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Wikipedia needs more new editors

Attracting new editors for Wikipedia is one of the main goals of Wikimedia Germany for 2016.

Survey among editors aims at gaining insights into:
(at least 5 Edits, active within 30 days before survey):

• Understanding current commitment of active community to support new editors
• Gathering experiences and opinions of active editors
• Improving the planned measures to attract new editors
• Increasing understanding of (perceived) welcome-culture / culture of openness
• Information regarding commitment to support new editors
Methodology
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Approach
• Creating list of questions in close collaboration with Wikimedia Germany – Based on existing WM-surveys
• Testing phase of questionnaire for amendment of questionnaire and ensuring usability
• Invitation for participation in the survey via banner
• Anonymous online-survey
• Analysis quantitative data: descriptive and analytic
• Analysis qualitative data: explorative

Questionnaire
• Length of questionnaire: 19 questions (17 closed, 2 open questions)
• Time of survey: January 2016
• Number of participants = 686
Profiles of survey participants
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Since when have you been active within Wikipedia or sister projects? [n=684]

- < 1: 4%
- 1 - 2: 8%
- 3 - 4: 15%
- 5 - 6: 14%
- 7 - 8: 16%
- >=9: 41%

Median = 4, Mean value = 3.57
Profiles of survey participants

Wikipedia-Activity (Q2 & Q3)

The majority of survey participants (71%) are active several times a week or almost daily. A good third fight vandalism.

A great majority (95%) write or edit articles, whereas approx. 10% organise projects for free knowledge and / or cater to administrative tasks.

On average, how often do you contribute to Wikipedia or other Wikimedia projects? (n=685)

To which of the following Wikipedia-activities did you contribute within the last six months (online and/or offline)? [n=683]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Writing or editing of articles</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Embedding pictures / images</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project discussions</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fighting / containing vandalism</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting others from Wikipedia community</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organising projects for free knowledge</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative tasks</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing software</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement in percentage (multiple answers allowed)
Profiles of survey participants
Wikipedia activity (Q3): other (open text field)

n=68
A vast majority of the participants think that gaining new editors is very important. 62% find that new editors are insufficiently supported. A rather large group (47%) did not feel welcomed when joining Wikipedia themselves. 9% assume that new editors do not want the best for Wikipedia.
16% of the participants assume negative consequences regarding the atmosphere of an increased number of new editors; 47% assume a higher work load for experienced editors. Positive consequences are broadly assumed for the diversity of topics covered.
Consequences of gaining more editors – open text field (Q5)

Central issues (n=103)

- **Higher quality of articles**: Quality will be improved, content easier to understand, higher objectivity, stronger science-based backup of information.
- **Higher diversity of topics / articles**: Diversity of topics would increase, topics of “the new generation” will be more included, fostering of topics that became less relevant over time.
- **Shaking up of old patterns**: More openness and pluralism, fighting of old boys’ club mentality / structure.
- **Better atmosphere**: Increase in friendly manners, thoughtfulness.
- **Change in workload for editors**: Reduced workload after familiarization of new editors vs. increase in edit-wars and discussions due to increase in editors.
- **Guaranteeing Wikipedia’s future**: For continuing the Wikipedia project, it will need new editors, “biological continuity”
Deleting of one’s contribution and the conflicts within Wikipedia are assumed barriers for new editors by many participants – more so than technical barriers. According to this, the way editors treat each other is assumed the main barrier in joining Wikipedia.

What do you think are the main reasons why there aren't more new editors becoming involved with Wikipedia? [n=686]

- Deleting of one's contributions by others: 62%
- Conflicts between editors within Wikipedia: 59%
- Lack of knowledge how to contribute: 36%
- Editing is too complicated and too difficult to learn: 27%
- The feeling of not being able to contribute – everything has been said already: 26%
- Less chance to influence compared to established editors: 24%
- Lack of confidence regarding quality of own articles: 22%
- Lack of time for participating in lengthy article discussions: 20%
- Other reasons: 25%
The majority of assumed barriers relate to the negative atmosphere and discussion-culture, the coarse and arrogant way of communicating, especially by “old top-dogs“.

