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1. Executive Summary

The Film Literature Index (FLI) Usability Walkthrough study was designed to test the FLI web site prototype\(^1\), which has been created based on subsequent usability studies\(^2\). The overarching goal for this study was to further test user feedback received to date as manifested in the prototype. General goals include the evaluation of overall organization, terminology, simulated search, browse and results functionality and help.

The prototype is a non-functioning mock-up based on sample FLI data; actual browsing and searching the prototype is not possible. The prototype was used as a basis for discussion. Participants did not interact (mouse/keyboard) with the prototype in any way. Instead, I navigated throughout the site based on the discussion at hand.

The group walkthrough was held March 1, 2004 in the LETRS conference room in the Main Library. The walkthrough consisted of completion of task scenarios as well as general discussion grounded in the prototype and similar resources.

Students, especially undergraduates, were the targeted user group for this study since they are by far underrepresented in the user data collected to date. A $10.00 gift certificate to a local movie theater, Kerasotes, was offered in exchange for their participation. Of the six students who signed up, only four showed.

The students were all undergraduates affiliated with the Communications & Culture department. Their areas of interest ranged from film to writing to media and society. The resources most often used include EBSCO’s Academic Search Premier and MLA Online; none of these students have ever used nor heard of the *Film Literature Index*.

The participants rated the prototype web site highly overall. The major problems revealed dealt with labeling. Other issues explored included the ability to rank results based on relevance as well as provide in the “No Results” screen more relevant suggestions as opposed to a list of generic tips.

The recommendations set forth (see section 5) for the web site prototype are based only on the data collected from this study. Only a handful of recommendations emerged from this study. Each recommendation contains a priority ranking.

2. Methodology

The FLI walkthrough study consisted of two components: completion of task scenarios followed by a prototype walkthrough session. The study took place March 31, 2004 from 9 am to 11:00 am in the LETRS conference room in the Main Library. The walkthrough session was audio recorded; note takers were unavailable at that time. A print volume (53, 1995) of the FLI was provided to ground discussions, answer questions and for general exploration.

Participants completed several forms before commencing with the walkthrough: consent form, contact information form and background questionnaire. Upon completion of general

---

\(^1\) Web site prototype accessible: http://www.letrs.indiana.edu/~mdalmau/fli/index.php

introductions, participants were given task scenario packets, which consisted of eight screen shots of the search, advanced search, browse and results screens with corresponding task scenarios (see Appendix E). Participants were asked to solve the tasks based on the screen shot. This approach enables the collection of individual data that could be impacted when discussing these screens in a group context.

After completion of this activity, we began exploring the prototype web site based on a script (see Appendix A). The usability investigator navigated within the web site due to limited/simulated functionality. Participants did not interact with the prototype itself.

Lastly, participants completed a satisfaction questionnaire and a standard gift reimbursement form for the distribution of the $10.00 gift certificate, per participant, to the 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>Walkthrough Script (Appendix A)</td>
<td>Olympus Digital Recorder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent Form (Appendix B)</td>
<td>Conference Microphone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contact Form (Appendix C)</td>
<td>Computer/Projection HDTV for</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>demonstrating prototype</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background Questionnaire (Appendix D)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Scenarios (Appendix E)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfaction Questionnaire (Appendix F)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gift Reimbursement Form (Appendix G)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2.2. Task Scenarios

Participants were handed eight screen shots with corresponding tasks relating to searching, advance searching, browsing and results manipulation (see Appendix E). The task scenarios were designed to understand how users:

- Interpret labeling of filters and features on the various pages, especially the advanced search screen
- Formulate queries based on the simple search screen, including the use of filters provided, use of complex Boolean operators, and use of wildcard/exact phrase features
- Formulate complex queries, including use of filters and results display features, on the advanced search screen
- Perceive and interact with the syndetic structure presented on the browse pages
- Manipulate results including refining a search, filtering a current result set and selecting citations for emailing

Participants were given approximately 25 minutes to complete all eight tasks.
2.3. Group Walkthrough

Following completion of the task scenarios, the group walkthrough began. Every area of the prototype was explored: home, search, advanced search, browse, results, no results, full record, selected records, email/print/save records, and help. Certain questions were scripted to ensure feedback was obtained, but often ad-hoc questions arose. Participants referenced how they completed the tasks individually during the task scenario exercise when the corresponding screen was shown. This facilitated further discussion regarding confusions, alternative approaches or confirmation of how the task was intended to be resolved. The walkthrough discussion was guided by a script (see Appendix A).

3. Participants

Students were the targeted user group for this study. To date, students, especially undergraduates, are underrepresented in the usability data collected. Email recruitment messages were posted to the department of Communications & Culture’s listserv. Recruitment was also facilitated by the help of liaisons. Of the six students who signed up, only four attended the session. All four of these students are undergraduates in the department of Communications & Culture with ranging interests in film, writing, media and culture.

All the students are PC users at home and work/school (1 does not even have a computer at home), and most spend a significant amount of time online, between 16-25 hours. During the discussion, it was made clear that they hold a preference for online resources when meeting assignment requirements. The time spent online may reflect that finding.

All students but one, who was unsure, use Internet Explorer 6.0 when surfing the web or accessing electronic resources.
The participants were finally asked to rate how frequently they use various online resources: *The Film Literature Index*, Film Index International, *International Index of the Performing Arts*, MLA Bibliography, Reader’s Guide and EBSCO’s Academic Search Premier. The students stated that many of their written assignments are based on class readings, however, when a term paper is assigned, most rely on Academic Search Premier and MLA Bibliography for articles. One participant uses search engines on the Web such as Yahoo! or goes to the IU Libraries web site for access to unnamed licensed resources. Other online databases relevant to mass media were also cited such as ComAbstracts.

