
  - Preference for all levels section-headers and sub-sections are showing
  - Preference that that sub-sections show by default without need to expand

- **Overall Preference**:
  - Second most liked by participants

*When expanded obstructs article text*
**PROTOTYPE 3**

Once you scroll past the main ToC, a dot menu appears on the left that, upon hovering, opens with first level headers, and header of user’s current section is in bold.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noticeability</th>
<th>Easily noticeable – the most noticeable ToC among the five prototypes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Design Functionality| • Should have “Content” as the title boldly indicating to users that it's a ToC, otherwise it can be mistaken as just a design on the page, especially by newcomers.  
• Obstructs article text when expanded |
| Aesthetics          | • Dot design is modern and a refreshing look for a Wikipedia design which is often perceived as conservative  
• Highlighting and boldening of active section title is seen as cool  
• Scrollbar is clumsy. Should be designed similar to Prototype 5, all section-titles and sub-sections show yet has not scroll bar  
• Hovering near dots to trigger expansion of ToC seems unnecessary. Should be expanded by default so its obvious it is a ToC |
| Depth               | • Section titles not expandable to show sub-sections. It should have sub-sections |
| Overall Preference  | • Passive appeal. Mostly disliked but design seen as modern by some participants. Suggestions that design could be merged with Prototype 5. |

Take out scrollbar
Once you scroll past the main ToC, a CONTENTS button appears. Clicking the button jumps you back to the main ToC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noticeability</th>
<th>Not noticeable/easy to miss/may think it is part of the main article text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Functionality</td>
<td>Limited functionality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Only marginally better than having to scroll-up</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Consider moving to the top or middle of the blank space on the right</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>Has no section-title or sub-sections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Preference</td>
<td>Not liked by any participant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inazushi**

Wikibooks Cookbook has a recipe module on Inazushi.

Inazushi (稲荷寿司) is a pouch of Weed rice typically filled with sushirice alone. Yara toll that inazushi is named after the Shinto god Inari. Fears, messages of hope, are believed to have a fondness for fried tos, and as a fruit roll has paired comics that resemble fox eyes. Regional variations include pouches made of a thin omelette, both cooked or raw, instead of tofu. It should not be confused with Inari sushi, which is a roll filled with flavored fried tofu.

Cone sushi is a variant of sansho-zushi originating in Inazushi that may include green beans, carrots, or yellow okra, with rice, wrapped in a triangular oboro-ago piece. It is often sold in oboro-ago (Japanese deli) and as a component of sashimi boxes.

**MakiSushi**

MakiSushi (巻き寿司, "rolled sushi"), norimaki (のり巻き, "nor-i roll") or maki-zushi (巻き寿司, "variety of rolls") is a cylindrical piece, formed with the help of a bamboo mat known as a maki-wa (巻き華). MakiSushi is generally wrapped in nori (seaweed), but is occasionally wrapped in a thin omelette, soy paper, sucrumber, or rice (teriyaki leaves). MakiSushi is usually cut into six or eight pieces, which constitutes a single roll. Many other varieties exist.

Futomaki (大巻, "thick, large or fat roll") is a large cylindrical piece, usually with nori on the outside. A typical futomaki is five to six centimetres (2 to 2.5 in) in diameter. They are often made with rice, two, or more fillings that are chosen for their complementary tastes and colors. During the evening of the Setsubun festival, it is traditional in the Kansai region to eat uncut futomaki in its cylindrical form, where it is called oshi-maki (押寿司).
**PROTOTYPE 5**

On the left side, first level headings by default and expandable sub-headings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Noticeability</th>
<th>Easily noticeable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design Functionality</td>
<td>ToC permanently available to the user right from the start of the article. This was highly liked by users. Also highly preferred having only one ToC, instead of two ToCs as seen in the other four prototypes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>Clean and simple style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>All section titles and sub-sections are present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Preference</td>
<td><strong>Strongly preferred by all participants.</strong> Prototype 5 was used as a benchmark to suggest improvements to the other prototypes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there a preference for ToC that is always visually available?</td>
<td>Preference for supplemental vs. persistent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All participants preferred a ToC that will be always visually available.</td>
<td>All participants preferred a ToC which is visually available from the start of the article and remains in view throughout without the need to trigger a supplemental ToC as the user moves down the article.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were asked to complete TASK 4, which provided key insights to the questions below.

