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ABOUT THE STUDY

The Wikimedia Foundation was interested in learning the experience of readers on desktop Wikipedia. The study focused on various aspects of desktop reading including welcomingness of Wikipedia, credibility of Wikipedia and readers trust, and the readability.

We conducted an in-person study with 24 participants in our lab in Pune, covering 12 new and 12 casual readers as defined by Wikipedia.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. WHAT DID READERS LIKE ABOUT WIKIPEDIA?
2. WHAT WERE READERS’ CHALLENGES WITH WIKIPEDIA?
3. WHAT DO READERS WISH FOR?
WHAT DID READERS LIKE ABOUT WIKIPEDIA?

1. INFORMATION AT ONE PLACE
   The readers liked that Wikipedia contained in-depth information about every topic and they did not have to visit any other websites for information.

2. IMAGES
   The readers liked that the article contained images as they could relate it with their topic. They also felt that images elevated the look of the site.

3. TABLE OF CONTENTS
   The readers liked that they could directly read about their topic from the table of contents.

4. LANGUAGES
   The readers liked that they had an option of changing the language and read in their regional languages.

5. NO ADVERTISEMENTS
   The readers liked that the page contained no advertisements.
**WHAT WERE READERS’ CHALLENGES WITH WIKIPEDIA?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TOO MUCH INFORMATION</th>
<th>MAIN MENU</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>The readers found the content of the page overwhelming and did not feel like reading the article.</td>
<td>The readers were unable to understand the purpose of the Menu on the left hand side of the site. They felt that it was not relevant for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>ARTICLE TOOLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The readers could not understand the terminology and concept of most of the article tools.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>Feature</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>More Images &amp; Videos</td>
<td>The readers wanted to see more images in the article. Some of them also wanted to see videos related to their topic embedded in the article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>More Segregated Information</td>
<td>The readers wanted to easily search for or find the information that is relevant in terms of what they want to read. They wished the information to be more segregated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Ease of Navigation</td>
<td>The readers wanted to be able to go back to the Table of Contents or other places within the site without scrolling too much.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Easy to Access Table of Contents</td>
<td>Some readers mentioned that they would like to see the contents table in the form of tabs on the top. Some of them wanted to see it on the left side of the page instead of the main menu.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>More Colors</td>
<td>The readers wanted to see more colors and background color on the page.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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METHODOLOGY & PARTICIPANTS

Study Goals | Methodology | Participant Profiles
STUDY GOALS

Understanding and establishing a baseline of how new and casual Wikipedia readers feel towards Wikipedia in regards to:

1. WELCOMENESS
   To understand the initial feelings of readers towards the site.

2. CREDIBILITY AND TRUST
   To understand the impressions of trust towards the site, and how the readers compare it with other sites.

3. READABILITY
   To evaluate the understanding of terminology and concept of the main menu/sidebar (especially the article tools), and the user tools.
Number of Participants: We interviewed 24 participants in total.

Duration: Each session lasted 45-60 minutes.

Method:
- We conducted an in-depth, in-person study in our lab in Pune. We created a script based on predefined goals to test welcomeness, credibility, and readability of Wikipedia. During the session, participants were interviewed about their online reading, laptop usage, feelings towards the Wikipedia site, challenges and wishlist.
- The devices that we tested included desktop browsers.
Who were the participants of the Wikipedia Desktop study?

**Age & Gender**
All participants were within the age group of 20 to 40 years and included both genders.

**Professions**
Participants were diverse backgrounds such as students, engineers, housewives, supervisors, etc.

**Devices**
Participants were using smart phones – Android and iOS. Other devices they used were tablets, laptops, and some used desktops at work.

**Online Reading**
Participants were reading news, technical articles, blogs, travel-related information and research papers. They were reading on sites like Quora, Wikipedia, DailyHunt, Udemy, News18, Byjus etc.
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SECTION 1: READERS – NEW & CASUAL

1. WHO IS A WIKIPEDIA DESKTOP READER?
WHO IS A WIKIPEDIA DESKTOP READER?

A Wikipedia Desktop reader reads online in English and is technologically savvy. They are from diverse backgrounds such as student, professionals, and homemakers.

We have divided them into two groups – New Readers and Casual Readers.
SECTION 1: READERS – NEW & CASUAL

WHO IS A WIKIPEDIA DESKTOP READER?

