REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

Appendix D11

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Table of Contents

1 Questionnaire: General Part

Usability – Internet Prototype

This questionnaire is addressed to

REGNET partners' personnel

Guidelines and questions to record observations during the test

I. General Part

Before beginning please give some information about the goals and the course of the test. Example: The goal of this test is to evaluate how users could work with the REGNET system. I will ask you a series of questions and would like you to think out loud while you look for the answer. I will be timing you. Some questions are easy to answer and some are more difficult. Don't worry if you can't find the answer every time. Remember, we are testing the effectiveness of tools - this is not a test of you! The whole test should take about 1/2 hour. Do you have any questions?

Test information

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

Content partners shortcut: _____

Name of observer: _____

Name of tester: _____

The tester belonged to the following user group:

❏ Sys Admins / Developers   ❏ Catalogue Admins

☒ Catalogue staff   ❏ Curators / Educators

❏ Marketing specialists   ❏ Other: _____

Date: 2003-01-10____

Browser used: Netscape version _____   Explorer version   6.0____

            Others _____   Version _____

Platform :   MAC   ❏   PC   ☒   UNIX   ❏

Internet connection: _____

System component tested: _____

URL of the tool: http://csc000.cscaustria.at/test1_____

1. General questions (concerning the test person)

Please answer to the following questions before you begin:

1.1 Gender: ☒   male   ☐   female

1.2. Age: **1.3. Your highest educational level:**

❏ - 18
❏ 18-25
☐ 26-35
| 36-45
❏ 46-55
❏ + 55

❏ Primary / Elementary school
❏ Secondary / High school
❏ Professional training
☒ University / College

1.4. Where are you employed ?

❏ Information Centre
❏ Archive
☒ Library
❏ Museum
❏ Gallery
❏ IT-Company
❏ Consultancy/Service company
❏ University/educational institution
❏ Other institution

1.5. Your type of profession:

❏ Curator
❏ Librarian
❏ Archivist
❏ Collection administrator
❏ Information specialist
❏ Multimedia developer
❏ Computer scientist
❏ Photographer
❏ Artist
❏ Project manager
☒ Others

1.6. How do you assess your competence regarding computer knowledge (internet, word-processing, picture editing)?

☐ Advanced
| Intermediate
❏ Beginner

1.7 How frequently do you use a computer ?

☒ every day
❏ once a week

1.8. How familiar are you with the project?

☐ not at all familiar
| partly involved in the project

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

❏ once a month

❏ very knowledgeable about the project

> Please take now the scenarios you prepared and write down your observations: What did the test person do? Was the test person able to find the correct answer resp. way to the requested information? Did any problems occur? Please write down all the comments and observations using the scenario sheet (Part II). After the performance of tasks asked the test person about his impression (list below).

2. Design

Please ask the test person for his impression regarding the design of interface. Take the following questions as an orientation and mark the choice according to the given scale!

	Absolutely satisfactory	Very satisfactory	Satisfactory	In need of little improvement	In need of much improvement	Unsatisfactory
General appearance	❏	❏	❏	☒	❏	❏
Colour (colour appliance)	❏	❏	❏	☒	❏	❏
Text (textual presentations, i.e. text blocks, fonts, etc.)	❏	❏	❏	☒	❏	❏
Usability and quality of images	❏	❏	❏	☒	❏	❏

	Much too big	Too big	Ideal	Too small	Much too small	Don't know
The font size is ...	❏	❏	☒	❏	❏	❏

Further comments and suggestions:

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

---

3. User support

This section refers to the user support (navigation, help features etc.) the tool offers.

	Absolutely satisfactory	Very satisfactory	Satisfactory	In need of little Improvement	In need of much improvement	Unsatisfactory
Navigation methods and navigation quality	❏	❏	❏	☒	❏	❏
Help functions are	❏	❏	❏	❏	☒	❏
The login procedure and its functionality is	❏	❏	☒	❏	❏	❏
The templates and input fields (quality, consistency, ease of use) is	❏	☒	❏	❏	❏	❏

Further comments and suggestions:

4. Impression

Now, the user should describe his overall impression of the tool in terms of professionality, support of tasks etc. Please give him the possiblity to comment on necessary improvements and functionalities.

