

Speaker: Before we jump in, do you have any questions?

Participant 22: I don't think so.

Speaker: Okay.

Participant 22: So let's ... Yeah. Go ahead.

Speaker: Great. So Participant 22, first, I really just wanna get to know you just a little bit better. So could you maybe tell me where you're calling in from, and what do you do?

Participant 22: Sure. I'm calling from the East Village in New York City. I work for a small NGO. We do mostly public diplomacy work around the nation.

Speaker: That's amazing. How long have you been doing that?

Participant 22: So this job, it's been 10 years, but I've been in foreign affairs, international development stuff for almost 30 years.

Speaker: What kind of drove you to that industry?

Participant 22: I kind of always grew up knowing that I wanted to do international stuff, so the international development stuff, I started out as a Peace Corps volunteer. I always wanted to help people help themselves, so I did that for a number of years. I was overseas for about 10 years between getting my master's degree and other overseas jobs. I returned in 2000, and like I said, I've done some international development stuff. And probably the last six or seven years, I switched over to more foreign affairs, foreign policy kinda stuff.

Speaker: Okay. That's awesome. I'm calling in from Brooklyn. How long have you been in the East Village? It's like my dream to live there.

Participant 22: Right, so about ... I guess I've been in New York for 14 years, and I've been in the East Village for 12 of those. Yeah, well, 13 of those 14 years so ...

Speaker: It's my dream. You're living my dream, Participant 22. Participant 22, a couple of days ago you took a survey, and you mentioned that the last time you used Wikipedia on your phone was to look up the Kordofan state of Sudan. Can I ask you to recall that experience and tell me what was your motivation behind that?

Participant 22: Sure. I can even ... It's part of my job. I actually just got back from Sudan day before yesterday. We were going to be going to South Kordofan state, and so I needed to do a little research on where I was. I had been to Sudan like two weeks ago, but that trip was so short that I knew that I was only going to be in Khartoum, the capital. And then there was a possibility we were going to go to South Kordofan state. Didn't end up going there because the security reasons mostly. So yeah. That was why I looked it up. I just didn't know anything about where it was or stuff like that.

Speaker: Okay. So when you were looking stuff up for South Kordofan, were you looking up just geography or just to clarify for me like places to stay, places to eat? Just what were you looking at?

Participant 22: Well, just mostly politics and geography, the civil war that's been going on there since probably 2012, who were the players, who were ... what's the political situation, what's the humanitarian aid situation. That's what I've been looking for.

Speaker: Okay. Participant 22, in your opinion, how often would you say you typically use Wikipedia to look up information for your job since that was kind of why you were looking up the state of Kordofan?

Participant 22: Sure, but my job, if I was thinking a percentage, probably around 30-40%.

Speaker: Okay. So it's quite a bit.

Participant 22: [inaudible 00:03:40] Yeah. And then the rest of the time I use Wikipedia is for kicks.

Speaker: For what?

Participant 22: For kicks, for fun.

Speaker: Oh, for fun. Oh, okay. I was like is this-

Participant 22: Yeah, I'm sorry.

Speaker: ... an app?

Participant 22: [crosstalk 00:03:50] Yeah.

Speaker: Okay. So for your job, how often would you say you're using Wikipedia on your phone then? Of that, like 40%?

Participant 22: Probably about half the time. Usually when I'm ... for my job, usually at my desk. [inaudible 00:04:12]

Speaker: Would you say that you use Wikipedia on your ... I imagine you have a desktop or a laptop computer, so you use Wikipedia on that platform instead sometimes?

Participant 22: Correct, yeah.

Speaker: Okay. Great. Participant 22, can I ask what is your general perception of Wikipedia?

Participant 22: My general perception of it is that it is probably about 90-95% accurate. Yeah.

Speaker: What is that 5% that you feel is not accurate?

Participant 22: Because it is crowdsourced, it could come from anywhere. And you just don't know, and that's why you have to kinda double verify.

Speaker: Okay. So when you do find ... Does that happen often for you where you find an article where you're like, "Oh, no. I don't trust the validity of this content."