1. Rank elements on usefulness
2. Header elements always shown or not
3. Are icons self-explanatory
4. Are there other types of triggers that would be preferred?
Header Elements

As part of the desktop improvement, one of the improvements being considered is to streamline the header to have fewer elements. To determine which elements to keep in the header, participants, both logged-out and logged-in, were asked in TASK 4 to rank the usefulness of the header elements to them when navigating and to indicate which of these header elements they would like to always be available in the header and which should be hidden until triggered.

The table shows the elements ranked as most useful to least useful and which of those users would always like available to them in the header.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Header Elements</th>
<th>Overall Usefulness Rank (logged-out)</th>
<th>Overall Usefulness Rank (logged-In)</th>
<th>Always Available</th>
<th>Hidden Until Triggered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article title</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes (N,C,E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikipedia logo</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes (N,C,E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section title within the article</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Yes (N,C,E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching Wikipedia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes (N,C,E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language change</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Yes (N,C)</td>
<td>Yes (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit article</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes (E)</td>
<td>Yes (N,C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk Page</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>View history</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watch page</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Page tools</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (E)</td>
<td>Yes (E)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User Tools (watchlist, talk page, etc)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes (E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorite gadgets</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>No (E)</td>
<td>Yes (E)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**KEY:**
N = Newcomers
C = Casual readers
E = Editors
The design of the header was described as good by all participants.

Participants did not have any issues with the three ways in which the header triggered - scroll-up, hovering cursor at the top and switching back to the Wikipedia page tab in a browser.

Even though participants did not have any concerns about how the header was triggered, the overwhelming preference by all participants was to have the header fixed in its position and always visible as you move up and down the page. Participants questioned why the header should be triggered when it can be fixed.
Icon Representativeness

As part of TASK 4, participants were asked to indicate whether they think icons in the header clearly represented the actions that the icons were meant to be used for.

Only four of the icons, the “Watchlist”, “Talk” “Notifications” and Profile icons were considered sufficiently representative that they could be understood without the need for a description beside it.

All participants were of the view that the icons should be maintained with their names besides them to avoid any ambiguity, especially for newcomers to the Wikipedia website.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Icon</th>
<th>Icon Representativeness</th>
<th>Comments, if any</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Log in</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Could be confused to mean “Next”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Relatively universally known to represent talk or comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 Languages</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandbox</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watchlist</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gadget</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Similar to the preference icon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log out</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Could be confused to mean “Next”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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The usability test revealed 3 main insights

1. Prototype 5 is the most preferred ToC. Users prefer a ToC a persistent ToC that is always visually available, without a need for supplementary ToC.

2. The header should be fixed and always visible and not have to be triggered.

3. Icons in the header should have a description next to them, that explains the use of the icon.
URIKA INSIGHTS (formerly URIKA Research) prepared this research report for the Wikimedia Foundation. At the time of submitting this report, the research team made every effort to ensure that the findings in this report are as accurate as possible.

URIKA INSIGHTS (formerly URIKA Research) is an African-based full-service independent market research firm dedicated to delivering data-driven insights to organisations to help them make informed decisions, improve business performance, maximise profitability and address their most pressing strategic challenges.

For more than a decade, URIKA INSIGHTS has built its operational footprints across sixteen African countries where we provide robust, trusted and actionable insights to leaders and organisations from all over the world operating in Africa or seeking to operate in Africa and need a tangible and nuanced understanding of African markets, consumers and societies.

For more information, please visit the URIKA INSIGHTS website: www.urikainsights.com

Submitted: March 2021
SECTION 1: RESEARCH INTRODUCTION
STEP 1: EXPLORING user’s behavior in navigating through Wikipedia web page to understand what are essentials during reading a particular article in Wikipedia’s website.

STEP 2: TESTING the TOC & Sticky Header Prototypes to users, in order to provide corresponding tools that can cater their needs.

STEP 3: VALIDATION of QUALITATIVE INSIGHTS.

QUANTITATIVE STAGE
SECTION 2: UNDERSTANDING THE CONTEXT
UNDERSTANDING USER GROUP’S PROFILE

NEWCOMER
They rarely use Wikipedia – might come across Wikipedia through Google search result when trying to find information widely from general search on the internet, rather than particular site.

CASUAL READER
They casually read Wikipedia articles as the source of knowledge – as a reliable source to find some information, usually for work, curiosity, or helping their kids in finding information.

EDITOR
They are the contributors, who are not only passively consume information – also contributing to edit Wikipedia contents to develop and provide better contents to the wide users. Usually an active & critical person/ have close relationship with writing contents.

