






# Initial Report

Last Modified: 02/25/2015

1. Compared to the Wikimedia Blog, would you say that the quality of the reports published in The Signpost is...

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
0	Much better		18	13%
1	Somewhat better		25	18%
2	About the same		20	14%
3	Somewhat worse		7	5%
4	Much worse		1	1%
5	Don't know		69	49%
	Total		140	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	0
Max Value	5
Mean	3.11
Variance	4.01
Standard Deviation	2.00
Total Responses	140

2. Compared to national newspapers or news websites of your country, would you say that the quality of the reports published in The Signpost is...

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
0	Much better		8	6%
1	Somewhat better		27	19%
2	About the same		48	34%
3	Somewhat worse		41	29%
4	Much worse		6	4%
5	Don't know		10	7%
	Total		140	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	0
Max Value	5
Mean	2.29
Variance	1.46
Standard Deviation	1.21
Total Responses	140

3. Compared to the Wikimedia Blog, would you say that your interest in the reports published in The Signpost is...

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
0	Much higher		37	26%
1	Somewhat higher		33	24%
2	About the same		17	12%
3	Somewhat less		4	3%
4	Much less		2	1%
5	Don't know		47	34%
	Total		140	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	0
Max Value	5
Mean	2.30
Variance	4.34
Standard Deviation	2.08
Total Responses	140

4. How likely are you to recommend The Signpost to others?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Definitely will recommend		36	26%
2	Probably will recommend		49	35%
3	Not sure		37	26%
4	Probably will not recommend		15	11%
5	Definitely will not recommend		3	2%
	Total		140	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	2.29
Variance	1.07
Standard Deviation	1.03
Total Responses	140

5. If you have contacted The Signpost regular staff, how responsive were the staff to your questions or comments?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	Very responsive		29	21%
2	Somewhat responsive		18	13%
3	Somewhat unresponsive		8	6%
4	Very unresponsive		3	2%
5	I have not attempted to contact the regular staff, or I don't remember		82	59%
	Total		140	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	5
Mean	3.65
Variance	2.92
Standard Deviation	1.71
Total Responses	140

6. How long have you read The Signpost?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
0	Less than 1 month		1	1%
1	1 to 6 months		4	3%
2	6 months to 1 year		9	6%
3	1 to 2 years		20	14%
4	2 years or more		104	74%
5	Never read		2	1%
	Total		140	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	0
Max Value	5
Mean	3.63
Variance	0.65
Standard Deviation	0.81
Total Responses	140

7. How often do you read The Signpost?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
0	Usually once a week		89	64%
1	2 to 3 times a month		36	26%
2	Once a month		11	8%
3	Every 2-3 months		3	2%
4	2-3 times a year		0	0%
5	Once a year or less often		0	0%
6	Never		1	1%
	Total		140	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	0
Max Value	6
Mean	0.52
Variance	0.75
Standard Deviation	0.87
Total Responses	140







10. How often do you use each of these platforms for reading The Signpost?

#	Question	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Often	Always	Total Responses	Mean
1	Desktop	3	2	6	19	101	131	4.63
2	Mobile	84	19	13	10	5	131	1.73

Statistic	Desktop	Mobile
Min Value	1	1
Max Value	5	5
Mean	4.63	1.73
Variance	0.70	1.32
Standard Deviation	0.84	1.15
Total Responses	131	131