- **Atmosphere / discussion-culture**: Unpunished attacks, coarse communication, arrogance, despotism, block-leader (Blockwart) mentality, high-handedness, fixation on rules, lack of support for new editors by experienced editors
- **Technical barriers for new editors**: Access to editing confusing, banning of stubs, weak editing-help, outdated software, problems with referencing
- **Relevance criteria**: Too many and not up to date
- **Culture of deleting**: Deletion-buzz, arbitrary deleting of articles
- **Resource problem**: Lack of time, no interest in contributing (correlated with prevailing consumer culture)
- **Gender topic**: Language within German Wikipedia not gendered correctly, forces editors to use old-fashioned gender language
The largest group (42%) is willing to support new editors – one third is yet undecided.

Are you willing to support new editors in 2016? (n=686)
A large majority of those willing to support new editors, would like to answer questions asked by new editors. One third would be willing to offer individual support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Support</th>
<th>Agreement in Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answering questions</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcoming new editors</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual support (e.g., mentoring programme)</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create information for new editors</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other support</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A large group see the time conflict with other Wikipedia activities and a lack of knowledge on how to support new editors as barriers to offering support.
Barriers to support – open text field (Q9)
Central issues (n=156)

- **Resource problem**: Not enough time, other commitments, continuous availability is difficult
- **Lack of experience**: Too new, too inexperienced myself
- **Lack of motivation**: Continuance of established / singular editors more important; no desire to engage with Wikipedia’s system of rules, no personal advantage
- **Reputation of Wikipedia / German Wikimedia**: WMDE not worth being supported, other language version are more tolerant, bad reputation of Wikipedia (editors and contents), lack of sustainable structures (money for unofficial editors)
- **Offline-support preferred**: Support of regional / local contacts
- **Atmosphere**: Manners, conflicts, old male top-dogs, lack of social competence in some admins
- **Questionable motivation of new editors**: Single page accounts, self-depiction
- **Lack of foundation at Wikipedia**: Easy to understand FAQ section, good tutorials, lack of guidelines, edits by new editors hard to identify
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Half of the participants find a mentoring program helpful, a majority find the question-formats as rather helpful.

**Helpfulness of support options (Q10)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support Option</th>
<th>Very Helpful</th>
<th>Rather Helpful</th>
<th>Rather Not Helpful</th>
<th>Not Helpful</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>No Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring programme</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions by new editors</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Questions reg. Wikipedia</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welcome-messages</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wikipedia information</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support-Team (OTRS-Team)</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tearoom (test version)</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage within answer categories:*
- **Helpful**
- **Rather Helpful**
- **Rather Not Helpful**
- **Not Helpful**
- **Don't Know**
- **No Specification**
When deleting or applying major changes to an article by a new editor – what are common reasons for doing so? (n=680)
Formal standards: e.g., style, language, quality, no encyclopaedic style

Content deficits: e.g., quality, incomplete text
The communication with new editors is assessed as rather negative (sceptic, patronising, impatient, unfriendly).
At the same time, about 25% of the participants find the communication with new editors supportive.

How would you describe the communication with new editors within the German Wikipedia?
(n=672)
„80% positive, 20% negative – enough to scare them off. “
Consequences of low female participation (Q13 & Q14)
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Most language versions of Wikipedia have a very low female participation. **Which consequences do you assume regarding the following aspects within Wikipedia? [n=686]**

- **negative consequences**
  - 25%
  - 47%
  - 58%

- **positive as well as negative consequences**
  - 16%
  - 25%
  - 27%

- **positive consequences**
  - 4%
  - 3%
  - 3%

- **cannot make any assessment**
  - 21%
  - 23%
  - 43%

- **not specified**
  - 1%
  - 1%
  - 1%

**Percentage of the different consequences with the assessment categories**
Suggestions female participation – open question (Q14)

Central issues (answers n=293)

- **Specific ads on Wikipedia website:** Females recruit females, every editor recruits in their circle of friends, banners (looking for female editors), promoting female editors / role models
- **Targeted personal communication:** Universities, high schools, websites frequented by females, female knowledge-based professions, ...
- Address women via **content topics**, not via gender topic
- **Reduce technical barriers:** Make editing easier (e.g., WYSIWYG), offer regional (personal) introductions, ...
- **Improve atmosphere:** Improve manners / atmosphere, increased punishment of machismo & sexism
- Ease **relevance criteria**
- **Refusal of question:** The question in itself is discriminatory; higher female participation not necessary; if more females wanted to participate, they would; it is not possible (to win more females); it is not important
In most language versions of Wikipedia, female participation is very low. **Which consequences do you assume for ...**

**Agreement in percentage within the consequence "diversity" split according to gender**

- **Negative consequences**: Male (59%), Female (46%), Other (15%)
- **Positive and negative consequences**: Male (17%), Female (15%), Other (8%)
- **Positive consequences**: Male (2%), Female (8%), Other (3%)
- **Cannot make any assessment**: Male (22%), Female (15%), Other (13%)

![Graph showing agreement percentages](image)
In most language versions of Wikipedia, female participation is very low. Which consequences do you assume for ...

