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1. Introduction

Indiana University’s Digital Library Program along with State University of New York-Albany’s Film and Television Documentation Center received a National Endowment for Humanities (NEH) grant to convert the print version of the Film Literature Index (FLI) for online retrieval. A twenty-five year span (1976-2001), or approximately 550,000 citations, will be made available in the new FLI website.

The Film Literature Index is a comprehensive, authoritative resource that annually indexes approximately 200 film and television periodicals from various countries around the world. Over 1,500 unique subject headings, including cross-references, have been created for citation assignment. The index is a rich source, stemming beyond mere citation information, to include subject headings, personal names, corporate names and geographic location; designation of article type (article, review or book review), language and more.

The FLI’s electronic version will positively change how users interact with the resource. In the print form, users could only access citations one year at time, via subject heading, author name or film/television title. The web significantly increases access by supporting keyword and advanced searching options such as the ability to search citations across various access points and range of years. Before the web interface and features can be fully defined, it was important to learn from representative users how they: a) use the FLI in its native format; b) how they use related film and television indexes in print and electronic form; and c) perceive the richness of the FLI data and determine how it should be searched and displayed.

This report outlines the usability methodology employed for this user study, including summary of techniques followed, participant selection and profile and a survey of the instruments utilized. Next, the “Findings” section of this report will be organized by recurring themes generated by the study. Each significant finding will be categorized, summarized and supported with the participants’ impressions and suggestions. A recommendations list will follow that will inform the early stages of the interface design as well as approaches for future studies. The report will conclude with the “Further Investigation” section, which will identify issues not fully explored in the context of this study or issues that require additional input from other representative users. Instruments used for this study, such as questionnaires and scripts, will be included in the appendix.

2. Methodology

The FLI user study included three components: a discussion session (modeled after focus groups), metadata or data field analysis task, and a prototype walkthrough session. The study took place March 31, 2003 from 9 am to 10:30 am in the LETRS Conference Room in the main library. The discussion and prototype walkthrough session were audio recorded. Two note takers were also present, Ning Zou, the DLP’s graduate assistance and Don Strawser, FLI Project Manager.

Before commencing with the discussion, participants completed consent forms (see Appendix B) and demographic questionnaires (see Appendix C). During the discussion, a print version (volume unrecorded) of the FLI was present and referenced as well as screen shots taken from the American Film Institute Catalog online resource and screen shots of World Cat’s advanced search page. After the discussion, participants were asked to select which metadata/fields are helpful for searching as well as display (see Appendix D). After completion of this activity, we
discussed each of the fields for further clarification. The study ended with a walkthrough of the prototype created primarily to show our SUNY/Albany partners that the FLI data has been converted and ingested into our database. However, we were interested in the participants’ feedback of a semi-functioning prototype. It should be noted that the prototype was demonstrated; participants did not actually interact with the website. Lastly, the study ended with the participants’ completion of the standard gift reimbursement forms and distribution of a $5.00 gift certificate, per participant, to a local movie theater in exchange for their time.

2.1. Instruments/Equipment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instruments</th>
<th>Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discussion Script (Appendix A)</td>
<td>MP3 Archos Recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Form (Appendix B)</td>
<td>Microphones</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Form for possible follow-up study; form not connected with data recorded</td>
<td>Computer/Projection HDTV for demonstrating prototype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metadata/Field Form (Appendix D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Reimbursement Form for movie gift certificates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.2. Discussion Session

Holding a discussion session during the preliminary stages of design is helpful in understanding how representative users interact, in this case, with the existing print version of the FLI; how they interact with similar resources both online and in print; and, thusly, how to translate those interactions and expectations to the creation of an online version of the FLI. The discussion session afforded representative users to reveal, anecdotally, their experiences with the FLI and other resources.

The discussion was based on a script (see Appendix A), but many topics were also explored in an ad-hoc basis.

