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The Wikimedia Foundation was interested in understanding the experience of new and casual readers for desktop Wikipedia in regional languages. The study focused on various aspects of desktop reading including welcomeness, readability and credibility and readers trust.

We conducted combination of in-person study in Pune and remote sessions with participants from Pune and Hyderabad in multiple languages. Out of the 24 participants, 9 were new readers and 15 were casual readers, as defined by Wikipedia.
COMPARISON BETWEEN

ENGLISH READERS
AND
REGIONAL READERS
What Were The Differences/ Takeaways Between Phase I And II Findings?

Overall, there were many similarities between phase I and phase II. The main differences were in welcomeness and readability of Wikipedia which can be attributed to the regional Wikis explored in phase 2 rather than any differences in the reader groups themselves.

For welcomeness of the site, both the new and casual readers in phase I and II found the site to be welcoming for similar reasons such the content, visual elements, etc. However their reasons for finding the site to be not welcoming were different. In phase II regional content also played a role why the readers found the site not welcoming.

For readability of the site, which includes understanding and usability of features, the findings were similar for both new and casual readers from phase I and II.

Readers for both phases also had similar perceptions of trust and credibility of Wikipedia.
Both new and casual readers found the site to be welcoming, and also not welcoming, for similar reasons in phase I and phase II. However, in phase II, the spacing and fonts in regional languages affected the welcomeness as well.

**Why it was welcoming**: Readers found the site welcoming because of the availability of in-depth information at one place, availability of images, and categorization of information. Phase I readers also liked that there were no ads on Wikipedia.

**Why it was not welcoming**: Readers also had similar reasons for not finding the site very welcoming mainly the vast amount of information on the page. However, Phase II readers also struggled with a lack of regional content and difficulty in understanding the existing regional content, affecting the welcomeness of regional Wiki.
How Did Readability Differ Between Phase I And Phase II?

Both phase I and II readers found the site to be readable for similar reasons. Readers also struggled with readability for similar reasons.

However, in phase I, readers struggled with the features due to their lack of awareness and limited conceptual understanding. Whereas in phase II, inability to understand the language also played a role in the difficulties of the readers in understanding and usability of features such as Tools etc.

- **Which features did readers understand**: Both new and casual readers in both Phases understood the concept of Table of contents, Search and liked the features.

- **Which features did readers not understand**: Both new and casual readers in both Phases struggled to understand the concept of Tools, Contributions, View history and Talk.

"I don't understand what tools are meant to be. I will not use it. It is not useful for me.

- User 2, Casual Reader (Phase I)"

"I am unable to understand what tools indicates. It is difficult to understand. I have to go to the English article to know what it is.

- User 4, Casual Reader (Phase II)"
How Did Credibility And Trust Differ Between Phase I And Phase II?

For both new and casual readers in Phase I and Phase II, the trust varied based on the information they searched for. Both Phase I and II readers had similar perceptions about creation of Wikipedia content and were not aware of who is creating it.

Readers trusted Wikipedia for general information on places, personalities but for information that was important for them they would confirm that information in other sites.

Both the readers trusted Wikipedia for similar reasons such as reliable source of information, consistent with other sources etc. However, there were some additional points such as references provided in Wikipedia Phase II.

Both the readers did not trust Wikipedia for similar reasons such as Wikipedia content is editable by anyone, unsure if the content was verified or not.

“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.”

- User 9, Casual Reader (Phase I)

“It depends on the content, it if it serious then I cross check, if it is critical for business I will cross check, will go to the official website and cross check on Wikipedia.”

- User 18, Casual Reader (Phase II)
## What Is The Comparison Between Phase I And Phase II Readers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNOLOGY ACCESS AND OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>PHASE TWO</th>
<th>PHASE ONE</th>
<th>PHASE TWO</th>
<th>PHASE ONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEW REGIONAL LANGUAGE READERS</td>
<td>• Own a smartphone&lt;br&gt;• Access to laptop/desktop in hostels etc</td>
<td>• Own a smartphone&lt;br&gt;• Access to laptop/desktop in office or homes</td>
<td>• Own a smartphone, laptop or desktop and other electronic devices</td>
<td>• Own a smartphone, laptop or desktop and other electronic devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEW ENGLISH LANGUAGE READERS</td>
<td>• Mostly reading in regional languages as they are proficient in their regional language&lt;br&gt;• Know Basic English</td>
<td>• Mostly reading in English language and sometimes in their regional language</td>
<td>• Reading in both English and their regional language</td>
<td>• Mostly reading in English language and rarely in their regional language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>READING SITES</td>
<td>• Use local sites to read information online&lt;br&gt;• Read information related to entertainment and education.</td>
<td>• Use local sites to read information online.</td>
<td>• Use both local and global websites to read online</td>
<td>• Use global websites and local sites to read information online.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIKIPEDIA AWARENESS</td>
<td>• Aware of Wikipedia that is limited to seeing Wikipedia links in google search.</td>
<td>• Aware of Wikipedia and use it for completing their children’s school assignment.</td>
<td>• Aware of Wikipedia and browse it reading about personalities, places etc.</td>
<td>• Aware of Wikipedia and browse it to learn something new based on what they are reading.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Is the Comparison Between Phase I and Phase II Readers?

New Readers – Phase I and II

- Both new readers for Phase I and Phase II, owned a smartphone and had access to either a laptop or desktop. They both were reading content in their regional language as well as English. They both referred to local websites for reading content online.

- However, the new English language readers from Phase I were reading more in English and less in their regional language. They were sometimes reading content in regional language to help in their children’s school assignment or to get information on topics like history, etc.

- The new regional language readers from Phase II, were more proficient in their regional language and knew basic English. They read content in regional language so that they could understand the concepts better or get more in-depth information on topics. They read information on topics related to their course, content related to entrance exams, local news or general information about places, personalities, movies etc.

- The new regional language readers from phase II were aware about Wikipedia as they had seen it in Google search results. The new English language readers from phase I were aware about Wikipedia as they had used it for school projects or their course work.
What Is the Comparison Between Phase I and Phase II Readers?

Casual Readers – Phase I and II

• Both casual readers from Phase I and Phase II, owned a smartphone and laptop or desktop. They both were reading content in English and sometimes in their regional languages. They referred to both local and global websites for reading content online.

• However, the casual English language Readers were reading content mostly in English and rarely read information in their regional language. They only read information in regional language if they saw some post on Facebook or message on WhatsApp.

• The casual regional language readers from Phase II were reading content both in English and their regional language. They were reading articles, poetry, news, personalities etc. in regional language.

• Both the casual readers from Phase I and Phase II, were aware about Wikipedia and browsed Wikipedia to learn something new based on what they were reading or watching at that time.
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
Who Are New And Casual Wikipedia Desktop Regional Readers?
## Who Are New And Casual Wikipedia Desktop Regional Readers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TECHNOLOGY ACCESS AND OWNERSHIP</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>CASUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Own a smartphone, have access to a laptop</td>
<td>Own a smartphone, laptop, other devices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING LANGUAGES</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>CASUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly reading in regional language, sometimes in English</td>
<td>Mostly reading in English and also in regional language</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>READING SITES</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>CASUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mostly use local websites for reading online</td>
<td>Mostly use both local and global websites to read online</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WIKIPEDIA ACCESS</th>
<th>NEW</th>
<th>CASUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access Wikipedia on mobile, rarely on laptop</td>
<td>Access Wikipedia both on mobile and laptop</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Was The Readers Understanding Of The Regional Wikipedia?

Both new and casual readers initially believed that regional Wikipedia is a translation of the English Wikipedia.