11. What best describes your role in Wikimedia?

#	Answer	Bar	Response	%
1	I read Wikipedia and/or use content that I find on Wikimedia sites such as Wikimedia Commons. I read and/or use content for personal, school and/or work-related use. I rarely or never contribute or edit content on Wikipedia or its sister projects, and have no formal role in it.		3	2%
2	I am a volunteer content contributor/editor or volunteer technical contributor, with no formal role.		81	62%
3	I am a volunteer who has a formal role in a WikiProject (other than The Signpost), Wikimedia chapter, Wikimedia thematic organization, Wikimedia user group, Wikimedia committee, Wikimedia technical operations or development, or Wikimedia site administration or governance.		34	26%
4	I am a volunteer editor with a formal role in The Signpost.		4	3%
5	I am a volunteer for a public service, philanthropic or professional organization (such as the International Red Cross/Red Crescent, the Ford Foundation, or the American Psychological Association) who contributes to or edits Wikipedia or its sister projects as part of my volunteer role.		0	0%
6	I am a volunteer for an organization that uses or develops MediaWiki-related software, other than the Wikimedia Foundation, the Wiki Ed Foundation, and their formal affiliates.		0	0%
7	I am a paid intern, contractor, and/or employee of a Wikimedia chapter, Wikimedia thematic organization, or Wikimedia user group.		2	2%
8	I am a paid intern, contractor, and/or employee of the Wikimedia Foundation.		4	3%
9	I am a paid intern, contractor, and/or faculty or staff member of an educational institution who participates in the Wikipedia Education Program as a part of my job.		0	0%
10	I am a paid intern, contractor, and/or employee of the Wiki Education Foundation.		0	0%
11	I am a paid intern, contractor, and/or employee of a gallery, library, archive, museum, medical/psychological institution, scientific institution, or educational institution who contributes or edits Wikimedia/Wikipedia content as a part of my job.		0	0%
12	I am a paid intern, contractor, and/or employee of a government or military organization who contributes or edits Wikimedia/Wikipedia content as a part of my job. (This option is not for government employees who primarily work in galleries, libraries, archives, museums, medical/psychological institutions, scientific institutions, and educational institutions. These employees should select another option).		0	0%
13	I am paid intern, contractor, and/or employee of a public service, philanthropic or professional organization (such as the International Red Cross/Red Crescent, the Ford Foundation, or the American Psychological Association) who contributes to or edits Wikipedia or its sister projects as a part of my job.		1	1%
14	I am a paid intern, contractor, and/or employee of a for-profit or political organization who contributes or edits Wikimedia/Wikipedia content as a part of my job.		0	0%
15	I am a paid intern, contractor, and/or employee of an organization that uses or develops MediaWiki-related software as a part of my job, and I am not paid directly or indirectly by the Wikimedia Foundation.		0	0%
25	Other		2	2%
	Total		131	

Statistic	Value
Min Value	1
Max Value	25
Mean	2.99
Variance	9.98
Standard Deviation	3.16
Total Responses	131

12. Optional: What kinds of features or reports would you most like to see us produce in the future? (Please do not include personally identifying information because we may make your responses public. You can contact us publicly under your regular username by writing on [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia\\_talk:Wikipedia\\_Signpost](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia_talk:Wikipedia_Signpost).)

