Speaker 1:   Thank you.

Interviewer: Okay, great. So do you have any other questions before we start?

Speaker 1:   No, thank you.

Interviewer: Perfect. So, first I really just want to get to know you a little bit better. Could you maybe tell me where you're calling in from and what do you do?

Speaker 1:   Okay. I'm calling in from Hackettstown, New Jersey.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker 1:   And I am semi-retired, but when I am working, I split my time between a consulting business that I have. It's specifically communications and marketing. I work with companies to put together policies and procedures and things like that, strategic documents. And then just for fun, I substitute teach.

Interviewer: For fun?

Speaker 1:   Just for fun. I like the little ones, so that's much more pleasurable then the older kids.

Interviewer: That's such a spectrum of jobs.

Speaker 1:   Yes, isn't it?

Interviewer: It's amazing.

Speaker 1:   You know what? If I can wrangle executives, kids are no problem. You can usually reason with them a little bit better.

Interviewer: That's an amazing way to think about it. (laughs). What made you interested in consulting?

Speaker 1:   You know, like all things in this world these days, sometimes companies restructure and jobs end and I had gone out on quite a few interviews and just was not either happy with the companies or their expectations of me and I thought, you know what? I've been doing this for more than 20 years. I have good experience, good connections, I'm gonna go and do this on my own. And it's worked out very well, because I can be true to myself, which a lot of times you always can't.

                 I worked for the plastics industry and also the metals industry to ... pretty much hated sectors of business. You know mining and things like that. And it sort of wore on me after a little while. I went against my principle.

Interviewer:	I feel like you could write a book.
Speaker 1:	I probably could.
Interviewer:	That's so interesting. So, great. So you had taken a survey a few days ago and you mentioned that the last time you used Wikipedia on your phone was to look up a movie.
Speaker 1:	Right.
Interviewer:	Do you recall that experience and tell me why you were looking it up and what was your motivation behind it?
Speaker 1:	Okay. The reason I chose Wikipedia was I find it very fact based, I guess if I could call it. More factual than a review and we were watching a movie. Of course I can't remember what it is now. But I just wanted to look up the players, the actors in it, and where it was filmed, and things like that. Just get more factual detail rather than opinion based. And that's why I chose Wikipedia. I usually do when I'm looking up movies that I'm watching or going to see.
Interviewer:	Can you tell me how often would you say you typically look things up that way, you know, kind of that "in the moment" for ... you had used the words for factual information. How often would you say you do that?
Speaker 1:	Probably 85%, just on the fly. And 15 because I want to do research on something.
Interviewer:	Would you say that of that 85% on the fly, you are very strategically looking to use Wikipedia. Or is it more of a Google search?
Speaker 1:	No, it's specifically going to Wikipedia.
Interviewer:	Okay. That's good. So can I ask you what is your general perception of Wikipedia?
Speaker 1:	The general perception of Wikipedia?
Interviewer:	Mm-hmm (affirmative).
Speaker 1:	Well, I know from working, again, in the metals industry, that I knew someone who was one of the, I guess, administrators, writers, and he explained to me the rigorous process that he had to go through to become sort of valued or allowed to do particular things. And I know that what's out there is not supposed to be marketing based and things like that. It's supposed to be factual. But I found, for a lot of things that I've done, I was able to get what I felt was unbiased information.

Interviewer:	Just out of curiosity, what kind of sources of information do you find biased?
Speaker 1:	Oh, I find things that ... these days, in my opinion, just about everybody is a journalist and so, it's very hard to discern unless I'm going to a known piece of media like the New York Times or the Wall Street Journal, which leans towards my political views, etc. I just find that other sources can be very emotional and unprofessional.
Interviewer:	So, you had mentioned that your understanding of editorship really came from your friend who was kind of an administrator. Can you speak a little bit more to what you understand editing and contributing is on Wikipedia?
Speaker 1:	Well, I know that there is ... it's been a long time since I've actually delved into the pages, because he would talk to me about it. A lot of times when I worked in the metals industry, people would come on to the pages, generally, say copper, silver, something like that, and write things. And so he showed me how to go on to see who was editing the pages and what their connections were and things like that. He was the driver, but he showed me that he was able to go, sort of, into the back end of Wikipedia, and see how things were vetted.
Interviewer:	Mm-hmm (affirmative). Okay. So with that understanding of editorship, how he showed you the back end, like here's editing history, and things like that.
Speaker 1:	Mm-hmm (affirmative). Yup.
Interviewer:	Did that change your perception of Wikipedia, in terms of where this content is coming from, your trust in the the content?
Speaker 1:	No, I don't think it shook my trust in any way. There's three sides to every story. Yours, theirs, and what could be the truth of facts and so, no. For me, it gave me more confidence that Wikipedia was trying to do their best to get, I guess, just facts out-
Interviewer:	Mm-hmm (affirmative).
Speaker 1:	... rather than opinion. I know they work very hard on that to make sure that people weren't putting in marketing pieces and things like that.
Interviewer:	Would you ever consider editing?
Speaker 1:	No. At the time, no, I was working and I was doing enough editing in my job.
Interviewer:	I see.
Speaker 1:	Because I was director of communications, so I didn't want to do that in my spare time. (laughs)

