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EuropeanaLocal Advanced User Test Group

The following 8 EuropeanaLocal content providers took part in the advanced user testing:

- ABM-Utvikling, NO
- Angewandte Informationstechnik Forschungsgesellschaft mbH, AT
- Ministry of Culture, Spain, ES
- Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica, SI
- PAN - Poznańskie Centrum Superkomputerowo-Sieciowe, PL
- Provincie Limburg, BE
- Public Library 'Pencho Slaveykov' (Public Library of Varna), BG
- Sogn og Fjordane County Municipality, NO
1 Introduction

This report is a part of EuropeanaLocal D3.5 ‘Report on user and usability testing’ reflecting the results of Advanced User Testing (Test Phase 1). EuropeanaLocal user testing is a part of work conducted under the EuropeanaLocal Evaluation Work Group (EWG). The EuropeanaLocal user testing consists of 2 phases: TP1 – Advanced User Testing, and TP2 – End-User Testing. This report covers solemnly TP1 – Advanced User Testing. Thus, EuropeanaLocal D3.5 consists of 2 individual reports corresponding to described above test phases.

EuropeanaLocal user testing work plan was initially introduces to all EuropeanaLocal partners at the project mid-term meetings in Poznan in December 2009. In March 2010 it was presented at Europeana meeting in Paris and was successfully validated by Europeana V1.0 WG ‘Users’. Following this, the Advanced User Testing Specifications were prepared by EuropeanaLocal to assist the test group. Those were validated at EWG meeting in Lisbon in July 2010 (Annex 2). The testing took place between July and October 2010. As additional task EuropeanaLocal also provided feedback to the first draft of Danube specifications released in September 2010. The feedback was included in the report produced under Europeana V 1.0 ‘Validation’ WG.

Test Phase 1 (TP1) was focusing on assessment of the functionalities that were coming up in the new Europeana portal (Rhine release). The objective of TP1 was to identify which functionalities were missing and could be added to Europeana portal in order to make it more attractive specifically to the local and regional content providers. Thus, the report consists of feedbacks and remarks jointly produced by the test group in relation to main functionalities of Europeana portal (after Rhine).

The test group for the TP1 was a small focused group where the test users were selected from the advanced EuropeanaLocal content partners satisfying the following criteria:

- already involved in regional or national aggregation,
- advanced service providers,
- and have been dealing with the portal application features on the regional or national level.

The prime objective of TP1 was to test the functionalities and provide feedback with the purpose of making Europeana service attractive to local and regional content providers, and therefore, encouraging their content contribution.

The report consists of 8 chapters where each provides analysis of responses from the test group.

The report is sent to Europeana technical team and Europeana V 1.0 ‘Validation’ WG.
2 Search and results

Search APIs

1. As mentioned in D3.2 / 4.3.2 the search API based on the OpenSearch protocol will be updated and refined taking into account its interrelation with SRU.

2. Synonyms are good to have, but not feasible to implement in the Rhine release. This functionality is closely related with semantics - in order to propose synonyms the system must understand the meaning. This brings into the area of semantic tools like 'thesauri'. Furthermore, if 'synonyms' functionality is put in place, the step to other languages is very small from there, therefore, multi-lingual search should then also be mentioned. Translations of words are in fact nothing else but synonyms in other languages.

Query context

1. It would be beneficial to give higher scores to smaller collections, or the least represented collections in the result set. The main purpose of Europeana is not to promote the larger collections, which can be accessed in different ways, but rather to guide people to content which is held in databases which are not so accessible.

2. Specific fields could be added: when a search term is found in the field ‘creator’, ‘title’ or ‘subject’, this is potentially more relevant than when same search word is found in the description field.

The query mechanism

Possibly the most effective would be using together OpenSearch and SRU as foreseen, at least concerning SRU, in the first drafts of TEL. There must be taken into account that SRU and OpenSearch are being checked together and, above all, SRU has been declared as a web service by OASIS what allows to assume many of the special and contextual features of the model that Europeana expects to implement. OpenSearch and SRU not only shape an excellent query language, as there can be seen in the recently put in production Networked Digital Libraries of Thesis and Dissertations (NDLTD) carried out by OCLC/RLG, but makes up one of the constituent pieces of Open Linked Data as an ontology.

In this way, it is a model the case study carried out by W3C for VIAF in which are participating important European projects. A basic aspect of this case study is SKOS, one of the bases of the Europa Data Model that is probably going to be the most difficult to implement, apart from the countries that are using Rameau in SKOS format or LSCH in SKOS format. The Ministry of Culture will convert the Subject Heading List for Public Libraries in a SKOS structure in the next months.
**Result specification**

1. Related items that are part of the query result metadata should be displayed in the detail view via a link to the related object (identifier information is in the HasPart or isPartOf fields)

2. The definitions that are being developed by the Date and Time working group for the HTML5 environment would be used. It is foreseen to use geospatial data that, additionally, allow an efficient linking with interfaces such as Google Earth or Google Maps and many other international platforms that using the same geospatial presentation.

**Advanced search**

1. So far the advanced search allows only to search in 4 metadata fields and in 3 different search lines. What if a person wants to search for the data of a special data provider (not aggregator), or for a publisher, or for some text parts of a description?

2. There is no highlighting of search terms within the detail display of the results. This will be a helpful aid once the search is multilingual. The metadata values in another language will display the search word also in a different language. Or is the translation for all metadata values envisaged?

3. For users it would be interesting to go back in a search history (of the current session).

4. In ‘MY Europeana’ the tags could be displayed when the details of an object are viewed. This should be also allowed without registration.

5. The search engine Lucene/SOLR includes very useful functionalities as misspelling detection and proposes a more accurate reading as the user is used with Google and it is migrating to the cloud which may be useful for a model as the Europeana one that counts with many aggregators at different levels.

D3.2 / 4.1.7 proposes using Google Translate what we consider an appropriate tool, but it must be taken into account that an important part of the European cultural heritage is written in Latin and Google Translate doesn’t seem to have made advances concerning this language.

Another improvement specified in D3.2 / 4.1.9 (Improved accessibility for visually impaired and blind people) is related with Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 produced by W3C. Nevertheless, the Daisy standard, supported by NISO, seems to be more developed. In Spain it is used by ONCE (National Institute for Visually Impaired and Blind People) and is being implemented in some digital libraries.
**Word autocompletion**

Using OpenSearch and SOLR makes easier Word autocompletion even when it is possible that its adaptation to such a multilingual environment as the European one will be very complex.

**Alternative spellings**

Even when it is very difficult to solve, the uniform resource identifier for alternative terms from standardised vocabularies could come from the identifier that provides VIAF or the standard number of FRANAR/FRASAR. Maybe the last one would be better because of the most accurate structure even when it is more complex.

**Query expression specification for advanced search**

Taking into account the structural richness of Europeana and the broad variety of materials that includes it will be very desirable.

**Tips and suggestions**

Concerning the different aspects of 1.7, there must be used a suite of functionalities, from using SOLR to solve misspelling to using semantic operators (as foreseen in the White paper). The capacity to suggest broader or related terms will depend on richness of EDM structure and, above all, on the skosification of the terms. The prototype launched by the University of Braunschweig shows that if there are broad and well structured lists, as the NACO and LCSH ones used by the University of Braunschweig, it will be possible to provide alternative, broad or specific terms, based on the previous using by the user, provided that these terms can be stored in each session, just as SOrl allows.

3 **Browse**

**Spatial, person, index browsing**

1. It would be better to have one list containing the items that have a person as value of the dc:creator, dc:contributor and dc:publisher attribute (= a person as producer of content/an item), and one list containing the items that have that person as a value of the dc:subject attribute (= a person as subject).

2. The alphabetically sorted display of dc:creator and dc:contributor in one field named “Creator” caused quite some discussion. This will probably change with the next release? Creator and contributor should be displayed in separate fields. Very often the most important creator or contributor is in the first dc:creator field and an alphabetical sorting is furtheron misleading.
3. In case of aggregators that serve data providers from different countries the spatial browsing based on Europeana:country is not always possible (EFG - The European Film Gateway; Europe / or Video Active; Europe).

4. Spatial browsing should include both attributes. In fact, country doesn’t say much about the object, especially in Europe where borders were changing through history.

5. The best procedure would be to abide the Content Accessibility Guidelines 2.0 as mentioned in D3.2 / 4.19. This has two advantages. On the one hand, it is a standard maintained by a powerful institution in which Europeana would have to be represented. On the other hand, W3C has an agreement with the Library of Congress for developing SKOS that is essential for every issue related with this point and even more for the convergence with Linked Open Data as foreseen in D3.1 / 4.3.5

**Subject cloud**

There can be 3 possibilities rather than 2: the 3rd would be to let the user decide which he prefers to see. In either case it has to be clear to the user what it is that he/she is being presented with. If only one is going to be used then dc:spatial would be the most relevant one.

**Related items**

1. It should be more transparent for the users why these items are related. Could be useful to highlight the search term within the detail view.

2. From the point of view of EuropeanaLocal the criteria could be geography – linked to the map, if possible.

**People are currently thinking about**

The display depends on the language you choose. It would be interesting to see it more generally.

**Visibility of individual data providers**

The new field europeana:dataProvider is a good step towards the visibility of the individual data providers. It would be nice to be able to browse a list of all Europeana data providers per country (not only aggregators), and when someone clicks on one he/she gets all the Europeana entries of this data provider (NB!: not the homepage of the data provider)
4 Distribution – APIs

Extended search

Europeana API that could be useful for Erfgoedplus.be is related to extended search, i.e. a user of Erfgoedplus.be could at the end of his/her search be interested in what Europeana has to offer extra about the topic. This would require semantics, therefore, the functionality highly unlikely to appear before the Danube release.

Query expansion

Query expansion could be useful (e.g. to include multilingual terms).

OpenSearch API

Given the conditions of durability that are expected from Europeana, it should be considered, as a functional strategy, the use of persistent identifiers among which it might be selected PURL or DOI that has an European agency and is under development by ISO/DIS to become an ISO standard.

RSS: very recently and in a paradigmatic way, the Bloglines project, the largest currently support to RSS, has been cancelled. So it doesn’t seem a future option to bet on RSS although it could be necessary to maintain it in the systems that are still using it.

The same can be said of ATOM. In fact, content indicators seem to be in the process of disappearing, although the proposal made through social networks does not seem, at the moment, to be completely seated.

HTML: in a future perspective, it would be essential to take into account the development of HTML5 that, because of its flexibility and rich content capabilities, can be very useful for the end user. Moreover, as it is planned by W3C, it will take on most of the functionalities that are now supported by XML, in which most of the functionalities of the Europeana internal information structure are based.

It should be also taken into account that HTML5 is used to provide security to certain transactions in the network. It is very likely to be the most acceptable solution to the visualization of all of those items subject to copyright law since HTML5 restricts them to the limit established by the rights holder.

Zoom (present image or a part of it with a specified scale)

Perhaps it is sensible that images are transfered into image pyramids. This is especially usufull in the case of files in mrSID formats, which are usually very big.
5 Facilitation: Europeana Labs

For the Ministry of Culture of Spain everything related to Europeana Labs is essential. The Ministry of Culture is very interested in using, under the Europeana license, those pieces of software from EuropeanaLabs that would allow the improvement of their own applications, always in line with the general targets of facilitating open access to heritage content of all types in a web environment.

Technical requirements

Given the volume of information and the transaction regime foreseen, there are some doubts whether the use of PostgresSQL would be enough not only for the correct functioning of the system but for a similar system behaviour to other international projects.

It is clear that for strategic reasons Europeana performance must be as good as other systems are. In this way, PostgresSQL could be not enough when digital objects and functionalities are multiplied as foreseen at D3.2.3 (when speaking of PostgresSQL’s capacity as a back-end for triple-stores, however, not as a database).

6 Content Ingestion

The current SIP, at least as presented as a prototype in the wiki, seems insufficient perhaps because it has been produced before version 5.2 was consolidated. It has a flat file aspect at least in the examples shown and there are hardly any semantic relationships between the terms, for example triplets are not seen. Given that the Ministry of Culture of Spain has started to generate this SIP for its databases, and taken into account the variety of metadata schemas, it would be necessary to have a SIP model EDM 5.2 compliant.

Related with this, it would be also necessary to provide end-user ingestion procedures, as for example in one of the latest versions of Chronicling America, the newspapers digitization project of the Library of Congress, where together with ingestion procedures for institutions there are planned end-user ingestion procedures using Flickr and, specifically, a Flickr tool with this aim.

It would be important to take into account that the broad set of metadata defined by EDM could be transmitted using not such a specific model, but a broader one, as METS, that already has many available tools. METS Editorial Board is carrying out a task highly similar to that of the Europeana and that collects the five standards that shape EDM, namely RDF, OAI-ORE, SKOS, DC VRA, FOAF. METS also allows to encapsulate both preservation and IP metadata, METS Rights, and, which is very important from the Europeana functional point of view, ALTO that is already defined as a METS extension.
Perhaps it would be more reasonable to create one or more METS profiles suitable for Europeana than to develop a specific SIP whose biggest problem wouldn't be, in our opinion, the developing itself but the maintenance of the different versions.

Taking into account that European institutions as the British Library, the National Library of the Netherlands and others are involved in METS, ALTO and other Editorial Boards, it would seem reasonable to reuse procedures already consolidated and where Europe has a voice through its more qualified representatives.

In fact, and as a general proposal, Europeana should participate in the different International boards of standardization since it is going to use them. And the same concerning the different American standardization institutions

In any case, it would be very convenient to check the SIP not only with a sample of records, but big datasets moving from the prototype carried out by EuropeanaLabs to a beta phase in which both the information structures as defined in EDM 5.2 from 07/31/2010 and functional requirements of 08/31/2010 could be checked. The issue of the schedule is very important because, as defined in D3.2, it is intended to be operative in April 2011 and, therefore, there will have to optimize all the processes, checking, validation and implementation, if the objective of this date is kept.

**Content checker**

The Content Checker has some other important functions in addition to validation of the metadata format:

- visualization of the data prepared in a mock-up of Europeana, which allows fine-tuning of the mapping to ESE;
- the 'caching of thumbnails' helps to discover some images that are not properly readable in content provider’s own system;
- being able to show to potential contributors what their own data would look like in Europeana is an important incentive for motivating content providers to contribute and improve their data.

Content Checker is a useful tool which can do more than originally intended. Maybe it's worth investing a bit more in its stability and maintenance, e.g. sometimes it doesn't work or works not properly. There is no indication whom to contact in case it doesn't work.

**OAI-PMH**

A recommendation is to provide an alternative to OAI-PMH for getting data in Europeana. OAI-PMH is good if you have it readily available on your software, If you have good ICT support in house, and if you want to expose your data for harvesting also for other uses than Europeana. In other cases it is quite a burden, especially for smaller, local collections. It is a
burden for the provider as well as for the Europeana office, because they must test and keep track of the good operation of each single repository.

A nice lean alternative would be for Europeana to set up a central repository of its own, which is fed by smaller content providers through an interface similar to that of the Content Checker. This way, content providers do not have to install and maintain a repository (very often separate from their database), they can easily decide by themselves when to upload updates, uploading is really simple, the data and thumbnails can be validated during the uploading and report immediately to the content provider without need for intervention from Europeana’s staff, Europeana can easily ingest the content from their own repository.

This being said, some other content providers support the idea of use OAI-PMH protocol. They find it convenient especially for smaller content providers to ‘manually’ upload the content – similar to the mechanism of the Content Checker. So both possibilities shall be allowed.

**Continuity of ingestion process and information about it**

At the moment there is practically no way to plan the timing of harvesting by Europeana. Content providers can ask via e-mail, and hope to get a response, but it would be much better if there would a small information panel for each content provider showing:

- date of last harvesting;
- amount of records harvested (or information that it is in progress);
- amount of thumbnails cached (or information that it is in progress);
- date of next harvesting.

Especially aggregators coordinating delivery of content from tens or hundreds of institutions would appreciate this. Also the time between harvests could be shorter. At the moment it is about 3-4 months. In Austria it is done every night, including thumbnails caching, without super fast servers or large number of staff.

7 Editorial Virtual Exhibitions

When Slovenian library uploaded its collections, the element in IsPartOf was included, but the collection (LC) was not displayed on Europeana. Only dc:relation was showing.

8 Future developments
The test group suggested the following improvements for Rhine and future releases (e.g. Danube).

**Tagging(annotation)**

Multilingual controlled ontologies could be used to tag objects. It could be considered to provide for the users the option to display the tags taken from a controlled ontology.

**Infrastructure for automatic upload mechanism**

A number of content providers suggest the idea to offer small (local) institutions a central repository at Europeana premises, which they can feed on a regular basis. Furthermore, it would be good to have an automated procedure for re-harvests of aggregator repositories (e.g. once a month or within another agreed time interval).

**Quality of content**

There should be some automated tools to evaluate the quality of metadata uploaded to Europeana and content behind this metadata. It would be good both for Europeana end users and for content providers who care about what they upload. As the amount of content in Europeana increases, the amount of low quality content also increases. Few examples below.

There is almost no metadata and the image is also just a small thumbnail:
http://www.europeana.eu/portal/record/07404/D28D51F0F37CC74E5A5DD11898D2171F4E168617.html

There is just a thumbnail and no quality image:
http://europeana.eu/portal/record/00401/4BCDFAEAE59856C0F2F42085E8BA3567E347EDB.html

How do I reach the content of this object?
http://europeana.eu/portal/record/00301/03A3F2E5E37070A5EC8B8061856D529AA856B080.html

**Reports for content providers on attracted traffic and sources of this traffic**

The content providers would like to know what volume of traffic their content attracts through Europeana and how (using which interface features) people find their objects in Europeana. The second point would allow them to work on metadata in order to be more visible in selected interface features. For example, if I would know that my content is not clicked via the timeline view, I would work to improve the temporal parts of metadata.
Annex 1 Questions and issues raised by the content providers

Ontologies

It would be interesting to know which ontologies Europeana is planning to use.

The update to the new data model EDM of Europeana will involve an update of the mapping routine for data providers and aggregators.

- Which tools will support these new mappings?
- Which ontologies will be recommended for data enrichment prior to Europeana ingest?
- Will any (multilingual) ontologies be provided as web services?

Query expansion

Will there be a method in the Search API providing query expansion?

Clustering on the fly

1. Will FRBR also be used for that?
2. Is it that objects are classified as TEXT, SOUND, VIDEO?

Target group of Rhine/Danube Specifications

Which is the target group of the Specification? If it is targeting technical people, then it must be more precise from technical point of view. If it aims to promote Europeana and to attract people to ingest their content, then some parts must be removed.

Collection, normalization and data enrichment

How Europeana collect, normalise and enrich data?

Query mechanism

The query mechanism – where in Europeana? Is it in MyEuropeana? Where the query context can be seen?
Functional Specifications

Europeana Portal / Rhine Release
EuropeanaLocal Advanced User-Testing

Prepared by Olga McHenry, EWG, EuropeanaLocal
1 Search and results

1.1 The Europeana content database

The Europeana content database consists primarily of:

- metadata: information describing the content objects.
- views of the content objects, such as thumbnail images
- semantic resources capturing lexical and domain knowledge in the cultural sector, such as thesauri, taxonomies, subject heading systems and ontologies.

The collation process is handled by the ingestion layer. Broadly, the process works as follows:

- The content providers ensure their data complies to Europeana requirements
- The content providers upload the compliant data to Europeana
- Europeana collects, normalizes and enriches the data
- Europeana integrates the data into the Europeana system.

1.1.1 Integration of data into the content database

The process is as follows:

- Europeana v1.0 and Europeana:connect will jointly develop a data model, the Europeana Data Model (EDM). The EDM will provide high level classes and properties to match the requirements set by Europeana management, which take into account business requirements and user expectations.
- The content providers will relate the domain-specific classes and properties of their own data models to those of the EDM. In some cases, the relation will be realized declaratively by specialization links, asserting that certain classes or properties of content providers are, respectively, sub-classes or sub-properties of some EDM elements. In more complex cases, the relation will be realized procedurally by a transformation of the original metadata into instances of EDM, carried out through a possibly complex transformation algorithm.
- The compliant data and mappings collected from the content providers will be uploaded to Europeana.

**Important**: The more complex European Data Model, introducing more classes and properties, will be developed in time for the Danube release.

1.1.2 The query mechanism

A query mechanism consists of three main parts:

1. Query language
Definition: this comprises syntax, semantics and pragmatics defining:

• the expressions that users can use to extract information from Europeana
• the meanings of these expressions and
• their usage in accomplishing the tasks defined in the requirements.

2. Context definition

Definition: this specifies the elements used to extract answers to queries. These include:

• information about the user, such as languages spoken, preferences, history and communities of interest
• a characterisation of the objects being searched, such as degree of authoritativeness, composition relations and equivalence criteria

3. Query evaluation engine

Definition: this is a piece of software that computes the result of queries according to the semantics of the query language and the context.

1.1.3 The query mechanism API

This API will be used by applications serving three different types of user:

• end users who want to search for objects relevant to their information needs or to browse the Europeana information space. These users typically sit behind a graphical user interface such as the Europeana portal. This interface acts as a mediator between the end user and Europeana.

• external applications that aim to extract the information needed for a specific application task or for integration with other information.

• internal components of Europeana that need information in order to implement a Europeana service.

1.1.4 Search APIs

Europeana will offer the following Search APIs:

• Simple search
• Advanced search
• Auxiliary search functions:
• Word autocompletion
• Synonyms
• Query expression specification for advanced search

1.2 Simple search
From a user point of view, a simple search query is a full-text query, like a typical query on a web search engine. It returns a set of item descriptors sorted/ranked by predefined criteria, and can be repeated to refine the result of a previous query.

1.2.1 Query expression

This is a sequence of words from any of the supported languages, including social tags. Information retrieval operators, such as boosting, phrases and windows, may be allowed in a query expression if supported by the chosen query evaluation engine.

Note: The query expression will be specified in detail after the query evaluation engine has been selected.

1.2.2 Query context

This is a set of features that specifies additional conditions to be considered when computing the final sorting/ranking of the search results. These features are:

- **phrase**: when the user has entered a query without isolating any of the terms as a phrase (e.g. with quote marks), this feature indicates whether the search engine should consider whether any sequence of words in the query constitutes a phrase
- **size**: this feature indicates whether items coming from larger collections should be given a higher score
- **region**: this feature indicates whether objects in one of a set of specified languages or countries should be given a higher score
- **collection**: this feature indicates whether objects in one of a set of specified collections or providers should be given a higher score
- **view**: this feature indicates whether items endowed with content (such as thumbnails) should be given a higher score.

1.2.3 Result specification

This is a set of variables that specifies:

- which part of the query result should be displayed to the user, and
- how the results should be displayed.

These variables are:

- what is the relative position in the final sorting/ranking of the first item to be returned
- how many items of the final ranking should be returned
- by which criteria the displayed items should be sorted
- by which criteria the displayed items should be clustered
- whether related items should be returned.
1.3 Advanced search

An advanced search query is a formal query describing the desired results in a logical form, very much like a database query.

The form is a Boolean combination of simple clauses. This addresses classes and properties of objects and their metadata within the EDM.

From the user point of view, an advanced search is similar to a simple search, except that the query expression is typically entered in boxes associated to attributes (such as author or title), and there is usually the possibility of further specifying:

- an operator associated to the selected box (i.e. if the selected box requires a date, the user may specify whether the results must be BEFORE or AFTER that date)
- whether all the conditions stated are to be satisfied simultaneously by the results or just anyone of them is to be satisfied.

Advanced search returns a set of results sorted/ranked by predefined criteria, and can be repeated to refine the result of a previous query.

Note: As the EDM for the Rhine release is ESE, the clauses of an advanced search are restricted to the ESE metadata elements. The Danube release will be based on a more complex version of the EDM, allowing for deeper advanced search.

1.4 Word autocompletion

Word completion is an auxiliary search function that helps the user when entering the terms of a simple search.

1.5 Alternative spellings

This functionality provides alternative spellings of the name of a place or an agent, or in general of any term Europeana happens to have in any of the vocabularies it knows about. Where there is no exact match, the system searches its vocabularies for similar terms and suggests alternative spellings of those terms.

1.6 Query expression specification for advanced search

This functionality provides an easy way of specifying an advanced search in one or more of the Europeana facets. The user selects the facets he wants to search and then enters a search string in each one.

1.7 Tips and suggestions

This functionality helps the user to discover information after a query has produced no results. It displays tips and suggestions that the user may want to try in order to satisfy his information needs. The tips fall under four categories:
alternative spellings of names used in the previous query
• completions of the first characters of the terms used in the previous query, leading
to different terms
• more general terms of those used in the previous query, if a term taxonomy is
available
• suggestion to use collections other than Europeana.

2 Browse

From a functional point of view, browsing involves two main aspects:

• the data aspects, which concern the functionality required to obtain the data displayed to
the user during a browsing session

• the GUI aspects, which concern the functionality required to display the data to the user
and support the user in the interaction with Europeana

Note: This specification addresses the data aspects of browsing only. Reason: the GUI cannot be
specified in words but require a user-centered design and specification approach.

2.1 Clustering on the fly

The term “clustering”, when applied to search results, means selecting a theme (for
instance “object type”) and organising the results in several lists, each relative to a
particular value on the selected theme. This is opposed to, say, presenting all of them in a
single list.

2.2 People are currently thinking about

This is a complex functionality aimed at capturing, storing and re-using the most popular
queries issued by the users of Europeana. The aim is to discover out what people are
currently thinking about.

2.3 Related items

Finding related items to those retrieved by a query q, amounts to:

• creating a set of queries q1, q2, ..., qn, depending on q; we call these the related
queries
• evaluating the related queries in parallel to the evaluation of q
• displaying the results of the related queries as asides of those of q.
2.4 Subject Cloud/Wall of pictures

The data for this type of browsing can be captured as follows:

- Issue a query $q$ that returns the different subjects used to describe a predefined set of Europeana items (a target dataset). **Note:** the target dataset may be the full Europeana infospace, or a subset of it selected previously via a search operation.
- The query $q$ must return, for each subject, the number of times it occurs in the target dataset.
- Finally, the result is sorted in descending order by the number of subject occurrences.