After exploring language switching feature and multiple articles, there was mixed response. Some understood that regional Wikipedia is a separate Wiki while some were still unsure.

"The Telugu article is a translation of the English article. There is no other person to do it manually."

- User 22, New Reader
For both new and casual readers, their trust was varied and also dependent on the content they were searching for. Their trust in English Wikipedia also informed their trust in regional Wikipedia.

**Trusted:** They would trust Wikipedia for general information on places, personalities, etc.

**Will check other sources:** They would check multiple sources for sensitive information. For example, on the COVID 19 pandemic they would check government websites, etc.

*It depends on the content, if it is serious then I cross check, if it is critical for business I will cross check, will go to the official website and cross check on Wikipedia.*

- User 18, Casual Reader
Did The Readers Find The Current Site & Prototype to be Welcoming?

For both new and casual readers, welcomeness varied depending upon multiple factors such as amount of information, presentation of content, use of images, as well as the articles they explored.

CURRENT SITE

Readers liked that there was in-depth information supported by images, but also thought that there was too much information sometimes making it overwhelming.

PROTOTYPE

For the prototype as well, readers liked the clean layout but compactness of the content made reading a challenge.
Did The Readers Find The Current Site & Prototype to be Welcoming?

While comparing the two, both new and casual readers found the prototype more welcoming and easy to use.
What Was The Readability Of The Current Site And Prototype?

For both current site and prototype, readability varied for each feature tested as well as reader group.

Readability depended upon the readers understanding each feature and their ability to use it. New and Casual Readers had varied understand of the features in both the current site and prototype.
Both user groups found the features in the prototype easier to discover. However some readers found the current site more readable as the information was more spaced out as compared to the prototype.
Both new and casual readers preferred the prototype due to its clean layout and discoverability and design of features such as language switching and main menu.

However while they appreciated the white space and clean design, some readers found the content to be congested.
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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 with regards to:

1. WELCOMENESS AND READABILITY
   To understand the initial feelings of readers towards the site and their reading experience.

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

3. COMPARISON BETWEEN CURRENT VERSION AND PROTOTYPE
   To test how the welcomeness and readability, and credibility and trust differ between the new prototype and current version of the site.
1. Stakeholders’ meeting
2. Creating a screener
3. Creating a script
4. Recruiting
5. Conducting the study
6. Pivoting the methodology from in-person to remote
7. Weekly updates with stakeholders
8. Analyzing the data
9. Reporting
METHODOLOGY: USABILITY STUDY

IN-PERSON & REMOTE SESSIONS

Number of Participants: We interviewed 24 participants

Method:

• Hureo team conducted a combination of in-depth and remote usability sessions with the participants in two locations - Pune and Hyderabad.
• During each session participants were interviewed to understand their reader profile and Wikipedia usage followed by tasks as per the goals of the study. During the sessions, researchers carefully observed, listened and collected participants feedback.

Location: Pune & Hyderabad, India

Language: English, Hindi, Telugu, Tamil and Marathi

Medium: Desktop
METHODOLOGY
IN-PERSON INTERVIEWS

In-person interviews were conducted in Hureo’s lab in Pune, India. Participants used their own laptops or were provided one for the session and were taken through task-based session.
Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, Hureo had to move the rest of the sessions remote wherein researchers conducted sessions online. Participants to use their own devices which also allowed the team to get a glimpse of the participants context.
PARTICIPANT PROFILE

The study was conducted with 24 participants which included 15 casual readers and 9 new readers of Wikipedia.

- **Age & Gender**
  All participants were within the age group of 18 to 40 and included male & female genders.

- **Profession**
  Participants were from diverse backgrounds such as students, government employees, software developers, supervisors, accountants, etc.

- **Device Usage**
  Participants were using smart phones. Other devices they used were - laptops, Kindle and some used desktops at work/hostels.

- **Language**
  Participants were reading in different languages such as Marathi, Hindi, Telugu and Tamil.
HOW WERE THE PARTICIPANTS SEARCHING FOR REGIONAL LANGUAGE INFORMATION?

Readers searched for regional information by either typing in regional language or by adding the regional language in their search query.

Typing regional language in English

Readers typed their regional language search query in Roman script. Example: “Fadnavis artha sankalp book”

Adding “in (regional language)” as a suffix to the query

Readers also typed their search query in English but would add “in _” as a suffix. Example: “spiritual books in Marathi”

I might be looking for Hindi information but, I will search for it by typing in English only.

- User 14, New Reader
FINDINGS

PART I: WHO ARE THE NEW AND CASUAL WIKIPEDIA REGIONAL READERS?

PART II: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ FEEDBACK ON THE CURRENT SITE AND PROTOTYPE?

PART III: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ PERCEPTION OF WIKIPEDIA?
PART I: WHO ARE THE NEW AND CASUAL WIKIPEDIA REGIONAL READERS?

1. Wikipedia Desktop Regional Readers
2. Differences Between New and Casual Readers
SECTION 1:
WIKIPEDIA DESKTOP REGIONAL READERS

1. Who Are Wikipedia Desktop Regional readers?
2. New Readers: Getting to Know them
3. Casual Readers: Getting to Know Them
The Wikipedia Desktop regional readers read online in their regional language and in English.

They are technologically savvy.

They read regional content in the form of news, literature, books, poetry, information on government websites, articles & blogs related to fitness, movies, coding etc.

They are aware of Wikipedia and use the site.

They are from diverse backgrounds such as student, professionals, government employees, supervisors, etc.

These readers are divided into two groups based on their Wikipedia usage –

1. New Readers
2. Casual Readers
New Readers: Getting To Know Them

New readers own a smartphone and have access to a laptop. They are students, freelancers, government employees. They read regional news and books for various purposes like education and entertainment.

What are their professions?
- Students
- Professionals e.g.: Government employees, freelancers, etc.

What devices do they use?
- Own a smartphone
- Access to a laptop in college libraries, hostels, or offices

What is their device usage?
- WhatsApp, Telegram
- Facebook, YouTube
- Microsoft Office, etc.
- News apps (way2sms, Inshorts, etc.)
- Office work or study work
- Web search, YouTube
Casual Readers: Getting To Know Them

Casual readers are students and professionals like architects etc. They own multiple devices like a smartphone and laptop. They use these devices for their work and for recreational purposes. They look for regional content as well as more global content - articles, blogs, information (e.g. Quora), news, etc.

What are their professions?

- Students
  - Professionals
  - e.g.: Architects, software developers, government employees, book store owners, etc.

What devices do they use?

- Own a smartphone and laptop
- Few own tablets and Amazon Kindle

What is their device usage?

- WhatsApp, Telegram
- News apps (Loksatta, Daily hunt)
- Quora, Rektha (Poetry apps)
- Facebook, YouTube, etc.
- Office work, e-mails
- Web search
- Movies, YouTube, Netflix
- Blogs, Wikipedia, etc.
What Sites Do New Readers Read?

New readers are reading more regional information in the form of news, books, articles & blogs from various sites & apps like Jansatta, Eenadu, telegram app to download books. They are reading mostly on local websites.
What Sites Do Casual Readers Read?

Casual readers are reading regional information and also global content in the form of news, books, articles & blogs, poetry, etc. from various sites & apps such as Times of India, New York Times, etc. They are reading on both local and global websites.

- **News**
  - Regional e-news in app and site on smartphone
  - Local & global e-news websites

- **Education**
  - Readers reading regional literature on Facebook groups & Quora app
  - Readers using unacademy app & Telegram for exam preparation

- **Stories and Poetry**
  - Examples of regional websites to read stories & poetry
SECTION 2: DIFFERENCES BETWEEN NEW AND CASUAL READERS
# What Are The Differences Between New And Casual Readers?