Text Response
Background reports explaining who plays which roles and to which end.
As for the past few years: it's about the people and our product, which of course has its political dimension. Keep up the well-written, independent, incisive journalism and opinion on the English Wikipedia, other sites, the WMF, and affiliates. Social reward of coverage for editors who do really good work, which I guess will inevitably be mostly on the English Wikipedia. More interwiki focus—as much as possible, please: here's one of the few ways in which we can bring together this sprawling, international movement; recruit correspondents from non-English-language sites for occasional input, either directly, edited, or through informing the regulars. It's going well. Scandal is always great. :-)
Invite some of Wikipedia's critics, including banned users, to explain their reasoning. At the moment, even those sections putatively critical of elements of Wikipedia tend to be suffused with a "we are on a glorious mission, and just disagree about the best way to carry it out" feel. If the Signpost were more willing to criticise, it might reduce the need people feel to go off-site to express honest criticism.
What is going on in other language Wikipedias, and other Mediawiki projects; "how to" guides or reviews of best practice; op-eds.
1) More coverage of sister projects, if only "in brief". 2) More frequent "in depth" reportage, if anyone can find the time.
Less is more. Dismantle the echo chamber.
The traffic report is not sufficiently interesting as it is stuck with major news related issues. It would be good if spikes in traffic are also included so that we know about other kinds of traffic drivers - websites, discussion groups
I often see newspapers as deriving their main content on scandal. Occasionally I see that bleeding over into The Signpost. I much prefer articles that inspire me (and other editors?) to contribute and volunteer more. Something unique - story on an editor who has done an amazing job -- raising the level of Wikidata and its potential, etc.
background articles on considerations needed for current events writing
Please index new issues of other Wikipedia newsletters - Books & Bytes, The Bugle, etc.
As I mentioned earlier, OpEds on complex or controversial topics.
Profiles of contributors and WMF staff.
I usually want to only quickly read the Signpost. In the "News and Notes" and the "In the Media" sections I usually read only the "In Brief" sections, because I don't want to read all the details. A TL;DR/summary of the longer sections would be useful to me.
See first text answer
Media and reports on arbcom, ani etc.
More information about Commons; background stories on editors or photographers
interviews of cute editors!
interviews, even if they are simple like sending people questions by email and publishing their responses.
Non-controversial reports on user-friendly features such as the <span>{{cite web}}</span> template series, which allow people who don't know how to make citations to easily make them while burying the technical formatting stuff in the background.
Things related to Wikimedia news (including ArbCom things, RfCs, Wikipedia controversies, etc.)
More about Gender Gap grant initiatives.
policy discussions, big issues like gender gap, civility, community health. op-eds. more voices than the usual suspects.
more op-eds
More opinion pieces and sociological-angle articles
Anything announcing the death of media view or Windows 8. Outside of these two points brains teasers, a funnys section, and perhaps a classifieds section with links to...say relevant wiki project new flyers that were published or help wanted section for editors or contributors looking to get someone with experience or information to assist with their pet projects. A little community input here would help alot, I think. I suppose I wouldn't hurt to mention recent additions of the bounty or reward boards either, strictly as a help wanted ad section.
Big picture pieces: trends over time, etc.
More detailed technical report, public poll on any topic
I'm a long-time user (10 years?) of Wikipedia but only edited sporadically until two years ago when I became active. The more involved I became, the more I came across references to ARBCOM cases or disputes that happened years ago that I was clueless about. So, I've spent a fair amount of time in the Signpost, AN/I and ARBCOM archives trying to learn what happened to understand why a conflict was being referred to. For example, I seen editors refer to conflicts over Userboxes which seemed to me to be such a harmless feature of Wikipedia that I was very surprised it had been the subject of controversy. So, what I find most useful to me in Signpost are analysis of Wikipedia, how voting, RfAs, ARBCOM cases, number of editors, etc. have changed over the past 14 years. If a new ARBCOM case is reminiscent of an older ARBCOM case, note that and provide a link to it. The Signpost has, for the most part, done a good job of this, especially linking to older Signpost articles. I guess what I'm just emphasizing is that the bulk of editors are here a short time and it is nice to know the "signposts", so to speak, of what Wikipedia has been and what it has become (sorry for the pun). I find it most useful when it helps me understand the world of Wikipedia and WMF particularly how things have changed. This is because as a new editor, one often thinks, "Why on earth doesn't Wikipedia do X?" without knowing that X has been tried in the past and failed miserably. New editors only know Wikipedia of the present moment so providing some context for the work they do is invaluable and, I believe, keep them editing productively, learning the ropes and out of trouble. I know, for myself, that if it hadn't been for the Teahouse, a place where I could vent my frustrations and not get templated warnings for it, I wouldn't have lasted a week here. The Signpost is not only a news bulletin but an archive of English Wikipedia history and you should consider what an important role you can have in educating new editors.
Signpost needs to cover ARBCOM actions and elections more often. ARBCOM's workshops are too long for the casual reader to stay informed. The election guides are good but they're all POV material. A neutral guide announcing the elections and the technical end of enfranchisement would help.
More about WP's high level corruption, hidden agendas and so on
I'd love to know more about the movement worldwide and how the various Wikipedias differ. I'm very curious about the status of Wikipedia in Kazakhstan, Russia and other places with major freedom of speech problems. I'd like to know more about what the paid staff of the foundation do, how resources are distributed (like is it 90% programming or 50% legal or what). I'd like to know how decisions are made about fund raising. I'd like to know the cost per edit, per page view, article, etc.
I would most like to see analyzes and special reports on under appreciated aspects of Wikipedia, as mentioned previously.
Wiki project about other Wikipédias (Swedish, German, Turkish, Portuguese)
Continuing to develop the new Gallery could be quite promising, in my opinion. Focus on "core" sections like news and in the media are also important to me.