In order to state the query precisely, it is specified in SQL. To this end, the following assumptions are made:

2.5 Spatial browsing

Europeana metadata (ESE) include two attributes that give spatial knowledge:

- Europeana:country (the country in which the content provider is based), or
- dc:coverage.spatial (what the resource represents or depicts in terms of space).

It is at the moment unclear how to utilize these attributes for the spatial browsing. There are two possibilities: (1) to use only one of them; (2) To use both of them.

2.6 Person browsing

This functionality allows the user to browse the content of Europeana by specifying the name of a person.

Europeana will return two ranked lists of items in response to a request to browse by person. These are:

- a list containing the items that have that person as value of the dc:creator attribute;
- a list containing the items that have that person as value of the dc:contributor, dc:publisher or dc:subject attribute.

2.7 Index browsing

This functionality allows users to browse the content of Europeana by looking at various types of indexes. In particular, the following indexes will be browsable:

- the **global** index, that is the index of all the terms that are searched when a simple search query is evaluated
- the **facet** indexes, there is one such index for each facet. The index has all the terms that are searched when the relative facet is searched. The following facets are considered:
• the **who** index, that is the index of all the names that are returned when person browsing is performed, as detailed in the previous Section

• the **what** index, that is the index of all the subjects that are returned when subject browsing is performed, as detailed in a previous Section

• the **where** index, that is the index of all the geographical names that are returned when spatial browsing is performed.

### 3 Distribution – APIs

#### 3.1 APIs included in the Rhine Release

The APIs included in the Rhine Release are:

• Simple search
• Advanced search
• Auxiliary search functions:
  - Word autocompletion
  - Synonyms
  - Query expression specification for advanced search

#### 3.2 Specification for HTTP APIs

The following is the specification for the HTTP (external) APIs.

All Europeana APIs will use the base-URL set out below, unless stated differently:

http://europeana.eu/<function>?<request parameters>

Valid values for <function> are:

• search (SRU and OpenSearch)
• find (semantic search via SPARQL)
• resolve (get object)
• zoom (present image or a part of it with a specified scale)
• getThumbnails (eg for showing thumbnails in carousel)
• annotate (add, search and modify annotation)
• info (get object info, eg number of pages, object structure)
• highlight (highlight text in digitised images).
3.2.1 Search and retrieve specifications

For search and retrieval Europeana will support the SRU protocol (http://www.loc.gov/standards/sru/) and OpenSearch (www.opensearch.org), as below:

3.2.2 OpenSearch API

The OpenSearch API is:

<base-URL>?q=<query>&start=<start record>& format=<format>

The URL syntax is described in the OpenSearch Description Document. Formats to be supported are as follows:

- RSS
- ATOM
- HTML
- JSON.

4 Facilitation: Europeana Labs

4.1 EuropeanaLabs.eu

The main purpose of EuropeanaLabs.eu is to test and validate components and applications, in a setup similar or close to Europeana’s production configuration and connected to a representative dataset.

4.1.1 Formal requirements for contributing code to EuropeanaLabs.eu

All partners in the Europeana group of projects can contribute functionality and code to Europeana via a managed process moderated by the core development team. Functionality and features may come from agreed work plans or be additional innovations.

4.1.2 How to develop at EuropeanaLabs.eu

Functionality accepted for Europeana.eu will be allocated a dedicated folder in the ‘contrib’ section of the EuropeanaLabs subversion repository. This ensures that the core development team can access the source code, keep an overview of the progress, and give iterative feedback. You will be given access to this folder by the Europeana Configuration Manager and the rest of the environment detailed below.
4.1.3 Maintenance of the Europeana.eu code-base

Once code has been accepted and released as part of the Europeana.eu code-base, Europeana.eu will take full ownership for future maintenance. Concretely, this means that the code submitted will move from the ‘contrib’ directory in the Version Control into the main Europeana code-base, under Europeana Dev.

4.1.4 Technical requirements for contributing to the Europeana code-base

Overview of Europeana Functional Components
To promote reuse of the code, the Europeana code-base has been divided into the following functional components. For further explanation on their function and relationship to each other, please consult the documentation to be found inside the source-code that can be obtained from either EuropeanaLabs or Subversion.

- Cache
- Resolve Servlet
- Cache Servlet
- Query
- Database
- Dashboard
- Normaliser
- Portal-core
- Portal-lite
- Portal-full

Overview of core Europeana technologies used
- Java 6 or higher
- Hibernate (Object-relation-mapping, i.e. database interaction)
- Spring Framework 2.5 or higher (dependency injection, M
- Maven 2.0.9 or higher (build and dependency manager)
- Freemarker 2.3.15 or higher (template rendering engine)
- Apache Solr 1.4-dev or higher (Apache Lucene-based search engine
- Postgresql 8.3 or higher (SQL database).

Overview of coding requirements and best practices
A key requirement for Europeana integration is for the software to run on Linux and in the Java Virtual Machine [JavaVM]. Therefore please bear in mind some extra requirements:

- Use Apache Maven2 (2.0.9+) as build manager. ApacheAnt, can be embedded, but each component needs to have a Project Object Model file (i.e. pom.xml) defining the build and dependencies.

- All code must have Junit4 unit tests (use annotations). This is to enable continuous integration. We generally recommend Test-Driven-Development.

- All code must be able to be deployed and proven to work well on
Linux operating systems.

- Your web applications can be deployed on Apache Tomcat 6.* and Jetty. Europeana prefers the Spring À la carte approach to J2EE application servers like JBoss, GlassFish, etc.

- The use of Spring in general and Spring-MVC in particular, is highly recommended. Using Spring to wire your application will greatly increase the likelihood that we will be able to integrate your functionality, with ease.

- If you aim to develop Rich Internet Applications (RIA)–like functionality, please use Google Web Toolkit (GWT). Other RIA frameworks can be discussed. Currently, we prefer not to use Flash or Flex because of accessibility concerns.

- Java 6 or higher is the recommended programming language. Other languages that compile to Java byte-code and can run on the JavaVM might be considered.

- Due to the clustered and replication nature of the Europeana portal, all web-based interaction needs to be 100% stateless. Please keep this in mind in designing your component. The stateless nature is enforced on the server by disabling support for sessions.

- For all user authentication please re-use the Hibernate/Spring security functionality.

- When you need external libraries please consult the Europeana Maven pom.xml files, to be found inside the root of each module of the source code. This will tell you if a library that provides similar functionality is already being used. In order to keep maintenance manageable you might be asked to use different libraries or replace your custom code by library invocations.

**Overview of the Europeana.eu production environment**

The Europeana production environment contains the following components:

- Dashboard Server: contains collection management software, the master search index, and the master thumbnail cache

- Postgresql database: contains ESE-metadata records, static-pages, interface translations, user-related information (saved searches, saved items, user-tags etc)

- Portal Web Application: contains all the web-interfaces and Java code of the Europeana.eu website

- Image thumbnail slaves: contains a replicated copy of all cached thumbnails for high-performance display.

- Apache Solr Search engine slaves: contains the replicated search index used for queries by the portal.
Your component can be deployed in the following four environments, depending on its stage in the development to deployment lifecycle:

- Production (http://www.europeana.eu)
- Test/Acceptance (http://test-portal.europeana.eu)
- EuropeanaLabs (http://www.europeanaLabs.eu)
- Locally (local server or computer to test or develop functionality)

### 4.1.5 Further development of EuropeanaLabs

In the near future, an OpenSource project, EuropeanaLabs.org, will be established in parallel to EuropeanaLabs.eu. EuropeanaLabs.org will contain local or non-core functionality. Initially EuropeanaLabs.org will be moderated by the core development team of Europeana, but eventually it is intended to become a self supporting community with its own community guidelines and moderated processes.

### 5 Content Ingestion

#### 5.1 Metadata for digital objects: Europeana Semantics Elements

The Europeana Semantic Elements V3.2 (ESE) is the metadata set developed for the prototype version of Europeana launched in November 2008. It is a Dublin Core-based application profile providing a generic set of terms that can be applied to heterogeneous materials thereby providing a baseline to allow contributors to take advantage of their existing rich descriptions.

The Europeana Data Model (EDM) marks an evolution of ESE towards a more sophisticated framework that will be able to support the functionality within the Danube release. The EDM is currently being developed jointly by WP3 of Europeana version 1.0 and Europeana:connect, with the contribution of a number of subject matter experts.

#### 5.2 Data validation

In the process of preparing their data sets the providers can use two tools to verify the compliance to ESE and the quality of mapping in relation with the Europeana portal functions.

##### 5.2.1 XML Schema

Providers can use an XML Schema to check the validity of XML instances (data sets) with regards to ESE.
In particular the schema verifies the obligation constraint described in the table of the previous section.

5.2.2 Content Checker

Providers can also use the Content Checker. With this tool they can check the compliance to ESE and the quality of the mapping and normalisation activities.

5.3 Data transfer

The mechanism used to transfer Data to the Europeana production environment is the Open Archive Initiative Protocol for Metadata Harvesting (OAI-PMH).

A standard harvesting job performed by Europeana requires:
• **Base URL** of the Provider OAI-PMH repository server
• **ListRecords** verb to get a response which is a list of metadata records in XML
• **metadataPrefix** parameter that represents the ESE dissemination format. **Note:** *ese* is typically used for the export of the data in ESE.

6 Editorial Virtual Exhibitions

A virtual exhibition is a set of Europeana content items linked together under a common theme.

The curators of these virtual exhibitions can be well-known people from one of the domains (artists, writers, and curators), celebrities or ordinary Europeana users.

Virtual exhibitions are logical collections (LCs) of a particular type of object from the Europeana information space, each with its own set of metadata. Items featured in the LC may get additional metadata.

6.1 Modeling LCs in ESE

LCs can be modelled as ESE records as follows:

- dc.title = the title of the collection
- dc.creator = the curator of the collection
- dc.type = [http://purl.org/dc/dcmitype/Collection](http://purl.org/dc/dcmitype/Collection) (a specific value)
- dc.publisher = Europeana
- dc.description = a text provided by the curator for describing the collection
- dc:hasPart = the identifiers of the items in the collection

**Note:** the attribute dc:isPartOf should include the collection identifier as a value.

In order to enable LCs to have further LCs as members, Europeana will maintain a cycle-free inclusion graph.
6.2 Functionality available for LCs

Typically, the functionality available for LCs consists of:

- insert/remove item (only for the curator)
- view the collection content (as a query result)
- vote for collection
- post a comment on collection
- tag/annotate collection.

These functionalities will be specified in more detail in the following months and finalized in the specifications of Danube.

7 Future developments

This Section outlines functionality that has been requested, for instance as a Priority for Rhine, but has not been specified as actually outside the scope of Rhine.

7.1 Demos on the site

Requirement: Provide demos on the site for:

- Extensive search
- MyEuropeana
- Tagging (Why, how & what)
- New functionalities
- Annotations.

7.2 Personalisation preferences

- IP related interface settings *
- Recognition of expressed personal preferences
- Enabling services such as ordering a reproduction

7.3 EuropeanaConnect

- Semantic Layer – WP1 (Danube)
- Multi-lingual access – WP2 (Danube)
- Multi-media annotation – WP4 (Danube?)
- eBooks on Demand – WP4 (Danube?)
7.4 **ASSETS Search**

Project proposal accepted in current call to deal with searching, ranking and displaying. However, the results will be too late for Rhine.

For the Danube release, classes and a richer set of properties will be used for advanced searches.

7.5 **IPR Framework**

This covers rights to content and will be introduced in the Danube release.

7.6 **Further browsing opportunities**

Allows users to discover the content of Europeana. Wall of pictures, other visualisation options discussed by SS during Plenary 1.

7.7 **Content based queries on multimedia documents**

Search on shape or colour or similar, producing a ranking against closeness of similarity for use directly by users or to facilitate behind the scenes semantic search techniques.

This requires a number of elements: indexing, scoring and a very rich GUI. This implies several person/years of work and will be provided by ASSETS.

7.8 **Ontology queries**

**Definition:** expressions ranging over the constructs of ontologies eg the terms which are synonymous with bank or the sub classes of painting.

This requires a semantic layer, which is currently not part of the ESE. We can specify this functionality as soon as the richer EDM is finalised, and then it can make its way into Europeana possibly before Danube, depending on development resources.

7.9 **New facets/better configuration of facets**

The addition of new facets requires elicitation of requirements. Once the facets to be added are identified, they should be mapped to properties of the EDM. They can then be queried in an advanced search, either in the full or the simplified form. Combination of facets is already considered in the specification. “Better configuration” is a GUI matter.

7.10 **To get help about the semantic net of the descriptor**
Example: topical map feature including topical based browsing

Out of scope for Rhine. **Reason:** Cannot happen with data in current form.

### 7.11 To upload objects from private collections

Out of scope for Rhine. **Reason:** Cannot happen for legal or management reasons
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Introduction and Summary

This report is a part of EuropeanaLocal D3.5 ‘Report on user and usability testing’ reflecting the results of End-User Testing (Test Phase 2). EuropeanaLocal user testing is a part of work conducted under the EuropeanaLocal Evaluation Work Group (EWG). The EuropeanaLocal user testing consists of 2 phases: TP1 – Advanced User Testing, and TP2 – End-User Testing. This report covers solemnly TP2 – End-User Testing. A separate report describing findings of Advanced User Testing was submitted in November 2010. Thus, EuropeanaLocal D3.5 consists of 2 individual reports corresponding to described test phases.

Objectives

The objective of Test Phase 2 (TP2) was to:

- Test the content provided by EuropeanaLocal;
- Test Europeana portal (after Rhine release) by end-users of different target and age groups from all Member States and Norway in order to provide necessary feedback for Danube release and further.

Methodology

The testing methodology is described in EuropeanaLocal End-User Testing Specifications (Annex A). In order to ensure comparability of EuropeanaLocal findings with the previous end-user tests conducted by Europeana (within Europeana Connect and Europeana V 1.0), same questionnaires were used.

Target groups

The target groups and age of the testers were pre-defined in a way which allowed to reach as broad coverage as possible of potential Europeana audience. Below target groups went through the testing in all partner countries, where the majority of partners covered at least 80% of the requested audience. Following end-user groups were identified by Europeana (EDLnet, WP 3) and lay a foundation for D3.1. Functional Specifications for Rhine release (Europeana v 1.0):

1. General user

   The general user has a generic interest in culture or history. He is familiar with
basic search functionalities, has no specific domain knowledge, is ‘google-minded’ and visits sites such as YouTube and Wikipedia that have large volumes of content to offer.

2. **Schoolchild**

   The schoolchild will make use of the service as part of their schoolwork. Given that culture and heritage are incorporated in many school curricula, Europeana could be used in a variety of educational contexts. The school child will expect the service to be easily accessible, immediately appealing, visually attractive or even playful, free of jargon and easy to use while doing their schoolwork.

3. **Academic user (both students and teachers)**

   The academic user represents the other end of the educational spectrum. He may have excellent domain knowledge, or aspires to achieve that. He will expect the information offered to be comprehensive, accurate, representative if not complete, and easy to reuse in the context of educational assignments.

4. **Expert researcher**

   The expert researcher looks for specific information on a specific topic. He is to a certain degree skilled in using retrieval services and may make use of the advanced search button to get the most out of the system. As this group is most likely to publish the results of the research, it will include users who are prepared to buy something or travel to visit the contributing institutions.

5. **Professional user (e.g. librarian, archivist)**

   The professional user is most likely to be a staff member of a cultural heritage organisation. He is skilled in using information systems, but has a different perspective from the expert researcher. He may be interested in details as well as very generic information, for instance with a view to improving the information services offered by his own institution.

*Additional target groups proposed by EuropeanaLocal:*

EuropeanaLocal suggested to include additional end-user groups which are not mentioned in D 3.1 of Europeana v 1.0, but appear to be important potential users of Europeana service:

6. **Tourist authorities**

   Promotion of tourist destinations through online presentation of existing cultural heritage, branding of national/regional/local cultural heritage and presentation
through Europeana for access and re-use, etc.

7. **Governments (national, regional, local)**

Europeana service could be used by different levels of government, for example, for regional development, promotion of tourism, promotion of country/region/locality as a place with rich cultural heritage, etc.

The most of the testing activities were performed by EuropeanaLocal partners between November 2010 and February 2011. Each content contributing partner has organized testing activities in his/her respective country. The following sections of this report will present individual country reports for each of the 27 participating partners.

**Participating countries**

27 countries participated in EuropeanaLocal end-user testing: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Ireland, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Netherlands (The), Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom. The individual country test reports are presented in the next chapters.

**Number of participants**

642 people went through EuropeanaLocal end-user testing. Below diagram shows distribution of testers per country.

Diagram 1. Distribution of participants per country
Number of test events

EuropeanaLocal partners conducted 92 test events, plus a number of phone and e-mail briefings.

Diagram 2. Number of test events per country
Target group distribution

The following diagram shows an overall target group distribution.

Diagram 3. Target group distribution

Age groups

Diagram 4 shows the age distribution of participants. More detailed age groups could be found in each individual country report.

Diagram 4. Age groups
Gender distribution

Diagram 5 presents the gender distribution of participants. An overall gender balance was achieved during the testing events.

Diagram 5. Gender distribution
General awareness

Majority of participants have not used Europeana before and were first introduced to it during the test events. Thus, the events had an additional positive ‘side-effect’ of an awareness campaign.

Diagram 6. Percentage of participants who have not used Europeana before

Key findings

The following paragraphs highlight the most common feedback received in throughout testing in different countries.

What users like about Europeana

• Content of high quality from trusted sources
• Single access point to European culture

How users see Europeana

• Search engine
• Cooperation mechanism between European Countries
• Good European initiative
What users want?

- “Needs more fun stuff”
- “More information about search options and mechanisms available on Europeana website”
- “Needs more interactive materials”
- “Needs to focus on how information is provided and organized”
- “More contemporary information”
- “More videos and music”
- “Annotating all items in English”

Common problems

- **Language** and multilinguality
- **Timeline** should be improved (difficult to retrieve publications connected to a specific period of time)
- Needs **better performance in search results** (especially, advanced search)
- Many **failed links**
- Many **similar hits**
- **Not intuitive**

Suggestions

- Need of **national promotion and dissemination**
- More **(national) content**
- Better developed ‘**user space**’ (My Europeana)

Potential

- “Could be a great site with more work” (Ireland)
- “Europeana offers a great number of digital resources” (Austria)
- “Is a quality valued site on the internet” (Denmark)
- “Positive initiative to promote culture” (Spain)
- Europeana “has great potential” (Poland)

**Structure of country reports**

Below sections describe in detail results achieved in each country. Each country report follows the same structure:

1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)
2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)
3. First impressions of Europeana (summary).
4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary).
5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana).
6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary).
7. Comments of the moderator (*Optional*)
Austria

End user testing conducted by: Angewandte Informationstechnik Forschungsgesellschaft mbH
Country report prepared by: Gerda Koch
1. **Descriptions of testing procedure**

The introduction to the testing was prepared on various occasions:

A. During the Austrian national EuropeanaLocal conference in November 2010 a power point presentation and the “Content and Data Preparation” workshop introduced the participants to the Europeana portal. Afterwards the questionnaire was distributed to the community and further support was given online (Email) or via personal contact.

B. The introduction to Europeana was part of a university lecture at the University of Graz. Afterwards the questionnaire was distributed to the attendees (students) and the data was collected online.

C. In addition, individual testing with participants from the various target groups was carried out.

Main testing period: January 2011

2. **Statistics of the group**

Nationality: 15 from Austria

Gender: female (8)  
           male (7)

Age: 25-30 (8);  
       31-40 (5);  
       41-50 (2).

We tried to involve test users from most of the proposed target groups. The majority of our testers belonged to the following groups: General users, Academic users, Expert researchers, Professional users.

3. **Individual searching preferences**

How often do you search for information online?

14 - Very often (almost every day)
1 - Often (once a week)
How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

8 - Very often (almost every day)
4 - Often (once a week)
3 - Rarely (perhaps only once per month)

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

13 - Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities”
7 - Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London”
2 - Searching by date

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

15 - A search engine such as Google
3 - An image sharing site such as Flickr
1 - A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images

What objects do you search for most often?

14 - Texts
8 - Images
6 - Video
2 - Audio

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

12 - Yes
3 - Not sure

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

8 - No
5 - Yes
2 - Not sure

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

7 - Not sure
4 - Yes
4 - No
Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?
10 - No
5 - Yes

4. First impressions of Europeana

How would you rank the Europeana website:

UNATTRACTIVE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 ATTRACTIVE
AVG: 7,33

BORING 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 FUN
AVG: 6,07

BADLY ORGANISED 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 WELL ORGANISED
AVG: 6,67

DULL 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 EXCITING
AVG: 6,33

DIFFICULT TO USE 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 EASY TO USE
AVG: 6,80

UNINTERESTING 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 INTERESTING
AVG: 7,87

SIMILAR TO OTHER SITES 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 UNIQUE
AVG: 6,33

Have you seen this logo before?

11 - Yes
3 - No

Have you used Europeana before?

6 - Yes, for my studies
6 - No
5 - Yes, for my personal interests

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?
5 - Someone told me about it
2 - Link from another web site
2 - Someone sent me a link
1 - Other
How many times have you visited Europeana?

6 - This will be my first visit
2 - 2 to 4
3 – 5 to 9
3 – 10 to 19
1 - 100+

5. Europeana is about...

Culture; to provide a wide range of useful information; search portal; Europas kulturelles und wissenschaftliches Erbe der Öffentlichkeit zugänglich machen; digital long-term archive; digital resources of the European cultural heritage; life; art; texts; pictures; videos; audios; information technology; Aufbau einer europäischen digitalen Bibliothek; Archiving data by using common standards of metadata-annotation; Europe; history; images, texts, sounds of Europe; building an intercultural collective database; enabling public access to European digitized contents; aggregating metadata from other Institutions'; catalogues; education; cultural heritage text enabling access to archives on a European level; preservation of cultural heritage; network; Die Bilder, Tonaufnahmen, Texte; stellen eine enorme Bereicherung für die Vermittlung von kulturellem Erbe dar, sowie für die wissenschaftliche Auseinandersetzung; die Vernetzung von vielen europäischen Museen, Archiven und Bibliotheken bietet eine große Vielfalt; network of European LAM organisations for the transfer of knowledge on cultural heritage; finding information from different countries for scientific purposes; Ermöglicht den Zugang zu diesen digitalen Beständen in vielen verschiedenen Sprachen und ist sehr Benutzerfreundlich angelegt; enabling the userfriendly access to the digital collection in different languages; treasures from archives, museums, libraries, collections giving all people access to cultural heritage; Sammlung von visuellen oder audiovisuellen digitalen Beständen aus Archiven, Museen, Bibliotheken; collection of visual and audio-visual digitale content from LAM; European culture information; cultural heritage of most European countries; searching the net for cultural information.

6. Deeper impressions of Europeana

A. Does the language appear to be an issue?

Yes. (4)
No.
Yes (for “Discovery of America” bzw. “descubrimiento de America”)
No (for Map of America bzw. mapa de America)
Participants’ comments:

The language seems to be an issue.
Of course language is an issue since I don’t know how to speak Spanish.
The compared results show the great difference between the search results in Spanish and English. The language is an issue.
The language seems to be an issue in terms of number of search results.
English seems to have more entries. But I can find useful results in both languages (also for the map).
In English there are much more search results. In English plenty of images are found, but most of them unsuitable. Also for “mapa de america” the English term finds much more results.
Query in English displays more accurate results.

Summary: The majority of the respondents found the language to be an issue.

B. Is it easy to find the content related to specific period?

No (4)
No results (2)
Yes

Participants’ comments:

It’s difficult, the search function doesn’t work well
I don’t see an option in advanced search to search for a range of dates, only date 1780 and therefore returns 0 results.
With the date function on the right side it is easy to find a specific year. But the search for a period is not that easy.
I can’t find content related to the specific period

Summary: The search for specific time periods is not self-explanatory. Without guidance the end-users won’t easily find out how to do it. Most of them look into the advanced search section to find this feature.

C. Search for content related to Peter Paul Rubens....?

Erfgoedplus.be: 11

I couldn’t find “Jezus aan het Kruis” with the provide function.
But I could find it with the advanced search and the result was, that it is the
Erfgoedplus.be.

There seems to be a problem.

Couldn’t be found with “Peter Paul Rubens”, I had to type in “Rubens”, then it worked.

It’s just tagged with “Rubens” but it should be “Peter Paul” too, because there could be more persons who are named “Rubens”.

D. Some responses to exercises 4 to 6

I was logged out when adding a tag.

Saving the search works. Choosing a language does not make a difference for the search results.

This (My Europeana) shows only saved content, I can’t find any personal settings apart from username and email address.

Works fine. Only the constraint for the language is not visible in the name or info of the saved search, but it works.

Can I save my mother tongue anywhere? I can’t find that setting.

It is quite difficult to search for items with reference to a specific language when the language is not used in the title (like in this case (name))

It is great to be able to save the search parameters but I miss the function to export the results for further manipulation

7. Lasting impressions

Intentions to use Europeana:

Yes, I will use it.

Auf dieser Seite sind sehr viele interessante Dinge zu vielen Themen zu finden, die für mich von Interesse sind.

I could discover many interesting things on this site. (translation)

I could use it for study in depth of a certain issue

Is a good platform, where official cultural information is saved.

The quality of the objects/pics etc is high

Europeana is of help for my studies

It is a great opportunity to search for additional interesting information for my studies.

Europeana is of help because it offers the opportunity to search for additional interesting information.

Europeana offers a great number of digital resources and helps to impart knowledge.

Not use, unless I need to find special cultural information

Is a niche product

I will maybe use it for research on cultural material

Europeana will be of help because it concentrates on cultural material

Is nice for people with the need for cultural information.

Use for professional searches in cultural studies. Not use for current private searches
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I can imagine the massive effort behind this project and would like to sustain the idea behind it by helping to improve its features.