... the quality of the articles?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male (n=589)</th>
<th>Female (n=66)</th>
<th>Other (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative consequences</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive as well as negative consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive consequences</td>
<td></td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot make any assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agreement in percentage within the consequence "quality" split according to gender
Consequences of low female participation (Q13)
Answers split according to gender – Atmosphere

In most language versions of Wikipedia, female participation is very low.

Which consequences do you assume for ...

![Chart showing the percentage of responses for different consequences of low female participation, split by gender.]

- Negative consequences: 47% male, 62% female, 23% other
- Positive consequences: 3% male, 5% female, 8% other
- Cannot make any assessment: 12% male, 24% female, 54% other
Consequences of low female participation (Q13)
Answers split according to gender – Reputation as source of info

In most language versions of Wikipedia, female participation is very low. Which consequences do you assume for ...

... Wikipedia's reputation as a reliable source of information?
[n=668]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Male (n=590)</th>
<th>Female (n=65)</th>
<th>Other (n=13)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative consequences</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive as well as negative consequences</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive consequences</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cannot make any assessment</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreement in percentage within the consequence &quot;reputation reliable source&quot; split according to gender</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Use of communication channels (Q15)

### Background & Aims

### Methodology

### RESULTS

#### How often to do communicate with other editors via...? [n=686]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Channel</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>No Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion sites</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal email, Wikimail</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing-lists</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC/Chat</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage within answer categories:
- often
- sometimes
- rarely
- not at all
- no specification
Personal meetings (Q16)
Filter question: Q16 only if Q15 included “personal”

RESULTS

How often do you personally meet other Wikipedia-actives at ...? [n=332]

- Regulars' tables
  - Often: 18%
  - Sometimes: 23%
  - Rarely: 22%
  - Not at all: 35%

- Project meetings (Wikipedia-related)
  - Often: 11%
  - Sometimes: 18%
  - Rarely: 21%
  - Not at all: 47%

- Private meetings (friends & acquaintances)
  - Often: 7%
  - Sometimes: 20%
  - Rarely: 25%
  - Not at all: 46%

- Conferences
  - Often: 7%
  - Sometimes: 14%
  - Rarely: 18%
  - Not at all: 59%

- Workshops
  - Often: 6%
  - Sometimes: 13%
  - Rarely: 17%
  - Not at all: 61%

- Edit-a-thons
  - Often: 7%
  - Sometimes: 8%
  - Rarely: 81%

Percentage within answer categories:
- Often
- Sometimes
- Rarely
- Not at all
- No specification
What were the answers to other survey questions from participants with / without / undecided willingness to support new editors in 2016?

- **Profile**
  - Gender (Q18),
  - Age (Q17)
- **Wikipedia-activity**
  - Number of active years (Q1),
  - Frequency of Wikipedia activity (Q2),
  - Type of activity (Q3)
- **Communication with other editors**
  - Use of communication channels (Q15),
  - Personal meetings

