

Wikipedia Editing Environment Survey

Do you currently edit Wikipedia? (Choose only one answer)			
		Response Percent	Response Count
N/A (Answered "No" to question #1)	<input type="text"/>	45.8%	204
No	<input type="text"/>	49.2%	219
Yes	<input type="text"/>	4.9%	22
Comments [max. 150 characters]:			30
answered question			445
skipped question			5

Comments [max. 150 characters]:		
1	But not very often anymore.	Dec 21, 2009 4:50 AM
2	Doesnt seem to work.	Dec 23, 2009 9:17 PM
3	Why bother?	Dec 27, 2009 3:14 AM
4	But I will regarding EU/PC! Time is why.	Dec 28, 2009 4:37 AM
5	Occasionally.	Dec 28, 2009 5:09 AM
6	Barred from correcting misinformation on my own research.	Dec 28, 2009 6:17 AM
7	Got thrown out/got dismissed/threw myself out (depending on the localized WP)	Dec 28, 2009 10:37 AM
8	The bias was clearly evident even in my one attempt.	Dec 28, 2009 12:10 PM
9	I have been banned after false accusations of sockpuppetry by SA.	Dec 28, 2009 2:27 PM
10	NO and YES; in that it's been several years since I did edit it, but I will edit when I feel the need to. I need to update the Keiko Matsui page, as the 'Tribal Beethoven' cd arrived, it took several years to get a copy. I can now add that to her discography !	Dec 28, 2009 3:12 PM
11	Haven't seen current need.	Dec 28, 2009 5:55 PM
12	I have not for a year, but plan to do so again, withing the next month or two.	Dec 28, 2009 6:26 PM
13	i use it almost daily !	Dec 28, 2009 8:17 PM
14	Wiki has banned my name and IP from their site (see comment to Q-1 above).	Dec 29, 2009 6:15 PM
15	Very rarely, unfortunately.	Dec 29, 2009 6:18 PM
16	I felt it was useless because someone would come along right behind me and exchange the truth for a lie.	Dec 29, 2009 8:52 PM
17	I am barred because I suggested to an "editor" who had made wholesale reversals of a careful edit that he might face prosecution as part of the "global warming" fraud investigation that is looking into the profiteers and scamsters who have peddled the "global warming" fraud.	Dec 29, 2009 11:18 PM
18	I have started a website using wikipedia as a source ,but open to all points of views	Dec 29, 2009 11:34 PM
19	it is frustrating that one has no say in an edit or knowledge of why it is accepted, amended, or dumped	Dec 30, 2009 2:54 AM

Comments [max. 150 characters]:		
20	Even when placing in my first edit, well documented data, on Robert The Bruce, one of their editors came in an deleted it, saying I could only put "facts" on there. Not only was this "non-fact" readily available to any lay person, but to myself, and other professional genealogists, who must refer to the "original" original source, they said that I couls not put on there personal opinion. Silly me, a genealogist, and Robert the Bruce's grand daughter can't even place a fact. That was it for me. i saw it for what it was then.	Dec 31, 2009 4:31 AM
21	Don't have the time or desire to fight the Zealots.	Dec 31, 2009 5:39 AM
22	Even though I'm well educated, my edits were flamed because I didn't meet the expectations of the higher ups.	Jan 1, 2010 2:01 AM
23	I was expelled from the Spanish Wikipedia where most of my editions were made	Jan 2, 2010 2:46 PM
24	Its a joke, I dont waste my time on "joke" information websites. Although it's a serious deceptive tool of the leftwingers.	Jan 2, 2010 7:28 PM
25	nothing to add	Jan 3, 2010 10:04 PM
26	But significantly less	Jan 4, 2010 1:20 AM
27	It happends but no point, it's controlled. An example is the cancer treatment Gerson Therapy. It is treated as bull even if it is proven to work.	Jan 5, 2010 8:37 AM
28	lack of time, esp. when it's wasted	Jan 8, 2010 4:07 AM
29	But increasingly rarely. Disenchanted with those who insist on pursuing a particular agenda with no regard for truth.	Jan 8, 2010 4:25 PM
30	Gave up on these arrogant nurds	Jan 9, 2010 2:45 AM