Summary: The majority of the users (all but one) expressed the intention to use Europeana, when aiming to find cultural information.

8. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants

Recommendations
No need for improvement.
Better design, logic and more self explanatory
Is in an early phase of development (I cannot go back to the Start site ("Home" missing - so when i want tom make a new search, i have to enter the portal again). Does not work properly with Virtual machines (VM Ware Player) or Internet Explorer 6. Some Exercises cannot be done, because no results found!
No comfort function e.g.: browse through time "Next" or "Previous" Button)
Yes, it should be more user-friendly (2)
It should include more text
Giving the users more options in clear text, less icons and hidden facet searches
Search interface could be improved.
Europeana should include walkthrough videos.
Has great potential but still needs work to become more useful and show visitors the potential at the first visit, at first sight. It's too much hidden away from view.
Better internationalization of metadata. (2) The different results for the same questions in different languages is not perfect.
I would expect the same results, because of the same content and key words!
Europeana should included more sounds. Audiofiles of important speeches or something similar. (2)
Making it easier for not so advanced users
Include more videos (2)
Europeana should be integrating as much data as possible
Europeana should be becoming more known to the general public
Adding more metadata-fields or entering them more thoroughly
Europeana should include information regarding a broader range of domains
Europeana ... needs to be improved and become more attractive/popular for end users
Europeana can be improved by tutorials.
Europeana should include personal data about artist.
Summary: The testers expressed the need for the Europeana portal to become more “self-explanatory” and that way more user-friendly. Many thought that much of the functionality is “hidden away” from end-user view. Some advised less use of icons and more clear text. They also perceived the need to work on metadata quality, mainly on providing the high level of information quality thoroughly. (The detail level of description varies very much from record to record.)
Some users recommended to include more audio and video in Europeana.

9. **Favorite sites for getting information**

Wikipedia, Google, university catalogues, yahoo, spiegel.de, derstandard.at, heise.de, ebay
Belgium

End user testing conducted by: *Provincie Limburg*
Country report prepared by:  *Jef Malliet*
Country Test Report Belgium

1. **Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)**

Various target groups were sent invitations to volunteer with the testing. The results were collected by e-mail.

2. **Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)**

It has proven hard to motivate people to complete the testing in time. Only 13 questionnaires were received.

Gender: 7 M, 6 F

Age:

- 5 people 19-30,
- 3 persons 31-50,
- **4 people 50+**

Target groups: 0 school student,

- 2 academic,
- 7 professional,
- 4 general users.

4 never saw the logo nor have used Europeana before, 8 have used Europeana for personal interests before, 1 for professional use.

3. **First impressions of Europeana (summary).**

- Low return of questionnaires: hard to motivate people if not approached directly
- Those who returned the questionnaire seem all quite interested and found unexpected things. The multitude of sources is much appreciated
4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary). *Please include the data from collected questionnaires.*

- All see room for improvement, s well at technical level (search functions) as on the content level
- There seems to be quite some expectations about semantic linking and multi-lingual which is still not possible. Several also expect more precision when searching and in-depth information (though this does not depend on Europeana, but on the quality of the source information)
- The timeline is too hard to use and understand, searching by time span seems in great demand

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana). *Where necessary please use the quotes from the questionnaires or verbal comments of participants.*

- Most intend to return and use Europeana, mainly for the wealth of information gathered.
- One declares not to use Europeana again because at this moment it does not offer additional value compared to other information sources currently available

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary). *Please include 5-6 main suggestions.*

- Semantic functionality is expected by most
- Language-independent search
- Clear indication of error conditions required

7. Comments of the moderator (Optional)

- The consistency and relevance of the metadata offered needs to be improved. This is not a job for Europeana, but for the content providers. The Europeana website gives them an incentive to work on this, and Europeana together with the aggregators should encourage content providers to improve this.
Summary of replies

Questionnaire part 1

Country of origin: Belgium__________ Sex ☐ 7 M ☐ 6 F

What is your age? ☐ 0 Under 15 ☐ 0 15-18 ☐ 5 19-30 ☐ 3 31-50 ☐ 4 Over 50

To which of the following groups would you belong?

☐ 0 Student at school
☐ 2 Academic user (student/teacher)
☐ 0 Expert researcher (researching specific topics)
☐ 7 Professional user (library, archive or museum staff)
☐ 4 General user

Have you seen this logo before?

☐ 9 Yes
☐ 4 No
☐ 0 Not sure.

Have you used Europeana before?

☐ 8 Yes, for my personal interests
☐ 0 Yes, for my studies
☐ 4 No
☐ 0 Not sure

1 professionally

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

☐ 1 Someone told me about it
☐ 0 Someone sent me a link
☐ 1 Read about it in paper/journal
☐ 1 Link from another web site
☐ 0 Link on a blog
☐ 1 I can’t remember
☐ 4 Other: professiona (dbproject), work, job, colleague

How many times have you visited Europeana?
This will be my first visit

2-4
5-9
10-19
20-29
30-39
40-49
50-99
100+

How often do you search for information online?

Never
Rarely (perhaps only once per month)
Often (once a week)
Very often (almost every day)

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

Never
Rarely (perhaps only once per month)
Often (once a week)
Very often (almost every day)

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities”
Searching by date
Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London”

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

A search engine such as Google
An image sharing site such as Flickr
A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images

What objects do you search for most often?

Texts
Images
Audio
Video
Are you interested in links between different cultures?

- 8 Yes
- 0 No
- 5 Not sure (some found the question not clear)

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

- 1 Yes
- 11 No
- 1 Not sure

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

- 5 Yes
- 3 No
- 5 Not sure

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

- 6 Yes
- 7 No
- 0 Not sure
Questionnaire part 2

How would you rank the Europeana website:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNATTRACTIVE</th>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</th>
<th>ATTRACTION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BORING</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>FUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADLY ORGANISED</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>WELL ORGANISED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DULL</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>EXCITING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFICULT TO USE</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>EASY TO USE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNINTERESTING</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>INTERESTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMILAR TO OTHER SITES</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td>UNIQUE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average:
- UNATTRACTIVE: 6.8
- BORING: 6.7
- BADLY ORGANISED: 6.2
- DULL: 6.5
- DIFFICULT TO USE: 6.3
- UNINTERESTING: 7.5
- SIMILAR TO OTHER SITES: 6.2
Exercises

Exercise 1

Search in English for content related to discovery of America. Then search in Spanish for the same “descubrimiento de America”. Based on the search please indicate how many hits are presented for texts, images, videos and sounds. Open 3 most interesting images with the sources of content “Biblioteca Nacional de España”. Make an advance search and look for a map of America in English and Spanish (‘mapa de America’). Compare the results. Does the language appear to be an issue?

Comments:

• More results in English, more sources in English
• English results cover different periods and themes, different relevance of results
• Europeana should work on relating content more
• Different knowledge of languages means that one can more easily search in one language than in another
• Advanced search not functioning as expected: often ‘malformed query syntax’ error, and no indication of what was wrong

Exercise 2

Search for content related simultaneously to Islas Baleares and Granada. Make a new search related only to Islas Baleares for the period covering years 1780-1880. Is it easy to find the content related to specific period?

Comments:

• Refinement of search is very easy
• Searching on timespan seems impossible
• Search on single years not very handy
• Results not in chronological order, confusing

Exercise 3

Search for content related to Peter Paul Rubens. Find all content related to Rubens provided by Erfgoedplus.be. Chose ‘Jezus aan het Kruis’. See the picture and related content. Is it easy to find? Is the content logically linked?
Comments:

• ‘Jezus aan het kruis’ is not found by the majority of testers (9 against 4). They seem to look for ‘Peter Paul Rubens’, while ‘Rubens’ would have been much more effective. Even professional database users seem not to properly understand how to formulate efficient search strategies

**Exercise 4**

Register as a user of Europeana.

Comments:

• Most find it easy
• Some want to understand what the purpose and consequences of registration are, and don’t immediately find an answer

**Exercise 5**

When logged-in, search for content related to Ibsen and save your search (in English and Norwegian). Logout and login again. Go back to your saved search. In the saved search make an advanced search and look for content related to Ibsen only on English. *Are you able to perform such search? Is it easy to do?*

Comments:

• Most report that this is easy
• A few report problems with switching languages, that they are required to log in again at various stages

**Exercise 6**

Chose settings of ‘My Europeana’ best fitting your needs. Save them. *Anything missing?*

Comments:

• Nobody found where they can chose settings or change them

**Exercise 7**

Searching topics of your own interest and choice.

Comments:
• Results are not precise, sometimes the found words do not match the input
• ATHENA as provider seems weird, as ATHENA does not offer the content
• Various fields for source, provider, data provider are confusing
• Thumbnails sometimes have bad quality
• Refinement by language: ‘mul’ is not clear
• Sometimes unexpected, weird search results
• Error messages concerning malformed search queries do not explain what the problem is. Hyphen as part of a name in a search causes such an error (e.g. Hechtel-Eksel)
• A pity that audio and videos cannot be played directly from Europeana website but require to go to provider website, with sometimes long waiting or errors in the links
• Timeline is difficult to use and understand
• Data shown is not always interesting (dimensions, material, …). Wish for more meaningful descriptions, historical background, … (this is a problem at the source of course)
• Suggestions on home page are very interesting
• Not always easy to find what one is looking for, probably due to different results in different languages (maybe better thesauri can help)
• Search engine doesn’t seem to see relations between related content
• Exit from My Europeana only possible through restarting the main website

Europeana is about...

• culture, paintings, heritage
• open mind, sharing information, common culture, constructing a transnational identity, free access to public domain data, connecting culture and cultural heritage, enriched knowledge, relating data from different sources, viewpoints and interpretations
• heritage, Europe, access
• sharing cultural heritage across Europe
• assembling collections and make jointly searchable (though not yet well implemented – now very few relations made)
• inspiring, not just searching
• Europe’s cultural and scientific heritage
• culture, museums, libraries, archives, objects, books, videos, audio, history, art
• culture, art
• about cultural objects in European institutions, often part of European heritage, large data sets
• heritage for the more professional or subject related user
Complete these sentences:

- I think Europeana can be improved by.................................................................
  
  • better metadata – better agreement on consistency – better thumbnails, thumbnails with every description
  • customer-oriented and customer-friendly applications, specific search tools designed specifically for Europeana content (better grouping and relating data)
  • show target groups and stakeholders how data can be used, show added value
  • following current ‘history’ (news?)
  • better relationships in content
  • improve connections with providers
  • using professional and multi-lingual thesauri
  • semantic linking of content
  • automatic translation
  • better search options, better error messages, not too many languages, keep interface language and content language separated, hits on search syntax
  • search results in a logical and adaptable order

- I think I will use/not use (delete as appropriate) Europeana because..................
  
  • multitude of sources, not so much useful for professional use
  • diversity of sources, access to information otherwise difficult to find
  • many examples from other institutions, can give inspiration for describing own collection
  • well organized
  • easy to find information about cultural heritage across Europe
  • heritage shown in context
  • Europeana contains data that cannot be found with a search engine like Google
  • improvements required to offer added value above Google
  • large offer and reliability of the information

  • not use: no immediate application – virtual exhibitions see more interesting than general search

- I would like Europeana to include more ..............................................
  
  • more content from Belgian museums, archives, libraries
  • more of everything
  • more search fields
  • background information about objects
  • digitized texts
• distinction between objects (e.g. gothic artefacts) and subjects (texts about gothic)
• contemporary, in-copyright material

- For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because.............................

• very easy
• it contains many older texts and images, hard to find elsewhere
• (teacher): API to make direct links to metadata from own documents

- In my personal opinion, Europeana.................................................................

• further development required, with clearer choice for which public
• should remain free access
• is a great initiative
• is very good
• is a good search engine for cultural heritage
• is a pioneer, an incentive for doing a lot of work which will be very valuable in the future
• very useful tool for the preparation of my work
• contains loose digital objects, without structure or cohesion
• is a very fast search engine
• should offer more than the portal, which is just a giant container; other forms of reuse of the data required

- What are your favourite sites for school work?........

• Google
• ARTstor, Flickr, Prometheus, Joconde, WikiMedia, Delicious, CiteUlike, ...

- Where do you normally get information online?.............

• Google
• Wikipedia
• specialized websites and databases (e.g. MovE, AAT, Erfgoedplus.be)
• online articles and books
Bulgaria

End user testing conducted by: Public Library of Varna
Country report prepared by: Radka Kalcheva
Country Test Report Bulgaria

1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

1. 17.12.2010 - Public Library Varna - 8
2. 20.12.2010 - Public Library Varna - 8
Total: 16

2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)

Sex: M - 3
     F - 13

Age: 15-18 - 1
     19-24 - 2
     25-50 - 10
     50+ - 3

Target group: General user - 3
              Schoolchild - 3
              Academic user - 4
              Expert researcher - 2
              Professional use - 4

10 participants (62%) haven’t used Europeana before.

3. First impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.

Participants ranked Europeana web site as follows:

Attractive - 7
Fun - 7
Well organized - 8
Exciting - 6
Easy to use – 8
Interesting – 7.5
Unique – 6.5

Some of them think that Europeana is about

- culture
- history
- art
- education

According to the survey Europeana users are:

Students, Researchers, Professionals and Experts, General users

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.

1. In general the language appears to be a problem for 6 participants (37%)

The other participants mention that searching for information using English interface or English keywords is not a problem. The real problem for all of them is that the information itself is in English.

2. Searching for content related to specific period.

Most of the participants think it’s easy to find an item related to a particular year. But searching for period (from – to) is difficult to be done even impossible. Advanced search doesn’t return relevant results as well. Refine your search option is useful to narrow the results but when the number of the results related to the particular period is large it’s not easy to find the right item.

3. Searching for content by provider.

Not problems with this option.

4. My Europeana
Easy to use this tool. Settings option is missing.

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana). Where necessary please use the quotes from the questionnaires or verbal comments of participants.

15 of 16 participants will use Europeana because they find information very useful for both professional and personal use.

Comments:
- There is a lot of information in all European languages;
- Europeana is a very useful site for researchers.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary). Please include 5-6 main suggestions.

Suggestions for site improvements:
- more information in our native language (Bulgarian);
- site personalization;
- linking words (key words) between languages (multilingual search by translating key words to all Europeana languages);
- annotating all items in English.
Czech Republic

End user testing conducted by: Cross Czech
Country report prepared by: Ivana Haladova
Country Test Report Czech Republic

1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

The end user testing was organized in 4 testing groups to provide a personal approach and to provide enough time and space for answering individual questions and requests. 6 questionnaires were filled-in on-line by the testers. The reason was that they were from different parts of the Czech Republic and it was complicated to organize and synchronize sessions with them (also the weather situation in Czech Republic was problematic and there were problems with transportation – so we did not want to risk any inconvenience that the journey to Prague could cause to them). These participants were from the institutions in West Bohemia (Plzen), South Bohemia (Vodnany) and Moravia (Brno, Mikulčice). But they were instructed by the moderator over the phone or skype while working with Europeana.

Regarding the practical exercises the testing was based on original tasks to enable the international comparison.

The sessions:

5/1/2011 – Cross Czech - 4 participants  
6/1/2011 - Cross Czech - 4 participants  
12/1/2011 – Cross Czech - 3 participants  
19/1/2011 – Cross Czech -3 participants  
21/1/2011 – on-line session – 2 participants  
26/1/2011 – on –line session – 3 participants  
27/1/2011 – on-line session – 1 participant

2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)

Country of origin: Czech Republic

21 participants took part in the Europeana End User Testing in the Czech Republic.

General user : 2  
Schoolchild : 0  
Academic user: 0
Expert researcher: 1 (historian)
Professional use: 14 (11 librarians, 2 persons working in cultural sector, 1 museologist)
Tourist authorities: 0
Governments: 4 (different Ministries)

F: 19
M: 2

Age groups:

Under 15: 0
15 – 18: 0
19 – 25: 0
25 – 35: 10
35 – 45: 3
45 – 55: 5
55+: 3

3. First impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.

Have you seen this logo before?

Yes (10)
No (8)
Not sure (3)

Have you used Europeana before?

Yes, for my personal interests (7)
Yes, for my studies (1)
No (13)
Not sure (0)

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

Someone told me about it (2)
Someone sent me a link (1)
Read about it in paper/journal (1)
Link from another web site (2)
Link on a blog (0)
I can’t remember (0)
Other (3: 1 at conference, 2 at seminars)

How many times have you visited Europeana?

This will be my first visit (13)
2-4 (1)
5-9 (2)
10-19 (1)
20-29 (1)
30-39 (1)
40-49 (0)
50-99 (2)
100+ (0)

How often do you search for information online?

Never (0)
Rarely (perhaps only once per month) (0)
Often (once a week) (1)
Very often (almost every day) (20)

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

Never (0)
Rarely (perhaps only once per month) (3)
Often (once a week) (5)
Very often (almost every day) (13)

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities” (14)
Searching by date (5)
Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London” (11)

*Participants used multiple answers in this case.*
If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

- A search engine such as Google (19)
- An image sharing site such as Flickr (0)
- A specialist site such as artnet.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images (6)

*Participants used multiple answers in this case.*

What objects do you search for most often?

- Texts (21)
- Images (6)
- Audio (1)
- Video (1)
- Others (0)

*Participants used multiple answers in this case.*

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

- Yes (17)
- No (1)
- Not sure (3)

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

- Yes (14)
- No (6)
- Not sure (1)

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

- Yes (8)
- No (8)
- Not sure (5)

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

- Yes (11)
- No (10)
- Not sure (0)
| **UNATTRACTIVE** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 1 |
| **ATTRACTIVE** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| **BORING** | 2 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 5 | 2 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 1 |
| **FUN** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| **BADLY ORGANISED** | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| **WELL ORGANISED** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| **DULL** | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| **EXCITING** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| **DIFFICULT TO USE** | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 1 |
| **EASY TO USE** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| **UNINTERESTING** | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 |
| **INTERESTING** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |
| **SIMILAR TO OTHER SITES** | 1 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 5 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 |
| **UNIQUE** | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 |

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.
The mostly shared opinion was that Europeana is about:
- European cultural heritage
- European culture
- Sharing and exchange of information and knowledge
- Multilingual space and networking
- Culture
- Art
- History
- Science
- Creating of virtual network of cultural heritage
- Digital library
- Digitization of texts, pictures, works of art
- Europe
- Education
- Cultural heritage preservation
- Cultural cooperation
- Communication
- Useful gate to European culture (museums, libraries, archives, etc.)
- Information
- Accessibility of documents and sources

There were also some negative responses within testing groups, e.g.:

The Europeana is about:

- Politicalization of culture
- Copying of features and searching possibilities of other search engines
- There is no sense in it, it cannot be used for scientific work and as an entertainment it is not enough “cool”. It looks like it was done by somebody who never used the internet.

Regarding the practical exercises the testing was based on original tasks to enable the international comparison. The search for specific items was not a problem, some problems occurred with search for the content linked to specific period.

Language was not felt as a problem by the participants, a lot of testers appreciated the possibility of the language selection. The language versatility was highly valued. Some maybe technical problems were with registration, saving of search results and My Europeana...
configuration (according to some testers this is not very well arranged). Some of them needed our assistance with both the search and also with registration and configuration.

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana). Where necessary please use the quotes from the questionnaires or verbal comments of participants.

18 out of 21 persons plan to use Europeana for professional and also for leisure time activities in the future. They mainly highlighted the access to large amount of texts and pictures of European cultural heritage, quality and richness of the information, etc.

Comments of participants:

- it could be one of the high – quality information sources in the future,
- very useful for background research
- the design is imaginative and playful
- it is intuitive

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary). Please include 5-6 main suggestions.

The participants had comments and recommendations mainly on the search functionalities:

- More structured search regarding the object and/or topic (combined with full-text search)
- More choices for search of the object (theme, person, corporation, action, place, time, category) – to offer these in more refined search
- To improve time chronology (UNIMARC/MARC)
- The functioning of the “timeline” should be improved
- The search and work with Europeana and its functionalities should be more intuitive
- The Czech translations are not very good – needs to be improved
- Some of the links did not work
- A lot of records does not contain a picture
- My Europeana should offer more functions
- The Europeana should be synchronized with other similar scientific webpages.
- The display of search results should be better structured and more synoptic

Some of the also commented on the weak representation of Czech digital content in Europeana.
7. Comments of the moderator (Optional)

As the majority of participants were “beginners” (first-time users), we had an opportunity to see an unbiased approach to the Europeana and its tools and content.

The design of the Europeana webpage was evaluated as neutral in many cases, on the other hand some of participants valued its imaginativeness and playfulness. We also faced some negative reactions as mentioned above (“it tries to copy google or other engines without their productivity”).

Language was not felt as a problem, a lot of testers appreciated the possibility of language selection. The language versatility was highly valued. Some maybe technical problems were with registration, saving of search results and My Europeana configuration (according to some testers this is not very well arranged). Some of them needed our assistance with both the search and also with registration and configuration.

The Czech cultural content was also an item of the interest of participants, they were a little bit disappointed with the fact, that Czech digital content is not so widely represented in Europeana.
Cyprus (1)

End user testing conducted by: *Cyprus Research and Education Foundation*

Country report prepared by:  *Sorin Hermon*
Country Test Report Cyprus (1)

1. Descriptions of test events

Two test events took place in Nicosia, Cyprus, at the Cyprus Institute.

The first test took place in September 2010 with 9 participants (4 males and 5 females), all young students and researchers (19-24) from various disciplines (humanities, technologies, natural sciences).

The second test also took place in Nicosia, Cyprus, at the Cyprus Institute, in November 2010 with 12 participants (9 males and 3 females) from different disciplines.

In both events, extensive explanations were given to participants and the outcomes were discussed with them in order to draw conclusions.

2. Statistics of the group composition

![Diagram 1. Gender distribution of participants](image)

Females

Male
Diagram 2. Distribution of participants by research field

3. First impressions of Europeana (summary)

The answers and diagrams below show the joint outcomes of the two tests.

Questionnaire part 1

- Country of Origin: Cyprus
- Do you know the Europeana logo / Have you used Europeana before?
Diagram 3. Knowledge of Europeana Logo/Use of Europeana

- How did you find about Europeana: Somebody told me
- How many times have you visited Europeana (average): 21
- How often do you search for information online

- How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines
• If you use advanced search features, which feature are you confident in using: Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London”
• If you were searching for images online, which one would you use: A search engine such as Google

(For the above two questions, almost all the participants gave the same answer)

• What objects do you search for most often? 1 - Texts  2 - Images
• Are you interested in links between different cultures? Yes (65%)
• Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth? Yes (60%)
• Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity? No (90%)
• Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs? No (100%)
Questionnaire part 2

Evaluation of the Europeana site using a scale 1 to 10.

- **Attractiveness**
- **Fun**
- **Organization**
- **Excitement**
- **Ease of use**
- **Interest**
- **Uniqueness**
Europeana is about: (most agreed answers)

- Collection of digital data about European culture
- Linking between European Cultural institutions
- Showing the diversity of European culture

Summary conclusions (as discussed with participants): According to the test outcomes, Europeana is still in its infancy, it is a promising initiative and with great potential, but has to be much improved, in particular interface, search and cross-search options, visualization of results.

(Comment by the moderator) It seems that there is interest in principle towards Europeana, but participants are not completely comfortable with the web site and they appear to find it confusing. The lack of a hierarchy and the generic purpose of it are what make them mostly confused.

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana

Questionnaire part 3

Complete the sentences. (The sentences were completed individually and then adjusted collectively discussing what appeared to be a shared conclusion)

I think Europeana can be improved by better filtering information, improving the way search results are presented and quality of stored content.

I think I will use Europeana because it provides a good cross-institutions search.

I would like Europeana to include more options for visualizing search results and search options, for example starting from a map, from a timeline, etc.

For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because it contains a huge amount of digital content.

In my personal opinion, Europeana is useful at this stage only for a very generic purpose.
What are your favourite sites for study? Web of knowledge, Cite Seer, Google scholar, Jstor

Where do you normally get information online? Digital catalogues of academic libraries

Summary conclusions (as discussed with participants): Europeana has to be improved a lot, there is a lack of data quality control, cumbersome navigation through the site and between Europeana and provided institutions, there should be more investment in providing analysis tools, such as image viewers, video, sound, etc.

(Comment by the moderator) It seems that Europeana is not considered as a work tool for research and study. Information retrieved does not satisfy these needs, for which more focused tools are requested.

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana)

(Summary conclusions as discussed with participants) Europeana is not yet ready to be used massively and cannot yet compete with existing specialized search engines, and there is still much work to be done.

(Comment by the moderator) Again, it seems that Europeana is perceived as too generic to be used for “serious” work.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary)

a. Improved visualization of results  
b. Higher control over data quality  
c. More search options (with a geographic map for example, timeline, etc.)  
d. Better relation between images, text, audio and video  
e. Integration of advanced tools for interaction with content (e.g. possibility to save groups of images, annotations, etc.)
Cyprus (2)

End user testing conducted by: Veria Public Library, Greece
Country report prepared by: Sarantos Kapidakis
Country Test Report Cyprus (2)

Participants: 8 students of the Computer Science Department
5 male, 3 female
7 participants aged 19-24,
1 participant aged 25-30

Questionnaire part 1

Have you seen this logo before?

- Yes / 0
- No / 6
- Not sure. / 2

Have you used Europeana before?

- Yes, for my personal interests / 0
- Yes, for my studies / 0
- No / 7
- Not sure / 1

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

- Someone told me about it / 0
- Someone sent me a link / 0
- Read about it in paper/journal / 0
- Link from another web site / 0
- Link on a blog / 0
- I can’t remember / 0
- Other / 0
How many times have you visited Europeana?

- This will be my first visit / 8
- 2-4 / 0
- 5-9 / 0
- 10-19 / 0
- 20-29 / 0
- 30-39 / 0
- 40-49 / 0
- 50-99 / 0
- 100+ / 0

How often do you search for information online?

