

Speaker: Alright, we are recording. Do you have any questions for me really quick before we get started?

Participant 20: No, I just don't think that we have the greatest connection, so I might have to ask what a couple times.

Speaker: That's okay. That's totally fine. I can repeat myself, we'll be good.

Alright, so let's go ahead and get started. First off, I just want to get to know you a little better. First off, could you tell me where you're from and what you do?

Participant 20: I currently live in New Hampshire and I am a graduate student.

Speaker: Cool. Where are you at in your program?

Participant 20: I just finished the masters portion of the degree. I'm actually on medical leave currently.

Speaker: Okay.

Participant 20: With a bunch of stuff.

Speaker: Okay, cool. Awesome, awesome. So a few days ago or a little while back you took a survey for us and you mentioned that the last time that you used Wikipedia on your phone was to see if miniature pigs were real. I really appreciated the response for that in there. Can I ask you to recall that experience and tell me what your motivation to do that was?

Participant 20: So I was at a friend's house, my friend just got a puppy. And she was talking about the pet she wanted to get in her life, and she told me she really wanted a mini pig. And I told her that there's no such thing. When people think about mini pigs, they think about these little five, 10 pound pigs that don't exist. Those are piglets. She didn't believe me, so I was googling it and I couldn't really find it. And I was like, "I'm gonna look at Wikipedia," so I did. And there are smaller pigs, but they get to like 100, 200 pounds. But not like a five-pound thing.

Speaker: Still never really that small.

Participant 20: Yeah, no, they don't get that tiny.

Speaker: Alright. So how often would you say that you typically read Wikipedia to kind of find information like this, fun facts kind of stuff?

Participant 20: I use it at least daily, I'd say.

Speaker: Alright, cool.

And what's your general perception of Wikipedia?

Participant 20: It's generally very reliable, you can usually just tell based on the phrasing. You know, if there's a bunch of citations it's nice to look at the bottom, but if someone says something that has a little question mark you can easily tell where you need more skepticism.

Speaker: Okay. And on average, how much time do you spend on your mobile phone weekly?

Participant 20: Weekly? Not too great with my phone. Maybe like two hours a day, so maybe like 14.

Speaker: 14 hours a week? Cool.

Participant 20: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Less than 20.

Speaker: Okay. How concerned are you with data usage?

Participant 20: I have unlimited data with my thing, so I'm not, yeah.

Speaker: Alright, cool.

In that survey that you filled out for us, you mentioned that you primarily access Wikipedia on the mobile browser, but you also use the application. Which one of those would you say you use more often?

Participant 20: Usually I would say the mobile browser just because ... Actually, I think it may open through the app. But I usually google something to check the Wikipedia link, so I click that first, versus I don't always think to go into the app first.

Speaker: Okay. So you start in mobile and kind of are prompted to go into the app?

Participant 20: Yeah. Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker: Okay. And why do you think that starting in the mobile browser is your preferred method, to kind of start there?

Participant 20: Usually 'cause I'm say, looking up "Are there such things as mini pigs?" And I'll look and see if there's a card or something, 'cause those are quick to read. And if not, I'll go looking.

Speaker: Okay. So it's just kind of a general starting point for your research.

Participant 20: Yeah, I don't always know what term to use, whereas if you google something and it says Wikipedia with a specific term, you're like, "Yeah, that's what I wanted."

Speaker: Okay. So in the app, is there anything that you would like to see modified or changed in the current structure layout?

Participant 20: There's nothing I really can super think of. Sometimes I don't realize that it keeps open all your old searches. Rather than having a search history it keeps up the pages of all of it, so sometimes I forget that and I have to close all of them. So if there was maybe an auto timeout for that, that'd be good.

Speaker: Okay. In addition to kind of an auto timeout, is there anything else that you'd like to add to the current Wikipedia app?

Participant 20: To be honest, it works-

Speaker: Based on previous experience, sorry.

Participant 20: No, you're fine. To be honest, it works pretty well. I don't easily have any "Gosh, if only it did blank." It works at least on iPhone really well on the mobile platform.

Speaker: Okay. Do you typically ... I'm sorry, do you use Wikipedia on a computer as well, or do you mainly just use it on your phone?

Participant 20: I use it on computer as well.

Speaker: Okay. How does your mobile experience with Wikipedia differ from your experience with Wikipedia on a desktop or laptop computer?

Participant 20: If I'm on a computer, I'll usually go on a Wikipedia spiral. You know, you click one link and all of the sudden you're like 800 pages away.