## Part I: Differences Between New and Casual Readers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Casual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology Access and Ownership</td>
<td>Own a smartphone, have access to a laptop</td>
<td>Own a smartphone, laptop, other devices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Languages</td>
<td>Mostly reading in regional language, sometimes in English</td>
<td>Mostly reading in English and also in regional language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Sites</td>
<td>Mostly use local websites for reading online</td>
<td>Mostly use both local and global websites to read online</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikipedia Access</td>
<td>Access Wikipedia on mobile, rarely on laptop</td>
<td>Access Wikipedia both on mobile and laptop</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS

PART I: WHO ARE THE NEW AND CASUAL WIKIPEDIA REGIONAL READERS?

PART II: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ FEEDBACK ON THE CURRENT SITE AND PROTOTYPE?

PART III: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ PERCEPTION OF WIKIPEDIA?
PART II: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ FEEDBACK ON THE CURRENT SITE AND PROTOTYPE?

1. Language switching feature
2. Language switching concept
3. Welcomeness
4. Readability
5. Comparison between current site and prototype
SECTION 1:
LANGUAGE SWITCHING FEATURE

1. Were readers aware of the language switching feature?
2. Were readers able to discover the language switching feature?
1. Were Readers Aware Of The Language Switching Feature?

Both new and casual readers (22/24) were not aware of the language switching feature in Wikipedia.

• Readers (8/24) had either read or seen Wiki in regional languages since it was one of the top search results when they searched in regional languages by typing in English e.g.: “history of Pune in Marathi”.

• But they were unaware that Wikipedia is available in multiple languages or that they can switch languages within Wikipedia.
If I need the Hyderabad Wikipedia Telugu version, then I will search it on Google by typing "Hyderabad Wiki in Telugu.

- User 22, New Reader

I don't know that there is a language switching feature in Wikipedia.

- User 1, Casual Reader
2. Were Readers Able To Discover The Language Switching Feature?

Both new and casual readers were able to discover the language switching feature in the prototype and the current site.

CURRENT SITE

The readers (20/24) struggled to locate the language switching feature on the site and discovered it after being asked to explore. They were searching for the feature at the top of the page and didn't expect it to have to scroll to find it.

PROTOTYPE

The readers (23/23) were able to discover the language switching feature easily as it was located on the top of the page and was visible to the user.
2. Were Readers Able To Discover The Language Switching Feature?

Both new and casual readers were able to discover the language switching feature in the prototype and the current site.

Difficult To Locate

- The readers (20/24) were frustrated with scrolling to the bottom of the page to find the list of languages and wanted the feature to be visible.

- The readers (6/24) had also seen/used the option of reading the content in other languages on other websites such as Quora, Rekhta, government websites etc. located on the top of the website and expected the same as it is easily accessible/discoverable on those websites.
In the current site, it is difficult to find the language switching feature because it is placed at the bottom of the page.

- User 17, Casual Reader
2. Were Readers Able To Discover The Language Switching Feature?

Both new and casual readers were able to discover the language switching feature in the prototype and the current site.

Easy To Locate

The readers (23/23) could easily find the language switching option as it was located on the top of the page and was easily visible.

"I like the language switching feature in the prototype because it is in front of me and is easily accessible."

- User 11, Casual Reader
PART II: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ FEEDBACK ON THE CURRENT SITE AND PROTOTYPE?

1. Language switching feature
2. Language switching concept
3. Welcomeness
4. Readability
5. Comparison between current site and prototype
SECTION 2:
LANGUAGE SWITCHING CONCEPT:

1. Did Readers Understand that Regional Wikipedia is a Separate Wikipedia?
2. Why Did Readers Think Regional Wikipedia Was Translated from English?
3. Why Did Readers Think Regional Wikipedia is a Separate Wikipedia?
4. Did Readers Trust The Regional Wiki After Switching From English Wikipedia?
1. Did Readers Understand That Regional Wikipedia Is A Separate Wikipedia?

Both new and casual readers had varied understanding.

After switching the language, readers (18/18) initially thought it was translated by various means.

But after exploring, some (5/18) understood that regional Wiki was a different article. Others were unsure of whether the content is translated or it is a separate Wikipedia article.
2. Why Did Readers Think Regional Wikipedia Was Translated From English?

Readers relate regional Wiki to their *previous experience with other sites* where they were given the option of translating the content into a regional language.

After switching the content to a regional language, readers felt that the article was either translated in different languages through various means - either machine or manually or a combination.
The readers (9/18) felt that the content has been translated using the Google Translate feature as they had used the feature for reading content in regional languages.

The readers (4/18) felt that an exact translation of the entire article is not possible so the main summary of the article was translated using coding so that people have access to basic information.

The readers (9/18) felt that the articles were translations of English articles as Wikipedia does not have a team who can translate each article in different languages.

The readers (2/18) had seen the option of reading content on other websites such as Marathi.com, Rekhta, Quora and related the same on Wikipedia.
Readers (2/18) felt that some parts of the article had been translated using software and the rest of the article was written by someone.

User 14, New Reader
The Tamil article must be translated through Google translation because the words used here are different from our regular Tamil words.

- User 12, Casual Reader

The Telugu article is a translation of the English article. There is no other person to do it manually.

- User 22, New Reader
3. Why Did Readers Think Regional Wikipedia Is A Separate Wikipedia?

After exploring the English and regional articles, some readers (8/18) felt that regional Wiki is a separate Wiki since they found various inconsistencies within the English and regional articles:

1. Length of the Article
2. Different Photos
3. Features Were Missing
1 Length of the article

The content was length was not the same as English article - it was either longer or shorter in regional Wiki.

Most of the Wikipedia Marathi articles have less information.

- User 5, Casual Reader
2 Different photos

The regional article contained different photos as compared to the English Wiki.

In the Hindi article, the content has changed, pics changed, the format has changed when compared to English article.

- User 11, Casual Reader
3 Features were missing

Some features such as table of contents/infobox were missing in the regional Wiki.

Information in English article is explained more in detailed when compared to the Marathi article.

- User 5, Casual Reader
For the readers that explored trust (4/24), the answer depended on their trust in Wikipedia in general. If they trusted Wiki, they trusted the content in regional languages.

The readers trust in regional Wikipedia varied depending on the length for the articles, understanding of the content and the amount of information available in regional languages.

- Trusted The English Wiki Due To More Content
- Trust Depended On Language Used
- Trust Depended On Article Length
Readers (1/4) trusted the English Wikipedia more as compared to the regional Wikipedia as the articles they explored had more content available in English Wikipedia.
Trust Depended On Language used

Readers (2/4) found it difficult to understand content in regional languages due to the complex words/heavy words used. They struggled to relate to the content in regional language.

"This is very complex Hindi whereas, my Hindi is different and I am unable to understand this article in Hindi. So, that's why I prefer reading Wikipedia in English."

- User 8, Casual Reader
Trust also varied for different articles depending on their length.

**Longer articles** – Readers (1/4) trusted the article more if the regional article was long and contained detailed information.

**Shorter articles** - If the article was short, readers had lesser trust and would verify the information from other sources as well.

"I would trust the information on regional article if it has more information or else I will go to other sources."

- User 23, Casual Reader
PART II: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ FEEDBACK ON THE CURRENT SITE AND PROTOTYPE?