A history of Wikipedia, especially of the post-2006 period, which is not covered in any of the standard books on Wikipedia. This would need be a series. (And lots of luck to whoever attempts this; that person would doubtless upset at least one long-time Wikipedian with overlooking or misstating the facts.)

I always enjoy the opinion pieces, but of course you need volunteers for those.

More highlighting of outreach

Technology, sister projects, other languages.

In addition to things already mentioned, maybe a few more features relating to current events and or anniversaries, something like the main page but maybe on a weekly basis? Also, perhaps, some indications of level of development of articles related to such topics.

Summaries of the discussions on Wikipedia:Administrators' noticeboard and WP:ANI. That's where a good portion of real day to day decision making is done.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	40

13. Optional: please tell us how we can improve the quality of Signpost content and/or make it more interesting to you. (Please do not include personally identifying information because we may make your responses public. You can contact us publicly under your regular username by writing on [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia\\_talk:Wikipedia\\_Signpost](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia_talk:Wikipedia_Signpost).)

Text Response
Don't use writers who are known to hold strong opinions about controversial topics, eg: Gamaliel.
I don't read Wikimedia blog so can't compare. What I've read Signpost tends to follow the party line so hardly comparable with a decent quality newspaper.
Havera regular column that reports on results of RFC on policy or guideline changes. This kind of thing is so poorly conveyed to the comunity members who work in maintenance areas that Signpost is one of the ways of helping to diseminate this knowledge.
Disappointed that the survey lumps the whole publication together for responses. News and notes, and the occasional Special report, are the most challenging to write: hard to judge without more examples of how the journalistic register and the framing of politically sensitive questions to sources, and quotes from them, are handled. But the early signs are good. I think choosing of themes and the handling of each theme throughout a story is the hardest thing, and that many readers probably don't appreciate the huge amount of brain-work and time that goes into this. Journalism is about people, and the Signpost is a cohesive force in the WM community and the English Wikipedia. That is its value and its power.
Try to discourage the writers from injecting their personal biases into sections which aren't explicitly op-ed. The torrent of "aren't foreigners funny!" racism every time a non-US story gets on the Traffic Report (and the accompanying assumption that all Wikipedia readers are familiar with US sports and television) is by far the worst offender for this, but certainly not the only one.
Keep going. You do a great job.
It's good. I'd suggest a series of "favorite Wikipedia tools" (user scripts, labs tools, gadgets)
It could be interesting another section about other languages Wikipedia editions.
Less USA and en.wiki-centric, less wikipolitics bias
I like a balance between internal WM issues and external WM issues (how the projects are perceived or used). I'm biased toward Wikipedia, but I also like to hear what's happening with the other projects, even if only a month-to-month comparison of edits.
Include more stuff about what's going on in other language projects
You should make the project easier for new participants to join.
Long-form journalism, better roundup of community events - ideally all editathons and meetups should be indexed in a "Community events" page, much like a local paper would do.
Controversial OpEd pieces, and the wide-ranging discussions that sometimes ensue, are by far the most interesting content. It might be interesting to commission opposing or different viewpoints on a particular topic, particularly if participants were encouraged to respond, civilly, to each other's pieces. More detailed reports on academic studies of Wikipedia would be of interest. Many articles assume far too much knowledge of recent events even for one who's been around for most of a decade. More background information would be helpful.
Caution needs to be taken regarding which stories are published. I've seen several that although made for interesting reading, did not need the attention given to the issue it was about.
Topics about Wikimedia/Technology are too complicated for a layperson to understand. Not sure if this helps, maybe they are, by nature, only interesting to a specific audience.
Make sure you keep the News and Notes section going each week.
More coverage of controversial events involving Wikimedia projects.
More content, please: 1. Regular reports on the doings of ARBcom, WMF 2. Articles on how various language Wikipedias operate (cross-pollination) 3. A list of Wikipedia in the news URLs (with < ten word headline) 4. An occasional article about Signpost operations (ombudsperson) 5. Regular posting of the numbers (perhaps ten) 6. Short articles on the hottest issues within Wikipedia, the good and the bad) 7. Less space and work devoted to feature articles, in fact, spin off a 'Monthly Magazine' for feature content, a space for more in depth coverage for 'soft news'
From time to time, you can publish Special Issues dedicated to one single subject. Also section "Wikipedia in media" should be a permanent section quoting Wikipedia mentioned in news, articles, interviews, arts, opinions of notable people in wikipedia etc
Make more off-beat reports.
Probably get more authors - I know that is hard.
I find it confusing to figure out what comprises an issue of the Signpost. Does it even come in "issues", each containing a set of articles distinct from those in the previous issue?
I like to read the Projects and Arbitration material ... it gives us a sense of what is going on in the encyclopaedia at large. I find the Signpost to be very collegial and large-minded in spirit.
Less sensationalist, POV article writing; more fleshing out of facts, circumstances, and sides.
Include links to more wikimedia blog posts, when relevant. Include links to other planet wikimedia blog posts, when relevant.
Be less sensational and stick more to the facts. Do better research.
There are reports about nice articles and images. But how about data? (To say Wikidata inclusion)
Stop with the tawdry, tabloid-like hystronics. I get the need to post, something, ANYTHING, with a team of volunteer writers who often work against the deadline, but far too often the result is the takeover of sections by editorialising nuts with an axe to grind. Whether it's the gender gap, wider movement politics or various WMF initiatives, the signpost has consistently served as a platform for inaccurate wailing about The End Being Nigh and very inconsistently served as a platform for actual, neutral reporting. The Signpost is not enwiki's newspaper of record. It is enwiki's yellow press.
Less drama-of-the-week crap.
consistent reporting on the same day, consistent newspaper sections
In depth coverage of a single topic in a single edition, e.g. a long factual piece combined with pro- and con- opinion pieces. Topics might be gender gap, paid editing, use of media (fair use and video), arb com elections, new technology, role of the WMF, what's wrong with Commons, the admin system, ... No lack of topics to be discussed in-depth.
While I compared the Signpost as "somewhat worse" than the national newspapers, it is "somewhat better" than my US state's state-level newspaper. I would like to see some non-controversial ease-of-use stories, like a general introduction to the <span>{{! cite web}}</span> series of templates, which try to bury the "detail work" of displaying citations while making the basic functionality very accessible to people who don't know how to cite things.
Fewer sexual double-entendres. Appreciate coverage of ArbCom and WikiProjects, women, diversity, GLAMs, and gatherings.
Tackle more community health and policy issues, less blow-by-blow procedurals.