Speaker: Oh yeah.

Participant 20: I don't tend to do that as much on iPhone, usually because it's more on the go if I'm doing it on my phone, versus if I'm sitting down at my house and have to be on the computer and I'm procrastinating. So I probably don't go as far into those rabbit holes on mobile.

Speaker: Alright, cool.

Back to your use of the mobile app. Why did you choose to download the Wikipedia application?

Participant 20: Just because in my browser the spacing doesn't always ... I mean it works fine, but my fiance has the mobile app and I just liked kinda how it worked a little bit better than doing it on the browser, so I downloaded it.

Speaker: Okay, cool. And how long would you say that you've been using it? The application?

Participant 20: Uh, on the phone maybe like two years.

Speaker: Okay, so a little while. Two years, cool.

Just in general, when it comes to applications, how do you generally decide whether or not you wanna download any kind of application other than games?

Participant 20: Other than games? Price, definitely. I don't enough to throw down on a lot of stuff. Also utility, everyday utility. And you don't have that much space on your phone, so things like single-use applications I don't tend toward as much as Wikipedia has multiple uses. It's a lot of different knowledge, so it's kinda worth the space for me.

Speaker: Okay, cool. Are you typically concerned with kinda the space that apps take up on your phone?

Participant 20: Yeah. The phone I got, a Galaxy, I dunno, it has a little better storage than my last phone, but that is something I'm concerned about is how much storage. And how much the app is running in the background, the app constantly runs in the background and is using a lot of my space and battery, I'll delete it and this app doesn't do that.

Speaker: Okay, cool. So earlier you had mentioned that you just spend a couple hours on your phone every day.

Participant 20: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker: And that you read Wikipedia pretty much every day.

Participant 20: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker: Tell me how often your interactions with Wikipedia are done on your phone versus your computer. How often they're on your phone.

Participant 20: Probably more likely to do it on my phone, 'cause I always have my phone with me versus when at home sometimes I'll be on my phone rather than a computer. I'd say probably 70% phone, 30% computer if I had to quantify it.

Speaker: Okay, cool.

Can you recall the last time ... I know we talked about the mini pigs earlier, but let's just do more recently. When was the last time that you looked something up on Wikipedia?

Participant 20: Last night.

Speaker: Last night? Cool. Can you tell me what your motivation was behind what you were looking up?

Participant 20: So I saw one of those BuzzFeed Unsolved videos, I don't know if you've seen them, like True Crimes.

Speaker: Oh yeah.

Participant 20: Yeah. So I looked at the Somerville Man one. But I actually was a little disappointed with it because I thought there was more mystery to it, and there is, 'cause he had a suitcase and a bunch of other stuff. So I looked up that like Somerville Beach murder thing on Wikipedia to get more information on it.

Speaker: Okay. Were you satisfied with the information that you found?

Participant 20: Yeah, definitely.

Speaker: And what do you recall most about your experience with Wikipedia?

Participant 20: Just last night?

Speaker: Yeah.

Participant 20: Um. The fact that it had The Mystery, or I forgot what they called it, but Controversy Surrounding It, that was the section I was looking for. It was nice that it had that headline. I was like, "That's what I want."

Speaker: Okay, cool.

Participant 20: Easy to navigate to.

Speaker: Easy navigation to.

In general when you're reading Wikipedia content, what are things that have to happen to make you feel satisfied with what you're reading?

Participant 20: In general I like something vaguely appropriate. If something is wildly incorrect or just out there then I would be unsatisfied, but you don't typically find that, especially with the discussions and stuff. I prefer when there's a clear headline, a clear header, what it's called? Where you click on them at the top? You know what I mean?

Speaker: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Participant 20: Yeah. So those I really like. I'm definitely more satisfied if there's an area there that says, you know, "Health Consequences" I'm looking at the food or something for a generic topic. 'Cause sometimes they're covered better on certain articles than on others.

Speaker: Okay. And you mentioned that if something is wildly inaccurate ... How do you gauge when something is accurate or inaccurate on Wikipedia?

Participant 20: I'm like a skeptical person, so I don't tend to believe any one source usually. So if it's something that I need to use ... You know, the mini pigs. She was talking about getting a pig, I'm telling her, you get the whole pig. But if something is a little more like it was for my research, I use Wikipedia as a starting point to make sure I found it in a couple of places. Not because I don't trust Wikipedia, I just don't trust anything, to be honest.

Speaker: Okay. That's fair.