1. Language switching feature
2. Language switching concept
3. Welcomeness
4. Readability
5. Comparison between current site and prototype
SECTION 3: WELCOMENESS

1. Did the readers find the site to be welcoming?
2. Why did readers think the site was welcoming?
3. Current site & Prototype: which did the readers find more welcoming and why?
SECTION 3: WELCOMENESS

1. Did the readers find the site to be welcoming?
2. Why did readers think the site was welcoming?
3. Current site & Prototype: which did the readers find more welcoming and why?
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?

What is Welcomeness: Readers were asked to explore multiple articles and were asked about their initial feelings for each article.

For both the current site and the prototype, welcomeness depended on the articles seen/explored by the readers. Other factors that influenced welcomeness were the amount of information, presentation of content, use of images, etc.
1. Did the Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?

Current Site

The welcomeness for the current site received a mixed response based on the articles seen/explored by the readers and different factors such as the amount of information, images etc.

Content With Images

- Readers liked that the site contained images which helped them to relate to the topic of the article.

In-Depth Information

- Readers liked that the articles gave in-depth information and included links to get more information about other topics.

Too Much Text

- Readers did not feel like reading the article when there was too much information on the page without any images or fewer images.

I feel like reading this information. I am seeing this for the first time. I think of when he would have been born. I feel like reading because you can see childhood details here. As in all information is here.

- User 2, New Reader
Pictures are placed with an explanation. It is eye-catching and distance between the words is also good and space is also good.

- User 10, New Reader

““

When you see "Poshak tatva" information gets bombarded, there is so much to read.

- User 9, New Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?

Current Site

Various factors affected Welcomeness such as:

**WHY IT WAS WELCOMING**

1. In-depth information
2. Content with images
3. Availability of content in regional languages
4. Quick access to information
5. Information in systematic format
6. Provided references for content
7. Design elements

**WHY IT WASN’T WELCOMING**

1. Difficulty in understanding content in regional languages
2. Lack of information in regional languages
3. Vast amount of information
4. Design elements
1. In-Depth Information

Readers (17/24) liked that Wikipedia contains a lot of information on various topics.

They liked that Wikipedia gave in-depth information and contained links through which they could get even more details.

"The whole information is given herein in an in-depth way. I can explore more through the links provided on the page."

- User 2, New Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?
Why it was welcoming

2. Content With Images

Readers (14/24) liked that the page included images that helped them in relate to the topic of the article.

"Wikipedia is providing the pictures in the infobox and also pictures within the paragraphs which is helpful, where I can quickly relate to geography, culture, etc."

- User 22, New Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?
Why it was welcoming

3. Availability of Content In Regional Languages

Readers (10/24) liked that Wikipedia contained information in different regional languages.

They liked that they could read the information in their own language which helped them in understanding the topic.

“Yeah, I can spend more time reading here, because the information is in my language. It is easier for me to read in the regional language than English.”

- User 23, New Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?
Why it was welcoming

4. Quick Access To Information

Readers (8/24) liked that they could get quick details about the topic they searched for.

They liked that they could see a reference image and the details were given in bullet points.

"Instead of viewing the entire article, the info box provides you with beneficial information in the summarized version, which is good."

- User 19, Casual Reader
1. Did the Readers Find the Site to Be Welcoming?

Why it was welcoming

5. Information In Systematic Format

Readers (8/24) liked that information included a brief summary, followed by the table of contents and detailed tabs.

"I like tables with colors like green and red. It makes me curious to read what they are and also feel like spending time."

- User 1, Casual Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?

Why it was welcoming

6. Provided References For Content

Readers (7/24) liked that Wikipedia contains references that helped them to understand the articles better or helped them to verify the information given on the page.

"Wikipedia provides you with information including references which is really nice.

- User 16, Casual Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?
Why it was welcoming

7. Design Elements

There were various elements that influenced the welcomeness of the article such as fonts, colors, etc.

Fonts: Readers (5/24) felt that the fonts were comfortable to read.

Colors: Readers (1/24) liked that the page looked simple with minimalistic colors.

"The font is visible to eyes, and they have maintained a proper distance between the words."

- User 9, New Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?

Why it wasn’t welcoming

---

1. Difficulty In Understanding Content In Regional Languages

Readers (15/24) struggled to understand the regional content as it included heavy or complex words that were difficult to comprehend.

“

I don’t find this article interesting because they have used very complex Hindi, I see the difficulty in reading it.

- User 11, Casual Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?
Why it wasn’t welcoming

2. Lack Of Information In Regional Languages

Readers (8/24) found that the information was less in regional Wiki as compared to the English Wiki. They struggled to find regional content for different topics ex personalities.

"Wikipedia is biased at providing the content there is a lot of information is missed out in regional languages compared to English."

- User 8, Casual Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?

Why it wasn’t welcoming

3. Vast Amount Of Information

Readers (6/24) found it difficult to read the content as there was too much information on the page and found it overwhelming. They did not feel like reading the article.

"The content here is disorganized and highly congested."

- User 5, Casual Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?

Why it wasn’t welcoming

4. Design Elements

There were various elements that influenced the welcomingness of the article such as font size and spacing.

- Font Size: Readers (6/24) struggled with the font size and wanted the size to be bigger for better readability.

- Spacing: Readers (3/24) did not like the empty space beside the table of contents and wanted the space to be utilized.

"The font is problematic here. I read a lot of news and never habituated with this type of font."

- User 19, New Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming? Prototype

The welcomeness for the prototype received a mixed response based on the articles seen/explored by the readers.

The readers saw multiple articles and the response varied based on different factors such as the layout of the page, visibility of various features such as table of contents, alignment of images with the content etc.
### 2. Why Did The Readers Find The Site Welcoming?

Various factors affected Welcomeness such as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>WHY IT WAS WELCOMING</th>
<th>WHY IT WASN'T WELCOMING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Table of contents along with the content</td>
<td>1. Compressed information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Main menu not visible</td>
<td>2. Difficulty in understanding content in regional languages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Simple and clean layout</td>
<td>3. Design elements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Alignment of images with the content</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?

**Why it was welcoming**

---

1. **Visibility Of Table Of Contents**

Readers (21/24) liked that the table of contents was visible on the page along with the content.

They liked that they could refer to the table of contents while reading the content as it moved along with the article.

"The table of content is nice. It is on the left side and scrolls subsequently to the paragraph and also saves time by not scrolling up every time to choose the topic."

- User 12, Casual Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming? 

Why it was welcoming

2. Main Menu Not Visible

Readers (18/22) liked that the main menu is not visible on the left-hand side as they felt that it was not relevant for them.

"Generally, I don’t like this main menu section as it is irrelevant to me. I am happy that it is hidden."

- User 21, Casual Reader
3. Simple And Clean Layout

Readers (16/24) liked that the layout of the page was clean and had a simple layout. They liked that everything was clearly visible and aligned on the page.

"The page looks lean, and it feels like a book, the information here appears to be compact and is structured well. I feel like reading more here.

- User 7, Casual Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?
Why it was welcoming

4. Alignment Of Images With Content

The readers (10/24) liked that the images were placed along with the content that helped them to relate to the content also.

One of the reasons I liked the article was because of the pictures present in the article. I could easily read, relate to and refer for more information from the pictures which were placed beside the content, within the article. This will make my reading experience more interesting.

- User 15, Casual Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?

Why it wasn’t welcoming

1. Too Compact

Readers (6/24) felt that the information was not spread out on the page and felt that the information was compressed. They struggled to read the information on the page.

"The content here is at one place and it remains congested. Whereas, in the current, it is free and widely spread."

- User 4, Casual Reader
1. Did The Readers Find The Site To Be Welcoming?
Why it wasn’t welcoming

2. Difficulty In Understanding Content In Regional Languages

Readers (5/24) struggled to understand the regional content as it included heavy or complex words that were difficult to comprehend.

