Community Health Metrics / Editor Drop-off Questionnaire Report

May 2nd, 2022

Marc Miquel Ribé
David Laniado
Cristian Consonni

Abstract

- Community health has become commonplace in the Wikimedia discussions, but editors have different understandings and perceptions of the current state of it based on their personal roles and experience.
- There is no common understanding of the state of community health. Respondents tend to associate community health with the quality of the social interactions, whose consequences may go beyond their intent and can lead to editor drop-off and community decline.
- Respondents have generally taken Wikibreaks, sometimes for personal reasons (e.g., education), but other times to prevent retirement or to take some distance from conflict. A quarter of the respondents have considered retiring. Signaling Wikibreak is considered helpful to most of the respondents.
- The potential causes for editor drop-off that respondents identify are harassment, disagreements with wiki politics, and discussions on controversial topics.
- A majority of the respondents agree that having more possibilities of taking the responsibility (obtaining a user flag) could be helpful to encourage editors to participate.
- There is a general view that improving community health should be firstly a matter of a better culture and prevention activities (e.g., awareness, facilitation, discussions, etc.), and secondly, it should be addressed with a code that allows taking action against harassers.
- Respondents would find it helpful to have metrics that could allow them to understand and improve on the current state of community health and suggest some metrics related to editor drop-off, editor-editor interaction, and others more related to content.
- Almost all respondents would like to have a space within Wikimedia where everyone was invited to express their concerns related to the community and to learn about the topic, and to obtain a sense of the general state of the community.

1. Introduction

In the Movement, there have been some attempts at describing the factors that surround community health[1] and also to understand how to advance gender equity[2].

Similarly, we prepared and designed a questionnaire with open-ended questions to obtain opinions of selected Wikipedians with a long experience in the community or involved in community health matters.

With these questions, we want to:

- Collect general perceptions around how they feel about the current state of community health.
- Obtain a description of the process of retiring and the different states of editor drop-off.
- Validate the causes (e.g., from situations to spaces) that lead to editor drop-off and obtain more nuances on them.
- Generate ideas for potential research and design interventions to improve community health.

This questionnaire is created on the basis of the preliminary model of Wikipedia Editor Drop-off by Miquel-Ribé, Consonni and Laniado (2021).

---

[1] https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Learning_and_Evaluation/Community_Health_learning_campaign
[2] https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Gender_equity_report_2018

2. Methodology

4.1 Questionnaire design

The questionnaire is divided into four sections: introductory questions, drop-off, causes of drop-off, and solutions to community health, each of them aimed at the four objectives previously mentioned.

The questions were designed to be administered in a form, although participants were also given the option of a live interview and transcription of it. The questions have been made available on the project Website (Meta) page for anyone to discuss or add any remark.[3] If the reader wants to read the entire questionnaire, it is also attached to this document in the Appendix.

Answers were collected during a period of three months between July and September 2021.

4.2 Participants

Wikipedians with a long experience in the community with a presence in international events, or involved in community health matters (e.g., based on their participation in the creation of the Universal Code of Conduct[4]) were selected and contacted through e-mail or their user page.

Participants were also selected on the basis of the criteria of geography, underrepresented communities, and gender.

19 participants agreed to publish at least partially their answers anonymously. 13 agreed to publish them along with their names: Laura Fiorucci, Bobbyshabangu, Maor X, Sannita, Luigi Salvatore Vadacchino, Mannivu, Adrián Estévez Iglesias (Estevoaei), LuchoCR, Soylacarli, and Afifa Afrin.

As mentioned above, the sample consisted of 32 Wikimedians. A majority of participants were men (n = 19, 59.4%) whereas the remaining 40.6% were women (n = 13).

These are the language editions present in the sample that are related to western world countries: eswiki (6), itwiki (5), enwiki (4), cawiki (2), arwiki (2), rowiki, ukwiki, plwiki, orwiki, nowiki, ldwiki, knwiki, glwiki, and sqwiki.
These are the language editions of underrepresented languages present in the sample: pawiki, sswiki, zuwiki, igwiki (2), tlwiki, pagwiki, cbk-zamwiki, cebwiki, pamwiki, warwiki, bclwiki, ilowiki, and bnwiki.

On the first question, we asked participants to "tell us in a couple of sentences or three your involvement in the Wikimedia Movement." Taking into account the 32 participants in the questionnaire, we see they occupy a wide range of roles both online and offline all over the movement. They are all volunteers, but for two affiliate staff members, one of which started as an editor. 8 of them are sysops.

