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Overview

- Discussion of “Discovery”
- UIC environment
- Study planning and execution
- Data portion of our afternoon
- Lessons learned
- Next steps
What is web-scale discovery?

http://hubblesite.org/newscenter/archive/releases/2010/01/image/a/
What is web-scale discovery?
Benefits of Discovery Tools

- Closest thing we have to *gaocomprehensive* single *g* search *l* boxe
- Users *discover* your lesser known collections
- Allows librarians to teach to content and strategy
Discovery Drawbacks

- Users find it difficult to interpret complicated result sets
- Users don’t understand faceted searching (yet)
- Misconception about “what’s inside”
- Back-end set-up complications
Fame Factory: Performing Gender and Sexuality in Talent Reality Television

by Ganetz, Hillevi


Through an analysis of some key episodes of this reality show, the article discusses how gender and sexuality are produced and reproduced within this music television context. It is shown how the performances rest on highly traditional conceptions of these categories, but there are also certain transgressions, especially concerning sexuality, which undermine hegemonic structures.

Genders

by Glover, David and Kaplan, Cora

2009, ISBN 020383970

themes and figures, gender

Book: Citation Online
Book: Available, H21076 G50 2009, Eastern Illinois University; Book Stacks A-H 3000; J-L 2000; P-Z 1000 Level

The Politics of the “Sink”
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Deadly sins, reality
Psychological stress, appraisal, emotion and cardiovascular response in a public speaking task.

Feldman, Pamela J. 1; Cohen, Sheldon 2; Hamrick, Natalie 1; Lepore, Stephen J. 2.
Psychology & Health 19.3 (Jun 2004): 353-368.

Abstract (summary)  Translate

Forty-three undergraduates (30 males, 13 females) prepared and performed a speech task (stressor) or a reading task (no-stressor control). Preparing to speak led to greater threat appraisal, negative emotion, and cardiovascular (CV) response than preparing to read aloud, particularly in speech anxious individuals. Delivering the speech, however, did not result in an increment in CV response over and above preparation. Although threat appraisals could not explain the effect of stress on CV response during task preparation, negative emotion accounted for over half of the effect. These data support the hypothesis that CV response in these studies is at least partially accounted for by psychological processes (stressor-specific anxiety and negative emotional response) and suggests that these processes may be best studied during a period of stressor anticipation. (PsycINFO Database Record (c) 2012 APA, all rights reserved)(journal abstract)
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Psychological stress, appraisal, emotion and cardiovascular response in a public speaking task

by Feldman, Pamela J; Cohen, Sheldon; Hamrick, Natalie; Lepore, Stephen J

Abstract
Forty-three undergraduates (30 males, 13 females) prepared and performed a speech task (stressor) or a reading task (no-stressor control). Preparing to speak led to greater threat appraisal, negative emotion, and cardiovascular (CV) response than preparing to read aloud, particularly in speech anxious individuals. Delivering the speech, however, did not result in an increment in CV response over and above preparation. Although threat appraisals could not explain the effect of stress on CV response during task preparation, negative emotion accounted for over half of the effect. These data support the hypothesis that CV response in these studies is at least partially accounted for by psychological processes (stressor-specific anxiety and negative emotional response) and suggests that these processes may be best studied during a period of stressor anticipation.
Set-up and Maintenance
UIC Environment

Photo by Roberta Devlin, UIC Photo Services
Making a Recommendation

- Which tool had the better/most-relevant content?
- Which tool was easiest to use?
- Which tool did users prefer?
Study Design

- Test users’ ability to:
  - Find local known items
    - Print
    - Electronic
  - Find/request I-Share items
  - Perform general subject research
Test Instrument

- Pilot with students during design phase
- Pre-test questions
  - Current research experience and tool use
- Main usability questions
  - Known item and subject search
    - Books and articles
  - First one tool, then the other
  - Reflection on each tool
- Wrap-up questions
  - Compare tools, give preferences
In the past several years, discovery tools have become an important new way for libraries to assist users in their research, search multiple data sources, such as the library’s local catalog, and provide a single interface to search many sources at once and compare results in various ways: by format, type of publication, etc. They are also able to provide a single search interface to federated databases. The user can conduct the same search across multiple databases and report the results to the user. Discovery tools aggregate and report the search results to the user. Studies of discovery tools (see Becher, 2011; Bertot, 2012) have implemented these tools, and the use of discovery tools, each implemented at a different library. In 2012 Majors published a comparison of WorldCat Local products currently available. However, students do not find a published comparison of WorldCat Local products currently available. With the same usefulness, student users retain a higher level of understanding. In order to choose a single discovery tool, the UIC Library will provide access to both the Summon and the WorldCat Local users.
Participant Recruitment

- Participants: 4 groups
  - Faculty, graduate students, health science professional students, undergraduate students
- Recruited 6 users from each group
- Fliers, e-mail, personal contacts
- $25 Amazon gift card incentive for students
Preparation for Testing