Interviewer:	That's a fair answer. Very fair.
Speaker 1:	Right.
Interviewer:	So earlier ... how much time would you say you spend on your mobile phone in a week, without using the internet?
Speaker 1:	I probably use my phone a lot more than I use my actual laptop. I would guess maybe three hours a day on my phone? So 21 a week?
Interviewer:	Okay. So are you ever concerned with your data usage?
Speaker 1:	I'm sorry, can you repeat that? It's hard to hear you now.
Interviewer:	Is this better?
Speaker 1:	Yeah, that's fine.
Interviewer:	Are you ever concerned with your data usage?
Speaker 1:	No.
Interviewer:	No? Why is that?
Speaker 1:	I think we have one of those better data plans.
Interviewer:	Okay.
Speaker 1:	And I'm not on it all that much. I don't think I'm on it all that much where I'm concerned. No.
Interviewer:	Okay.
Speaker 1:	I can put my phone down and shut it off.
Interviewer:	Perfect. Okay. So you had said in the survey as well that you primarily access Wikipedia on your phone using a mobile app.
Speaker 1:	Mm-hmm (affirmative).
Interviewer:	Why is this your preferred method of access?
Speaker 1:	It's just easier and if I'm out somewhere or sitting on the couch, it's a lot easier to just look at my phone than to get up and walk into my office.
Interviewer:	Okay.

Speaker 1:	Which I guess, is shameful, but you know.
Interviewer:	No, it's totally fair. It's just the inconveniency.
Speaker 1:	Yeah, exactly. It's convenient.
Interviewer:	Are there any other ways that you access Wikipedia on your mobile device besides the app?
Speaker 1:	Occasionally, if I do a Google search and Wikipedia comes up in the top one, two, or three, I'll get to it that way.
Interviewer:	When would you use a Google search versus just going straight into Wikipedia? How does that occur?
Speaker 1:	I couldn't get on Yelp and I was looking for a restaurant.
Interviewer:	Oh, okay. And you found Wikipedia kind of organically that way?
Speaker 1:	Right. Well, no, I'm sorry. I misunderstood the question. So, you mean a Google search to get to Wikipedia? I just didn't, either didn't think about it or whatever and just went in that way.
Interviewer:	Okay. Great. So using the app and, correct me if I'm wrong, you're using an Android phone?
Speaker 1:	No, an iPhone.
Interviewer:	You're on an iPhone. Okay.
Speaker 1:	Six, I think or 6S.
Interviewer:	Okay. So on your iPhone Wikipedia app, is there anything that you wish you could modify on the current platform to improve your experience?
Speaker 1:	Just trying to think, 'cause it has changed over time and gotten better. Yeah, I hate predictive text, but that's just me.
Interviewer:	Okay.
Speaker 1:	I want to be able to type out the word. I don't want you to give me examples.
Interviewer:	I don't own an iPhone. So does it do that anytime you search for something?
Speaker 1:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Oh, okay.

Speaker 1: Yeah. If you start the first two letters, it'll come up with ... start to give you choices, which is helpful, but sometimes maybe I'm looking for something that's obscure.

Interviewer: So, just so I understand correctly, you wish you could turn that off personally?

Speaker 1: Exactly, yes. I would like to be able to turn it off and just use my own thought process to type in the words.

Interviewer: No, I know exactly what you mean. Is there anything on the current iPhone app, that platform, that you would want to add to improve your experience? Anything pie-in-the-sky that would just make your experience that much better?

Speaker 1: And I don't know if the app does it, but I would like to be able to translate the pages from another language. Like I lived in Denmark for a little bit and so I have a second-grader's knowledge of Danish. Like I can read newspapers and books and things like that, that aren't all that sophisticated. And so every once in a while, I will look something up, like in, you know, in the Danish language, and I wish that I could translate it immediately. Maybe there's a way to do that. I haven't found it. I usually just take it out and put it into another translation app.