### 4. Findings

The findings are divided into three parts: task scenarios, walkthrough commentary and satisfaction questionnaire responses. The task scenarios consisted of a packet of eight questions with corresponding screen shots for each student to complete (see transcription in Appendix H). It was designed to collect individual feedback. The group walkthrough consisted of a group discussion prompted by exploration of the web site prototype. The satisfaction questionnaire consists of sixteen, some multi-part questions, distributed to collect individual, subjective responses.

#### 4.1. Task Scenarios

The task scenarios were designed to test search, advance search, browse and results manipulation approaches. Relevant screen shots of the prototype web site were provided along with task scenarios and instructions. The instructions encouraged the participants to think “out-of-the-box” if the screen shot did not provide the needed features to accomplish the task. The only task that stumped the participants (3 out of 4) had to do with emailing results. Most participants successfully completed the tasks presented. Specific findings as they relate to each area of the prototype tested are presented below.

#### 4.1.1. Search

The tasks created for the search screens were meant to test how the participants used (or didn’t use) filters, Boolean operators, wildcard and exact phrase syntax. The tasks were also designed to test how participants would formulate queries to determine how these queries reflect the data structure in general as well as provide clues for fields that should be keyword indexed.
A common characteristic expressed among the four participants is this notion of evolving the search query, which includes typing in various terms in various combinations to see what happens. This willingness and expectation to continually revise the query until satisfactory results arise is typical of online searching behavior. Two of the four participants used exact phrase searching for names and production titles with a combination of the Boolean AND, which is an efficient approach. Only one considered focusing her search by using the Production Title filter, but only after an initial attempt. All users searched in the default keyword mode.

The participants approached composing a high recall query in various ways, but only one clearly understood the Boolean OR in this context. Another participant, P3, stated he would avoid exact phrase and Boolean AND for that might narrow the search. The exact phrase logic makes sense, but she seemed to assume that the search engine uses the Boolean OR operator by default.

Three of four participants would eventually include the term “articles” or “reviews” as part of their query. However, utilizing the document types in a keyword search could have been influenced by the way task 1 was worded.

4.1.2. Advanced Search

The first task scenario for this area of the prototype tested labeling terminology. The advanced search screen includes several filters and a few options for formatting the results display so it was important to understand if the labeling made sense.

Only one user, P4, seemed to understand what all the labels meant for the most part. The “document features” label (physical descriptors) was guessed incorrectly by three of the participants and even P4 was a bit ambiguous in how she defined this label. “Display style” was the second least understood label (P3 and P5) and others misinterpreted or could not define “document type” and “results number.”

P6 expressed uncertainty with many of the labels but felt that if she could click and look at the options that they would make sense. This sentiment was constantly reiterated during the discussion abating the notion of finding that one label the universe of users will understand. Natural exploration of a web site will begin to answer aspects that seem unclear.

Two of the four participants clearly understand that a scholarly journal is peer reviewed. However, P3 assumed that “scholarly journals” would be a document type. It is unclear if he noticed or understood the “peer review” filter. For the most part, all of the participants built their complex query rather accurately.

4.1.3. Browse

The main purpose of these task scenarios (5 and 6) is to gage how the participants understand and interact with the syndetic structure presented. All
the participants understood the headings, the see also references and the see references. P3, however, indicated that if his first or second browse attempts failed (they didn’t), he’d search. This inclination to search rather than browse manifested during the walkthrough as well.

4.1.4. Results

The two results tasks were meant to test how participants would refine their queries using the various filters provided on the results page and how they would email citations.

Three of the four participants understood the concept of refining a search on the results page. All of them would use the refine search feature. No one mentioned using any of the results filters provided.

All but one participant simply had no clue as to how to email citations. The participant who stated the correct steps (P5) later mentioned during the walkthrough that she had no clue but referenced the search tips on the right hand side of the screen shot. Two of the four explicitly stated clicking in the checkboxes. However, they could not figure out what link to click in order to email the results.

4.2. Group Walkthrough

Following the completion of the task scenarios, a group discussion ensued as each area of the prototype web site was explored. As stated earlier, questions were scripted to guide discussion. Also, participants did not interact with the prototype directly.

The overall reaction to the prototype as a whole was positive. Issues raised repeatedly by one or more than one participant included clarification of certain terminology, relevance ranking of results and specific as opposed to generic “No Results” suggestions.

The group felt that the ability to explore the prototype (reviewing field options, clicking around, etc.) would clarify what seemed confusing due to labeling. This idea of exploration carried through when assessing relevance of search results and refining searches. In short, for these participants, if exploring is facilitated, and they felt it was by the FLI, then they would be able to master the web site.

Findings are organized below based on the major web site areas.

4.2.1. Search

http://www.letrs.indiana.edu/~mdalmau/fli/search.php

Participants in general expected to perform Boolean searches in the simple search page: “Do you have an option that’s like, ‘I am searching for this but NOT for that?’” They also preferred the default keyword search option though two
participants stated they would use exact quotes for known names (title and persons) for a more efficient search.

The filter label, “production title,” confused half the group. One person felt the label was “too technical,” but two others felt the label was clear.

4.2.2. Advanced Search
http://www.letrs.indiana.edu/~mdalmau/fli/advanced.php

When exploring the advanced search field options, a couple of the participants found the label “subject” unclear. It seems like they intuitively understood it but felt “topic” might be a better label.

In the filters section, “document features” confused nearly everyone. After revealing the options for this filter, one participant stated she guessed correctly when completing the task scenario (she did). The group was unable to pose alternative labels, but they all felt that the label would be clarified by exploring the options.

The language filter was not problematic but did intrigue this user group. They didn’t realize that the index was as comprehensive as it is.

The display options generated discussion, especially “results number” per page: Did it mean the “top 30” or could you have the top 50 instead of thousand of results? These questions translated to the notion of relevance ranking for search results. Questions that stemmed from reviewing this area of the Advanced Search page include:

“What am I going to be seeing? Just random [results] that was the word [query] in it or one that has that word in it the most . . .?”

