

# TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING DIGITAL INFORMATION DISCOVERY

by

ELENA VOYLOSHNIKOVA  
B.Sc., University of Victoria, 2002

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements  
for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

in the Department of Computer Science

We accept this thesis as conforming  
to the required standard

---

Dr. \*\*\*\*\*, Supervisor,

Dept. of Computer Science

---

Dr. \*\*\*\*\*, Member,

Dept. of Computer Science

---

Dr. \*\*\*\*\*, Member,

Dept. of Computer Science

---

Dr. \*\*\*\*\*, External Examiner

© ELENA VOYLOSHNIKOVA, 2015

University of Victoria

*All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced in whole or in part by  
photocopy or other means, without the permission of the author.*

**Supervisor:** Dr. Margaret-Anne Storey

## ABSTRACT

Everyday life revolves around the discovery and curation of digital information. People search the Web continuously, from quickly looking up the information needed to complete a task, to endlessly searching for inspiration and knowledge. A variety of studies have modeled information seeking strategies and characterized information seeking and curation activities on the Web. However, there is a lack of research on how existing Web applications support the discovery and management of information, especially concerning the motivations behind them and how different approaches can be compared.

In this paper, we present a study of information discovery tools and how they relate to the nature of information seeking. We propose a conceptual framework that deals with the opportunistic and purposeful aspects of how people discover and manage digital information. This framework can be used when designing, evaluating or updating Web applications.

**Examiners:**

---

|                        |                           |
|------------------------|---------------------------|
| Dr. *****, Supervisor, | Dept. of Computer Science |
|------------------------|---------------------------|

---

|                    |                           |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Dr. *****, Member, | Dept. of Computer Science |
|--------------------|---------------------------|

---

|                    |                           |
|--------------------|---------------------------|
| Dr. *****, Member, | Dept. of Computer Science |
|--------------------|---------------------------|

---

|                              |
|------------------------------|
| Dr. *****, External Examiner |
|------------------------------|

# Table of Contents

|  |             |
|--|-------------|
| <b>Abstract</b>  | <b>ii</b>   |
| <b>Table of Contents</b>   | <b>iv</b>   |
| <b>List of Figures</b>   | <b>viii</b> |
| <b>List of Tables</b>  | <b>ix</b>   |
| <b>Acknowledgement</b>   | <b>x</b>    |
| <b>Dedication</b>  | <b>xi</b>   |
| <b>1 Introduction</b>  | <b>1</b>    |
| <b>2 Methodology</b>   | <b>4</b>    |
| 2.1 Research Questions . . . . .   | 5           |
| 2.2 Literature Review . . . . .  | 5           |
| 2.3 Building and Refining<br>the Conceptual Framework . . . . .                        | 5           |
| 2.4 Applying the Framework to Design<br>an Information Discovery Application . . . . . | 8           |
| 2.5 Framework Validation . . . . .   | 8           |
| 2.6 Limitations . . . . .  | 8           |
| <b>3 Web-based Information Discovery and Curation</b>                                  | <b>10</b>   |
| 3.1 Information Behavior . . . . .   | 10          |
| 3.1.1 Information Behavior Model . . . . .   | 10          |
| 3.1.2 Information Seeking Models . . . . .   | 11          |
| 3.1.3 Information Exploration . . . . .  | 12          |
| 3.1.4 Information Foraging . . . . .   | 12          |
| 3.1.5 Information Discovery . . . . .  | 12          |
| 3.1.6 Digital Curation . . . . .   | 13          |

|          |   |           |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 3.2      | Web Tasks and Modes of Web Use . . . . .  | 13        |
| 3.3      | Collaborative Information<br>Discovery and Curation . . . . .                       | 16        |
| <b>4</b> | <b>A Preliminary Framework for Information Discovery and Curation</b>               | <b>17</b> |
| 4.1      | Preliminary Framework Composition . . . . .   | 17        |
| 4.2      | Limitations of the Preliminary Framework . . . . .                                  | 19        |
| <b>5</b> | <b>A Conceptual Framework for Information Discovery and Curation<br/>on the Web</b> | <b>22</b> |
| 5.1      | Discovery and Navigation . . . . .  | 22        |
| 5.1.1    | Descriptive Navigation . . . . .  | 22        |
| 5.1.2    | Referential Navigation . . . . .  | 25        |
| 5.1.3    | Random Navigation . . . . .   | 26        |
| 5.1.4    | Direct Navigation . . . . .   | 26        |
| 5.2      | Exploration and Discovery . . . . .   | 26        |
| 5.3      | Integration . . . . .   | 28        |
| 5.4      | Curation . . . . .  | 30        |
| 5.4.1    | Management . . . . .  | 31        |
| 5.4.2    | Information Preservation . . . . .  | 32        |
| 5.4.3    | Augmentation . . . . .  | 33        |
| 5.4.4    | Sharing . . . . .   | 34        |
| 5.5      | Channelled Curation and Discovery . . . . .   | 34        |
| 5.5.0.1  | Channel-based Discovery . . . . .   | 34        |
| <b>6</b> | <b>Framework Evaluation and Application</b>   | <b>37</b> |
| 6.1      | Application . . . . .   | 37        |
| 6.1.1    | KeePlaces . . . . .   | 37        |
| 6.1.1.1  | Navigation . . . . .  | 38        |
| 6.1.1.2  | Exploration . . . . .   | 38        |
| 6.1.1.3  | Integration . . . . .   | 38        |
| 6.1.1.4  | Curation . . . . .  | 38        |
| 6.1.1.5  | Channeling . . . . .  | 38        |
| 6.1.1.6  | Directions for Future Development . . . . .   | 38        |

|         |  |    |
|---------|--|----|
| 6.2     | Final Evaluation . . . . .                     | 38 |
| 6.2.1   | Pinterest . . . . .                            | 39 |
| 6.2.1.1 | Navigation . . . . .                           | 39 |
| 6.2.1.2 | Exploration . . . . .                          | 39 |
| 6.2.1.3 | Integration . . . . .                          | 40 |
| 6.2.1.4 | Curation . . . . .                             | 40 |
| 6.2.1.5 | Channeling . . . . .                           | 40 |
| 6.2.1.6 | Identified Gaps and Future Prospects . . . . . | 40 |
| 6.2.2   | Google Maps . . . . .                          | 40 |
| 6.2.2.1 | Navigation . . . . .                           | 40 |
| 6.2.2.2 | Exploration . . . . .                          | 41 |
| 6.2.2.3 | Integration . . . . .                          | 41 |
| 6.2.2.4 | Curation . . . . .                             | 41 |
| 6.2.2.5 | Channeling . . . . .                           | 42 |
| 6.2.2.6 | Identified Gaps and Future Prospects . . . . . | 42 |
| 6.2.3   | Wikipedia . . . . .                            | 42 |
| 6.2.3.1 | Navigation . . . . .                           | 42 |
| 6.2.3.2 | Exploration . . . . .                          | 43 |
| 6.2.3.3 | Integration . . . . .                          | 43 |
| 6.2.3.4 | Curation . . . . .                             | 43 |
| 6.2.3.5 | Channeling . . . . .                           | 43 |
| 6.2.3.6 | Identified Gaps and Future Prospects . . . . . | 43 |
| 6.2.4   | Delicious . . . . .                            | 43 |
| 6.2.4.1 | Navigation . . . . .                           | 44 |
| 6.2.4.2 | Exploration . . . . .                          | 44 |
| 6.2.4.3 | Integration . . . . .                          | 44 |
| 6.2.4.4 | Curation . . . . .                             | 44 |
| 6.2.4.5 | Channeling . . . . .                           | 44 |
| 6.2.4.6 | Identified Gaps and Future Prospects . . . . . | 44 |
| 6.2.5   | Yelp . . . . .                                 | 45 |
| 6.2.5.1 | Navigation . . . . .                           | 45 |
| 6.2.5.2 | Exploration . . . . .                          | 45 |

|          |  |           |
|----------|--|-----------|
| 6.2.5.3  | Integration . . . . .                          | 45        |
| 6.2.5.4  | Curation . . . . .                             | 45        |
| 6.2.5.5  | Channeling . . . . .                           | 45        |
| 6.2.5.6  | Identified Gaps and Future Prospects . . . . . | 45        |
| <b>7</b> | <b>Implications</b>                            | <b>46</b> |
| 7.1      | Research and Design                            |           |
|          | Implications . . . . .                         | 46        |
| <b>8</b> | <b>Future Work and Conclusions</b>             | <b>47</b> |

# List of Figures

|            |   |    |
|------------|---|----|
| Figure 2.1 | Methodology Overview . . . . .          | 4  |
| Figure 5.1 | Conceptual Framework Overview . . . . . | 23 |
| Figure 6.1 | KeePlaces . . . . .                     | 37 |



# List of Tables

|            |  |    |
|------------|--|----|
| Table 2.1  | Web-based Information Discovery and Curation Tools . . . . . | 7  |
| Table 4.1  | Preliminary Framework - Discovery . . . . .                  | 20 |
| Table 4.2  | Preliminary Framework - Curation . . . . .                   | 21 |
| Table 5.1  | Navigation Mechanisms . . . . .                              | 24 |
| Table 5.2  | Automation and Support for Navigation . . . . .              | 27 |
| Table 5.3  | Exploration Mechanisms . . . . .                             | 29 |
| Table 5.4  | Support for Exploration of Multiple Resources . . . . .      | 29 |
| Table 5.5  | Support for Exploration of a Single Resource . . . . .       | 30 |
| Table 5.6  | Integration . . . . .  | 30 |
| Table 5.7  | Support for Integration . . . . .                            | 30 |
| Table 5.8  | Curation Mechanisms . . . . .                                | 31 |
| Table 5.9  | Curation Support and Automation . . . . .                    | 32 |
| Table 5.10 | Chenneling Mechanisms . . . . .                              | 35 |
| Table 5.11 | Channeling Support . . . . .                                 | 36 |

## *Acknowledgement*

## *Dedication*

# Chapter 1 — Introduction

Today, people use Web technologies to satisfy their information needs. People research their interests and hobbies using various online resources, shoppers search online stores for product characteristics to make purchasing decisions, and travelers visit online booking sites to find information about flights and hotels. In order to accommodate diverse and evolving user needs, Web applications continuously introduce new features and services, empowering information discovery and curation.