Participant 22: Not very often because I think, like I said, the majority of the time that I'm using Wikipedia is kinda for entertainment purposes. [inaudible 00:05:23] It is for entertainment purposes. That random article button, my partner before the advent of tablets and cellphones, my partner would be like, "You have got to get off the computer. You're just sitting in front of Wikipedia and pressing the random article button." It's kinda the equivalent of just taking out the encyclopedia and finding a page and going from there, and that's what I love about Wikipedia.

Speaker: I have two followup questions where one's a statement. You tell him it's an amazing feature and let you be. Two ... You tell him I said that. And two, I guess-

Participant 22: Okay. Sounds good.

Speaker: I think you also said in your survey that you're using a mobile app for Wikipedia?

Participant 22: Yes.

Speaker: So is that randomizer also present on the app for you?

Participant 22: Correct. Yup.

Speaker: Okay.

Participant 22: It's on my phone and on my tablet.

Speaker: Oh, okay. Is there anything else about the app, any of the features or anything that the app presents to you that you really enjoy like the randomizer?

Participant 22: The randomizer is awesome. Other than the fact that you can get lost in the links, I really enjoy that as well.

Speaker: Okay. How often would you say you use the randomizer on your phone specifically?

Participant 22: Probably once a day at least.

Speaker: I'm sorry. I didn't catch that.

Participant 22: Once a day at least.

Speaker: Okay. Is there any motivation behind why you're choosing to go into the app and find a random article? What's kind of the behavior behind that?

Participant 22: Well, I wish I knew. I think it's just ... Maybe it's ... I don't think it's borderline ... I think it actually is really wanting to learn new things and then just, hey, [inaudible 00:07:28]. And you know what? I was just looking a little bit ago, and I don't really need to know about ... I don't know what the person ... It was [Ristina Metaxison 00:07:37]. It was a Greek hurdler who was born in 1981. That's the nice thing is that you can push randomizer again, and it will give you something else.

Speaker: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Okay. That's great. Is there anything about the app that you wish you could modify to improve your experience?

Participant 22: Not that I can think of at the moment.

Speaker: Okay. In a perfect world if you could add something to the Wikipedia app, anything at all that would just make your experience better, what would that be?

Participant 22: I suppose it might be maybe clips for the music and movies, and I know that's probably copyright stuff that would be hard to do. But that's probably something that would make it a little more enjoyable.

Speaker: Okay. And currently-

Participant 22: I really just like that it's ... Sorry.

Speaker: I'm sorry.

Participant 22: I also do like the fact that it tells me about ... Would you like to continue reading on whatever you were reading about? The whole trending thing is kinda cool as well.

Speaker: Okay. That's great. Perfect. Do you kind of look at the trending section as also kind of like a randomizer, or do you have any different opinions for the ...

Participant 22: I don't use the trending as much. The randomizer, I like a lot and the because you read, giving suggestions about you were reading about this subject. You might like this subject, which is kinda cool.

Speaker: Okay. Just for my clarification, I don't have the app. The because you read feature, is that when you get to the end of an article or is that on the homepage or is that in the menu?

Participant 22: That's on the homepage of the app.

Speaker: Okay. Cool. Perfect. Participant 22, on average, how much time would you say you spend on your mobile phone in a week to use it as an internet source?

Participant 22: Oh, boy. Probably two to three hours a day. No, well, maybe one to two hours a day.

Speaker: Okay, so like max of like 14 hours.

Participant 22: [crosstalk 00:10:03] Yeah, a maximum of 14 hours. That sounds good.

Speaker: Perfect. In your opinion, does your mobile experience with Wikipedia differ from that of the experience you have on your desktop or laptop?

Participant 22: Yeah because the homepage on the desktop comes with the today on Wiki ... It comes up with the article of the day and then what happened on this day and on the side. When I'm doing it on my phone or on my tablet, I'm really more doing it to look for something specific. Not always.

Speaker: Okay.

Participant 22: Not always but usually.

Speaker: Perfect. Do you ever access Wikipedia any other ways on your phone? And specifically, I guess, I'm asking on like a mobile browser? Or is it always the app?

Participant 22: It's almost always the app.