Many of the respondents are members of local affiliates and continue editing in their local Wikipedia. Half of them (16) mention the year they joined the movement (median 2008, mean 2008.9). The remaining respondents, not mentioning the precise year, claim to have taken many roles, and therefore one can deduce their tenure. They participate in or even lead GLAM activities, their local affiliates' boards, community building activities, community health strategy discussions, among others.

---

[3] https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Community_Health_Metrics/Drop-off_Questionnaire
[4] https://meta.wikimedia.org/wiki/Universal_Code_of_Conduct/Drafting_committee

4.3 Analysis

We collected answers that sum up to over 18,000 words. In order to make sense of the data, we will use an approach of analyzing qualitative text through thematic coding (Vaughn and Turner, 2016; Rädiker and Kuckartz, 2020).

This consists in organizing and highlighting meaning in the answers according to an encoding system that has been previously defined. Considering that one of the goals of the questionnaire is to validate the preliminary model of drop-off (Miquel-Ribé, Consonni, and Laniado, 2021), we have translated its concepts and hypotheses into the following hierarchical encoding system:

Encoding system

- community health: very unhealthy, unhealthy, neutral, healthy, very healthy
- states of drop-off:
  - wikibreak, retirement, semi-retirement
- drop-off causes:
  - external to the movement
  - internal to the movement
    - conflict
      - received reverts
      - discussions
      - harassment
      - controversial topics
      - membership/actions questioned
        - flag denied
        - block / ban
    - burnout
    - mission accomplished
    - no other editors with characteristics in common
- spaces
  - discussion pages

- user profiles:
  - cause of drop-off:
    - admins
  - effect of drop-off:
    - gender
    - newcomers

This structure has five different areas and two or three levels of depth. Questions are specifically directed toward the areas or the levels, which means that to some extent they will be expanded.

This approach allows us to identify new concepts that are on deeper levels or parallel to the existing ones , but were overlooked by the model. This will require updating the encoding system, which will be presented in Section 4.6.

At the same time, we obtain a diversity of genuine expressions to refer to the same concept. Once we have tagged the answers according to this coding system, we will count the tags to obtain quantitative outcomes. When possible, we take into account further dimensions of analysis such as gender or belonging to an underrepresented language community as defined in the previous section.

In addition to that, to accompany the analysis, we will make some statistical calculations in order to illustrate the data (length of the answers in number of words, average number of words).

Along with the analysis of the answers, we will highlight frequent expressions or examples of "common answers", if there are any.

4. Results

In this section, we present the results of the analysis divided by each of the areas and questions. In Section 4.1, we present the introductory general questions on the state of community health. In Section 4.2, we present questions concerning the states and process of editor drop-off. In Section 4.3, we present the analysis of the causes of drop-off. In Section 4.4, we present the analysis for the answers related to finding solutions. In Section 4.5 we present some general analyses and in Section 4.6 we show the updated encoding system with the new concepts added to it.

4.1 Community Health

Q1. How do you feel about the community atmosphere right now? Do you think it is healthy and encourages growth?

- Generally, community health is a topic respondents care about, and therefore, they wish to express their opinion with all the necessary nuances.
- We observe a diversity of perceptions with respect to whether Wikipedia is a friendly place, with no univoque view.
- In three respondents' comments, different spaces are highlighted as valuable to understanding community health. These are those in which editors communicate with each other, especially the "Tea space", "Village Pump" or "Café" (the same space in various languages). There is consensus that these can have a negative atmosphere.
- Even though they were not asked about what causes bad community health, they highlight the factors they think matter the most: a) communication in discussions, b) conflict resolution in favour of the experienced editor.
- Some also mentioned the presence of people pushing their own agenda, a too "professional"; "SilyconValley-styled" and cold environment; an obsession for making everything politically correct; attacks on the movement; polarization between centralization and decentralization of power.
- A couple of respondents point out that Wikipedia was not meant or designed to be a friendly space.
- Some respondents report conflict or harassment related to gender or political issues.
- Some respondents express their position of privilege and do not experience the same problems as others because of it.
- Three respondents think that newer or smaller communities are healthier.
- There is one mention of factors that are also problematic to newcomers, such as a complicated user interface.
- There is one mention of the potential risk of having a substantial number of experienced editors drop off.

Q2. When did you first start reflecting on community health?

