Wikimedia Attribution Survey Results

By: Erik Moeller, Deputy Director
For: Wikimedia community
March 6, 2009

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 nices 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-en.ods
http://wikimediafoundation.org/wiki/File:Attsurvey-de.ods
http://wikimediafoundation.org/wiki/File:Attsurvey-misc.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]		
Answer	**Count**	**Percentage**
No answer	10	1.02%
1 (1)	5	0.51%
2 (2)	41	4.18%
3 (3)	182	18.55%
4 (4)	224	22.83%
5 (5)	519	52.91%
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]		
Answer	**Count**	**Percentage**
No answer	0	0
1 (1)	0	0
2 (2)	108	11.01%
3 (3)	228	23.24%
4 (4)	209	21.30%
5 (5)	436	44.44%
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]		
Answer	**Count**	**Percentage**
No answer	14	1.43%
1 (1)	148	15.09%
2 (2)	333	33.94%
3 (3)	223	22.73%
4 (4)	99	10.09%
5 (5)	164	16.72%

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]

Answer	Count	Percentage
No answer	20	2.04%
1 (1)	307	31.29%
2 (2)	352	35.88%
3 (3)	167	17.02%
4 (4)	70	7.14%
5 (5)	65	6.63%

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]

Answer	Count	Percentage
No answer	25	2.55%
1 (1)	280	28.54%
2 (2)	220	22.43%
3 (3)	168	17.13%
4 (4)	105	10.70%
5 (5)	183	18.65%

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.)]

Answer	Count	Percentage
No answer	23	2.34%
1 (1)	330	33.64%
2 (2)	284	28.95%
3 (3)	164	16.72%
4 (4)	103	10.50%
5 (5)	77	7.85%

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). [I participate in software development and/or system operations work]

Answer	Count	Percentage
No answer	36	3.67%
1 (1)	830	84.61%
2 (2)	72	7.34%
3 (3)	14	1.43%
4 (4)	12	1.22%
5 (5)	17	1.73%

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]

Answer	Count	Percentage
No answer	45	4.59%
1 (1)	762	77.68%
2 (2)	76	7.75%
3 (3)	40	4.08%
4 (4)	19	1.94%
5 (5)	39	3.98%

Field summary for NOT1:

If you want, please elaborate on your responses above.

Answer	Count	Percentage
Answer	71	7.24%
No answer	910	92.76%

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

with the most. You can elaborate further below. [Ranking 1]		
Answer	**Count**	**Percentage**
No credit is needed. (NONE)	102	10.40%
Collective credit (e.g. "Wikipedia community"). (COMM)	243	24.77%
Link to the article must be given. (LINK)	318	32.42%
Link to the version history must be given. (HIST)	114	11.62%
For online use: link. For other uses: full list of authors. (OFFL)	100	10.19%
Full list of authors must always be copied. (ALWA)	64	6.52%

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]

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

Field summary for WHICH [3]:

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]

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

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]

Answer	Count	Percentage
No credit is needed. (NONE)	108	11.01%
Collective credit (e.g. "Wikipedia community"). (COMM)	85	8.66%

Link to the article must be given. (LINK)	97	9.89%
Link to the version history must be given. (HIST)	204	20.80%
For online use: link. For other uses: full list of authors. (OFFL)	244	24.87%
Full list of authors must always be copied. (ALWA)	107	10.91%

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]

Answer	Count	Percentage
No credit is needed. (NONE)	68	6.93%
Collective credit (e.g. "Wikipedia community"). (COMM)	150	15.29%
Link to the article must be given. (LINK)	25	2.55%
Link to the version history must be given. (HIST)	70	7.14%
For online use: link. For other uses: full list of authors. (OFFL)	254	25.89%
Full list of authors must always be copied. (ALWA)	268	27.32%

Field summary for WHICH [6]:

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 6]		
Answer	**Count**	**Percentage**
No credit is needed. (NONE)	453	46.18%
Collective credit (e.g. "Wikipedia community"). (COMM)	13	1.33%
Link to the article must be given. (LINK)	9	0.92%
Link to the version history must be given. (HIST)	16	1.63%
For online use: link. For other uses: full list of authors. (OFFL)	13	1.33%
Full list of authors must always be copied. (ALWA)	322	32.82%
Field summary for NOT2:		
If you want, please elaborate on your response above.		
Answer	**Count**	**Percentage**
Answer	141	14.37%
No answer	840	85.63%