Speaker: Okay.

Participant 22: And actually it's because my phone ... If I look something up on, say, Google and it comes up with a Wikipedia article, the phone will ask me if I wanna use the app or if I wanna use the browser, and I almost always use the app.

Speaker: Okay. What's the advantage there of using the app over the browser when you're in that situation?

Participant 22: The app is easier to navigate than it would be on the phone. Yeah.

Speaker: Okay. What makes it hard to navigate on the phone? On the browser, excuse me.

Participant 22: In the browser. Yeah. Maybe I'm just accustomed to using the browser so much. That's why I always choose that one to use. I can't think of anything that would make it easier or that would make it harder on the browser.

Speaker: Okay. Totally fair. So can I ask how long have you been using the app?

Participant 22: Oh, man. Five or six years probably. Since I got my first smartphone.

Speaker: Okay. Do you recall why you chose to download the Wikipedia app?

Participant 22: 'Cause I love Wikipedia.

Speaker: Okay.

Participant 22: 'Cause I gotta do it with something that I will be constantly.

Speaker: Okay. Just in general, how do you normally decide whether or not to download any app onto your phone?

Participant 22: I do look at how often I would be using it. Probably ... Yeah. Frequency of use would probably be the first thing. Like I have KAYAK, but I don't travel all the time.

Speaker: Mm-hmm (affirmative). Okay. Since you've had the app for so long and you've used Wikipedia for so long, has anything changed your perception of Wikipedia throughout the years? Have you noticed any big changes to which you were like, "This is great," or, "This is horrible." Anything like that?

Participant 22: No. What I do like is its consistency. The interface that stayed basically the same the entire time I've been using it.

Speaker: Okay. Perfect. So earlier you said on average you'll spend a max of about 14 hours of your time on your mobile phone, and in the survey you said that you read Wikipedia daily. So of that 14 hours, can you tell me how much time you believe you spend on your phone on Wikipedia?

Participant 22: I'm sorry. Can you say that one more time?

Speaker: I'm sorry. It's a bit verbose. So you spend 14 hours a week using your phone as an internet source. How much of that 14 hours are you using on your phone Wikipedia?

Participant 22: Oh, okay. So maybe about ... I would say 30 minutes of those two hours per day. That's different every day but yeah.

Speaker: Can I ask you what was the very last thing you did on Wikipedia on your phone? Can you recall that?

Participant 22: Can I look it up?

Speaker: Yeah, sure. Go ahead.

Participant 22: Hold on here.

Speaker: It's just for my own [crosstalk 00:14:57].

Participant 22: Oh, you know what? Here's what it was because ... I'm sorry.

Speaker: I'm sorry.

Participant 22: It was because ... Go ahead.

Speaker: I don't know the app. Is there like a history tab or how are you finding the last thing you looked at?

Participant 22: There's a thing called because you read, and it will say what I read today. And the last thing that I looked at was I had ... When I was coming back on the plane on Wednesday, I watched a movie called The Vanishing of Sidney Hall. I read that today. [inaudible 00:15:30] but I looked it up.

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

Participant 22: Yeah. Pretty much.

Speaker: Okay. What do you recall the most about it and why you were satisfied?

Participant 22: Because I think I wanted to know a little bit more about the stars and about where it was filmed and how it came about, and it does ... Not every article about a TV show or a movie will tell you everything about it, but this one really did. It told me a lot about where it was filmed and how the production came about and who wrote it and that kinda stuff.

Speaker: Okay. Can I ask for things like that, for movies, very specific category of information or type of content, do you ever use an alternative source to look up that kind of information? Like not Wikipedia for like movies and [crosstalk 00:16:24]?

Participant 22: Yeah. For something like a movie, I might look at IMDb.com.

Speaker: Is there anything that IMDb provides for that type of content that you kind of wish Wikipedia could [inaudible 00:16:37]? Even in the way that it presents the information to you?

Participant 22: It's funny because I usually end up ... I like the way that Wikipedia presents the information to you. That's why it's my preferred, go-to thing for information. The only thing that IMDb kinda provide that is different is it'll say something about ... It'll give you trivia about the actor or the movie or something like that. Most of the time, that is appropriate, I think, to be included in a Wikipedia article, but most of the times, I don't think it would be.