2.3. Metadata/Data Field Analysis Task

Participants were asked to review a form, which listed 21 fields along with accompanying explanations (see Appendix D). They were asked to select which fields were important for: a) automatic keyword searching, b) filtering a search, c) the brief results display, and d) detail results display.
2.4. Prototype Walkthrough Session

Finally, participants were shown the FLI prototype website designed primarily for our SUNY/Albany partners. Impetus for demonstrating the prototype was mostly due to the participants suggesting various ways of accessing and sorting the citations, some of which Don Strawser happened to build into the prototype.

3. Participants

Recruitment messages were sent the last weeks of February 2003 to film and telecommunications faculty and reference librarians. We also asked faculty and librarians to recruit representative graduate students and patrons respectively. The original discussion session was scheduled to take place March 6th, 2003 since our SUNY/Albany partners would be visiting. However, many faculty and some graduate students were unable to participate due to the Society for Cinema and Media Studies annual meeting, which was scheduled for March 6-9, 2003.

Although subsequent recruitment messages were sent to film and telecommunications faculty announcing a rescheduling of the user study for the end of March, only librarians and reference assistants confirmed their participation. Thus, the discussion was held with three participants (one had to cancel last minute) representing the library community.

Two of the three participants were reference assistants in graduate school pursuing a Masters in Library Science. One of the participants is a faculty librarian who works at the Reference desk. He has written a few books about famous suicides in film, horror films and Russ Meyer. It should be added that he utilized the FLI heavily while writing these books. One of the graduate students is a film buff and works with Indiana University’s Bradley Film Collection.

All the participants use current computer platforms and browsers at work and at home: Windows XP and Internet Explorer, 6.0. IU is known for their up-to-date technology so it is no wonder that in their work environment computer hardware and software are current. However, often times, home use differs. Not in this case. Participants were all strictly PC users at home as well.

For a graphical interpretation of the questions summarized above, see Appendix F.

Lastly, participants were asked to rate each of the five pre-selected film and television-related resources. Frequency of use or consultation of resources ranged from not at all to all the time; a scale of 0-4 respectively. Only the faculty librarian rated the Film Literature Index highly in terms of frequency of use. This frequency of use reflects mostly his personal utilization of the resource. He tends to direct patrons to the FLI only if they are graduate students working on a research paper or their thesis. One of the participants, the film buff, has never used the FLI while the other reference assistant has used it some of the time in his job capacity. EBSCO and Reader’s Guide are referenced significantly for two reasons: a) undergraduates typically seek online resources, especially if full-text (EBSCO); and b) undergraduate assignments that are

---

1 The FLI prototype can be found here: [http://www.letrs.indiana.edu/~dstrawse/index.php](http://www.letrs.indiana.edu/~dstrawse/index.php). This prototype was designed as a way to show all partners involved in the project, that the data has been converted successfully (up until that point of data conversion, approximately, March 1, 2003), thus it has limited functionality. The prototype was developed by Christina Dulude and Don Strawser.
film-related are basic assignments that either concentrate on a theme, e.g. masculinity and *Braveheart*, or filmography, e.g. short essay on a film produced the year of their birth.

![Index Usage](image)

Participants were also given the opportunity to list other film/television related resources they use personally or as intermediaries. Resources listed include: American Film Institute Catalog (AFI), IMDB database, Facets and World Cat.

4. Findings

The findings are based on recurring or significant themes explored during the discussion session. Also added to this section of the report, are comments from two interviews facilitated by Don Strawser, FLI Project Manager, in mid-February 2003, with two professors from IU’s department of Communication and Culture.² One professor is a film scholar, whose areas of concentration include avant-garde and horror films. The other professor’s area of focus is the television industry.³ Since it was an informal interview to gather preliminary information (see Appendix E for interview questions), a formal report was not written. Upon reviewing Don’s notes, many of the issues explored during the discussion study were similarly explored in the faculty interview. Rather than let those voices go unheard, it is fitting that their comments and