	Absolutely satisfactory	Very satisfactory	Satisfactory	In need of littleImprovement	In need of much improvement	Unsatisfactory
The proposal looks professional	❏	❏	❏	☒	❏	❏
The software supports me in performing my tasks	❏	❏	❏	❏	☒	❏
The proposal seems reliable. I can trust the information provided by REGNET	❏	❏	❏	☒	❏	❏
REGNET combines the information on regional culture in an innovative way	❏	❏	❏	☒	❏	❏

Further comments and suggestions:

REGNET

**Cultural Heritage in
Regional Networks**

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

Thank you for supporting me!

2   Questionnaire: Scenarios

Usability – Internet Prototype

This questionnaire is intended for

REGNET partners' personnel

Guidelines and questions to record observations during the test

II. Scenarios

Data Generation – Editing and Search & Retrieval
I. Data Entry

1. You are looking for a measurement tool that is called "Elle" (in german). You know there are catalogue records in the database, you even know the specific item you are looking for and it 's actual length which is exactly 1 m.

2. Find a record by using the AAT Thesaurus: there is one Thesaurus test record to the thesaurus term "Museums / Library domain", it's object name is ………

3. Edit this record by

a) deleting the empty Dublincore section

b) Deleting the entry in the field "Remarks" in the object section

c) Filling in the field context in section "object" choosing the term "Bildungswesen" from the lookup and deleting this entry.

d) Filling in the field "Remarks" with cursory data

4. Delete a test record (Object name: "test record")

5. Search for records with the term "Eros" in them. You should find at least three: now do a batch modify by replacing the word "Eros" (or other writings) by the word "Karl VI". Check by a second search if all the names have been correctly replaced. Do the same transformation again, this time from "Karl VI" to "Eros". Rename your objects using different spellings (e.g. Eros, EROS, eRos) and numbering your records' object names "Eros" from 1 to three ("Eros 1", "EROS 2", "eRos 3").

6. (Re-)create the test record you have deleted (see above 4.),

7. (Re-)create the empty Dublincore section you have deleted (see above 3)

8. Create a second thesaurus term of your own choice as a child term to the AAT thesaurus term "Museums / Library domain". Delete this term.

Scenarios

Please write down what the user did! If any comments/suggestions to improve the tool/interface were given write them down!

time started: 12:26

time stopped:12:34

Case 1: Data Entry / Search for "Elle"

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

Indicate what the tester did (e. g. used search tool, browsing, used search terms)

Click on lookup

click on term « ELLE » clicks on button search

display of Resultframe

5 items found

new search with term " ELLE " plus "1" in the Full Text field (to find Elle of exactly 1 m length)

again 5 search results as full text search also searches in the field "number of records"

Comments/Suggestions made by the tester (e. g. necessary improvements)

lookup-button is slow to react on click, system should be faster;

Describe issues/problems:

Did the tester find the answer? ☒ yes   ___ no

Scenarios

Please write down what the user did! If any comments/suggestions to improve the tool/interface were given write them down!

time started: 12:35

time stopped:12:40

Case 2: Data Entry / Find record via Thesaurus

Indicate what the tester did (e. g. used search tool, browsing, used search terms)

Click into the empty thesaurus field

Comments/Suggestions made by the tester (e. g. necessary improvements)

empty thesaurus field at the beginning confusing, as it is not possible to write in it

Describe issues/problems:

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

Did the tester find the answer? ☒ yes   ___ no

Scenarios

Please write down what the user did! If any comments/suggestions to improve the tool/interface were given write them down!

time started:13:00

time stopped:13:10

Case 3: Data Entry / Record Editing

Indicate what the tester did (e. g. used search tool, browsing, used search terms)

Full text search; search

Lists all entries; first entry edited

Changed data; applied modifications.