WHEN ACCESSING WIKIPEDIA PAGE, MOST PEOPLE ARE LOGGED OUT, MORE ABOUT CONSUMING INFORMATION WITH NO ATTACHMENT. HOWEVER, EDITORS ARE USUALLY LOGGED IN AND FOND TO SUGGEST EDITS WHEN HE/ SHE THINKS AN IMPROVEMENT IS NEEDED.
SECTION 2:
TABLE OF CONTENTS
When I look for a certain information on Wikipedia page, I usually look at the table of contents first to see what the article covers and if there’s the information that I need to find…

- Newcomer
BROWSING BEHAVIOR IN WIKIPEDIA WEB PAGE

**NEWCOMER  
CONTEXT SETTING**
When browsing Wikipedia, newcomers tend to scroll around the article to look for the topic.

*On medium & longer articles, TOC is important to get an overview & context of the article, but still scroll around – will use TOC when they couldn’t find the topic.*

**CASUAL READER  
KNOWING CONTEXT & NAVIGATING**
TOC become an essential part in exploring the content – first to look to grasp the article context.

Then, they will click on the TOC to navigate directly, especially on medium-longer articles, while short article can be easily scrolled.

They might also use CTRL+F to find a keyword when above efforts takes too much time.

**EDITOR  
MIND MAPPING & NAVIGATING**
Editors always look at the TOC at the first chance to get the idea on how complex & robust the article is about (article structure).

Navigating are mostly done through TOC at the beginning – further navigation uses scrolling since they had learned the mapping of the article overview & context to find their desired content.

*TOC IS BECOMING AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE BROWSING BEHAVIOR FOR ALL USERS, HOWEVER EDITOR & CASUAL READER ARE UTILIZING THEM MORE – NOT ONLY SETTING CONTEXT, BUT ALSO TO NAVIGATE*
WHAT ABOUT CURRENT WIKIPEDIA EXPERIENCE?

CURRENT WIKIPEDIA TOC IS CONSIDERED GOOD ENOUGH WITH CLEAR OUTLINE & NAVIGATION, BUT OVERALL IMPRESSION SEEMS TO BE BORING – TOC IS STILL, LACK OF INTERACTIVE FEATURE (LESS HELPFUL ON LONGER ARTICLES SINCE IT IS ON THE TOP OF THE PAGE)

DELIGHTFUL EXPERIENCE

- Well-presented TOC structure – a good and simple structure elaboration with numbers, like TOC in books
- Can easily navigate to the topic when clicking the TOC
- Showing up to 4-level TOC, which is considered detailed enough to get a grasp on the overview of the article contents
- Clean & clear contents – easy to read contents with white space

CHALLENGES

- TOC only available on top of the page makes it harder to get a sense of where they are in the article, especially for newcomer & casual reader – also create inconvenient to navigate
- Considered boring – due to lack of interactive feature & all contents are still, it builds up boredom & reading fatigue on longer articles

BLUE HYPERLINK is considered helpful

When they opening Wikipedia, a focus reading commonly happens rather than opening multiple tabs to understand certain topic on the main topic that they focus on.
PROTOTYPE 1: FLOATING BOX – OVERALL IMPRESSION

LOW ACCEPTANCE

LOCATION IS NOT COHERENT TO THE READING FLOW

= GOOD   = MEDIUM   = LOW

Sejarah

Konsen terlalu mengarahkan lihat dengan menggunakan kaca dan tahu berdasar dari datang ke arah di padang rumput. Letak sungai berada dari bentuk tanah kekuatan yang tidak lagi diperdagangkan dalam konteks ke duaserta berlaku. "Sudah" berarti "Tu (beri) waxar"? 74 Kita masih mengamati proses fenomena dalam sejarah di satu kata. Coba lihat di batik proses fenomena lihat yang dibentuk di dalam ini bagi kita yang terkait dari kesimpulan ini mengenai eaus ini. dan langit yang. Haraplahlah satu dari time rasional, yang dalam masa dalam bahasa tampak?77

INCONVENIENT LOCATION

TOO SMALL

UNNOTICABLE

POTENTIALLY OVERLAPPED
DURING AN ONLINE MEETING VIDEO

UNCOMFORTABLE TO USE

"Ahh there’s a TOC at the right bottom.. I don’t really notice it was there.. I prefer to move it to the left.. If not informed, I wouldn’t really know that this TOC even exist..