² Communications and Culture departmental information can be found: http://www.indiana.edu/~cmcl/index.html
³ Some background for perspective: Both professors use the FLI. The film professor references it for every research project (4-5 a year), while the television professor typically uses it only twice a year for research projects. Both seek information in either scholarly journals or popular magazines. The film professor has listed the FLI in her syllabus as a reference tool; the television professor refers the FLI on a per-student basis. Both mentioned that graduate students tend to use the FLI more; however, motivated undergraduates have been known to utilize it.
suggestions also appear in this findings section. Comments or suggestions stemming from the faculty interview will be clearly marked as such so not to confuse the comments made by the discussion participants.

4.1. Online Version Will Increase Usage, but Full Text Access Will Blow Other Film/Television Recourses Away!

A recurring theme in this discussion is how students, primarily undergraduates but faculty and graduate students also, prefer to interact with an online resource over a print resource. This preference is heightened if the online resource also contains or points to full-text documents. As reference workers, the participants handle their patron’s request either in person, via email or chat or via the telephone, which is the faculty preference according to this group, and most requests include preference for online resources. Participant 2 illustrates this point: “One of the things from our perspective in reference . . . if a student comes up and wants information on film-related topics, they will go to every online resource before they even think about looking in these [points to FLI volume on table].” He goes on to say that “use is inhibited because the resource is not electronic.”

The two reference assistants in the group mentioned that they often refer undergraduates to EBSCO or help them use EBSCO because it is a) an online, full-text resource; b) it is easy to use and broad (could be used for other projects as a resource); c) it is easy to conduct topical searches; and d) easy to find movie reviews. Graduate students and faculty have also been known to use EBSCO for their research, but they seem to understand the peer-reviewed filter available when searching the database.

Both faculty interviewed prefer electronic access to resources because of ease of use and flexibility. One professor felt that the print version of the FLI is inconvenient because it is difficult to perform a comprehensive search (since it is an annual index) in the print format. He feels that an electronic version would significantly increase its utility.

Participant 3 summarized the benefit of simply going digital best: “The MLA only has citations and people use it all the time. It is nice. PCI [Periodical Contents Index] has links to JSTOR for full-text access, and that’s also nice. People would use it more, either way, if it is easy to find and easy to use. Once it is online you can search across years; it'll be more searchable.”

It should be noted that the stereotyped undergraduate who prefers only online resources is not alone. It is increasingly the preference of graduate students and faculty, based on the discussion participants and the faculty interviewees’ stories highlighted above, to be able to access resources online—especially if searching is enhanced, such as the ability to collocate and sort information and search across years.

4.2. Diverse Audience Requires Diverse Search Options

It is often the expectation that different user groups require different ways to access the content. This notion holds true for the wide-variety of users and potential users of the FLI. Part of the discussion focused on searching principles in general and distinct searching and browsing aspects foreseeable for the online version of the FLI. Before

---

4 Access to the Periodical Contents Index can be found here: [http://pci.chadwyck.com/](http://pci.chadwyck.com/).
such discussion ensued, participants were given a list of all the key metadata fields to mark as important for a) keyword searching, b) search filters, c) brief results display and d) detail results display. This section focuses on keyword searching and search filters. It should be noted that these findings are as much based on explicit comments by the participants as implicit comments made of access barriers to the print version and how those can be overcome in the online world.

First, this section will provide glimpses based on user groups. Keep in mind that further discussion (see section 6 of this report) is required with actual undergraduates and graduate students and faculty to transform the glimpses into a more complete view.

Based on typical film-related assignments given to undergraduates, the angles of interest include: filmography (about the film itself in terms of factual – not interpretive or critical information), themes in films, and reliance on reviews. Most of these angles are contingent upon currency: Was the film made at least in that student’s lifetime?