More coverage of third-party articles discussing Wikipedia culture and events - I find the sections covering these types of topics the most interesting. I think there is a rich culture to explore from an opinion. For example, seeking out a handful editors and getting their input on a hot topic, or finding editors who have a unique/interesting perspective to share. This is kind of done already in the Project pieces, but arguably the project will always be primary focus of that section, less so the things around it. I may well put myself forward for writing a couple of opinion pieces, but I am aware that some may find having this in the Signpost counter to the Wikedian spirit. A sociological perspective could be used to reveal what drives people to take on certain roles on the website (serial corrector, article writer, vandal fighter, admin, etc). This may highlight some unspoken cultures among the community. A direct investigative journalism approach (emailing editors for comment, leads) would be interesting, but perhaps very time-consuming.

You could include a crossword puzzle or a word search or a comic strip or some such thing as most papers have a section for the brain and the funny bone, but the post never has. Also, move interviews and an opinion section would be nice, although I suppose that the comments added to each story fulfill the latter point.

Be more objective. Canonize Wales less.

1) Reintroduce tech report + weekly user poll on a number of topics 2) In the featured content report, use mostly featured images to avoid confusion whether some of the images are featured or not

It's hard for me to answer the previous questions because I was not aware of the Wikimedia Blog so I have no basis of comparison. I like the Signpost as it is and particularly enjoy In the Media, Traffic Report, Research and Arbitration Report, that is, articles about how Wikipedia operates and also how it is viewed by the larger media world. I am less interested in articles about specific topics like individual WikiProjects but I know what a morale booster these articles can be as well as a source of new recruits. I'm undecided about having opinion pieces from Signpost staff...I think they are okay if the author is a person with knowledge about a subject under debate or even a participant in a conflict but one can find a plethora of opinions from random editors on noticeboards and talk pages so I think an oped has to be carefully assigned to a particular person with some special insight on the topic.

