Speaker 1:	... you. So, before we begin, is there any questions that you have before we start?

Participant 3:	I didn't hear that because I heard that you want to make an announcement. What was the question?

Speaker 1:	Is there any questions that you have for me before we start?

Participant 3:	None whatsoever.

Speaker 1:	Great. So first, I really just want to get to know you a little bit better. Could you tell me where you're from and what do you do?

Participant 3:	I am British by birth. I've lived in the U.S. and New England for about 20 years now, 20 plus years. I work in IT, and I volunteer in emergency medicine healthcare, I'm a paramedic.

Speaker 1:	You're a volunteer EMT?

Participant 3:	Yes.

Speaker 1:	That's amazing. Wow. What really interested you to do that? That's such a heavy ...

Participant 3:	It's a similar skillset as IT, it's real-time problem solving. Have you had this problem before, what was it last time, what fixed it last time, what steps have you tried to this point? Not really too different. You're from the West Coast, yes?

Speaker 1:	I'm from Hawaii, yeah.

Participant 3:	Very West Coast.

Speaker 1:	Very, very West.

Participant 3:	In the northeastern U.S., you'll find a lot of volunteer EMS, and across most of the U.S. many fire departments are all volunteer. So I'm not that uncommon.

Speaker 1:	Are you in the Midwest?

Participant 3:	No, I'm in New England.

Speaker 1:	You're in New England, excuse me. Oh wow. So how long have you been volunteering as an EMT?

Participant 3:	I was first licensed 2007.

Speaker 1:	Oh, so for a good amount of time. It's amazing. How long have you been doing IT?

Participant 3:   I went to school for computer science in the U.K., so it's been by career for ... I was using it a little bit before that, but yeah, I've been officially in IT since what, '92-ish.

Speaker 1:   That's great. I also work in tech, so it's not the same as IT but we're in the same family of career. So, in the survey that you took a couple of days ago, you mentioned that the last time you used Wikipedia on your phone was to reminisce about a microcomputer that you owned 35 years ago. Can I-

Participant 3:   Absolutely correct.

Speaker 1:   Can I ask you to recall that experience and really tell me what your motivation was to do that?

Participant 3:   Oh, good lord. I was trying to remember, just because it crept into my head, the correct coding for colors on the BBCB microcomputer. And I couldn't remember right offhand, so I figured Wikipedia would have some information on it, and I just went down that rabbit hole. You know what it's like.

Speaker 1:   No, it's definitely a click bait. Were you satisfied with the information that you found about the microcomputer?

Participant 3:   Yes. It didn't actually answer the specific question I had, but it did give me resources which would allow me to find the answer. It was a fantastic article and it led to me reading about things for probably the best part of an hour.

Speaker 1:   It was about an hour? So, I guess my followup question is, how often does that happen, you find? Where you're looking up something on Wikipedia, and it just becomes ... you didn't exactly find what you were looking for, but you found another resource that did, and you just go into an hour long info session. How often is that for you?

Participant 3:   Probably a daily basis. I don't think it's every time I use it. Sometimes I'm constrained by the environment. If I'm using something at work, for example, I don't really surf that too long. I am always cautious to try and not use Wikipedia as a primary source. So, for casual knowledge, what year did something happen, what's the capital of Outer Mongolia, no problem. I often try to find some basic information, then look for the references and the external links if I'm doing anything "serious."

Speaker 1:   What kind of led you to have that behavior, or that understanding of Wikipedia, where it's not for something that you're going to seriously dive into, if not your primary-

Participant 3:   Well firstly, you let me edit it. Not you, but they let me edit it. So if I can edit it, anybody can. And if I make that assumption, I'm not going to get caught by surprise. I suspect it's a little paranoid, but I've seen ... especially with items in the news, individuals in the news, events in the news, it's so rapidly changing, and people with the best of intentions might be putting in information that's either outdated or incorrect. I would much rather use it as a starting point rather than ending point, when possible.

Speaker 1:   How often would you say that you question the content on Wikipedia then?

