Editing Tasks Survey

Design Research Team | Abbey Ripstra | Daisy Chen | Kaity Hammerstein | March 2015

Methodology

- Survey built in Qualtrics; to date there have been 745 responses
- We asked participants about:
  - the frequency at which they perform a variety of editing tasks on Wikipedia
  - approximately how much time they spend editing per month
  - approximately how many edits they make per month
  - their general feedback on Visual Editor and Wikitext Editor
- From the results, we pulled numbers and qualitative findings from within the participant subcategories (new, casual, and experienced editors) and also looked for trends in feedback across all participant types

Goals

- Understand "basic editing tasks" for new, casual and experienced editors
- Gather feedback from new, casual and experienced editors on wikitext editor and VE

Who Participated?

Total of 726 respondents

Fewer than 5 edits = 102 participants
5-100 edits in a month = 333 participants
100 + per month = 291 participants

High Level Findings Summary

Most frequently done tasks for brand new, casual and experienced contributors:

(only difference across the three types of users is that the experienced editors rate "add / edit text (sentences and paragraphs) above "add / edit text (small typos and grammar)

1. Add / edit text (small typos and grammar)
2. Add / edit text (sentences and paragraphs)
3. Add a wikilink
4. Add / edit a citation
5. Format text

Most frequent other tasks people do besides basic editing:

1. Reverting vandalism (new 1 / casual 16 / experienced 23)
2. Admin actions (casual 2 / exp 10)
3. Advanced image action (casual 3 / exp 4)
4. Template-related (casual 2 / exp 5)
5. Tagging/categories (casual 2 / exp 4)

Feedback on Wiki text editor

Tables are really hard

Experienced editors prefer it as they are familiar with it and have gone up the learning curve to figure it out. Some experienced editors think everyone should do the same learning they had to do, other editors think editing should be easier, and VE is easier for new editors.

It is not intuitive for new users.

It works well and is consistent for those who know how to use it

Some casual and experienced editors are afraid WTE will be phased out.

A lot of requests specifically for a syntax highlighter and also other gadgets and features

Requests for better help and tutorials

Feedback on Visual Editor

Some casual editors say there are things they can't do in VE that they can do in WTE

Some trust issues - (not knowing what VE is actually doing VS what it looks like it is doing)

Some (30) experienced editors say they will never use VE, they prefer WTE.

Some experienced editors say they will never use it, but it might be useful for others

A few experienced editors think VE is confusing and complicated.

A few experienced and casual editors think VE will be good

Some hate of VE was expressed as expected. (20 casual and 30 experienced)

Casual editors shared some compliments

4 experienced editors said they think the VE project has been poorly managed

A few feature requests (many of which have been done :)

Task Difficulty

Most difficult tasks for new and casual contributors :

Very hard: Add / edit tables or citations (it's a tie with citations for new contributors)

Hard: Add / edit tables

Add a wikilink

Add / edit a citation

Format text

Open Feedback for Wikitext Editor

I like it and am familiar with it!

Like it/familiar with it (experienced editors 30)

- 28b "I am used to use the Wikitext Editor, I only sometimes try the Visual Editor in stead and only for small corrections. I find it easier with the Wikitext Editor."
- 46b "Once you learn it, it is easy and preferred. I am a software developer so I am more partial to raw editing. I widely use the Cite, Sfn, and Sfnm templates; there should be a faster and easier way to use those useful templates."
- 52b "You guys are asking the wrong person... I don't have a problem with the markup editor, but I've been using MediaWiki for almost 10 years and I'm a software developer. The problem is it's difficult for almost everyone else."
- 57b "Once you've figured out the wiki syntax basics, it's quite easy to use. To learn new tricks, I study examples on existing pages."
- 105b "After 8½ years the Wikitext Editor is like an old, reliable friend."
- 178b "I prefer this version (the basic html version aka "the old way") because it's what I know and what I'm used to. I suppose that Visual Editor could be easier for newer users to edit with, but because it was so different and because I'm used to the other style (more control over edits) I just prefer to use this way."