Pay the Signpost contributors. We have many talented Wikimedians that supply great content and they ought to be both rewarded for their efforts and freed from real-life needs so they can contribute more often.

Less cheerleading, more hard news

When my watchlist indicates that a new edition has been published, the page I go to is not very attractive and has some extra code which has no meaning to the reader on it. (This may be out of date, I tune it out usually.)

Advertise what the signpost is to other users as I have absolutely no idea...

I think you're doing a great job.

I would like to see more analyzes and special reports on parts of Wikipedia that often go unnoticed. Examples would include interviewing FA/FL/FT/FP coordinators or reporting on the Help Desk, Teahouse, Reference Desk, Village Pump, recent changes, etc. Other interesting areas to delve into could include the overall quality of Wikipedia according to Wikipedia:Version 1.0 Editorial Team's rating scale, the number of articles on the English Wikipedia and the current and past rate of growth, or the Wikimedia Foundation's financial state and fundraising efforts.

I'd love to see the Signpost try to be more objective/NPOV in all of its stories except op-eds, which should obviously be subjective. In particular, the Top 10/traffic report seems to often be too subjective in its descriptions, and the featured content review can be that way as well. On the flip side, the news section seems to be a model section in this area.

More reliable publication schedule and more journalism rather than simple reporting of X said Y

More content on a regular basis. Hmm. Since the Signpost currently relies on volunteer contributions, that might require paying the contributors. (And no, I don't contribute to the Signpost on a regular basis.)

The only concern I've ever had is that sometimes the writing is less than neutral, and often they write about users without talking to them first or even letting them know they are going to be in the signpost.

I'd like to see a section on how to be a better editor: tools, tips, etc

Viewing on mobile, I am easily confused when there is a link to a discussion page; it is not clear whether I have been directed to an article discussion page or maybe a Signpost discussion page.

I think there are two problems: first Signpost doesn't highlight the conversations related to outreach (GLAM-Wiki, Education, library partnerships, etc), as much as it does internal matters: this often leaves Wikipedians thinking "I am not part of the outreach community, I don't need to worry about that". Highlighting how to be empowered by outreach (partially through highlighting the various newsletters like Education and GLAM-Wiki), and how its something most editors can do, would greatly improve the feeling of "includedness" that editors have in changing the community. The second problem is awareness: I don't think many Wikipedians realize Signpost exists, or that they should be included in its conversation. I would recommend trying to set up an echo notification that lets users who have made 50 (or 100) or more edits, that the community has a communications portal, with news about the community (also maybe a reminder after 200 edits, and at a couple other points). Or maybe even echo notifications when new editions are out, rather than talk page delivery.

The new featured pictures report should include a thumbnail of every featured picture (as the Signpost used to do). This would be much more useful than just having the captions.

More opinion pieces! Rats; I've given away my identity.

More on technology, Mediawiki software. More on sister projects, other languages.

More opinion pieces, more significant discussion of current issues facing the WMF community, preferably from all sides, and, if possible, maybe some sort of Signpost-specific contests

This survey is useless, because

Need to remain objective and cover topics as neutrally as possible. Over the past years the Signpost has often directly taken sides in their coverage (in the news sections, not editorials). Not as badly as something like Fox News, say, but very clearly. You can tell the authors feel quite strongly about topics, which is fine in general, but not for news, which is supposed to be just the facts and clearly cited opinion.

It would be good if the writers could provide more comprehensive stories on ongoing disputes, RFCs, move requests, etc. I was also disappointed by the lack of coverage given to last year's arbcom elections.

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	60

14. Optional: what would motivate you to contribute occasional or regular content to The Signpost? (Please do not include personally identifying information because we may make your responses public. You can contact us publicly under your regular username by writing on [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia\\_talk:Wikipedia\\_Signpost](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia_talk:Wikipedia_Signpost).)

