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By Jason Krüger, CC BY-SA 4.0, via Wikimedia Commons
Methodology:
• Online feedback survey via Qualtrics
• Questionnaire on Wikimedia Commons

Data collection:
• April 24th – May 6th 2016 (after closing of the Wikimedia Conference 2016)
• Conference participants (registration): 202
• Participants invited to the survey via email: 194
• Two reminder emails
• Completed questionnaires: n=128 → 63 % of conference participants
  (2015 survey: 67% of participants)
Q1: What is your age? (n=128)

Q1.1: Age

- 15 - 24 y.o.: 6%
- 25 - 34 y.o.: 10%
- 35 - 44 y.o.: 24%
- 45 - 54 y.o.: 52%
- 55 - 64 y.o.: 6%
- >64 y.o.: 6%

Q1.2: Gender

- Female: 31%
- Male: 68%
- Other/ n.s.: 1%

Q2: What is your gender? (n=128)

WMCON 2015:

Age

- 15-24 y.o.: 7%
- 25-34 y.o.: 10%
- 35-44 y.o.: 5%
- 45-54 y.o.: 21%
- 55-64 y.o.: 56%
- > 64 y.o.: 1%

Gender

- Female: 29%
- Male: 70%
- Other/ n.s.: 1%
Q2: Years of Involvement
- less than 1 year: 4%
- 1 - 3 years: 21%
- 4 - 6 years: 26%
- 7 - 9 years: 24%
- 10 - 12 years: 9%
- more than 12 years: 3%

Q3: Occupation
- Volunteer: 9%
- Staff: 33%
- Other: 58%

Q3: For how many years have you been involved in the Wikimedia movement? (n=128)

WMCON 2015:

Involvement
- less than 1 year: 5%
- 1 - 3 years: 26%
- 4 - 6 years: 24%
- 7 - 9 years: 22%
- 10 - 12 years: 22%
- more than 12 years: 1%

Occupation
- Volunteer: 5%
- Staff: 30%
- Other: 65%
Q4: Main Affiliation

- Wikimedia Chapter: 52%
- Thematic Organization: 16%
- User Group: 20%
- Wikimedia Foundation: 2%
- FDC: 1%
- AffCom: 4%
- Other: 5%

Q5: What is your main affiliation? (n=128)

Q7: Travel Costs

- Affiliation: 66%
- Wikimedia Foundation: 40%
- Other/ n.s.: 4%

Q7: Your travel and accommodation costs were covered by... ? (n=128)
Q6: Total Conference Attendances

- 1st time: 32%
- 2nd time: 11%
- 3rd time: 7%
- 4th time: 18%
- 5th time: 2%
- 6th time or more: 3%

Q5: Conference Attendance 2015

- Yes: 54%
- No: 46%

Q6: How many times (incl. this year) have you attended Wikimedia Conference (formerly known as “Chapter’s Meeting”)? (n=128)

Q5: Have you attended last year’s Wikimedia Conference in Berlin? (n=128)

WMCON 2015:

Total Conference Attendances

- 1st time: 32%
- 2nd time: 11%
- 3rd time: 7%
- 4th time: 18%
- 5th time: 2%
- 6th time or more: 3%
Background of participants:

- This year’s participants tended to be slightly younger and somewhat newer to the movement (29% being three or less years involved with the movement vs. 23% in 2015).

- As in 2014, there was a large proportion of first time participants (2016: 45%, 2015: 32%, 2014: 49%). On the other hand, at least 54% of the 2016 participants have also attended the 2015 conference.

- The proportion of female participants marginally increased (2016: 31% vs. 2015: 29%).

- Like in 2015, due to the eligibility criteria and the rising number of User Groups, there also was a further increase in representatives of User Groups at the conference (2016: 20%, 2015: 12%).
Looking Back

By Jason Krüger, CC BY-SA 4.0, via Wikimedia Commons
Q8.1: If you reflect on last year’s Wikimedia Conference and your activities in the time between WMCON15 and WMCON16: To what extent do you agree or disagree to the following statement? (n=59)
[Filter: This question was only displayed if participants attended last year’s conference (Q5)]

The 2015 conference led to tangible outcomes for me and my work in the Wikimedia movement.