Interviewer: Okay. What, in particular, do you want ... I'm sorry, just so I understand. So you want Danish translated to English? Or English translated into Danish?

Speaker 1: No, I would like Danish ... I would like other languages, specifically Danish, because that's usually where I'll go and look. If I could just hit a button that said, "translate," and it automatically translated it into English so I could read it without struggle.

Interviewer: Okay. Got it. So, is it safe to assume that you have used Wikipedia on a laptop or desktop computer?

Speaker 1: Oh yes. I have.

Interviewer: In your opinion, how does this compare to the mobile experience? Is there anything better or worse for either device?

Speaker 1: All things, when you're looking at it on a laptop or a computer, the resolution is better. I think you can read more chunks at once. And on the phone, it's like anything. It's a smaller device and so it's ... I think it's less effective for scrolling and things like that.

Interviewer: Okay. That's great. So, why did you choose to download the app?

Speaker 1: Because I had been using, years ago, exclusively on my computer and then when I got an iPhone and learned about the app store, I found the Wikipedia

app and downloaded it. So that was the main reason. It was convenience and I guess I was enjoying the fact that I had an iPhone.

Interviewer: Okay, yeah. That's totally fair. Could you recall how long, a ballpark figure, how long you've been using the app?

Speaker 1: Seven years maybe?

Interviewer: Okay.

Speaker 1: I know I've been aware of Wikipedia since it sort of came to the forefront, but I'm not sure how long that's been.

Interviewer: Okay. Can you tell me how do you generally decide whether or not to download any app on your phone?

Speaker 1: Well, sometimes I'll look at the ratings in the app store.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker 1: Or how many people have it. I sort of look at that as a benchmark for how many people might have tried it. Obviously, you don't know how many people have been successful or liked it. You just know how many people have downloaded it. So, that's usually ... or if it's something that interests me.

Interviewer: Okay.

Speaker 1: Most of the apps on my phone are, like I have the New York Times, Washington Post, you know, more I guess ... not so much fluff.

Interviewer: Okay.

Speaker 1: More practical things.

Interviewer: Okay. Great. So you said earlier that you will generally spend about 21 hours of your time in a week on your mobile phone.

Speaker 1: Probably, yes.

Interviewer: In the survey, you mentioned that you reader use Wikipedia daily.

Speaker 1: I do.

Interviewer: Could you tell me how often you imagine your interactions on your mobile phone or Wikipedia?

Speaker 1: At least once a day.

Interviewer:	Okay. How long would you average you spend on Wikipedia, time wise?
Speaker 1:	If I just do it once a day, it's probably 10 minutes.
Interviewer:	Okay. Can you recall the last time you looked up Wikipedia? If it was yesterday or today?
Speaker 1:	It was this morning.
Interviewer:	Can I ask you, what were you looking for and what was that motivation for that information?
Speaker 1:	After I do the mini-New York Times crossword puzzle, I go to Wikipedia. That's my next thing and I look in the obituaries.
Interviewer:	Is there Wikipedia obituaries?
Speaker 1:	Yes, there's deaths, recent deaths. Yes.
Interviewer:	Oh.
Speaker 1:	I know that's morbid, but ...
Interviewer:	No, that's really interesting. Is it just a habit? Or ...
Speaker 1:	It's just a habit. It's something that I've always ... it was very ... for some reason, as a kid my parents always read the newspaper and one of the first places they always went after they read the first page, was ... they looked in the obituaries to see if someone in our town had passed away or something like that. It's funny, because my siblings do the same thing too, not necessarily on Wikipedia, but they read the first page of the newspaper and then they look in the obituaries. So it's habit, really, from growing up I think.
Interviewer:	That's so interesting. So when you were looking up that information, were you satisfied with that you found? I guess ...
Speaker 1:	Yeah, I was. Yes. It was fine. A lot of times on there, you don't know who the person is, but yeah. Interesting. So now you'll have to go and look. It's called Recent Deaths.
Interviewer:	I really do. I'm so interested in what this is. I've never heard of it. Huh.
Speaker 1:	Yeah, and it goes back. Very interesting. People from all over the world. People we know in the U.S., people from other countries, all walks of life, you know, different actors and politicians and people in sports and stuff like that.
Interviewer:	I'm looking at it right now and it's so interesting.

Speaker 1: It's very interesting. It goes back years and years and years and years. You know, what happened to so-and-so?