![Pie chart showing willingness to support new editors in 2016](chart.png)
Are you willing to support new editors in 2016? (n=675)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Are you willing to support new editors in 2016? (n=677)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Willingness/Age (n)</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20 years or younger (n=60)</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 (n=99)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 (n=110)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 (n=175)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60 (n=144)</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61-70 (n=61)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 years or older (n=28)</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Willingness to support new editors in 2016 – Activity
Number of active years (Q7 & Q1)
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78% of those willing to support new editors are active at Wikipedia several times a week or daily – but also two thirds of those not willing to support and those who are undecided.
Those willing to support new editors, show above average participation in project discussions and personal meetings.
Those willing to support new editors, communicate with others most frequently, especially via discussion sites.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Channel</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>No Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion sites</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal email / Wikimail</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing-lists</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC/Chat</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agreement in percentage*
Those not willing to support new editors, communicate less frequent – and when communicating, they do so on discussion sites.
Those undecided regarding their supporting of new editors, communicate more often than those who are not willing to offer their support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Communication Channel</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>No Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion sites</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal email / Wikimail</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing-lists</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social networks</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courier</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRC/Chat</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Agreement in percentage*
Those willing to support new editors, meet at regulars’ tables and project meetings; allo over, they meet personally more often than than those undecided or unwilling to offer support.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>No Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulars’ tables</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project meetings (Wikipedia-related)</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private meetings (friends &amp; acquaintances)</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit-a-thons</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Willingness to support in 2016 No – Communication
Personal meetings (Q7 & Q 16)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Not at All</th>
<th>No Specification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regulars' tables</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project meetings</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Wikipedia-related)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private meetings</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(friends &amp; acquaintances)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workshops</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conferences</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edit-a-thons</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Filter question: only asked if personal meetings were confirmed in earlier question)
How often do you personally meet other Wikipedia-actives at ...? (Willingness to support = DON'T KNOW, n=100)

(Filter question: only asked if personal meetings were confirmed in earlier question)

- **Regulars' tables**: 7% (often), 24% (sometimes), 28% (rarely), 40% (not at all), 4% (no specification)
- **Project meetings (Wikipedia-related)**: 15% (often), 30% (sometimes), 49% (rarely), 4% (not at all), 2% (no specification)
- **Private meetings (friends & acquaintances)**: 14% (often), 23% (sometimes), 58% (rarely), 4% (not at all), 3% (no specification)
- **Workshops**: 12% (often), 11% (sometimes), 73% (rarely), 3% (not at all), 1% (no specification)
- **Conferences**: 9% (often), 14% (sometimes), 76% (rarely), 2% (not at all), 1% (no specification)
- **Edit-a-thons**: 8% (often), 10% (sometimes), 93% (rarely), 2% (not at all), 1% (no specification)
Other comments / suggestions – open question (Q19)

Vital issues (n=330)

- **Technical aspects**: Make editing easier: Provide sample articles; Visual Editor; software out-dated; too many templates (reduces clarity); introduce button for editing on main page; overall layout should be systematised and simplified; ...
- **Atmosphere / culture**: Overall atmosphere is very negative and arrogant → discouraging; registration for active editing as requirement; go easy on new editors (puppy protection); blocking of editors and tougher punishment for breaking rules (e.g., edit-wars, offenses); establish code of ethics; professional conflict management; ...
- **Deleting articles**: Extremely frustrating; consider relevance criteria as criteria of inclusion, not exclusion; slow down form-freaks in favour of content; ...
- **Publicity**: Make the topic of editing visible – at schools (e.g., class projects), to the reader / within the article
- **Denial of topic**: There are less editors due to decrease in topic / knowledge gaps within Wikipedia
- **Rejection of the phrase**: „Welcome-culture“ as „Unwort“
Comments about the survey – open question (Q19)

Quotes

Wikipedia with the rules of officialdom:

It’s always been like this.

It’s never been like this.

Well, that’s what they all say.

The existing offers are more than sufficient. People who don’t know how to make use of them, we do not need as editors.

The tone of communication, also within tough discussions, needs to be more respectful. – The feud between inclusionists and exclusionists needs to be confined.

Improving the welcome-culture can no longer be undertaken at the expense of the Wikifants, who built up the project.
Conclusions

• **High number of participants** \((n = 686)\) despite short survey time: topic seems very relevant

• **High number of comments** provides many and diverse suggestions and remarks

• **Results confirm the necessity to improve the communication culture and the support offered to new editors within the German Wikipedia.**

• **Challenge:** Communication culture can be significantly disturbed by a small but active number of editors (8-10%) – as long as they are allowed to dominate.
• **Potential:** 42% of the participants are willing to commit to support new editors—this poses a great potential for offering special support to new editors. The 42% are those who are very active, communicative editors that also meet other editors personally.

• **Gender:** Improvement in addressing females and new editors in general calls for an overall improvement of the communication towards a culture of openness within the German Wikipedia.

• **Open questions:** a high number of helpful suggestions and comments, i.a. other Wikipedia communities (e.g., English) are less destructive (learning from them?); lack of enforcement of rules regarding disrupters; recognisability of new editors vs. vandals, etc.