The general expectation is that search results should be organized based on some type of scoring: “I would expect that the one that comes out first would be the one that have the topic that I put in as my keyword in the article most and that’s the article basically about.”

Sorting was then explored. Most felt that the way you search automatically determines sorting, but this assumes that default sort order is based on some sort of relevance ranking. No other sort options were offered.

The “citation style” label was initially confusing, but once the options were revealed, it made sense. One participant felt that APA should be included as an option because most of her papers are written using that style guide.
4.2.3. Browse
http://www.letrs.indiana.edu/~mdalmau/fli/browse.php

All the participants have experienced browsing subject headings online. Also, all the participants understood the SEE and SEE ALSO references. Two in particular really liked them: “I actually enjoy them and use them” and “It's nice that you can see those and become familiar with all the possible headings.”

One participant felt that browsing reveals what the web site has to offer; however, when the group was asked about other browse options, they were unable to specify.

Overall, the group was excited about the browse. A few comments that reveal this include: “I can’t wait to start browsing them.” To which a participant responded, “I know, they look like fun.”

4.2.4. Results/No Results
http://www.letrs.indiana.edu/~mdalmau/fli/results.php

Before exploring the results page, the group engaged in a general discussion about the differences between browsing and searching as well as perceptions regarding “too many results.” Three of the four participants felt that they prefer high recall for the very reason summed up by this participant:

“I usually just go through them all. Just because I might not have typed in the specific topic that I wanted. I might have been too general, but I'll look through because a lot of times I find something that wasn’t really looking for but that could help me a lot.”

Only one participant, the one who prefers searching to browsing, would like to see no more than 100 results.

The group highly rated the results page. They felt it was clear, it made sense and they knew where to look for things.

The discussion of No Results was far more involved. When asked what they expected to find if their query didn’t yield results, they said, “a search box” in order to try again and simple message that states, “No Results.” One participant suggested that if there’s any feedback, it should be a suggestion based on the query that was typed: “And have something like suggestions of different ways to word it [the query].”

To ground their responses, I showed them the Charles W. Cushman Collection “No Results” page (see Appendix I). The first reaction to this page was: “I like to see suggestions related to what I typed. I don’t know, I don’t think I’d read them [Cushman suggestions].” The group then chimed in by stating that they are too many tips and they wouldn’t read them.

3 The FLI Online requirements document to date includes two other browses not yet prototyped: by Production Title and by Corporate Name.
Two participants inquired about the syndetic structure they witnessed on the browse screens to work here as well. Following is an excerpt from that exchange:

[p] I was thinking more along the lines of like when people type that in like if they type "racism" then you can say: “Try searching for stereotypes” or like words that are commonly associated with it.

[md] So kind of like the browse where you have SEE and SEE ALSO references?

[p] yeah

[p2] I guess I’ve been to some other websites that if your search results don’t come up they’ll give you suggestions and then give you some examples of what other I mean so you’ll put in racism on then they’ll give you some articles on discrimination or something. So you know, you might not have to redo your search and you can go onto other things that are similar.

[md] Ok, in keeping with that idea. Let’s say you type “bias in films” rather than get no results, bias should map to “discrimination” and give you results. Is that what I understood you to say earlier?

[p] yeah

[md] So would you be okay with this behind-the-scenes mapping? Would it confuse you?

[p] no. I don’t think so. No.

[p] no [group consensus]

[p] no because I’d go and I click on the article and I look through it and that wasn’t what I were looking for I’d continue on.

[p] I mean I’ll definitely leave the “new search option” there [on the No Results page] .. if you didn’t want .. but I don’t see how you wouldn’t want to unless you want that certain word

[md] That’s really not the convention for a lot of these online resources. If there is a structure for the subject headings they tend to be a separate feature – not automatically part of the search itself. . .

The participants assumed a recommender system model such as Amazon’s recommendations when making these suggestions.

After discussing options for the No Results page, we explored the filters on the results page. The filters made sense to the group. However, one participant was curious to know if she searched, Life is Beautiful, would the English title map to the Italian original title.

The biggest hurdle for the participants was figuring out how to email citations (based on the task scenario). They knew to select the desired citation, but could not find the link or button that would initiate the action. Only one person knew to select “View Selected Records,” but that’s because she read the search tips on
the side of the page. After demonstrating the link, the participants felt it made sense. However, a better label was proposed such as “Email/Print/Save.”

4.2.5. Search Tips/Help

The participants felt that the search tips on the side of each page were helpful because they were context-sensitive. They also liked the concrete examples provided as well as not having to leave the page for help.

We discussed the idea of also having an overall help page for general information, troubleshooting information and so on. They all agreed that it would be helpful.

A participant did ask if there would be a way to type a question for help, referencing a knowledge base model. However, this type of help model is inappropriate for this resource. In turn, a section for frequently asked questions was explored as an alternative.

4.2.6. Full Record, View Selections & Save/Email/Print

Participants found each of these pages intuitive.

4.3. Satisfaction

At the end of the walkthrough session, a satisfaction questionnaire (see Appendix F) was administered. The main purpose of the questionnaire was to provide participants with an individual and anonymous way to recap the group walkthrough.

The satisfaction ratings generally reflect the positive responses to the FLI prototype website as a whole. However, there are some ratings that do not necessarily corroborate with the discussion comments. The open-ended questions did not reveal anything differently, whether positive or negative, that was learned during the walkthrough session.

Thirteen of the twenty-one questions provided were quantitative. The scale ranged from -4 to +4. Each quantitative question included an option for comments (see below). Table 1 indicates the average rating of the 13 questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>1.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>1.769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>3.538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>2.077</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Average rating of 13 Questions

Participants P3 and P4 rated the site slightly below average despite their generally positive comments. Both felt that the site needed more color.