- Casual Reader
PROTOTYPE 1: FLOATING BOX – LIKES & DISLIKES

LIKES

• Concise enough when TOC is being collapsed – small enough that doesn’t really bother the main text
• Can easily navigate to the sub-topic when clicking the TOC
• Showing 2-level TOC, which is considered detailed enough
• Comfortable reading view – allowing wide & centered text on page

DISLIKES

• Bottom-right position\(^1\) is considered less convenient – common reading direction is from top left to right below, where the higher hierarchy content, such as TOC, should be first to show
• Overlapping the main text\(^2\) when TOC is being expanded – create reading inconvenience, while looking to navigate on web page → a very displeasing experience (can’t multitask between reading & navigating the page)
• Less grasp on where they are in the article – mapping function is disrupted when TOC is collapsed
PROTOTYPE 2: HEADER – OVERALL IMPRESSION

I think this one is really convenient, and the collapse make it neat. The TOC easily follow the direction of our reading and the main text are wide and centered

- Editor
PROTOTYPE 2: HEADER – LIKES & DISLIKES

**LIKES**

- **Easily noticeable** – follow user’s reading POV (from top/ left to bottom/ right side of the page)
- **Simple and contemporary** – minimalism style (some are aware of this spontaneously)
- **Does not hinder the main text when being collapsed**
- **Wide & comfortable reading view** – wide & centered text on page
- **Directly navigate to the topics chosen on TOC** – by clicking on it
- **Create a good sense/ overview of the article** – setting context & mapping

**DISLIKES**

- **Overlapping the main text** when TOC is being expanded – create reading inconvenient since they might still be looking at the text while trying to find another topic/ keyword
- **Missing section title** when navigate using TOC to a certain section – create confusing whether it is the right/ wrong section
PROTOTYPE 3: HIDING DOTS – OVERALL IMPRESSION

MEDIUM ACCEPTANCE

It's good that it shows the location & map where we are, but the dots are not clear and have to be hovered to see. Even then, there's only the main section title only..

- Casual Reader
PROTOTYPE 3: HIDING DOTS – LIKES & DISLIKES

LIKES

• Convenient being on the left side – follow the natural reading flow, left to right
• Can easily navigate to the sub-topic when clicking the TOC
• Does not cover up the main text - which is a plus to make reading & navigating easier
• Create some overview on where they are on the page – though only basic mapping

DISLIKES

• Showing only 1 level of TOC1, which considered a key issue: diminishing the essence of having TOC functionality in understanding the article coverage & detailed mapping
• Scrolling bar is deemed unnecessary2 – considered to be taking up space and have no use, especially when all texts can be displayed
• Have to be hovered all the time to see the TOC - inconvenient
PROTOTYPE 4: BACK TO TOP – OVERALL IMPRESSION

LOW ACCEPTANCE

NO OTHER FUNCTIONALITY & BIG HASSLE TO NAVIGATE

NOT HELPFUL

HASSELE

BASIC

ONLY BACK TO TOP

NO OTHER FUNCTION

"I don’t see the necessity of this feature. It only goes back to the top, nothing more. It would be very inconvenient if I have to back and forth, up and down to look for the TOC and contents.."

- Editor
PROTOTYPE 4: BACK TO TOP – LIKES & DISLIKES

**LIKES**

- **Lack of functionality** – considered as something that has little to no use, since they could easily scroll up, or press ‘Home’ from the keyboard to get to the top of page

- **Inconvenient mechanism** – they need to move around a lot in the article back to the TOC at the beginning, which might lose track on what they were reading before, especially when trying to find certain topic in the article

- **Does not tell where they are in the article, especially on long articles** – this prototype is lacking the mapping functionality of the TOC, which are given on other prototypes

- **And as a result**, using this feature does not create novelty nor improvement on user’s reading experience
PROTOTYPE 5: STICKY – OVERALL IMPRESSION

GOOD ACCEPTANCE

It’s really helpful to have the TOC to be always there so I know where I am in the article and can easily learn about its context. This way I can navigate easily and use the TOC more.

- Newcomer
**PROTOTYPE 5: STICKY – LIKES & DISLIKES**

### LIKES

- **Clear functional TOC** – being all displayed at once persistently
- **Convenient being on the left side** – follow the natural reading flow, left to right
- **Does not hinder the main text when being collapsed**
- **Directly navigate to the topics chosen on TOC** – by clicking on it
- **Create a good sense/ overview of the article** – setting context & mapping
- **Very detailed: showing 3-level TOC** – high liking from newcomers, which provoke them to use TOC

### DISLIKES

- **Main text layout is slightly moved to the right side of the page** – not a big issue, but less convenient
- **Particularly for editor, the 3-level TOC seems too crowded**

---

1. Some text is not fully visible or legible due to the image quality.
There’s quite a gap between the acceptance of the prototypes.