Participant 3:   It's not that I question it, because I often don't know more than what the article is giving me. I just bear in mind that it's a crowdsourced information archive, so I really should go to ... you know, if we're looking for peer-reviewed journals, if we're doing medicine, that sort of thing, or manufacturer sites, or official documentations, things like that. That's where I would like to go, but for cursory knowledge and putting things in their place, it's a great point to start.

Speaker 1:   Just out of my own curiosity, has there been a time where you truly questioned the authenticity of an article based on everything that you just said about sourcing-

Participant 3:   I've definitely seen things that I either know are incorrect, or I disagree with, or are just errors. It may be something as basic as a typographical error, or confusion, or incorrect use of a term, something straightforward like that. That's when I'd be able to try and correct them a little bit.

Speaker 1:   Oh, so then when you see these types of small errors, you yourself will try to edit and correct it?

Participant 3:   If I believe I can prove it, I will do so, yeah.

Speaker 1:   Okay. That's great. Also earlier, in your survey, you said that you primarily access Wikipedia with both the mobile web browser and the app. Could you tell me which one is your preferred method of access?

Participant 3:   It's whatever I have at the time. I have a personal cellphone which is Android, and I have a work cellphone which is iOS. So if one of those is what I'm using, then that's what I'm using. On my work PC, if I'm at my desk, I typically use a Chrome browser for accessing Wikipedia, but I use the Wikiwand interstitial site. Are you familiar with that?

Speaker 1:   I am not familiar with that.

Participant 3:   Okay. So W-I-K-I-W-A-N-D. It presents Wikipedia data, it just changes the layout. And they also have an iOS app, which I will use if I'm using my iPhone. On Android, I will use the Wikipedia app, and on other machines, my home machines, I typically use the regular Wikipedia page.

Speaker 1:   Can I ask you ... so, you're a ... to me, a Wikipedia super user. You've literally used every mobile platform that they offer on both devices, an iOS and an Android. Do you have a preference for either?

Participant 3:   My preferred experience for reading Wikipedia for any length of time is the Wikiwand interstitial page in a desktop browser.

Speaker 1:   For mobile specifically, though? Would you-

Participant 3: For mobile, I probably prefer the Wikipedia app on Android, is my favorite for smaller screens.

Speaker 1: So it's just for ... correct me if I'm wrong, the Android is your preferred app because it presents the text a little bit more visually appealing, it's easier to see?

Participant 3: The Android app is my preferred app because it has the best navigation. You know, scrolling up and down is pretty easy, tapping on links is fine, but being able to go to tables of contents, go backwards and forwards, going out to other applications to share information, bookmarking, that sort of thing. I believe that's best implemented in, well for me, in the Android app. On iOS, the Wikipedia app is not as good, so I like the Wikiwand implementation a little bit more.

Speaker 1: Got it, okay. Are there any other big differences that you've seen that you kind of wish that was apparent on iOS? You've said that there's better nav on the Android. Is there anything else like that that you wish could have been spread across both devices?

Participant 3: Nothing springs to mind, and I suspect anything that I could come up with would be more of a restriction of the operating system. You know, split screens and stuff like that.

Speaker 1: Great. Is there anything that you would modify about the current Android app platform?

Participant 3: Nothing I can think of. I really have very few problems with the interfaces.

Speaker 1: If you could just have a magic wand and anything could appear on either app for you that would just improve your experience with Wikipedia, is there anything that you would like to add?

Participant 3: It might be nice to see an update tracker, so I could flag a page and I would be notified when it was updated.

Speaker 1: Okay. How do you currently know if a page is being updated?

Participant 3: Well, you can see when a page was most recently updated, in all of the ways that I access Wikipedia. Knowing precisely what was updated, you then have to do a little bit of digging and go into the history page, and review the notes, and compare versions and stuff like that. So it's not often that I want to know exactly what has been updated, but sometimes it would be nice to know that a page that I frequent has been updated and I can go if there's new information been added.