The quantitative questions (13) were visually represented with pie charts. The number next to the participant number indicates the rating for the particular question.
The FLI Prototype Website seemed: Complex (-4) to Simple (+4)

The FLI Prototype Website seemed: Unattractive (-4) to Attractive (+4)

The FLI Prototype Website seemed: Frustrating (-4) to Satisfying (+4)

The FLI Prototype Website seemed: Low Quality (-4) to High Quality (+4)

The FLI Prototype Website seemed: I dislike (-4) to I like (+4)

Characters on the computer screen were: Hard to read (-4) to Easy to read (+4)

Use of terms, such as labels, throughout the website was: Confusing (-4) to Very Clear (+4)

Information displayed on the screen was: Confusing (-4) to Very Clear (+4)

Organization of information on the computer screen seemed: Confusing (-4) to Very Clear (+4)

Navigating within the site seemed: Confusing (-4) to Very Clear (+4)
Below are the transcribed answers to the open-ended questions:

1. Please tell us what you think of the major areas of the FLI prototype.
   
   a. Navigation?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Fairly easy -- straight forward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>simple navigation with clearly marked links. I like the red font for links</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>I think it flows pretty well. I was able to understand for the most part how to find what I wanted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>I thought it was fairly easy to navigate around</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   b. Organization of Content?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>seems good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>It isn’t cluttered making it easier to see where I need to go and the options I have.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>The tips on the side are helpful. I would rather go there then to the help link for tip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>seems organized</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

   c. Instructions/Label/Help?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Some labels and instructions are fuzzy but for the most part they are good!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>The tips on the side are helpful. I would rather go there then to the help link for tip.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Very clear, I like the help subjects on the side.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>I did have some concern with the labels-- seems like they are a little too technical a/o wordy and could be simplified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
d. Browsing?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>I really liked the browse section. I would spend time here for fun.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>very clear, &quot;see also&quot; is very helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>OK, would like to try it out -- but some specific examples for searches are always helpful.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

e. Searching (including Advanced Search)?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Very Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>There is a clear distinction between simple search and advanced which helps me make a decision between the two.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>very clear, very specific, that's what I like to see</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>good filter options.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

f. Results?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Good. Maybe regiment number of results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>clearly marked and well organized.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>add option for similar topics of search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>I would like to see suggestions or links to similar search results.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

g. Other?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>generally looks pretty awesome, I'm excited to use it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. What aspects did you find particularly useful?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>The advanced search.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Browsing!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>The advanced search was well designed, but I was very impressed with the browsing, the topics were extremely helpful and the &quot;see also&quot; looks very useful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>I found it useful that you could refine the search to be specific if needed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. What aspects did you find particularly problematic?

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>The production title [label] on the first page.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Sort by and Document features heading. Maybe additional features or extra features. Sort by makes me think of narrowing down rather than organization style.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Some of the headings/labels were a bit confusing but if a person were searching and playing around with the options it would become clear how to use all of the options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>again, just some of the wording, but its nothing …that can't be explained by its pull-down menu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Recommendations

Based on the findings, the following recommendations are proposed for implementation consideration:

### Advanced Search

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rename &quot;subject&quot;</td>
<td>The label “topic” was suggested.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rename “Document Features”</td>
<td>No alternatives offered.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Add &quot;APA&quot; to Citation Style</td>
<td>Based on only 1 participant request.</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Results (Brief View)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sort results by relevance ranking as default</td>
<td>Need to look into Oracle’s built-in scoring/ranking capabilities.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change &quot;View Selected Records&quot; label</td>
<td>“Email/Print/Save” was suggested.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### No Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include Search box for New Search</td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offer suggestions based on query input (map to x-reference list?)</td>
<td>To be discussed in terms of technical implementation.</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide general tips.</td>
<td>Though participants did not agree, general tips should be offered to keep with convention.</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Help

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consider FAQ</td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Conclusion

The feedback from this usability study reveals that the overall organization, terminology and represented flow of the prototype are acceptable. The recommendations proposed above mostly effect the interface.

The recommendations that impact functionality will be considered in terms of technological and timeline constraints. The ranking of results is already on the Functionality Requirements list and is pending review of how Oracle can support this without too much intervention from Don Strawser, our super programmer. Also to be considered is the notion of integrating the cross-references into the search process. Currently, they will be utilized in the browse pages. Although two participants explored this notion in the “No Results” context, the likelihood of receiving no results when searching over a half a million citations is low.

Since the findings based on this walkthrough were minor, future user studies will not be scheduled until a functioning prototype is in place. At that time, representative tasks will be created and tested with users actually using the FLI online web site.
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Walkthrough Script for the Film Literature Index Online

[Overview of the Walkthrough]

The Film Literature Index website is in the early design stages. We are here today to hold a guided discussion of the prototype site. The discussion will be prompted by specific questions that address the prototype. I will navigate to the relevant parts of the website so that you can see what we have mocked up. The idea is to refer to the prototype site when answering the questions posed.

Feel free to bring up related sites such as EBSCO Host, MLA, or other film-TV resources you typically use if you wish to illustrate a certain feature that you find particularly helpful in other resources.

Do you have any questions about the walkthrough?

[Overview of the Film Literature Index]

Before we begin the walkthrough, 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.

Are any of you familiar with FLI [show print version]? Have you ever used it when researching for a paper?

Anyway, the DLP was awarded an NEH grant to digitize 24 years, from 1976-2000, 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 students 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?

The website we will soon review is a prototype site with no functionality. This means that the searches and browses and other similar features do not really work. However, they are mocked up with examples to illustrate how they could work.
Feel free to ask questions at any time.

[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” but I am obliged to mention them: 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 – Usability Specialist!]
At any time, feel free to mention film and TV resources that you may use to illustrate or support your points.

**[Home Page]**

1. [Quickly summarize page]

   [Most of this information is targeted at institutions who would like to subscribe to the index. ‘Latest News’ section]

**[General Questions]**

I have a few general questions to ask you before we continue:

- When you browse or search a site, how many results are too many? You can think of this in terms of number of pages you’ll scroll through if this helps.
- How do you feel when you receive a very large number of results when you browse?
- How about when you search?
- What do you usually do when your query retrieves too many results?