The term “information discovery” has been used by many researchers to define or explain various information behaviour paradigms, such as information exploration [1], serendipitous information seeking [2], etc. However, the definition of information discovery itself is difficult to pinpoint.

Lynch describes resource discovery as a complex collection of activities ranging from locating a well-specified information to iterative research activities, that in turn can involve identification of potentially relevant resources, organization and ranking of resources, and resource exploration [3]. Proper and Bruza apply the term “information discovery” in the context of the identification and retrieval of relevant information from electronic sources [4].

In the field of cognitive psychology, Jerome S. Bruner [5] defines information discovery as “all forms of obtaining knowledge for oneself by the use of one’s own mind.” I build on Bruner’s definition to underline the importance of the cognitive processes that govern information discovery. Therefore, *information discovery* is a process of obtaining knowledge from digital sources that can involve complex mental tasks and information behavior.

Information behavior, which refers to the totality of ways in which humans interact with information [6], can enable and support information discovery when targeted at information maintenance and augmentation. This type of information behavior is also known as *digital curation*.

Just as the term “information discovery”, the term “digital curation” is perceived

differently across various disciplines and among researchers. In this thesis, I use the definition proposed by Giaretta [7] and adopted by the Digital Curation Centre<sup>1</sup> which states that digital curation is a process of maintaining and adding value to existing body of information to improve its future use and retrieval.

Information discovery can take on many forms. Web users might be hoping to find particular pieces of information, such as show times and phone numbers, to satisfy specific information needs [4], or they might be lacking well-articulated information needs so they engage in opportunistic browsing [8]. Sometimes, people discover information online without even looking for it [9]. The nature of information discovery can vary, and therefore, it requires elaborate tool support. Required functionality for information discovery and curation can also be distributed among two or more applications, which often leads to tools providing integrated solutions. With people having such diverse information needs and methods of looking for information, designing for information discovery is a challenging task [10, 11].

Addressing the problem of designing Web applications for information discovery, my research goal is to gain an understanding of how existing tools support digital information discovery and curation. While several researchers propose frameworks targeted at design of information discovery systems [4, 12], the importance of information curation in realm of information discovery has been largely overlooked despite the rapidly increasing popularity of socially-curated information spaces. Moreover, many of existing studies that focus on how people look for and discover information online [9, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 8, 19, 20] fail to examine concrete features of existing Web-based information discovery applications, which empower real-world users. More research is necessary to determine how different tools and their features provide fundamental support for information discovery and curation.

To enhance information seeking and curating experiences and support users' interactions, I extend existing research by (1) deriving factors that enable information discovery and curation and relating them within a framework, (2) using the framework to establish a set of questions that can be used when evaluating and designing new applications, (3) iteratively evaluating the framework by using it to study and

---

<sup>1</sup>The Digital Curation Centre is a UK-based organization established to support expertise and practice in digital curation and preservation across communities of practice.

describe current Web applications and to design a new application, which in turn helped refine the framework of factors and questions, and (4) relating the framework to user information discovery goals, that drive the underlying usage of many Web-based applications.

This thesis is organized as follows. The methodology and the process of building and refining a conceptual framework is documented in Chapter 2. Chapter 3 highlights some of the studies and technologies related to information discovery and curation tasks. Chapter 4 describes preliminary attempts of building the conceptual framework and outlines its shortcomings. In Chapter ??, I expand on the goals that motivate information discovery. Chapter 5 outlines the conceptual framework and provides questions that enable digital information discovery and support curation, as well as gives specific examples from real-world Web applications. In Chapter 6, I demonstrate how the framework can be used to reveal missing features in tools and propose new directions for development with relation to user goals. Chapter 7 summarizes implications for research and practice, followed by future work and conclusions in Chapter 8.

## Chapter 2 — Methodology

Methodology for the study presented in this thesis consists of five major steps. To gain deeper understanding of the problem of information discovery and curation, (1) a systematic literature review was conducted. Based on the literature review, (2) I derived the preliminary information discovery and curation design factors and related them within a framework. (3) The framework was then applied for evaluation of 20 different information discovery applications and iteratively refined after every evaluation. (4) The resulting framework was applied to develop a place photo discovery application. Applying the framework for a Web tool design revealed unforeseen gaps that were consequently addressed. Lastly, (5) the framework was applied to reevaluate some of the tools with the purpose of validating its effectiveness. A summary of the methodology is presented in Figure 2.1.



Figure 2.1. *Methodology Overview*

## 2.1 Research Questions

This study is designed to address the problem of designing for information discovery, and it is motivated by the following research questions:

*RQ1: How do existing Web applications support information discovery?*

*RQ2: How do existing information discovery applications support information curation?*

## 2.2 Literature Review

Development of the framework began with an extensive literature review. A diversity of topics contributed to forming an understanding of information discovery and curation, including information behaviour and information seeking models, high-level Web tasks and modes of Web use, exploration-based models of discovery, and methods of personal and social curation. From this review, the preliminary design factors for the framework were derived. Key findings in current literature are presented in Chapter 3.

## 2.3 Building and Refining the Conceptual Framework

Through a careful analysis of 20 information discovery applications (see Table 2.3), the framework was iteratively expanded by adding new concepts and establishing relations between those concepts. The framework was refined as I explored the literature and available tools, and for presentation purposes in this thesis, I present only two versions of the framework. The first preliminary framework was a result of this tool analysis, and it is depicted in Chapter 4. The final version of the framework (see Chapter 5) was a result of developing an information discovery application based on the preliminary work.

For the case study, I selected the most popular information discovery applications in use today and considered the full range of features in those tools (both by referring to the literature and documentation on those tools, as well as exploring the features).



The popularity of information discovery applications was determined using Website popularity ranks provided by Alexa<sup>1</sup>, a commercial Web traffic data provider. The focus was on applications that had strong information discovery components and lesser priority was given to applications whose purpose revolved only around curation.

I used Yins strategies for designing a case study [21] for guidance. The motivation behind choosing a case study over other methods of qualitative research was based on my choice of research questions (which have an explanatory nature), the lack of control over existing applications and their development, and having to focus on contemporary use of real-life Web applications. According to Yin [21], a case study would be an optimal research strategy given the above characteristics.

For each case of my study, I chose a Web application whose primary purpose is to support information discovery. I examined the overall purpose of each application, its description as defined within the application, and literature and documentation related to the application (if they were available) against the features that the application provided. For example, if an application provided bookmarking features, I checked if it was indeed intended to be used for information preservation.

Consequently, the methodology was an iterative process of selecting cases, analyzing them, and determining whether they could be described and evaluated using the framework. If I found a key feature that could not be described, I adapted the framework according to the findings. I repeated the process of case selection and evaluation until the framework was usable for all cases. I then grouped the elements of the framework into categories, recording corresponding questions to ask in order to evaluate applications.

A list of the tools that were used as cases as well as identifying descriptions for each tool are presented in Table 2.3. Other tools were considered throughout the study, however, only the 20 applications presented underwent systematic examination.

---

<sup>1</sup>Alexa is available at [www.alexa.com](http://www.alexa.com)

**Table 2.1.** *Web-based Information Discovery and Curation Tools*

| Application     | Address  | Description                         |
|-----------------|--|-------------------------------------|
| Pinterest       | <a href="http://www.pinterest.com">www.pinterest.com</a>           | Visual discovery tool               |
| Delicious       | <a href="http://delicious.com">delicious.com</a>                   | Social bookmarking service          |
| Tumblr          | <a href="http://www.tumblr.com">www.tumblr.com</a>                 | Microblogging platform              |
| StumbleUpon     | <a href="http://www.stumbleupon.com">www.stumbleupon.com</a>       | Web page discovery tool             |
| Wikipedia       | <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org">en.wikipedia.org</a>             | Free content Internet encyclopedia  |
| Google Maps     | <a href="http://www.google.ca/maps">www.google.ca/maps</a>         | Web mapping service                 |
| Rotten Tomatoes | <a href="http://www.rottentomatoes.com">www.rottentomatoes.com</a> | Movie and TV database               |
| 500px           | <a href="http://500px.com">500px.com</a>                           | Photography site                    |
| BucketList      | <a href="http://bucketlist.org">bucketlist.org</a>                 | Goal tracking and discovery service |
| We Heart It     | <a href="http://weheartit.com">weheartit.com</a>                   | Visual discovery tool               |
| Scoop.it!       | <a href="http://www.scoop.it">www.scoop.it</a>                     | Online publishing platform          |
| Google Images   | <a href="http://images.google.com">images.google.com</a>           | Image discovery service             |
| Vimeo           | <a href="http://vimeo.com">vimeo.com</a>                           | Video sharing Website               |
| LifeHacker      | <a href="http://lifehacker.com">lifehacker.com</a>                 | Daily blog                          |
| YouTube         | <a href="http://www.youtube.com">www.youtube.com</a>               | Video hosting platform              |
| Yelp            | <a href="http://www.yelp.ca">www.yelp.ca</a>                       | Business review site                |
| IMDb            | <a href="http://www.imdb.com">www.imdb.com</a>                     | Movie database                      |
| Trip Adviser    | <a href="http://www.tripadvisor.ca">www.tripadvisor.ca</a>         | Travel site                         |
| Urban Spoon     | <a href="http://www.urbanspoon.com">www.urbanspoon.com</a>         | Online bar and restaurant guide     |
| Thesaurus       | <a href="http://thesaurus.com">thesaurus.com</a>                   | Online thesaurus                    |

## 2.4 Applying the Framework to Design an Information Discovery Application

In order to analyze the framework's capabilities in design for information discovery and curation, I used the framework as a guide for developing a place photo discovery application. Applying the framework to design an application has triggered more changes within the framework, its further extension and refinement. The resulting application is discussed in Chapter 6.