- Practice sessions for testers
- List of participants
- Schedule test sessions
- Assign testers
- Prepare packets – scripts, questions for participants, consent forms
- Prepare equipment (3 locations)
Project Management Challenges

- Keeping track of testers, participants, paper work
  - Release forms, completed interviews
- Scheduling interviews
- 3 locations; 2 cities

http://www.flickr.com/photos/calliope/5772909/
Testing

- April 18-May 3, 2013
- Two librarians
  - Interviewer; note-taker
- Separate packet for each test
  - Scripts, release forms, questions
- Recorded with Camtasia
- Half started with Summon/half with WCL

http://www.flickr.com/photos/6648084@N00/2462966749/
DATA COMPONENTS

QUALITATIVE

- Bottom-up
- Post-test questionnaires
- Screencasts
  - Grouping similar actions/observations
  - Creating categories and sub-categories of functionality and content

QUANTITATIVE

- Top-down
- Task benchmarks
  - Determining rates of success or failure in tasks
  - Creating categories and sub-categories of functionality and content
Post-task questions

- Which tool did you prefer? Why?
- Which tool provided the best results?
- Why did you like these results better?
- Which tool was easier to use? Why?
- Would you use either of these tools again? Why or why not?
- If the library could only keep one of these tools, which would you choose?
Results – overall preferences

- Summon: 46%
- WCL: 46%
- NP: 8%
Preferences by academic status

**Summon**
- F: 46%
- UG: 18%
- G: 18%

**WCL**
- F: 9%
- UG: 36%
- G: 37%
- HS: 18%
Which tool provided the best results?

- Summon: 42%
- WCL: 29%
- No preference: 29%
Which tool was easier to use?

- Summon: 54%
- WCL: 21%
- No preference: 25%
If the library could keep only one tool, which would you choose?

- Summon (50%)
- WCL (37%)
- No preference (13%)

The diagram shows the percentage preferences for each tool.
Screencasts

- Camtasia® screencasts
  - Affinity matching
  - Created benchmarks for success/failure of tasks
  - Benchmarks coded into two categories:
    - Functionality
    - Content
  - Several sub-categories

http://www.flickr.com/photos/10588069@N00/491410298/
### Top user preferences for Summon

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top user preferences for Summon</th>
<th>Coder 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Coder 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
<td><strong>Indicator/sub-category</strong></td>
<td><strong>n=24</strong></td>
<td>** (%)**</td>
<td><strong>n=24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Functionality</td>
<td>Advanced Search</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability/Location</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtering</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Link/url resolver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content</td>
<td>Format/material type</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I-Share/ILL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interface/display</td>
<td>Results list</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Year Search</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Inter Coder Reliability:** 77.8% Agreement; 0.731 Kappa; 0.742 Alpha
# Top user preferences for WCL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Top user preferences for WorldCat Local</th>
<th>Coder 1</th>
<th></th>
<th>Coder 2</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indicator/sub-category</td>
<td>n=24</td>
<td>(%)</td>
<td>n=24</td>
<td>(%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functionality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced Search</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-mail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filtering</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link/url resolver</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Format/material type</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I-Share/ILL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interface/display</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results list</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year Search</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTER CODER RELIABILITY:** 33.3% AGREEMENT; 0.239 KAPPA; 0.239 ALPHA
Task Success (Usability)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Undergraduates</th>
<th>Health Sciences</th>
<th>Graduates</th>
<th>Faculty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WorldCat Local</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summon</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Usability findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CATEGORY</th>
<th>SUB-CATEGORY</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>SUMMON n=24 (%)</th>
<th>WCL n=24 (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Functionality</strong></td>
<td>Availability/location</td>
<td>1a</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1b</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability/location</td>
<td>2a</td>
<td>21 (n=23)</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2b</td>
<td>21 (n=23)</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Availability/location</td>
<td>3a</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3b</td>
<td>10 (n=22)</td>
<td>45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Article availability/location</td>
<td>4a</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4b</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Retrieval</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>3c</td>
<td>9 (n=23)</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Filtering</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5c</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E-mail</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>5d</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Content</strong></td>
<td>Format/material type</td>
<td>6a</td>
<td>18 (n=23)</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>77.3%</td>
<td>83%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**

- SUMMON: 269/348 (77.3%)
- WCL: 289/348 (83%)
TAKEAWAYS

- WorldCat Local = highest proportion of preferences
- WorldCat Local = more usable than Summon
- Summon = more usable for undergraduates
Summon Implementation

- Decision - Summon
- Resistance from users and staff
- Need for internal training

http://www.flickr.com/photos/91883096@N00/3766009204/
Lessons Learned - Users

http://www.flickr.com/photos/88645472@N00/2533394592/
Lessons Learned - Research
Next Steps

- Writing article for publication (fingers crossed!)
- Information literacy
- Summon 2.0

http://www.flickr.com/photos/mafleen/142968757/in/pool-shadows
Questions

- Thanks for listening!
- More information, including interview questions, user tasks, and references available here: http://bit.ly/1j0e3BS

http://www.flickr.com/photos/70731452@N04/6403101327/