86% of respondents who attended both WMCON15 and WMCON16 experienced tangible outcomes of the 2015 conference for their Wikimedia work.
Q8.2 Did you pursue any concrete initiatives that you joined or started in the aftermath of last year’s conference?  
(Filter: This question was only displayed if participants attended last year’s conference, too (Q5, n=59))

- Yes: 66%  
- No: 34%

Q8.3 Which initiative(s) did you pursue? (Examples)  
(Filter: Only displayed if Q8.2 “Yes”)

- Movement policies/ movement relations  
- Working on specific projects/ new ideas  
- Peer-to-peer support  
- Regional cooperations  
- Internal capacity building  
- Learning initiatives
Looking back at the 2015 conference:

- 86% of the respondents who attended both WMCON15 and WMCON16 experienced tangible outcomes of the 2015 conference for their Wikimedia work (32% “strongly agree”, 54% “agree”).

- 66% of these respondents stated also having pursued concrete initiatives they had joined or started in the aftermath of the 2015 conference. Most of the initiatives mentioned focused on engaging in movement policies/movement relations, working on specific projects and new ideas, peer-to-peer support with other affiliates and regional cooperations.
Content & Program

By Jason Krüger, CC BY-SA 4.0, via Wikimedia Commons
### Q9: To what extent do you agree or disagree to the following statements? The conference …

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree (4)</th>
<th>Agree (3)</th>
<th>Disagree (2)</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (1)</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2015*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>… gave me the <strong>opportunity to exchange ideas</strong> with others on <strong>movement issues</strong>.</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… provided <strong>useful information</strong> for me and my organization.</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… made clear the <strong>significance of sharing and collaboration</strong> in the Wikimedia movement.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… was suitable for my <strong>background and experience</strong>.</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… helped me to gain <strong>applicable knowledge / improved my capacities</strong>.</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… contributed to reaching a <strong>shared understanding</strong> of the future of our movement.</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… improved my <strong>understanding of impact</strong> in the context of the Wikimedia movement.</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>… led to clearly defined <strong>next steps</strong> and documented <strong>outcomes</strong>.</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Some questions were changed from the 2015 to the 2016 survey. Significant differences in mean values are highlighted (p=0.05)*
Q12: How satisfied were you with the following aspects of the conference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Less Satisfied</th>
<th>Not satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall flow and choreography of the conference</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference facilitation by the facilitators during the conference</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition of the audience (organizations, groups and stakeholders that were invited)</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of conference participants</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication regarding the program design process before the conference</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall scope and selection of the conference topics</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of contributions</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Session formats</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call to action, definition of next steps</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some questions were changed from the 2015 to the 2016 survey. Significant differences in mean values are highlighted (p=0.05)
Remarks on content in general have been very diverse. Positive comments dominate. Several critical comments referred to the session formats/program schedule, the content of the tracks and more differentiation between new and more experienced participants.
The majority of the respondents judged the conference as an opportunity to exchange ideas with others (100% ‘agree’ or ‘strongly agree’), as providing useful information to them and their organization (97%), as making clear the significance of sharing and collaboration (95%) and as being suitable for their background and experience (96%).

Although other items like reaching a shared understanding of the future of our movement and clearly defined next steps and documented outcomes scored a bit lower, there are significant improvements in these aspects if compared to the 2015 survey results.

Overall, the satisfaction with different program facets was slightly higher than in 2015. For example, the overall flow of the conference (97%, ‘very satisfied’ or ‘satisfied’), the conference facilitation (97%) and the composition of the audience (95%) received very good ratings.

If compared to 2015, the overall scope and selection of topics was rated significantly higher than in last year’s survey (Mean value: 3.30 vs. 3.05 in 2015).