Subject access to the citations would be important for the student user-group. Since the subject terms are assigned from a controlled list, a browseable index of all the subject terms would be more beneficial and transparent than simply a “subject field” in the advanced search page. Undergraduates tend to use the simple search or browse online resources according to the participants. This tendency has also been uncovered during previous studies conducted here at the DLP. Being able to filter citations based on reviews and even filmography (physical description) will also be helpful to this user group. While it is true that the FLI is not intended to serve as a filmography, some citations are flagged as such and could be useful to students. Of course, FLI is not only current but diverse so undergraduates should be able to find literature on any film from Goonies to The Piano Teacher.

Some of the above-mentioned access points equally apply to faculty, professors or librarians. Subject access via a browseable index was suggested as an easy way to expose the subject headings. Participant 2 felt that a browseable index would facilitate converting a “conceptual idea to a subject heading” otherwise that’s difficult to do, especially with pre-defined subject headings.

Limiting a search to a time period is also important for all the users surveyed. Students tend to write about films experienced in their lifetime, and faculty interviewed, such as the film professor, are most interested in contemporary film years.

From the information gathered in conversation, it seems that the three main access points to the online FLI version are: a) film title, b) subject/topic search, and c) persons. Librarians and professors also mentioned the importance of being able to search by journal title. This is particularly important since the scholarly or peer-reviewed journals are currently not flagged as such. However, faculty, as experts in the field, will be able to easily identify peer-reviewed journal titles. Also mentioned by this group is the ability to limit results based by language or country.

The participants of the discussion study were given a form (see Appendix D) to identify which fields should be searched automatically as well as which fields should serve as search filters. Before completing the form, participants were given an opportunity to ask questions. Some did not understand what the authors and occupations fields meant.
All participants requested the ability to perform keyword searching across the fields. Since we are unable to index every field for keyword searching (performance issue), we hope that as more of these Metadata/Field forms are completed, we’ll get a better sense of which fields to index for keyword searching.

**Automatic Searching**

Fields selected for automatic or keyword searching include:

(Selected by all participants)
- Film/TV Title

(Selected by 2 out of 3)
- Author
- Film Subject
- Journal Title
- Person
- Subject

(Selected by 1 out of 3)
- Article Year
- Director
- Production Year

**Search Filters**

Fields selected as filters for searching include:

(Selected by all participants)
- Director
- Film Subject

(Selected by 2 out of 3)
- Production Year
- Article Language
- Corporations
- Person

(Selected by 1 out of 3)
- Article Year
- Journal Title
- Author
- Person Subject
- Corporate Subject
- Production Location
- Obituaries

Some fields were not selected for either automatic searching or as filters. These include:

(Not selected for either category)
4.3. Diverse Audience Requires Flexible Results Display

The librarians and faculty alike felt that the ability to display results by article type: article, [film] review or book review is important. Some comments from the discussion illustrating this include:

- “That’s very nice; PCI [Periodical Contents Index] does that.”
- “Better function to limit results to just reviews.”
- “A lot of people will come up [to the reference desk] and want a place where they can get lots of reviews in a hurry.”

It seems that all user groups would benefit from this greatly. Undergraduates typically look for reviews to comply with assignment requirements so sorting results into these main categories/types will make it easy for them to find what they are looking for. Likewise, faculty and graduate students rely significantly on the articles category.

Both librarians and faculty also felt it was important to be able to sort results. Some mentioned chronological by article year or alphabetical order by title, but further discussion is necessary to understand which sort options would be most useful.

Participants also suggested that the results detail (full record view) contain certain data as hyperlinks that will generate a new search: “There are the obvious things [referring to search results features] like linking the name of a director to generate a list of other citations related to that director.” It was also suggested that subject headings be linked as well to generate a new search based on that subject. Further investigation is required in order to identify which parts of the citation should be hyperlinked to generate a new search.

The participants also indicated (see Appendix D) which fields should be displayed in the brief and detail results pages.