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in
Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

Comments/Suggestions made by the tester (e. g. necessary improvements)

Describe issues/problems:

Did the tester find the answer? x ___ yes   ___ no

Scenarios

Please write down what the user did! If any comments/suggestions to improve the tool/interface were given write them down!

time started: 13:55

time stopped:14:00

Case 4: Data Entry / Filling the field "Remarks" with cursory data

Indicate what the tester did (e. g. used search tool, browsing, used search terms)

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

Fullt text search for "Test Record"

Object removed;

Full text search for " Test Record"; no hits.

Comments/Suggestions made by the tester (e. g. necessary improvements)

Describe issues/problems:

Did the tester find the answer? ☒ yes ___ no

Scenarios

Please write down what the user did! If any comments/suggestions to improve the tool/interface were given write them down!

time started: 14:00

time stopped:14:05

Case 5: Data Entry / Search, batch, change

Indicate what the tester did (e. g. used search tool, browsing, used search terms)

Full text search: Eros > only two entries found..

"Batch modify": change "Eros" by "Karl VI". 2 records changed.

Creating new Dublin Core object for Eros_4, replacing Eros_4 by eRos_2.

Changing Object type to object, then to Dublin core object; Recalling entry from the hitlist; Visual Basic Error.

New Search; All changes were shown correctly

Comments/Suggestions made by the tester (e. g. necessary improvements)

Describe issues/problems:

Did the tester find the answer? ☒ yes ___ no

Scenarios

Please write down what the user did! If any comments/suggestions to improve the tool/interface were given write them down!

time started: 15:00

time stopped: 15:10

Case 6: Data Entry / Add new record

Indicate what the tester did (e. g. used search tool, browsing, used search terms)

Creating new object; dataentry applying modifications.

Comments/Suggestions made by the tester (e. g. necessary improvements)

Describe issues/problems:

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

<div style="border:1px solid black; height:300px;"></div>

Did the tester find the answer? _x__ yes   ___ no

Scenarios

Please write down what the user did! If any comments/suggestions to improve the tool/interface were given write them down!

time started: 15:10

time stopped: 15:15

Case 7: Data Entry / Add new section to an existing record

Indicate what the tester did (e. g. used search tool, browsing, used search terms)

Adding new Dublin Core Section to object; apply modifications

Success; it takes too long to save modifications

Comments/Suggestions made by the tester (e. g. necessary improvements)

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

Describe issues/problems:

Did the tester find the answer? _x__ yes   ___ no

Scenarios

Please write down what the user did! If any comments/suggestions to improve the tool/interface were given write them down!

time started: 15:20

time stopped: 15:25

Case 8: Data Entry / Create thesaurus term

Indicate what the tester did (e. g. used search tool, browsing, used search terms)

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

Doc type: "Thesaurus AAT" – click on "Museums / Library domain" > edit (editing mode).

"new child": entry. apply modifications.

Comments/Suggestions made by the tester (e. g. necessary improvements)

Describe issues/problems:

System is reacting too slow

Did the tester find the answer? x___ yes   ___ no

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

3   Brainstorming Session in Den Haag

RESULTS WORKING GROUPS AT REGNET TEAM MEETING DEN HAAG.

This document is split in two parts:

 Firstly the general impression and secondly an overview per tool of improvements needed on a more detailed level.

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS

I. Data Entry, Search & Retrieval

POSITIVE issues (advantages)	NEGATIVE issues (advantages)
Fast application	The system is not self explaining
The system was designed as a general documentation system and it fulfils this requirement.	If the system is to compete with existing Collection Management Systems, then the more specific data field should be added to the data entry. For each domain (Biology, Geology, Archaeology, etc.) separated "views" or templates should be created in which the all general and domain specific data entry field are listed. The domain specific field of other domains have to be left out. Example, Archaeology data requires specific entry field such as, the co-ordinates of the exact locality where an object was found. Biology requires fields such as "holotype", "paratype" etc.
	The system contains scattered and separated information, which "pollutes" the search results: Image descriptions without relations to objects and the images concerned.
	The search facility is present and functional, but in specific cases it takes to many steps and time (20 minutes!) to find a record, and change a mistake in the text. More detailed information is given in the second part of this document.