CASUAL READERS

What Languages Do They Read Online?

A a
English

What Is Their Device Usage?

Social Media, Reading, Watching Videos
Use both Laptop and Phone frequently

Where Do They Seek Information?

Through Social Media, Through advertisements, Google Search

Where Did They Learn About Wikipedia?

In School or College through their friends or teachers

STUDENT

PROFESSIONALS

e.g.: medical, engineer, business
CASUAL READERS

What Are They Using Wikipedia For?

- General Knowledge
- Research Aid
- Search For Specific Information
- Use The Information For Project Work

What Sites Do They Use?

- Wikipedia.org, Quora.com, Wattpad.com
- YouTube.com, Netflix.in
- Mostly global websites such as Coursera.org, Udemy.com, Scholar.Google.co.in, Pubmed.gov, StuffYouLook.blogspot.com, Behance.net, StackOverflow.com
- DailyHunt.in, theBetterIndia.com, YourStory.com
- Amazon.in, Ajio.com, Koovs.com, Myntra.com
- TravelTriangle.com, Holidify.com, LonelyPlanet.com

How Did They Find These Sites?

Google Search, Friends or Family, Reference Links in Articles
NEW READERS

What Languages Do They Read Online?

- English
- Regional languages

What Is Their Device Usage?

- Use Phone frequently and Laptop rarely

Where Do They Seek Information?

- Through Social Media, Through advertisements, Google Search

Where Did They Learn About Wikipedia?

- Are aware of Wikipedia but mostly have not used it

STUDENT

PROFESSIONALS
e.g.: supervisor, receptionist

HOMEMAKER
How Did They Find These Sites?

- Google Search
- Online Advertisements
- Friends or Family

What Are They Using Wikipedia For?

- Sometimes, they have used the information for project work of their kids

What Sites Do They Use?

- Mostly watching videos than reading
  - YouTube.com
- Mostly local websites such as Guru99.com, Byjus.com
- TimesofIndia.in, IndiaTimes.com, MoneyControl.com
- Amazon.in, BigBasket.com, Grofers.com
**Differences Between Casual & New Readers**

- The new readers are watching more videos than reading, as compared to the casual readers who are doing both.

- The new readers use more local websites as compared to the casual readers who are using more global websites.
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SECTION 2: WELCOMENESS

1. WHAT DO READERS SEE & FEEL UPON LANDING?
2. WHAT ARE THE FACTORS AFFECTING WELCOMENESS?
3. WHAT SITES DO READERS COMPARE WIKIPEDIA WITH?
1. WHAT DO READERS SEE & FEEL UPON LANDING?

There are differences in how the new readers and the casual readers see the Wikipedia site on landing. However, all of the readers understood that the purpose of Wikipedia is to provide information on vast number of topics.
WHAT DO THEY SEE ON THE SITE?

CASUAL READERS

SECTION 2: WELCOMENESS
WHAT DO THEY **SEE** ON THE SITE?

**CASUAL READERS**

---

1. **Images**

   They first see the images and information on the left hand side of the page.

2. **First paragraph**

   Some of the readers read the first paragraph and then go to the Table of Contents.

3. **Table of Contents**

   Some of them directly go to the Table of Contents and click on the topic that they are interested to read.

4. **Main Menu**

   Almost all of the readers do not see the Menu on the left hand side.
HOW DO THEY FEEL ABOUT WIKIPEDIA?

CASUAL READERS

The casual readers related to Wikipedia as follows:

• “The look & feel of Wikipedia has not changed over time”
  The casual readers were used to reading the Wikipedia site since school or college days and felt that the look of Wikipedia has been the same since then.

• “Wikipedia provides information for all types of people”
  They felt that the main purpose of Wikipedia was to make information accessible for everyone and would refer to Wikipedia for information.

• “Maybe Wikipedia could become a little more trendy”
  Some of the casual readers also mentioned that Wikipedia could evolve as per the modern websites they visit - in terms of more visual elements like photos or videos, and less or segregated content.
WHAT DO THEY SEE ON THE SITE?

NEW READERS
WHAT DO THEY SEE ON THE SITE?

NEW READERS

1. Entire page
   Most of the readers see the whole page upon landing.

2. Images
   Most of them see the images and information on the right hand side of the page.

3. First paragraph
   Some of them read the first paragraph or go the Table of Contents and view the topics that are listed.
HOW DO THEY FEEL ABOUT WIKIPEDIA?