- Reflecting on community health is not detached from reflecting on the causes of it. By looking at the answers, we start identifying the causes of drop-off from our model.
- Interest in community health for our respondents started either a) after a direct experience of incidents and unpleasant situations, b) after being introduced by other contributors (2 times), c) as part of their job or mission (e.g., ED to care about newcomers in underrepresented fields).
- Some factors influencing community health negatively are pointed out:
  - Battled discussions, personal attacks, passive-aggressive conversations
  - Newbies' speedy deletion is a thing. They have a terrible impact on newcomers.
  - Doxxing cases: search for and publish private or identifying information about (a particular individual) on the internet, typically with malicious intent.
- There is one surprising comment by one respondent: "community health is not a problem, people come and go."

Q3. Where do you get information to understand community health? Do you think there is agreement on its current state?

- Again, respondents consider that social spaces are key to understanding whether a community is healthy or not: social networks, Telegram, meta-wiki (mentioned twice), village pump (mentioned four times).
- One answer considers that community health is a term that is difficult to understand, and that, while there is a mainstream discussion on it, it is difficult to follow.
- Another answer points out that there is no common understanding of the term, or there is only a common understanding among a minority.
- Three other answers consider that it is not a priority of the experienced editors.
- Another answer points out that there is not enough interest around community health, despite editors being unhappy.

4.2 Editor Drop-off

Q4. Do you think it is helpful to know when other Wikipedians take a break from being active or retire?

- Every respondent considered that Wikibreaks are useful to editors.
- Two respondents stated that it would be useful to know when editors are on Wikibreaks to send presents or signs of gratitude.
- Generally, respondents consider that it is good that Wikibreaks are signaled. Twenty-five considered it useful that other editors signal they are on a Wikibreak, and that it is especially important for certain roles to know when you cannot count on them. The three negative views on the Wikibreak signaling are from respondents who consider that it should be kept as a choice to preserve the user's privacy.
- Some respondents reflect on the need to have more information on why editors take a break or retire. We highlight these two:
  - "We need an integrated system in the wiki to obtain the reasons why editors stop and deal with it."
  - "I think [Wikibreak signaling] is helpful, especially if they are involved in offline activities, but in general that should be a personal choice. Unless they leave because of conflicts. Then I think it should be helpful to know why and how to help so that doesn't happen again."
  - These comments suggest or imply that having more nuanced data on the activity state of the editor could be helpful, either to try to revert the possible retirement or to

simply try to address the general community health. Based on this need, an integrated solution could be designed to collect information and generate community health indicators.

Q5. Have you ever considered retiring? Have you spent periods in semi-retirement (decreasing the activity) or in inactivity (wiki-breaks)?

- All these possibilities are very familiar to respondents. We counted the reasons they give for every choice.
  - Respondents have taken Wikibreaks (16x).
    - Because of personal reasons; education; etc. (5x).
    - As a way to avoid retirement (3x).
    - To take some distance from those things they disagree with within the movement (2x).
  - Respondents considered retirement (8x).
  - Respondents plan to semi-retire or, in other words, decrease their wiki-activity (2x).

Q6. Was it only due to external reasons, or also related to some community dynamics or interactions?

- Some of the factors that respondents pointed out as possible causes of retirement are:
  - Attacks and harassment (5x)
  - Tired of wikipolitics / not shared values (3x)
  - Controversial topics
- The respondents mainly considered that leaving was mostly due to reasons related to Wikimedia (21x) in opposition to reasons external to the movement (11x); five respondents reported both internal and external reasons.
- No reason that was not included in our model was mentioned.

Q7. Do you know when someone might be about to leave Wikipedia? How do you know?

- Many respondents' answers explain they can perceive the potential reasons why others leave: harassment, community power dynamics, receiving criticisms, calling in social spaces, being pressured by others, experiencing a lack of appreciation, and being mentally abused. These are factors that can be objectified in social spaces, and therefore it is possible to assess the risk of someone specific/group of editors leaving.
- Generally, editors think other editors leave silently.
  - Eight respondents said that they do not know if an editor will leave or if she or he has left.
  - Only three respondents said that other Wikipedians told them directly their intentions to leave.
  - Two respondents say it is very complicated to know and that it can be very sudden.

Q8. Have you noticed someone leaving because of or after explicitly saying that they cannot deal with a particular situation anymore?

- Yes (18x), No (6x)

4.3 Causes of Drop-off

Q9. What are the situations that drain editors' energy?