- Never / 0
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month) / 0
- Often (once a week) / 0
- Very often (almost every day) / 8

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

- Never / 2
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month) / 0
- Often (once a week) / 4
- Very often (almost every day) / 2

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

- Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities” / 5
- Searching by date / 1
- Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London” / 1

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

- A search engine such as Google / 8
- An image sharing site such as Flickr / 0
- A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images / 0

What objects do you search for most often?

- Texts / 7
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Images</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others – please specify __________________</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

- Yes / 1
- No / 2
- Not sure / 5

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

- Yes / 0
- No / 4
- Not sure / 4

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

- Yes / 4
- No / 0
- Not sure / 4

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

- Yes / 3
- No / 5
- Not sure / 0
**Questionnaire part 2**

*How would you rank the Europeana website:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNATTRACTIVE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>ATTRACTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BORING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>FUN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BADLY ORGANISED</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>WELL ORGANISED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DULL</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EXCITING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIFFICULT TO USE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>EASY TO USE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNINTERESTING</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>INTERESTING</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMILAR TO OTHER SITES</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europeana is about...**

- Culture
- Searching of paintings, music, films, books from European galleries, libraries, archives & museums
- Saving documentations, videos, pictures from different cultures giving the user the ability to search find and explore something he wants to know and learn
Questionnaire part 3

I think Europeana can be improved by...

Fixing page errors. Doesn’t save settings and keeps logging me out.
The searching type for a context in a more friendly (use) way.
Better webpage.
Include more subjects.

I think I will use/not use (delete as appropriate) Europeana because...

Half of participants answered that they won’t use Europeana, most of them think that they are not interested in its content. The other half answered that they will use Europeana, because it helps finding information about other countries and cultures (useful and interesting).

I would like Europeana to include more ...

Participants would like Europeana to include more video, sounds, subjects of technology, information about Greece and Cyprus.

For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because...

It offers information especially on culture and it doesn’t involve non relevant information

Opposite quote: “It does not contain subjects that they can help in our science”

In my personal opinion, Europeana is...

Most of participants express their opinion by saying “useful”, “something unique”.
They think that it offers interesting information for people who are interested in cultures.

What are your favourite sites for school work
Most participants mentioned Wikipedia and Google.

One of them answers www. Cplusplus.com and another one “no specific site”.

Where do you normally get information online

Almost all the participants answer Google search. Some of them say Wikipedia and search engines.

Comments of moderator

All participants were senior Computer Science students of Cyprus University. All of them haven’t heard of Europeana before. This can be explained because of their study discipline or because Cyprus is not actively involved in Europeana and EuropeanaLocal, and little promotion on them is done.

Most of them did not appreciate the cultural content of Europeana that much, and were wishing to have technological content as well. So they also wonder: Who is Europeana meant for? Who and why would use it?
Denmark

End user testing conducted by: Roskilde Public Library
Country report prepared by: Hans Michelson
Country Test Report Denmark

17 end-users participated in the end-user testing in Roskilde Denmark. Unfortunately, exceptionally bad weather conditions prevented some participants in taking the test. The test was conducted at Roskilde Libraries. The participants were recruited from 6 of the 7 target groups defined in the EuropeanaLocal End-User Testing Specifications. The testing was conducted in Danish with a Danish version of the questionnaire. Quotes from end-users included in this report have been translated from Danish to English.

1. Test event
The test was conducted on January 26th and lasted 2 hours.

2. Statistics of the group

Demography

Nationality: Danish

Gender: Female (17); male (1)


Background information: Internet habits and prior knowledge of Europeana

The end-users were skilled internet users, 82% used the internet almost every day. Nevertheless only 35% had used Europeana before, and they prefer to use search engines like Google to search information.

3. First impressions of Europeana

Have you seen this logo before?

☐ Yes: 47.0%
☐ No: 41.8%
☐ Not sure: 5.8%
Have you used Europeana before?

- Yes, for my personal interests: 35,3%
- Yes, for my studies: 0%
- No: 41,4%
- Not sure: 23,2%

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

- Someone told me about it: 64,7%
- Someone sent me a link: 23,5%
- Read about it in paper/journal: 23,5%
- Link from another web site
- Link on a blog
- I can’t remember
- Other

How many times have you visited Europeana?

- This will be my first visit: 52,9%
- 2-4: 35,3%
- 5-9
- 10-19: 5,9%
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-99
- 100+

How often do you search for information online?

- Never
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month)
- Often (once a week): 11,7%
- Very often (almost every day): 82,4%

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

- Never: 5,9%
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month): 23,5%
- Often (once a week): 35,3%
- Very often (almost every day): 35,3%

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

- Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities”: 82,6%
- Searching by date: 41,2%
- Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London”: 64,7%
If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

- A search engine such as Google: 100%
- An image sharing site such as Flickr: 70,6%
- A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images: 23,5%

What objects do you search for most often?

- Texts: 88,3%
- Images: 70,6%
- Audio: 29,4%
- Video: 35,3%
- Others – please specify ______________________

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

- Yes: 82,4%
- No: 17,6%
- Not sure

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

- Yes: 5,9%
- No: 76,5%
- Not sure: 17,6%

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

- Yes: 23,5%
- No: 47,1%
- Not sure 29,1%

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

- Yes: 35,3%
- No: 64,7%
- Not sure

The end-users ranked Europeana as follows (summary):

Actual numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNATTRACTIVE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>ATTRACTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BORING</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>FUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In response to what Europeana is about, three main tendencies could be identified in the answers:

European Cultural Heritage: sharing of material and knowledge, historical knowledge, pictures and sources for European history, to enhance scientific work, digitizing, securing of European cultural heritage.

Dissemination: to supply digitized material to interested end-user.

End-user experience: serendipity, visualizing European history, visual experiences / good presentations, information on our own and other countries.

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana

Exercise 1

*Compare the results. Does the language appear to be an issue?*

- The language is a problem. We would like some related terms and alternative spelling like Google.

- Relations depend on the language

- Yes. You have the results in English even if you search in Spanish
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- A help-function would have been nice
- Language problems limits the search

Exercise 2

*Is it easy to find the content related to specific period?*
- Yes, if you use manual choices on the site.
- Not in advanced search
- Easy on years
- No: but in Advanced search Islands Baleares AND date
- No. Searching on intervals is impossible
- No
- Boolean: no. Year: no. Advanced on date: no

Exercise 3

*Is it easy to find?*
- No!
- You had to delete Peter Paul
- We could not find it
- You have to search on title precisely

*Is the content logically linked?*
- No
- If you don’t know the title, you have no results
Exercise 4

Register as a user of Europeana

- It is easy
- Difficult in advanced search (Field type not defined)

Exercise 5

Are you able to perform such search? Is it easy to do?

- Yes, but not in Advanced Search
- Yes if you use the facets (to the left)

Exercise 6

Anything missing?

- Yes (answer unspecified)

5. Lasting impressions

Almost all end-users intend to use Europeana, because it offers information and content of high quality from trusted sources, and because Europeana makes it easier to find information/content from various sources.

Complete these sentences:

I think Europeana can be improved by

- having only a last name for searching criteria
- searching on time periods
- better advanced search
- better help function
- download to Android and iPhone
- looking at the functionalities of My Europeana (People were cut off)
- rights for the works included (e.g. not all of Ibsens works were accessible).
I think I will use/ Europeana because

- of the many databases you get
- many good experiences
- serendipity
- if the site gets faster, better advanced search
- the pictures are very good
- I will know European culture better
- it is very good for library users
- its funny, also because of the old material included

I think I will not use Europeana because

- there is not enough material on local history
- the functionality is not good enough
- as a database it is too small

I would like Europeana to include more

- on Denmark and Roskilde (!)
- museums objects
- info on Help for searching
- Google functionality
- popular goals for tourists
- popular culture (music, fashion)

For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because

- I can use it for research
- planning of travels
- surprising findings
- my interests can be stimulated
- information on other countries and peoples
- it is funny
- it is more useful than Google

In my personal opinion, Europeana

- has great opportunities for fantastic searches
- should improve its functionality
- promote digitisation
- has a great potential especially for teachers, pupils and students
- is a quality valued site on the internet
- is an ambitious idea

What are your favourite sites for school work?

- bibliotek.dk
- Google
- library paid e-resources

Where do you normally get information online

- Google
- Google
- library paid e-resources

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test group participants

Participants mentioned and wanted refinement of the functionality as a big issue. They want a better help function and better search functionality. Of course the language is a challenge. They also wanted more content and more variation.

7. Comments of the moderator

The moderator agrees with most of the statements mentioned above. To me it was a great pleasure that the end-users in this test all had a great experience in meeting Europeana and that almost all of them would like to use it and get better at it.
Estonia

End user testing conducted by: Estonian National Museum
Country report prepared by: Helen Valdma
Country Test Report Estonia

1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

Two test events were conducted on 20.01.2011 and 21.01.2011 in Estonian National Museum lecture hall. Total number of participants was 22. The participants were divided into 2 groups – students and academic users. The testing was in Estonian, the questionnaire was translated to Estonian and answers were made in Estonian.

2. Statistics of the group

Country of origin: Estonia (22)

Gender: Male (8); Female (14)

Age: 19-24 (10); 25- (12)

Answers to questions about participants internet usage and cultural interests:

How often do you search for information online?

   Very often (almost every day) (22)

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

   Very often (almost every day) (15)
   Rarely (perhaps only once per month) (4)
   Often (once a week) (3)

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

   Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities” (16)
   Searching by date (4)
   Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London” (4)

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?
A search engine such as Google (22)
An image sharing site such as Flickr (5)

What objects do you search for most often?

Texts (22)
Images (5)
Audio (2)
Video (2)

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

Yes (22)

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

Yes (19)
Not sure (3)

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

Not sure (10)
No (8)
Yes (4)

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

Yes (18)
No (4)

3. First impressions of Europeana

Answers to questions about relation to Europeana:

Have you seen this logo before?

Yes (22)

Have you used Europeana before?

Yes, for my personal interests (14)
Yes, for my studies (8)
If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

Someone told me about it (12)
I can’t remember (6)
Other (4)

How many times have you visited Europeana?

2-4 (12)
10-19 (6)
5-9 (4)

What is Europeana about?

Heritage
European cultural heritage site, which opens the collections of libraries, archives, museums; it’s the memory of Europe.

Usability

Europeana means easy to use; it’s for the students; it’s for ordinary users; Europeana is not meant for specialists or cultural heritage experts.

Appearance

The web-based database looks fashionable, youthful and could be a meeting place.

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.

1. Language
Searches are very various according to languages used; language limits the results.

2. Usability
The database is not user friendly; it’s hard to find particular and needed information.

3. Getting information
Europeana is mostly for finding information, but it’s more for fun and discovery then getting the necessary data. Search by date was difficult.

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana). Where necessary please use the quotes from the questionnaires or verbal comments of participants.

Most of the participants were planning to use Europeana in future, the usage will be mostly related to free-time and surfing in the web. For the particular needed information, both for work and university studies, the participants are using their special databases.

Participants were optimistic saying that if more information is coming online and if the search systems will be improved, they will use more.

Europeana is mostly regarded as mediocre as - more boring than fun, not exiting or dull, but the design rather good, rather well organized, rather easy to use, rather interesting and rather unique among web-based databases.

And some quotations:
“If I want to use Europeana more often it needs also more developed in order to find correct data”
“All memory institutions and their collections could be in Europeana”
“The search is made in very quick way”
“The Google phrase-search is the most useful and better, nothing can change that habit at the moment”
“Improving of the database should be made mostly in the thematic structure”
“Database is with rich various data, but it is difficult to find what you want”
“I won’t use Europeana in the future regularly, as the search options are not very comfortable”
“I would hope to see in there more alternative ways to approach to cultural heritage, also the design and white background is to conventional”
“Language is the question to change”
“I can use Europeana in my assignments, work and hobbies”

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants.

1. To change search system to more user based categorizing
2. “My Europeana should also have “search” field, at the moment I can see there only my saved searches; I can always click to Europeana logo, but it needs extra intuition”
3. “After saving my search in English, and changing to the language of search, it disappeared and the system logged me out, it should be changed”
4. “Basic information about the material could be also in English, beside original language.”
Finland

End user testing conducted by: Helsinki City Library
Country report prepared by: Pirjo Lipasti
Country Test Report Finland

1. Descriptions of test events

Two test events - 19.1.2011 and 20.1.2011 held at Helsinki City Library.

2. Statistics of the group

13 participants

Female          3
Male            10

Age
19 – 24         1
25 – 34         1
35 – 44         2
45 – 54         1
55 – 64         4
64 +           4

3. First impressions of Europeana

Have you seen this logo before?

☐ Yes (2)
Have you used Europeana before?

- No (10)
- Not sure (1)

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

- Someone told me about it (1)
- Someone sent me a link
- Read about it in paper/journal
- Link from another web site
- Link on a blog
- I can’t remember
- Other

How many times have you visited Europeana?

- This will be my first visit (12)
- 2- 4 (1)
- 5- 9
- 10- 19
- 20- 29
- 30- 39
- 40- 49
- 50- 99
- 100+

How often do you search for information online?

- Never
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month)
- Often (once a week) (1)
- Very often (almost every day) (12)

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?
Never  
Rarely (perhaps only once per month) (3)  
Often (once a week) (5)  
Very often (almost every day) (5)

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

- Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities” (10)  
- Searching by date (3)  
- Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. ... (7)

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

- A search engine such as Google (13)  
- An image sharing site such as Flickr  
- A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images

What objects do you search for most often?

- Texts (11)  
- Images (2)  
- Audio (3)  
- Video (2)  
- Others – please specify ____________________

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

- Yes (12)  
- No  
- Not sure (1)

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

- Yes (3)  
- No (6)  
- Not sure (4)

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

- Yes (5)
Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

- Yes (1)
- No (10)
- Not sure (2)

*How would you rank the Europeana website:*

- Unattractive – Attractive 6,5
- Boring – Fun 5,75
- Badly organized – Well organized 5,9
- Dull – Exciting 6,1
- Difficult to use – Easy to use 5,6
- Uninteresting – Interesting 6,5
- Similar to other sites – Unique 6,6

*Fill in the bubbles:*

- Database of European cultural heritage
- Database of European museums, libraries etc.
- Search engine
- Access to European digitised material
- Important democratisation of culture

- Free

- Pan- European database

- EU- project

- Digital library

- Without content of good quality just another rather unnecessary database

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana

- On some objects there is only metadata or just blurred thumbnail, thus useless

- Some clumsy search characteristics, e.g. Advanced search and how to search on the grounds of time period

- Moving around in Europeana is awkward, especially use of Timeline

- Interesting and useful with greater mass of content

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana)

As a rule participants found Europeana interesting and they are going to use it in the future. They are curious on how it will develop. Some of them expect more content and one stated, that he/she can find information needed from elsewhere.

6. Comments and recommendations

- More content (high- quality files of paintings, music, movies)
- Easier to use (some found usage quite confusing)

- In places text is too small

- Relevance of search results
France

End user testing conducted by: Conseil Général de la Gironde
Country report prepared by: Nathalie Gascoin
1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

A total number of 29 end-users participated in the testing in France. The participants were recruited from 6 of the 7 target groups defined in the EuropeanaLocal End-User Testing Specifications. Five separate test events were conducted in Bordeaux and Bourg-en-Bresse, with a French version of the questionnaire.

Test event 1 was conducted on 26 January 2011 at the Archives départementales de la Gironde in Bordeaux, with 10 participants.

Test event 2 was conducted on 27 January 2011 at the Archives départementales de la Gironde in Bordeaux, with 12 participants.

Test event 3 was conducted on 27 January 2011 at the library E. & R. Vailland in Bourg-en-Bresse, with 2 participants.

Test event 4 was conducted on 27 January 2011 at IUT of Lyon 1’s University in Lyon, with 2 participants.

Test event 5 was conducted on 28 January 2011 at the library E. & R. Vailland in Bourg-en-Bresse, with 3 participants.

2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)

Country of origin: France (29)

Gender: Male (14), Female (15)

Age:
- Under 15 (2)
- 19-24 (5)
- 25-50 (16)
- 50 and + (6)
**Target groups**: General user (8); Schoolchild (1); Academic user, students and teachers (7); Expert researcher (4); Professional user, e.g. librarian, archivist (8); Tourist authorities (1)

3. **First impressions of Europeana**

The home page is clean but the white background gives an impression of coldness. The home page does not land on the native language of the country from which it’s opened. The codification of the languages names does not simplify the user’s navigation as it is not in native language.

The user interface seems simple to use. The basic search is easy on contrary to the advanced research. The chronological plank is badly made, it does not give a global views of the web site.

It is not understood that it is necessary to click on the logo to go back to the summary.

4. **Deeper impressions of Europeana**

For the users who tested the portal Europeana.eu, it talks about Culture, patrimony, Europe, Art, archives, literature and knowledge sharing.

The content is considered as rich, stimulant and reliable.

But advanced research is not intuitive. Multilingual research is non-existent, that’s damageable for the impression. Search per period is untraceable.

“My Europeana” suffers from being disfunctional (unexpected disconnections are occurring during research operations), and is not really customizable. My Europeana is not understood from the use point of view. There is a confusion between My Europeana, Community and Partners. It’s making people thinking of a social networks without being one.

We have noticed is a heavy tendency of the users not to read the descriptive note and we need a little time to understand that the resource is not on the site and then to find out the link towards the resource in its context.

The interface does not comply with a PDA or Smartphone.

5. **Lasting impressions**
The testers have the declared intention to use Europeana since it is easy to find documents coming from various sites, to find reliable and free to use content, to search on a public site (noncommercial), to find local content related to his living area, or for professional motivation and or his personal culture.

Some testers said they do not intend use Europeana mostly for the lack of data or because it’s not in their own research field.

The site is considered as a very good site to consult available documents, reliable sources, and to discover new provider which would be never visited by lack of time.

Only one site for all the European languages is better considered than Google because one portal give access to all the EU sites which does not appear in his domaine.fr.

Europeana is considered as more serious and reliable than Wikipedia.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants

Most common comments and recommendations are:

- To improve the search functions: by period or geographic coverage.
- To improve automatic translations and multilingual search.
- To clarify the utility and added value of My Europeana
- It is necessary that the links towards the resource in context are opening a new window otherwise we lose the initial Europeana’s page.
- To add texts documents, multimedia object, useful links, statistics, events list (Schedule of exhibitions, or cultural events in Europe).
- To improve quality (technical and indexing) of the documents.
- To add an online tutorial and info-bubbles.
- To improve the visibility of My Europeana and its reliability.
- To increase number of partners
7. Comments of the moderator

The website is generally very positively judged for its content, its ergonomics and its ambition.

Some users appreciated the general approach while others regretted the absence of an thematic specialized approach capability (history, art, regulations and laws, etc...)

The suggested exercises were disconcerting for people who were not English fluent but nevertheless wishing to have results coming from various countries. The user interface is not successful. Searching operations are not very conclusive on the advanced search engine.

The sets of thematic proposals of the exhibitions (fairy tales, art nouveau) should be better presented since very few of our testers made an effort to give a look into them.

8. Questionnaire, statistics

Have you seen this logo before?
- Yes (7)
- No (19)
- Not sure (3)

Have you used Europeana before?
- Yes, for my personal interests (8)
- Yes, for my studies (2)
- No (20)
- Not sure

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?
- Someone told me about it (10)
- Someone sent me a link
- Read about it in paper/journal (2)
- Link from another web site
- Link on a blog (1)
- I can’t remember
- Other (2)
How many times have you visited Europeana?

- This will be my first visit (16)
- 2-4 (5)
- 5-9 (4)
- 10-19 (3)
- 20-29
- 30-39
- 40-49
- 50-99 (1)
- 100+

How often do you search for information online?

- Never
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month) (1)
- Often (once a week) (7)
- Very often (almost every day) (21)

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

- Never (3)
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month) (9)
- Often (once a week) (12)
- Very often (almost every day) (6)

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

- Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities” (20)
- Searching by date (4)
- Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London” (9)

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

- A search engine such as Google (27)
- An image sharing site such as Flickr (4)
- A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images (10)

What objects do you search for most often?

- Texts (26)
- Images (13)
- Audio (4)
- Video (5)
- Others (3) please specify (maps, exhibitions events, statistics)

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

- Yes (24)
- No (3)
- Not sure (2)

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

- Yes (8)
- No (17)
- Not sure (4)

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

- Yes (10)
- No (15)
- Not sure (4)

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

- Yes (12)
- No (16)
- Not sure (1)

_How would you rank the Europeana website:_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNATTRACTIVE</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>ATTRACTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BORING</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BADLY ORGANISED</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_WELL ORGANISED_
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dull</th>
<th>Exciting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 1 6 5 7 7 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Difficult to use</th>
<th>Easy to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 1 8 7 7 4 2 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Uninteresting</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 1 8 10 4 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Similar to other sites</th>
<th>Unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 6 1 1</td>
<td>3 3 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Germany

End user testing conducted by: Berlin Central Library
Country report prepared by:  Michael Götze, Angela Koch
Country Test Report Germany

A total number of 20 end-users participated in the testing in Germany. The participants were recruited from 6 of the 7 target groups defined in the EuropeanaLocal End-User Testing Specifications. Three separate test events were conducted. The testing was conducted in German with a German version of the questionnaire. Quotes from end-users included in this report have been translated from German to English.

1. Test events

Test event 1 was conducted on 17 December 2010 at the Central City Library in Berlin. 2 professional users participated.

Test event 2 was conducted on 19 January 2011 in the eLearning-Center of the Central City Library in Berlin. The group, counting 8 participants, was a mixed one and consisted of general users, academic users, expert researchers, professional users, tourist authorities and representatives from the regional government level.

Test event 3 was conducted on 21 January 2011 in the eLearning-Center of the Central City Library in Berlin. The group, counting 10 participants, consisted of academic users, expert researchers and professional users.

2. Statistics of the group

Demography

Nationality: German (20)
Gender: Female (14); male (6).
Age:
  25-34 (8); 35-39 (5);
45-49 (3);
55-59 (2);
60-64 (1),
70-74 (1).

Target Groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General User</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic User</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional user</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments (regional)</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolchild</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert Researcher</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist authority</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Background information: Internet habits and prior knowledge of Europeana

65% of the end-users had not used Europeana before. 90% used the internet very often. The majority of the end-users used a search engine to find information online. 80% of end-users used the advanced search functionalities offered by search engines. Google and Wikipedia were mentioned most often by end-users as their favorite websites for work & studies.

3. First impressions of Europeana

The end-users ranked Europeana as follows (summary):

- Unattractive – Attractive: 4,2
- Boring – Fun: 6,7
- Badly organized – Well organized: 6,2
- Dull – Exciting: 6
- Difficult to use – Easy to use: 7,1
- Uninteresting – Interesting: 7,1
- Similar to other sites – Unique: 7
In the discussion after the introduction and first own experiences (3-4 minutes), statements included the following:

- interacting with the site is entertaining
- is good for searches for images
- it's boring when there are many similar hits and very tiring to get to other ones
- Where to click for getting to the object at the providers page is confusing: sometimes the preview-link leads to a picture only, sometimes to the object in more context.
- Language is a problem when different from German + English
- search in texts of books, etc. is expected, but not there...
- more clicks are necessary than in google.books

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana

In this part of the evaluation, end-users were asked to do specific tasks.

Tasks 4-6 with the need to register in 'My Europeana' didn't work, since users were logged out automatically after searching or saving (with the firefox browser and standard library network settings). Moreover, users were mixed up between the different computers in the eLearning-Center by Europeana. Therefore we skipped these tasks in test event 3.

We summarize the main impressions of working with the Europeana site here:

**Overall Design and User Interaction**

The Europeana site is not well-arranged and confusing for some end-users. This is the case for the start screen (with too many options, the advanced search is difficult to find), as well as for the search-result view (with no good facetted search implementation) and with the single object view.

**Search is not state-of-the-art**

The search functionality is not well developed and the end-users are used to other standards.
a) Searching for the town “Wittenberg” gives results also for “Wittenberge” (among the first).

b) An example for another type of search problem is the following: searching for “Märkische Juden” (which is the standard form in German) gives no result, while searching for “Märkischen Juden” (inflected form) gives the wished result.

c) Furthermore, the advanced search does not save the research request.

Presentation of results

Search result presentation was criticized, mainly because of too many similar items (in Germany, we have the 'Deutsche Fotothek' with more than 1 Mio. photos, which delivers a high number of similar hits), and also because of the unknown ranking strategy and lack of sorting options for the results.

Refining Results

Refining results with the text/image/video/sound options works quite well. But more options for refining were asked for (e.g. content provider, date, etc.). With the facetted search, the ordering of the options (especially for the years) is not well arranged and confusing.

Europeana Virtual Exhibitions

The exhibitions (Art Noveau + Weddings in Eastern Europe) are interesting from their content, but their design is not very modern. Furthermore, they should be offered in more languages.

Language issues

Language is a problem, for searching (e.g. in the tests: “wedding”: English the event, German: a city district of Berlin) and for understanding metadata. Users said that they are not happy with descriptive information they don't understand. A proposal was to include machine translation facilities or links to web-services that offer these.

5. Lasting impressions

Intend to use
85% of the end-users intend to use Europeana. The majority state that they will use Europeana because it offers 1) additional information to other search portals, 2) international, european-wide content, 3) also images, sound and film, and 4) content of good and trusted quality.

Reasons for not using Europeana is lack of content (no luck with finding results/answers) and lack of being connected to other portals and sources.

**It is my personal opinion that Europeana... (a selection of quotes)**

9. “is a good idea, but with a fair implementation only”
10. “could have a great future, if 'all' participate”
11. “will need a long time, before it's really profitable for me”
12. “is a good opportunity to promote cultural heritage to the masses...”
13. “will not become the standard”
14. “has a lot of potential, even if it is not usable for some purposes currently”
15. “is focusing too much on technical issues, ..., too much quantity, not enough guidance (of the user), not enough preparation of data”
16. “could be a central platform for decentralized digitization projects”
17. “is a good amendment to other search portals”
18. “is a good amendment especially for older images”
19. “will be better with more content”

6. **Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test group participants**

**Better design and structure of the site**

More care with this would be good, a better structure with less options. Previews of hits could be visualized without jumping to a new site with pop-ups (cf. http://collections.vam.ac.uk/). Less clicks should be necessary to go to results. More than 12 hits on the results page should be possible.