## 2.5 Framework Validation

In order to finalize the framework, it was applied to reevaluate five of the previously examined tools (see Chapter 6). For each tool, I identifies gaps and proposed directions for future development.

## 2.6 Limitations

The case study I conducted has a number of limitations: a lack of documentation, literature, and formal descriptions of available features for some applications introduces a threat to the construct validity of the study. In addition, information discovery tools and features can be used in manners unintended or unforeseen by designers and developers. Therefore, the use of some features within information discovery applications was recorded based on my interpretations. To compensate for such limitations, I employed the tools for personal use over an extended period of time to gain a deeper understanding of their use. In addition, I considered some cases with repeating functionality and design to be able to validate or clarify prior findings.

Many Web applications rapidly evolve. Therefore, my tool analysis only applies to tools at the moment of the study.

Only Web applications running in browsers on a desktop computer were considered in this study. The study can be extended with use of various devices, such as smartphones and tablets, as information discovery patterns and mechanisms may vary for different platforms.

Another limitation was the lack of prior research studies on the subject matter. Some researchers have studied information seeking models and high-level Web tasks, but there is a lack of literature on how to enable and support different Web tasks. This opens up opportunities for future research to analyze methods of developing and building frameworks for facilitating and evaluating tools that support other Web tasks, such as communication, transactions, and goal realization.

## Chapter 3 — Web-based Information Discovery and Curation

Given the complexity of Web-based information discovery and curation tasks, a variety of topics was examined to gain an understanding of how current Web tools support these tasks, including known characteristics of information-related Web usage, currently existing information behavior models, and other aspects of information discovery and curation. This chapter outlines the key background literature that contributed to the development of the conceptual framework and helped answer the research questions.

### 3.1 Information Behavior

As defined previously, information behavior refers to the totality of ways in which humans behave in relation to information [6]. A number of models and frameworks were proposed to represent human information behaviour in its entirety or to represent some of its components, such as information seeking and searching, information retrieval, information discovery, and information curation.

#### 3.1.1 Information Behavior Model

One of the early information behavior models was proposed by Wilson [22] in 1981. According to the original model, information seeking behavior results from the user trying to satisfy their perceived information need. Consequently, the user makes demands on information systems. Success or failure of such demands dictates whether the process is repeated or, if the information need is satisfied, used or communicated with other people.

These underlying ideas remained in the revision of Wilson's model [23]. In the new model however, Wilson defined possible barriers (psychological, environments,

demographic, etc.) that can impede information seeking. Additionally, the model recognizes that information seeking behaviour can take on many forms and is not limited to active search. Saracevic [24] and Ingwersen [25] derived resembling models that focus on human behaviour when interacting with information retrieval systems.

### 3.1.2 Information Seeking Models

*Information seeking* refers to “the purposive seeking for information as a consequence of a need to satisfy some goal [6].” A number of researchers have tried identifying what modes of seeking information seeking behaviour may entail.

According to Kellar et al. [17], information seeking is composed of browsing, fact finding, and information gathering. Although the authors categorized information gathering as part of information seeking, it appears to be more closely related to digital curation [26, 27].

Bates [9, 13] proposed a model of four information seeking modes: being aware, monitoring, browsing, and searching. Bates differentiated the modes based on the user’s level of attention being active or passive, and information needs being directed or undirected. Thus, browsing can be characterized as undirected active information seeking because users do not know directly what information they are looking for, but they are actively looking. Searching falls under active directed information seeking because the information need is clearly defined and the search is directed. Finally, monitoring and being aware are passive modes of information seeking although monitoring is directed and being aware is undirected.

Ellis et al. [15, 16, 28] proposed a model of information seeking characterized by six different patterns: starting, chaining, browsing, extracting, monitoring, and differentiating. Ellis’ model complemented Kuhlthau’s work, in which the researcher correlated stages of information seeking with feelings, thoughts, actions, as well as anticipated information tasks [29].

Finally, Wilson proposed a “problem solving model” of information seeking behavior [30]. The model reflects on the idea that people engage in information seeking and searching in order to resolve some uncertainty that stands in the way of solving, defining, or identifying a problem.

### 3.1.3 Information Exploration

*Information exploration*, or exploratory search, does not have a single definition in realm of information behavior. Waterworth highlights that exploration is a "broad" activity and identifies browsing as an example of exploration [1]. According to Marchionini [11], exploratory search involves learning(knowledge acquisition, comparison, comprehension, etc.) and investigating(analysis, synthesis, evaluation, discovery, etc.) Similar to Janiszewski [31], my focus is on the visual aspects of information exploration, specifically visual and spatial data representations.

### 3.1.4 Information Foraging

*Information foraging theory* is another approach towards understanding how people adapt their strategies of interacting with technology when seeking, gathering, or consuming information depending on the environment [32]. The theory resonates with explanations of human behavior in the context of food foraging.

The underlying assumption of the information foraging theory is that people, similarly to when they forage for food, adopt their foraging strategies to the environment in order to gain the maximum amount of valuable information. The theory states that "natural information systems evolve towards stable states that maximize gains of valuable information per unit cost."

The theory introduces three key concepts to formulate an understanding of information foraging: information scent, information diet, and information patch. An *information scent* refers to proximal cues (often visual or linguistic) that people use to identify the value of information. An *information diet* deals with user preferences when it comes to information. At last, *information patches* are clusters of information that a an information system presents before the user. The theory with these concepts lay foundations for existing information foraging models [33, 34] as well as social information foraging models [35, 36].

### 3.1.5 Information Discovery

Kerne and Smith proposed an information discovery framework [12] that connects human cognitive processes or states to those of an information system. The frame-

work represents a continuum of information flowing through different system and cognitive states as a result of an iterative reformulation process. The framework consists of five mental states: formulating a problem, evaluating results, updating and forming mental models, running mental models, and discovering solutions. Each mental state have a corresponding interaction with the system. For example, browsing resources (human-system interaction) facilitates evaluation or immediate results (cognitive state). The framework helps understanding how to support the user's cognitive processes and provide affordances that facilitate information discovery.

### 3.1.6 Digital Curation

In 2002, Bates extended her research on the topic of information behaviour with the notion of *information farming*, which involves people collecting and organizing information for future use and revisitation [13]. More commonly, information farming is referred to as digital curation.

Wittaker believes that in terms of Web use, a significant shift is happening from information consumption to information curation, which means that people no longer just use the Web to find and consume the information that they are interested in, but they also try to save and manage that information so that it can be reaccessed and exploited later [27].

## 3.2 Web Tasks and Modes of Web Use

Outside of the realm of cognitive models and frameworks for information behavior, there exists a body of research that examines information discovery, curation, and other Web information behaviours in terms of Web use and corresponding tasks, methods, and modes.

Kellar et al. [17] separated Web tasks into five categories: transactions, browsing, fact finding, information gathering, and other uncategorized tasks. In their later work, Kellar et al. [18] added communication and maintenance as additional Web tasks. Similarly to Kellar et al., Sellen et al. [20] identified six tasks that are commonly performed by Web users: browsing, finding, housekeeping, information gathering, communicating, and transacting. Using different terms, Kellar et al. and



Sellen et al. identified highly comparable tasks, such as fact finding and finding, housekeeping and maintenance, etc.

Building on Ellis' model of information seeking [15, 16, 28], Choo et al. [14] derived anticipated Web tasks that correspond to the information seeking patterns in the model. According to the authors, when users *identify* sources of interest, they usually identify which Websites can point to that information of interest. *Chaining* corresponds to users navigating through links on those initial pages. When people *browse*, they scan top-level pages, headings, lists, and site maps. *Differentiating* takes place when people bookmark, print, copy and paste information, or choose an earlier selected site. *Monitoring* occurs when users revisit Web pages or receive updates from previously visited sites. Finally, *extraction* can occur when the user systematically searches sites to extract information of interest.

People often engage in information seeking activities to close some knowledge gap that occurred as a result of not having enough information to perform a task [4]. Therefore, when providing tool support for various information discovery tasks, it is useful to consider the motivation behind these tasks as it can be different for each task. Morrison et al. [19] make a distinction between methods of Web use and purposes. The authors derived a purpose-based taxonomy of Web use, including three purposes or motivations: finding information, comparing pieces of information or choosing products to make a decision, and using the Web to find relevant information to gain an understanding of some subject. Consequently, methods of finding information identified by Morrison et al. are collecting, finding, exploring, and monitoring. The differences between the two taxonomies suggest that different information seeking tasks may be performed to satisfy more than one information seeking purposes. Therefore, each purpose may require more than one task-supporting mechanism.