**MOST PREFERRED**
- **STICKY**
  - Considered to be the top of the cream prototype — clear navigation in detail, without disrupting the main text, good sense of content & context of the article.

**LEAST PREFERRED**
- **BACK TO TOP**
  - Having only one functionality considered as not really useful — users can use ‘Home’ button from the keyboard.

**CLEAR WINNER**
- **STICKY**
  - Considered to be the top of the cream prototype — clear navigation in detail, without disrupting the main text, good sense of content & context of the article.

**RUNNER UP**
- **HEADER**
  - Simple & convenient — wide reading layout, in the middle of the page, while still providing a navigation when needed.

**ACCEPTABLE**
- **HIDING DOTS**
  - Being on the left & not disrupting the content is a good point, yet having only 1 level considered as less useful.

**LACK OF INTEREST**
- **FLOATING BOX**
  - Being on the right-down side of the page create inconvenience, since it doesn’t correspond with how users read.

**VERY LOW ACCEPTANCE**
- **STICKY**
  - Having only one functionality considered as not really useful — users can use ‘Home’ button from the keyboard.

There’s quite a gap between the acceptance of the prototypes:

- **PERSISTENT TOC IS PREFERRED THAN SUPPLEMENTAL DUE TO EASIER OUTLINE MAPPING, WHILE TEND NOT TO BLOCK THE MAIN TEXT.**

- **TOC PROTOTYPES IN SUM…**

- **MAIN TEXT SHOULDN’T OVERLAP WITH TOC WHEN EXPANDED.**
  - Text layout can be adjusted to give space for TOC.

- **MORE LEVEL OF TOC SHOULD BE PROVIDED.**
  - To be able to make use of TOC functionality.

- **MAIN ISSUE IS ON THE LOCATION.**
  - When moved to the left, might create higher acceptance.

- **CONSIDERED LACK OF FUNCTIONALITY.**
WHAT IS THE IDEAL TOC FOR THE USERS?

DEPTH

• **HIDDEN VS PERSISTENT**
  A persistent TOC is preferred due to convenient in outline mapping & navigation, yet a hidden TOC is also acceptable – would be nice if it can be accessed easily

• **TRIGGERING HIDDEN TOC**
  When hidden, TOC should be able to be triggered easily – however, the trigger will depend on the type of TOC: the most common is by **click**, though **hover** is also acceptable and getting very common

• **LAYERS/ LEVELS**
  ✓ **Newcomers**: expect 3-level TOC to give more details → drive them to use TOC since they can funnel down to find a specific topic

  ✓ **Casual readers & Editor**: expect 2-level TOC since they already have a better grasp of Wikipedia – also due to the persistent/ supplemental TOC is considered to take space and minimize the space for the main text

LOOK & FEEL

• **TOC LOCATION**
  TOC should be located on the left/ top side of the page to be coherent with common reading direction

• **TOC POINTS PRESENTATION**
  Bullet points are preferred due to the simplicity that are considered suitable for the new prototypes

• **DIFFERENTIATION TOC LEVELS**
  When differentiating levels, colors are preferred rather than using other format – however, only 2 colors should be used to avoid being too colorful & confusing

• **EXPANDED/ COLLAPSED**
  ✓ **Persistent**: collapsed view is acceptable, yet need to have arrow sign that shows the TOC can be expanded on several topics

  ✓ **Supplemental**: collapsed view is preferred due to the limited space of being a supplemental TOC

MAPPING FEATURE IN TOC IS CONSIDERED TO BE VERY CRUCIAL TO THE USERS – HELPING THEM TO SET THE PACE WHEN READING THE ARTICLE, WHILE GRASPING THE CONTEXT & WHERE THEY ARE ON THE TOPIC
SECTION 3: STICKY HEADER
STICKY HEADER

Sticky header is not an essential element, but considered to be good-to-have → helping users to know the website, informed about the article/topic they are reading, and help them to easily search contents.

IMPORTANCE TO USERS

It’s only informational, displaying the article title and website. I think we can merge this with table of content, especially the previous header TOC, putting an expand sign on the section title shown under the W logo…

- Editor

Note: This information was implicitly derived from the discussion rather than spontaneously mentioned by respondents.
KEY ELEMENTS NEEDED ON STICKY HEADER – LOGGED OUT

MUST-HAVE/HYGIENE ELEMENTS

The key elements on a sticky header that are fundamental to the Wikipedia web page.