Brief Results Display

Fields selected for brief results display include:

- Film/TV Title
- Journal Title
- Article Year
- Author
- Subject

See appendix G for a graphical representation of the fields selection.
(selected by 1 out of 3)
- Article Year
- Director
- Production Year

**Detail/Full record results display**

Fields selected to be displayed in the detail/full record display include:

(selected by all participants)
- Article Language
- Film Subject

(selected by 2 out of 3)
- Article Year
- Journal Title
- Film/TV Title
- Person

(selected by 1 out of 3)
- Author
- Corporations
- Subject
- Director
- Person Subject
- Author Subject
- Production Year
- Article Illustrations

Some fields were not selected for either brief or detail results display. These include:

(not selected for either category)
- author occupation
- corporate subject
- production location
- obituaries
- filmography
- occupation

See appendix G for a graphical representation of the fields selection.

### 5. Recommendations

The below recommendations are based on the comments and suggestions from the Discussion Study as well as the Faculty Interview. These recommendations are preliminary and need to be supported by further studies with students and faculty. However, the recommendations proposed henceforth seem to be universally accepted as is evident in other online indexes as well as documented browse and search behaviors of the various users groups.
- **Simple Search Screen (default keyword search, Boolean AND default)**
  - Automatically index for keyword searching:
    - Film/TV Title
    - Author
    - Film Subject
    - Journal Title
    - Person
    - Subject
    - Article Year
    - Director
    - Production Year
  - Considering adding Film/Title and Person as additional filters
  - Considering supporting Boolean operations in simple search (Google model)

- **Advanced Search screen (reference organization and intuitiveness of WorldCat and AFI per participants recommendations)**
  - Support Boolean AND, OR and NOT
  - Search filters or field search options include:
    - Year or Year Range
    - Director
    - Film Subject
    - Article Language
    - Corporations
    - Person
    - Journal Title
    - Author
    - Person Subject
    - Corporate Subject
    - Production Location
    - Obituaries
    - Filmography * (not ranked by librarians but desired by students)
  - Add lookup reference lists for controlled heading (subjects) and name (personal, corporate) fields

- Browse menu for subject headings, film titles, persons and perhaps journal titles

- Automatically sort brief view of results by article type (article, film reviews, and book reviews)

- Ability to further sort results by year and film title (others to be identified)

- Make certain parts of the citation hyperlinks to generate new search in record detail (to be identified)

- Ability to select citations to email

- Provide access to full-text article (somehow)
6. Further Investigation

Further user studies with students and faculty are required in order to clarify and support the above-listed recommendations. Several issues persist, such as:

- complete set of sort options
- complete set of fields to index for keyword search
- identify all browse access points
- facilitate access to full-text article
- ability to save citations in standard format (such as MLA, APA)
- ability to email, print and save (to computer) citations selected

Both librarians and faculty interviewed expressed that constraining searches to peer-reviewed journals would be a plus, but “it shouldn’t be a stumbling block” (Participant 2). It is worth examining this concept with students in order to make a determination as to its universal utility.

Concerns about large set of results when conducting keyword searches were also discussed. Some felt that a way to initially counteract that is by automatically sorting results by article type: “Lots of times when you do a keyword search for most recent films like *Braveheart* you get hundreds and hundreds of hits when all you want are just the reviews.” We should explore with other user groups alternative ways in providing users the ability to further refine their such as providing a “search within results” search box.

While the faculty librarian and two professors mentioned the ability to browse or search by journal title, the FLI indexes over 900 journals. Further exploration is required to determine how to best expose the journal titles without overwhelming the users. Some asked if the journal titles per citation would link up to our library online catalog. The ability to facilitate access to the article needs to be explored whether we provide full-text access on the spot or access to a document delivery service.