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

II. E-Shop, Auction and E-Procurement

POSITIVE issues (advantages)	NEGATIVE issues (advantages)
Clear layout, easy to use	Response time is much too long
	The design is rather formal and sober. For better examples see: www.museumshop.com, www.smithsonianstore.com, www.louvre.fr
	The legal aspects, as established by the EC, for the operation of an E-shop need to be fulfilled.

III. Topic Map Generation

POSITIVE issues (advantages)	NEGATIVE issues (advantages)
Pleasant & attractive presentation of information	The present state of the visualisation has not jet reached its full potential. Image, text are not displayed on the same screen: see www.thinkmap.com use the Smithsonian Institute demo as an example. Another example is www.cultuurwijzer.nl which has a interesting way of presenting documents and internet web pages associated to the topic map occurrences.
Very clear and dynamic connection between images and text	
For specialist rather easy to make	
Interesting to make links & connections with other themes and topics	

IV. E-Publishing

POSITIVE issues (advantages)	NEGATIVE issues (advantages)
Very clear presentation of the information	
Image, text and map are displayed on the same screen	
Printed form is available	

V. Portal

POSITIVE issues (advantages)	NEGATIVE issues (advantages)
Personalisation of the layout	The page is rather static
	The page does nor give enough references to the Cultural Heritage. Other image(s), referring more to our domains should be added to the design.

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

Detailed comments

I. Data Entry, Search & Retrieval

The search

II. E-Shop, Auction and E-Procurement

E-Shop: After confirming your order the system should display once again all items bought, costs etc. The customer can now make a last check. (this is a legal obligation for E-shops).
E-Shop: After having bought one or more items the customer will receive an email confirming his order. It will also shortest the items bought and a point of contact for further information (the museum supplying the item).
E-Shop: The functionality which calculates the shipping costs must be added. It has already been done for the Procurement tool (VALT).
E-Procurement: After having found items you want to buy you must have the possibility to contact automatically the supplier: click the button next to the items you want to contact the supplier about. An email will be generated in which you have the email address of the supplier, and the details (as they were presented in the E-procurement tool) are automatically copied into the mail's body. The mail can also be further edited by the customer as to ask for example more specific question.
E-Procurement: In the data entry for the field "name" the restriction that a name can only be used once must be lifted. It is impossible to think of individual names for e.g. each ring we are offering on sale.
Auction: When the object is sold or if the auction is closed, each individual bidder will receive an email notifying them that the object is sold or the auction is closed.
Auction: When a user of the auction system (or one of his products is refused to be on sale, e.g. pornographical items) the user will receive an email notifying this.
Auction: When the object is sold or if the auction is closed, each individual bidder will receive an email notifying them that the object is sold or the auction is closed.

III. Topic Map Generation

Note: It is essential that the content providers deliver the correct terms to use. Also there should be consistency in terminology used in different topic maps. The Topic Map Content Board as proposed by TARX should be established.

IV. E-Publishing

Mouse pointer does not change in appearance when touching a link
Note: the use of "guiding words" (words appearing on clickable button and links) should be carefully checked by the content provider. In general: the technical information is too specialised for the content provider to work out. An intermediate museumworker (to be semi-part of the CSC's) may work between the technical specialist and the content provider as to facilitate the production.

V. Portal

Mouse pointer does not change in appearance when touching a link
When a feature of the portal is not yet implemented a message stating this should appear. At this moment is confusing for the user: they do not know if their own system is not functioning or that something is missing in the Portal itself.
A further check on multilingualty is needed: e.g. the factsheets are still in English when using the Portal in the Dutch language.
The interface: change colour ➔ language should be translated
Change colour: White background & white links ➔ system should refuse a white background
Helpfunction is not yet implemented

4 Free-Style Documents

Reports of the next tools:

- Data Exchange (RegNet Broker)

- ebusiness

- e- Procurement

- e- Publishing (the Faydherbe application)

Data Exchange (the RegNet Broker)

Comments
It seems that everything is working well with the current data that we have for testing. We should see if it really works with our big databases.
Lacks
A tiny lack. It's necessary a direct link from the Broker to the portal.
Suggestions
I think this tool is or will be very useful for those organisations that already have stored their catalogues in xml files. It's a very fast and useful tool to transfer items from the Database to the e-Shop.

ebusiness

Comments
It's an easy and fast way to share this kind of information. Huge opportunities for museums, art centers, cultural organisations, etc. to plan exhibitions and to know very quickly what other museum can offer to share or exchange.
It's a good opportunity for museums, art collections, and so on in order to make dynamic their exhibitions' program and also to show their art fund that usually can't be exhibited in their rooms

REGNET
Cultural Heritage in
Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11
Version 01
Date: 2003-03-04

because of a lack of space. Therefore more people will be able to enjoy it.