It works well

- b12 *"This is what I use all of the time. It seems fairly simple to me."* (n)
- *"It is nearly 100% reliable and consistent."* (c)
- 12B *"I'm pretty accustomed to wikitext and find it faster and more straightforward/precise than trying to make a visual text editor do what I want."* (c)
- 51b *"I like working with the wikitext editor, I feel that I have better control over how I place tables and photos;"* (c)
- 98 *"Basically flawless. Very useful."* (c)
- 85b *"It works well, and it allows a lot of flexibility in going about one's business."* (e)
- 89b *"It works just fine. Generally, I know what I am going to get."* (e)
- 96b *"It is simple and straighforward, and for all that it exposes the editor to raw wikitext (and thus places the responsibility for knowing such skills as this survery ponders on the editor), at least it doesn't screw up, and it doesn't do bizaare things"* (e)
- 112b *"A good general purpose editor, integral to the construction of Wikipedia."* (e)

WTE is not intuitive for new users

Not intuitive for new users/some things difficult (new 7 / casual 26 / experienced 16)

- b11 *"I find it complex and non-intuitive. I would use it a great deal more if it was easier to use."* (n)
- b6 *"Wikitext editor is clumsy, confusing and archaic. It needs a major overhaul. There is no design consistency among the templates for info boxes and they are impossible to modify. / There is nothing easy, intuitive or straightforward about editing Wikipedia Commons sites and this is a major impediment to contributors who have a lot to give in terms of content but give up trying to climb the steep learning curve of the content management system as well as the bureaucratic cabal of the senior editors, who are also inconsistent in their interpretation of policy."* (n)
- 69b *"Wikitext Editor really sucks, it's nothing, has no help, any work you gonna do, you should check out a very long, randomly sorted, hard to find list of Wiki help and instruction pages, and still you're not sure you're editing the text the right way. it's easier for me to learn piloting a fighter jet than learning the tricks of editing hypertext in Wikitext Editor."* C

WTE is not intuitive for new users

Not intuitive for new users/some things difficult (new 7 / casual 26 / experienced 16)

- 74 *"I wish that putting a space at the beginning of a paragraph didn't put all the text into a weird box that almost no one ever intentionally makes."* (c)
- 101 *"Formatting requires a lot of information about codes. There seems to be no easy way to review all of the formatting options."* (c)
- 84 *"It sometimes takes me far too long to locate the template I want -- there are so many of them, and their names are not always intuitive."* (c)
- 158 *"Tasks like tables, lists and text formatting are still tricky for me to remember and there is not a lot of help in the editor."* (c)
- 41b *"The editor itself is fine. The markup language could use some work. Some stuff is just downright cryptic (eg why do you have to use a vertical bar to name a link within wikipedia (eg [[Particle Physics|My Name]]) but you need a space character for external links (eg [http://theParticlaPhysicsPlace.com My Name]. /"* (e)
- 142b *"It takes a little getting used to and may be off-putting for beginners."* (e)
- 146b *"It scares away the newbies"* (e)

Fear that WTE will be phased out

Fear of WTE going away (casual 5 / exp 5 (2 from VE feedback section))

- Yes. Most certainly keep it around. Removing it might make me stop editing completely. (c)
- Don't remove it. (c)
- I'll simply stop editing Wikipedia the day it will be dropped and completely replaced by Visual Editor. (c)
- Keep the basic editor as default. Do not adopt the Wikia editor. Wikia is too bloated and never works. (c)
- Don't ever get rid of it until/unless it's clear that it's almost never used (i.e. maybe in a decade you can ditch it). (c)
- Significantly changing or depreciating it is not something I'd support. (e)
- A PERFECTLY WORKING VE would be a more user-friendly alternative, as long as the option for wikitext editing remains a possibility. (e)
- Been at it since 2005 and always found it easy to use. Which of course leads to being resistant to change. (e)
- I hope it never becomes the only option (or a default one). (e, from VE feedback section
- Using Visual Editor is very difficult. It's very easy to use wikitext editor. I don't know, why Visual Editor is considered for Wikipedia! If some day using Visual editor would be the only way for editing in Wikipedia, I would not be participating in editing in Wikipedia any more. (e, from VE feedback section)

Syntax highlighting, other gadget requests

Gadgets/syntax help (new 1 / casual 18 / exp 10)