"I am more comfortable reading in English than in Marathi because there are a lot of heavy words used in Marathi. Certain types of words can only be readable by Marathi intellectuals, but for the common people like us, it would be challenging."

- User 5, Casual Reader
There were various elements that influenced the welcoming of the article such as fonts, colors, etc.

- Fonts: Readers (5/24) were not comfortable with fonts as they did not find them to be readable.

- Colors: Readers (1/24) felt that the page was boring due to the lack of colors.

"I don't like the font style and colors, rather using blue color, they could have made it bold."

- User 20, Casual Reader
SECTION 3: WELCOMENESS

1. Did the readers find the site to be welcoming?
2. Why did readers think the site is welcoming?
3. Current site & Prototype: which did the readers find more welcoming and why?
3. Current Site & Prototype: Which Did The Readers Find More Welcoming And Why?

The readers (17/24) mostly found the **prototype version more welcoming** as compared to the current site.

"I like the prototype because of its features and is very attractive"
- User 10, New Reader

**Feature Discoverability**

Readers (21/24) liked all the features such as table of contents, language switching are easily discoverable on the page and they don’t struggle to find them on the page.

**Clean Layout**

Readers (16/24) liked that the layout of the page was simple and clean. They liked that the features were clearly visible and aligned properly.

**Easy to Use**

They (10/24) also felt that the page was easy to use and anyone could use it easily.
PART II: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ FEEDBACK ON THE CURRENT SITE AND PROTOTYPE?

1. Language switching feature
2. Language switching concept
3. Welcomeness
4. Readability
5. Comparison between current site and prototype
SECTION 4: READABILITY

1. How was the readability of the current site?
2. How was the readability of the prototype?
3. How do Features Compare between Current Site and the Prototype?
What Was The Readability Of The Current Site And Prototype?

**What is Readability:** Readers were asked to explore various articles and tested on their understanding of the features and their ability to use them.

**Current Site & Prototype:** The readability was tested for the multiple features of the current site. The features in the prototype version were limited and hence we tested the table of contents, search, main menu and language switching features.

There were **two types of behavior**:

1. No difference in feedback from the new and casual readers
2. Difference in feedback between the new and casual readers
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?

The readability for both new and casual readers varied depending on whether they were able to understand the features:

1. Language Switching
2. Table of Contents
3. Main Page
4. Article Tools - Tools
5. User Tools - Edit, View History, Contributions, Talk
6. Search
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?

Language Switching

Both new and casual readers (24/24) partially understood the concept of language switching.

Understood The Terminology
Once the readers (24/24) discovered the language switching feature, they understood that it meant that they could read the article in the various languages mentioned there.

Did Not Understand The Concept
Readers (18/18) did not understand that Languages is a separate Wikipedia and not a translation.

Unaware About The Location
Readers (22/24) unaware about the location language switching feature had not seen it before.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?

Table of Contents

Both new and casual readers (24/24) understood the concept of Table of Contents and liked the feature.

Understood The Concept
Readers (24/24) understood the concept of table of contents and liked the feature.

Liked The Concept Of Links
Readers (22/24) liked that they go to a particular section in the article by clicking on the links.

Includes All Topics and Subtopics In The Article
Readers (3/24) liked that they go to a particular section in the article by clicking on the links.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?
Main Page

Both the new and casual readers (20/24) were unable to understand the concept.

They felt that the main page would include the homepage of Wikipedia, history of Wikipedia or the main content of the article they were reading.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?
Main Page

**MAIN PAGE: STRUGGLED**

**NEW READERS**

Unable To Understand The Concept

- **Home Page of Wikipedia:** The (4/7) readers who explored the feature did not understand the concept and thought the main page is the home page of Wikipedia.

- **History of Wikipedia:** They (5/7) felt that it would include the information about how Wikipedia started or what readers can expect from Wikipedia.

**MAIN PAGE: STRUGGLED**

**CASUAL READERS**

Unable To Understand The Concept

- **Includes The Main Content:** The readers (2/13) who explored the feature did not understand the concept. They felt that it would include the main content of the article they were reading.

- **First Page Of The Website:** Some (11/13) of them also felt that it would be the first page of the website and would include Wikipedia’s logo with an option to search for anything.
Mukhprash: Maybe the main page about Wikipedia, like who has started or when it was started. I never noticed it.

- User 6, New Reader

“It is like the opening page, there might be a search box where I could search for information.”

- User 18, Casual Reader
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site? 
Article Tools: Upload File

Upload File: Both the new and casual readers (6/10) partially understood the concept of Upload Files.

Partially Understood Upload File

The readers (6/10) partially understood the concept. They felt that they could upload information which included both images and textual information, and not only images.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?

Article Tools: Tools

Tools: Both the new and casual readers (23/24) were unable to understand the concept of Tools and related it to either settings, option to add content or contributions by Wikipedia.

Article tools on the current site.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?
Article Tools: Tools

**ARTICLE TOOLS > TOOLS - STRUGGLED**

**NEW READERS**

Unable To Understand The Terminology

The readers (5/9) who explored the feature did not understand the terminology as they found it difficult to understand the meaning of tools in regional language.

Unable To Understand The Concept

- **Option To Edit/Add Content**: The readers (4/9) did not understand the concept. They felt that it includes options to either edit the article or add information in the article.

- **Related to Wikipedia**: Some (3/9) of them also felt that it is related to Wikipedia and includes the contributions done by Wikipedia.

**ARTICLE TOOLS > TOOLS - STRUGGLED**

**CASUAL READERS**

Unable To Understand The Concept

The readers (11/14) who explored the feature did not understand the concept. They felt it included settings to customize the page.

Unable To Understand The Terminology

The readers (3/14) who explored the feature did not understand the terminology as they found it difficult to understand the meaning of tools in regional language.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?
Article Tools: Edit

Only casual readers (12/13) understood the concept of edit but struggled to understand the process.

New readers (7/7) didn't understand the concept of editing on Wikipedia.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?  
Article Tools: Edit

Aware of Editing Articles

Readers (12/13) who explored were aware that articles could be edited on Wikipedia as they had heard from other sources such as friends or read online.

"Sampadan is to add information. I can add if I have some information because I have heard people can edit information."

- User 8, Casual Reader
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?

Article Tools: Edit

---

ARTICLE TOOLS > EDIT - STRUGGLED

NEW READERS

Did Not Understand The Concept

- Option To Save Articles: The readers (3/7) who explored the concept did not understand the concept. They felt that it allowed them to save the article they were reading.

- Add Comments: They (4/7) also felt that it included an option to add comments/suggestions related to the article.

---

ARTICLE TOOLS > EDIT - STRUGGLED

CASUAL READERS

Editing Without An Account

- Create Account Requirement: The readers (2/13) who explored the feature were confused whether they could edit the article without creating an account.

- Who Can Edit: They (2/13) felt that only privileged account holders could edit the article, but were confused after they saw an option to edit in the article.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site? 
Article Tools: View History

Both new and casual readers (22/24) were unable to understand the concept of View History.

Unable To Understand The Concept

The readers (22/24) did not understand the concept. They felt that it would include the history of the topic that they were reading, the history of pages they visited or the history of Wikipedia.

I guess it contains the history of football. Because now we are on football article.
- User 11, Casual Reader

View History on the current site.
Both new and casual readers (14/24) were unable to understand the concept of contributions.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?
User Tools: Contributions

**NEW READERS**

Unable to Understand The Concept

Readers (3/5) thought they could give their suggestion/feedback for the article from contributions.