Morrison et al. also draw distinction between finding or looking up information and exploratory search. Whereas information lookup involves tasks such as fact retrieval, navigation, and verification, exploration is more cognitively demanding and involves learning and investigation [11]. Learning and investigation can be performed over multiple iterations, and can involve learning through various media, "social searching", and serendipitous browsing performed with the goals of knowledge acquisition, socialization, forecasting, and planning.

Categorizing Web usage into information seeking, digital curation, and other Web tasks does not necessarily give full insight about how information-related tasks are performed. Lindley et al. [8] conducted a qualitative study involving 24 participants, tracking their daily Web usage in the form of a diary. As a result of this study, the researchers identified five distinct modes of Web use: respite, orienting, opportunistic, purposeful, and lean-back. According to the authors, people browse the Web *opportunistically* when they look for information related to some personal interest, long-term goal, or future ambition. *Purposeful use* occurs when the users know what information they need to acquire or what online action they need to perform in order to continue or finish some other activity. *Respite* mode usually occurs when users are in the process of waiting for something or taking a break, and it serves as a means for people to temporarily occupy themselves when high engagement with the content is not a requirement. *Orienting* mode usually occurs when people want to be updated on what has been happening in their environment. Examples of this mode are checking email at work or looking at the news and updates on a social networking site. Finally, *lean-back* mode of Web use can be thought of as listening to the radio or watching television, and usually involves watching videos online or browsing through other types of entertainment content.

Lindley et al.'s primary motivations behind looking at use modes that occur when people browse the Internet was that traditional Web use studies and Web tasks discovered by other researchers cannot reflect the depth of user's intentions online. Understanding the characteristics of different modes guides the design of Web interaction. For example, opportunistic use can have unarticulated or continuously changing information needs. People often cannot indicate the completion of Web tasks, and they finish whenever they have been browsing the Internet for too long, or whenever they need to complete some other task of higher priority. Then, they will often resume their opportunistic information seeking. Finally, opportunistic use is 'grasshopper-like', which means that users jump from one resource to another [8]. From these factors, we can assume that to support such Web usage, we would need to consider mechanisms for supporting users' information needs and support revisitation and arbitrary navigation.

### 3.3 Collaborative Information Discovery and Curation

By surveying 204 Web users, Morris found that people often desire to or do collaborate on information seeking tasks [37]. To collaborate on information seeking, people often use instant messaging, email, and create documents and Webpages to share information. Occasionally, collaborative information seeking occurs when collaborators work side by side and share search results in person.

Collaborative information-related activities on the Web are not limited to information seeking. Collaborative information tagging is a way of organizing content for future search and navigation. Although it is usually performed for personal reasons, tagging greatly enhances information retrieval [38].

Today, there are a multitude of tools that support different aspects of information discovery and curation, but understanding how these tools are similar (or differ) is difficult. Moreover, the existing research is not useful at helping identify gaps in current tools or ways that current tools may be improved to support information discovery and curation.

## Chapter 4 — A Preliminary Framework for Information Discovery and Curation

A preliminary framework for information discovery and curation (see Tables 4.1 and 4.2) was designed in hopes to merge the gap between existing high-level information behaviour models and existing Web tools [39]. It was constructed by identifying important elements in current Web applications (see Table 2.3) and relating them among themselves with help of background research highlighted in Chapter 3. The framework in this chapter only represents the preliminary efforts, and it is presented with the goal to illustrate how the framework evolved as well as outline some of the challenges with its construction.

### 4.1 Preliminary Framework Composition

The two main parts of the framework (discovery and curation) encapsulate other categories of design factors for Web applications. Serendipitous discovery, fact discovery, rediscovery, and channel-based discovery are the main types of information discovery. Curation consists of four most commonly performed curation tasks: information management, preservation, augmentation, and sharing. This section provides brief summaries of each part of the framework.

*Serendipitous discovery* refers to information discovery resulting from serendipitous browsing. Such discovery is characterized by underdefined, absent, or hidden information needs, and it usually involves browsing through diverse resources with varying content types [17, 18]. Here, resource is defined as a collection of information about a single unit of inquiry, usually bundled together for presentation purposes. Some examples of resources are places, images, blog posts, and Web pages.

*Fact discovery* is defined as information discovery resulting from the search for a specific piece of information. It is characterized by a well-defined information need

and is easier to perform within systems that provide access to homogeneous types of information [17, 8].

*Rediscovery* refers to information discovery resulting from revisiting previously discovered resources [40]. Rediscovery can be enabled using search, history, or bookmarking.

*Channel-based discovery* can incorporate two different information seeking tasks, monitoring and awareness. It occurs when information is suggested to users based on the content that they are subscribed to. If users can actively look for updates, then an application affords monitoring [19]. If users can receive notifications about updates, then an application facilitates awareness [9, 13]. Channel-based information discovery is usually enabled at sites that have regularly updated content, such as Pinterest and YouTube.

*Management* of information can be performed through organizing information into lists (or collections) or tagging publicly or privately, for personal use.

To *preserve* information, people use diverse bookmarking mechanisms. Information can be preserved within the same application where it was found or in a different application. As another form of preservation, new information can be added to the Web application in question.

Information *augmentation* is the notion of adding value to existing digital assets [26]. Augmentation can be accomplished through activities such as rating, commenting, describing, upvoting, etc.

Information *sharing* is commonly performed within information discovery and curation applications. It is a way to communicate information to other individuals or groups of people through various Web channels. Information communication is an important aspect of Wilson's information behaviour model [22].

The preliminary framework aims to help with evaluation and design of currently existing tools; however, it is built not without certain shortcomings, which are outlined in the next section.

## 4.2 Limitations of the Preliminary Framework

Although the preliminary framework can be applied to evaluate some aspects of information discovery and curation for Web applications, some of characteristics of the framework make it difficult to use.

There is a clear distinction between the types of curation and discovery subcategories. Discovery subcategories represent **types** of information discovery (serendipitous discovery, fact discovery, etc) whereas curation subcategories represent curation **tasks**. For comparison, information discovery tasks would be *navigating* to a target resource or *exploring* a resource in order to extract necessary information.

Furthermore, the types of information discovery in the framework are not parallel to each other. Serendipitous and fact discoveries are defined using specificity of the user's information need. Defined information need results in fact discovery and undefined in serendipitous discovery. However, rediscovery and channel-based discovery are defined mostly by how the information in question is related to the user, whether or not it has been discovered before or if the user chose to receive it. Therefore, there can be serendipitous rediscovery, channel-based fact discovery, etc.

Another aspect of information discovery and curation support that the framework fails to thoroughly address is the ways in which the system provides cognitive support to the user and reduces the amount of effort the user needs to put in order to perform a task. Examples of such support are automatic sharing of curated content and suggesting search terms to the user. The framework has to be extended beyond the factors that **enable** information discovery and curation and showcase strategies that can help **improve** mechanisms that enable given factors.

Addressing some of the major drawbacks of the preliminary framework, Chapter 5 presents the final version of the framework.

**Table 4.1.** *Preliminary Framework - Discovery*

| Design factors                        | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of Web-based information discovery tools |
|---------------------------------------|--|
| <b><i>Serendipitous discovery</i></b> |  |
| Arbitrary navigation                  | Does the application provide a means for arbitrary navigation among resources?                 |
| Search-based navigation               | Does the search engine help retrieve diverse resources related to the topic of interest?       |
| Category-guided navigation            | Do categories suggest and help with navigating to resources related to the topic of interest?  |
| Integration                           | If resources originate from a different site, do they link to their original sources?          |
| Visual link preview                   | If resources are delivered as links, do they have visual previews?                             |
| Spatial arrangement                   | Is there a semantic to the spatial arrangement of resources?                                   |
| <b><i>Fact discovery</i></b>          |  |
| Search-based navigation               | Does the search feature help discover the specific resource of interest?                       |
| Category-guided navigation            | Do categories help narrow results to specific types of resources?                              |
| Integration                           | If resources originate from a different site, do they link to their original sources?          |
| Uniform representation                | If resources are uniform, are they presented in a uniform way?                                 |
| Visual link preview                   | If resources are delivered as links, do they have visual previews?                             |
| Spatial arrangement                   | Is there a semantic to the spatial arrangement of resources?                                   |
| <b><i>Rediscovery</i></b>             |  |
| History-based rediscovery             | Does the application save and provide access to browsing history?                              |
| Bookmark-based rediscovery            | Does the application support bookmark-based resource revisitation?                             |
| Search-based rediscovery              | Is the search a reliable method for resource revisitation?                                     |
| <b><i>Channel-based discovery</i></b> |  |
| Site subscription                     | Does the application allow subscriptions to news and updates?                                  |
| User subscription                     | Does the application allow subscriptions to other users' activities?                           |
| Notifications                         | Does the application have one or more notification mechanisms?                                 |
| Subscription to news feed             | Can subscription updates be visible within the application?                                    |
| Content news feed                     | Can content updates be visible within the application?   |

**Table 4.2.** *Preliminary Framework - Curation*

| <b>Design factors</b>                       | <b>Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of Web-based information discovery tools</b>                 |
|---|---|
| <b><i>Management</i></b>                    |   |
| List-based categorization                   | Does the application support sorting information into list-like structures, either privately or publicly?             |
| Tag-based categorization                    | Does the application support tagging, either privately or publicly?   |
| <b><i>Preservation</i></b>                  |   |
| Internal preservation of internal resources | Does the application support bookmarking mechanism(s) for preserving internal information within the application?     |
| Internal preservation of external resources | Does the application support bookmarking mechanism(s) for preserving external information within the application?     |
| External preservation of internal resources | Does the application support bookmarking mechanism(s) for preserving internal information outside of the application? |
| <b><i>Augmentation</i></b>                  |   |
| Evaluation                                  | Can the resource evaluations be recorded privately or publicly?   |
| Annotation                                  | Can resources be annotated privately or publicly?   |
| <b><i>Sharing</i></b>                       |   |
| Adding resources                            | Can resources be publicly added to the collection of information within the application from other Web pages?         |
| Internal sharing                            | Can internal resources be publicly reshared within the application?   |
| External sharing                            | Can internal resources be publicly reshared outside of the application?   |



## Chapter 5 — A Conceptual Framework for Information Discovery and Curation on the Web

Although Web-based information discovery and curation tasks are commonly performed today, as we mentioned above, there is a lack of literature on how to support them when building Web applications. I reduce this gap by presenting a framework of design factors facilitating digital information discovery and curation (see Figure 5.1).