Questions arose about browsing controlled lists of names such as subject headings and corporation names, especially if those names are ever changing. Browsing helps people access this type of information without knowing exactly how it is spelled or punctuated. While no direct conversation explored the idea of SEE and SEE ALSO headings, it can be inferred from the conversation that the system should exploit the established structure of cross-headings. If a user types in a lead-in search term, rather than get no results, the query should automatically map to the authorized term. Utilizing the SEE cross-reference behind-the-scenes will ensure retrieved results.

Upcoming discussions need to not only clarify issues uncovered in this discussion, but need to include explicit questions about cross-referencing capabilities and expectations. Also, the metadata/field assessment form distributed may have not been clearly understood by the participants of this discussion. Refining that form for the next set of users is required. Also, expanding that form so users not only indicate which fields should be searched or displayed, but also, which fields should generate new searches from the detail display.
Appendix A. Discussion Script

Discussion Script for the
Film Literature Index Project

[Introduction]

Before we begin the discussion, I’d like to give you an overview of the Film Literature Index project that the Digital Library Program in collaboration with the Film and Television Documentation Center from SUNY Albany (creators of the print index) is currently developing.

Most of you are probably familiar with the FLI . . . The DLP was awarded an NEH grant to digitize 25 years, from 1976-2001, of the print index or approximately half-million citations.

It is one of the most comprehensive film indexes with citations representing national and international publications, from popular magazines to scholarly journals. By converting the FLI to digital form, we are hoping to increase access and possibly usage of the index.

This is why I have asked you to attend this discussion. We need to learn from you how you as subject specialists or information intermediaries use the FLI or any other film and television related resource, and apply those usage patterns and expectations to the online Film Literature Index.

Do you have any further questions about the Film Literature Index project?

[Discussion Protocol]

Let me mention a few protocols for this discussion session.

I will pose questions to the group and collectively we will explore them. Some questions are scripted—there are issues that we have identified beforehand that we would like to address, but others will stem from the discussion at hand.

We have a couple of rules to heed.

They are common-sense “rules” and ones that I know we won’t violate because we are all respectful, civilized folks! There are only 2 to remember: 1) we should not speak over one another and 2) we should respect the statements and opinions expressed by others.

Okay- so now that’s out of the way on to introductions . ..

[Introductions]

I am not sure how many of you know each other, but let’s go around the table and introduce ourselves before we begin.
I can start. [Michelle introduces herself as usability specialist]

Questions
Let’s begin . . .

At any time, feel free to reference or mention online or print indexes that you may use to illustrate or support your points.

[About the FLI or Related Sources]

1. Have you ever consulted the Film Literature Index (FLI)?
   How often do you typically reference it?
   When was the last time you used it?

2. Have you used other film or television related indexes recently?
   Which ones?
   How often do you consult those?
   Would you say you consult one of these indexes more than the FLI?
   Could each of you, off the top of your heads, list and rank the top 3 to 5 film and television related resources you have experience with?
   Could you each explain why you prefer to consult the resource you ranked as #1 versus the others?

3. To those of you who have used the FLI, what aspects of the index do you find most useful?
   Which aspects do you find least useful?
   (probe with: subject access, broad coverage, filmography, etc.)

4. Do you have a preference for print/paper resources over electronic?
   Are their circumstances that determine use of one over the other? What are those circumstances?
[Students/Patrons Perspective]

5. As information intermediaries, when students have film or television related assignments, which resources do you tend to recommend?

6. Do students come to you with a particular resource in mind?
   
   If they do, can you recall if that resource is cited in their syllabus or suggested by the instructor?

7. In your opinion, which film and television related resources do your patrons prefer?

8. Have you received any requests lately for the Film Literature Index or help with the FLI from patrons?
   
   If so, can you recall why the patron needed to consult the FLI?

9. Is there a difference between graduate students and undergraduates in terms of the type of film and television related materials consulted? [online versus paper, scholarly versus popular]
   
   Can you explain what the difference is?

[Online Searching/Access]

Think of an online film and television resource you have used, like the International Film Index for these next sets of question. . . .