Lacks
The only problem that I see is that you have to send the entire catalogue to the other partner. You can't send only few items. But perhaps it will be useful for organisations to get ready a catalogue to be showed and shared.

Suggestions
Also museum can foreseen it and design a special catalogue to do this kind of transaction, selecting a number of pieces to be lent.

e – Procurement (2nd test)

Comments
A very useful tool, with very good intentions.

Lacks
One of the problems from my point of view is to find wholesalers that provide products to the RegNet managers with good catalogues and offers.
But to me, the main problem is that the organisation (museum, art centers, etc.) that be interested in to buy something, they will have more or less the same products in their e-Shops. This will produce a homogeneous market in all the e-Shops of different centers in different countries. This is bad because one of the most important aspects in the cultural field is the originality of what they offer. This is one of the methods that they have to compete with the others and in this way to mark the difference in quality.

Suggestions
This tool could be more useful for small museums and organisations because they have fewer opportunities to compete in this aspect because of their budgets and possibilities.
The key is to find good and different wholesalers that mark the difference in their products.

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

e – Publishing (the Faydherbe application)

Comments
At the first sight it seems a good multimedia material with a lot of information and pictures that facilitate the user to be in the Faydherbe environment (city, work, history, etc.) The design is pretty good but it needs some improvements. To me it's necessary that any multimedia material have to be more dynamic to catch the attention of the user. And also we have to think to who is addressed this material, who will be the main user of it (scholars, adults, expertises, etc.). This is the most important before to design a material like this. If we are thinking in young people it's necessary to make dynamic the multimedia, if we are thinking in adults the current design is pretty ok, and if we are thinking in expertises the kind of information must to be more specific and technical.
Lacks
Little things to be improved: When you click on any button your step is not registered with any change, like for instance a change of colours in the word that you have pushed, in order to let you notice the previous steps that you have done. This can confuse the user using the multimedia. When you enter in "Traces in Mechlin" you can find two options to look for information: from the map and from the left menu. I miss next: If I choose the map option to look for a place, when you are on a blue dot that marks a place to go in, no sign or message let you know about where you are or which building are you going to visit. I would suggest that when you are on a blue dot the word that describes this place on the left menu make a change of colour. Also in the map could appear a message putting the name of the place. This would be in order to situate the user in the map. If I choose one place to visit and I want to go back to the last step that I have done, the system doesn't allow me and it sends me back again to the main menu, changing again the language. When I enter, for instance, in the Sculptor entry I found the text that describes this entry at the end of it, forcing me to scroll it until the beginning of it. I think that every time that a new user goes in, he or she has to find the description ready to be read. In the main page the picture of Faydherbe seems to be clickable because the hand that represent the mouse appears on it, but the link doesn't work.
Suggestions
This tool is necessary for all the centers. But we have to think in the users and it's very important to achieve a good material and good learning results. It's necessary to take into account a

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

professional aid of a pedagogue team that is the expert one to design the contents of this kind of materials.

5   Technical Response

Comment on validation report of data entry tool - AIT:

Features already available :

General remark: the system interface is widely configurable and if content providers define their needs, they will be taken into account. This concerns the display of the search mask as well as the display of the search result.

 Expert users have to define their requirements and wishes for adaptation.

The view of the search result can be accustomed as needed. For a search result view that is defined as the content providers wish please have a look at: http://csc000.cscaustria.at/sul or http://csc000.cscaustria.at/onb.

Lookup tables: starting with another letter than A in the lookup: just type the required letter into the first field.