- These are the situations mentioned in respondents' comments:

- ○ Conflict and discussions (20x). Discussions are often described as "endless", "constant" or "senseless".
- ○ Harassment (6x).
- ○ Non-constructive attitude (3x).
- ○ Deleted articles (3x).
- ○ Lack of recognition.
- ○ No answer to their requests.
- ○ Having problems and non-tech skills.

Q10 What kinds of situations do you think are more demotivating for you and an average editor (e.g., receiving reverts, participating in heated discussions, editing controversial pages...)?
- ● These are the situations mentioned in the respondents' comments:
  - ○ Discussions (21x).
  - ○ Reverts (9x).
  - ○ Deletions (6x).
  - ○ Controversial pages (4x).
  - ○ Power dynamics (3x).
  - ○ No answers to their requests (2x).
  - ○ No recognition.

Q11. Do you think there are specific profiles of editors (e.g., by gender) that tend to be more affected by this kind of situation?

- ● Among the group of women, 4/10 recognize that women may be more affected by the mentioned situations. 2/10 women consider that this is related to the editor psychology.
- ● Among the whole group, 11 respondents consider that women and gender minorities are usually more affected by these situations, 7 consider that these affect everyone, 5 that they impact more newcomers, and 1 considers that LGBT+ people are more affected.

Q12. Have you seen any editor who has been blocked or questioned leave after that incident?
- ● Yes (22x), No (8x), and Not sure (1).
- ● If the general perception from respondents is accurate, perhaps there should be further engagement with blocked or questioned editors to explore the possibilities of re-engaging them.
- ● Two respondents' comments explain the situation of being questioned:
  - ○ "I'd say so. This happens with a certain frequency with newbies that have a hard time because of conflict of interest in their very first editions, things escalate, and they decide to give up."
  - ○ "Many. Why would they stay? This is not even paid. So if you do something as a volunteer and in return receive questioning and blame, why would you stay? (this was my reflection also when I considered retiring offline)."

Q13. Have you seen any editor who has left after a moment of "burnout" because of an excess of tasks? Do you want to describe it?
- ● No (12x), Yes (7x).
- ● From respondents' comments, we can see a potential link between burnout and conflict. For example, this comment explains the interactions between editors in a near burnout situation:

- ○ "I think it happens many times. While people may not articulate that this is a direct reason for them leaving you may see a pattern: engaged editors start to talk about having a lot of work, after a time they communicate a lack of hope of successfully doing all the necessary work in the project, then they become harsh and cynical. And after that, they either just stop editing or engage in a conflict and then leave. While in the latter the conflict is the direct reason to leave, the reality is that burnout resulted in that person being more likely to engage in conflict and as a result, leave."
- ● Another respondent' description of burnout is also valuable:
  - ○ "I wouldn't say burnout comes as a result of too many tasks on the projects. It usually comes, in my personal experience as well as from cases I witnessed, from interactions going 'the wrong way'.

    If you have too many tasks on the project, nobody will ever question you for "abandoning" them, because, in the end, we're volunteers. Having too many people questioning your edits, or behaving aggressively, or dealing with patrolling and/or copyvio is much more taxing on someone's mental health.

    It is slightly different when you act on behalf of the chapters, especially if you hold a position. The role you have makes you a bit more responsible for not answering (in time or at all), and that might make you more prone to burnout."

Q14. Do you think some editors may be discouraged from editing because of a feeling of isolation? e.g., unable to interact with other editors with similar characteristics (registration time, gender, etc.)?

- ● Yes (19x), No (8x).
- ● Generally, the need to feel part of a community is very present in the answers.
- ● Newcomers are mentioned on 5 occasions as a type of editor who may need the community much more. Two comments specify aspects that impact the newcomers' experience in addition to isolation:
  - ○ "Difficult UI and policies."
  - ○ "Ineffective mentorship."
- ● There is no answer explicitly addressing homophily (editors requiring other editors with similar characteristics, e.g., same gender, same interests).

4.4 Solutions

Q15. Which kind of actions do you think we are missing to improve community health?

- These are the most mentioned actions:
  - Spaces and actions for sensitization, conflict resolution, and creating a culture for prevention (6x). This would include raising awareness, facilitation, small-scale community discussions, surveys outside "the establishment, i.e., WMF".
  - Work on dialogue, empathy, tolerance to create a better atmosphere (4x)
  - Action against harassers based on a code like the Universal Code of Conduct (3x).
  - Dedicated roles to community health (3x).
  - Train, educate, and look out for sysops to make sure they do not abuse their power (3x).
  - Understanding editors' motivation and needs, for each community (2x)
  - Attention to newcomers (2x).
  - Attention and support to veteran editors (2x)
  - More fun time and activities (2x)
  - Tools for sysops to fight trolls.