**CASUAL READERS**

Unable To Understand The Concept

Readers (6/9) did not understand the concept. They felt that contributions meant that they could donate on Wikipedia or an option to add content.
Both new and casual readers (15/24) were unable to understand the concept of the Talk feature.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?
User Tools: Talk

Unable To Understand The Concept

Readers (8/8) who explored the feature did not understand the concept. They felt they either could chat with the Wikipedia team or included conversations about the topic or notifications.

NEW READERS

Unable To Understand The Concept

Readers (7/7) who explored the feature did not understand the concept. They felt that it included discussions about the topic by different readers.

CASUAL READERS
1. How Was The Readability Of The Current Site?
Search

Both new and casual readers (23/24) understood the concept and liked the feature. They liked that they could search about other topics in Wikipedia itself and did not have to visit any other website.

Understood The Concept

Readers (23/24) understood the concept and liked the feature. They liked that they could search about other topics in Wikipedia itself and did not have to visit any other website.
SECTION 4: READABILITY

1. How was the readability of the current site?
2. How was the readability of the prototype?
3. How do Features Compare between Current Site and Prototype?
1. How Was The Readability Of The Prototype?

The readability for both new and casual readers varied depending on whether they were able to understand the features:

1. Language Switching
2. Table of Contents
3. Main Page
4. Search
Both new and casual readers (23/23) **partially understood the concept** of language switching and liked the feature.

---

**Understood The terminology**

Once the readers (23/23) discovered the language switching feature, they understood that it meant that they could read the article in the various languages mentioned there.

**Did not understand the concept**

Readers (18/18) did not understand that Languages is a separate Wikipedia and not a translation.

**Easy To Locate**

Readers (23/23) liked the feature as they could easily find the language switching option as it was located on the top of the page and was easily visible.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Prototype?

Table of Contents

Both new and casual readers (24/24) understood the concept of Table of Contents and liked the feature.

Understood The Concept

Readers (24/24) understood the concept of table of contents and liked the feature.

Liked The Location Of Table Of Contents

Readers (21/24) liked the location of the table of contents on the left hand side of the as it was easily visible and accessible.

Move along the content

Readers (20/24) liked that the table of contents moved along with the article and they did not have to scroll back to come back to the top in the article.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Prototype?

Main menu

Both new and casual readers (22/22) were unable to understand the concept of main menu.

Unable To Understand The Concept
The readers (22/22) did not understand the concept. They felt that it would include the settings, login options of Wikipedia.

Main Menu not Visible
The readers (18/22) liked that the main menu is not visible on the left-hand side as they felt that it was not relevant for them.
1. How Was The Readability Of The Prototype? Search

Both new and casual readers (23/23) understood the concept and liked the feature.

Understood The Concept
Readers (23/23) understood the concept and liked the feature. They liked that they could search about other topics in Wikipedia itself and did not have to visit any other website.

Picture Along With Search Query
Readers (2/23) liked that in the prototype version they could see a picture along with the search query.
SECTION 4: READABILITY

1. How was the readability of the current site?
2. How was the readability of the prototype?
3. How do Features Compare between Current Site and Prototype?
3. How Do Features Compare Between Current Site And Prototype?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURES</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROTOTYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table Of Contents</td>
<td>Readers liked that the table of contents included sub topics of the topics also.</td>
<td>Readers liked the location of table of contents and also that it moved along with the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language Switching</td>
<td>Readers struggled to locate the language switching feature.</td>
<td>Readers liked the location of the language switching feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search</td>
<td>Readers were neutral about the location of the search feature.</td>
<td>Readers were neutral about the location of the search feature.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main Menu</td>
<td>Readers mentioned that the main menu was not relevant for them as they came to Wikipedia only to get information.</td>
<td>Readers like that the main menu was not visible and they could decide if they wanted to see it or not.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How Do Features Compare Between Current Site And Prototype?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROTOTYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table Of Contents</td>
<td>Readers (3/24) liked that the table of contents also included sub headings of the topics that they use to understand the content.</td>
<td>Readers (21/24) liked the location of the table of contents in the prototype as compared to the current version.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Readers (20/24) liked that the table of contents moved along with the content within the page and they do not have to scroll through the article to read a particular topic.

Readers (3/24) wanted the sub topics to be included in the prototype version also.
3. How Do Features Compare Between Current Site And Prototype?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROTOTYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language Switching</td>
<td>Readers (20/24) struggled to locate the language switching feature as it was located at the bottom of the page and difficult to locate.</td>
<td>Readers (23/23) liked the language switching feature as it was located on the top of the page and was easily visible.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3. How Do Features Compare Between Current Site And Prototype?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROTOTYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search</td>
<td>Readers (23/23) were neutral about the search feature as it was located on the top of the page and was visible. They were comfortable with the feature being on either side of the page.</td>
<td>Readers (2/23) liked that in the prototype version they could see a picture along with the search query. Incase of the current version, they could only see the search query.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 3. How Do Features Compare Between Current Site And Prototype?

### Main Menu

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEATURE</th>
<th>CURRENT</th>
<th>PROTOTYPE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readers (17/24) felt that the main menu wasn’t relevant for them and weren’t interested in exploring it.</td>
<td>Readers came to Wikipedia for information and didn’t typically explore the main menu section.</td>
<td>Readers (18/22) liked that the main menu was hidden and could see only if they wanted to see it. They liked that they could read without any distraction and page looked less cluttered.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ FEEDBACK ON THE CURRENT SITE AND PROTOTYPE?

1. Language switching feature
2. Language switching concept
3. Welcomeness
4. Readability
5. Comparison between current Site and prototype
SECTION 5: COMPARISON BETWEEN CURRENT SITE AND PROTOTYPE

1. What are the factors that influenced the readers’ while comparing the current site and prototype?
2. Which version did the readers’ prefer and why?
1. **What Are the Factors that Influenced the Readers’ while Comparing the Current Site and Prototype?**

The factors that contributed to the comparison for both the versions include the layout of the page, visibility of the features and readability of the content. The various factors that influences readers’ while comparing both the versions are listed below:

1. **Layout of the Page**
   - Structure of the page, usage of images, and segregation of content

2. **Visibility of Language Switching Feature**
   - Visibility and discoverability of the feature

3. **Readability of the Content**
   - Presentation of content on prototype vs current site and it’s readability

4. **Location of Table of Contents**
   - Location and accessibility of the table of contents

5. **Hidden Main Menu**
   - Location of main menu
SECTION 5: COMPARISON BETWEEN CURRENT SITE AND PROTOTYPE

1. What are the factors that influenced the readers’ while comparing the current site and prototype?
2. Which version did the readers’ prefer and why?
2. Which Version Did Readers’ Prefer And Why?

The readers (17/24) preferred the prototype version as compared to the current version. However, there were some readers who felt that the readability was better (5/24) in the current version as the information is more spaced out and easy to read.

The readers preferred the prototype version for various reasons:

1. Layout of the Page
2. Visibility of Language Switching Feature
3. Table Of Content Moved Along The Content
4. Main Menu was Hidden
2. Which Version Did Readers’ Prefer and Why?

Layout Of The Page
The readers (16/24) liked the prototype version as they felt that the layout of the page was simple and clean. They liked that the page was not cluttered and everything was clearly visible.

Visibility Of Language Switching Feature
The readers (23/23) liked that the language switching feature was visible on the top and they did not have to search for it on the page.

“This is very systematic. In Wikipedia(current) you can see some content is disorganized. It is like you’re going through a book. The content here is good and also looks good.”
- User 5, New Reader

“I like this option in the prototype because in the current Wikipedia article we need to scroll down to find the language.”
- User 3, Casual Reader
2. Which Version Did Readers’ Prefer And Why?