- You need to have open/close bulleted list capability like they use with twiki at CERN. You need to have a decent tutorial/help for syntax. (n)
- more bulleted/numbered list options (2)
- tutorial/help for syntax
- syntax highlighter (user configurable mention) (15)
  - Big chunks of syntax for references are a little annoying though, muddying up the screen when you're trying to edit text. I'd like syntax highlighting maybe. (OK, there's probably an extension for syntax highlighting, but I haven't really looked into it.) Or maybe just visually-collapsed references within wikitext. ©
  - A user-configurable code highlighter would be useful. ©
  - It's a lot easier to use with syntax highlighting enabled and is generally quicker for small edits than Visual Editor. ©
  - If the Wikitext Editor window did code highlighting like many other source code editors already do, then that would help a lot! ©
  - Syntax highlighting should be integrated into the editor. (c)
- I think my prefered editor would be in wikitext but with all templates, refs, tables etc as collapsable elements and a right click menu that let you add new elements via a HotCat-like suggestion box. (c)
- What I need in there is more links to Wikipedia-specific notice and infobox templates so that I don't have to go looking. I'm an experienced MediaWiki editor but I spend most of my editing time away from Wikipedia, so I don't know all of the local templates. (c)
- syntax check on formatting cites
- preview of footnotes/citations (2)
  - The preview of footnotes and citations is missing - so some errors can't be caught early. / A syntax check on formating tags would be helpful. / Sometimes editing of just the introduction would help - currently need to edit whole article. (c)
- References are not displayed when editing a section. This has to wait until the whole page has been saved. / / The reference template needs bring into line with the current naming standards. It would be nice if the inserted date used the same format as the rest of the category - there is frequenty a date format template. / / Where there are several numbered lists a way of selecting letters would be nice. (c)

Syntax highlighting, other gadget requests (continued)

Gadgets/syntax help (new 1 / casual 18 / exp 10)

- feature that gathers information for cite just from providing url (2)
  - It would be useful to have a feature that automatically gathered information from a website (such as responsible organisation) just by providing the link. (c)
- auto-find wikilinks to redirects and replace them by article (2)
  - It should live and automatically find wikilinks to redirects and replace them by the article, to which the redirect directs (c)
- glossary names sections of wiki article and links to info about templates, syntax, etc. (2)
  - one of the most difficult things as a new editor was looking things up when you don't know what they're called ... there needs to be a "map" of the sections of a standard wikipedia article that names them and links to the information about the relevant templates, syntax etc. (like a kind of glossary) (c)
  - Link to a complete reference of notations at the edit page is needed. / A simpler way for indenting paragraphs. / An equation editor as in Microsoft word is needed. (c)
- Link to a complete reference of notations at the edit page is needed. / A simpler way for **indenting paragraphs**. / An equation editor as in Microsoft word is needed. (c)
- equation editor
- \<poem\> to insert bar
- reftoolbar enabled by default

Templates (casual 1 / exp 4)

- reference template needs bring into line with the current naming standards
- The main problem with editing the text is that people keep changing the templates, particularly the citation templates.
- I think most edtiors can (and do?) add simple templates like {{anchor}}, {{cn}}, or even {{quote}}. More complex templates, like {{cite}}, are a different story..
- It can sometimes be a pain to find the correct template name needed for a task.
- using templates (like references) can still be a headache though.

Requests for Tutorials / Help

- I'm pretty experienced so overall I don't have a problem with it, but for newer editors it must be extremely confusing. I work a lot with brand-new editors at AFC, and a huge number of them get very frustrated trying to do things like even make section headings, add citations (you can tell from their errors that they tried to understand the material since they get it partway right but still mess up), etc. / / I strongly believe that especially for AFC "Article Wizard" there should be something even simpler than Visual Editor, like a "Type your section heading here" and "to add a source to this sentence you just wrote, click here and fill out the form". We must be losing thousands of potential new editors because they get frustrated with the initial process. Also, a *huge* problem is that a ton of new article submissions fail Notability. We really need to beat folks over the head with a "if you don't have any sources, this is not going to get published, if you only have sources to the subject's own webpage, it won't be published. Here's a 10-second summary of how Notability works so you can see what you *must* do if you want your article to be accepted/survive (something like [[WP:42]])".
- I think it would be nice if some of the more common tasks, like how to add the link to a diff to a comment on a talk page, were explained somewhere that is easily accessible.
- Most of these errors are caused as simple mistakes the user missed creating, or new users who dont know and should be pointed to the help info (i.e. images page, the deletion page, cant hotlink page, etc...)
- finding out how to write syntax for templates, tables, citations etc can be time-consuming when the exact syntax is unknown to me.

