Melissa Lafranchise
LIBR 247
Assignment 1 – Indexing and Abstracting

Article selected:
Bilal, D. (2002). Perspective on children's navigation on the World Wide Web: Does the type of search task make a difference? *Online Information Review, 26*(2), 106-117. doi: 10.1108/1468520210425376

Index terms:

Major:	Minor:	Identifiers:
1. Online Searching	1. Grade 7	Yahooligans!
2. Information Skills	2. Web Browsers Usability	Fact-based search
3. Information Seeking	3. Library Instruction Information Literacy	Research-based search
4. Search Engines		Self-generated search
5. Search Strategies	4. Information Needs	East Tennessee
6. Information Retrieval		

Abstract:
Bilal, D. (2002). Perspective on children's navigation on the World Wide Web: Does the type of search task make a difference? *Online Information Review, 26*(2), 106-117. doi: 10.1108/1468520210425376. Dania Bilal, Assistant Professor, School of Information Sciences, University of Tennessee-Knoxville

Perspective on children's navigation on the World Wide Web

Bilal's study investigates information-seeking behavior in East Tennessee 7th graders and their ability to use the search engine Yahooligans! to successfully complete three searches (fact-based, research-based, and self-generated searches). Goals also included determining which search task students preferred, how the search experience affected them, and their suggestions for Yahooligans! interface improvements. Qualitative and quantitative research methods were utilized with 22 middle school children (14 of whom provided usable data). Lotus ScreenCam tracked the children's activities on Yahooligans! An internet/web quiz, personal question sheet (for self-generated searches), and exit interviews enabled data gathering for search skills, affective experience, and interface improvements. Descriptive statistics were used to derive specific results. The study concludes the children were most successful in performing self-generated searches (73%) followed by a 69% *partial* success rate for research-based searches, and a 50% success rate for fact-based searches. Students had no external motivators (rewards) for completing the tasks and that my have affected performance. Results indicate children do not comprehend the difference between fact-based and research-based searches, revealing a need for information literacy training. Self-generated search success was due in part to researchers helping students identify information needs, indicating a need for search strategy training. Children did not use effective search syntax, nor know how to properly use the search engine, suggesting a need for search engine and web training. Recommended Yahooligans! interface improvements include adding spell-checking, favoring keyword search over browse, reducing complexity of browsing hierarchies, and adding context-driven help. M.A.L

Indexing and Abstract Comparison: A Study of Children's Web Navigation

In the following paper, I compare index terms and abstracts written for Bilal's study "Perspective on Children's Navigation on the World Wide Web: Does the Type of Search Task Make a Difference?" Index terms include those of the ERIC indexer and those I selected for this assignment. Abstracts include those prepared by the article author and ERIC abstractor, the abstractor from *Online Information Review*, and the abstract I wrote for this assignment.

Index Terms

Overall, I feel that the ERIC index terms have a greater level of exhaustivity whereas my terms have a greater level of specificity. Per Cleveland and Cleveland, "an indexing agency aimed at a general user will go with the broader term approach and more exhuastivity, whereas s specialized indexing service will use narrower terms, increasing specificity" (2013, p. 161). It is possible that I was considering more of a specialized audience than were the ERIC indexers. I was focusing on the journal's audience while I assume ERIC indexers were focused on the Education Information Resource Center audience, which would be rather broader in my estimation. The exhausivity of ERIC indexing certainly leads to more entry terms, which are vital in that they "give users access to the database" (Cleveland & Cleveland, 2013, p. 158). And, having reviewed both my terms and the ERIC terms, I prefer the increased number of entry terms that ERIC provides. I may have misinterpreted the ERIC guideline's recommendation to index to the specificity of the article and held too narrow a focus on online information retrieval. I may have also been impeded by inexperience with the ERIC thesaurus. Assigning terms was often difficult and many of the concept terms I originally searched for in the ERIC thesaurus yielded no results, necessitating browsing by topic until I found terms related to what I was looking for.

Similarities

Both Eric indexers and I used Grade 7 as the Education Level descriptor. I actually only included Grade 7, where ERIC indexers also included Middle Schools, because I thought that Grade 7 matched the specificity of the article where Middle Schools was a broader term and hence unnecessary. I may, however, have been confused by the ERIC indexing guideline's mention of *search* specificity for Education Levels (2001, p. xviii). I can certainly see why the inclusion of Middle Schools would benefit a wider user group as an entry point. (The repetition of the two Education Levels in the Eric list seems unnecessary and is perhaps a mistake.)

The only other terms on which there was agreement were Information Seeking and Search Engines, and these do seem to represent the core aboutness of the article.