**Table Of Content Moved Along The Content**
Readers (20/24) liked that the table of contents moved as they scrolled down the page and they could refer to it when needed.

**Main Menu Was Hidden**
The readers (18/22) liked that the main menu section on the left hand side was not visible as there was no distraction on the page. They liked that they could focus on the content only.

"In the prototype, index is on the left hand side. From here I can go wherever I want. No need to scroll."
- User 5, New Reader

"I prefer the prototype you need not to go anywhere and there is no unnecessary information like hamburger, search is also before me. I like this version."
- User 17, Casual Reader
FINDINGS
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PART II: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ PERCEPTION OF WIKIPEDIA?

1. Perception of wikipedia
2. Credibility and trust
3. readers’ feedback on wikipedia
SECTION 1: PERCEPTION OF WIKIPEDIA

1. Who did the readers believe created content on wikipedia?
2. Did readers’ understand that they can contribute?
1. Who Did Readers Believe Created Content On Wikipedia?

Both new and casual readers were not sure who was creating the content on Wikipedia. The readers believed that content was created by the following possibilities:

1. Wikipedia Employees
2. Research Scholars
3. Compiled Data From Other Sites
4. Privileged Users
5. Freelance Writers At Wikipedia
1. Who Did Readers Believe Created Content On Wikipedia?

**Wikipedia Employees**
Readers (12/24) believed that the content on Wikipedia was created by the employees of Wikipedia.

**Research Scholars**
Readers (12/24) felt that content was created by professors, PHD Students, professionals with 10 years of experience or who were researching different topics.

**Compiled Data From Other Sites**
Readers (5/24) believed that Wikipedia collected information from different sites and compiled it.

**Privileged Users**
Readers (2/24) felt that the content was created by privileged users of Wikipedia who were given admin access by the Wikipedia team.

**Freelance Writers At Wikipedia**
Readers (2/24) thought that Wikipedia hired freelance content writers to create the information.
SECTION 1: PERCEPTION OF WIKIPEDIA

1. Who did the readers believe created content on wikipedia?
2. Did readers’ understand that they can contribute?
2. Did Readers Understand That They Can Contribute?

Both new and casual readers partially understood that they could contribute content on Wikipedia.

- The readers (16/21) felt that they could contribute as they had seen the option of edit or heard from different sources. However, they believed that the content can be published only after being verified by the team.

- Some readers (9/21) were aware that they could contribute but were not sure how they could contribute as they were not aware about the process of contribution.

"I can add the information on Wikipedia, but the Wikipedia team will verify it before publishing"
- User 20, Casual reader
2. Did Readers Understand That They Can Contribute?

New Readers

The new readers had mixed understanding about contributions on Wikipedia.

Option Of Edit

The readers (7/8) believed that they can contribute as they saw the option to edit on the Wikipedia page. They felt that maybe they could contribute after creating an account on Wikipedia.

Not Enough Knowledgeable

The readers (2/8) felt that they can contribute but are not knowledgeable enough to contribute on Wikipedia.

"I think we have to make an account to edit. You can get the details on YouTube to how to edit on Wikipedia. I have to know the process how to provide, log in and I think they also cross check."

- User 14, New Reader
2. Did Readers Understand That They Can Contribute?

Casual Readers

The casual readers had mixed understanding about contributions on Wikipedia.

Heard From Different Sources

The readers (9/13) believed that they can contribute as they heard that content can be edited on Wikipedia through various sources. However, they felt that the content can be published only after being verified by the Wikipedia team.

Only Upload Content

Some readers (2/13) believed that content cannot be added by them; they can only upload the content and request the Wikipedia team to add their content.

“I can't add the content or do suggestion or like, I will upload it and the team will authenticate it and the team will react to it.”

- User 15, Casual Reader
PART II: WHAT WAS THE READERS’ PERCEPTION OF WIKIPEDIA?

1. Perception of wikipedia
2. Credibility and trust
3. readers’ feedback on wikipedia
SECTION 2: CREDIBILITY AND TRUST

1. Did the readers trust wikipedia? Why or why not?
2. How did the readers’ feel about wikipedia as compared to other sites?
3. What sites did the readers’ compare wikipedia with?
1. Did The Readers Trust Wikipedia?

The trust in Wikipedia content varied based on the information the readers searched for.

Both the new and casual readers (7/24) trusted Wikipedia for getting basic information on topics related to places, personalities, movies etc.

However, in cases where the information was important for them, they would verify it on other sources also. For example: If they wanted information related to COVID 19 they would check other official websites such as WHO, government websites etc.

"It depends on the content, if it serious then I cross check, if it is critical for business i will cross check, will go to the official website and cross check on Wikipedia."

- User 18, Casual Reader
Why Did Readers Trust Wikipedia?

New Readers

The readers felt the content could be trusted as the site contained reliable, up-to-date information, was consistent with other sources and provided references.

- **Researched and Updated Information**
  Readers (6/9) felt that information on Wikipedia was reliable as it was updated regularly after a lot of research. They verified the updated content on other sources and found it to be correct.

- **Consistent with other Sources**
  Readers (3/9) found the content on Wikipedia consistent with other sources of information such as newspapers, books etc. and so trusted the content.

- **Provided References**
  Readers (2/9) felt that the information could be verified through the references provided on Wikipedia and they were trustworthy references. Hence, they felt that Wikipedia was trustworthy.
Why Did Readers Trust Wikipedia?

Casual Readers

The readers felt that the content could be trusted as it was consistent with other sources, provided trustworthy references. The readers also trusted the brand of Wikipedia as it was used by everyone.

Readers (9/15) found the content on Wikipedia consistent with other sources of information such as government books, other websites on Google, etc. and hence trusted the content on Wikipedia.

Readers (4/15) felt that the information could be verified through the references provided on Wikipedia and they are trustworthy references. Hence, they felt that Wikipedia is trustworthy.

Readers (3/15) felt that Wikipedia has been used by people all over the world for a long time. Hence, they trusted the Wikipedia brand and believed that it provided authentic information.
Why Did Readers Lack Trust In Wikipedia?

Despite using Wikipedia for various reasons, both new and casual readers did not trust Wikipedia completely.

Earlier I used to rely on Wikipedia and then I have heard from people that you can’t trust witnessed myself and after reading so many pages, papers I came to know that it is slightly so biased as per the person.

User 8, Casual Reader

Editable by Anyone

The readers (6/24) believed that the edit option gave anyone the ability to edit the content and hence information could not be trusted.

Not Sure if Content was verified

The readers (2/24) were not sure if the content was verified by the Wikipedia team. They were unaware of the process of verification and hence did not trust the content fully.

Old References

The readers (2/24) found that some of the articles had older references. They felt that the information was not updated and did not trust the information completely.
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2. How Did Readers Feel About The Wikipedia Website As Compared To Other Sites?

The readers liked that Wikipedia contained information on various subjects and also contained references.

Information In One Place: The readers (13/13) liked that Wikipedia included information about different topics in one place and liked that they did not have to go other websites for content.

Contained References: They (7/13) liked that Wikipedia contained references which helped them to verify the information. Other websites did not provide references, so it was difficult to trust the information.

"It is a great platform that gives you reference and you can verify from there and it isn't written randomly."

- User 18, Casual Reader
SECTION 2: CREDIBILITY AND TRUST
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3. What Sites Do Readers Compare Wikipedia With?

The readers (12/12) compared Wikipedia with books, newspapers etc. as they felt Wikipedia contains information about different topics and everything was available on one site.