NEW READERS

The new readers related to Wikipedia as follows:

• “Wikipedia has not been used other than for project work”

Some of the new readers had either heard about Wikipedia or had previously referred to it for some information/project work.

• “Other websites provide information in pieces unlike Wikipedia”

They felt that Wikipedia included detailed information about each topic at one place and liked that would not have to go to any other website for finding content.
### 2. WHAT ARE THE FACTORS AFFECTING WELCOMENESS?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WORKED</th>
<th>STRUGGLED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>IN-DEPTH INFORMATION</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>READABILITY</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>INFOBOX</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO ADVERTISEMENTS</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>CONTENT WITH IMAGES/VIDEOS</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>UI ELEMENTS (Colors, Fonts)</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MAIN MENU</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WORKED

1. IN-DEPTH INFORMATION

Most of the readers liked that Wikipedia shows them enough content - it keeps them engaged.

- In Depth Information
  Most of the readers liked that each article in Wikipedia gives in-depth and new information at one place.

- References
  Some of them liked that the site contained references which they could refer for more information.

- Hyperlinks
  Some of them liked that the site had hyperlinks which will contain in-depth information about other topics as well.
2. READABILITY: CATEGORIZATION OF INFORMATION

Some of the readers liked that the article was divided into different categories. (for example, ‘History’, ‘Culture’, etc.)
2. READABILITY: AMOUNT OF INFORMATION

Most of the readers felt that the amount of information on the site is a lot.

- Difficult To Search Content
- Not All Topics Are Relevant
- Too Much Information To Read

Most of the readers felt that it is difficult to find the relevant topic from the article.

Readers wanted to see only specific content in which they were interested.

Some readers did not feel like reading as there was too much information on the page.
WORKED

3. INFOBOX

Most of the readers who explored the Infobox liked that they could get quick information about the topic.

Reference Image

They liked that they could immediately see a reference image of their topic in the right side column.

Highlighted Concise Information

They also liked that they could read basic information in bullet points.
4. NO ADVERTISEMENTS

- Most of the readers liked that there were no advertisements on the Wikipedia website.

- A few of them compared the website positively to education websites where they have to pay subscription for an advertisement-free experience.

"Wikipedia does not remind me of any other website. This is ad-free. Other websites showing me a periodic table will show me ads. So the Wikipedia page is good to see. I use Study Shaala which shows ads and says ‘pay us to subscribe to us’.

- Casual Reader

User Three"
WORKED

5. CONTENT WITH IMAGES/VIDEOS

Most of the readers liked that the page contained images.

Quick Understanding

The images helped in understanding the topic better. Readers felt that adding related videos to the site will give them a quick understanding of the topic.
6. UI ELEMENTS

Certain elements influenced the Welcomeness for the readers – these received a mixed positive and negative response. The elements were as follows:

1. Colors

2. Fonts
6. UI ELEMENTS
COLORS

WHAT ARE THE FACTORS AFFECTING WELCOMENESS?

WORKED

Some of the readers liked that the page looked minimalistic with black and white colors.

STRUGGLED

Some of the readers found the article page boring due to lack of colors.
6. UI ELEMENTS

FONTS

WORKED

• Most of the readers felt neutral about the current font size.

• They felt that the fonts are standard reading fonts and were comfortable to read.

STRUGGLED

• Few of the readers found the fonts boring and wanted to see better fonts like the fonts they are used to seeing on other websites.

(For example, a few blogging sites like ‘YourStory’.)
The look is not that eye-catchy. The colors are too dull. They should put some lively colors that would make people want to read. The topics written in the content like the Ancestors section can be more catchy.

- CASUAL READER
  User Five
Almost all of the readers were unable to understand the purpose of the main menu section and did not find it to be relevant.
3. WHAT DO READERS COMPARE WIKIPEDIA WITH?

They compared Wikipedia with a library, book, online old books or to an encyclopedia. Almost all of the readers felt that Wikipedia contains in-depth information about everything and they would not get this kind of information on any other website.
Almost all of the readers felt that Wikipedia contains in depth information about everything and they would not get this kind of information on any other website.
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SECTION 3: CREDIBILITY & TRUST

1. DO THE READERS TRUST WIKIPEDIA? WHY OR WHY NOT?
2. WHO DO READERS BELIEVE CREATES CONTENT ON WIKIPEDIA?
1. DO THE READERS TRUST WIKIPEDIA?