**[Task Scenarios]**

Before we actually have a look at the rest of the prototype, I’d like for you to take a few minutes to complete the task scenarios (8 total) in your packet.

[Hold up a set as an example].

On every page there is a screen shot, a scenario and instructions with room to fill in the steps you would take to solve that task. Feel free to think “out-of-the-box” – don’t feel constrained by the screen shot. If there is something you’d do that is not represented in the screen shot, make sure to note that.

Let’s try to wrap this section up in 15-20 minutes.
[Search Page]

1. Let’s look at the ‘search’ page.

   How would you use this search page? Do you find the filters useful? If so, why?
   - When would you use the keyword filter? What type of content do you expect it to search?
   - When would you use the production title filter? How would you enter a title when searching in this field?
   - When would you use the person filter? How would you enter someone’s name in this field?

   Did you notice the search tips? What type of examples would you like to see in this section?

[Advanced Search]

2. Let’s look at the ‘advanced search’ page.

   How often do you use Advanced Search pages?

   Let’s have a look at the field search options.

   [review fields one by one]
   - Are they clear? Are they satisfactory?
   - Which field options would you add or remove?
   - Do you understand how you would use these fields when searching?

   Let’s have a look at the filters.

   Do these labels make sense?
   - Year
   - Format
   - Document Type
   - Document Features: Do you look for articles that contain any other features not listed here (e.g. stills, scores, etc.)?
   - Language
- **Peer Review**

  Let’s have a look at the **display options**.

  Do these labels make sense?

  - Citation Style – Is there a style you use that is missing? How or why would you use this feature?
  - Results Number
  - Sort By – What other sort options would be helpful to you?

  What are other results display options you would like to see here?

  I’d like to remind **you to interject at any time** in terms of how content is also laid out. If **you find the screen cluttered** or filled with too many links or **you like the layout** because it’s intuitive, please feel free to say so.

[Browse Options]

3. Let’s have a look at the **browse page**.

   Are the browse categories presented clearly [in terms of labeling]?

   - Subject Headings
   - Person as Subject

   Have you ever browsed subject headings online? Do you find it helpful?

   What other browse lists would you find helpful?

[Subject Headings]

4. Let’s look at the **browse by subject headings**.

   Would you like to browse a subject heading that could potentially yield over 2,000 results? How would you restrict the number of results when browsing?

   [click on A]

   - Do you understand what the SEE and SEE ALSO references indicate?
   - Where do you expect these links will take you?
   - [Click on SEE ALSO example]
[Person as Subject]

5. Let’s look at the **browse by person as subject**.

How would you approach browsing for someone’s name [by first name, last name]?

[Quickly demo Person page]

[Help]

6. How often do you visit the help when searching or browsing? Did you notice the help tips?

Do you use or prefer to use context-sensitive help (tips on every page) or overall/external help reference?

[Results Pages]

7. Let’s look at the results pages.

- What are your first impressions of this page? [in terms of presentation – Is it confusing? Is it clear?]

- Is the information displayed on this page (Query Feedback, Number of results) sufficient?

- How would you like to order or sort your results? What sort options would be most useful to you?

- What would be an acceptable default result sort order, for instance chronological, descending (most recent on top)?

- What do you expect to find if your search yields no results?

[refine search]

- If you want to narrow your search based on the results from this page, how would you do it?

- Have you ever narrowed browse/search results from the results page? What do you think of this feature?
[filters]

- What do you think these options [filter by format, document type and language] do?
- Do you find these helpful or can you think of other ways to manipulate your results that you would find helpful?

[view selected]

Do you understand how you would email, print or save citations from this page?

[open URL]

You like to access the full-text article. How would you do this from here?
What do you expect to find when you click the “Check for Full Text” link?

[Full Record]

8. Let’s look at a full record.

- Does the information presented make sense?
- Do the labels make sense?
- What do you the linked names, titles and headings will do?

[View Selected Records]

9. Let’s pretend we selected citations of interest. Now we are ready to view them for emailing, saving or printing.

- What are your initial impressions of this page?
- Do you understand the “Change Citation Style” feature? Is this useful?

[email]

Does this page make sense?
This wraps up the evaluation of the FLI prototype. Do you have any comments or questions that we did not address about this prototype or other online databases/collections—especially image collections—that you have used?

Walkthrough completion and questionnaire

Thank you for your feedback.

[Administer Post-Test Questionnaire.]

We now have a final questionnaire. Keep in mind that this questionnaire is anonymous. If you have some comments that you didn’t express for any reason during the walkthrough, include them in this questionnaire. Be blunt—it’s anonymous and confidential!

Please feel free to ask me any questions about the questionnaire.

When you finish we have some thank-you gifts to offer.

Debriefing

Once again, I’d like to thank you for coming today. Your participation will help us refine the design of the FLI online.

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.]
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INDIANA UNIVERSITY - BLOOMINGTON
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

FILM LITERATURE INDEX ONLINE PROTOTYPE: GROUP WALKTHROUGH EVALUATION

You are invited to participate in a research study. This study investigates how you use or would use the Film Literature Index Website (FLI Online) in your research and/or teaching.

INFORMATION

If you chose to participate, you will be part of a group walkthrough evaluation that will explore how you would use the FLI Online as well as how you do use existing film and television-related resources. There will be 5-7 others participating in the evaluation session. Also present will be a facilitator and note-takers.

You will be asked to complete a short background questionnaire and contact information form before the website evaluation commences. The contact form is the only form along with this consent form that will contain identifying information. We will keep these forms in a separate file. In other words, your name will not be mapped to any data we collect during this study. You will also be asked to complete a satisfaction questionnaire upon completion of the evaluation.