**Improvement of the search refinement functionality**
Here, more options for sorting (date, alphabetic order, according to content provider, etc.) should be offered. Furthermore, the ranking of results should be improved - the need for presenting a variety of results on the first result page should be included as an important factor. Furthermore, selecting content by one content provider only should be possible.

**Offer Structured Approach to Content**

In addition to the search facilities, there should be pre-structured paths to the content. E.g. with the opportunity of browsing through hand-made lists, special topics, time periods, regions, etc. - which helps user to find its path through and to interesting content.

**Search is a key element and should be improved**

Search should reflect the current standard of other search engines and consider the special features of the single languages. This is a key factor for information specialists and expert researchers.

**Search in the text of objects - in particular in books**

This is something that users expect, expecting at least the functionality that google.books offers.

**More and better content and metadata**

End-Users want more books and films, better quality (and size) of pictures, and good quality metadata.

**7. Comments of the moderator**

Europeana could profit a lot from state of the art web design and advanced user interaction. This is something very important for accepting and supporting Europeana and its overall goals, especially among professional users.

Guiding the user to the content and showing interesting and entertaining paths not only to the big providers is another task, which is profitable both for content providers and users.

Finally, “My Europeana” should be made usable or skipped (and handed over to other sites).
Greece

End user testing conducted by: Veria Public Library
Country report prepared by: Sarantos Kapidakis, Alexandros Koulouris, Emmanouel Garoufallou, Anna Mastora, Evangelia Simou
Country Test Report Greece

Participants: 54 students of the Department of Library and Information Systems

Gender: 12 male,
42 female.

Age: 1 participant aged 15-18,
50 participants aged 19-24,
1 participant aged 25-30,
2 participants over 30.

Country of origin: Greece 51, Belarus 1, Russia 1, Canada 1

Questionnaire part 1
Have you seen this logo before?

☐ Yes / 26
☐ No / 20
☐ Not sure. / 8

Have you used Europeana before?

☐ Yes, for my personal interests / 5
☐ Yes, for my studies / 16
☐ No / 31
☐ Not sure / 3

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

☐ Someone told me about it / 23
☐ Someone sent me a link / 2
☐ Read about it in paper/journal / 2
☐ Link from another web site / 1
☐ Link on a blog / 0
☐ I can’t remember / 2
☐ Other / 8
How many times have you visited Europeana?

- This will be my first visit / 34
- 2-4 / 11
- 5-9 / 2
- 10-19 / 2
- 20-29 / 1
- 30-39 / 0
- 40-49 / 0
- 50-99 / 2
- 100+ / 1

How often do you search for information online?

- Never / 4
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month) / 7
- Often (once a week) / 18
- Very often (almost every day) / 25

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

- Never / 8
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month) / 21
- Often (once a week) / 16
- Very often (almost every day) / 9

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

- Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities” / 26
- Searching by date / 6
- Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London” / 20

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

- A search engine such as Google / 48
- An image sharing site such as Flickr / 4
- A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images / 24

What objects do you search for most often?
Are you interested in links between different cultures?

- Yes / 39
- No / 9
- Not sure / 7

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

- Yes / 18
- No / 19
- Not sure / 10

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

- Yes / 37
- No / 7
- Not sure / 11

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

- Yes / 21
- No / 25
- Not sure / 8
Questionnaire part 2

How would you rank the Europeana website:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unattractive</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>15</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boring</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Badly organised</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Well organised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dull</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficult to use</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>7</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uninteresting</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similar to other sites</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unique</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Europeana is about...

- Easy access
- Useful information
- Accessible
- Culture, dissemination of knowledge
- Digital resources, pictures, videos, texts, sounds
- Museums, libraries, archives
- Countries
- Europe
- Digitized paintings, books, films and archives.
- All kind of digital resources from museums or libraries, which can be easily explored by the users and transferred from one service to another!
- Enables people to search digital resources of Europe’s museums, libraries and audiovisual collections.
- Some of the items are world famous and other is not so widespread.
- Europeana always connects the user with the original source of the subject so he can be sure of its authenticity.
- Making local and regional content accessible.
- Helping local and regional libraries, museums and other carriers of information to improve and provide their digital collections.
- Provide new services and organise digital and audiovisual material
- Exploring culture
- Encouraging self-education
- Ideas and inspiration
- Sharing treasures
- Enriching the teacher–student experience in the classroom
Europeana is a search platform to a collection of European digital libraries with digitized paintings, books, films and archives. The European Commission initiated the project.

Europeana enables people to explore the digital resources of Europe's museums, libraries, archives and audio-visual collections. It promotes discovery and networking opportunities in a multilingual space where users can engage, share in and be inspired by the rich diversity of Europe's cultural and scientific heritage.

Ideas and inspiration can be found within the more than 14.6 million items on Europeana. These objects include:

* Images - paintings, drawings, maps, photos and pictures of museum objects
* Texts - books, newspapers, letters, diaries and archival papers
* Sounds - music and spoken word from cylinders, tapes, discs and radio broadcasts
* Videos - films, newsreels and TV broadcasts

Allowing people to explore digital resources museums, libraries, archives and audiovisual collections in Europe. Promotes opportunities for discovery and networking in a multilingual environment where people can work, to share and be inspired by the rich diversity of cultural and scientific heritage.

Europeana is about the cultural heritage of Europe. It hosts more than 14 million digital items, provided by more than 1500 contributing institutions from all over Europe. All the content is readily available through the web, using simplified search mechanisms.

Europeana is primarily perceived as a portal exposing impressive amounts of cultural heritage from various sources to Europe citizen.

**Questionnaire part 3**

**I think Europeana can be improved by...**

- adding more detail in the interface, so that it can attract more people. It’s well organized but people remember the unique and exciting sites more than the dull ones
making the results of advanced search more comprehensive and better organized. And there should be more fields in advanced search. Also would be better if the results in other languages were more than it offers.

- trying to attract more users to deal with this service and also by often adding new interesting content!
- librarians and other information scientists
- a computer scientist!
- adding more stuff, something that depends of course on every country itself.
- prioritizing search results
- enhancing the research tools and including more research keywords
- more contemporary information
- videos
- sharing more information with the users and making it easier for the user to achieve his goal
- adding a browsing tool in the search box
- help us find more easy the data we need relating to three-dimensional pictures and artworks
- making the results and the data which are given more sufficient and more accurate.
- adding more detail in the interface, so that it can attract more people. It’s well organized but people remember the unique and exciting sites more than the dull ones.
- making a more friendly interface of the “advanced search” facility organizing better it’s foreign material.
- Music
- having more free access – the ‘paid access’ of course puts many people off, especially those of us using it private
- allowing access to all types of materials requiring subscriptions. Also, providing at the description field a summary or abstract of the content in English would be very useful. Also, many images are not displayed properly and someone has to go to the web site of the provider to see the image.
- the content of ‘Communities’ should be translated in all the languages provided by Europeana so that teachers and students use them more effectively. This applies to other areas of Europeana. There are not translations in the deeper lever of information.
- separate results by relevance with percentages
- the quality of some images was not good
I think I will use/not use (delete as appropriate) Europeana because...

Many participants say that they use Europeana because it has a big variety of content (much information about different cultures). It is a very useful and well organised site when they are looking for cultural information.

It also provides a good search engine and the chance to save results. They mention that they like trying out new things.

Quote:

“I discover a very useful site which provides specific information for everything I need to look for. It’s interesting because it has lots of pictures and so it’s not boring”.

Same of the participants say that they won’t use Europeana as they need to understand it better, the barriers to accessing material is too high and they find search engines such as Google/Scholar more productive in terms of returning actual results.

I would like Europeana to include more ...

Information in other languages, audiovisual material, images, maps, art, varied materials. Even more cultural information (different cultures) and about the modern world.

More information about the new users and how to explore the world of Europeana (easy ways searching). In addition, I would like Europeana to include more indexes by subject to better enable retrieval of documents relating to specific areas, i.e. local correspondence on issues.

For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because...

It has a very big information database with easy access. There are information and images on useful themes.

It gives a possibility to find information that might be useful for studies, work and hobbies.

Quote:

“I can find an unprecedented collection of multimedia items for a wide range of cultural interests”.
In my personal opinion, Europeana is...

Most of participants express their opinion by saying useful, interesting, very well organized site with unique content, can be easily used by any user... it is quite a good attempt to provide an online access to information for those who needs.

They also say that it has a big potential but still lacks data on some topics (can become very popular in the future).

“Could be improved and strengthen the user interest”.

“Offers less than Google”.

“Could perform better than Google but needs to translate the results into a commonly used”

“Needs more content and solid advertisement”

“Still needs some improvement due to the fact that it’s not easy for a person with no advanced knowledge of information seeking to find any results.”

What are your favourite sites for school work

Almost all participants mentioned Google.

They also say about Argo (www.argo.ekt.gr), Wikipedia, Heal link, Google scholar, Europeana.

The official site of school and school library, National Library site, Archive, ask.com, teenproblem.com.

Various pedagogical sites from institutions open access journals as well as information from other similar institutions.

Where do you normally get information online


From sites of Digital Libraries, many other websites.

From all types of sources which provide credible information.
Comments of moderator

Participants were mostly librarian undergraduate students. We include most of their comments, for more details on their opinions.

Although the majority of the users are searching information very often, and half of them search for audio/video too, 60% of them had never used Europeana before.

The question, which was asked all the time was: “Who is Europeana meant for? Who and why would use it?”
Hungary

End user testing conducted by: Bekes Megyei Tudashaz es Konyvtar, HU
Country report prepared by: Laszlo Karman
Country Test Report Hungary

1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

1. 24.01.2011 – Bekes County Knowledge Centre and Library 10 participants
2. 26.01.2011 – Bekes County Knowledge Centre and Library 9 participants
   Total: 19 participants

2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)

   Sex: M – 4  
   F – 15

   Age: 15-18 – 2  
       19-24 – 5  
       24+ – 12

   Target group: General user – 7  
                 Schoolchild – 4  
                 Academic user – 2  
                 Expert researcher – 3  
                 Professional user – 3

   14 of 19 participants (74 %) have not used Europeana before. 3 users visited Europeana 2-4 times. 1 user already visited Europeana 10-19 times. 1 user already visited Europeana more than 100 times.

3. First impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.

   Participants ranked Europeana web site as follows:

   Attractive – 7  
   Fun – 5  
   Well organized – 5
Users think that Europeana is for accessing texts, images and audiovisual cultural contents.

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.

* In general the language appears to be a problem for 7 participants of 19.

* Searching for content related to specific period.
  Only 2 users found it easy; 4 users succeeded but found it difficult; 13 of 19 users did not succeed at all.

* Searching for content by provider.
  3 users reported having problems during certain tasks.

* My Europeana
  Registration and using the profile did not mean any problem to users except one.

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana). Where necessary please use the quotes from the questionnaires or verbal comments of participants.

1 of 19 users answered that she will not use Europeana, because she is fine with the browsers she is already using.

18 of 19 participants intend to use Europeana in the future, because:

- It is excellent for accessing contents on arts.
- She will need this kind of knowledge for school work (images, foreign language texts).
- It contains much, easily accessible and valuable information (picture, text) which can be used for educational purposes.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary). Please include 5-6 main suggestions.
Most participants did not have any suggestions.

2 users had the following remarks:

- I cannot modify my email address.
- There is no link to the search option, e.g.: back to search/new search.
- I cannot find an option for labeling.
- No, but I might not be able to see the significance of these possibilities, yet.

7. Comments of the moderator (Optional)

The task we gave the participants was finding contents in Hungarian. The task was successfully completed by all (19) test users.

Regarding searching for contents of their interest many users reported that they would like to have more documents in Hungarian and about local issues.

Users’ remarks on Europeana:

- Searching by date is difficult to use, it should be simplified. If the time line was vertical, it would be clearer how to use the scroll bar. The interface is not user friendly from a webergonomical point of view.

- Users would like to see more contents in Hungarian, and more audiovisual and image contents.

- 8 out of 19 users had difficulties to make a new list from the saved list when refining search by language. (e.g.: Yes, I am able to do the task, but I needed several attempts to get the new list (refining by language) from the saved list.

- 2 test users suggest a translator tool in order to solve the language problems.

- Most participants (14 out of 19) found that Europeana is useful for his work and study. Some of the remarks:

  - Excellent facility to find information, texts, images for my educational work all at one location.
• Good possibility to search the contents of different libraries at the same time. It saves me time.

• Not a bad site, but you need to speak languages at advanced level to use it.

• Need to be improved and extended.

• Useful, helpful.

• Test users use the following internet devices for collecting and searching information:
  
  • Browsers – primary Google (all users)
  
  • Forums (4 users)
  
  • Google Readers (1 user)
  
  • Twitter (1 user)
  
  • Video and file sharing pages (1 user)
  
  • Other (1 user)
Ireland

End user testing conducted by: The Library Council
Country report prepared by: Annette Kelly
Country Test Report Ireland

1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

A total number of 19 end-users participated in the testing in Ireland. The participants were recruited from the target groups defined in the EuropeanaLocal End-User Testing Specifications. For practical reasons, briefing tests were conducted online during the period 24th to 30th January.

2. Statistics of the group

Demography

Nationality: 18 from Ireland, 1 from Northern Ireland

Gender: Female (7);

male (12).

Age: Under 15 (4);

15-18 (2);

19-24 (4);

25- (9).

Background information: Internet habits and prior knowledge of Europeana

10 of the end-users had not used Europeana before. 6 used Europeana often or very often. The majority of the end-users heard about Europeana from others or read about it.

All users used a search engine to find information online. The majority- very often. 5 of end-users used the advanced search functionalities offered by search engines rarely. The remaining 14 used them often or very often, mainly searching by phrase. Google was mentioned by all end-users as their favorite search engine for information/ school/work/studies.
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Most frequently used online resources for seeking information by users:

1. Google search engine (all participants cited this)
2. Online newspapers
3. Youtube
4. Facebook
5. Bing images

Also: Emerald database; Jstor; EBSCOhost

Text was by far the most commonly searched object, followed closely by images. Audio and video were only mentioned as being regularly looked for in a third of the participant group.

15 participants stated that they were interested in learning about culture, 3 participants said they were not sure, and only one participant said that they were not interested in learning about cultures.

11 of the 19 participants stated that they had studied a foreign culture in depth. 3 participants said they felt society is losing its cultural identity, while 11 said they felt they weren’t losing their cultural identity. 5 participants said they were unsure.

Just over half of the participant group said they were not involved in projects to preserve traditions and customs, while 8 participants said that they had been involved in projects to preserve traditions and customs.

3. First impressions of Europeana

The end-users ranked Europeana as follows:

Actual numbers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unattractive</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Boring       | 0 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 6 | 4 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | Fun         |
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In response to what Europeana is about, the main responses most frequently found in the 19 answers were:

- Europeana as providing a single point of access to European culture. All the younger participants (all under 19) referred to the large collection of photos available on one website.
- The majority of participants showed awareness of the range of different objects available on Europeana – images, audio, texts, videos
- A quarter of participants referred to cultural institutions in their understanding of Europeana

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana
Language issues

The majority of participants stated that language was a barrier when evaluating the relevance of objects. However, the majority of younger participants (under 19s) were less concerned about language; they were more interested in the pictures.

One participant referred to the language choice option on the front page which they stated wasn’t obvious that it was the interface which would be changed - that this should be clearer that it was just the interface language and not the language for all objects/results which would be translated.

Language was considered a particular barrier when searching and evaluating the list of results. It was suggested that the title of an object should be translated.

Search by date / finding content related to a time period

The majority of participants thought it was easy to use as it is currently presented, however they also felt the current search options for date was very limited as it is not possible to search ‘between’ periods of time. For example, if you wished to search for all of a certain type of painting between 1600 and 1700 – this doesn’t appear possible to do.

5. Overall impressions of Europeana

Response to question: In my personal opinion, Europeana ...

- “Needs more fun stuff”
- “Needs more interactive materials”
- “Could be improved with a games section and a chat section”
- “Needs to work on accessibility issues rather than further increasing the amount of resources available”
- “Is more about organizations than users”
- “Has a lot of potential but needs to be better organized”
- “Would be better if it had more essays to explain the objects”
- “Seems like a useful tool for finding information on a variety of subjects”
- “Has lots of good information but is a bit dull to look at”
- “Is okay, but some of the searches I did didn’t produce anything I would find very interesting”
“Could be a great site with more work – needs to focus on how information is provided and organized”

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the group participants

Suggestions for improvements

The majority of participants suggested that it can be improved by further work on the searching tools and translation. Also specified, in terms of design, was greater use of colour and a more dynamic user interface. It was mentioned that the interface didn’t appear to be particularly active or demonstrated it was a new and modern resource. A number of participants noted that thumbnail sizes should be bigger and also that some of the thumbnails which have a white background blended into the white of the webpage and were barely visible.

The majority of participants felt that results needed to be ordered by relevance as this is what one would expect - particularly as Europeana appears to function in a similar way to Google.

The majority of participants also mentioned that it is difficult to tell from the homepage exactly what is on the website or what the site is about – also that it doesn’t give any indication as to the extent of content.

Suggestions for additional content on Europeana

Games

More audio/music

A chat/discussion section

Travel-friendly information

Greater variety of photos

More colourful photos rather than a very large collection of black and white photos for some locations

More background information on European culture to support all objects already available

Regular updates of new content added to the site
Potential for future use by participants

Yes, I would use it again, because:

“It is a trusted source of information due to the fact that it is moderated and sources are provide for all objects”

“I may need information on images for projects”

“It is useful for research purposes”

“It shows what’s on offer from different cultural institutions before visiting a country”

“It provides useful information from one point of access and collates information and offers links”

“Has a great deal of material that no other site has”

No, I would not use it again, because:

“I get the results I need through Google”

“It is not particularly related to my area of study or research”

“It’s not very exciting”

“It’s easier to use Google”

“It’s not my area of interest”

Potential use as a resource for school work (as stated by participants under 19 years)

“I can quickly get pictures of different things for my projects”

“I can use the photos as studies for art”

“It has pictures which aren’t available anywhere else”

“It’s easy to use”

“It includes resources, especially newspapers which would look well as a reference source for my projects”
“All these cultural resources are available on one site so it’s quick to find things”

7. Comments of the moderator

From the ‘first impressions’ section in the questionnaire given to participants, it suggests that a more attractive, fun and modern interface would be more enticing to potential users, with more colour and interactives. Particular attention was also drawn by users to thumbnail size and presentation.

Participants felt overall that the search facility could be further developed to provide more options for refining searches and for ordering of search results so that the top results are more relevant to the search terms. They also felt overall that the homepage should provide a better overview of what Europeana offers.
Italy

End user testing conducted by: Marche Region
Country report prepared by: Ivan Antognozzi
Country Test report Italy

1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

Regione Marche (Aula Verde), 07 February 2011, from 12 am to 3 pm

2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)

17 participants

Sex:  M: 6  
     F: 11

Age:  15-18: 2  
     19-24: 1  
     25-31: 1  
     32-40: 4  
     41-48: 3  
     49-55: 5  
     55+: 3

Target group: Schoolchild 2
              General user 4
              Academic user 3
              Expert researcher 3
              Professional user 3
              Government user 1
              Tourist user 1

Have you seen this logo before?

Yes / 8
No / 9
Not sure / 0

Have you used Europeana before?
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Yes, for my personal interests / 4
Yes, for my studies / 0
No / 13
Not sure / 0

**If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?**

someone told me about it / 2
Someone sent me a link / 1
Read about it in paper/journal / 0
Link from another web site / 0
Link on a blog/ 0
I can’t remember/ 0
Other / 1

**How many times have you visited Europeana?**

This will be my first visit / 13
2-4 / 1
5-9 / 1
10-19/ 1
20-29/ 0
30-39/ 0
40-49/ 1
50-99/ 0
100+/ 0

**How often do you search for information online?**

Never/0
Rarely (perhaps only once per month)/2
Often (once a week) / 9
Very often (almost every day) / 6

**How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?**

Never / 3
Rarely (perhaps only once per month) / 8
Often (once a week) / 5
Very often (almost every day) / 1

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities” / 10
Searching by date / 6
Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London” / 4

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

A search engine such as Google / 17
An image sharing site such as Flickr / 5
A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images / 5

What objects do you search for most often?

Texts / 11
Images / 13
Audio / 2
Video / 4
Others – please specify: words, phrases / 1 (phrases) / 0

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

Yes / 12
No / 4
Not sure / 1

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

Yes / 3
No / 14
Not sure / 0

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

Yes / 6
No / 9  
Not sure / 2

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

Yes / 9  
No / 8  
Not sure / 0

3. First impressions of Europeana (summary).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unattractive</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0 0 0 2 5 4 6 0 0 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boring</th>
<th>Fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 1 2 3 6 4 0 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Badly Organised</th>
<th>Well Organised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 0 0 3 7 5 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dull</th>
<th>Exciting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 2 8 3 3 1 0 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficult to Use</th>
<th>Easy to Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 1 2 2 0 5 4 2 1 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uninteresting</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 1 0 1 2 3 7 1 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Europeana is about...

- European digital library;
- Database search;
- Portal for museum, libraries and galleries;
- Cultural heritage and people identity;
- Interesting to enjoy;
- Interesting, useful;
- Easy to use, good organized;
- Availability of collection;
- Web portal of cultural heritage;
- Text and image searcher, more specialized than Google
- Once you know how to search it become more fun and easier
- Can search different types of content
- Sharing knowledge
- Useful, advanced
- Interesting
- Needed
- Nothing special
- I don’t know it

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary).

**Exercise 1** - Does the language appear to be an issue?
For each participants the language choice is really very important. The results change if you change the language

**Exercise 2** - Is it easy to find the content related to specific period?
It is not particularly difficult to find out objects of a particular period. It is less friendly to refine the research by period.

**Exercise 3 - Is it easy to find? Is the content logically linked?**

It is very easy and comprehensible.

**Exercise 4 – 5 – 6 Register as user.**

It was possible to register for only one participant, due to some problem of connection. It was easy to do and to use the different options. We can’t change the settings of ‘My Europeana’.

---

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana). Where necessary please use the quotes from the questionnaires or verbal comments of participants.

10 participants (60%) said will use Europeana in future, 4 participants (25 %) don’t know, yet.

In summary, they think Europeana is a good tool for searching information about cultural heritage.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary). Please include 5-6 main suggestions.

Suggestions:

- Better graphic and more interactive features to attract more people;
- More video and audio object;
- More possibility to refine research;
- Better way to search by period (such as timeline, ect.)
- More tool to search images (by colour, by dimension, such as google, special sites)

7. Comments of the moderator (Optional)

Overall the test went well, the participants were satisfied with the portal, even if some do not know if they will use again. The majority believes that it is already good but has a room for improvement.
Latvia

End user testing conducted by: Latvian National Library
Country report prepared by: Ginta Zilcmane
Country Test Report Latvia

1. Descriptions of test events

Two test events were conducted on 27.01.2011 and 03.02.2011 in The National Library of Latvia in the Reading room for electronic resources. Total number of participants was 27.

There were 2 different groups – school children and students. The testing was in Latvian, the questionnaire was translated to Latvian and answers were made in Latvian. These are participants who are more open to participate in the tests. We reached test group participants during the library teaching classes.

2. Statistics of the group

Nationality: Latvian

Gender: Female (15);
        male (12).

Age:

1. Group (15-18) – 11
2. Group (19-24) – 16

3. First impressions of Europeana (summary).

Have you seen this logo before?

Yes – 15
No – 7
Not sure – 5

Have you used Europeana before?

Yes, for my personal interests – 9
Yes, for my studies – 4
No – 10
If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

- Someone told me about it - 7
- Read about it in paper/journal – 3
- Link from another web site – 5
- Link on a blog – 3
- I can’t remember - 9

How many times have you visited Europeana?

- This will be my first visit 15
- 5-9 4
- 10-19 1
- 30-39 2

How often do you search for information online?

- Often (once a week) –3
- Very often (almost every day) - 24

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

- Rarely (perhaps only once per month) – 15
- Often (once a week) – 10
- Very often (almost every day) – 6

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

- Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities” – 11
- Searching by date – 1
- Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London” –10

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

- A search engine such as Google – 27
- An image sharing site such as Flickr – 5
- A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images – 2
What objects do you search for most often?

Texts – 27
Images – 22
Audio – 23
Video – 18

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

Yes – 20
No - 2
Not sure – 3

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

Yes – 7
No – 12
Not sure - 2

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

Yes – 14
No – 5
Not sure – 9

**How would you rank the Europeana website:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNATTRACTIVE</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BORING</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BADLY ORGANISED</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DULL</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFICULT TO USE</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
4. What is Europeana about?

Culture
The site where one can search information about culture and history. Possibility to search information from libraries, archives, museums around Europe. Verified information. Particularly positive aspect - searching in European languages.

Appearance
Enjoyable design, interactive view with slideshow on the front page.

Complete these sentences:

- I think Europeana can be improved by: more content from archives and museums; keywords in English for all content, which could help to comprehend the added content in different languages.
- I think I will use Europeana, because there is an access to the various content of many different institutions, especially visual information, historical photographs and postcards.
- I would like Europeana to include more video and sound information.
- For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because the diversity content opens new conceptions and ideas; possibility to add visual information to work.
- In my personal opinion, Europeana is very useful search engine, it could successfully compete with Google. There are many useful options – sharing results, timeline.

- What are your favourite sites for school work?
  Google.com, Wikipedia.org; www.atlants.lv; blogs.

- Where do you normally get information online?
5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana).

Most of the participants were planning to use Europeana in the future for school work, for entertainment, for self-education. This is virtual network with very wide content from European cultural institutions, different from Google. It will help to get knowledge from different European countries – once you are in, it suggests to search more around. It opens up pathways of interest about cultural institutions in the Europe – libraries, archives museums.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary). Please include 5-6 main suggestions.