Speaker: Okay. Great. In general, Participant 22, when you're reading or using Wikipedia content, what are the things that have to happen for you to feel satisfied?

Participant 22: It has to answer my questions, or it has to peak my interest.

Speaker: Okay.

Participant 22: Like I say, that randomizer button is great because it brings stuff up that I wouldn't have ever thought of. But if it's about a Greek hurdler who was in the Olympics 15 years ago, I can skip that fairly quickly as well. But if it's something specific like I read a lot of history, and so if it answers the question that I went to look up about a specific figure in history then that is very satisfying to me.

Speaker: Okay. Can you ever recall a time when you were reading or using Wikipedia content and you were dissatisfied with what you had gotten?

Participant 22: Only when there isn't enough information about something. If the article is very short, sometimes that can be a little frustrating.

Speaker: What do you generally do if you find an article that's too short?

Participant 22: I go back to Google and try and find more information. Yeah. That's probably what I usually do.

Speaker: Okay. Perfect. Can I ask you now, so when you ... Earlier you had mentioned like crowdsourcing and how that's how content is created on Wikipedia. Can I ask you what is your general understanding of editors and people who contribute content on Wikipedia?

Participant 22: I'm sorry. What is my general understanding?

Speaker: Yeah.

Participant 22: I know that they're all volunteer. I know that Wikipedia does have some control over who those people are. I do also know that there's sometimes some controversy about what those editors agree to put in and agree to take out, but I'm glad that there is somebody there who's making sure ... The story that comes to mind was ... It was probably four or five years ago when Sarah Palin was getting ice cream in Boston, and she said, "I'm just celebrating the American Revolution because the British were trying to take our guns," and then all of a sudden somebody took over Paul Revere's Wikipedia page and said, "Well, the British were trying to take our guns, and that's why the Revolutionary War was" ... Well, that's not true at all.

That was one of the things where I'm glad that Wikipedia does have those controls in place to make sure that it's not complete bullshit that they're putting up there. That these crowdsourced articles are not complete utter nonsense.

Speaker: Okay. So kind of going off of that train of thought, when you, it was such a long time ago, read that article or that Paul Revere, the misinformation there. What really influences or affects your level of trust in content? Obviously when you see something that's vagrantly wrong, but is there anything else that's kind of like a flag for you that will start to make you be like, "I can't trust this," or what would that be?

Participant 22: I do look at the references at the end almost always. If there is only one or if there's none, then I really know, "Well, maybe I should look at simpler stuff to really find out if this is true or not."

Speaker: Okay. Is there like a minimum amount of sources that you'd kinda expect to see that would make you feel that the content is really trustworthy?



Participant 22: Like three or four probably.

Speaker: Okay. Have you ever thought about yourself becoming an editor or contributing content on Wikipedia?

Participant 22: I think I'm more a consumer of information as opposed to a creator of information like this.

Speaker: Okay. So there's nothing that would encourage you to want to edit or contribute on Wikipedia?

Participant 22: If the right opportunity came along, especially being the editor, I think that would be interesting. I can't think anything right off the bat that would make me go, "Oh, I really need to do that."

Speaker: Okay. I think I know the answer to this, but I just have to ask. So if you were to become an editor, do you think it would be for small, minor edits and some content that you're already looking at or do you think it would be big edits, adding an entire category to a certain topic and things like that?

Participant 22: Probably minor edits.

Speaker: Okay. What kind of minor editor would you feel most comfortable with right now? Let's say that I forced you to become an editor today, and we only had to do minor edits. What kind of edits would those be?

Participant 22: Probably more stylistic and grammar type edits as opposed to large content or accuracy. Yeah.

Speaker: And can I ask if I also had you do those edits on your phone, would you even be likely to do those types of edits on your phone?

Participant 22: No.

Speaker: Okay. Why's that?

Participant 22: To me, we're more of that sit down at our desk and ... type of thing. [inaudible 00:23:22] That's where I would be.