Q16. Are there any indicators about community and interaction dynamics that you think could be helpful to understand and improve the current state of community health (e.g., controversy indicators over time)?

- Respondents' answers generally refer to the negative factors that influence community health and editor drop-off.
- Some metrics were suggested as possible indicators of community health. We highlight the following ones:
  - related to the community members and drop-off:
    - ratio of experienced editors/newcomers.
    - number of "veterans" who leave the project every year. / number of editors dropped-off.
  - related to the editor interactions:
    - number of blocks of experienced users
    - occurrence of certain keywords in discussions
    - demands for conflict resolution/conflict reports in the Wikimedia Foundation "Trust and Safety" department.
    - length of discussions about issues, RFD, RFC, etc.
  - related to editor content interactions:
    - number of revert chains
    - number of categories for discussion.
    - number of tasks taken by a small group (potential burnout risk indicator).
    - centralization of the discussion around one single voice.
    - "controversy indicator".
    - drops in edits, changes in topics, and dropping out of discussions.
    - pages for cancellation procedures.
- One answer expresses the importance of "access to a like-minded person in the community" (homophily) even though it might not be related to the question.

Q17. Do you think having more opportunities or paths to take responsibility/obtain user flags could encourage editors to stay longer on Wikipedia or participate more?
- Yes (12x), maybe (6x), not sure (4x), no (11x).

Q18. Do you think there should be roles or spaces where editors could explain how they feel about the current atmosphere in the community?

- Almost everyone agrees that it would be good to have such spaces. Yes (31x).
- The answers hint at some possible characteristics of such "community health-related spaces". They should be spaces:
    - where everyone would go, not just veterans and newcomers.
    - where people could speak anonymously.
    - where people could express their opinions freely, without feeling vulnerable to subsequent attacks.
    - where someone would listen and always answer.
    - where feedback could be processed and digested in a useful way to understand the general state of community health.
    - where people could follow the statistics on community health.

- We would like to highlight one of the comments highlighting the diversity of spaces in which editors communicate:
    - "Yes. This is a must. There should be one in Wiki, but also others outside, on social media, and on the WMF page somewhere (Affcom or Trust and safety page? - but after that Affcom and T&S are radically changed, of course :D :D)."

4.5 General analysis

The aims of this questionnaire were to collect general perceptions around the state of community health as well as understand the causes of editor drop-off, and ultimately, generate some potential solutions to work on it.

- Community health has become commonplace in the Wikimedia discussions, but editors have different understandings and perceptions of the current state of it based on their personal role and experience.
- There is no common understanding of the state of community health. Respondents tend to associate community health with the quality of the social interactions, whose consequences may go beyond the intent of the specific topic of the interaction, and lead to editor drop-off and community decline.
- According to respondents' answers, one of the places concentrating social interactions that can be more harmful to community health is the Village Pump and its equivalent in different languages.
- Respondents have generally taken Wikibreaks, sometimes for personal reasons (e.g., education), but other times to prevent retirement or to take some distance from conflict. A quarter of the respondents have considered retiring. Signaling Wikibreak is considered helpful to most of the respondents.
- It is very hard according to respondents' answers to identify when an editor will drop-off, although in some cases editors communicate their intent to leave to one another.
- The potential causes for editor drop-off that respondents identify are harassment, disagreements with Wikipolitics, and discussions on controversial topics.
- Other situations that drain editors' energy and may demotivate editors are, on the one hand, receiving reverts, deletions, and no answer to their requests, and on the other hand, not being recognized and power dynamics.

- Almost half of the women respondents considered that women tend to be more affected by the mentioned factors. Other respondents considered it something very related to individual psychology and hence not generalizable.
- Respondents mainly consider that being blocked or questioned creates a situation in which a user is likely to leave, and therefore, there could be an opportunity to establish effective communication and re-engage that person.
- Newcomers should receive special attention as they face the risk of feeling isolated from the community. Respondents suggest improving the mentorship, UI, and policies' clarity.
- A majority of the respondents agree that having more possibilities of taking the responsibility (obtaining a user flag) could be helpful to encourage editors to participate.
- There is a general view that improving community health should be firstly a matter of fostering a culture of dialogue, tolerance, empathy, and prevention activities (e.g., raising awareness, facilitation, conflict resolution, spaces for discussion, etc.), and secondly, it should be addressed with a code that allows taking action against harassers.
- Respondents would find it helpful to have metrics that could allow them to understand and improve on the current state of community health and suggest some metrics related to editor drop-off, editor-editor interaction, and others more related to content.
- Almost all respondents think it would be helpful to have a space within Wikimedia where everyone is invited to express their concerns related to the community and to obtain a sense of the general state of the community.