Necessary to add more categories in advanced search system; to improve option timeline; to add more communities; to improve my Europeana with searching option; to add navigation from search results to the main page.
Lithuania

End user testing conducted by: DIZI
Country report prepared by: Jouzas Markauskas
Country Test Report Lithuania

1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

Two test events were conducted in Lithuanian with Lithuanian questionnaires. Test groups consisted of general users, students, schoolchild, academic user, professional user.

Event 1. 12 January 2011, Šiauliai Povilas Višinskis Public Library, Šiauliai. 12 participants.

Event 2. 19 January 2011, DIZI heritage office, Vilnius. 6 participants.

2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)

   Sex:
   
   F  13
   M  5

   Age
   
   15-18  1
   19-24  6
   25-30  3
   36-40  1
   Over 40 7

   61% of users have seen Europeana logo before.

   56% of users visited Europeana before for studies or personal interest.

   89% of users searches for information online very often and 11% often.

   Advanced search features are used very often by 50% of users, often - 33%, rarely - 17%.

   82% of users prefer Google, 14% specialist sites and 4% Flickr for image searching.

   Objects that are searched most often: 46% texts, 35% images, 11% audio, 8% video.
3. First impressions of Europeana (summary).

| Unattractive – Attractive: | 8,7 |
| Boring – Fun:              | 8,2 |
| Badly organized – Well organized: | 8,3 |
| Dull – Exciting:           | 7,5 |
| Difficult to use – Easy to use: | 8,9 |
| Uninteresting – Interesting: | 8,8 |
| Similar to other sites – Unique: | 7,5 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unattractive</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boring</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Func</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Badly organised</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Well organised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dull</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Exciting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficult to use</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Easy to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uninteresting</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similar to other sites</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Europeana is about:
- Heritage
- European Cultures
- Single accesses point to heritage information

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.

Search options
For most of the users it was problematic to search for content belonging to specific time period. Professional users noted that input boxes like “Date from” and “Date to” are missing from advanced search menu. During the discussion it was agreed that search related to time period is generally possible through timeline. However it doesn’t work if you only enable “timeline view” for your search results. You have to run your search again in order to have working timeline. One user with IT background used Boolean operators for this kind of search.

Most of the users noted that they would like to have search result sorting option (by title, by date added, alphabetic order)

Few users thought that change of Europeana interface language will result in change of content available for searching.

Refine options
“+” and “-” signs are little bit confusing for some of the users. They expect that content will be added by “-” sign and removed by “+” but not vice versa as it is now. It would be better to find more neutral sign for marking selected and unselected option, new sign shouldn’t reflect any functionality itself.

Refine options are listed according to number of content related to every option. There should be also possibility to choose alphabetic sorting order.

One user noted, that language codes are not very well known for general users (especially codes of small European countries) and should be replaced by full names or at least have alternative text (ALT)
**My Europeana**

No problems with registration and using “My Europeana” services. However few users wanted to be sure about spam protection before registering. At some points users were logged out by the system.

“Saved Items” containing Cyrillic characters in title are not displayed correctly (encoding problem, http://bit.ly/gQklg8)

---

5. **Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana). Where necessary please use the quotes from the questionnaires or verbal comments of participants.**

Only one user said that he will not use Europeana in the future because it doesn’t offer anything related to his hobby and work. Others were happy to learn more about Europeana services and will used it for personal and business interest. To users indicated that Europeana will be very useful for their final paper at university.

Users would like Europeana to include more video content. Content should represent higher number of providers.

Two of user indicated that Europeana will be useful for their home assignment as provided content is relevant to their studies.

According to personal opinion of users Europeana is:

- Comfortable and informative
- Interesting
- Offers many possibilities
- Good initiative
- User friendly and well designed
- Perfect search engine for cultural heritage objects
- Promising portal for access to cultural heritage resources
- Should be improved
6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary). *Please include 5-6 main suggestions.*

- Fix bugs related to “timeline view” and “My Europeana” user login session
- Improve refine by adding alphabetic sort of options possibility
- Improve refine by changing “+” and “-” signs to other signs for indicating “selected” option
- Use full names of languages instead language codes (refine)
- Aggregate more content from countries that contributes very small number of content at the moment
- Add custom sorting option to search result list view
- There should be more information about search options and mechanisms available on Europeana website. Video tutorial is very welcome.
Malta

End user testing conducted by: *Across Limits*
Country report prepared by: *Cedric Farrugia*
1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

Two end user testing events were held in Malta. The users consisted of various target groups, mainly general users, students, schoolchildren, academic user, and professional user.

Event 1. The first event was held on the 10th December 2010, at Gateway Centre, Kappillan Mifsud Street, Hamrun, Malta and the testing group consisted of 9 participants from the categories mentioned above.

Event 2. The second test was held on the 14th January 2011, Sliema Local Council Offices, Depiro Street Sliema, Malta and the group was made of 9 participants from the categories mentioned above.

2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Under yrs</th>
<th>15 yrs</th>
<th>15 yrs - 18 yrs</th>
<th>19 yrs - 24 yrs</th>
<th>25 yrs - 50 yrs</th>
<th>50 yrs +</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The end users have seen Europeana logo before 33.3% have seen the logo before
The end users visited Europeana before for studies or personal interest 33.3% have visited for studies or personal interest
Participants answering very often or often to the question search for information online Very often Often
77.7% 22.2%
Participant answers on advanced search features Very often Often Rarely
33.3% 50% 16.6%
Preferred sources for online images Google Flickr Specialist
3. **First impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.**

The Malta end user test summary shows that Europeana was found attractive with scores being given 6 and higher on the chart. Moreover, the feedback shows that it was also found fun and well organized. However, some of the test participants found the portal dull and difficult to use. While the majority agreed that the site is interesting and unique. Underneath please find a summary of the data together with a chart with the collective results:

- Unattractive/Attractive – answers between 6 and 9 mostly 6
- Boring/Fun – answers between 6 and 8 mostly 6
- Badly Organised/Well Organised – answers between 6 and 9 mostly 6 and 7
- Dull/Exciting – answers between 4 and 9 mostly 6
- Difficult to use/Easy to use – answers between 3 and 7 mostly 6
- Uninteresting/Interesting – answers between 6 and 10 mostly 6 and 8
- Similar to other sites/Unique – answers between 5 and 9 mostly 5 and 8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unattractive</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Boring</th>
<th>Fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Europeana is about:

According to the comments by the testers the most mentioned descriptions were the following:

- Information/accessibility to information
- Content and resources related to European heritage/history/culture/art
- Knowledge

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.

*Search Options*
The test participants found that when using the search option, language proved to be an issue. Whilst carrying out searches of the same item but in a different language as indicated in the example provided, the results were not the same.

The content related to a period specific search was not successful since the participants were not able to achieve the results that they searched for. The search was quite complicated and results were only achieved after a few attempts when the selected subject which was typed first instead of the author.

My Europeana
The end user test participants found that the save search was complicated; in one incident a participant reported instant logging out from the site. On testing the My Europeana settings most of the participants did not find any difficulties. However, one participant said that none of the previously saved items could be found.

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana). Where necessary please use the quotes from the questionnaires or verbal comments of participants.

I think I will use Europeana because.....

- Has a variety of info,
- It has content deriving from trusted sources that is interesting both for leisure and research since the content is provided from reliable sources.

I would like Europeana to include more

- Content/audio and video,
- Items related to society
- More old photographs and paintings of Malta

In my personal opinion, Europeana

- Is about Europe
- Contains information from trusted resources
- Provides accessibility to content.

Where do you normally get information online?

- Google,
- Wikipedia,
- The odd historical website

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary). Please include 5-6 main suggestions.

I think Europeana can be improved by...

- increasing registered users,
- improved by being able to provide multilingual search results
- being more user friendly by introducing a ‘help’ window
- Provide a more balanced amount of content
- Customized options even for the aesthetic look of ‘My Europeana’
- More interactivity and user contribution
Netherlands (the)

End user testing conducted by: Erfgoed Brabant
Country report prepared by: Cris Kremers
1. Descriptions of test events

A total number of 17 end-users participated in the testing. The participants were recruited from the target groups defined in the EuropeanaLocal End-User Testing Specifications. The following users were recruited:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General user.........</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolchild..........</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic user........</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert researcher....</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional user....</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist authorities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments..........</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total:</td>
<td>17 participants</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tests were all conducted at the offices of Erfgoed Brabant. For practical and logistical reasons; the tests were split up in 6 events during the period from 23/02/2011–25/02/2011:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event date</th>
<th>Participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23/02/2011</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23/02/2011</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/2011</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24/02/2011</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25/02/2011</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total: 17 participants

2. Statistics of the group

Nationality: all participants (17) were from the Netherlands.

Gender

![Gender Chart]

Age

![Age Chart]
3. First impressions of Europeana

Have you seen this logo before?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>64.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you used Europeana before?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for my personal interests</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for my studies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>76.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone told me about it</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone sent me a link</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about it in paper/journal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link from another web site</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link on a blog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can't remember</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How many times have you visited Europeana?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This will be my first visit</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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10-19......................................................... 1 [5.9%]
20-29........................................................... 0 [0.0%]
30-39........................................................... 1 [5.9%]
40-49........................................................... 0 [0.0%]
50-99........................................................... 0 [0.0%]
100+ ......................................................... 0 [0.0%]

How often do you search for information online?

Never......................................................... 0 [0.0%]
Rarely (perhaps only once per month) ............ 2 [11.8%]
Often (once a week)................................. 3 [17.6%]
Very often (almost every day)................. 12 [70.6%]

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

Never......................................................... 6 [35.3%]
Rarely (perhaps only once per month) ............ 4 [23.5%]
Often (once a week)................................. 5 [29.4%]
Very often (almost every day)................. 2 [11.8%]

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

Searching by phrase .................................... 9 [60.0%]
Searching by date........................................ 2 [13.3%]
Searching using Boolean operators .......... 4 [26.7%]

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

A search engine such as Google............... 16 [72.7%]
An image sharing site such as Flickr .......... 2 [9.1%]
A specialist site such as *artcyclopedia.com*... 4  [18.2%]

What objects do you search for most often?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Object Type</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others – please specify ___</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
No.............................................................. 8  [47.1%]
Not sure ....................................................... 1  [5.8%]

*How would you rank the Europeana website:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unattractive</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 3 2 4 2</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boring</th>
<th>Fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1 5 5 1 3 1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Badly organised</th>
<th>Well organised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 2 2 1 6 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dull</th>
<th>Exciting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 1 6 4 2 1 1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficult to use</th>
<th>Easy to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 5 1 3 2 3</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uninteresting</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 4 7 2 1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similar to other</th>
<th>Unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1 3 4 3 4 1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Europeana is about...

"...future"

"...a lot of information"

"...extra"

"...making national heritage accessible on an European scale"

"...the cultural heritage of Europe"

"...diversity"

"...cultural objects"

"...culture inside Europe"

"...history"

"...information" [3]

"...information about Europe"

"...culture"

"...art etc."

"...Europe"

"...culture + history"

"...about searching things"

"...good information"

"...a lot of information about Europe"

"...historical pictures"

"...collections, information, Europe"

"...new possibilities"
"...sharing research"
"...connections"
"...assembly of culture"
"...remembering"
"...past history"
"...photo's, text"
"...collections"
"...heritage"
"...links/connections"
"...us"
"...objects"
"...historical objects and where they are"
"...heritage from all European countries"
"...searching in more collections"

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana

In this section the results of 'Questionnaire part 3' are summarized and presented per selected question. Most participants expressed themselves in Dutch. Those answers were translated from Dutch to English.

- I think Europeana can be improved by...

  "More information on the homepage"
  "The use of 'help pop-ups' to clarify the different elements"
  "If more content on Europeana is divided by certain subjects"
  "Providing even more information with bigger pictures"
  "Giving more context (text) with the pictures"
"using more colour in the user interface"

"providing more local and regional information/objects"

"a better search algorithm. Many times the objects which had the search words in it’s title weren’t at the top of the list."

"improving the user interface of the website. Now it is too complicated"

"using a better information architecture"

"making the navigation facets on the left more visible"

"a more userfriendly structure of the information"

"a better design of the site"

"improving 'Refine Search'. By making it simpler en more discoverable"

"Switch the positions of 'Login' and 'Register'. Register should be first."

"making de design more attractive"

"using bigger pictures"

"providing more browsing options besides the search box"

• I would like Europeana to include more...

"information!"

"photographs"

"historical movies"

"there is more than enough information on Europeana"

"more diverse information"

"non-object cultural heritage"

"music from the past"

"movies and audio"
"modern art"

"lyrics from old songs"

"information of the provinces in Europe"

• For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because...

Only two participants (who were schoolchildren) answered this question:

"it provides a lot of information"

"if the question is about culture I can find the answer on Europeana"

• In my personal opinion, Europeana...

"is very interesting"

"is fun"

"is interesting in its idea (in 'theory') but too user-unfriendly in the way it is actually structured"

"a total package of information"

"a good and new site"

"has a lot of historical and cultural information about Europe"

"is comparable to Google"

"has a lot of potential"

"is a trusted source for cultural information"

• What are you favourite sites for schoolwork?

Only two participants answered this question (because they were schoolchildren):

"Google, Wikipedia"
"Google, Wikipedia and from now on Europeana"

• Where do you normally get information online?

Almost every participant mentioned Google and Wikipedia.

"Google"

"Wikipedia"

"Google, Wikipedia and from now on Europeana"

5. Lasting impressions

Part of the results of 'Questionnaire part 3' are summarized and presented here per selected question. Most participants expressed themselves in Dutch. Those answers were translated from Dutch to English.

• I think I will use/not use Europeana because...

Most of the 17 participants expressed to use Europeana in the future:

"to look up cultural information"

"to expand their cultural knowledge"

"if I want to find information for school assignments"

"it's a good source for school presentations"

"to find information"

"to search for historical objects"

One participant won't use Europeana again because 'of its user-unfriendly structure'.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants
The six main suggestions for improving Europeana were (based upon the answers from *Questionnaire part 3*):

- a better and more attractive design,
- a better information architecture (more themes, subjects, better browsing),
- adding even more content,
- using bigger pictures for the objects,
- a better search algorithm,
- multilingual search; when you search for 'church', you must also find the other language terms for 'church' (like: 'kerk' (Dutch), 'Kirche' (German) etc.)

7. Comments of the moderator

Observing the participants during testing I noticed a few things that didn't come forward in the answers of the participants. I think it is important to mention these observations here:

- Only 2 persons (of the 17 participants) noticed the navigation facets ('Refine your search') on the left. Therefore, most people had trouble refining their search. This could be improved if the navigation facets were made more visible to the user.

- About a quarter of the participants got lost in the linked websites (were the actual content is). Some were even performing search queries on these sites instead of on Europeana.

- More than half of the participants had trouble understanding the functionality of the site.

- Most participants didn't click on the thumbnail-image. They weren't aware the thumbnails were a gateway to a bigger picture of the object. They thought the thumbnail was as big the picture would get. After a while they seemed to lose interest because of the small pictures.

- Most of the participants had trouble with the language aspect of Europeana. They were mainly confused by the different languages the content is described in. English, French, German... anything is possible. They wanted to have more content available in their native language.

- Only 2 participants noticed the 'Browse through time' timeline. Because of usability problems with the timeline it wasn't of much use to them.
Norway

End user testing conducted by: Sogn og Fjordane County
Country report prepared by: Elin Østevik
Country Test Report Norway

A total number of 43 end-users participated in the testing in Norway. The participants were recruited from 6 of the 7 target groups defined in the EuropeanaLocal End-User Testing Specifications. For practical reasons five separate test events were conducted. The testing was conducted in Norwegian with a Norwegian version of the questionnaire. Quotes from end-users included in this report have been translated from Norwegian to English.

1. Test events

Test event 1 was conducted on 29 November 2010 at The County Archives in Sogn og Fjordane. 7 professional users participated.

Test event 2 was conducted on 17 December 2010 at Sogn og Fjordane County Municipality. The group, counting 7 participants, was a mixed one and consisted of general users, professional users, academic users and representatives from the regional government level.

Test event 3 was conducted on 10 January 2011 at Sogn og Fjordane University College. 3 end-users from the academic and expert researcher groups participated.

Test event 4 was conducted on 11 January 2011 at Leikanger secondary school. 13 school children participated.

Test event 5 was conducted on 13 January 2011 at Leikanger secondary school. 13 school children participated.

2. Statistics of the group

Demography

Nationality: Norwegian (40); Icelandic (1); Polish (1); Eritrean (1).

Gender:  
  Female (26);  
  male (17).
Age:

- Under 15 (26);
- 19-24 (1);
- 25-34 (5);
- 35-39 (5);
- 45-49 (3);
- 55-59 (2);
- 60-64 (1).

**Background information: Internet habits and prior knowledge of Europeana**

79% of the end-users had not used Europeana before. 82.6% used the internet often (42%) or very often (44.2%). The majority of the end-users used a search engine to find information online (for school children this number was 100%). 30% of end-users used the advanced search functionalities offered by search engines often or very often. Google and Wikipedia were mentioned most often by end-users as their favorite websites for school/work/studies.

**3. First impressions of Europeana**

The end-users ranked Europeana as follows (summary):

- Unattractive – Attractive: 6.6
- Boring – Fun: 6
- Badly organized – Well organized: 7.6
- Dull – Exciting: 6.6
- Difficult to use – Easy to use: 7.6
- Uninteresting – Interesting: 6.9
- Similar to other sites – Unique: 6.4
### Actual numbers:

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unattractive</strong></td>
<td>1 1 2 4 11 11 6 4 1</td>
<td><strong>Attractive</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                |                        |                  |
| **Boring**     | 1 4 1 11 8 1 5 2       | **Fun**          |
|                | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10   |                  |

|                |                        |                  |
| **Badly organised** | 1 1 4 5 6 11 1 4     | **Well organised** |
|                | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  |                  |

|                |                        |                  |
| **Dull**       | 1 2 2 7 11 6 5 7 2    | **Exciting**     |
|                | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  |                  |

|                |                        |                  |
| **Difficult to use** | 1 1 4 2 7 16 6 6  | **Easy to use** |
|                | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  |                  |

|                |                        |                  |
| **Uninteresting** | 1 1 3 5 5 9 11 6 2 | **Interesting** |
|                | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  |                  |

|                |                        |                  |
| **Similar to other sites** | 3 3 11 4 9 6 4 3 | **Unique**       |
|                | 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10  |                  |
In response to what Europeana is about, three main tendencies could be indentified in the answers:

1. Dissemination; information to all; one access point to information/content.
2. Culture; cultural heritage; history; society.
3. “Things”: Photos; books; paintings; videos; music; art; objects; resources, etc.

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana

Language issues

The language options offered by Europeana are confusing. It is not immediately clear to users that when they change the language in the dropdown menu on the front page, what they are doing is in fact only changing the language of the interface. Furthermore having to browse through a number of two-letter codes in order to refine a search by language was perceived as not being particularly user-friendly. The fact that search results vary widely according to which language one is using when searching was perceived as a problem.

Search by date / finding content related to a time period

Finding content related to a specific time period was reported as being either impossible or difficult by the end-users. The fact that dates are listed according to number of items associated with them rather than chronologically in the refine your search list, was reported as making it more difficult to find the content one was looking for.

My Europeana

When clicking on “My Europeana” one is sent directly to the login/registration page, and this login/registration page is lacking information about what My Europeana is and what the benefits of registering are. Because of this lack of information the end-users questioned whether persons with no prior knowledge of Europeana/My Europeana would be motivated to register for My Europeana.
The school children particularly were skeptical about registering, and a number of them opted not to do exercises 4-6. The reasons they gave for not wanting to register was that they feared they would get spammed by Europeana, they were not allowed to register at web sites without their parents’ permission or simply that they didn’t want to do it.

There is a bug in My Europeana: You get thrown out and have to log back in when you try to add a tag. This bug was reported back to Europeana in November, and still remained to be sorted out at the last test event. Bugs and errors like this needs to be fixed fast, end-users felt. Academic users particularly stressed this point – if a teacher is going to use Europeana in class he/she must be confident that the portal works like it should or at least that bugs/errors get fixed within a reasonable time period.

5. Lasting impressions

Intent to use

83,3% of end-users intend to use Europeana. The majority state that they will use Europeana because it offers information and content of high quality from trusted sources, and because Europeana makes it easier to find information/content from various sources.

School children make up 85,7% of end-users with no intention to use Europeana. Prior experience with/habit of using Google and/or Wikipedia, and an opinion of these services as being better than Europeana was given as the reason for not intending to use Europeana.

It is my personal opinion that Europeana… (a selection of quotes)

- “can become too big”
- “is a good website, but too difficult to use for some age groups”
- “is not better than Google”
- “is a good website where I can find information that I trust and need”
- “has potential”
- “seems somewhat unfinished”
- “is not as intuitive as it ought to be”
- “is interesting. To gather the information in one place is a good idea. I will use it in class”
- “can become a good and useful tool”
- “is exciting and probably useful”
- “is big – you can find a lot of content here, but it can become too big”
- “is an OK website, but I don’t use it”
- “can improve”
- “is an ordinary website”
- “is useful for those interested in culture and in regards to schoolwork”
- “is a good search portal, but I think I will use Google more than Europeana”
- “is pretty good”
- “is an important contribution towards making cultural heritage more accessible”
- “at present is confusing and somewhat bothersome to use, but the idea of a common European search portal is very good”

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test group participants

Improvement of the search refinement functionality

Participants suggested that Europeana could be improved by adding more categories to the “refine your search” section. They also suggested that the search refinement be improved by listing the refinement options chronologically and alphabetically, i.e. that dates are listed chronologically and providers/languages/countries alphabetically rather than ranked by number of related content items. The participants would also have preferred three-letter codes or the full names of languages to be listed rather than the two-letter codes when refining a search by language.

Language

The language aspects of the portal were confusing to many end-users, and language issues were discussed at all test events. Several comments and recommendations for improvements were made:

1) It should be clearly stated what one is doing by choosing/changing language in the drop-down list on the front page (that is; only changing the language of the interface).

2) There should be the option of searching by language in the advanced search.

3) When refining by language one gets hits in other languages than the language one has chosen. The refinement by language should be associated with the language of the content items and not the official language of the provider.
4) The English version of Europeana automatically loads – the portal should be able to recognize which country the users are coming from and load the appropriate version of the site.

5) Europeana should include translation software or a dictionary. Translating more metadata to English was also suggested, since that would make more content accessible to a large number of users.

More and better content and metadata

Participants from all user groups commented that Europeana could be improved by adding more and better quality content and metadata. The fact that the quality of for example images varies from small thumbnails (or in some cases non-existent digital content) to large high-resolution files, was seen as problem. The same issue was mentioned in relation to the quality of metadata. Particularly school children commented that they wanted Europeana to include more information about the objects.

The participants also mentioned specific content types that they wanted Europeana to include more of; maps, sounds and videos were most frequently mentioned. Moreover the participants would like to see Europeana include newer content as well.

7. Comments of the moderator

Europeana would most likely benefit from adding more information about the various functionalities and search refinements it offers, and increase the visibility of this information. As mentioned above the participants particularly found the various options related to language in the portal confusing, and they also mentioned the need for more information about My Europeana at the registration/login page. The “Using Europeana” section does not include information about language, and has a barely visible placing on the page. The participants did not go to the “Using Europeana” section when they had difficulties doing the exercises, but rather asked for help from the moderator.
Poland

End user testing conducted by: Poznańskie Centrum Superkomputerowo-Sieciowe
Country report prepared by: Agnieszka Lewandowska, Marcin Werla
Country Test Report Poland

As required by EuropeanaLocal project, Poznan Supercomputing and Networking Center performed a series of end-user tests in Poland. The tests were conducted between 15th and 28th January 2011 by a group of thirteen moderators in accordance with EuropeanaLocal End-User Testing Specification prepared by Olga McHenry.

1.1 Organization

To achieve best possible feedback from the participants, special emphasis was put on the close cooperation with moderators. Small test groups were organized of one or two persons each. This method was chosen to minimise the possible group influence on the individual opinion, also known as the “bandwagon effect”.

There was only one case when a group of seven people (professional users) was questioned at once, due to logistical issues in their workplace.

In order to be able to test many small groups, thirteen volunteers (already familiar with Europeana and the digital libraries domain) were trained to conduct the tests. They later led twenty eight test sessions with forty four end users. All of the sessions took place in the Greater Poland region: most in Poznań (twenty five), two in Swarzędz and one in Konin.

1.2 Questionnaires

As the questionnaires from the tests specification were written in English, for the purpose of conducting the tests in Poland they were translated into Polish. This allowed to include users independently of the knowledge of English. An obvious consequence of this decisions was presenting the Europeana portal always in the Polish version of the interface. Presumably it also helped to test the Polish interface.

Furthermore some exercises were adjusted to cover the actual available at a time of testing functionality in Europeana.eu. The following task from the third annex of the test specification:

“Choose settings of ‘My Europeana’ best fitting your needs. Save them.”

was changed due to the lack of any settings options in ‘My Europeana’. Task was transformed into a question connected with the settings in user space:
“What settings do you miss in ‘My Europeana’?”
This was done to minimise the confusion of tests participants.

Finally, as an optional seventh exercise, the following question about hometown was added:

"Find objects connected with your hometown? Is there something missing?"
This was done in order to stimulate natural interest of the found objects among the end-users and also to test the visibility of local content in Europeana and expectations of users towards it.

2 Description of test events

During ten days of January twenty eight test sessions were run by thirteen moderators in three different cities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th># of end-users</th>
<th># of events</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2011-01-15</td>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-01-18</td>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-01-20</td>
<td>Poznań, Swarzęd</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-01-21</td>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-01-22</td>
<td>Poznań, Konin</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-01-23</td>
<td>Poznań, Swarzęd</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-01-24</td>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-01-25</td>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-01-26</td>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011-01-28</td>
<td>Poznań</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As required, users from all seven target groups were questioned. The least represented groups were government and professional users – both had only one participant. The most numerous was that of general users, with exactly twenty people. Other groups counted at least four participants.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group</th>
<th># of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General user</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolchild</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic user</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert researcher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional user</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3 Statistics of the group

3.1 Demographic data

All participants were Poles. There were slightly more women (57%) than men (43%), but nothing can be said about the significant dominance of any sex as you can see in the Figure 1.