Participant 20: Yeah.

Speaker: So when it comes to your mobile usage as well, what are the kind of things, what are the advantages or disadvantages that make you ... wow, I'm having trouble saying this question. What are the advantages-

Participant 20: You're good!

Speaker: -advantages of reading Wikipedia content on a mobile device for you?

Participant 20: Advantage is definitely it's super convenient. Disadvantage I think on the computer it's kind of easier to go through long articles and find what you want. I know there's a find in page or something in the mobile app, but because your screen is so small it sometimes makes some articles look like they're a million pages long, which can be a little overwhelming. But I don't really know how you can fix that, 'cause making the font tiny wouldn't be very nice either.

Speaker: Okay.

So what about that experience would you like to change? Is it just the font, or is there something else you'd like to see changed with the mobile experience?

Participant 20: It's hard. I'm not sure how I guess you would change that sort of thing. Because of the articles that long, I want you to show me all that content. I think what they're doing now is probably the best they could with having them sort of collapse. You can open and close the headers underneath in the app.

Speaker: Okay, alright.

How much content do you generally feel like you have to sift through in order to find something like an amount of information that makes you feel satisfied?

Participant 20: It kind of depends. On more public interest sort of things like the Somerville murder case, or things where it's a little more concrete like the pig's weight, I feel like I can really trust it the first time I see it and that sort of thing is usually pretty reliable. But if it's something like I study the brain, and if I'm gonna look up this pathway and how it's involved in why people are addicted to drugs, a lot of times we don't know much about it, so the people who will edit those articles are usually of a certain camp of thought. So they'll write it like ... The more complicated it gets, the more skeptical I'm going to be and the less that I'll take it at face value.

Did I answer your question at all?

Speaker: Yes. Yeah, I'd say so.

Participant 20: Okay!

Speaker: So you mentioned a couple times you're generally pretty skeptical, which there's nothing wrong with that. So when it comes to Wikipedia content, what kind of helps ease that skepticism? Is it like sources, or just the general idea of the content, what makes you feel more comfortable with what you're reading?

Participant 20: Citations, definitely.

Speaker: Citations. Alright. That's the biggest one?

Participant 20: Yeah, definitely. I mean, the discussion's helpful too sometimes if you're kind of unsure where to go next with the citations and you look at that, you can kinda tell. Someone will say, "No, there's two camps of thought to this." It's a little more casual than the article, but you still get a better idea of how much to trust it.

Speaker: And I'm not really familiar with the discussions on Wikipedia, can you tell me a little bit more about that?

Participant 20: Yeah. So there's a page at the top by the tabs, it's like article, then I think the next one says discussion. It'll sometimes say on the article, "See discussion for more information." A good example again, let's say drug addiction. So looking at how the front of your brain interacts with control over addictive behavior is not known. So there's a lot of debate about it, and there's some people who think it's one area who are very gung ho on that one area, and some people are really, really, really devoted to the other area. So that discussion page will show that, whereas I don't know that the article would have necessarily shown how much of a debate there is in the community.

Speaker: That's super cool. I never actually heard of that, so that's super awesome.

Participant 20: Oh yeah. 'Cause if you love something and you're curious.

Speaker: I'm gonna use that in the future most likely. How do you imagine that content gets published onto Wikipedia?

Participant 20: I assume someone looks it up, and if it's not there, they're like, "Oh, I'll look this up too." And if they know a lot about it they'll write it or they'll edit something. I assume it probably starts with, though, someone looking it up and finding that it's not there.

Speaker: Okay.

And what's your perception of editing on Wikipedia?

Participant 20: That's actually changed a lot over my time at Wikipedia. I remember I used Wikipedia in high school, back in the good old days, and it was just becoming a thing. I remember no one trusted it. I remember teachers telling you, "Don't use Wikipedia," because it wasn't as big of a forum, so I don't think that the checks and editing and discussion were really

as thorough. Whereas now, you can't really leave false information on it for very long. People fix it very quickly. The community aspect of Wikipedia, people are really on. So I trust it a lot more now than I did when I was younger.

Speaker: Okay, cool.

I know that you mentioned that you typically just read Wikipedia. What, if anything, would encourage you to edit content on Wikipedia or even contribute content to Wikipedia?

Participant 20: I don't tend to write out of nowhere, 'cause I am really anxious and I second-guess myself so much. I tried before and it was deleted, so I was like, "Never mind!" It's like a text message you look at like a hundred times, and you're like, "Screw it. This, I'm not gonna send it."