In my framework, I built on existing classifications of information seeking tasks and methods and existing Web tools to derive corresponding design factors. The framework consists of two main categories (discovery and curation) that are consequently decomposed into subcategories. Each of the lower subcategories contains mechanisms that enable given aspect of discovery or curation and corresponding questions that can help application design and evaluation. Every component in the framework has corresponding automation and support elements that can improve user experience. This chapter outlines the main components of the framework.

### 5.1 Discovery and Navigation

In order to discover information, a user needs to have a way of navigating to it. Common methods of navigation that facilitate information discovery include descriptive, referential, random, and direct (see Table 5.1).

#### 5.1.1 Descriptive Navigation

A navigation is descriptive when the user describes the information need. Most commonly is implemented as search-based navigation since it allows users to enter the search query and describe their information need.




Figure 5.1. Conceptual Framework Overview

**Table 5.1.** *Navigation Mechanisms*

| Navigation mechanisms      | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Descriptive</b>         |  |
| Search-based navigation    | Can users navigate the site using search mechanism?            |
| <b>Referential</b>         |  |
| Category-guided navigation | Can users navigate using categories?                           |
| Facet-guided navigation    | Can users navigate using facets?                               |
| Filters-guided navigation  | Can users navigate using filters?                              |
| Tag-guided navigation      | Can users navigate using filters?                              |
| Search by resource         | Can the user search by resource?                               |
| <b>Random</b>              |  |
| Random navigation          | Is it possible to randomly navigate through resources?         |
| <b>Direct</b>              |  |
| Direct display             | Is any information displayed directly without active search?   |

There are two common ways of aiding information discovery when search-based navigation is used. The first method entails returning personalized results when the user enters a search query. There are a number of ways to accomplish personalization, but this chapter only focuses on which features can support information discovery and curation have rather than their implementations. The second method is to suggest search terms to make it easier for the user to formulate the information need (see Table 5.2).

There exist numerous ways in which descriptive navigation supports information discovery. With fact discovery, an information need is known [? ?]. Therefore, descriptive navigation provides a way of for the user to express her information need.

Search-based navigation often serves as an entry point for information seeking [? ]. In case of serendipitous discovery, since the information need is not well articulated,

descriptive navigation can be used to express a topic that could potentially relate to the information need. For instance, searching for a location within Pinterest returns numerous images of the location that link to (or integrate with) other resources, blogs, and Web pages, whereas searching for the same place on Google Maps usually returns a small set of possible locations with limited information about those places.

Descriptive navigation can help rediscovering information. However, search-based rediscovery is not always a reliable way of refinding information [? ]. In information portals that provide access to fairly ambiguous information and that have information regularly repopulated and updated, the search feature is usually designed around retrieving information related to some topic, but is not very specific. In order to revisit a resource, search must provide consistent results. In information discovery applications that provide access to specific information, such as Wikipedia and Rotten Tomatoes, search can usually lead directly to a specific resource. However, within Web applications such as We Heart It or Pinterest, search-based rediscovery is often unreliable.

### 5.1.2 Referential Navigation

A navigation is referential when the user finds a reference to the term that she is looking for. The underlying assumption of this method of navigation is that the user can recognize needed information as she sees it.

Referential navigation methods can take many different forms. Some common ones are searching categories, facets, and filters. Often, Web applications implement tag-based navigation. In some applications, users can search by a given resource (see Table 5.1).

To further support referential navigation, applications can either personalize search results (similarly to descriptive navigation) or personalize reference suggestions (see Table 5.2).

Referential navigation is used to direct the user to relevant resources [? ]. In the case of fact discovery, such navigation should narrow the results to a specific type of resource so that further fact discovery is bounded by that type. For example, TripAdvisor lets the user choose among flights, hotels, vacation rentals, restaurants, and destinations.

For serendipitous discovery, referential navigation should provide a way to narrow the results to those related to one topic. In addition, categories, facets, filters, and tags can help the user formulate an information need by suggesting topics [? ]. For example, when using Google Images, every search query suggests related categories of images to help users define an information need.

### **5.1.3 Random Navigation**

In order to browse diverse information, an information discovery tool needs to provide a way to randomly navigate among resources, thereby supporting serendipitous information discovery [? ]. Many applications, such as StumbleUpon, support random navigation to allow for opportunistic jumping from one resource to another. This method is useful when the information need is undefined.

To further enhance random navigation, Web tools sometimes allow users to personalize this type of navigation, which makes it less 'random'. However, this way the user can discover new information within a specific category, for example.

### **5.1.4 Direct Navigation**

In a broad sense of Web-based navigation, direct navigation is associated with entering an address of a site and being redirected directly to it. In the context of Web applications for information discovery, direct navigation means displaying certain content to the user without user's active participation.

Often, applications display certain information as soon the user visits the site. It can be news feed, featured content, context-dependent information, or other types of information. Displayed content can also be personalized to improve information discovery with direct navigation.

## **5.2 Exploration and Discovery**

Exploration of resources is another factor that enables information discovery. In particular, visual and spatial explorations of single or multiple resources allow for rapid information searching (see Table 5.3).

**Table 5.2.** *Automation and Support for Navigation*

|                               |  |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Automation                    | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools |
| <b>Descriptive</b>            |  |
| Personalized results          | Do the descriptive mechanisms return personalized results?     |
| Guided search                 | Is the descriptive mechanism guided by suggested search terms? |
| <b>Referential</b>            |  |
| Suggesting topics of interest | Does the application suggest topics of interest?               |
| Suggesting similar resources  | Does the application suggest similar resources?                |
| Suggesting tags               | Does the application suggest similar tags?                     |
| <b>Random</b>                 |  |
| Personalized destination      | Is random navigation personalized to the user?                 |
| <b>Direct</b>                 |  |
| Personalized display          | Is direct display personalized to the user?                    |

Abrams et al. [?] identified link representation as one of the problems with traditional bookmarking. Analogous with browsing through a bookmark manager, identifying relevant information when browsing through links to diverse resources can be a challenging task. A visual preview should make it easier to evaluate the relevance of resources. Applications that facilitate serendipitous information discovery often employ elaborate resource representation techniques. Many social bookmarking systems, such as Scoop.it! and StumbleUpon, support visual previews of bookmarked pages. Delicious is a social bookmarking application that lacks this type of link representation support, which makes it harder to determine if the link will lead to a relevant resource.

Similar to link representation, spatial visualization of numerous links is another problem that occurs when browsing through diverse content [?]. Therefore, a semantic to the spatial arrangement of resources is of major importance. Information discovery applications that support serendipitous discovery often have a special way of spatially arranging resources to make it easier to browse through large amounts of

information. For example, many tools use a 'pinboard' layout of resources similar to Pinterest.

**Uniform representation.** Uniform representation is a method of displaying diverse resources in a common way, with each resource having the same set of components [? ]. Such a representation assures that each resource has the same set of facts associated with it, and therefore, the user can afford to have expectations about information that can be found when looking for a specific fact. For example, Yelp displays rating, price range, and address for all restaurants, so not only is it easy to find specific information, but the user can have expectations about the content of resources within the application. On the contrary, searching Tumblr for a restaurant will return a chaotic collection of information about the place.

**Visual link preview.** If an application provides links to resources, a visual preview makes it easier to recognize the relevance of the resource [? ]. Applications that support fact discovery often use visual link preview, similar to applications that support serendipitous browsing. However, the motivation behind having a link preview for fact finding is to make it possible to identify if the resource is indeed what the user is looking for. For example, searching for an actor in IMDb will return a list of actors and their photographs, so that the user can pick the one they are interested in.

**Spatial arrangement.** Similar to serendipitous information discovery, spatial arrangement of resources is important [? ] as a poor semantic to the arrangement can make it difficult to visually navigate to the facts of interest.

### 5.3 Integration

Similar to serendipitous discovery, if an information discovery application provides access to resources from other Websites, the user should be able to navigate to those sites as they may contain the facts of interest. Integration for fact finding is especially important when it gives an opportunity to display specific information about resources that otherwise would not be accessible. For example, Google Maps displays business ratings as a result of its integration with Google+.