The contact information form will only be used if we need to reach you for clarification. You are not obligated to participate if we do contact you. If you do participate, the follow-up session should not last more than 30 minutes.

The walkthrough session will last no more than 2 hours. You will be asked to comment on various prototype web pages. Specific questions related to the function or design of the pages you are viewing will be posed, as well as general questions regarding your previous use of online image collections.

The group walkthrough will be audio recorded to assist information collection. The audio recording will not be broadcast or heard by anyone other than the investigators leading this evaluation. The questionnaires, session notes and the audio recording of your responses will be used strictly for the development of the Film Literature Index website.

BENEFITS

Your participation benefits all future users of the Film Literature Index Online. Your input will help us ultimately design a website that meets the needs of people like you who may utilize the website for scholarly or general interest purposes. In addition, the findings from this study will help in the design of future digital library projects that rely on the basic principles and methods of information access and retrieval with regard to online indexes.

RISKS
There are no foreseeable risks in participating in this study.

CONFIDENTIALITY
Participants will not be identified in reports of this study. All collected information will be kept confidential and no reference will be made in oral or written reports that could link you to the study. Access to the recorded interviews and questionnaires will be limited to research investigators and will be kept in restricted access in the Digital Library Program offices until completion of the website. Transcripts and questionnaires will be identified only with a generic participant number, e.g. Participant #1. Upon the scheduled completion of the Film Literature Index website, December 2004, the audiotapes and forms related to this interview will be destroyed.

The only form with identifying information is the Contact Information form that may be used to reach you for follow-up/clarification purposes. This form will be kept in a separate file, thus, there will be no mapping to the questionnaires and interview recordings.

COMPENSATION
You will receive a gift certificate to Kerasotes, local movie theater, worth $10.00, for participating in this study. If you chose to forego participation after reading this consent form, you will not be compensated.

CONTACT
If you have any questions about this study or its procedures, please contact Michelle Dalmau, 1320 E. 10th Street, Main Library, E170, (812) 855-1261, mdalmau@indiana.edu.

If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or that your rights as a participant in research has been violated during the course of this project, you may contact the office for the Human Subjects Committee, Carmichael Center, L03, 530 E. Kirkwood Avenue, Bloomington, IN 47408, 812/855-3067, or by e-mail at iub_hsc@indiana.edu.

PARTICIPATION
Your participation in this study is voluntary; you may decline to participate without penalty. If you decide to participate, you may withdraw from the study at any time without penalty. If you withdraw from the study your individual data will be returned to you or destroyed, and your contribution to the interview/observation sessions will not be used for research purposes.

CONSENT
I have read this form and received a copy of it. I have had all my questions answered to my satisfaction. I agree to take part in this study.

Participant’s signature                                Date

Investigator’s signature                               Date

Last revised: February 27, 2004
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Participant Contact Information for
Film Literature Index Prototype Group Walkthrough

All the information you provide is confidential. This contact information will be stored in a separate file and thus will not be associated to any of the questionnaires and evaluation sessions you will complete. Future follow-up studies may arise in which you could partake. If you are contacted by the Digital Library Program for a future study, you are under no obligation to participate.

Name: ____________________________________________

Department: ____________________________

Email Address: ____________________________
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Participant Background Information for
Film Literature Index Prototype Group Walkthrough

This questionnaire is designed to help us gain an understanding of people who will use the Film Literature Index web site. You may use the back of the form if you need more space. All the information you provide is confidential.

1. Status (circle all that apply): Faculty Graduate Student Undergraduate Librarian Staff Alumnus Non-IU:__________________
   a. Area(s) of study or expertise:

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

3. About how many hours a week do you spend online (WWW, email, etc)?
   Less than 5 hours 5-15 16-25 26-35 More than 35 hours

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

5a. Please indicate with an “x” how frequently you use the following indexes
   for film/TV-related research:
5b. List other film/TV-related resources that you use:

_____________________________________________________________________

6. How often do you consult online resources for film/TV-related articles?
   Never __ __ __ __ __ Always

7. If you prefer online film/TV-related resources, please briefly explain why (e.g. searching capabilities, full-text access, convenience, etc.).

_____________________________________________________________________
_____________________________________________________________________

8. How important is it for you to know if the journal contained in the FLI online is peer reviewed?
Very Important  Important  Neutral  Somewhat Important  Not Important

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
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Search

FLI Online is an index to film and television-related articles, film reviews and book reviews.

**SCENARIO:**
You need to find articles about and film reviews of Orson Welle’s *Citizen Kane*.

Please state step-by-step how you would complete the task using the above screen shot. How would you formulate your query? Be as descriptive as possible.

**SEARCH STEPS:**

1. Click on the search button.
2. Enter the keyword "Citizen Kane" in the search box.
3. Click on the search button again to execute the query.
4. Review the search results for relevant articles and reviews.

**Note:** The screenshot shows the FLI Online search interface with the search bar and options for advanced search, browse, about FLI, and help.
Search

FLI Online is an index to film and television-related articles, film reviews and book reviews.

SCENARIO:
You are interested in articles about post-production sound effects. You are curious to know about sound recording and editing processes. Compose a search query that finds as many articles about sound effects as possible.

Please state step-by-step how you would complete the task using the above screen shot. How would you formulate your query? Be as descriptive as possible.

SEARCH STEPS:

1. Open the FLI Online website.
2. Navigate to the search section.
3. In the search bar, enter the following query: "post-production sound effects OR sound recording OR sound editing".
4. Click on the search button to retrieve the results.
5. Review the articles returned and select relevant ones for further reading.

By using the OR operator, you can ensure that the search returns articles related to any of the terms specified, increasing the chances of finding articles about sound effects that meet your interest.
Advanced Search

FLI Online is an index to film and television-related articles, film reviews and book reviews.