Although slightly improved compared to 2015 (2016: 71%; 2015: 62%), a clear call to action/ definition of next steps is still missing for roughly a third of the respondents.

Further remarks on program and content in general have been very diverse, though predominately positive. Some critical comments referred to the session formats/ program schedule, the content of the tracks and insufficient differentiation between new and more experienced participants.
Q14: How many new working contacts (in terms of people with whom you expect to have online or offline collaboration on movement issues or activities in the future) did you make at the conference? (n=127)

Q15: Meeting all those Wikimedia people at the conference...

- ... helped me to **gain knowledge** from other Wikimedians.
  - Strongly agree (4): 64%
  - Agree (3): 35%
  - Disagree (2): 10%
  - Strongly Disagree (1): 10%
  - Ω: 3.48
  - Ω 2015: 3.45

- ... helped me **share my knowledge** with other Wikimedians.
  - Strongly agree (4): 61%
  - Agree (3): 38%
  - Disagree (2): 10%
  - Strongly Disagree (1): 10%
  - Ω: 3.62
  - Ω 2015: 3.60

- ... helped me **make new friends**.
  - Strongly agree (4): 59%
  - Agree (3): 38%
  - Disagree (2): 10%
  - Strongly Disagree (1): 10%
  - Ω: 3.59
  - Ω 2015: 3.56

- ... helped me get a **better understanding of each other’s views**.
  - Strongly agree (4): 52%
  - Agree (3): 42%
  - Disagree (2): 10%
  - Strongly Disagree (1): 6%
  - Ω: 3.48
  - Ω 2015: 3.45

- ... helped me **join or start an initiative**.
  - Strongly agree (4): 40%
  - Agree (3): 45%
  - Disagree (2): 10%
  - Strongly Disagree (1): 15%
  - Ω: 3.18
  - Ω 2015: 3.25

- ... helped me **reduce tensions and misunderstandings** with other participants.
  - Strongly agree (4): 42%
  - Agree (3): 39%
  - Disagree (2): 17%
  - Strongly Disagree (1): 10%
  - Ω: 3.28
  - Ω 2015: 3.21
Q15: Meeting all those Wikimedia people at the conference...

Q16 [if Q15 item “helped me join or start an initiative” was rated “strongly agree/ agree”, multiple answers]:
Can you provide a short example of an initiative you joined or started at the conference?

Most of the new initiatives inspired at the conference focus on specific new projects, regional cooperation, Wiki loves competitions and mutual support.
Networking:

• Getting in contact with other Wikimedians and affiliates is one major benefit of the Wikimedia conference. In terms of networking, 27% of the respondents reported making up to ten new working contacts and 36% reported 11-20 new working contacts. 36% of the participants made even more than twenty new working contacts.

• Meeting all the Wikimedia people at the conference mainly helped to gain knowledge (99%, ‘strongly agree’ or ‘agree’), share knowledge (99%), make new friends (97%) and to achieve a better understanding of each others views (94%). At least 85% felt supported to join or start an initiative.

• Overall, the 2016 ratings in terms of networking showed now significant differences to the 2015 conference survey results.
Organizational Aspects
Wikimedia Conference 2016
Organizational Aspects

Q17: How would you rate the following organizational aspects of the conference?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>2015*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support from WMCON logistics team during the conference</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>3,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>3,84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atmosphere at the conference</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>3,78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>3,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from WMCON logistics team before the conference</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3,67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3,66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from logistics team with visa formalities (if applicable, n=53)</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3,66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3,69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from WMF travel coordinator (if applicable, n=88)</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3,61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>3,64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3,69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference venue</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>3,56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3,73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support from WMF travel coordinator</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>3,47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(if applicable, n=88)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conference catering</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>3,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3,43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social events at WMDE premises (“Dinner snack“)</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3,35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>3,28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saturday’s party at HomeBase Lounge</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3,72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>3,78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Some questions were changed from the 2015 to the 2016 survey.
Predominately positive comments. Some critical remarks regarding Wi-fi and conference food. Rather rarely: critical comments about the concept of the Saturday party, the accommodation and the general composition of the audience.
Organizational aspects:

• As in 2015, the organizational aspects of the 2016 conference received very good ratings: especially the support by the WMCON logistics team during (100% ‘excellent’ or ‘good’) and before the conference (99%) or their help with visa formalities (95%) were highlighted. Also perceived very positively: the overall atmosphere at the conference (99% ‘excellent’ or ‘good’).