Speaker 1: In your experience, how does any of the mobile experiences differ from that of what you experience Wikipedia on a desktop or a laptop? Are there any clear differences to you?

Participant 3: In the applications, compared to the default website for Wikipedia, navigation I believe is superior, because I'll have tables of contents, things in the UI, which in a webpage, you just have to scroll.

Speaker 1: Got it. Okay, that's great. So, can I ask, why did you choose to download the Wikipedia app?

Participant 3: That was a long time ago. It was probably one of the first applications I downloaded when I first got an Android phone. I'm guessing at the beginning, it was more of an association with, "Oh, I use Wikipedia a lot. I should have the application for it. This is a cool one. I should go get it." And I've just maintained it ever since. I don't think there was a specific reason, there was no specific incentive, it was more of a name recognition at the time when everybody was coming out with applications.

Speaker 1: Taking a step back, just thinking about your general use of your mobile phone ... let's just say your personal phone. On average, how much time would you say that you spend on your mobile phone in a week?

Participant 3: You mean talking, or using it as a internet device?

Speaker 1: As an internet device.

Participant 3: In a week ... probably eight to ten hours.

Speaker 1: Are you ever concerned with data usage?

Participant 3: No.

Speaker 1: No? Okay. Totally fair. So, just in general again, how do you typically decide whether or not you want to download an app, any app?

Participant 3: If it's an application from a known source, like a commercial provider, if I'm familiar with the authorship of the app, then I'll probably look at the reviews. If it's something where it's a third party or an independent developer, I'll probably look at the reviews in the App Store, or Google Play Store, and then I might do some extra research somewhere to make sure that there's been no surprises contained within.

Speaker 1: Great. So again, earlier on your survey, you said that you generally will edit monthly, and not take anything-

Participant 3: That's right.

Speaker 1: You said that you spend about, let's just say eight to ten hours a week on your mobile phone. Could you tell me how often you edit or contribute or made on your mobile phone?

Participant 3: That's pretty rare. I can't think I've ever edited a Wikipedia page from a mobile platform. I've always done it with a real keyboard and a real screen. So that would be a rarity at best.

Speaker 1:   In your opinion, do you imagine there are any advantages or disadvantages of contributing on a mobile device?

Participant 3: I can't think of any striking advantages. I guess it could be if something is breaking news and so that's all you have at the time, then that's the best device that you have at the time. Disadvantages, you know, full screen keyboards, full operating systems, ability to select from edited images, screen display, yeah, a think a desktop application either through a browser or if somebody came up with a Wikipedia desktop app, I think that would always be superior.

Speaker 1:   So, in general, when you're editing or adding content, what are the things that have to happen for you to feel successful?

Participant 3: Successful ... You know, now that you said that, I very rarely go back and look at my edits. I don't know if they persist. I don't know if people undo them. I really give it my best attempt, I try and make it clear, I will try and use straightforward language, I'll try and make sure the information's accurate, and it's formatted correctly, and that's pretty much the end of it. I just give it my best effort. I really don't follow up on things very often.

Speaker 1:   That's totally fair. I guess going off of that, it sounds like you're very strategic when you're making these edits or contributions, so I guess, how much time are you committing in a month to edit and contribute?

Participant 3: Quite little, really. I don't think I can remember making changes where I've had to do research. It's usually when I see something that I know can be improved and know quickly how to do it, then I'll go ahead. I have a pretty low bar to not being bothered.

Speaker 1:   Can you recall the last time you made an edit, and what it was?

Participant 3: I can't remember what it was, and I think I did some minor typographical cleanup toward the end of last week.

Speaker 1:   In your opinion, is there anything that Wikipedia currently provides to you that aids with your content contributions?

Participant 3: They have a plethora of templates and guidelines and user interface tweaks and stuff. I don't think any of it necessarily make it easier for the type of edit I'm doing. I'm not doing large scale edits, I'm typically not adding in tables and images. I'm just making minor changes to textual content. So from my perspective, the short answer would be not really.