DEFINITIONS:

To ensure that the labels on this screen make sense, please list the options you would expect to find for each of the following labels:

Format: _______________________________________________

Documents Type: _______________________________________________

Document Features: _______________________________________________

Display Style: _______________________________________________

Display Number: _______________________________________________

Sort By: _______________________________________________

Any comments?:  

_____________________________
SCENARIO:
You are looking for articles that address African American and Hispanic stereotyping in television programs aired during the 1960s thru the 1990s. You’d like citations from scholarly journals only. You would also like to sort these results in a format meaningful to you as well as display more than 30 results per page.

Please state step-by-step how you would complete the task using the above screen shot. Not all the options are shown, but hazard a guess as to which fields and filter options you would use. How would you formulate your query? Be as descriptive as possible.

SEARCH STEPS:

___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
___________________________________________________________________________
Subject Browse

FLI Online is an index to film and television-related articles, film reviews and book reviews.

SCENARIO:
You are interested in articles about the aesthetics of film-making practices. While you are looking for articles about aesthetics in general, you are also specifically interested in the sublime in film. How would you use this browse list to find articles about these topics of interest?

Please state step-by-step how you would complete the task using the above screen shot. Be as descriptive as possible.

BROWSE STEPS:
Subject Browse

FLI Online is an index to film and television-related articles, film reviews and book reviews.

SCENARIO:
You are writing a paper about racism in film. How would you use this screen to find articles on this subject?

Please state step-by-step how you would complete the task using the above screen shot. Be as descriptive as possible.

BROWSE STEPS:
Results Page

FLI Online is an index to film and television-related articles, film reviews and book reviews.

SCENARIO:
You have conducted a search on “horror films and gender,” which has yielded too many results. You decide that you are really looking for citations about the depiction of female sexuality in horror films. How would you use this page to revise your query?

Please state step-by-step how you would complete the task using the above screen shot. Be as descriptive as possible.

BROWSE STEPS:
Results Page

FLI Online is an index to film and television-related articles, film reviews and book reviews.

SCENARIO:
You are interested in emailing the first two citations. How would you do this?

Please state step-by-step how you would complete the task using the above screen shot. Be as descriptive as possible.

BROWSE STEPS:

1. Click on the first citation to view it in full text.
2. Click on the second citation to view it in full text.
3. In the full text view, click on the email link associated with each citation.
4. Fill in the email form with your desired recipient and message.
5. Submit the email form to send the citations to the recipient.
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Satisfaction Questionnaire for the Film Literature Index Prototype Group Walkthrough

This questionnaire is designed to tell us how you feel about the FLI prototype website you reviewed today. We will use this information to ensure that the web site meets the needs of people who will be using it. Please try to answer each question. All information you provide is confidential.

1. Please tell us what you think of the major areas of the FLI prototype.
   a. Navigation?
   b. Organization of Content
   c. Instructions/Lables/Help?
   d. Browsing?
   e. Searching (including Advanced Search)?
   f. Results page?
   g. Other?

Your overall reaction to the web site?

Feel free to comment on any of the statements or questions below.

The FLI Prototype Website seemed:

Complex Simple
4 . . 3 . . 2 . . 1 . . 0 . . 1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4

Comments:____________________________________________________________

Unattractive Attractive
4 . . 3 . . 2 . . 1 . . 0 . . 1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4

Comments:____________________________________________________________
Frustrating  Satisfying

4 . . 3 . . 2 . . 1 . . 0 . . 1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4

Comments: ______________________________________________________________

Low Quality  High Quality

4 . . 3 . . 2 . . 1 . . 0 . . 1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4

Comments: ______________________________________________________________

I dislike  I like

4 . . 3 . . 2 . . 1 . . 0 . . 1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4

Comments: ______________________________________________________________

**Terminology and Screen Evaluation**

*Feel free to comment on any of the statements or questions below.*

Characters on the computer screen were:

**Hard to read**  **Easy to read**

4 . . 3 . . 2 . . 1 . . 0 . . 1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4

Comments: ______________________________________________________________

Use of terms, such as labels, throughout the website was:

**Confusing**  **Very Clear**

4 . . 3 . . 2 . . 1 . . 0 . . 1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4

Comments: ______________________________________________________________

Information displayed on the screen was:

**Confusing**  **Very Clear**

4 . . 3 . . 2 . . 1 . . 0 . . 1 . . 2 . . 3 . . 4

Comments: ______________________________________________________________

**Organization**

*Feel free to comment on any of the statements or questions below.*

Organization of information on the computer screen seemed:

**Confusing**  **Very Clear**
Navigating within the site seemed:

Confusing  Very Clear

Comments:____________________________________________________________

Organization of the site as a whole seemed:

Confusing  Very Clear

Comments:____________________________________________________________

Website Capabilities

Feel free to comment on any of the statements or questions below.

Searching the collection seemed:

Confusing  Very Clear

Comments:____________________________________________________________

Browsing the collection seemed:

Confusing  Very Clear

Comments:____________________________________________________________

What aspects of the site did you find particularly useful?
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
What aspects of the site did you find particularly problematic?

____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________ __________________________________________

Thank you for completing the questionnaire.
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Gift Acknowledgement Form

By signing below, I certify that I participated in a usability evaluation of the *Film Literature Index* prototype website for Indiana University's Digital Library Program and received a Kerasotes gift certificate in the amount of $10.00 in exchange for my participation.

