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Results of the survey on author attribution run from February 28 to March 6, 2009

Methodology: The survey below was publicized from February 28, 2009 to March 6, 2009 on site-wide banners shown to a sample of 5% and 10% of signed in pageviews of the English and German Wikipedia, respectively (the survey was translated into German). In addition, links to the survey were disseminated through various media in the Wikimedia community.

The following results tables combine data from English and German Wikipedia respondents, as well as respondents from other languages who discovered the survey. While result patterns are very similar in the three groups, for further analysis, raw results from the different groups are available here:

http://wikimediafoundation.org/wiki/File:Attsurvey-de.ods

The responses below are filtered to exclude users who answered “never” or did not answer to the question whether they have edited Wikipedia articles, resulting in a total of 981 relevant responses.

The question on the preferred attribution method was a ranking question where respondents were asked to rank their preferred method, first being the most preferred, last being the least preferred. In the tables below, the number of responses who ranked the respective options first, second, third, and so forth are shown in separate tables.
### Field summary for WHAT(USER):

Please characterize your activities as a Wikipedia contributor (1=no activity; 3=regular activity; 5=multiple hours of activity every week).

[I use Wikipedia as a reader]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>18.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>224</td>
<td>22.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>519</td>
<td>52.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Field summary for WHAT(EDIT):

Please characterize your activities as a Wikipedia contributor (1=no activity; 3=regular activity; 5=multiple hours of activity every week).

[I edit existing articles]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>11.01%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>228</td>
<td>23.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>21.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>436</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Field summary for WHAT(NEWA):

Please characterize your activities as a Wikipedia contributor (1=no activity; 3=regular activity; 5=multiple hours of activity every week).

[I contribute new articles]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>15.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>333</td>
<td>33.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>22.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Field summary for WHAT(MEDI):

Please characterize your activities as a Wikipedia contributor (1=no activity; 3=regular activity; 5=multiple hours of activity every week).

*I contribute images, sounds, video files*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>31.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>35.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Field summary for WHAT(ADMI):

Please characterize your activities as a Wikipedia contributor (1=no activity; 3=regular activity; 5=multiple hours of activity every week).

*I do administrative and vandalism patrolling work*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>28.54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>22.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>17.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>10.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>18.65%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Field summary for WHAT(META):

Please characterize your activities as a Wikipedia contributor (1=no activity; 3=regular activity; 5=multiple hours of activity every week).

*I participate in meta discussions (policy, deletion, quality, etc.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>33.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>28.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>7.85%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Field summary for WHAT(TECH):

Please characterize your activities as a Wikipedia contributor (1=no activity; 3=regular activity; 5=multiple hours of activity every week).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>307</td>
<td>31.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>35.88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>17.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>6.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
activity; 3=regular activity; 5=multiple hours of activity every week). [I participate in software development and/or system operations work]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>3.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>830</td>
<td>84.61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>7.34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field summary for WHAT(ORGA):

Please characterize your activities as a Wikipedia contributor (1=no activity; 3=regular activity; 5=multiple hours of activity every week). [I am involved in the organization, a chapter, or the Wikimedia movement]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (1)</td>
<td>762</td>
<td>77.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (2)</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>7.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (3)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>4.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (4)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1.94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (5)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>3.98%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field summary for NOT1:

If you want, please elaborate on your responses above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>92.76%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field summary for WHICH [1]:

As an author, which of the following model for giving credit to article authors do you consider appropriate for Wikipedia text, including third party use of Wikipedia content? For example, "link to the article must be given" means that you expect that anyone copying a Wikipedia article should provide a link/URL to the article in question together with their copy. Please note that especially popular articles can have hundreds or thousands of contributors (example), and re-use can include DVDs, books, spoken versions, etc. You can also assume that a "full list of authors" would be filtered to exclude irrelevant and tiny edits. Please try to rank all options, focusing first on the one you agree...
As an author, which of the following model for giving credit to article authors do you consider appropriate for Wikipedia text, including third party use of Wikipedia content? For example, "link to the article must be given" means that you expect that anyone copying a Wikipedia article should provide a link/URL to the article in question together with their copy. Please note that especially popular articles can have hundreds or thousands of contributors (example), and re-use can include DVDs, books, spoken versions, etc. You can also assume that a "full list of authors" would be filtered to exclude irrelevant and tiny edits. Please try to rank all options, focusing first on the one you agree with the most. You can elaborate further below. [Ranking 1]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No credit is needed. (NONE)</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>10.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective credit (e.g. &quot;Wikipedia community&quot;). (COMM)</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>24.77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the article must be given. (LINK)</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>32.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the version history must be given. (HIST)</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>11.62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For online use: link. For other uses: full list of authors. (OFFL)</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>10.19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full list of authors must always be copied. (ALWA)</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>6.52%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field summary for WHICH [2]:

As an author, which of the following model for giving credit to article authors do you consider appropriate for Wikipedia text, including third party use of Wikipedia content? For example, "link to the article must be given" means that you expect that anyone copying a Wikipedia article should provide a link/URL to the article in question together with their copy. Please note that especially popular articles can have hundreds or thousands of contributors (example), and re-use can include DVDs, books, spoken versions, etc. You can also assume that a "full list of authors" would be filtered to exclude irrelevant and tiny edits. Please try to rank all options, focusing first on the one you agree with the most. You can elaborate further below. [Ranking 2]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No credit is needed. (NONE)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective credit (e.g. &quot;Wikipedia community&quot;). (COMM)</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>23.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the article must be given. (LINK)</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>31.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the version history must be given. (HIST)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>16.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For online use: link. For other uses: full list of authors. (OFFL)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full list of authors must always be copied. (ALWA)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field summary for WHICH [3]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No credit is needed. (NONE)</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective credit (e.g. &quot;Wikipedia community&quot;). (COMM)</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>23.85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the article must be given. (LINK)</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>31.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the version history must be given. (HIST)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>16.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For online use: link. For other uses: full list of authors. (OFFL)</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>11.11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full list of authors must always be copied. (ALWA)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>4.59%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As an author, which of the following model for giving credit to article authors do you consider appropriate for Wikipedia text, including third party use of Wikipedia content? For example, "link to the article must be given" means that you expect that anyone copying a Wikipedia article should provide a link/URL to the article in question together with their copy. Please note that especially popular articles can have hundreds or thousands of contributors (example), and re-use can include DVDs, books, spoken versions, etc. You can also assume that a "full list of authors" would be filtered to exclude irrelevant and tiny edits. Please try to rank all options, focusing first on the one you agree with the most. You can elaborate further below. [Ranking 3]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No credit is needed. (NONE)</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>9.48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective credit (e.g. &quot;Wikipedia community&quot;). (COMM)</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>17.13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the article must be given. (LINK)</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>14.27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the version history must be given. (HIST)</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>29.87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For online use: link. For other uses: full list of authors. (OFFL)</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>14.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full list of authors must always be copied. (ALWA)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>4.18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field summary for WHICH [4]:

As an author, which of the following model for giving credit to article authors do you consider appropriate for Wikipedia text, including third party use of Wikipedia content? For example, "link to the article must be given" means that you expect that anyone copying a Wikipedia article should provide a link/URL to the article in question together with their copy. Please note that especially popular articles can have hundreds or thousands of contributors (example), and re-use can include DVDs, books, spoken versions, etc. You can also assume that a "full list of authors" would be filtered to exclude irrelevant and tiny edits. Please try to rank all options, focusing first on the one you agree with the most. You can elaborate further below. [Ranking 4]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No credit is needed. (NONE)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective credit (e.g. &quot;Wikipedia community&quot;). (COMM)</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15.29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the article must be given. (LINK)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2.55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the version history must be given. (HIST)</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>7.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For online use: link. For other uses: full list of authors. (OFFL)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>25.89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full list of authors must always be copied. (ALWA)</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>27.32%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field summary for WHICH [5]:

As an author, which of the following model for giving credit to article authors do you consider appropriate for Wikipedia text, including third party use of Wikipedia content? For example, "link to the article must be given" means that you expect that anyone copying a Wikipedia article should provide a link/URL to the article in question together with their copy. Please note that especially popular articles can have hundreds or thousands of contributors (example), and re-use can include DVDs, books, spoken versions, etc. You can also assume that a "full list of authors" would be filtered to exclude irrelevant and tiny edits. Please try to rank all options, focusing first on the one you agree with the most. You can elaborate further below. [Ranking 5]
hundreds or thousands of contributors (example), and re-use can include DVDs, books, spoken versions, etc. You can also assume that a "full list of authors" would be filtered to exclude irrelevant and tiny edits. Please try to rank all options, focusing first on the one you agree with the most. You can elaborate further below. [Ranking 6]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No credit is needed. (NONE)</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>46.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective credit (e.g. &quot;Wikipedia community&quot;). (COMM)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the article must be given. (LINK)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link to the version history must be given. (HIST)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For online use: link. For other uses: full list of authors. (OFFL)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full list of authors must always be copied. (ALWA)</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>32.82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Field summary for NOT2:

If you want, please elaborate on your response above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>14.37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>85.63%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>