Text Response	
The return of Tony1, who was thoughtful, interesting and entertaining regardless of whether one agreed with him. The departure of Gamaliel and Serendipolous, who are none of the above.	
I seldom do, because my native language is French.	
If I could post it, and my grammar was corrected	
Hard to say. I actually began drafting "op-ed" essays on a couple occasions, but stopped when I got a sense that my "POV" was too narrow or idiosyncratic to interest your readership. In terms of news coverage, areas in which I could muster the effort to do the research and writing are precisely areas in which I am to personally invested to be an objective reporter.	
Sister projects coverage	
I regularly make suggestions. I have contributed 1-2 things on issues that I feel strongly about. I suppose I need an issue or topic about which I feel strongly about AND which I think would be useful for readers.	
If as a result of my activities in Wikimedia, I was asked to contribute -for instance, to be interviewed- I would be glad to help.	
A public page where topics were suggested and editors could sign up to put their viewpoint.	
Some easy task without any heavy responsibility, probably some housekeeping-related task. Again, doubt that is of any help.	
If I had something important to say, I would consider contributing it.	
A mentor relationship to help focus involvement in a way that is mutually rewarding	
Very motivated. I like to make suggestions of Wikipedia mentions in the media for example	
Writing guidelines.	
I have no idea what qualifies an article for inclusion in The Signpost	
Current news and history; things which go on in WikiProjects; things about what the chapters do; encyclopaedia content issues. I would like to be a more pro-active contributor than what I am now. If it were integrated into the rest of Wikilife...	
Maybe if asked?	
If the Signpost was more neutral and fact based	
I have almost no motivation for this	
One-off: A report on my WikiProject, on an area of editing in which I was involved. Other: I don't know. Perhaps if help was needed with the Report on Lengthy Litigation. I'd be interested in helping with "in the news" except that the Signpost always hears about those things before I do, so there'd be no point. :S	
I'd rather not, if that's all right with you.	
specific theme announcements, with enough lead time to make (volunteer) time to prepare something.	
I would only be interested in writing occasional opinion/societal pieces, but probably my lack of time and understanding of the Signpost production team are the barriers	
Some indication that the material would be welcomed the community, a very clear and very simple instructional for how to contribute that omits all the internal lingo and such, and in an absolutely ideal world a barnstar or other physical form of thanks to show that I didn't waste my time.	
More free time :-)	
Feedback/response. I only tried to contribute content once, and got absolutely no reply whatsoever. Granted, it was a long time ago with different editors, but responding to every potential contributor (even if it's a rejection) is very important.	
I mainly comment on your talk pages, usually when I have a question about an article or a correction. I've made some story suggestions with mixed results, meaning, the Signpost was already working on an article on the same subject or my suggestion didn't pique the editor's interest.	
Money. I have neither the time nor the inclination to "work a beat." I already have article content to work on. I'm only a customer of Signpost output. If I had to research and write the article myself I'm no longer a customer.	
Being asked personally based on something I have done. The work not requiring good writing skills.	
I think it would help if the Signpost ran an article on how the Signpost works and explained the process of contributing an article to the Signpost. Some potential contributors may be put off by the fact that they don't know how to submit articles for publication.	
Maybe if there was a feature on an area in which I am especially active, such as DYK or university/college student Wikipedia/Wikimedia clubs.	
Writing regular reports in N&N or ITM are a lot of work and have very temporary impact, compared to, say, bringing a sizable article to GAN, and if I recall correctly in both stints of writing I did I ended up quitting once I got tired of weekly commitments and wanted to go back to writing articles. Reading them is, on the other hand, is a very good idea for any active project contributor, and I think the Signpost should be more prominently advertised amongst the Wikipedia pages as the best way to keep up with changes in the community (and it definitely is that). I think that it would help if the Signpost published more unique articles. But there isn't any way to do this that isn't additive to the paper's current functioning, so I'm not sure; is it something that's worth removing production resources from the rest of the paper to get?	
A broader range of topics. I have a feeling I'm not the best person in any way to deal with any of the current regular features.	
Not sure	

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	33



15. Optional: do you have any other questions or comments? (Please do not include personally identifying information because we may make your responses public. You can contact us publicly under your regular username by writing on [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia\\_talk:Wikipedia\\_Signpost](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wikipedia_talk:Wikipedia_Signpost).)