10. General question about searching: Do you prefer simple/keyword searching to advanced searching or vice versa? Why?
   
   When do you tend to use the advanced search screen?

[feel free to make specific references to online collections—we can even demo them here if you’d like]

11. What aspects of searching an index are most important to you? (probe with journal, author, title, keyword, subject, date, language, etc.)
12. The FLI categorizes each article by media--film or television--and by type--film review, book review or article. How would you use those categories when searching or reviewing results?

13. Is there an online resource that contains search and results features that you think are helpful?

Can we describe what you like about them? [we can look at these websites as well]

14. I am going to distribute a list of metadata that relates to each citation. Some citations in the FLI will not have all these fields or metadata assigned, but many do. Please designate which fields you consider key access points to the content in general; which you consider to be helpful or necessary search filters; and which you would like to see as part of the search results.

If you have any questions about this list at any time feel free to ask.

[distribute list]

Please pass them forward as you finish. I'll glance over them quickly and will ask you a few questions based on your selections as follow-up.

This wraps up the discussion.

Do you have any comments or questions that we did not address about other print or online indexes that you have used?

Discussion completion and questionnaire

Thank you for your input. We are stopping the audio recording now.

Based on what we have learned today, we will be able to design a prototype website. Once that first prototype version is complete we will follow up with you, if you are willing to participate, and other representative users to make sure that what we learned in discussion is captured in the interface.

Debriefing

Once again, I'd like to thank you for coming today.

Do you have any questions or comments about today's session?

We have a small thank-you gift [hand over certificate]. Please take a minute to sign this sheet as acknowledgement that you received this gift.

[Gift Acknowledgement Form.]
Appendix B. Consent Form

Understanding Your Participation
Consent Form: Film Literature Index Discussion

Please read this page carefully.

I, ________________________________, freely and voluntarily consent to participate in a study that involves discussing experiences with film and television-related resources. I understand that my participation in this evaluation is completely voluntary, and that the expected duration of my participation in this study is approximately 1.5 hours. I also understand that I may withdraw my consent and discontinue my participation at any time without penalty or prejudice to me.

Session notes, questionnaire/interview responses and the audio recording from this study will be used for continual development of the Film Literature Index web site. Therefore, I understand that these materials that record your feedback will be shared with the Digital Library Program at Indiana University. The audio recording will not be broadcast or viewed by anyone outside the specified program or used for any purpose other than those mentioned above.

I give my consent to the Digital Library Program at Indiana University to use session notes, questionnaire/interview responses and the audio recording for these purposes. I understand that all information will be kept confidential and will be reported in an anonymous fashion.

I have read and understood the foregoing and understand that I may receive a copy of this form, upon request, on the day of the study.

Participant’s Signature: ________________________________

Investigator’s Signature: ________________________________

Date: __________________

Digital Library Program
Indiana University, Bloomington
Appendix C. Demographic Questionnaire

Participant Background Information Film Literature Index Discussion

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain an understanding of people who will use the Film Literature Index website. Please remember that all the information you provide is confidential.

1. IU Status: Faculty  Graduate Student  Librarian  Staff
   a. Area of study or expertise: _______________________________________________________

2. What type of computer do you use? (circle all that apply)
   a. at home:    PC      MAC     LINUX
   b. at work:      PC      MAC     LINUX

3. What computer operating system(s) do you use?  (e.g. XP, 2000, OS 9)   _____________________

4. About how many hours a week do you spend online (WWW, email, etc)?   _____________________

5. Which browser(s) do you most commonly use?  (e.g. IE 6.0, NS 4.7)   _________________________

6. Please indicate with an “x” how frequently you use/consult the following indexes:

   **Film Literature Index**
   Not at all __  __  __  __  __  All the time

   **The Film Anthologies Index**
   Not at all __  __  __  __  __  All the time

   **Film Index International**
   Not at all __  __  __  __  __  All the time

   **Reader’s Guide**
   Not at all __  __  __  __  __  All the time

   **EBSCO**
   Not at all __  __  __  __  __  All the time

List other film or television studies related resources used/consulted:
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