GOOD-TO-HAVE ELEMENTS

Additional elements that are pretty much adding value, but might not be as important as the hygiene elements to the users.

NICE-TO-HAVE ELEMENTS

These elements are not necessarily needed or deemed to be less essential for users. Yet, the logo is still considered to be important for branding.

STICKY HEADER ELEMENTS

1. ARTICLE TITLE
2. SECTION TITLE
3. SEARCH
4. LANGUAGE SWITCH
5. WIKIPEDIA LOGO
6. EDIT

NEWCOMERS & CASUAL READERS ARE MORE FOCUSED ON ELEMENTS THAT ARE HELPING THEM TO UNDERSTAND AND FIND THE CONTENTS THAT THEY ARE LOOKING FOR – THE GOAL IS TO FIND THE INFORMATION
KEY ELEMENTS NEEDED ON STICKY HEADER – LOGGED IN

**MUST-HAVE/ HYGIENE ELEMENTS**

The key elements on a sticky header that are fundamental to the Wikipedia web page

**GOOD-TO-HAVE ELEMENTS**

Additional elements that are pretty much adding value, but might not be as important as the hygiene elements to the users

**NICE-TO-HAVE ELEMENTS**

This element is not necessarily needed, or deemed to be essential for users, but does not necessarily that it’s not important for the brand

**STICKY HEADER ELEMENTS**

1. SEARCH
2. ARTICLE TITLE
3. SECTION TITLE
4. TALK
5. EDIT/EDIT SOURCE
6. LANGUAGE SWITCHING
7. HISTORY
8. USER TOOLS
9. PAGE TOOLS
10. WATCH
11. YOUR FAVOURITE GADGETS
12. WIKIPEDIA LOGO

EDITORS HAVE MORE COMPLEX NEED – APART FROM BROWSING CONTENT, THEY NEED TO BE ABLE TO ACTIVELY ENGAGED TO DISCUSS AND EDIT IN THE FIRST INSTANCE, WHILE EDITING TOOLS CAN BE COME UP AFTERWARDS

DARK MODE gadget is considered to be an attractive feature
ICON REPRESENTATION

Let’s see how well the icons are representing each function on the sticky header

- WIKIPEDIA LOGO: CLEAR UNDERSTANDING
  These icons are widely known, and users can easily relate with them.
- TALK: CLEAR UNDERSTANDING
- HISTORY: CLEAR UNDERSTANDING
- EDIT/EDIT SOURCE: SOME CONFUSION
  Some users are not familiar with this icon.
- SEARCH: SOME CONFUSION
- LANGUAGE SWITCHING: TOTAL CONFUSION
  Users are not familiar and confused with this icon.

MOST ICONS ARE CLEAR ENOUGH TO REPRESENT THE FUNCTIONALITY, EXCEPT LANGUAGE SWITCHING – WHICH IS STILL CONFUSING FOR SOME, ESPECIALLY NEWCOMERS.
# PROTOTYPE 1: LOGGED OUT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>TRIGGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MULTIPLE TABS</strong></td>
<td><strong>IMPROVEMENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Switching tabs is **NOT** a good way to trigger sticky header due to the hassle.
- **Still a permanent sticky header is preferred**

- The current experience seems to be positive to users.
- However, **newcomers** want **section title** to be shown as well next to the article title for easier outline mapping.
- Language switching is considered unnecessary for newcomers and casual readers.
- **Generally, permanent sticky header considered to be easier** – can easily search for contents.
- **Hovering to W logo** is also a good alternative to trigger for users.
- Scrolling up is less commonly known for Newcomers & Casual readers.

**Header TOC could be incorporated with Sticky Header** as an alternative that addresses newcomer’s concern on article outline mapping.
Logged Out

LOGGED IN

STICKY HEADER
PROTOTYPES
**PROTOTYPE 2: LOGGED IN**

Editors like the sticky header as it is in the prototype. However, Bahasa (Language Switching) is not necessarily important – considered too much going on

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OVERALL EXPERIENCE</th>
<th>TRIGGER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MULTIPLE TABS</td>
<td>IMPROVEMENTS</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Switching tabs is **NOT** a good way to trigger sticky header due to the hassle, yet could be **good as a reminder on what article they were looking before**

Sticky header trigger with scroll up is **considered pretty common** – a good way to trigger due to habitual behavior