Interviewer: How did you hear about this though? I didn't know that this existed on Wikipedia. How did you find out?

Speaker 1: You know, I really don't know. I probably read somewhere else that someone had passed away and there wasn't a lot of information and I thought, "Oh, I'll go and look."

Interviewer: Huh. That's great. Awesome. And so, in general, when you're reading or using Wikipedia content, what are you looking for, for you to feel satisfied with the content you've gotten?

Speaker 1: I'm not looking for a lot of fluff. I'm looking, again, for interest facts, both interesting and mundane.

Interviewer: Okay.

Speaker 1: And I feel, because quite a few people touch Wikipedia. It's so collaborative that I think you get more of a broad spectrum of information.

Interviewer: And just so I'm clear. How would you describe fluff in content?

Speaker 1: Fluff in content to me is talking about ... I'm trying to put it in a diplomatic way. I think it's unnecessary ... most times you talk about people's personal lives as far as how many times they've been married, clothes that they wear, stuff like that.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Okay.

Speaker 1: That's just what I consider fluff.

Interviewer: Okay. Can you ever recall a time when you're reading or using Wikipedia content and you were just dissatisfied with what was presented to you?

Speaker 1: You mean dissatisfied as far as how I felt about it or the way it was written? Is that what you mean by dissatisfied?

Interviewer: It just wasn't enough information for you, or the content was- [crosstalk 00:20:11]

Speaker 1: No, I've always been able to find what I want. Sometimes it's too much information, especially in the scientific articles. It's not a complaint, but it's a lot of ... it's like pages of citations.

Interviewer: Is there a better way that information like that could be presented to you that you would prefer to see something that is a big lengthy.

Speaker 1: Mm-hmm (affirmative). They have sort of the headline-

Interviewer: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker 1: ... but maybe a synopsis might be nice.

Interviewer: Okay. Generally, when you get to items that are just really long, there's a lot of information about certain topics you're looking up, how will you go about finding the exact thing you want? 'Cause I imagine, from what you've described, you come in pretty strategically looking for something.

Speaker 1: Mm-hmm (affirmative). I can't remember if I scroll or if I can put in a keyword in. That I can't remember right now. But there must be some way that I was able to get to what I wanted without reading the whole article.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Just in general ... [crosstalk 00:21:21]

Speaker 1: Just in general. I think there might be like a "find" option. I don't know of it's on the phone, but maybe it is in the ... on my computer. Bear with me.

Interviewer: So ... no, no, it's okay.

Speaker 1: Like you know when you're searching for something you can ... if you have a word document or something, or depending on the website, you can just go and be able to ... you put in the keyword and it'll bring you to that section.

Interviewer: Yeah, you can search.

Speaker 1: Search. And I'm just looking to see if they have something like that name page, content, feature, current article. I probably would just scroll through that. Or try to look for a headline or something.

Interviewer: Okay. Do you typically ... right. So you would typically, on your phone, since there's not ... you would just scroll until you find ...

Speaker 1: Yeah. I'd probably just scroll.

Interviewer: Can you imagine at what point you would just give up if you couldn't find it? How much time would you commit to it before not conceding?

Speaker 1: I live in New Jersey. Probably 15 seconds. (laughs) And I live in western New Jersey, so it's very quiet out here, like 70 miles from Manhattan. It's very quiet.

Interviewer: Do you think that happens a lot when you're using the app? Where you get to a long article and you just can't find it, so ...

Speaker 1:   Yeah. I just bag it. Because usually I'm doing it for pleasure. If I'm doing it because I want to just get another perspective on something I might be researching for my job or something, then I would be more tenacious.

Interviewer: Got it. Okay. In your opinion, are there any advantages or disadvantages of reading Wikipedia content on your mobile device?

Speaker 1:   Well, of course a disadvantage is when you're looking at a laptop, everything is sort of laid out there in different sections all next to each other, so, its screen size is a disadvantage, but that's also a choice that I make.

Interviewer: What do you typically do if the screen is too small. I mean, if you get to content and it's just really hard to see, what would you typically do?

Speaker 1:   I usually try to ... I think I can pull the page to make it a little bit bigger.

Interviewer: Got it.

Speaker 1:   Double click or something like that?

Interviewer: Right.

Speaker 1:   I can't remember if that's what it is, but I'm pretty sure that I've done it from time to time.

Interviewer: Okay. So earlier you mentioned you speak a little bit of Danish.