The trust in Wikipedia content varies. – some people vouch for the content, others do not trust it completely.

**WHY DO THEY TRUST**

1. Reliable Source Of Information
2. Verified By Wikipedia Team
3. Belief In Experts

**WHY DO THEY LACK TRUST**

1. Editable By Anyone
2. Colleges Do Not Approve The Content
3. Authors Are Unknown
I can trust it 80% I think. Aspects like personal life I will least trust from Wikipedia. But the things that are like TV award and all is fine. In terms of an article on place, I might trust.

- Casual Reader
  User Nine
PERCEPTION:
WHY DO READERS TRUST WIKIPEDIA?

1. Reliable Source Of Information

Most of the readers felt that that content could be trusted as, in their experience, the information corroborated to what they had read/heard elsewhere, or they trusted due to familiarity.

- Consistency In Information
  The readers found the content on Wikipedia consistent with other sources of information such as books, online sites etc.

- Prior Knowledge
  The readers had prior information about the topic and found the content to be correct on Wikipedia.

- Using Wikipedia Since Long Time
  Some readers felt that they have been referring to Wikipedia for information, creating presentations etc. since they were young and thus consider it as reliable.
PERCEPTION:
WHY DO READERS TRUST WIKIPEDIA?

2. Verified by Wikipedia team
A few readers believed that the Wikipedia team verifies the content written by the people and trust that they keep the content reliable.

“
It has a 99.99% chance that it is accurate. the wiki members might be verifying and also anyone else who feels like. they need to be verified since they are showing it to the whole world.

- Casual Reader
User Twenty Three
PERCEPTION:
WHY DO READERS TRUST WIKIPEDIA?

3. Belief in Experts

A few readers believed that the content on Wikipedia is created by research scholars who have in depth knowledge on the topic.

"Research Scholars and subject experts might have compiled it. It could be wiki team. This is not the work of a normal person, it is very difficult. It is the work of experts only.

- New Reader
User Fifteen"
PERCEPTION:
WHY DO READERS LACK TRUST IN WIKIPEDIA?

Despite using Wikipedia for various reasons, users still do not trust Wikipedia completely. The lack of trust in Wikipedia exists because of various factors listed below:

- **Editable By Anyone**
  The readers believed that the edit option on the page gives anyone the ability to edit the content without being verified by anyone.

- **Colleges Do Not Approve The Content**
  The users mentioned that the content given on Wikipedia is not accepted by the authorities in college for assignments, which in turn reduces their trust.

- **Authors Are Unknown**
  The readers were not aware of who created the content and who the authors are. There were many assumptions made by the readers including that some agency has been hired to write the content.
2. WHO DO READERS BELIEVE CREATES CONTENT ON WIKIPEDIA?

Most of the readers are not aware of who is creating the content on Wikipedia or how it is created. These readers believe that content is created by the following possibilities:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Wikipedia Employees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Wikipedia Agencies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Freelance Content Writers at Wikipedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Research Scholars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Account holders of Wikipedia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Data from various other sites</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
WHO DO READERS BELIEVE CREATES CONTENT ON WIKIPEDIA?

Wikipedia Employees

Most readers believed that the content on Wikipedia was created by the employees of Wikipedia.

Wikipedia Agencies

Some readers believed that Wikipedia had hired agencies across the world to write the content and they wrote content on different topics.

Freelance Writers

Few readers thought that Wikipedia hires freelance content writers to create the information.
WHO DO READERS BELIEVE CREATES CONTENT ON WIKIPEDIA?

Research Scholars

Some readers felt that content was created by professors, PhD Students, professionals with 10 years of experience or who were researching different topics.

Account holders of Wikipedia

Few readers felt that the content was created by people who had created their account on Wikipedia.

Data from various other sites

Few also believed that Wikipedia collects information from different sites such as Google.
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SECTION 4: READABILITY

1. HOW WAS THE READABILITY OF WIKIPEDIA?
1. HOW WAS THE READABILITY OF WIKIPEDIA?

The casual and new readers both had mixed reactions about the readability of the site. These reactions depended on whether or not they were able to understand the components:

1. Table of Contents
2. Hyperlinks
3. Article Tools
4. User Tools
5. Language Switching
6. Search
All participants understood the concept of Table of Contents and liked the feature.
TABLE OF CONTENTS: WORKED

CASUAL READERS

Liked The Concept of Links

• The readers liked that they could go to a particular section in the article by clicking on the links.