To users with ambiguous information needs, one information portal might not

**Table 5.3.** *Exploration Mechanisms*

| Method of exploration                       | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools                |
|---|---|
| <b>Visual exploration</b>                   |   |
| Visual exploration of a single resource     | Does the system visual exploration of a single resource?                      |
| Visual exploration of multiple resources    | Does the system allow visual exploration of multiple resources?               |
| <b>Spatial exploration</b>                  |   |
| Spatial exploration of a single resource    | Does the system provide means for spatial resource exploration?               |
| Spatial exploration of a multiple resources | Does the system provide means for spatial exploration for multiple resources? |

**Table 5.4.** *Support for Exploration of Multiple Resources*

| Method of exploration of multiple resources | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools |
|---|--|
| <b>Visual exploration</b>                   |  |
| Visual preview                              | Are there visual previews of resources?                        |
| Textual preview                             | Are there textual previews of resources?                       |
| <b>Spatial exploration</b>                  |  |
| List  | Are resources presented in a list?                             |
| Grid  | Are resources presented in a list?                             |
| Gallery                                     | Are resources presented in a gallery layout?                   |
| Consistent representation                   | Are resources presented in a consistent way?                   |

provide access to all information of interest. If an information discovery application gives access to resources from various sources, such as other Websites, the user should be able to navigate back to those sources.



**Table 5.5.** *Support for Exploration of a Single Resource*

| Method of exploration of single resource | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools |
|--|--|
| <b>Visual exploration</b>                |  |
| Visual cues                              | Are there visual cues?   |
| Textual cues                             | Are there textual cues?  |
| <b>Spatial exploration</b>               |  |
| Spatial semantic                         | Is there a semantic to the spatial arrangement of resources?   |
| Consistent representation                | Are resources presented in a consistent way?                   |

**Table 5.6.** *Integration*

| Integration mechanism | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools |
|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Integration</b>    |  |
| Linking               | Is application linked to another application?                  |

**Table 5.7.** *Support for Integration*

| Integration support | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools |
|---------------------|--|
| <b>Integration</b>  |  |
| Visual integration  | Is another application's data visually integrated?             |

## 5.4 Curation

Information curation is a common activity within many information discovery applications. By asking questions about application design with regards to information curation as in Tables 5.8 and 5.9 of the conceptual framework, designers can find ways to add value to information and enable information exploitation over time.

Information discovery applications vary from being completely socially curated and populated by users, to those that lack any curation mechanisms. By definition, digital information curation is the notion of managing, preserving, and adding value to collections of information [? ?]. Thus, the curation category consists of information

management, preservation, information enhancement, and sharing.

**Table 5.8.** *Curation Mechanisms*

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Curation support                            | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools  |
| <b>Management</b>                           |   |
| Collection-based categorization             | Does the application support sorting information into collection-like structures, either privately or publicly? |
| Tag-based categorization                    | Does the application support tagging, either privately or publicly?   |
| <b>Preservation</b>                         |   |
| Internal preservation of internal resources | Does the application support mechanism(s) for preserving internal information within the application?           |
| Internal preservation of external resources | Does the application support mechanism(s) for preserving external information within the application?           |
| External preservation of internal resources | Does the application support mechanism(s) for preserving internal information outside of the application?       |
| <b>Augmentation</b>                         |   |
| Evaluation                                  | Can the resource evaluations be recorded privately or publicly?   |
| Annotation                                  | Can resources be annotated privately or publicly?   |
| <b>Sharing</b>                              |   |
| Adding resources                            | Can resources be publicly added to the collection of information within the application from other Web pages?   |
| Internal sharing                            | Can internal resources be publicly reshared within the application?   |
| External sharing                            | Can internal resources be publicly reshared outside of the application?   |

### 5.4.1 Management

Information management is one of the key elements of information curation [? ?]. Information categorization mechanisms are prevalent in applications that have a

Table 5.9. Curation Support and Automation

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Curation support   | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools   |
| <b>Management</b><br>Suggesting collections<br>Suggesting tags<br><b>Preservation</b><br>History<br><br><b>Augmentation</b><br>Automatic augmentation<br><br><b>Sharing</b><br>Automatic sharing | <br>Does the application suggest relevant collections?<br>Does the application suggests relevant tags?<br><br>Does the application automatically preserve found in-formation?<br><br>Does the application automatically annotates re-sources?<br><br>Are resources shared automatically? |

lot of information that is hard to categorize automatically or can mean something different for each user. In the context of Web information management, the following factors play a major role.

Resource categorization helps establish relationships between various resources [? ? ]. Allowing people to sort information using custom categories can aid rediscovery, discovery in a socially curated space, as well as add more value to resources.

Similar to list-based categorization, tagging aids rediscovery, adds value to re-sources, and aids discovery, especially in a socially curated space [? ]. For example, Pinterest supports tag- and list-based categorizations, where lists are represented as 'pinboards'. Tumblr, on the other hand, only supports tag-based categorization. In addition, Pinterest allows for private information categorization.

5.4.2 Information Preservation

Information preservation is a common Web task that is usually performed with the intent of revisiting information [? ? ]. However, in the case of opportunistic Web use, information gathering is sometimes performed with just the goal of collecting infor-mation rather than revisiting it in the future [? ]. Bookmarking is a traditional way

of preserving information and many Web applications provide diverse bookmarking mechanisms.

Internal preservation of internal resources means bookmarking resources to be reaccessed within the same application. Such bookmarking facilitates information curation within the system.

Internal preservation of external resources signifies bookmarking other Web pages within an application.

External preservation means bookmarking resources so that they become available through other bookmarking systems. An application must facilitate integration with other applications in order to enable external preservation [? ].

On We Heart It, users can preserve *internal information* using *internal collections* and they can add information from *external* Websites. However, there are no integrated means for bookmarking *internal content* using other bookmarking systems.

Bookmark-based revisitation is one of the most common ways of information rediscovery [? ]. The majority of Web browsers are equipped with bookmarking features. However, some modern Web applications, such as YouTube and Pinterest, provide integrated mechanisms for bookmarking and bookmark-based information rediscovery.

A Web application needs to automatically record browsing history in order to enable history-based rediscovery [? ]. History-based rediscovery appears to be the least common rediscovery mechanism, however, it can still be found in some Web applications, such as Google Maps.

### 5.4.3 Augmentation

One of the most important elements of digital curation is augmentation: adding value to information [? ? ]. It is often performed within social bookmarking systems. Many Web applications allow users to add value to the resources they curate.

Evaluation methods can have various forms. They usually take place in socially curated information systems. However, evaluation can also contribute to personal reflection and information preservation. In addition, many applications allow users to evaluate resources by rating them or recording other forms of approval or disapproval. Some sites, such as Wikipedia, do not allow any evaluation.

Annotations are metadata attached to a resource, such as comments and descriptions. Annotations make it easier to search for and interpret information.

#### **5.4.4 Sharing**

Sharing information is key to empowering social information curation [? ]. Therefore, the main components that facilitate sharing are adding resources, and external and internal information sharing.

Adding resources not only facilitates global Web information curation, but it also scales the information available through the system, providing more opportunities for information discovery. Resources can be created by users themselves, taken from some other sources online, or both. For example, YouTube allows users to upload their own videos, whereas Pinterest permits adding images from other sites in addition to users' personal images.

Sharing resources through different media supports channel-based information discovery within the media channels. Information discovery applications commonly allow for sharing information on popular networking sites outside the application.

Resharing resources within the system supports channel-based information discovery.

### **5.5 Channelled Curation and Discovery**

#### **5.5.0.1 Channel-based Discovery**

Subscriptions to updates from a site help users follow the news [? ]. In order to support subscription-based discovery, an application must provide a subscription mechanism. For example, Rotten Tomatoes allows subscriptions to newsletters; however, it does not allow subscriptions to movie critics, as a user-based subscription mechanism would allow.

In some applications, the content is updated and curated by users, and users can subscribe to other users. Similar to site subscriptions, user subscriptions are subscriptions to activity updates from individual users rather than all content updates, and help with networking and following users' activities [? ]. Such subscriptions help to

further filter new content delivered to the user.

Notification mechanisms enable user awareness about new content on the subscribed channel [? ]. Different applications provide various notification mechanisms including messages within the application, informative emails, and smartphone notifications.

Displaying a news feed within the application further promotes awareness and can serve as a monitoring mechanism. For such.

Similar to displaying a subscription news feed, displaying a content news feed promotes awareness and can serve as a monitoring mechanism.

Information discovery tools can have different implementations depending on the purpose of discovery. Using the information discovery factors in our framework (see Table 2), we described and evaluated currently existing tools. Similarly, the framework can be used for identifying gaps in information discovery support and developing new technologies (see Sec. 5).

**Table 5.10.** *Chenneling Mechanisms*

| Channelling mechanisms     | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools |
|----------------------------|--|
| <b>Subscriptions</b>       |  |
| User subscription          | Can the user subscribe to activities of other users?           |
| Site subscription          | Can the user subscribe to site updates?                        |
| Artifact subscription      | Can the user subscribe to artifact updates?                    |
| <b>Notifications</b>       |  |
| User activity overview     | Does the application display activities of other users?        |
| Site activity overview     | Does the application display site updates?                     |
| Artifact activity overview | Does the application display activities of other users?        |

**Table 5.11.** *Channeling Support*

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Channeling support   | Questions to be posed during the design or evaluation of tools  |
| <b>Subscriptions</b><br>Suggesting users<br>Automatic subscription<br>Suggesting artifacts<br><b>Notifications</b><br>User activity update notification<br>Site activity update notification<br>Artifact update notification | Are users suggested to the user?<br>Can the system subscribe the user automatically?<br>Are artifacts suggested to the user?<br><br>Does the application display activities of other users?<br>Does the application notify the user about site updates?<br>Does the application notify the user about updates on an artifact? |

## Chapter 6 — Framework Evaluation and Application

To verify that the final version of the framework was effective (see Chapter 5), I applied it to design a place photo discovery application as well as to reevaluate five of the applications that were used in the construction of the preliminary framework described in Chapter 4. This section outlines application design process, and evaluations of the tools with proposed directions for development of these applications.