Speaker 1:   Is there anything that you wish ... since you do such quick, minor, in your words, "small edits," is there anything that Wikipedia could do to make that easier for you?

Participant 3: No. There's a bit of a learning curve for some of the markup that Wikipedia uses, or that any of the Wikis use. I just realized that you're from Hawaii, that's kind of amusing. No, I

suspect there would be diminishing returns if it were simplified any further. I think it should be a little tricky to make these changes because people should be somewhat committed to it. If it were straightforward, then you know, are we going to start attracting in the Facebook crowd who wants to use it to get their message across, rather than information?

Speaker 1:   Okay, great. So can you tell me about the last time that you were reading Wikipedia content?

Participant 3:   Earlier today.

Speaker 1:   What were you looking at?

Participant 3:   I don't know, let me look and I can tell you. I hope this is suitable for distribution. My last Wikipedia ... oh, I was looking at the geography of California, and the reason I got into that was because of the arrest that was made in the Golden State Killer case. They were talking about cities and counties in California, and I just wanted to know what was where, and that was a good place to start.

Speaker 1:   Okay, great. Were you satisfied with the amount of information that you found?

Participant 3:   Yes.

Speaker 1:   Why?

Participant 3:   Well, it's pretty simple to continue into further articles, if you're not satisfied. Unless you're interrupted, I think you can always keep going until you're happy. I can start off with the geography of California and individual counties within California, and if I wanted to see more information about, for example, the towns that were mentioned in the summary of the crimes that were committed 40-something years ago, then I can start searching for individual towns.

Very rarely have I wanted to know something and not been able to find at least nearly complete content on Wikipedia. And then if I want further depth, I can go to the external links. Yeah, the only times I've found that I have not been able to use Wikipedia as a resource, is for ... I often use it to look up companies and other institutions, and if they're not notable enough to warrant a Wikipedia entry, you won't find them. So that would be the typical situation where I can't find something in Wikipedia because it's not suitable for Wikipedia and I can't really complain too much about that.

Speaker 1:   That's great. Can you tell me about a time that you remember reading or using Wikipedia content and were really just dissatisfied?

Participant 3:   No, not really. There's definitely been times where I would like to have more information but I wouldn't equate that to dissatisfaction with Wikipedia. Wikipedia doesn't and shouldn't try to have every piece of information known to man. It has to draw a line somewhere, where what's going to be included and what's not, and what's

opinion and what's factual, et cetera. So, not finding something in Wikipedia doesn't always equate to dissatisfaction.

Speaker 1: That's great. What, in general, influences or affects your level of trust in Wikipedia content? I know you kind of spoke to it a little bit earlier because it's crowdsourced editing, but is there anything else that really changes your perspective of Wikipedia in terms of content?

Participant 3: No. I would say that people are very careful to protect, and the crowd is careful to protect Wikipedia from any type of leanings or biases because I think the vast majority of people realize that if it obtains a reputation for bias, it starts to become less useful. There are reactionary Wikis, like Conservapedia, which claims to balance out against the liberal leanings of Wikipedia, but I would say I believe yes, the statement that the truth is liberal leaning, is reasonably accurate.

I really think it's well done. I think that people are very careful to put in verifiable information. There's a couple of times where there's been interesting loops where somebody put something on Wikipedia without attribution, and then it's quoted elsewhere, and then that article is used for attribution, so it's actually formed a loop. But that's the exception rather than the rule. Eventually those things are discovered.

Speaker 1: So I'm almost finished with my questions. In your opinion, what do you think is Wikipedia's most critical feature?

Participant 3: Most critical feature. I believe it's the editing. Allowing everybody to edit is what made it so successful in the first place, and what allows it to be so reactive to changing circumstances. You can look up breaking news events, and if you have the time, you can watch the article grow. Wikiwand in particular will actually give you a toast saying that this article's recently been updated, would you like to reload it? So, the decision to continue to allow that, with some exceptions when articles are continually being vandalized, there would have to be restrictions placed. But the ability to let everybody and anybody create and update articles is what makes it the strongest thing around.