4.6 Updated encoding system

After going through the answers, we have detected some gaps in our preliminary model of editor drop-off (Miquel-Ribé, Consonni, and Laniado, 2021) and subsequent encoding system. Therefore, we took the occasion to add some nuance to each of the different parts defining it. We highlight in bold and underline the new additions to the encoding system.

Encoding system

- community health: very unhealthy, unhealthy, neutral, healthy, very healthy
- states of drop-off:
  - wikibreak, retirement, semi-retirement
- drop-off causes:
  - external to the movement
  - internal to the movement
    - conflict
      - received reverts
        - received deleted article
      - discussions
        - **meta pages**
      - harassment
      - controversial topics
      - membership/actions questioned
        - flag denied
        - block / ban
    - burnout
    - mission accomplished
    - no other editors with characteristics in common

- **culture of "edit countitits"**
- **tired of wikipolitics / not shared values**
- **no answer from others (e.g., WMF)**
- spaces
  - discussion pages
  - **user talk pages**
  - **"tea space" or cafe**
- user profiles:
  - cause of drop-off:
    - admins
    - **veterans**
  - effect of drop-off:
    - gender
    - newcomers
- **solutions**
  - **universal code of conduct**
  - **affcom and trust and safety**
  - **fostering a culture of dialogue, tolerance and prevention**
    - **in-person meetings**
    - **small scale community discussions**
    - **surveys outside "the establishment, i.e., WMF"**
    - **fun activities**
  - **training and monitoring admins**
  - **specific roles dedicated to community health**
  - **space for expressing own feelings and perceptions on community health, and giving feedback**

4. References

Vaughn, P., & Turner, C. (2016). Decoding via coding: Analyzing qualitative text data through thematic coding and survey methodologies. *Journal of Library Administration*, *56*(1), 41-51.

Rädiker, S., & Kuckartz, U. (2020). Focused analysis of qualitative interviews with MAXQDA. MAXQDA Press: Berlin, Germany.

Appendix.

These are the questions administered through the form.

Community Health

- Q0: Could you tell us in a couple of sentences or three your involvement in the Wikimedia Movement?
- Q1: How do you feel about the community atmosphere right now? Do you think it is healthy and encourages growth? Do you think Wikipedia is a friendly place?
- Q2: When did you first start reflecting on community health?
- Q3: Where do you get information to understand community health? Do you think there is agreement on its current state?

Drop-off

- Q4: Do you think it is helpful to know when other Wikipedians take a break from being active or retire?
- Q5: Have you ever considered retiring? Have you spent periods in semi-retirement (decreasing the activity) or in inactivity (wiki-breaks)?
- Q6: Was it only due to external reasons, or also related to some community dynamics or interactions?
- Q7: Do you know when someone might be about to leave Wikipedia? How do you know?
- Q8: Have you noticed someone leaving because of or after explicitly saying that they cannot deal with a particular situation anymore?

Situations and profiles

- Q9: What are the situations that drain editors' energy?
- Q10: What kinds of situations do you think are more demotivating for you and an average editor (e.g., receiving reverts, participating in heated discussions, editing controversial pages...)?
- Q11: Do you think there are specific profiles of editors (e.g., by gender) that tend to be more affected by this kind of situation?
- Q12: Have you seen any editor who has been blocked or questioned leave after that incident?
- Q13: And after a moment of "burnout" because of an excess of tasks? Do you want to describe it?
- Q14: Do you think some editors may be discouraged from editing because of a feeling of isolation? e.g., unable to interact with other editors with similar characteristics (registration time, gender, etc.)?

Solutions

- Q15: Which kind of actions do you think we are missing to improve community health?
- Q16: Are there any indicators about community and interaction dynamics that you think could be helpful to understand and improve the current state of community health (e.g., controversy indicators over time)?
- Q17: Do you think having more opportunities or paths to take responsibility/obtain user flags could encourage editors to stay longer on Wikipedia or participate more?
- Q18: Do you think there should be roles or spaces where editors could explain how they feel about the current atmosphere in the community?