Search for the whole database and display it in the search result: this is no longer available.

Integration of the tool: VALT works on connection to eProcurement and eShop. The data entry tool can export and transform data into the appropriate topic map workspace.

Help function: we have now finished work on general improvements of the interface as reported in D10 and we have just finished the guidelines that will provide help. Help text can also be added to each data field. We need here just to know the text defined by content providers (see: http://csc000.cscaustria.at/rndatainput).

Old data can be integrated by the administrator in the batch add mode.

Suggestions that are not viable:

Order of data fields displayed in record: data of records is displayed in the same order as created by content providers, that cannot be changed in the general interface. It can be changed in an accustomed view of the search result, that has to be defined by the content providers.

Use of symbols: the only symbol used within the standard user interface is the symbol with the key for the system administrator, that does not affect the general expert user. Only the thesaurus feature provides symbols and they are implemented in accordance to standard windows symbols.

Case sensitive searching: unfortunately this issue cannot be solved. But please note that only fields with lookup tables are case sensitive. The fulltext – all data fields - field is not case sensitive.

Search of in Bulgarian text: the database system itself (TEXTML Server) does not yet provide indexing of cyrillic characters.

To do:

Refine query: this feature is not yet implemented.

Comment:

The modelling of data and the validation of the data entry tool should not be mixed up..

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

6 VNET5 Questionnaires

VNET 5 - Generic User Requirements for Interactive Electronic Publishing (IEP) Services and Products Questionnaire

VNET5 is a thematic network funded by the European Commission as part of the IST research program. The objective is to improve user-orientation in development teams in interactive electronic publishing. **The REGNET project (Silke Grossmann) is** a VNET5 member and responsible for this survey.

IEP services or products allow users to access electronic information in different formats, on different platforms and through different channels: requesting and receiving information is not only active or passive as with conventional publications (e.g. searching in a catalogue vs. newsletter), but also through different forms of interaction between users and the service/product (e.g. mobile phone, PDA, internet banking).

This questionnaire is developed for a survey, which we conduct together with the VNET5 project and other IEP projects to identify generic user requirements for future IEP services and products. You can help us with answering this questionnaire.

You will need approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

It consists of three parts:

- 1.   Background   questionnaire:
  We need some background information about you to identify your experiences with computers and IEP services.

- 2. Testing procedure (*I assume that the REGNET partners have been using the REGNET tools*)
  We have introduced you to the REGNET Data Entry, Search and Retrieval tools. You have tried out the REGNET tools yourself.

- 3.   User   requirements   questionnaire:
  We would like to ask you to complete the VNET5 user requirements questionnaire attached.

IMPORTANT: Your individual data will be analysed anonymously and not made available to third parties**.**

Please continue with the background questionnaire

REGNET
Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11
Version 01
Date: 2003-03-04

1. Background questionnaire

1. Age

☐ under 20 ☐ 21-30 ☐ 31-40 ☐ 41-50 ☐ 51-60 ☐ over 60

2. Sex

☐ female ☐ male

3. Education

Most recently completed education: ....

If you are still in education, what school are you attending? ....
....

please specify subject of study ....

4. Position at work

☐ Not employed ☐ trainee ☐ employee ☐ management ☐ self employed ☐ other

please specify branch ....

5. Current Use of IEP'

Please mark which of the following services/products you use and how often.

	never	seldom	frequently	regularly
Internet Banking	☐	☐	☐	☐
WAP Mobile	☐	☐	☐	☐
Personal Digital Assistant PDA	☐	☐	☐	☐
Public information kiosk	☐	☐	☐	☐
Online shopping	☐	☐	☐	☐
Online newspapers or journals	☐	☐	☐	☐
Other (eg. a system similar to REGNET)	☐	☐	☐	☐

6. Purpose of current use

What do you use IEP services / products for most often?

☐ I don't use IEP services
☐ Mainly for private use
☐ Equally for private use and for my work/study
☐ Mainly for my work/studies

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

7. Intention of use

Will you use (or continue to use) IEP services/products in the future?