Signature: ____________________________
Print name: ____________________________
Date: _______________________________
Email: _______________________________
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**Task Scenario Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1</th>
<th>You need to find articles about and film reviews of Orson Welles’s Citizen Kane.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>In the “search for” I would type Citizen Kane. If nothing came up that I wanted Orson Wells would be next and see if I can find something on Citizen Kane.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Type in &quot;Citizen Kane&quot; and &quot;Orson Welles&quot;, then click an &quot;and&quot; but connect them with quotes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>I would type &quot;Citizen Kane&quot; and &quot;film reviews&quot; then probably try both &quot;key word&quot; and &quot;production title&quot; If that did not work, I would probably just search for &quot;Citizen Kane&quot; under production title and go from there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>I would first search by entering Citizen Kane AND articles. After seeing those results and going through them I might add reviews if I feel that the first results weren’t specific enough.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T2</th>
<th>You are interested in articles about post-production sound effects. You are curious to know about sound recording and editing processes. Compose a search query that finds as many articles about sound effects as possible.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>first I would type sound effects- and look through. If that didn’t work then sound recording. Then editing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>I would probably Keyword it and type post-production Sound effects. No quotes or &quot;ands&quot; because that might be too specific</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>I would use the keyword search for &quot;sound effect composition&quot; or &quot;postproduction sound editing&quot; if either of those did not come up with what I was looking for, I might try something more general like &quot;sound effects&quot; and see if any of those links were about technical aspects of post production sound effects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>I’d probably use the OR search function since those typically give the most results in my past searches so I’d say something like &quot;post-production OR sound effects or recording&quot; or something similar to that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3a</th>
<th>Format (definitions):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Types of stuff-either Film, TV and Books.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Bc I see [film/tv] I would expect this means what type of production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Film, Television</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>(film/TV), (film), (TV)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3b</th>
<th>Documents Type (definitions):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>articles, journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>Bc I see [film/tv] I would expect this means what type of production.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Full text or if it is a summary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>(all types), (articles), (reviews), (journals)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3c</th>
<th>Document Features (definitions):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>not sure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>options + things offered in the article.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>? Audio?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>I’m not sure what this refers to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T3d</th>
<th>Display Style (definitions):</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>maybe, type of article, or review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>types of citings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>PDF, file type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>MLA, APA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
T3e | Display Number (definitions):
P3 | not sure  
P4 | # of results  
P5 | How many per page (results)  
P6 | 20 pr. Pg., 30 pr pg., 50 etc.

T3f | Sort By (definitions):
P3 | different ways to sort  
P4 | how you want the results organized  
P5 | date, author, title, size  
P6 | year (descending), yr. (ascending), month, etc.

T3g | Any comments?:
P3 | 0  
P4 | Document type + features seem a bit unclear to me w/out seeing my options on the pulldown.  
P5 | 0  
P6 | My only comment is that by looking at past this screen …I'm not sure what "features" means since I can't click on the drop down arrow to check it.

T4 | You are looking for articles that address African American and Hispanic stereotyping in television programs aired during the 1960s thru the 1990s. You'd like citations from scholarly journals only. You would also like to sort these results in a format meaningful to you as well as display more than 30 results per page.
P3 | in keyword I would type Black and Hispanic Stereotyping. Format would be TV. In years put '60 to '90. Document would be scholarly journals. Results number @ 30 per page.  
P4 | search for [key] [stereotyping] and ["African American"] and ["Hispanic"]  
P5 | I would use the keyword "African American" and "Hispanic", "Stereotyping" and "1960s - 1990s television" I would make sure they were peer reviewed and in English; then sort them by date. I would have to use "all years" because much has been written about stereotyping during the 60s - 90s on television more recently.  
P6 | first, I would enter some keywords such as Africa AND stereotyping AND television or something similar. Then I'd select the range of years as being probably 1960 - 2000 or I might have it as all since this index probably doesn't have anything earlier. Next, I'd select the document type as journal and click the peer reviewed sources button since those are typically all journals. Lastly, I'd customize my result # by making it large.

T5 | You are interested in articles about the aesthetics of film-making practices. While you are looking for articles about aesthetics in general, you are also specifically interested in the sublime in film. How would you use this browse list to find articles about these topics of interest?
P3 | I would first try by looking for aesthetics under A. Then sublime under S. Then if neither worked going back to search.  
P4 | I would click sublime in film under aesthetics.  
P5 | I would click on "sublime in film, the" under the Heading "Aesthetics"  
P6 | I'd probably just click on the "Sublime in film" link and so where that'd take me. I like to make my searches as easy as possible

T6 | You are writing a paper about racism in film. How would you use this screen to find articles on this subject?
P3 | First go under the B for racism. If that didn't work I would search.  
P4 | I would click "R" above and then look for the word racism
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P5</th>
<th>I would either click on &quot;discrimination&quot; under the &quot;Bias&quot; heading, or click on &quot;R&quot; for racism or &quot;S&quot; for Stereotyping.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>I'd probably go right to clicking on &quot;R&quot; since I'm looking specifically for racism, but based on only this screen I'd probably also click on the discrimination link.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T7</th>
<th>You have conducted a search on “horror films and gender,” which has yielded too many results. You decide that you are really looking for citations about the depiction of female sexuality in horror films. How would you use this page to revise your query?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>Research under &quot;female sexuality in horror films&quot; and the just &quot;female sexuality and browse over ones given.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>I would click &quot;refine search&quot; and in that search box I would type &quot;female&quot; sexuality on [female or women]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>I would search for &quot;female sexuality in horror films&quot; as a new search, or most likely as a refined search.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>I'd click &quot;refine results&quot; and enter &quot;horror films and females&quot; or something like that.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T8</th>
<th>You are interested in emailing the first two citations. How would you do this?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P3</td>
<td>I don't think I understand- I have no idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P4</td>
<td>I would click view full record?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>I would click on the boxes and &quot;view selected records&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P6</td>
<td>Honestly, I've never emailed search results before. I'm guessing it would involve clicking on the selection boxes to the left of the results and going from there, but beyond that I have no idea.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I

Results

No results for: bubbles

Suggestions for revising your search:

- Check the spelling of your search terms
- Verify your search syntax — make sure you have closed parentheses and double quotes
- If you are using advanced operators search syntax such as country, make sure that you are using the supported fields
- Make sure you searched years 1938 thru 1960
- Broaden your search by using fewer search terms
- Broaden your search by using wildcard symbol (*) at the end of term(s)
- Broaden your search by conducting OR searches
- Visit the help page for more information on searching