Liked The Location Of Table Of Contents

• Most of the readers liked that the location of the Table of Contents was after the first few paragraphs because that placement gives them some context about the topic.

• They felt neutral about the size of the Table of Contents.

NEW READERS

Liked The Concept of Links

• The readers liked that they could go to a particular section in the article by clicking on the links.

Includes All Topics

• Most of the readers liked that the Table of Contents includes all the topics covered in the article.
New Readers

Links

• Few of the new readers were unable to understand that there were links within the Table of Contents or the purpose of those links.
Hyperlinks includes Links, Hover Box and Superscripts.

Some of the readers understood the concept of Links while some were not able to understand that these are hyperlinks at first.
HYPERLINKS - WORKED

CASUAL READERS

Understood The Concept

Almost all casual readers understood the concept of Links and liked the feature.

In-Depth Information On Other Topics

They liked that from the Links they could get information about any topic by clicking on the link rather than searching for it again.

Information From Hover Box

Most of the readers liked that they could get brief information related to the topic from the Hover Box and could click on the link to get in-depth details.

HYPERLINKS - WORKED

NEW READERS

Detailed Information On Different Topics

Some readers who discovered the concept liked the feature. They liked that they can get detailed information about different topics and found it useful.

SECTION 4: READABILITY

HOW WAS THE READABILITY OF WIKIPEDIA?
I just hovered my mouse and realized the hover box. I liked it. This is a new feature introduced by Wikipedia some time back, I had discovered this sometime last year.

- Casual Reader
  User Twenty Three
SECTION 4: READABILITY
HOW WAS THE READABILITY OF WIKIPEDIA?

HYPERLINKS - STRUGGLED

CASUAL READERS

Number Of Links

Some of the readers found the Links on the page distracting and wanted to see less number of links or hover boxes.

NEW READERS

Unable To Understand The Concept of Hyperlinks

Most of the readers did not understand the concept of Links at first glance. They felt that words were highlighted in blue as they were important.
I think there are too many links mentioned over here. This much is not required actually. I think there is no need to link ‘match referee’ or ‘umpire’. While reading itself the person will get to know about this word. And it is quite disturbing also.

- Casual Reader
  User Nine

The blue words have their own definitions. They are highlighted so you can easily understand (remember) them.

- New Reader
  User Fourteen
The readers were confused about whether these tools are related to the topic they searched for, or related to the Wikipedia site.
Some of the readers partially understood the concept of Upload Files. They felt that they could upload both text and image, and not only image.
ARTICLE TOOLS > **TOOLS** - STRUGGLED

CASUAL READERS

Unable To Understand The Terminology

- Almost all readers were unable to understand the terminology of Tools.

- Some of them felt that Tools referred to settings that would make the page more personalized or it contained Tools that can be used for locating things within the article.

Unable To Understand The Concept

Almost all readers explored the Tools section but were unable to understand the concept.
NEW READERS

Unable To Understand The Terminology

- Almost all readers were unable to understand the terminology of Tools.

- A few of them felt that Tools referred to settings that would make the page more personalized.

- They felt that it would include settings to copy the article, make the page more colorful so that they can use it for their work or projects.

Unable To Understand The Concept

Almost all readers explored the Tools section but were unable to understand the concept.

- **What Links Here** - Most of the readers did not understand the concept and thought it contained the links from the article they are reading.

- **Related Changes** - Few readers felt that it includes the updates about the Wikipedia website.
Aware of Editing Articles

- Most of the readers mentioned that they were aware that articles could be edited in Wikipedia since they had heard it from somewhere such as from friends.
CASUAL READERS

Editing Without An Account

• Most of the readers who explored this feature were confused that they were able to edit without creating an account.

Navigated Through Upload File

• Some readers were not aware that articles could be edited by anyone but since they had seen the option to upload a file they felt that maybe they can also edit on Wikipedia.

NEW READERS

Did Not Understand The Concept

• Most of the new readers did not understand the concept of Edit.

• Few of them thought that Edit will let them create a version of the article for their personal use. (for example: edit the font size, add or reduce the content, copy information and save, etc.)