Removing language switching might be a good idea to make the interface leaner – a **customizable element being shown** would be appreciated
SECTION 4: WHAT HAVE WE LEARNED?
SO, WHAT CAN WE LEARN? – TABLE OF CONTENT

#1 **STICKY TOC** is considered to be the best prototype in the eyes of users do to being consistent, clear, detailed, and doesn’t disrupt user’s reading experience – REPLACING CURRENT TOC

#2 **HEADER TOC** can be another contender when improved – whole main text should be able to be seen, while the TOC is being expanded

**THESE 2 ARE THE MOST ATTRACTIVE TOC – COULD BE VALIDATED IN QUANTITATIVE STAGE**

**DEPTH**

Persistent TOC would be preferred for easy mapping & navigation – with click activation. Having 2-level TOC is preferred to avoid the display being too cramped

**LOOK & FEEL**

TOC position should be in accordance with the normal reading flow (left/ top), with bullet points and colors to display, while being collapsed as the default setting
SO, WHAT CAN WE LEARN? – STICKY HEADER

IMPORTANT ELEMENTS ON STICKY HEADER

#1 NEWCOMERS & CASUAL READERS are focusing themselves to find information – hence a detailed information on the article is essential

#2 EDITORS have the desire to feel engaged and actively involved in contributing to Wikipedia – hence, apart from the detailed article information, the ability to discuss & edit should be available in the sticky header

PROTOTYPE 1 – LOGGED OUT

Since these are mostly used by newcomers & casual readers, they are looking for something that are more straightforward: persistent sticky header

THERE IS AN OPPORTUNITY TO MERGE STICKY HEADER WITH HEADER TOC TO ENHANCE THE FUNCTIONALITY

PROTOTYPE 2 – LOGGED IN

This is used by editors – considered good enough and catered their needs

HOWEVER, A CUSTOMIZATION ON THE ELEMENTS WOULD PROVIDE HIGHER CONVENIENCE
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Results Debrief
**General Observations**

All the interviewees that participated in the research proved to navigate Wikipedia with great ease, naturality and familiarity. No criticism, improvement or optimization points were spontaneously mentioned.

The use of the ToC is however somewhat dissimilar. Some participants mention using it for unknown, highly technical or scientific topics, but not always. Some simply skip it, scrolling the entire article’s content from top to bottom. Moreover, users’ natural approach to an article seems to be reading it from beginning to end, especially in the case of recreational content, or material that is neither related to work nor academic purposes.

Thus, the ToC as is presented today, does not represent an aspect to be improved or optimized, or a highly relevant feature for users. In other words, the ToC does not seem to be a factor that influences users’ usability or navigation experience.

In some specific cases, when users search for highly technical or complex information, the ToC is found to be more relevant.

**ToC: Evaluated Prototypes**

Out of all evaluated prototypes, “Sticky” and “Hiding Dots” are the ones that perform best.

**Sticky**

A prototype considered to be intuitive, user-friendly, visually clear as well as light, modern and in tune with Wikipedia’s style.

Its main strongpoints:

- Quickly visible and identified when navigating.
- Its “look and feel” is totally aligned with Wikipedia’s style.
- Since it is placed in a side bar that usually contains information, which users are relatively attentive to, they intuitively direct their eyesight towards it, making it a natural location for the ToC.
• Does not visually overlap with the article’s information enabling the ToC and the rest of the content to be read in a constant flow without interruptions.

• Is clear and well organized.

• The fact that it is always visible while browsing the article is highly valued, resulting in a user-friendly ToC.

• Its visible yet not invasive design proves to be suitable for different types of articles (short, medium and long) and users (more or less accustomed to using the ToC).

• The dynamics of the ToC by which the active section is highlighted is greatly appreciated.

• Among the possible optimizations participants mention is the triangle that indicates the dropdown list, found to be somewhat small.

Floating Dots

• This prototype has a modern, innovative, somewhat surprising “look and feel” and is considered to be a way of refreshing Wikipedia’s overall style.

• Is visually light, somewhat “minimalist” in a positive sense.

• However some users find it slower to visualize and others even found it difficult to figure out that it expanded when hovering over.

• Once this feature is discovered, its mechanics segments opinions:
  
  o The more “modern” users regard the recourse as very novel, a means to visually clear the screen of information to enable reading the article.

  o Contrariwise, the more “classic” users consider this prototype somewhat complicated, less intuitive in comparison with the way they usually navigate an article.

  o Both segments expressed doubts in relation to how it would work in the mobile version (widely used).

• Once the ToC list is expanded, its design is correct and in line with Wikipedia.
• The way the different dots are highlighted during navigation is valued, although not totally noticed spontaneously.