People from all age groups were tested, most of them between 19 and 40 year of life (68%). A histogram of the age groups is shown in the Figure 2. The exact numbers are in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th># of participants</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15-18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13.64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>34.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20.45%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 60</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.27%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1: Participants’ sex
3.2 Familiarity with Europeana

Most of the participants had not seen the Europeana logo before (32 persons, 73%). Nine persons (20%) had already been familiar with the logo. The rest (3 persons, 7%) were unsure if they recognized it.

Similar situation was encountered when users were asked about using Europeana. Thirty nine (88%) people had never used it before. Three users (7%) had used it for their personal interests and two (5%) for their studies. What is interesting, all users who had used Europeana before, had visited the site because someone told them about it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How many times have you visited Europeana?</th>
<th># of users</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This will be my first visit</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Furthermore only thirty seven people where on the European site for the first time (as you can see in the table above). Comparing with thirty nine users who have never used Europeana before, we can see that two of them had visited the site, but had not used it.
3.3 Search habits
Almost all users (41 persons, 93%) search for information on-line often or very often. There was no single person who had never done it. And only five participants had never used an advanced search before.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question – How often do you...</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Rarely</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>search for information on-line?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>use advanced search features?</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The advanced search feature which users are most confident in is searching by phrase (28 persons, 63%). The runner-up is searching by date (10 persons, 22%) and last (not far away) – searching using Boolean operators (8 persons, 18%).

Participants most often search for text (42 persons, 95%), then for images (16 persons, 36%); only ten persons (22%) for video and eight (18%) for audio. Almost all participants (41 persons, 93%) use Google for searching for images on-line. Only four persons (9%) use Flickr. No one reported using more specialized sites.

3.4 Interest in culture
Two thirds of participants are interested in links between cultures. Almost half of them have never studied any foreign culture in depth before. Similarly, half of them think that we are not losing our cultural identity, in contrast to one fourth thinking the other way around. Finally only one third have been involved in local culture projects.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Not sure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are you interested in links between cultures?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are people losing their cultural identity?</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have you been involved in local culture project?</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.5 Information sources
As it was expected, most participants get information via Google (36 persons, 81%). Far behind Google is Wikipedia with seven votes (15%) and then digital libraries and GoogleBooks, both with a one vote (2%).

When the sites used for homework are considered, numbers are different: Google – 11 persons (25%), Wikipedia – 9 persons (20%), digital libraries – 2 persons (4%) and PubMed – 1 person (2%).
Based on the above numbers it can be assumed that people are not bound to any specialized site (except from Wikipedia for homework). They prefer using a general-purpose search engine which redirects them to (or so they think) the most appropriate site, rather than any other specialized source of information.

4 First impressions of Europeana

4.1 Europeana ranking

Below are the calculated coefficients for different characteristics of Europeana.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
<th>Min.</th>
<th>Max.</th>
<th>Std. dev.</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mode</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well organised</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>6.70</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As it can be noticed, minimal and maximal values range from the worst to the best possible rank. Standard deviation is usually near two, which is a medium value for a ten-point scale. Moreover, the histogram in the Figure shows that among participants there was no strong common opinion on any of the given attributes.

What can be deduced from the histogram and coefficients is that the site is ‘interesting’ and ‘easy to use’ in most cases. The median and mode are at the level of eight which means that at least half of the users graded eight points for those attributes. The worst assessed characteristic is ‘fun’. Average value, median and mode are five, which means that the site neither is boring nor fun.

The interesting case is ‘attractiveness’. The most frequent value is seven (assessed by one fourth of users), also the median is seven. However the average value is a little more than six. It means that there are ranks substantially lower than seven and values larger than seven do not overweight those low numbers. It makes the average value lower than median and mode value. Similar case is with ‘uniqueness’ and ‘easiness of use’.


4.2 Europeana is about...

From all users associations only those which were repeated at least two times (not always identically, but in a way which was similar enough) are included. For some original ideas exceptions were made. The number of users who entered that association is given in brackets.

- Place where you can find interesting things (12).
- Digital library, museum and archive with diverse resources (8).
- Search engine (7).
- Set of valuable information about European and world culture (6).
- Aid in learning (6).
- Site promoting culture of different countries (5).
- Cultural institutions and their resources in one place (4).
- Web page (4).
- New ways of accessing information (3).
- Web page for people interested in culture (3).
- Unknown page which is insufficiently promoted (3).
- Good, needed idea (2).
- Tool of work (2).
- Easy access (2).
- Integration agent of European culture (1).
- Cultures aggregator (1).
5 Deeper impressions of Europeana

5.1 Language issue – exercise 1
All users observed that language influenced search results. Some voiced their concerns that it should be improved in order to get better search results. Language was also an issue while reading objects descriptions. Descriptions are in different languages depending on the provider. It irritated some of participants, because they could not understand what kind of the search result they found.

5.2 Time period - exercise 2
Most participants found it extremely difficult to retrieve publications connected with a specific period of time. It was more intuitive for them to enter a phrase “1780-1880” in the simple or advanced search box (which returned no results), rather than use refinements. One of the reasons can be a problem with noticing refinements on the left side. Some blamed it on the grayish background and font colors used or on folded refinements details. If they noticed a data refinement box, it was an arduous task to mark all one hundred and one dates (also because of the unnatural order of the dates in the refinement component). Thus they would usually stopped checking dates after a minute with few dates chosen. Of course there were isolated cases when users chose the search results view called "browse through time" (but it was often unseen!). Then it was easier for them to distinguish objects from given time period.

It was also illogical for them that they cannot do the same thing with the advanced search that they can do with refinements (other example: choosing language or provider).

5.3 Relevance of objects – exercise 3
Most participants accomplished this task without any problems. There were some cases when refinement by the data provider was impossible to find. Sometimes they tried to enter the provider name in the advanced search box, but it did not return anything. Sometimes participants stated that term "provider" was unclear for them. Those who completed the task in majority stated that the displayed objects are relevant.

5.4 User space – exercise 4, 5 and 6
Almost one fourth (ca. 10 people) of test participants were unable to register or had problems while registering. There were two main symptoms: after registration they could not log in or the email with registration information did not come. In several cases people could not understand
what is the difference between logging and registering (especially older people). It should be clarified. But the main obstacle was finding the proper link to the logging/registration page. Many times it was easier to notice it on the search results page on the left side under the refinements box than in the header of each page of Europeana. The main reason is probably the incorrect translation of the link in the header, originally “My Europeana”, into Polish “Zachowaj w Moja Europeana”, which in fact means “Save in My Europeana”. Other said that the standard term “My Europeana” is also unintuitive.

When a task required search refinement by language, the same problems were observed as with the refinement by date in the third exercise (unnoticed refinement functionality or using advanced search first). Moreover, using two-letter codes for languages (!), not their names, was a big problem to overcome for many.

Also, a link for saving searches was hard to find on the spot. Some users suggested that putting it closer to the search box is more intuitive.

What is interesting, more than thirty people did not answer the question about what settings they would like to have in their user space. One user explained that he never uses such functionality on any web site.

5.5 Local content
Although many users were able to find content connected with their hometown, there were voices that there are too few such resources. Especially with images, videos and objects from other cultural institutions than libraries (e.g.: from well-known museums in the city). In spite of that they were positively surprised that such content was already in Europeana.

6 Lasting impressions – intention to use Europeana

6.1 Intention to use
The substantial majority (70%) have declared that they will use Europeana (see the Figure 4) even though many voiced their concerns about different parts of the Europeana portal.
Furthermore participants declared that their standard search engine will be still Google, as they assume that Google will have all results from Europeana. Only if they do not find anything interesting via Google, they will use Europeana.

6.2 More in Europeana

Despite the fact that Europeana has currently more that fifteen million digital objects, people want more and more resources, especially contemporary works and objects from Poland (maybe the reason is the language issue). Some have specifically pinpointed video (6 people), image (6 people) and audio (4 people) objects.

Others wanted to see more museums, archives and audio-visual collections. A professional user regretted that not all digital libraries which he uses on daily basis are visible via Europeana. There was even a suggestion that giving the exact number and a list of content providers (in contrast to the list of aggregators) would be a big incentive.

6.3 Personal opinions

Below most frequent or most interesting personal opinions are cited. Similar sentences were merged into one. The numbers added in brackets indicate how many users has expressed the given opinion.

Europeana...

• is an interesting site (6).
• has great potential (5).
• is a good idea (5).
• needs more work (5).

Figure 4: Intention to use Europeana in future
• is useful (5).
• is hard to understand at the beginning (4).
• makes many cultural resources available (3).
• is more useful for pupils, students and researchers than for common people (3).
• is interesting for people connected in any way with culture (3).
• is helpful in finding something very specific (2).
• is not interesting (2).
• is an unknown search engine (lack of promotion) (2).
• has a big advantage – no advertisements (1).
• is only for computer literate people (1).

7 Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants

7.1 Recommendations

• Sending the email with registration information faster.
• In the search results page, when refining by date, the dates should be sorted by date, not by the number of search results.
• Strongly advised full translation into Polish language. Some improvements also have to be made (e.g.: in the footer, the word ‘Privacy’ is translated into ‘Serbia’ in the Polish version of the interface, also ‘Using Europeana’ and ‘Language Policy’ from the footer are improperly translated).
• More frequent updates from content providers.
• Better user-interface (layout, design) with easy-to-find F.A.Q., tutorials and ‘about’ information.
• More search options, e.g. distinguished search functionality for time periods or geographical places (for example: disambiguation of different geographical locations with the same name).
• Multilingualism/cross-language features – the query language should not influence search results (it should be automatically translated into other languages).
• In the search results view, there should be an option to go to the first or the last page.
• In user space, add history of searches.
• In user space, add an option for saving default language of search results.
• In user space, add recommended resources based on previous users searches.
• In user space, add grouping of saved searches/tags/objects according to chosen label defined by a user.
• In user space, add sorting of saved searches/tags/objects.
• In user space, improve saved searches description. Sometimes it is impossible to distinguish two different searches according to its label.
• Add user forum.
• For logged-in users, add a possibility to personalize Europeana, e.g.: changing site colors, adding your own picture.
• Browsing functionality would be a nice feature for the first-time users.

7.2 Bugs
• In advanced search, when you enter a search query only in the second field, there is an error message after search execution.
• When users choose the Polish version of the Europeana interface, the email with the registration information comes in English.
• When user was logged-in, there were repeated problems with saving search results.
• Users were often logged out by surprise in different moments while using Europeana.

8 Comments of the moderator

8.1 First contact with Europeana
Some users expressed their initial attitude towards Europeana as expecting something like Wikipedia with objects described as in an encyclopedia. They could not explain what was the reason of this association.

While participants where getting to know Europeana, they usually chose between two approaches. The first was experimenting with the search functionality of Europeana, checking the results description and then results content on the providers sites. This one was more common with younger users (e.g. school children). The other approach was reading all possible descriptions of the portal (e.g.: ‘about’ information, FAQ) and then, optionally, searching for something.

It was also noticed by participants that the content type distinction into texts, images, sounds and videos is very well resolved.
8.2 Viewing content
Viewing content on the providers site often created confusion because of redirecting away from the original site. Additionally the sites are not even similar and differ for each data provider. Moreover there was a question about content availability and how often it is checked by Europeana.

Many times paid access was discouraging.

In some cases, the content was very small and similar to a thumbnail, so had no practical use to the participants. Sometimes it deviated from the description, e.g. it was described as a song, but there was only music with no singing.

8.3 Searching
While performing searching tasks, many users tried to use the Google query syntax for advanced search features. It seems that Google, by its popularity, has created a standard. As users are usually reluctant to learn new ways of doing the same thing, it could be a good pattern to follow.

Refinements were usually very hard to find at the beginning.

Sorting sequence for search results is confusing.

In the object description, when the object had no thumbnail, users usually had no idea how to get to the content. The link at the bottom right is completely unnoticeable. On the other hand, with thumbnails it was natural to click on the image.

8.4 Catching users attention
It is a good idea to show users the interesting aspects of Europeana and why it is worth to use it. Unfortunately, the exhibition widget was usually unnoticed and rarely clicked. Those who chose exhibitions were satisfied with the one about art-nouveau. On the other hand, exhibitions based simply on searching were confusing and users browsed away fast.
Portugal

End user testing conducted by: Fundação Museu Nacional Ferroviário
Country report prepared by: Maria José Teixeira, António Vieira
Country Test Report Portugal

1. **Description of test events**

End-user testing activities were conducted following specifications, instructions and methodology provided by EuropeanaLocal.

For practical reasons the questionnaire was translated into Portuguese language to guarantee the good understanding of questions, by all participants.

In order to guarantee a reasonable sample of potential end-users we requested the support of four entities to help us organizing four End-user testing sessions. End-users, in a total of 48, were invited and recruited by those entities that are:

- **Câmara Municipal de Vila Nova de Famalicão** (Municipality of Vila Nova de Famalicão) with the help of the Escola Secundária Camilo Castelo Branco (Middle School Camilo Castelo Branco);

- **ISEL – Instituto Superior de Engenharia de Lisboa** (Lisbon’s Engineering Institute);

- **Câmara Municipal de Lisboa – Rede de Bibliotecas Públicas** (Lisbon’s Municipality – Public Libraries Network);

- **Câmara Municipal de Oeiras – Biblioteca Municipal de Oeiras** (Oeiras’s Municipality – Oeiras Public Library).

### Test events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Number of participants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19 January</td>
<td>Vila Nova de Famalicão – Escola Secundária Camilo Castelo Branco</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 January</td>
<td>Lisboa - ISEL</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 January</td>
<td>Lisboa - Biblioteca Municipal</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were recruited from the groups General User; Schoolchild; Academic User and Professional user.

All four sessions were conducted by the moderator and followed the proposed methodology with small adjustments. In the beginning of each session the moderator provided a concise introduction to Europeana and to EuropeanaLocal project; Questionnaire part 3 was integrated in a conducted group discussion.

2. CHARACTERISTICS OF PARTICIPANTS

2.1 Gender of participants

20 Female (41, 67%); 28 Male (58, 33%).

2.2 Age of participants

None under 15; 10 between 15-18 (20,83%); 10 between 19-24 (20,83%); 5 between 25-34 (10,42%); 10 between 35-44 (20,83%); 6 between 45-54 (12,50%) and one with more 65 (2,08%)
2.3 Web searching

Most of participants referred and show evidence of very high web searching skills. 39 participants (81, 25 %) search information online very often (almost every day); 7 participants (14, 58%) search information often (more or less once in a week) and only 2 participants (4, 17%) referred that they rarely search information online.

23 Participants (47,92%) referred that they use very often advanced search features offered by search engines; 11 (22,92%) said that they rarely use these features and the same number referred that they often use advanced features. 3 Participants (6, 25%) never use advanced features offered by web search engines. When advanced features of search engines are used, 39 participants (81, 25 %) search by phrase.

If searching images, 44 participants (91, 67%) referred that they will use a search engine such as Google to do that web search.

Participants referred that search for most often texts followed by images and then video.

2.4 Cultural approach

Most of the participants are interested in links between different cultures with 35 (72,92%) responding yes; 8 participants (16,67%) are not interested and 5 (10,42%) are not sure if they are interested or not.
34 participants (70.83%) have not studied in depth any foreign culture; 12 (25%), respond that they didn’t studied any foreign culture, till the moment.

35 participants (72.92%) have not been involved in any project related to preservation of local traditions and customs against 10 (20.83%) whose have been involved in this kind of projects.

For 23 participants (47.92%) - people are losing their cultural identity; for 16 (33, 33%) - people are not losing their cultural identity and 9 (18.75%) are not sure about the response.

3. **FIRST IMPRESSIONS OF EUROPEANA**

Most participants (33) 68, 75% were not familiar with Europeana and have not seen the Europeana logo before. 14 recognized (29, 17%) it, 10 people who respond yes work in libraries, archives or museums.
38 (79,17%) participants never used Europeana. 9 participants have used it before and one did not remember if he used it before or not.

For the 9 people that used Europeana before (three from them belong to the professional group) they find out about it from different sources. 4 refereed that they known Europeana because someone told them about it; 1 because someone sent a link to him and 4 because of EuropeanaLocal National meeting.

As it was most participants did not know about Europeana. As a result of this, for 39 people (81,25%) end –users tests events were the first visit to Europeana. For 4 people (8, 33%) they visited Europeana 2-4 times; for 3 people (6,25%) for 5-9 times and finally, 2 people respond that have visited Europeana 10-19 times.

To gather first impressions of participants on Europeana portal it was also used questionnaire part 2. First impressions were most positive than negative. Participants said that Europeana is well organized and interesting but not much attractive or fun. Please see graphic representation below.
Opinions are very divergent among the different evaluation criteria. Below is the average of all participants:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impression</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>6,02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>5,46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well organized</td>
<td>7,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>6,08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>6,77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>6,88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>6,52</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Europeana is about....*

There are different perceptions about what Europeana is. Here we present the most common ones.
### Key words / Phrases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key words / Phrases</th>
<th>Number of references</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Culture / Europe</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Content/ multimedia content/ Digital content</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Online library/Libraries</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries, museums, archives</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Heritage preservation</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Deeper Impressions of Europeana**

4.1 **Language (Exercise 1):** It was noted that language is a problem as searches results are different, depending on the language; language limits the use of Europeana as it limits the results of searches. Participants commented some inconsistencies in the searching results, e.g. always more results in English than in other languages.

4.2 **Usability (Exercise 2):** Most participants had difficulties in finding the content.

4.3 **Usability (Exercise 3):** Most participants were successful in finding the information but they said that it takes too much time.

4.4 **Usability (Exercise 4):** No problems in registering in Europeana but some participants needed to be helped to find where this functionality is. The group from Vila Nova de Famalicão could not use this functionality because of school network specifications. For this reason they didn’t do exercises 5 and 6.

4.5 **Usability (Exercise 5):** Most participants were successful in finding the information. But most of them said that it was not easy to do. Participants suggested that should be used a more understandable classification for the different languages as for some of the languages is impossible to understand what language is. Shown the complete name (full text) would be better understandable.
4.6 Usability (Exercice 6): Impossible to choose settings in My Europeana. Participants mentioned that should be provided more functionalities such as the option to add favorites (contents, content providers, geo reference for spaces/cities/ countries); it should has historic for searches.

5. LASTING IMPRESSIONS AND INTENTIONS TO USE EUROPEANA

The lasting impressions of participants were collected through an oral discussion with the moderator using as guide the questions of Questionnaire Part 3 of the specifications. In this report are the most common answers.

5.1 Europeana can be improved by...

- including more Cultural content of more entities around Europe;
- having a better performance in search results;
- having a better search engine, more easy to use and not sensible to capital letters and accents;
- including a clear button to back to homepage;
- including more scientific content;
- including more contemporary information;
- having a better and most intuitive interface;
- having a better content organization;
- searching engine more similar to Google;
- having more advanced search options and better possibilities for searching refine;
- having help tips;
- having a most attractive layout and logo;
- having a sitemap;
- offering direct translations tools;
including FAQs.

5.2 I think I will use/use not Europeana because...

Most of participants were planning to use Europeana in the future mostly for personal reasons rather than for professional because it stills is not reliable to be used in professional environment because of its search constrains and still lack of contents.

Most of the young students from the Middle school testing event said that probably they will not use Europeana again because it is difficult to use and contemporary content is missing.

Most of the teachers from ISEL said that probably they will not use Europeana because the content is not directly related with their work but some of them will use it for personal reasons.

5.3 I would like Europeana to include more...

Young students from the Middle school said that they would like Europeana to include more music and more “out of the box” cultural content as well a different approach to Culture. They ask the moderator who is deciding in each country what Culture is and should be included in Europeana.

Professors from ISEL would like that Europeana include more scientific and technical content.

5.4 For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because...

For half of the participants Europeana will not be of help; for the other half it will be of help because it aggregates several different and reliable databases as well as reliable content sources. Participants also referred that besides the catalogue the fact of having the digital object related to the description is of great help.

5.5 In my personal opinion, Europeana....
For most of participants Europeana is an extraordinary idea and could be a huge instrument of European cohesion and promotion. It was also referred that Europeana could be a cooperation engine among European Countries.

It was also mentioned that there is many work to do and Europeana should be referred to as a “work in progress”.

Participants also mentioned that in what searching is concerned Europeana should be more Google alike.

5.6 What are your favorite’s sites for school work /work?

Generally participants search and get online Information using Google, what includes Google maps; Google books; Google scholar, Google Images. It was interesting to realize that no one was able to mention the name of other search engine besides Google. Wikipedia was listed in second place. Online encyclopedias and dictionaries were also mentioned. Teachers from ISEL referred specific databases as ELSEVIER and ISI web of knowledge. Youtube was also named by many participants.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by test-group participants

There are many positive comments.

Participants were very optimist and confident that as Europeana is a work-in-progress and more content is coming and search engine will get better. The conjunction of these two factors will lead to a better Europeana. It was also said that Eurpeana is a great idea and is extraordinary to have all that cultural content in only one portal.

It was said that for Europeana to be competitive and effectively used, European countries should have more cultural contents available thought it otherwise Europeana will miss its European scope.

The need of National promotion and dissemination was strengthen. Participants believe that increasing the number of users will press cultural institutions to have their content in Europeana. Some suggestions were made for a bigger dissemination in Portugal e.g. to involve public libraries in dissemination campaigns for general users and teachers; to ask municipalities to put Europeana link in their homepages and to organize dissemination sessions in the universities.
The most frequently mentioned suggestions to improvement were, as already said, related to the need of increase of cultural content for many countries, including Portugal, as well as the few flexibility of search engine comparing it with Google. Search functionalities and tools need to be improved in order to achieve better results without spending too much time.
Romania

End user testing conducted by: Biblioteca Judeteana "Octavian Goga" Cluj
Country report prepared by: Sorina Stanca
1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

There were organized 3 events:

In Iasi at University Library, on January 4th 2011 - 7 participants
In Cluj-Napoca at Cluj County Library, on January 7th 2011 - 8 participants
In Piatra Neamt at Neamt County Library, on January the 10th 2011 - 7 participants

Total 22 participants

2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)

Schoolchildren - 2
Academic users (both students and teachers) - 17
Professional users (e.g. librarian, archivist) - 3

Country of origin: Romania

Sex: M 15
F 7

Age:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Under 15</th>
<th>15-18</th>
<th>19-24</th>
<th>25-40</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. First impressions of Europeana (summary).

Have you seen this logo before?
Yes – 10
No - 8
Not sure - 4

Have you used Europeana before?
Yes, for my personal interests - 8
Yes, for my studies - 4
No - 8
Not sure - 2

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?
Someone told me about it -2
Someone sent me a link - 1
Read about it in paper/journal - 5
Link from another web site - 3
Link on a blog - 7
I can’t remember - 3
Other - 1

How many times have you visited Europeana?
This will be my first visit 8
2-4 5
5-9 1
10-19 4
How often do you search for information online?

Never - 0

Rarely (perhaps only once per month) - 5

Often (once a week) – 3

Very often (almost every day) - 12

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

Never - 2

Rarely (perhaps only once per month) - 5

Often (once a week) - 4

Very often (almost every day) - 11

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities” - 12

Searching by date - 6

Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London” - 4
If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

A search engine such as Google - 17
An image sharing site such as Flickr - 2
A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images – 3

What objects do you search for most often?

Texts - 15
Images - 13
Audio - 4
Video - 8
Others – please specify: e-books

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

Yes - 17
No - 3
Not sure - 2

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

Yes - 8
No - 10
Not sure - 4

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?
Yes - 11
No - 5
Not sure - 6

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?
Yes – 5
No – 14
Not sure - 3

4. **Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary)**

*How would you rank the Europeana website:*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unattractive</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boring</th>
<th>1 8 7 3 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Badly organised</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Well organised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dull</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1 0</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficult to use</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>Easy to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uninteresting</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Europeana is about...

- Multiculturalism
- Creation of intercultural links
- Possibility to explore digital resources of other cultures
- Other people culture
- Developing links between people
- Interculturality
- Pluriculturality
- Ethnic diversity
- Culture
- Exploration of digital resources from museums, libraries, archives and audio-visual collections from Europe
- About culture in all its aspects: music, paintings, literature, etc.
- European culture and civilization
- Art and museums
- Local history
- National culture

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana)

I think Europeana can be improved by

- increasing the number of digital resources, improving the portal and creating a better search crawler
- a better marketing strategy
- adding new and diverse content
- the contribution of the Europeana users
- developing new partnerships between different cultural institutions
- adding new texts, images and videos
- The quality of digital objects

I think I will use Europeana because

- It offers the possibility to develop inter and multicultural relations
- It offers the possibility of multicultural and/or cultural studies
- It is easy to use
- It offers new perspectives
- It has various information
- Here I find information that I need for my projects
- It offers structured information and in concise metadata
- It offers access to archives and audio-video European collections
- It is an interesting site for those who are interested in different aspects of culture
- It can be an useful alternative resource of information
- The information is well organized

I think I will not use Europeana because

- At this point I am not interested in its content

I would like Europeana to include more

- Digital material of old codecs and old graphics
- Information about European pluriculturality including Romanian
- Images and videos
- Information from different resources
- Audio and video documents and virtual tours of different museums
- Digital text in Romanian language
- Information about music history, music types, history of art, history of European countries, cultural news

For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because

- It offers the possibility of finding books one can buy or borrow
- It offers precious information about the culture of different peoples
- It is easy to use and browse
- One can find useful information
- It is a complementary source
- I can find proper images for homework
- It offers the possibility to learn in different languages
On my personal opinion, Europeana

- Is a very good structured site that offers the possibility to find multicultural resources
- Is of real help for understanding other peoples’ culture
- Is a good start for developing multicultural relationships
- Is a good example for other projects
- Is an useful project, very well documented and well realized
- Is a good initiative, but it should be developed
- I think it serves a certain category of users: researchers, teachers and generally persons interested in depth studies of different subjects who know foreign languages
- Will become better known if they will make more publicity

What are your favourite sites for school work?