### 6.1 Application

#### 6.1.1 KeePlaces




Figure 6.1. *KeePlaces*



#### 6.1.1.1 Navigation

Descriptive navigation is possible using search. The search feature is not guided, and so far, results are not personalized.

#### 6.1.1.2 Exploration

Spatial exploration of multiple resources is enabled through the gallery view. Resources are represented as photos, so visual exploration of multiple resources is enabled. However, there is no way of exploring each resource individually, therefore, exploration of a single resource is not supported.

#### 6.1.1.3 Integration

KeePlaces is integrated with Google Maps.

#### 6.1.1.4 Curation

Curation in Keeplaces is supported through management and preservation.

Management is implemented using collection-based classification. Every photo discovered on the site can be bookmarked, or 'kept', in a collection.

#### 6.1.1.5 Channeling

Channeling has not yet been enabled within the application, but it is an important aspect behind the conceptual model of the application.

#### 6.1.1.6 Directions for Future Development

As mentioned above, channeling is the first aspect that needs to be implemented along with enhancing management mechanisms.

## 6.2 Final Evaluation

To illustrate how the framework can be applied to evaluate current Web applications and suggest new tooling, we use it to examine five of the cases of the study.

### 6.2.1 Pinterest

Pinterest is an application for image discovery oriented towards finding inspirations and collecting knowledge about hobbies and interest. Resources on Pinterest are called 'pins', collections - 'boards', and users 'pinners'.

#### 6.2.1.1 Navigation

Navigation in Pinterest can be accomplished in a few different ways. Descriptive navigation is enabled with a guided search mechanism. However, results of the search are not personalized.

Referential navigation is accomplished through various implementations. The user can navigate using categories. Through clicking on any of the resources, the user can see related resources. When the user navigates using categories, the system makes further suggestions on subcategories. However, there is not facet-guided navigation or filtering. Furthermore, results and suggestions are not personalized for the user.

Although there isn't an explicit random navigation mechanism, both descriptive and referential mechanisms usually return novice and serendipitous results to facilitate opportunistic browsing. As mentioned above, results are not personalized.

Finally, Pinterest directly displays information to the users when they visit the site. Display is personalized and provides results of their own activity history or history and updates from the people they follow.

#### 6.2.1.2 Exploration

Exploration mechanisms are extensively taken care of in Pinterest. Multiple resources are represented in a gallery view that, in Pinterest culture, is thought of as a 'pinboard'. Such layout provides good spatial support for exploration and makes it easier to build a mental model by drawing analogies with a real pinboard.

Single resource does not have a lot of distinct spatial arrangements. However, visually it provides a glimpse into what can be found on the Website that the image came from. Textual preview, however, is limited to the address of the Website.

### 6.2.1.3 Integration

Pinterest is integrated with many other Websites and Web applications through visual linking.

### 6.2.1.4 Curation

Information management is accomplished through sorting 'pins' into different collections ('boards') thus enabling collection-based classification and internal preservation of internal and external resources.

Users can upload new 'pins', comment on existing ones, or add descriptions that enable information augmentation.

Users can also share 'pins' among themselves.

### 6.2.1.5 Channeling

Channeling on Pinterest is accomplished through Following users or individual boards, receiving notifications about their activities, and seeing updates that are directly displayed when users enter the site.

### 6.2.1.6 Identified Gaps and Future Prospects

After applying the framework, it became evident that some of the navigation mechanisms could be supported by personalization of results and personal suggestions.

## 6.2.2 Google Maps

Google maps is a Web application oriented towards place discovery. It provides services for finding information about places as well as directions. By answering the questions from the framework, we get the following description of Google Maps.

### 6.2.2.1 Navigation

Any other information discovery must be initiated by search, and thus, the user needs to formulate their information need—the application lacks category-based navigation, so there is nothing that aids users in the formulation of an information need. Once

the application returns search results, the possibility for serendipitous information discovery increases.

Fact finding is well supported in Google Maps. Since the application provides access to only one type of resource (places), there is no need for category-based navigation. Direct navigation is not always possible, but some places are visible on the map so the user can click on a place and the application will display relevant information. Search-based navigation within Google Maps is usually precise and returns accurate search results for specific places.

#### **6.2.2.2 Exploration**

However, the 'reviews' link doesn't have a visual preview to indicate that there are more than just reviews on the linked page. Considering the nature of Google Maps, the semantic of the spatial arrangement of resources is defined by the locations of actual places on the map. More information is presented as a list.

#### **6.2.2.3 Integration**

The application is conveniently integrated with Google+, allowing access to relevant information, such as reviews, images, and hours of operation. Resources are displaced in a uniform fashion making it easy to find information such as addresses and contacts. Some interesting information can be discovered on the business' official Website or integrated Google+ page that the user can navigate to by clicking on 'reviews'.

#### **6.2.2.4 Curation**

There are a few ways to rediscover information through Google Maps. Google Maps employs a history-based revisitation mechanism, so users can see the last few places they searched for when opening the page. Users can bookmark a place on a list called "My Places" by clicking on the 'star' icon. Lastly, it is easy to rediscover information about a place by simply searching for it. Returned results are usually both accurate and reliable.

Google Maps does not allow the creation of custom lists nor does it allow tagging. Users can only bookmark places to the "My Places" list.

Personal preservation in Google Maps is possible through adding the place to the "My Places" list as mentioned above—by adding internal content to internal storage. Other types of place preservation are possible through Google+, however, not within Google Maps.

Users can evaluate and annotate places through Google+. However, aggregated reviews and ratings are visible on Google Maps.

It is possible to add a new location to Google Maps. Sharing functionality is limited to the tool providing links and code for embedding.

#### **6.2.2.5 Channeling**

Channel-based rediscovery is common among applications with content that is frequently updated. Content provided by Google Maps is fairly stable, and therefore, there are no channel-based discovery mechanisms used by the application.

#### **6.2.2.6 Identified Gaps and Future Prospects**

Evaluating Google Maps using our conceptual framework helped expose some gaps in its design, so we propose directions for future development. From the description above, it can be estimated that Google Maps' curation mechanisms lack some functionality for public and private curation. Improving public curation mechanisms introduces the possibility of channel-based discovery. Furthermore, adding category-guided navigation mechanisms can help with serendipitous discovery. By no means should an application like that be a replacement to Google Maps. However, it could be oriented towards social discovery and curation, as well as opportunistic place exploration, thereby complimenting the Google Maps application.

### **6.2.3 Wikipedia**

Wikipedia is an open encyclopedia.

#### **6.2.3.1 Navigation**

Descriptive navigation on Wikipedia is accomplished through search. Results, however, are not personalized to the user, and the search mechanism is not guided by the

suggestions of what search terms to use.

Referential mechanisms include a broad category-guided navigation which returns just a few featured articles.

Random navigation provides opportunity to serendipitously discover new articles.

Wikipedia directly displays featured articles, but the content is, again, not tailored to the user.

#### **6.2.3.2 Exploration**

Exploration of multiple resources is very limited. Search results are presented in a list form, and links are represented as text.

#### **6.2.3.3 Integration**

Wikipedia is not integrated with other Websites though an occasional section of an article called "External Links". Visual preview is not provided.

#### **6.2.3.4 Curation**

There is not preservation mechanism available at the site, as well as no management mechanisms. Augmentation is possible through personal contribution to the content of articles. Sharing of Wikipedia articles is also not supported.

#### **6.2.3.5 Channeling**

Information on Wikipedia is curated by various users. Although it is not possible to subscribe to any particular channel, Wikipedia updates featured content that can be viewed on the front page and when navigated to using categories. The users can also see history of recently updates content.

#### **6.2.3.6 Identified Gaps and Future Prospects**

It is evident that the biggest gaps in Wikipedia is content curation.

### **6.2.4 Delicious**

Delicious is a bookmarking application.

#### **6.2.4.1 Navigation**

In delicious, users can navigate using search (descriptive navigation). Referential navigation is not as developed.

#### **6.2.4.2 Exploration**

Exploration for the most part is limited to non-visual factors.

#### **6.2.4.3 Integration**

Delicious is integrated with many other Websites through linking. Visual linking is only provided in the "Trending" section of the tool.

#### **6.2.4.4 Curation**

Curation is a very important aspect of Delicious. Management is performed through tagging.

Delicious enables internal preservation of external resources. External sharing of internal resources, as well as adding new resources.

Information augmentation is possible through tagging and commenting on the added links.

#### **6.2.4.5 Channeling**

Channeling is performed thorough subscription mechanisms: users can subscribe to other users and create their networks. "Trending" section displays results of social curation, and therefore, enables channel-based discovery.

#### **6.2.4.6 Identified Gaps and Future Prospects**

According to the framework, Delicious lacks visual exploration mechanisms, and certain personalization mechanisms. However, the "Trending" part of the system does provide visual previews and arrange resources in a grid. Although it helps with visual and spatial exploration, at the same time it undermines consistency of resource representation.

## 6.2.5 Yelp

Yelp is a Web application used to discover local businesses.

### 6.2.5.1 Navigation

Descriptive navigation is again supported with search-based navigation.

Referential navigation is enabled using category-based navigation.

### 6.2.5.2 Exploration

Both visual and spatial exploration is enabled at the site.

### 6.2.5.3 Integration

Resources are integrated with Google Maps and with the business Websites. In case of Google Maps, visual integration is applied but not with other links.

### 6.2.5.4 Curation

Users can bookmark businesses they like within the system.