• Overall, no major (or significant) differences occurred between the 2015 and the 2016 evaluation of the organizational aspects, as some of the values seem to have reached their ceiling levels.

• In the open comments, positive remarks clearly dominated. Some critical remarks referred to the Wi-fi coverage and the conference food. Rather rarely: critical comments about the concept of the Saturday party, the accommodation and the general composition of the audience.
Q10: From your perspective: What were the three main benefits of attending the conference? [open question, multiple answers, n=121]

Compared to answers of affiliate organizations before the conference [taken from organizational profile questionnaires filled out by orgs before the conference, n=79]

**Main Benefits**

- Networking, new contacts: 64%
- Learning: 39%
- Understanding the movement: 27%
- Sharing experiences: 22%
- Meeting specific people: 19%
- Inspiration/motivation: 17%
- New partnerships: 15%
- Working on specific issues: 12%
- Improve own organization: 8%
- Increase awareness of own group/org: 5%
- (Re-)build trust: 3%

**Benefits expected (from org profiles)**

- Networking, new contacts: 62%
- Learning: 77%
- Understanding the movement: 20%
- Sharing experiences: 44%
- Meeting specific people: 15%
- Inspiration/motivation: 16%
- New partnerships: 16%
- Working on specific issues: 15%
- Improve own organization: 10%
- Increase awareness of own group/org: 14%
- (Re-)build trust: 3%

n=79
Q11 My expectations towards the conference were... (n=128)
Q17: What is your overall rating of the conference? (n=128)

**Q9: Expectations**
- 8% were exceeded
- 44% were entirely met
- 48% were not entirely met
- 8% were not met

**Q19: Overall Rating**
- 1% Excellent
- 32% Good
- 67% Poor
- 0% Very poor

**Expectations (WMCON15)**
- 25% were exceeded
- 58% were entirely met
- 17% were not entirely met
- 2% were not met

**Overall Rating (WMCON15)**
- 1% Excellent
- 40% Good
- 57% Poor
- 2% Very poor
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Outlook – Wishes for the Wikimedia Conference

"More Lighting Talks. I think we should have more of this, more often, all the time :]

"It would be nice to see that WMF board members, if they are invited, also share their experience and learn from the others."

"Better Wi-Fi at the conference venue!"

"Use all the existing know-how: Keep it yearly, in Berlin and with a similar size."

"More people from affiliates, more people from WMF, more sharing of knowledge: best practices and how-to-do-things."

"Additional small rooms for small, useful meetings."

"Two participants per User Group, perhaps by reducing the number of participants per Chapter."
Overall Evaluation:

- Learning from the organizational profile the affiliates filled out prior to the conference: participating organizations mainly expected connecting & networking, sharing of experiences and learning as main conference benefits. Networking and learning were also stated as main benefits after the conference (Networking, new contacts: 64% / learning: 39%).

- On the one hand, sharing of experiences was less prominent at the conference than expected before (prior: 44% / post: 22%). On the other hand, understanding the movement a bit better was mentioned more frequently as before (prior: 20% / post: 27% of mentions).

- Expectations were more frequently exceeded as in 2015: 44% of the respondents stated that their expectations regarding the conference were even exceeded (2015: 24%). 48% perceived their expectations as entirely met (2015: 58%). Only 8% stated that their expectations were not entirely met (2015: 17%).

- Finally, the conference received an even better overall rating as in 2015 and 2014: 67% ‘excellent’, 32% ‘good’ (2015: 57% ‘excellent’ and 40% ‘good’).
See you all next year!
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