**Text Response**

If you want to make it more public then I suggest it is linked at the top of individual editors watchlists, easy to click on, everybody gets it, doesn't clutter talk pages.

As for the past few years: it's about the people and our product, which of course has its political dimension. Keep up the well-written, independent, incisive journalism and opinion on the English Wikipedia, other sites, the WMF, and affiliates. Social reward of coverage for editors who do really good work, which I guess will inevitably be mostly on the English Wikipedia. More interwiki focus—as much as possible, please: here's one of the few ways in which we can bring together this sprawling, international movement; recruit correspondents from non-English-language sites for occasional input, either directly, edited, or through informing the regulars. It's going well. Scandal is always great. :-)

Keep up the good work!

never heard of the Wikipedia Blog so including questions that require comparison without having the option to say "can't make comparison" was a bit silly

What was that line from CITIZEN KANE? Something like: "We make the news." Go for it. Be bold, etc.

Love the Signpost, keep it up

I usually access Signpost via the Community portal link. I feel this questionnaire would have benefitted from explaining what the Wikimedia blog is -- I've never looked at it and have no notion of its content.

In my opinion, Signpost is of high quality, but too limited in quantity. The writing is very professional (in two ways: high standards of balance and truthiness, and good use of the written word. How about a podcast? John Stewart is available by this summer, and has announced no plans for his future. How about a regular Humor Section with a Wikipedia cartoon?

making comments by readers should be made easier. I often like to leave comments on some articles I read but somehow it is complicated and my posts don't appear for some reason.

It is very hard to see when you have missed choices on the survey. Maybe merge "single issue page"/"individual articles". Should there be a check/confirm in the survey when you have answered?

n/a

None.

Thank you for publishing. I love the Signpost very much

The last multiple choice question had too many choices, which will confuse people and make the results difficult to interpret. Essentially almost all responses should be in the first 2 categories and the final dozen or so should have about 5% or less put together. But people reading all the way thru will start over-interpreting the answers and then mess it up. My role really was not included (maybe as part of 2) - I'm completely a volunteer, but have active informal roles in many projects, chapters, WMF, GLAMs. I think many of the most active Wikipedian are like this.

Restore the old Arbitration Report's name: The Report on Lengthy Litigation.

This publication is surprisingly useful and high quality for a volunteer-run effort. Appreciate that it is authentic expressions of volunteer opinions, and not a slick, cleaned up PR presentation.

n/a

Your publisher(s) have been suffering from schizophrenia lately, with both publishing dates and published content swinging wildly from one side to another. A little predictability in publishing and in the content publish, such as the post had back in the day, wouldn't hurt the project one bit.

If you do this survey again in the future, consider rewriting the question about the frequency of reading the Signpost. I often read a whole bunch of issues at once, then a couple of months go by before I read more. So I read every issue, but sometimes that is just a few times a year. I wasn't sure which you were going for.

No, I've already given long answers above. I just really appreciate the Signpost, I'm glad you have some new editors helping out because you serve an important purpose on Wikipedia. In fact, I like you so much, if I'm inactive for a while, I'll go read back issues that I missed when I was away. Keep up the good work! ;-)

I wish the WMF would stop taking the volunteers for granted. Someday everyone is going to leave and the readers will abandon Wikipedia for more up-to-date outlets. Signpost volunteers are important to the movement.

About the survey, more or less the worst page formatting I've seen on a website in twenty years.

I think some injection of humor and personal opinion is good - like in the page views report and in guest editorials. I think it should be clear that that can exist in some of the SignPost, but that other parts are strictly journalistic. Keep up the good work.

I'm very impressed with this survey; it was a lot longer and more sophisticated than I had expected. In particular, I like all of the optional responses, as they allow me to better express my opinions, something you can't really do with a 1 to 5 scale question on whether you like the Signpost or not. Good job! :)

No, but I do appreciate the fact that the Signpost values its readers' opinions such that it has taken the effort to create and run a survey such as this one. Thanks!

Is there really a cabal? If so, how do I apply for membership?

Not really, other than I know you all have a very serious task to do and am heartily grateful for your being willing to do it.

No

Statistic	Value
Total Responses	28