Speaker: Yeah!

Participant 20: So if there was like, I did the Google local guides and such. You can do reviews and stuff where they also ask you questions like "Can you check something? Is it true that this is the hours?" So maybe stuff like that if there's things that Wikipedia is maybe not 100% sure of or they want at least more user feedback, they could have that, "Hey, would you just take a quick five-minute survey?" And then they just say, "Did this thing actually happen on this day?" Just quick fact checks. And you can have like points that people get. I don't know, you don't have to give them real incentives, to be honest. I do that for Google because I use Google services. Just like I don't really care about the incentive of doing this phone call 'cause I use Wikipedia and it's, of course, in my interest to improve it. And I think other people believe that too. I think that would get people doing it.

Speaker: So kind of like prompts from Wikipedia themselves to kind of encourage more audience engagement.

Participant 20: Yeah. Because I think that people on their own, it's a lot to ask for people to have that self motivation.

Speaker: Okay, that's cool.

So on your survey you had mentioned that you fluently speak Spanish as well as English.

Participant 20: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Speaker: How much would you say that you use the Spanish Wikipedia page to look up information?

Participant 20: I tend toward English. English I'm much better at.

Speaker: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Okay. Is there any reason in particular that you don't use the Spanish page?



Participant 20: So if it's something that is generally Spanish, like I used to live in Texas and I used to live in a very heavily Mexico-oriented area of Texas. A lot of my friends spoke Spanish and I spoke Spanish, so if there were things that were more relevant to the landscape of where I was, where it would make more sense to see in Spanish, I would. But for typical things, like the mini pig, just 'cause English is my first language, it's a little easier to kinda ... Sorry I said that the most awkward way. "To a Mexican area of Texas," which is what my brain did. I'm sorry.

Speaker: That's okay. I used to live in Texas too. I understand.

Participant 20: Oh, I used to go to college there, I know you're not allowed to tell me where you work, but by A&M

Speaker: Well my dad went ... Yeah, I know that area.

Participant 20: Oh, yeah yeah. That's where I was.

Speaker: Yeah, cool! Cool.

So mostly focused towards English 'cause it's your first language, yeah?

Participant 20: Yeah. To be honest.

Speaker: Cool. Alright. Participant 20, that is pretty much everything we wanna talk about today, but I just have a couple final questions for you. In your personal opinion, what is Wikipedia's most critical feature?

Participant 20: Redirection.

Speaker: Redirection? How do you mean that?

Participant 20: Like when you search something and you have no idea what you're doing and you're like green thing, and it's like "Green thing redirects to Grapes" or whatever. And you're like, "Yeah, that's the word I wanted."

Speaker: Okay! Cool.

And how do you think that Wikipedia could serve you better?

Participant 20: So it's kinda the same thing. Getting a little bit better with that redirection. So now you have to have something pretty close, whereas something like Google (and again, Google their main thing is search algorithms, so you don't have to be at Google's level, they don't have to be at Google's level) but with Google I can search for "that movie with that guy who had that face" and Google's like, "I gotchu. Here you go." Whereas if you don't have something close or at least that most people commonly mistakenly search for on Wikipedia, it doesn't. Like, I can look up Russell Crowe, and look up that movie with

Russel Crowe by looking through his movies, but it's a little harder to put a full search term in a search bar.

Speaker: Okay. And is there anything else you'd like to share with me about your experience with Wikipedia? Positive, more negative?

Participant 20: It's really great! I like it a lot.

Speaker: Awesome, cool!

Participant 20: I don't have any more specifics.

Speaker: Fantastic. So that is all the questions that I have for you. Before we wrap up, do you have any questions for me?

Participant 20: Um, nope. Nothing. I'm fine.

Speaker: Alright, so thank you for participating in this session. Your comments and feedback are extremely useful and very much appreciated. I just wanna double check that it's still okay that I recorded the session today.

Participant 20: Yeah! That's totally cool.

Speaker: Fantastic. So following this, I'm gonna go ahead and send you an email with the document to select your incentive, and we'll be mailing that, so it'll be processed in five to seven business days and you should receive it shortly after that. So make sure you include your preferred shipping address with that information.

Participant 20: Okay.

Speaker: And if you have any questions or concerns, you'll have my email, so please feel free to reach out to me. And thank you again, and I hope that you have a great rest of your day!

Participant 20: Thanks Speaker, I hope you do too.

Speaker: Thank you very much! Bye-bye.

Participant 20: Bye.