Open Feedback for VE

Cross user findings

Can't do things in VE I can do in WTE

Casual editors (19 responses) - here are some examples:

- *"It is limited. Very clumsy in adding references"*
- *"It is not powerful enough to make bigger changes such as changing font style, adding parameters in infobox etc"*
- *"The most important thing that needs fixing is the ability to edit infoboxes. It's not intuitive."*
- *"table editing functions aren't good enough yet."*
- *"Lacks all the features to make it a viable replacement for the wikitext editor and I often find it cumbersome to use."*
- *"I have found it very frustrating trying to add a photo to a Wikipedia page."*
- *"It couldn't do citations at that time, and since I'm already comfortable with the old editor, I went back to the devil I knew."*

Trust issues

- 16 *"I don't use it because I don't trust it. / I feel it makes unintended changes."* (c)
- 110 "*I find the Visual Editor not sufficiently powerful to perform most of the tasks I want to perform, or if it does, I don't feel sure enough that I've done what I want to do."* (c)

Note(We also heard from some casual editors in the editing experience research (people with some programing, technical expertise) that they don't like WYSYWIG editors in general, because they don't know what it actually does in the background - and they want to know.. Similar trust issue.

Will not use or try VE. Wte is better.

- I have no intention of switching to Visual Editor unless there are no other options available.
- I'm used to the old way and want it to stay as it is.
- Among the more challenging tasks, templates and citations, VE wasn't actually making them easier. For the simple stuff, it didn't seem worth the added waiting time to get things to load and process.
- I don't use it, I just love working with the source code.
- Is almost hard to understand.... I only work with wikitext
- I've not used visual editor much as most of my editing relates to templated data

Not going to use VE, but it might have some benefits...

Casual editors (6) experienced editors (18)

- Though I don't and won't use it regularly myself, I have tested it out a few times, and I like the way it's going, and think it's a great improvement that is very user-friendly.
- The basic functions of changing text, adding links etc. are easier to do without cluttered, confusing code and some may find it easier to complete more complex tasks with the editor too.
- I've heard from many newbie on our unofficial IRC help channel (#wikipedia-en-help) that they find it very helpful.
- I use too many complex templates for VE to be of any use to me, but it is fine for discussions on talk pages.
- The visual editor might be better for newer editors.
- "I've only used it a handful of times but for people new to editing and for more complex markup like tables and lists it seems like it would be extremely valuable. Echoing my previous response, for people new to Wikipedia asking them to learn all the ins and outs of Wikitext and Wikimarkup is setting a very high bar. The visual editor would be a much easier introduction." (c)
- "I believe VisualEditor is an excellent way to get new users to contribute; I just personally like the wikitext editor." (c)
- "Visual Editor not for experienced participants, most likely it is for beginners." (e)

VE is confusing and complicated

Experienced Editors (5)

- find it non-intuitive and confusing to do anything more complicated than typing prose and basic formatting. For citations, images, and so forth, I find it much easier to edit the page source directly.
- slow and lacking in functionality. Being unable to edit infoboxes made it of little use. Was disconcerted by the change to the appearance of pages. The worst problem was that it was controlled by text menus. I had to make an edit to a non-English wikipedia and found myself unexpectedly in theVisual Editor. The non-English menus were hard to follow. A nice set of icons would have made it easier to use.
- It's too complicated for editing templates.

Hate

casual (10) / experienced (20)

- 154 *"Harmful. People should learn to edit the source code to understand what actually is going on. Using Visual Editor prevents from doing so."* (c)
- c16 - *"I hate it. Can't tell what it's doing. /"* (e)
- c50 - *"Hate it! WMF introduced it too soon, with too little feedback from the editing community."* (e)
- c85 - This is useless. It simply is unusable. Frills are the last thing Wikipedia needs. It needs no frills, which is what the Wikitext editor provides. I just don't understand how to use the Visual Editor. It has animations, it doesn't allow easy modifications of templates or citation coding. It is just useless, and should be abolished. (e)
- c132 - Tried it a couple of times. Hated it. Note thatI am located on a small island in the Philippines and my connectivity is slow in human terms.
- c141 - Tried it, HATE IT!!!! Quite a bit of my editing is taken up by fixing the messes cause by VE. It is Still not an acceptably functional tool. / VE is completely useless for making or editing tables and it screws up many references.(e)
- c149 - Tried it once its horrible - also had to fix quite a few articles broken by users using it! / / Personaly I think a better approach would have more imediate feedback on markup added when usin the Wikitext editor. If say when a users adds [[File:http:/ or [[File: https:/ add something on the screen popped up and said not allowed, or when adding a file, wiki link, category, template something indicated if it was valid or not. If users know things are wrong maybe it will stop them just hitting save and degading the artciles. (e)
- c189 - I really dislike the visual editor because it messes up the source (at least at the beginning when I tried it). (e)