7. Are there any features (e.g. content organization, search abilities, results display) that you especially
   like in any of the above online indexes/resources? Please state the index/resource title and brief
   comments.
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________
   ____________________________________________________________________________

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
Appendix D. FLI Metadata/Fields Selection for Searching and Display

Please check which fields you think are important to facilitate searching and results display. Check more than one field whenever you think it is appropriate. If some of the fields should neither be searched or displayed in the results screen, leave the row unchecked.

For example, Journal Title may be considered important in the Brief Results View Display and in the Detail Results View Display or Journal Title may be considered necessary information in the Detail Results View Display.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Name/Description</th>
<th>Automatic Access for Keyword Searching</th>
<th>Filter to Assist Searching</th>
<th>Brief Results View Display</th>
<th>Detail Results View Display</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Person - as subject of the article</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film/TV Title</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyword – across select fields</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations – Universal Studios</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author – of citation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation – producer, director, screenwriter</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Title</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Language</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Year (Date)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filmography</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obituaries</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Illustrations – maps, graphs, etc.</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Location</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production Year</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate Subject – e.g. Lawsuits</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Subject – author of the citation</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person Subject – related to the person who is the subject of the citation, e.g. Recollections</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author Occupation – author writing about his/her occupation related to film/tv production</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film Subject</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E. Informal Faculty Interview Questions

Questions compiled and interview facilitated by Don Strawser

General questions

1. When you do research what kind of articles are you looking for?
2. Where do you find articles?
3. Do you use any indexes?
4. What kind of periodical literature do you want your students to use?
5. Is there a big difference between undergraduate and graduate students in that regard?
6. Do you prefer using a paper or electronic index? Why?
7. If the FLI were available online would you use the paper version?

FLI knowledge questions

1. Have you used the Film Literature Index within the two years?
   If yes, how often?
2. Have you used other periodical indexes within the past couple of years?
   If yes, which ones?
3. Do you recommend FLI to your students? (Is it referenced in their syllabus? I just want to clarify if it’s a general recommendation on a student-by-student basis or an part of class expectations.)
4. Do you recommend other periodical or online indexes to your students? (same question as above—It could be an informal recommendation, formal (syllabus) or both—I am just curious + it'll help me ID students for upcoming interviews)

FLI usage questions

1. What aspects of FLI do you find most useful?
2. What aspects of FLI do you find least useful?

FLI online questions

1. What aspects of searching are most important to you? (journal, author, title, keyword/subject, date, production title, person, occupation, etc.)
2. What do you think of the film/tv, review/book review/article approach?
3. Is being able to search by physical descriptors such as statistics, graph, filmography important to you? Why?
4. Are there any particular features you would find useful?
Appendix F. Demographic Questionnaire Graphs

**Participant Status**

- Graduate Student: 1
- Faculty: 2

**Areas of Study/Expertise**

- Library Science/Film: 1
- Reference: 1
- Reference/Film: 1
Appendix F. Demographic Questionnaire Graphs
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Appendix G. Metadata/Fields Graphs

Main Citation Fields: Searching

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field Names</th>
<th>Search Automatically (Keyword Searching)</th>
<th>Filter to Assist Searching</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article Year</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Language</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journal Title</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Author</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keyword</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Film/TV Title</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Director</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Person</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Other Citation Fields: Searching

Field Names
- Film Subject
- Author Occupation
- Person Subject
- Author Subject
- Corporate Subject
- Production Year
- Production Location
- Article Illustrations
- Obituaries
- Filmography

Number of Participants

- Search Automatically (Keyword Searching)
- Filter to Assist Searching
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Main Citation Fields: Results Display
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Other Citation Fields: Results Display

Field Names
- Film Subject
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