Speaker 1:   Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Interviewer: Have you ever gone to the Danish Wikipedia site to look up information?

Speaker 1:   Yeah, I've gone there and, like I said, I know I can translate the page, like through ... I'm actually ... I'm on the computer now. And I can actually translate the page on my computer, but I can't on the phone. Okay, so.

Interviewer: Got it. Okay. How often do you go to the Danish Wikipedia?

Speaker 1:   Oh, like today is probably like the first time in months, months and months and months.

Interviewer: Okay.

Speaker 1:   'Cause I still have friends in Denmark and sometimes we'll be in touch and something will happen or they get a new job and I like to go on Wikipedia to look up the company they work for or something like that. Or some interesting news, like this terrible stuff going ... a woman was murdered, an entrepreneur, he built a ... named Peter Madson. I think he built a submarine and took this

journalist down and then he killed her. I don't know if you read about it. It's been in the American papers too. And so, I looked ... it's on the English Wikipedia site but I've also gone to the Danish one just to see if the story was a little different.

Interviewer: Was it?

Speaker 1:   Pretty much the same. I think it's just a translated version that's on the English site. It's under Current Events today-

Interviewer: Got it.

Speaker 1:   ... in the English site and also the Danish site too.

Interviewer: Got it, okay. So I only have about two more questions.

Speaker 1:   Sure.

Interviewer: In your opinion, what is Wikipedia's most critical feature for a mobile device?

Speaker 1:   Most critical feature?

Interviewer: Yeah, something that you couldn't live without on your mobile device about Wikipedia.

Speaker 1:   The app.

Interviewer: What about the app is kind of your favorite thing?

Speaker 1:   It's just convenient. It's like one-stop shopping. It's just there. I open it up. I don't have to log in. Everything is ... the main page is just in front of me and ... I mean, granted it's a truncated version of the page on the computer, but it's there and available.

Interviewer: Got it. Okay. And finally, is there anything else you'd like to share with me about an experience you've had about Wikipedia, positive or negative?

Speaker 1:   No, not really. No, I'm pretty satisfied. I like it. I enjoy using it.

Interviewer: Great. Okay. So before we wrap up, do you have any questions for me about anything we talked about?

Speaker 1:   What is this going to be used for? To improve the app? Or to see if people like it? Or are they gonna do away with the app? Or ...

Interviewer: So, I don't know what ... how much you know about the Wikipedia team, but so currently they're pretty much all remotes around the world.

Speaker 1:   Right.

Interviewer: So Wikipedia currently has a team for the Android app. They have a team for the IOS app

Speaker 1:   Right. Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Interviewer: We're trying to have this kind of like an anchor for the designers in their mental model because currently, there are different things on the IOS app versus the Android app.

Speaker 1:   Gotcha.

Interviewer: So, rather than having them just go down these rabbit holes of designing for what their team is doing, it would be a design for mobile as kind of the head

Speaker 1:   Gotcha. Okay.

Interviewer: Yeah, so, talking to people like you is just really great because I've never heard of the Wiki obituaries, but-

Speaker 1:   Right. (laughs)

Interviewer: ... [crosstalk 00:28:12] and it's just like you've formed this habit that is super interesting.

Speaker 1:   Right.

Interviewer: I'm going to present these kinds of things. All anonymous, it's all confidential.

Speaker 1:   Sure, of course.

Speaker 1:   Mm-hmm (affirmative). Right. Yeah, I love it. I think it's great and I don't know how things have changed, but when I was involved, sort of in the back end with this other person, there was a lot of rigor to their processes and hopefully it's still ... it's ongoing.

Interviewer: Mm-hmm (affirmative). It very much is.

Speaker 1:   Good. Nice to hear.

Interviewer: Well, thank you so much for participating in this session with me. Really, everything you've said is going to be really great feedback for our research.

Speaker 1:   Great.

Interviewer: And before we wrap up, I do want to double check that it's still okay that I recorded this session?

Speaker 1: Yes.

Interviewer: Great. So following this, I will send over a doc for you and you can pick out your incentive and again, it'll take about five to seven business days to get to you.

Speaker 1: Wonderful.

Interviewer: Then you'll have my email ...

Speaker 1: Yes, I do.

Interviewer: Any questions or concerns, please feel free to email me and I'm happy to answer.

Speaker 1: Super. Okay. Thanks Paige. It was a pleasure.

Interviewer: It was great talking to you. Thank you so much again.

Speaker 1: You too. Take care.

Interviewer: Have a great day.

Speaker 1: Bye.

Interviewer: Bye.