Differences

Computer Assisted Instruction was included by ERIC indexers and did not appear in my list. While the article did open with a discussion of the use of computers in classrooms, I felt that that is not what the core of the article was about, though I can see how the study results provide relevant information to those involved in Computer Assisted Instruction.

I used the precoordinated descriptor Web Browsers Usability to represent what I think the ERIC indexers intended to cover with Computer System Design, Navigation (Information Systems), and Problems. I felt that my descriptor was more specific to the type of computer system used in the study (i.e., web browser) and that Usability covered the *evaluation* of both navigation and user facility with an interface. However, I do see value in that ERIC's three terms provide more entry points for the audience, where my single precoordinated term may not.

I employed Search Strategies, Online Searching, and Information Skills where ERIC indexers chose Research Skills and Student Research. I felt my terms were more specific to the article content, and that the student aspect was covered by the Education Level descriptor.

ERIC indexers include World Wide Web as a descriptor, and it was deprecated in 2004, two years after this article was published, in favor of Internet. I included neither term as I felt Online Searching, Search Engines, and Web Browser Usability represented more specific aspects of the same concept. The broader ERIC term *would* be an entry point to a more diverse audience.

Task Analysis is employed by ERIC indexers, and I really have no direct equivalent, though possibly Information Skills and Information Needs combined with some of my identifiers might cover the concept. Here I think is an example of my lack of experience with an audience of educators as this is most likely a fairly common concept and term in the discipline.

I also included Information Retrieval and the precoordinated term Library Instruction Information Literacy. Information Retrieval was actually intended to be a broader term to enable entry by a wider audience. Library Instruction Information Literacy seemed to capture one of the key conclusions in the article and therefore be an important concept to represent. The ERIC indexers include the concept as the identifier Training Needs.

Search Behavior is the only other identifier ERIC includes, and my intention was to cover this concept under the descriptors Online Searching and Search Strategies. I included several identifiers exemplified by the ERIC indexing guidelines, including Yahooligans! and East Tennessee. I also included the three search task types studied in the research as I felt them to be important concepts in the article that were not represented in the thesaurus.

Abstracts

In comparing my abstract with those of the article author and ERIC abstractor and the *Online Information Review* abstractor, I feel my version is more comprehensive. In the first case, the ERIC abstract is an indicative abstract, and hence purposefully abbreviated, intended to only indicate the topic of the article. It is "an alerting device and is never expected to replace the

document itself" instead it "guides users to the item" (Cleveland & Cleveland, 2013, p. 130). It does quickly provide an overview of the study and some of the implications of its results, and hence serves its purpose to describe the aboutness of the article for users. The abstract included in the article itself appears to be more of an informative abstract. It covers the goals, investigative methods, general results and implications of those results. It also includes more of a description of the study itself than I would have considered including. In a general way, it can be considered to replace the article itself. I erred on the side of including more specific data in my abstract where possible (e.g., actual success percentages for the searches). I also described the data gathering and analysis techniques where neither of the other abstracts did so. I included the reason postulated for rather low success rates, and, for each major result, I specified its implication (e.g., results indicate children do not comprehend the difference between fact-based and research-based searches, revealing a need for information literacy training). I conclude with the list of improvements that could be made to the Yahooligans! interface. In terms of specific content related directly to the study and its results, I think my abstract does a bit more towards replacing the article for any user who may be too busy to read it in full. My abstract also helps users determine if the full article is something they *should* read (e.g., perhaps a user wants to better understand what evidence led to the suggestion of particular interface improvements).

Conclusion

The task of comparing the index terms and abstracts for Bilal's 2002 article goes far in revealing the complexity of information representation. What specific terms will allow a user to search for and find this article? In how many ways can this article be appropriate for any number of audiences (i.e., does its aboutness extend beyond the specific study content to tangentially related topics that might be supported by the implications of the study results)? In summary, my

index terms could be improved by the inclusion of some of the broader terms employed by the ERIC indexer. The abstract included in the article could possibly be improved by some of the actual data points and specific results implications included in my abstract, while the ERIC abstract seems to stand as a solid indicative abstract, not really requiring anything extra.

References

Bilal, D. (2002). Perspective on children's navigation on the World Wide Web: Does the type of search task make a difference? *Online Information Review, 26*(2), 106-117. doi: 10.1108/1468520210425376.

Cleveland, D. B., & Cleveland, A. D. (2013). *Introduction to indexing and abstracting*. Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited.

Education Resources Information Center. (2001). ERIC's indexing. In *ERIC's indexing and retrieval: 2001 update*. Retrieved from LIBR 247 Desire 2 Learn Course Site https://sjsu.desire2learn.com