• A potential optimization that is mentioned is that the ToC include sub-lists as in other prototypes.

The novelty and uniqueness of its design are its main strengths, while its usability seems to segment opinions.

**Floating Box**

This prototype presented several problems:

• The floating box is located in a space hardly predictable for usual Wikipedia contents.

• The space where it is located (bottom right) is usually occupied by undesired advertising that bother, irritate and in many cases are visually ignored. Although the presence of such advertising in Wikipedia is not spontaneously mentioned, the floating box has an excessive resemblance to what an advertising could look like.

• Besides, the location of the box is not a space in which Wikipedia would place relevant information (as opposed to where Sticky or Hiding dots versions are located).

• All these characteristics result in a ToC that seems to lack a fluid or intuitive usability.

• In some of the interviews, users did not manage to visualize the ToC until the interview was practically over.

• Once expanded, the ToC is visually clear and organized. However, the way in which it can be expanded is not totally visible.

• Once expanded, it is necessary to make it collapse once again, which for many users entails an “effort” that does not answer to an actual need, given the low incidence of the ToC use in general.

**Header**

• This prototype mainly presented visibility problems, to the extent that some users had to be guided in their evaluation because it went unnotice.
• The fact that users are not used to directing their eyesight towards top sectors of the article is observed, much to the contrary, reading is always done from left to right and from the top downwards.

• Once perceived, it is not considered as natural for the Wikipedia style as other options.

• As to its practicality, the following stands out:
  o The fact that only one main ToC headline is visible (for example “Ingredients”, “Etymology” “History”) is not perceived as a great advantage either, nor does it conclusively answer to the need to access the content.
  o Once the ToC is expanded, the way it overlaps the article’s content makes reading awkward and is criticized.
  o Being able to change titles in the header while navigating reaps lukewarm appraisals and in many cases users had to be guided to conduct the evaluation.

Back to Top

• This prototype triggered scarce appeal, mainly because:
  o It goes unnoticed due to its shape, color, location (for the same reasons given for Floating Box).
  o Its functionality does not seem to solve a need or fulfil an expectation. In other words, returning swiftly to the ToC fails to generate as much added value as other prototypes, which provide a better organization of the article’s information.
  o Could be mistaken for an advertising.
  o Additionally, compared with other prototypes, it is found to be excessively simple in its functionality to justify its use.
Sticky Header

The ranking of the elements evaluated in the current Header are included in the Annex. The most relevant elements were:

• Title
• Search
• Wikipedia Logo

And in the case of logged-in users, the following are added:

• Edit
• Talk

• As to Language, a particular aspect worth mentioning came up: the vast majority of interviewed users (5 out of 6) interpret that the language switch simply entails a translation of the content, and not a change of content.

• Only one of the interviewees mentioned that in certain occasions he switched to English to have access to a more extensive article.

• This explains why in most cases the Language icon is not perceived as very useful, since users mention that Wikipedia usually recalls their language of preference and they do not need to change it. In other words, they would only switch language if by mistake a language that is not Spanish were presented in the article, but not as a way to access different contents.

Elements common to the two versions of Sticky Header evaluated

It is important to underline that the impact of the evaluated prototypes was very moderate. Although though the prototypes’ appeal did neither stand out nor stir a high level of interest, it did not awaken criticisms or alarming aspects either.

Mechanics

• The header’s appearance in the visual field of users is somewhat difficult, in several cases it had to be specifically guided. Those who saw it without guidance, managed to identify it once they had reached the bottom sector of the article and their eyesight returned to the top.
• This is explained by the fact that in general nothing relevant takes place at the top of the Wikipedia article, hence users hardly focus their attention on this sector.

• On the other hand, even though the idea of having an always visible Header, with key elements at hand, triggered a positive - although guided- evaluation, it fails to generate a conclusive insight or answer to a need of accessibility to such contents.

• However, and despite its low appeal, the change does not seem to pose a threat to the bond with Wikipedia.

Visual Aspects

• Wikipedia’s “W” logo is clear and identifiable.

• The search bar is visible, and the way the search bar shifts to the side in the “logged-in” version stands out particularly.

• Having the title always visible is adequate.

• The iconography is fitting to the Wikipedia setting, natural for its overall style and what users expect.

• The clearest icons listed in order of preference:
  
  o Search bar
  o Edit
  o Language
  o User
  o Talk
  o View History
  o Code

  The automatic visibility when alternating navigator tabs is positively valued.