Evaluation is possible by rating the businesses. Reviews can also be evaluated by choosing between 'Useful', 'Funny', and 'Cool' metrics.

Users can add resources by writing reviews which also contributes to information augmentation. Users can also add images of the business.

### 6.2.5.5 Channeling

On Yelp, the user can see latest updates from activities of other users.

### 6.2.5.6 Identified Gaps and Future Prospects

Identified gaps include lack of management mechanisms when businesses are bookmarked.



## Chapter 7 — Implications

### 7.1 Research and Design Implications

In the previous section, we demonstrated how the framework can be used to reveal missing features in tools. We also showed how the framework can be helpful for designers who wish to improve existing tools or get ideas for new information discovery applications.

Factors and questions of the framework are there to guide the developer, but they do not dictate which features should be in the application. In other words, the framework helps expose gaps, but it is up to designers to decide whether those gaps need to be closed—some gaps cannot be closed because of certain constraints, such as data type and system design.

As with the Google Maps example, designers face certain trade-offs when developing applications with the help of the framework. For example, high precision with navigation mechanisms can potentially eliminate some opportunities for serendipitous discovery.

In the research domain, the framework can serve as a guide for selecting cases for studies and drawing distinctions between different Web-based information seeking applications. Hence, both researchers and developers can benefit from the systematic tool exploration guided by the framework.

## Chapter 8 — Future Work and Conclusions

In our study, we analyzed information curation and seeking tasks and developed a conceptual framework of factors and questions that are important when building and evaluating Web information discovery tools. We then evaluated and iteratively refined the framework by analyzing 20 different information discovery applications and provided concrete examples of tool support addressing various concepts of our framework.

One of the possible future research objectives would be to apply the framework to identify a gap in available information discovery tools, and then further use the framework to design an application that would close that gap. Another potential research question would be to expand our investigation to include the factors that influence the need for one information discovery type over another.

Our framework opens up opportunities for structured information discovery tool evaluation and design. As more tools are being developed within the social space of information discovery and curation, understanding how these tasks can be supported promises advancements in how Web applications are designed.

Additionally, I would like to investigate how collaboration in information discovery and curation relates to the framework.

## References

- [1] J. A. Waterworth and M. H. Chignell, "A model of information exploration," *Hypermedia*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 35–58, 1991.
- [2] A. Foster and N. Ford, "Serendipity and information seeking: an empirical study," *Journal of Documentation*, vol. 59, no. 3, pp. 321–340, 2003.
- [3] C. A. Lynch, "Networked information resource discovery: an overview of current issues," *Selected Areas in Communications, IEEE Journal on*, vol. 13, no. 8, pp. 1505–1522, 1995.
- [4] H. A. Proper and P. Bruza, "What is information discovery about?," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, vol. 50, no. 9, pp. 737–750, 1999.
- [5] J. S. Bruner, "The act of discovery," *Harvard educational review*, 1961.
- [6] T. D. Wilson, "Human information behavior," *Informing science*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 49–56, 2000.
- [7] D. Giaretta, "Dcc approach to digital curation," 2006.
- [8] S. E. Lindley, S. Meek, A. Sellen, and R. Harper, "It's simply integral to what i do: enquiries into how the web is weaved into everyday life," in *Proceedings of the 21st international conference on World Wide Web*, pp. 1067–1076, ACM, 2012.
- [9] M. J. Bates, "An exploratory paradigm for online information retrieval," *Intelligent Information Systems for the Information Society. Amsterdam: North-Holland*, pp. 91–99, 1986.
- [10] A. Conaway, C. Pikas, U. McLean, S. Morris, L. Palmer, L. Rosman, S. Sears, E. Uzelac, and S. Woodson, "Designing for information discovery: User needs analysis," *Johns Hopkins Applied Technical Digest*, vol. 28, no. 3, pp. 290–291, 2010.
- [11] G. Marchionini, "Exploratory search: from finding to understanding," *Communications of the ACM*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 41–46, 2006.
- [12] A. Kerne and S. M. Smith, "The information discovery framework," in *Proceed-*

- ings of the 5th conference on Designing interactive systems: processes, practices, methods, and techniques*, pp. 357–360, ACM, 2004.
- [13] M. J. Bates, “Toward an integrated model of information seeking and searching,” *The New Review of Information Behaviour Research*, vol. 3, pp. 1–15, 2002.
  - [14] C. W. Choo, B. Detlor, and D. Turnbull, “Information seeking on the web: An integrated model of browsing and searching,” *first monday*, vol. 5, no. 2, 2000.
  - [15] D. Ellis, “A behavioural model for information retrieval system design,” *Journal of information science*, vol. 15, no. 4-5, pp. 237–247, 1989.
  - [16] D. Ellis, D. Cox, and K. Hall, “A comparison of the information seeking patterns of researchers in the physical and social sciences,” *Journal of documentation*, vol. 49, no. 4, pp. 356–369, 1993.
  - [17] M. Kellar, C. Watters, and M. Shepherd, “A goal-based classification of web information tasks,” *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 2006.
  - [18] M. Kellar, C. Watters, and M. Shepherd, “A field study characterizing web-based information-seeking tasks,” *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, vol. 58, no. 7, pp. 999–1018, 2007.
  - [19] J. B. Morrison, P. Pirolli, and S. K. Card, “A taxonomic analysis of what world wide web activities significantly impact people’s decisions and actions,” in *CHI’01 extended abstracts on Human factors in computing systems*, pp. 163–164, ACM, 2001.
  - [20] A. J. Sellen, R. Murphy, and K. L. Shaw, “How knowledge workers use the web,” in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in computing systems*, pp. 227–234, ACM, 2002.
  - [21] R. K. Yin, *Case study research: Design and methods*. Sage publications, 2014.
  - [22] T. D. Wilson, “On user studies and information needs,” *Journal of documentation*, vol. 37, no. 1, pp. 3–15, 1981.
  - [23] T. D. Wilson, “Information behaviour: an interdisciplinary perspective,” *Information processing & management*, vol. 33, no. 4, pp. 551–572, 1997.
  - [24] T. Saracevic, “Modeling interaction in information retrieval (ir): A review and

- proposal,” in *Proceedings of the ASIS annual meeting*, vol. 33, pp. 3–9, ERIC, 1996.
- [25] P. Ingwersen, “Cognitive perspectives of information retrieval interaction: elements of a cognitive ir theory,” *Journal of documentation*, vol. 52, no. 1, pp. 3–50, 1996.
- [26] N. Beagrie, “Digital curation for science, digital libraries, and individuals,” *International Journal of Digital Curation*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 3–16, 2008.
- [27] S. Whittaker, “Personal information management: from information consumption to curation,” *Annual review of information science and technology*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 1–62, 2011.
- [28] D. Ellis and M. Haugan, “Modelling the information seeking patterns of engineers and research scientists in an industrial environment,” *Journal of documentation*, vol. 53, no. 4, pp. 384–403, 1997.
- [29] C. C. Kuhlthau, “Inside the search process: Information seeking from the user’s perspective,” *JASIS*, vol. 42, no. 5, pp. 361–371, 1991.
- [30] T. D. Wilson, “Models in information behaviour research,” *Journal of documentation*, vol. 55, no. 3, pp. 249–270, 1999.
- [31] C. Janiszewski, “The influence of display characteristics on visual exploratory search behavior,” *Journal of Consumer Research*, vol. 25, no. 3, pp. 290–301, 1998.
- [32] P. Pirolli and S. Card, “Information foraging,” *Psychological review*, vol. 106, no. 4, p. 643, 1999.
- [33] W.-T. Fu and P. Pirolli, “Snif-act: A cognitive model of user navigation on the world wide web,” *Human–Computer Interaction*, vol. 22, no. 4, pp. 355–412, 2007.
- [34] M. Kitajima, M. H. Blackmon, and P. G. Polson, “A comprehension-based model of web navigation and its application to web usability analysis,” in *People and Computers XIV Usability or Else!*, pp. 357–373, Springer, 2000.
- [35] P. Pirolli, “An elementary social information foraging model,” in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 605–614, ACM, 2009.

- [36] W.-T. Fu, “The microstructures of social tagging: a rational model,” in *Proceedings of the 2008 ACM conference on Computer supported cooperative work*, pp. 229–238, ACM, 2008.
- [37] M. R. Morris, “A survey of collaborative web search practices,” in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, pp. 1657–1660, ACM, 2008.
- [38] S. A. Golder and B. A. Huberman, “Usage patterns of collaborative tagging systems,” *Journal of information science*, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 198–208, 2006.
- [39] E. Voyloshnikova and M.-A. Storey, “Towards understanding digital information discovery and curation,” in *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference of the Center for Advanced Studies on Collaborative Research*, pp. 247–261, ACM, 2014.
- [40] L. Tauscher and S. Greenberg, “How people revisit web pages: Empirical findings and implications for the design of history systems,” *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 97–137, 1997.

## VITA

*Surname:* Voyloshnikova *Given Names:* Elena

*Place of Birth:* Nikolaev

### *Educational Institutions Attended*

|                        |              |
|------------------------|--------------|
| University of Victoria | 2008 to 2012 |
|------------------------|--------------|

### *Degrees Awarded*

|       |                        |      |
|-------|------------------------|------|
| B.Sc. | University of Victoria | 2012 |
|-------|------------------------|------|

### *Honors and Awards*

|       |      |
|-------|------|
| award | date |
|-------|------|

## PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis: TOWARDS UNDERSTANDING DIGITAL INFORMATION  
DISCOVERY.

Author: \_\_\_\_\_

ELENA VOYLOSHNIKOVA

30 Dec 2002