Compliments about VE

- 41 *"Makes some complex task easier. Nice"* (c)
- 43 *"Love it. Please keep improving for tables and other hard to edit bits and pieces :)"* (c)
- 74 *"It keeps getting better."* (c)
- 99 *"I love using it, it's definitely the way forward. Using it encourages me to make more substantial edits - it's very good at that."* (c)

VE Project said to be poorly managed

VE project poorly managed (exp 4)

- There has been plenty of feedback, and if the VE team can't take a hint from all that I don't see that my comments would be of any use.
- It was a great idea, much needed, and you blew it terribly. It would be better at this point to roll it back and have a competent team from within the editing community start from scratch: the programmers had no idea what we needed and did a terrible, buggy job anyway. I don't like visual editors in the first place, but the MediaWiki visual editor is a scandal. Which is a shame because many editors, especially some categories of new editors, could really use a good, intuitive visual editing interface.
- A flawed implementation of a deeply flawed concept. By trying to hide the underlying wikitext, it makes it impossible an editor to see the structure of the underlying article. For an encyclopedia that strives to have a consistent appearance and construction for all articles of a given type, the difficulty adding templates in a compatible structure, effectively cutting-and-pasting, and editing template-derived tables makes VE a non-starter.
- It was harder to use than Wikitext Editor. / It was released, indeed made the default editor, when it did not have a way to add references. It should never have been made the default editor while it did not allow the creation of references. / Apologists for the WMF damaged their own credibility by claiming that "most users prefer it".

Feature Requests

Casual (2) / exp (10)

- add a template for video including the time location within the content can be found
- a hybrid between the visual editor and the wikitext editor would give editors the chance to see change,
- The visual editor needs to get better at supporting citations.
- useful to be able to make the editing window larger.
- an "insert wikitext" option, that would bring up a separate dialogue box for free typing in of wikitext - there are some things I find easy/easier to do with wikitext, and it would be useful to copy, paste, and adjust wikitext from another article/page.
- would like to be able to perform text indentation
- would like to perform switching between VE and WikiText and back
- It is difficult to add a link
- Autocomplete for citations.
- Let it edit infoboxes.
- There are still issues around editing cells in a table, removing the last bullet in a bullet list, removing Multiple Issue template while keeping the other templates grouped inside, etc.

Appendix

Most Frequent Tasks

Most Frequent Tasks
New editors

New = Fewer than 5 edits / month

102 participants

1. Add or edit text (small)
2. Add or edit text (sentence / paragraph)
3. Add a wikilink
4. Add or edit a citation
5. format text

		Never	Once in a while	frequently	almost all the time	Total responses	
7	Add an image from Commons	74	23	3	0	100	1.29

Most Frequent Tasks
Casual editors

5-100 edits / month (Casual)

333 participants

1. Add or edit text (small)
2. Add or edit text (sentence / paragraph)
3. Add a wikilink
4. Add or edit a citation
5. format text

			Never		Once in a while		frequently		almost all the time		Total responses		
7	Add an image from Commons		95		182		47		11		335		1.92

Most Frequent Tasks Experienced editors

100+ edits / month (Experienced)

291 participants

1. Add or edit text (sentence / paragraph)
2. Add or edit text (small)
3. Add a wikilink
4. Add or edit a citation
5. Format text

		Never	| Once in a while	| frequently	| almost all the time	| Total responses	
7	Add an image from Commons	38	136	93	27	294	2.37

Most frequently done tasks: All

Add / edit text (small typos and grammar)

Add / edit text (sentences and paragraphs)

} Switched for experienced editors

Add a wikilink

Add / edit a citation

Format text

		Never		Once in a while		frequently		almost all the time		Total responses	
7	Add an image from Commons	207		341		143		38		729	2.02

Bugs reported

Cross user findings: VE Feedback

Casual (4) / exp (20)