Navigated Through Upload File

• Few of them thought they could edit the article as they had seen the Upload File feature and thought it meant they could add a photo or video and hence “edit” the article.
Understood The Concept

• Very few readers understood that it would include the revisions done by people who have edited the article.
Unable To Understand The Concept

• Most of the readers were unable to understand the concept. They felt that it would include the history of pages that they have visited on Wikipedia after they create an account.

• Some of them felt that it would show them how many times the article has been edited.

Unable To Understand The Concept

• Most of the readers were unable to understand the concept. They felt that it would include the history of pages that they have visited on Wikipedia. They compared it to Google history.

• A very few readers felt that included the history about the topic that they were reading.
Understood The Concept

- Some of the readers who explored Print/export understood the concept and liked that they could either print the article or download it as a PDF.
Unaware About The Feature

• Some of the readers who explored the Print/export feature were not aware that they could print or download the article directly from here. A few readers used to copy the article first and then paste it in a Word document.

Unable To Understand The Concept

• A few readers felt that using this feature they could create a customized book that would include only information that they wanted to read.
All participants understood Create an account and some readers understood that in order to edit the article, they will have to create their accounts first.

Most readers did not understand the concept of Contributions. They felt they could give their feedback or could see a list of people who contributed to the article.
SECTION 4: READABILITY
HOW WAS THE READABILITY OF WIKIPEDIA?

USER TOOLS > CREATE AN ACCOUNT - WORKED

CASUAL READERS

Understood The Concept

- Almost all readers understood the concept of Create an account.
- A few of them understood that they would have to create an account so that they could edit the article.

NEW READERS

Understood The Concept

- Most of the readers understood the concept of Create an account.
- They felt that after creating an account they would get latest updates about Wikipedia on their email ID and could also see their history on the page.
SECTION 4: READABILITY
HOW WAS THE READABILITY OF WIKIPEDIA?

USER TOOLS > CONTRIBUTIONS - STRUGGLED

CASUAL READERS

Unable To Understand The Concept

• Some of them felt that they could give their feedback related to the article after they created an account.

• Some of them felt that they could see the list of people who have contributed towards the article.

NEW READERS

Unable To Understand The Concept

• Most of the readers could not understand the concept. Some of them felt that it referred to the contributions of Wikipedia team in providing information.

• Some of them that it would contain a list that would include the names of people who contributed towards creating the article.
Unable To Understand The Concept

Almost all readers could not understand the concept and felt that it is either a chat bot or a way for them to contact the Wikipedia team incase of any issue. They related “Talk” to the support team at Wikipedia.
5 LANGUAGE SWITCHING

Most of the readers could understand the terminology and concept of Languages.

They were unaware that they had an option of changing the Language within the article.
SECTION 4: READABILITY
HOW WAS THE READABILITY OF WIKIPEDIA?

LANGUAGE SWITCHING - WORKED

CASUAL & NEW READERS

Understood The Terminology

• Once they discovered the feature, almost all of the readers understood that Languages meant that they could read the article in various languages mentioned there.
SECTION 4: READABILITY
HOW WAS THE READABILITY OF WIKIPEDIA?

LANGUAGE SWITCHING - STRUGGLED

CASUAL READERS

Unaware About The Location

Most of the readers who explored Languages were unaware about this feature and had not seen it before.

NEW READERS

Unaware About The Location

• Most of the readers who explored Languages were unaware about this feature and had not seen it before.

Unable To Understand The Concept

• Some readers felt that the entire page would be translated in the language that they had selected.

• They were confused as the entire page was not translated and had different photos than the ones in the original article page.
Most of the participants understood the concept and liked the feature.
SECTION 4: READABILITY
HOW WAS THE READABILITY OF WIKIPEDIA?

SEARCH - WORKED

CASUAL READERS

Understood The Concept
Almost all of the readers understood and liked the feature.

They felt that they could search and read about more topics rather than typing it on Google. However, some of them said they would still like to search on Google since they get varied results.

NEW READERS

Understood The Concept
Most of the readers understood and liked the feature. They felt that they could search and read about more topics rather than typing it on Google.
## ABOUT THE READERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Software Engineer</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Baker</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Engineering Student</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Software Engineer</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Software Engineer</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Admin</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Business Owner</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Homemaker</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Service Engineer</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Software Engineer</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Software Engineer</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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