Speaker: Totally fair. So Participant 22, also on your survey, you mentioned that you can speak Spanish?

Participant 22: Yes.

Speaker: Do you ever look at content on the Spanish Wikipedia page?

Participant 22: I have when there hasn't been an English page available, but that's been so rare. Maybe once or twice in the many years that I've been using it.

Speaker: Okay. Can you recall what that was that you couldn't find in English so you sought it out in Spanish?

Participant 22: I'm sorry. I can't.

Speaker: Okay. That's totally fine.

Participant 22: [inaudible 00:23:58]

Speaker: Perfect. So I only have a few more questions, and then we can wrap up. Participant 22, what do you feel is Wikipedia's most critical feature on your mobile phone?

Participant 22: Critical for me?

Speaker: Mm-hmm (affirmative).

Participant 22: That randomizer.

Speaker: Okay. Perfect. Is there anything at all that Wikipedia could do to serve you better? Just anything.

Participant 22: More content.

Speaker: More content? Okay.

Participant 22: Yeah. Although, it's funny because I remember when I first discovered it, I thought, "Jesus Christ, this is great." But there wasn't enough links inside the articles to link on other things, and now that's almost never a problem. But more content is always better.

Speaker: Okay. My final question is is there anything else that you'd like to share with me about an experience you've had with Wikipedia, either positive or negative?

Participant 22: I guess some of the positive things would be like people that I've met or people that I know being able to ... seeing that they have a Wikipedia page, it just doesn't mean that they're important, but it means that they're going to be remembered, that it means that [inaudible 00:25:28] that somebody holds them as important. I have a very good friend who was one of the pioneers of gay rights back in the '50s and '60s, and I've known him for four or five years. When I see that he has a Wikipedia page, I'm like, "Wow, that's really cool 'cause I know that guy." And I know why he's important. I know why he's there, and now other people do too. That's such a cool thing.

Speaker: Can I ask how do you imagine a page like that gets published since ... Forgive me if this is not correct, but if he was someone that most people won't know about, how do you think that that came about, that his page got to be published?

Participant 22: I guess he did something that his ... Just because he's someone that I know, and I guess maybe I don't know a lot of important people, but I know that he is an important figure in the earlier history of the gay rights movement. To have seen that he was published and that he had a Wikipedia page ... I think it's probably fairly recent. Actually I can look it up and see when it was added. It is kind of interesting to see how long that he's been on there.

Yeah. I knew a good part of his ... Yeah. Entered history, he was last updated four days ago, which is kinda cool. I thought it's actually [inaudible 00:27:22] was actually added but maybe not.

Speaker: Would that be important for you to see?

Participant 22: When it was added to Wikipedia, yeah.

Speaker: Why's that?

Participant 22: Because it's totally-

Speaker: Sorry, it's exact-

Participant 22: Right, it would totally [inaudible 00:27:42]. When it was a tipping point where more people wanted to know about it than not.

Speaker: Okay. Perfect. Do you have any difference in opinions of the new article versus kind of an older article?

Participant 22: I think like I just said, I want to know why did it become something important enough to be included in Wikipedia now and not a week ago or two weeks ago.

Speaker: Okay. Great. Well, that's actually all I have. Do you have any questions for me before we pack up?

Participant 22: I don't think so. I think that's good, Speaker.

Speaker: Okay. Well, Participant 22, thank you so much for participating in this interview with me. Really everything that you said is gonna be really helpful for my research and furthering this project. Before I hangup, I do want to double check that it's still okay that I recorded this session, and you're comfortable with that.

Participant 22: Absolutely.

Speaker: Perfect. So following this, Participant 22, I'm gonna send you an email. It'll have a link for you to fill out for you incentive, and again, it should be processed within five to seven business days. And if you can think of anything else following this conversation that you do have a question on, please feel free to ask. I'm happy to answer any

questions that you might have, and really thank you so much again. I know you must have a really busy schedule, so I appreciate that you took the time to speak to me today.

Participant 22: All right. No problem. Thank you, Speaker.

Speaker: Have a great rest of your day.

Participant 22: Thanks, you too. Bye bye.

Speaker: Bye.