### CURRENT SITE

**Books**
The readers (2/9) compared Wikipedia to books – both physical and online books.

**Newspapers**
The readers (3/9) compared Wikipedia to newspapers as they felt that it contained text heavy information with less images.

**Quora & other websites**
The readers (3/9) compared Wikipedia to Quora & other websites like Google which contains answers to questions and they get basic informations about any topic.

### PROTOTYPE

**Facebook**
The readers (2/3) compared Wikipedia with Facebook as they felt that the layout of the page was similar to the Facebook main page.
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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. **Content with images**
The readers liked that Wikipedia contained images, tables and maps which helped them to relate to the topic of the article.

3. **Information in systematic format**
The readers liked that the information was given in a systematic format. It included a brief summary, followed by the table of contents and detailed tabs.

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

5. **References for content**
The readers liked that the page included references which helped to verify the information or get more information.

6. **Sub topics in table of contents**
The readers liked that the table of contents included the details of the topic included along with the topics that were listed.
# What Readers Liked About The Prototype

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Simple and clean layout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The readers liked that the layout of the page was clean and had a simple layout. They liked that everything was clearly visible and aligned on the page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Location of language feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The readers liked the location of language switching feature as it was clearly visible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Location of table of contents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The readers liked that the table of contents was located on the left hand side and moved along with the content.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Hidden main menu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The readers liked that main menu was not visible on the page as they felt it was not relevant for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Alignment of images with content</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The readers liked that the images were aligned with the images and helped them to relate to the content.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Readers Struggled With On The Current Site

1. Vast amount of information
   The readers found the content of the page overwhelming and did not feel like reading the article.

2. Understanding content in regional languages
   The readers struggled to understand the regional content as it included heavy or complex words that were difficult to comprehend.

3. Article tools Terminology and Concept
   The readers could not understand the terminology and concept of most of the article tools such as Edit or View History.

4. Main menu was not relevant
   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.

5. Lack of information in regional languages
   The readers found that the information was less in regional Wiki as compared to the English Wikipedia.
What Readers Struggled With On The Prototype

1. Information was congested
   The readers felt that the information was not spread out on the page and found it difficult to read the content.

2. Lack of colors in the article
   Readers felt that the page was boring due to the lack of colors.

3. Main menu was not relevant
   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.
## What Was The Readers’ Wishlist?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More images and videos</th>
<th>Use of easy language</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</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>
<td>The readers wanted the content in regional language to be simple so that they could understand it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>More segregated information</strong></td>
<td><strong>More colors</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</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>
<td>The readers wanted to see more colors and background color on the page.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECOMMENDATIONS
1. VISIBLE LOCATION OF LANGUAGE SWITCHING FEATURE
2. SEGREGATION OF INFORMATION
3. MORE VISUAL ELEMENTS
4. TUTORIALS ON WHAT IS CONTRIBUTION
5. GUIDE ON HOW TO CONTRIBUTE ON WIKIPEDIA
6. INFORMATION ON HOW TO BECOME A CONTRIBUTOR
CHALLENGE

DIFFICULT TO LOCATE LANGUAGE SWITCHING FEATURE

The readers were not aware of the location of the language switching feature and struggled to locate as it was at the bottom of the page.
The readers had seen or used the option of translating the content on other websites such as government sites etc. The feature was easily discoverable as it was located on the top of the website and readers expected the same on Wikipedia.

"In the current site, it is difficult to find the language switching feature because it is placed at the bottom of the page."

- User 17, casual reader.
RECOMMENDATION

SIMILAR LOCATION OF LANGUAGE SWITCHING FEATURE AS IN PROTOTYPE

Consider keeping the location of the feature on the top of the page as it is easily discoverable.
The readers struggled to read the content as there was too much information on the page, making it difficult to read the content.
The readers felt that the information was not segregated properly and chunks of information were presented on the page.

"The content here is disorganized and highly congested."

- User 5, casual reader.
RECOMMENDATION

SEGREGATION OF INFORMATION

Consider segregating the information on the page by highlighting the points, numbering the points or including bullet points so that the readability is better.
CHALLENGE

LACK OF VISUAL ELEMENTS ON THE SITE

The readers struggled to read the content as it was too text heavy and found the page boring. The page included fewer visual elements related to the topic and was boring.
The readers felt the page included less visual elements such as photos, colors etc. The readers compared Wikipedia to regional newspaper like Jansatta as they felt that it included a lot of textual information and lacked photos.

"If there are more pictures on the page, then it makes me more interested in reading the article."

- User 5, casual reader.
RECOMMENDATION

INCLUDE MORE VISUAL ELEMENTS

Consider including more photos and videos on the site so that readers are engaged.
Contribution: Unable to understand the concept

The readers had mixed perceptions about contribution. They were confused if they could contribute or not or believed that they were not knowledgeable enough to contribute on Wikipedia.
Not aware who generates the content:
The readers were not sure who was creating the content on Wikipedia.

Not sufficiently qualified to contribute:
The readers felt that the content was created by research scholars or privileged users etc. and were not qualified enough to create content on Wikipedia.

“I can also provide the information, but I don’t have much knowledge to do that.”

- User 10, new reader.

“I am unable to understand what contribution is, maybe giving user feedback or suggestions.”

- User 15, casual reader.
RECOMMENDATION

TUTORIALS ON CONTRIBUTION

Consider including tutorials either through video or text that educate the readers on contribution.
The readers were aware that they could contribute on Wikipedia as they had either seen the edit option or had heard from different sources, but did not understand how they could start contributing on Wikipedia.
Unclear Workflow:
The readers were not clear about how they could start contributing on Wikipedia.

Terminology of Tools:
The readers were not sure what the article tools or user tools meant. They were confused if it was meant for Wikipedia team or for the readers.

"I think we have to make an account to edit. You can get the details on YouTube, to know how to edit information on Wikipedia. I have to know the process of how to Contribute the information."

- User 10, new reader.
RECOMMENDATION

GUIDE ON HOW TO CONTRIBUTE TO WIKIPEDIA

Consider Providing Some Related information In The Form Of Videos - How To Become A Wikipedia Contributor to make the process of contributing contributions more accessible to readers.

Consider Giving the Article and User Tools headings like “contributor tools” and also moving the article tools to the main menu.
RECOMMENDATION

INCREASE CONTRIBUTORS BY ENABLING THEM THROUGH ASSISTANCE AND SUPPORT

 Contributor Getting Started Videos: Promoting videos to show how a reader can become a contributor

Encourage Frequent Readers To Become Contributors: If readers visit Wikipedia quite often they should be prompted to become a contributor or should be informed about contribution through some kind of information or videos.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>one</td>
<td>20-25</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Accountant</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>two</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>four</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Software engineer</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>five</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Research scholar</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>six</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seven</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Software engineer</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eight</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nine</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Freelancer</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ten</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eleven</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Engineering Student</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twelve</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Assistant manager</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>thirteen</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Supervisor</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fourteen</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>IT recruiter</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fifteen</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Software engineer</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sixteen</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Software engineer</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>seventeen</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>IT recruiter</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eighteen</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Business owner</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nineteen</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Govt employee</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twenty</td>
<td>25-35</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Govt employee</td>
<td>Casual reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twenty one</td>
<td>25-40</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Software engineer</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twenty two</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Student</td>
<td>New Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twenty three</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Research scholar</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>twenty four</td>
<td>20-30</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Architect</td>
<td>Casual Reader</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Session Recordings are available [here](#).
Videos from the sessions are [here](#).
These links will be active for download till 30th May 2020.
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