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

No, not interested   Yes, but only rarely   Yes, frequently   Yes, regularly

8. Use of IEP in personal Network

Are IEP services/products generally used in your environment?

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

never   seldom   frequently   regularly

9. Experience with the Internet:

How do you rate your internet experience?

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

beginner   average user   expert

I have been using the internet for .... years

.... months

How often do you use the Internet?

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

daily   weekly   less than weekly

10. Knowledge of languages

Mother tongue: ....

How do you rate your knowledge of English?

☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

beginner   average   expert

Many thanks! Now the introduction, test and user experience will follow.

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

3. User requirements Questionnaire

On the following pages you will find a list of statements which refer to the REGNET tools which you have seen and tested.

Please indicate your position towards each statement spontaneously, according to your personal view. Imagine you could widely use the REGNET tools which you have seen and tested. All questions should be answered based on the use of the REGNET tools which you have experienced.

- Each statement can be rated on a five point scale, from -- disagree to ++ agree.

disagree		neutral		agree
--	-	0	+	++

- Important: the middle category **0** (neutral) stands for a medium or neutral rating of the statement (neither very positive nor very negative) and not for "I do not know" or "Undecided"! Please state your position for every item.

- Please check one answer per statement only. Choose the answer that reflects your views best.

- It is very important that you rate all the statements, so please answer each question in the questionnaire as good as possible.

- You will need approximately 15 minutes to complete the questionnaire.

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

		disagree		neutral		agree
		--	-	0	+	++
1	I would feel observed by other people when using the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2	I could explain the benefit of the service to my friends and colleagues	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3	I miss indications for the reliability of the contents	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4	I would not notice time going by when I use the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5	Alerts such as beeps, rings, sounds or vibrations would disturb me	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6	Few people will be willing to pay for the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7	Using the service is frustrating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8	I'm sure the service will not register my actions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9	I doubt if the service is worth a high price	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10	I would not like to use the service every day	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11	I would have to change my way of work to use the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12	The service makes one unique	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13	Even if you do not need it urgently it would look professional to have the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14	After some time it will be normal to have the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15	The service is not stimulating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16	Using the service fits well with the way I like to work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17	I would forget everything around me when using the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18	People might fear that the service is expensive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19	Most of the people in my environment will use services like this	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
20	The look of the service does not fit with my personal style	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21	The service does not match my interaction style at all	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22	It is acceptable to use the functions all the time	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23	The service helps me to find what I am looking for	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24	The service would make my life more complicated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25	I know what the service does	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26	The design fits the functionality	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27	I would feel comfortable with the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28	The service does not look attractive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29	It is not possible to determine if the information is useful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30	I can see that honest and trustworthy people stand behind the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31	The benefits of the service are self-evident	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
		disagree		neutral		agree

REGNET

Cultural Heritage in Regional Networks

REGNET trial service and recommendations

Appendix D11

Version 01

Date: 2003-03-04

		--	-	0	+	++
32	Using such services would make me appear confident	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33	I don't think that I could impress others by using the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34	The service is fun to use	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35	I am impressed by the look of the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36	You can rely on this information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37	It will be hard to get enough people to use the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38	The benefits from the service are worth a high price	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
39	When everyone has the service I will find it difficult to do without	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40	Using the service is exciting	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
41	I am not sure if my data will be shared with others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
42	Using the service does not improve ones professional image	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
43	The service matches my life style	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
44	I would enjoy using the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
45	I will buy the service only if it becomes cheap	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
46	Alerts are annoying	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
47	The service is visually not pleasing	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
48	The service floods me with information	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
49	I would not pay for the information I receive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
50	Using the service would not fit into my work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
51	I am sure that the service guarantees privacy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
52	I must have the service whatever the price is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
53	The content presentation fits with the purpose of the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
54	The information received is trustworthy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
55	The service would facilitate my daily work	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
56	The service is boring	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
57	Key people in my organisation would use the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
58	I like to be alerted when relevant information is available	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
59	Highly valued people would use the service	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
60	I do not know who has access to the information I enter	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
61	I can not imagine what some features of the service are for	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
62	The information is presented in an appealing way	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Thank you very much for your patience and co-operation!