Speaker 1: So is it safe to say, just hearing you talk on Wikiwand a bit, you use that app daily?

Participant 3: Yes, I do use Wikiwand daily. It has a couple of interesting little shortcuts that I find useful, keyboard shortcuts, start a new search, or to search on existing words. It reorganizes the page in a fashion that I prefer. But it's exactly the same content.

Speaker 1: How does it rearrange the page in a way that you prefer?

Participant 3: [inaudible 00:25:47] I'll do a side by side, and I shall give you my opinion. Okay, so, let's look at Hawaii, shall we?

Speaker 1: Okay.

Participant 3:   So we're looking at Hawaii, the 808 state, I didn't need Wikipedia for that. So, there's my Wikiwand page for Hawaii, and then I will look it up on the original page. I have quite a large monitor. If I have my regular Wikipedia page, I have Hawaii with a couple of paragraphs at the top, then a large table of contents, which I have to scroll through, which is breaking up the article. On the right-hand side, I have an info box with some information about Hawaii that also breaks up the article in the right-hand column.

If I come to my Wikiwand page, the table of contents is a floating window on the left-hand side. So I can scroll the article and still have access to the table of contents at any point, which makes it a lot easier to jump around the article itself. And the info box that's on the right, blocking out the text on the Wikipedia page scrolls with the page in Wikiwand. So, mainly the floating table of contents, and just a slightly better use of space on the page.

Speaker 1:   That's great. In general, what is your general perception of Wikipedia?

Participant 3:   I think it's great. I can't say enough about it. You have to be some caution, because it's crowdsourced, but if you sit and think about it for a few minutes, it's fantastic how much information's on there. And it's done by a not-for-profit with essentially amateur editors, which is fantastic.

Speaker 1:   Great. I just had a random thought that I wanted to ask you earlier and I didn't get a chance to. So you've edited. Have you ever created a page?

Participant 3:   I have not. I have never created a page.

Speaker 1:   Would you have any interest in doing so?

Participant 3:   If I thought I had ever identified something that I believed warranted a page, yeah, I would do so. I've come very close. I took a page once that was almost void of content and started putting content into it. Somebody else had created a page and asked if I could add a few things into it. So I've come close, but never actually from scratch. I have in Wikis but not on Wikipedia.

Speaker 1:   My last question. Is there anything else that you'd like to share with me about any experience you've had with Wikipedia, positive or negative?

Participant 3:   Nothing springs to mind. I've talked a lot. I really think it's great. I'm continually impressed by its availability and the fact that the model is still working, where they've managed to fund and that they haven't been acquired, and there's no advertising on it. So, very, very impressive. And then when you start seeing the translations and the learning tools like Wikipedia in Simple English, and things like that, which are fantastic, it's really amazing.

Speaker 1:   Great. That's all I have. Do you have any questions for me before we wrap up?

Participant 3:   No, I think I'm good.

Speaker 1:   Okay, great. Well, thank you so much Participant 3, for participating in this session with me. Your comments and feedback are fantastic, and this is really going to be helpful for us as we further our research. So, following this, I'm going to send over the form for you to pick the incentive that you like, and again, it should be processed-

Participant 3:   I didn't realize there was an incentive.

Speaker 1:   Yeah. You get stuff.

Participant 3:   I know we're still recorded ... Can I ask who commissioned the survey?

Speaker 1:   That was Wikipedia.

Participant 3:   Yes, the recording is fine because I trust you'll keep it to yourselves.

Speaker 1:   Yes. It'll never be [inaudible 00:31:22], I promise. So I'm going to send that link to you following this call, and pick what you'd like. It will be processed within five to seven business days. You'll have my email, so if you have any questions or concerns, please feel free to ask and I'm happy to answer them. But other than that-

Participant 3:   That's fantastic.

Speaker 1:   ... thank you again, and have a great rest of your day.

Participant 3:   Thank you. Aloha.

Speaker 1:   Bye, aloha.