- c13 - *"full of faults, doesn't work properly and should never have been released in the state it was in"* (e)
- c41 - *"In principle, I think it's a good thing - but every time I've tried it, it's been hopelessly broken and confusing. Changing text from boldface to italic (say) without knowing where it inserted the tags winds up being horribly confusing and broken. This is not unique to the Visual Editor - I find the exact same classes of problem in editors like wygEdit and tinyMCE. Try creating a project on Kickstarter (for example) and you'll find the exact same set of confusing screwups that Visual Editor has. The problem seems endemic to those kinds of editing paradigms. / / Wikitext take longer to learn (because you have to learn the markup) - but once you do, it's VASTLY easier to use than Visual Editor. / /"* (e)
- c71 - *"I never use it. I had the impression that it is fairly easy to "break" something in the article without noticing. Some otherwise easy editing tasks are difficult with VE."* (e)
- c74 - *"Issues: / 1) when adding/revising/deleting citations, the corresponding refs do not appear changed in <<preview>> mode. / 2) haven't yet figured out how to use Visual Editor for infoboxes or tables. Whatever the process, it's not intuitive like most of Visual Editor, which is mostly WYSIWIG."* (e)
- c140 - *"Speaking as a person involved in software quality control, I thought it was introduced with insufficient testing and is not sufficiently robust (in the technical QS sense). I still do not have sufficient confidence in it to use it more regularly. /"* (e)

Cross user findings: VE Feedback

Bugs/issues (casual 4 / exp 20) (what are the issues? list bugs and make sure they are fixed or in phab)

106 Cursor jumps on Google Chrome during editing, so I cannot start editing properly. (c)

15 if you don't save your edit soon enough then I can't do it and the whole work is lost.(c)

136 It seems to do some weird scrolling when I toggle between normal view and visual editor so I have to find my place again.(c)

172 Switching back and forth was unacceptably tedious.(c)

c27 - Still buggy. Filed some bugs and requests this week. Today's nit is that when you click edit on a section, it uses /* top */ instead of the section name. Still slow. I'd like to be able to add/remove items from an mi group without messing with brackets.

c41 - In principle, I think it's a good thing - but every time I've tried it, it's been hopelessly broken and confusing. Changing text from boldface to italic (say) without knowing where it inserted the tags winds up being horribly confusing and broken. This is not unique to the Visual Editor - I find the exact same classes of problem in editors like wygEdit and tinyMCE. Try creating a project on Kickstarter (for example) and you'll find the exact same set of confusing screwups that Visual Editor has. The problem seems endemic to those kinds of editing paradigms. / / Wikitext take longer to learn (because you have to learn the markup) - but once you do, it's VASTLY easier to use than Visual Editor. / /

c47 - The last time I used it, the "object" (link, image, template) boundaries were so vague that it was difficult to select the material to change or delete.

c74 - Issues: / 1) when adding/revising/deleting citations, the corresponding refs do not appear changed in <<preview>> mode. / 2) haven't yet figured out how to use Visual Editor for infoboxes or tables. Whatever the process, it's not intuitive like most of Visual Editor, which is mostly WYSIWIG.

c117 - Adding references is really cumbersome, with a lot of crazy assumptions. One of the most important things that is either missing or well-hidden is giving a specific page number with-in a cited article. For example, I want to cite Doe, John (1919) "Missing People," <ital>Poe Journal</ital> 666 (1): 235-813, with my specific quotation on p. 666. / / In general, VE, with its icons is opaque to me. And the explanation pages are usually not much help. I have slowly figured out things -- often only with the help of other editors -- so that now it is usually relatively easy to use (except for parts that I have given up on -- and there are a number of them), but the learning curve was much rougher than that for the Wikitext Editor. Also, I wish I could use the [[...]] method in VE. / / The paragraphing is poorly set up. How are we supposed to know what name (Heading, Subheading etc.) Wikipedia has assigned to things. Even MS has a mouse-over function that shows what some-thing will look like if a given font or size is adopted. / / The really nice thing about VE is its (more-or-less) wysiwyg style: The type-face is much more readable than that that appears when I'm editing in Wikitext Editor.

Cross user findings: VE Feedback

Bugs/issues (casual 4 / exp 20) (what are the issues? list bugs and make sure they are fixed or in phab)

c134 - Visual Editor should be enabled for IP users and all editors unless they have opted out. The Wikitext option should also remain for everyone. Everyone should have the option to use either editor. IP users do not know that the Visual Editor is an option, and they should. With all the money spent on Visual Editor, it should be visible to new users. The Visual Editor needs to be changed so the edit summary box saves past summaries in the browser. Not having this functionality is the main reason I seldom use it. Also, changing the text of Wikilink is very difficult in the Visual Editor. When you add a letter to a word the new letter isn't linked, which is a problem.

c136 - The redirect editing gives no way to put templates on redirects, and no way to change articles to redirects and back (as far as I know)

c159 - My computer are old, Visual Editor is slow, and its soo diffucult to figuere out to which page wiki link links (because you see the text, and not the link itself)