- en.wikipedia.org
- www.google.com
- www.altavista.com
- www.flickr.com
- www.google.com
- www.google.com
- Different blogs
- On-line encyclopedias
- www.wikipedia.org
- www.referate.ro

Where do you normally get online information from?

- I usually use search engines and trusted resources
- Blogs
- On-line encyclopedias
Slovakia

End user testing conducted by: Slovak Nationaal Museum
Country report prepared by: Erik Krissak
Country Test Report Slovakia

1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

We chose a personal approach, so it was several sessions with small groups (even with individuals), because it was not easy to gather so various types of people on one place at the same time.

Events:
15.12.2010, Slovak National Museum, Bratislava, 3 participants
23.12.2010, Slovak National Museum, Bratislava, 1 participant
28.12.2010, Ministry of Culture, Bratislava, 3 participants
29.12.2010, Home session, Bratislava, 2 participants
05.01.2011, Home session, Nitra, 3 participants
11.01.2011, Slovak National Museum, Bratislava, 4 participants
21.01.2011, Ministry of Culture, Bratislava, 1 participant

2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)

Sex: M: 7
F: 11

Age: 19-24: 3
25-30: 4
31-36: 2
37-42: 2
43-48: 2
49-54: 2
55+: 3

Target group: General user 4
             Academic user 5
             Expert researcher 2
             Professional user 2
             Government user 3
Tourist user 2

13 participants (72%) haven’t used Europeana before. The rest used it max. 19 times.

10 participants (55.5%) were interested in connecting cultures and a half of them thought that we are losing cultural identity. Only four participants (22.2%) never used advanced searching. Textual content is the most searchable type from all.

3. First impressions of Europeana (summary).

First impressions were mainly positive, there is not so much options in Europeana.

Average score (min. value, max. value):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>5.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>4.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well organized</td>
<td>5.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>6.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Europeana is about:

Culture, art, cultural heritage, connection, presentation, knowledge, money, history, libraries, museums, galleries, searching and even competition to google and megalomania of EU.

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary).

Language:

It is extremely important which search language is used and the language of the metadata is important for results. It is good that one can choose the menu language in Slovak, but results require knowledge of source languages.

Searching for content related to specific period:
It is not a problem to find particular year, rather confusing is the “browse through time” option. It is almost impossible to find relevant content to a period, even the specific use of Boolean algebra is needed in advanced search to find something (not very relevant).

Searching for content by provider:

It is very easy due to refine search options.

My Europeana:

It is easy to get involved and use the save search option (only one participant, age 55-find it confusing), but there is no possibility to change My Europeana settings.

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana). Where necessary please use the quotes from the questionnaires or verbal comments of participants.

44,44 % of participants (8) will use Europeana, 16,66 % (3) don’t know.

Europeana is good for professionals and for general public interested in history and culture. In genereal, Europeana is a good start of building European Culture Portal.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary). Please include 5-6 main suggestions.

Suggestions:

- Better design and graphic, to attract young people and to promote Europeana more effectively;

- more search options, especially for dates and related content;

- My Europeana needs to develop to become fully usable;

- a space for communities should be involved;

- multilinguality is not working very well;
- more Slovak content and videos should be involved.

7. Comments of the moderator (Optional)

It is obvious, that the main confusion for participants was to use advanced search, it was necessary to choose Boolean algebra for connecting searches of different content and there was no advanced search option for some fields that could be involved (for example language).

Refine search is very good, but some refinements can be made in advanced search option.

If change of password and name is not available it is not a good personalization.
Slovenia

End user testing conducted by: *Narodna in univerzitetna knjižnica*
Country report prepared by:  *Breda Karun*
Country Test Report Slovenia

Test event

Faculty of Art, 13 December 2010, from 2 pm to 5.30 pm

Participants

21 students of the Faculty of Art (librarianship, psychology, art history, Slovenian language).

Gender: 18 female,
3 male

Nationality: 20 Slovenians, 1 Polish

Age: 17 participants aged 19-24;
4 participants aged 25-35

The questionnaire was translated in Slovenian language. Participants were asked to write answers in English, if possible, and half of them did it.

Questionaire part 1

Have you seen this logo before?

- Yes /12
- No /7
- Not sure /2

Have you used Europeana before?

- Yes, for my personal interests /2
- Yes, for my studies /3
- No /15
- Not sure /1
If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

- someone told me about it / 4
- Someone sent me a link / 1
- Read about it in paper/journal / 1
- Link from another web site /1
- Link on a blog/0
- I can’t remember/0
- Other / 4

How many times have you visited Europeana?

- This will be my first visit / 15
- 2-4 / 5
- 5-9 / 1
- 10-19/0
- 20-29/0
- 30-39/0
- 40-49/0
- 50-99/0
- 100+/0

How often do you search for information online?

- Never/0
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month)/0
- Often (once a week) / 4
- Very often (almost every day) / 17

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

- Never / 1
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month) / 7
- Often (once a week) / 9
- Very often (almost every day) / 4

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

- Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities” / 9
- Searching by date / 2
Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London” / 10

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

- A search engine such as Google / 19
- An image sharing site such as Flickr / 2
- A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images

What objects do you search for most often?

- Texts / 18
- Images / 5
- Audio/0
- Video / 2
- Others – please specify: words, phrases / 1 (phrases)

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

- Yes / 19
- No / 0
- Not sure / 3

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

- Yes / 9
- No / 13
- Not sure / 0

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

- Yes / 15
- No / 2
- Not sure / 4

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

- Yes / 9
- No / 10
### Questionnaire part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNATTRACTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ATTRACTIVE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BORING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FUN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>BADLY ORGANISED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WELL ORGANISED</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DULL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXCITING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DIFFICULT TO USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EASY TO USE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNINTERESTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERESTING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SIMILAR TO OTHER SITES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNIQUE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europeana is about...**
- European digital library
- Database
- I don’t know it
- Interesting
- Needed
- User interface (with many failed links)
- Another web site
- Nothing special
- Portal for paintings, music, films and books from Europe galleries; Portal for museum galleries; Special and unique portal for research EU culture
- Important for researchers
- Boring, complicated
- Interesting to pass time, but for me quite useless; better than this questionnaire
- Interesting, useful
- Easy to use, good organized
- Easy to use, well designed
- Well designed, accurate, user friendly
- Advanced digital library, for everyone
- Web portal of cultural heritage
- Good organized digital library
- User friendly and interesting
- Once you know how to search for specific information, searching become fun and it isn’t hard to do it
- Useful, advanced
- Unique, new European browser

Questionnaire part 3

I think Europeana can be improved by...

Many participants say that they can not give suggestions, because they are not familiar with Europeana (15 of them haven’t used it before).

They have noticed that some links to original sites don’t work and it makes Europeana less reliable.

Reactions on the interface are contradictory: some like it very much, some think it’s boring.
They miss translation of metadata, because they are not familiar with languages other than English and their own. If they were translated, it could not happen that they get different results of search in different languages.

They have noticed that certain topics or geographies have no content, so they suggest more content.

They suggest more and better promotion as lot’s of potential users don’t know about Europeana.

“It firstly needs more exposure as most people don't know about it. It is not so used comparing to what it offers”.

I think I will use/not use (delete as appropriate) Europeana because...

10 of 21 answered that they won’t use Europeana, most of them think that they can access content through other sites.

8 of 21 answered that they will use Europeana, because it’s practical, easy to use, enable access to EU cultural heritage from one access point

I would like Europeana to include more ...

Participants would like Europeana to include more video, music, full texts.

They miss more content from/on Slovenia.

For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because...

Participants will use Europeana whenever they need content on EU culture, they can find objects from all EU countries, which are otherwise difficult to find. Europeana is rich, fast and transparent, relevant, they can use images for their presentations.

Two quotes, pro and contra:

“It contains international database which I can use for comparative analysis of content”
“I won’t use it because I’ll never remember it exist until after I get the necessary information elsewhere”

In my personal opinion, Europeana is...

Most of participants express their opinion by saying “useful”, “positive”. They think that it’s useful for people with interest on humanities.

Opposite quote:

“Not very positive, but I like logo and the inscription in all languages. The use is not complicated, but I don’t like the content”

What are your favourite sites for school work

All participants mentioned Google and most of them Google Scholar

Other international sites: Yahoo, Wikipedia, EbscoHost

Slovenian sites: Najdi.si, COBISS, DIKUL, university site, National Library site, dLib.si, Amebis

Where do you normally get information online

Here participants didn’t understand the question in the same way:

- Some of them just answer Internet
- Some listed favorite sites, blogs
- the third group answered: at school, at home, by friends.

Comments of moderator

Participants were second-grade Bologna students. It was very surprising that most of them haven’t heard for Europeana before or just heard and haven’t used it.

That is why we haven’t got many suggestions, because they have learned basic things about Europeana through testing process.
The question, which was present all the time was: *Who is Europeana meant for? Who and why would use it?*
Spain

End user testing conducted by: *Ministry of Culture of Spain*
Country report prepared by:  *Maria-Luisa Martnez-Conde, Eva Rivera*
1. Introduction

End-User Testing activity was done following specifications provided by EuropeanaLocal coordinators. This report was prepared applying similar methodology as used by Europeana in “User and Functionality Testing Report (March 2010)”.

For practical reasons the questionnaire was translated into Spanish language in order to facilitate the assignment to the end-users.

At the end, we decided to perform the tests by phone (calling of personal interviews) and e-mail due to the impossibility to do a meeting with attendees.

In the first contact it was explained what the test was for, how to fill in, what does Europeana means and the role of the Ministry of Culture in the EuropeanaLocal project. After performing the first and second part of the questionnaires participants were asked about their first impression of the portal. Afterwards they were asked to undertake the exercises, complete the questions and to return their completed questionnaires by e-mail.

Date events: 20-21 December 2010 and 05-12 January 2011.

A total number of 19 end-users participated in the testing in Spain. The participants were recruited from all the 7 target groups proposed in the specifications, but in the process we found especially difficult with groups 6 and 7. We chose participants from different areas of Spain (Madrid, Barcelona, Girona, Murcia and Salamanca).

Map 1. Participants recruited from different regions
Table 1. Participants by groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Groups</th>
<th>Num.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General user</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolchild</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic user</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert researcher</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional user</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist authorities</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Participation rate by groups](image)

Figure 1. Participation rate by groups

2. Statistics of the group

**Sex of participants**

58% of participants were female and 42% male.
Figure 2. Sex of participants

**Age of participants**

Almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of the participants were aged from 30 to 59.

Figure 3. Distribution of participants by age range

**Profession**

Five of the participants were students (secondary school or university), 1 teacher of secondary school, 1 teacher of university, 3 were librarians, 3 came from sciences, 4 more from humanities and 2 from other activities.
Familiarity with Europeana

Most participants were not familiar with Europeana and had not seen the Europeana logo before. Only five users recognize the logo, these people belonging to librarian and academic user groups.

Figure 4. Familiarity of participants with Europeana logo

Generally participants had not used Europeana before, a 68.4%. Six people had used it due to their studies or personal interests.

Figure 5. Familiarity of participants with using Europeana
For the six people that had used Europeana they find out about it from different ways.

![Bar chart showing how participants found out about Europeana]

Figure 6. How did they find out about Europeana?

As we said, most participants reported they had not known about Europeana, so that this test has been the first visit for a 63%.

Table 2. How many times have you visited Europeana?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Visits</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This will be my first visit</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Experience in online search

Most participants reported very frequent use of online search. More variety is detected at the use of advanced search features.

89.4% used the internet often (10.5%) or very often (78.9%).

At the question of which kind of features in advanced search participants are using, 3 do not answer anything and 4 of them answer more than one option. Search by phrase was the option used most frequently by participants.
The majority of participants (95%) used a search engine to find information online.

![Bar Chart](image1.png)

**Figure 9.** Online sites preferred by participants for image searching

![Pie Chart](image2.png)

**Figure 10.** Types of objects searched online

At the question related to what types of objects are being searched most frequently some participants answer more than only one option. Two participants said that they search other objects such as social networks or specialized information in music.
Cultural attitudes

Most participants are interested in links between different cultures, less than a half have studied in depth a foreign culture, almost 69% do not think or are not sure that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity and only 6 were actively involved in projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs.

![Figure 11. Percentage of participants with cultural attitudes](image)

3. First impressions

To gather the first impressions of participants on Europeana portal is used the questionnaire 2, which offered dichotomic pairs and bubbles to be filled in.

![Figure 13. First feedback on Europeana](image)
First impressions were more positive than negative. Generally participants find Europeana interesting and easy to use but not too much fun or exciting. There are different opinions about organisation or uniquely.

Table 4. First impressions average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impression</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attractive</td>
<td>6,52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fun</td>
<td>5,63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well organised</td>
<td>6,26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td>5,63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy to use</td>
<td>6,68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>7,05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unique</td>
<td>6,31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Europeana is about...

The most popular type of response mentioned was related to cultural heritage, digital resources, content provided by archives, libraries, museums from Europe.

Table 5. Impressions of Europeana from the bubbles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Key words/phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subjects</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heritage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aims

Music, literature, art
Sciences

Authenticity
Beyond national borders
Digitisation
Diversity
Exploitation new technologies
Explore
Facilitate access
Finding
Preservation
Reliable
Search
Sharing

Content

Archives
Digital resources
Exhibitions
Formats: text, images, video, sound, data
Historical collections
Libraries
Museums

Descriptive statement

Access from a single portal
Full text
Identification but you have to go to the original source to get digital content
4. Deeper impressions

Deeper impressions were gathered after the participants performed the assignment of exercises about different kind of searches, register as a user in Europeana and choose “My Europeana” settings (annex 3).

Exercise 1. Does the language appear to be an issue?

Table 6. Problems with language

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not succeed</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participants commented some inconsistencies found: always more results in English, the same search in different languages provided different results every time. A couple of participants commented that when they made typos, they missed proximity searches or other possibilities suggested. Some suggested that should include a translator in the search engine.

Exercise 2. Search by specific period

Mostly found impossible to search by a specific period of time. 3 participants succeed by using advanced search, refine options or using specific years.

It was suggested that it would be necessary in the advanced search a FROM and TO options.

Exercise 3. Search for content related

We observe equal results of this exercise; half participants found it easy and half difficult or had not results. Some commentaries were that for this exercise was easy because
they had exact information (author, title and provider) and some agree with it is easier if you look for general or only one concept, for example “rubens”.

It was suggested that it would be interesting to link this objects with others from external pages.

**Exercise 4. Register as a user of Europeana**

Most were registered without incident, one participant could not register, someone complained that waited a lot of time for the e-mail confirmation (20 minutes) and other suggested that it will be better if you not have to go to the e-mail account to continue the process.

**Exercise 5. Saved search and advanced search**

Eleven participants could save and do advanced search and seven could not because they not found any result or not could save the previous search, once was not registered.

Some participants suggested that should improve the appearance of languages, instead of only two letters (“es”, “hu”…) it would be better an extended way, more understandable (full text).

**Exercise 6. “My Europeana” settings**

Some participants asked how can do the change options? So is not clear where the options to choose are.

Participants that could finish this exercise they missed more options: total items, historical searches, filter by name, language, dates… as well as more help menus.

It was suggested that it would be interesting to have personal choices to transform or build their own content (folders), for example create My Museum, My Library…

**5. Lasting impressions**

The lasting impressions of participants were selected from the questionnaire 3 (annex 4) of the specifications. In this part participants were invited to complete some sentences related to how to improve Europeana, the intention to use in the future, what they miss or where normally people get information online from.
Participants recommended improvements basically on content, access and Europeana concept.

### Table 7. Recommendations on improving Europeana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I think Europeana can be improved by...</th>
<th>Content</th>
<th>Access</th>
<th>Brand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Including more contemporary information</td>
<td>Better and easier interface</td>
<td></td>
<td>Promotion, including more cultural institutions all over Europe, persuading them of the importance of being part of Europeana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregating more national-local information</td>
<td>Searches more flexible, not sensible at capital letters or accents, proximity options, by periods of time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More images and videos</td>
<td>Languages should not be a barrier</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multilingualism in the description of documents</td>
<td>Index system, thesaurus or list of descriptors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering tools to translate directly</td>
<td>Option of new search</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Including more scientific content</td>
<td>Save and retrieve my searches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizing collections better</td>
<td>Include a clear homepage button/link</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In response to the question of whether the participants would or would not use Europeana in the future, 73.7% of participants indicated that they would use Europeana again in the future against a 26.3%. Users that are going to use Europeana commented that is a great tool, easy and quick to search with interesting content from reliable sources and single access point in a multilingual platform. Users who answered no were not satisfied with the content (mixed up, indeterminate) and prefer Google or Wikipedia because offer better information and are friendlier to use.

For home assignments generally participants answered they use basically Google, and also general or regional encyclopaedias. For those from Group 3 (academic user) were educational portals, dictionaries, virtual museums or institutional webpages, Perceus, Liceus. Other sites mentioned were Wikipedia, Yahoo answers, some webpages with homework done for students, Delicious favourites.

Generally participants get information online from Google and Wikipedia. A few ones indicated also newspapers, magazines, articles, specific databases from the university, institutional webpages, archives, libraries and collection of photographs.
6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by test-group participants

Participants from Groups 1-2 (General and Schoolchild) commented that they want “More stuff, expand collections at maximum”, “More images with bright colors to catch your attention prior the text” and “Europeana can became a site visited by schoolchildren to search information and do homework”. Participants from Group 3 (Academic user) suggested to “spread the word in order to have the same engine in other continents to have the possibility to search by continent o globally” and commented that “Europeana is a powerful platform, especially in the field of education”. Participants from Group 4 (Expert researcher) said that “Is a good initiative but arrive too late because Google or Wikipedia have easy and better interface” and “Europeana should cover at least 80% of digital content of 80% of European culture institutions in order to be competitive”. From Group 5 (Librarians) users commented that “Europeana is still incipient but has a great potential of collaboration between countries as a collective archive but needs as much as possible promotion”, “Excellent project, is a reference in digital libraries but needs clarify aims and convince more providers to aggregate their content”. Some comments of participants from Group 6-7 (Tourist and Government) were “Europeana centralizes digital information from different institutions in a unic point access that saves you a lot of time looking for information”, “Is an instrument of cooperation and effective promotion of cultural heritage” and “Really interesting horizontal bar where is showed virtual exhibitions”.

Some comments regarding positive statements were:

- Reliable information from European culture institutions
- Availability in different European languages
- Very appropriate that European Union fund this project that is so necessary, useful and allows all citizens access to digital resources from archives, libraries and museums.
- Positive initiative to promote culture and a big effort on digitized historical documents to unify the reference and content search of European collections.

In addition, there were also complaints about:

- Sometimes language changes automatically
- Impossibility to search by period of time
- Language of documents, it is needed a translator tool
- Fewer flexibility of search engine compared with Google, needs improving search tools and retrieve results
- Lack of aims and definition of content
- Add more content not exclusively heritage, also from scientific field
Sweden

End user testing conducted by: ABM Resurs/Stiftelsen Länsmuseet Västernorrland

Country report prepared by: Christian Bajomi
Country Test Report Sweden

1. Descriptions of test events

We had one test event on 26th January 2011. This event was held at the city library in Härnösand, Sweden. The number of participants was 22.

2. Statistics of the group

*Country of origin:* Sweden

*Gender:* 10 Male and 12 Female

*Usergroups:*

8 General users, 2 Schoolchildren, 2 Academic users and 10 professional users.

*Age:*

- 15-18: 2
- 19-24: 4
- 25-40: 6
- 41-55: 4
- 56+: 6

3. First impressions of Europeana (summary)

Have you seen this logo before?

- 20x Yes
- 2x No
- 0x Not sure

Have you used Europeana before?

- 10x Yes, for my personal interests
- 0x Yes, for my studies
- 12x No
0x Not sure

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?

2x Someone told me about it
0x Someone sent me a link
0x Read about it in paper/journal
2x Link from another web site
0x Link on a blog
0x I can’t remember
6x Other

How many times have you visited Europeana?

12x This will be my first visit
4x 2-4
0x 5-9
0x 10-19
0x 20-29
0x 30-39
0x 40-49
0x 50-99
6x 100+

How often do you search for information online?

0x Never
2x Rarely (perhaps only once per month)
0x Often (once a week)
20x Very often (almost every day)

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

6x Never
0x Rarely (perhaps only once per month)
12x Often (once a week)
4x Very often (almost every day)

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

16x Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities”
2x Searching by date
6x Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London”

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

22x A search engine such as Google
4x An image sharing site such as Flickr
0x A specialist site such as artencylopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sports images

What objects do you search for most often?

20x Texts
4x Images
4x Audio
Are you interested in links between different cultures?

16x Yes
0x No
6x Not sure

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

6x Yes
14x No
2x Not sure

Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

4x Yes
12x No
6x Not sure

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

12x Yes
10x No
0x Not sure

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary)

How would you rank the Europeana website:
Europeana is about...

- Make European culture accessible to the public in a simple way.
- Making it easier to find pictures from different cultures and to connect these.
- Share information with others.
- A place to exchange findings, ideas and views on cultural heritage.
- A joint effort to make available Europe's cultural heritage.
- Common history, art and culture.
- Bits of information spread to the world.

- To discover the culture in Europe by using digital technology.

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana)

I think I will use Europeana...

- When I want to find cultural similarities.
- I liked the timeline, and the function "People are currently thinking about:"
- I will use Europeana because the quality is very good.
- I think I will use Europeana because of the mass of pictures.
- I will use Europeana to discover more about culture in Europe.
- As complementary to wikipedia and google.
- Because almost everything IS there.
- Great to have when you are searching for topics that affect several countries.
- Europeana will be of help for my studies.
- Europeana is a good ambition - a good start.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary)

I think Europeana can be improved by

- Not having flashing images on the startpage, hard to focus on the text.
- Smarter searchsystem.
- Better design of the website.
- Fewer clicks to get to the original item.
- Better and refined search results presentations.
- Improved functions for search.

I would like Europeana to include

- More audio and video, archival records, modern material, music, material from users.

7. Comments of the moderator (Optional)

Most of the participants in our test-group thought it was difficult to use the Europeana-portal, but most of them was surprised over the amount of objects. I think most of the participants felt that Europeana is a great project. Europeana should work more with marketing, to "spread the word".

The most often used search engines in our test-group was Google and wikipedia. I also showed the group the Swedish portal "kringla" (www.kringla.nu) where you can search both local and in Europeana.
United Kingdom

End user testing conducted by: Collections Trust
Country report prepared by: Gordon McKenna
Country Test Report United Kingdom

1. Description of test event

In order not to perhaps influence results we decided to ‘piggy-back’ our event on to another event with a professional audience who were already coming to Collections Trust offices. They were told on the day what we were trying to do. In addition we added some general users to survey process. Again they were not told before they took part the purpose, only that they were being asked to give their opinions on a website.

We considered trying to get school children to answer the survey but were advised by the Kids in Museums organisation that it was not suitable for that audience.

2. Statistics of the group

**Gender**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Age**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 to 18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 to 24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 to 44</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 64</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Target group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General user</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoolchild</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic user</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expert researcher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional user</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourist authorities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governments</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. First impressions of Europeana

Europeana logo recognition

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Previous use of Europeana website

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for my personal interests</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes, for my studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How did user find out about Europeana?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Someone told me about it</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone sent me a link</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Read about it in paper/journal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link from another web site</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link on a blog</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can’t remember</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never used Europeana</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How many times has Europeana been visited?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Group</td>
<td>Response Count</td>
<td>Response Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**How often does the user search online?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely (perhaps only once per month)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often (once a week)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very often (almost every day)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**User’s advanced search techniques?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Searching by phrase</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching by date</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Searching using Boolean operators</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**User’s search for images using**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search engine</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image sharing site</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist site</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**User’s most often search for:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>95.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Images</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audio</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Video</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Are users interested in links between different cultures?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Have users studied a foreign culture in depth?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>47.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Do users think people are losing their cultural identity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have users been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>61.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not sure</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Europeana is:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unattractive</th>
<th>Attractive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 1 2 1 1 3 7 2 0 1</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE = 5.84</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boring</th>
<th>Fun</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 2 3 3 4 6 1 0 0</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE = 5.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Badly organised</th>
<th>Well organised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 2 0 1 5 8 1 2 0</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVERAGE = 6.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dull</th>
<th>Exciting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 2 3 3 4 6 1 0 0</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Difficult to use</th>
<th>Easy to use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 1 3 2 2 4 5 2 0</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE = 6.47

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uninteresting</th>
<th>Interesting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 1 1 1 4 3 7 2 0</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE = 6.89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similar to other sites</th>
<th>Unique</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 0 0 5 6 1 5 2 0 0</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

AVERAGE = 5.63

**Europeana is:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Keywords and phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Heritage (5)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Culture (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Content (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Art (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Biodiversity (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aims</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Searching (3)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collecting (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Finding (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Linking (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sharing (2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Showing (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Collaboration (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Discovering (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Exploring (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Increasing ease of search (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords and phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Europe[an] (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Images (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Information (3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Museums (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Place (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Sites (2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Authentic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Creator (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Cultural institutions (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Digital (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Diverse (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Keyword (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Region (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Resources (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Stuff (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Theme (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Timeline (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• World[wide] (1)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Descriptive statement**

(all 1 occurrence)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Keywords and phrases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• In one place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Virtual museum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A numbers game</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Strengthening European Union identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access for all people to all collections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Quantity not quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Wide ranging</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Deeper impressions of Europeana

The comments below are based on notes taken during the event and some phone calls and face to face conversations afterwards.
**Language issues:**

Unsurprisingly as the users were all native English speakers they had little difficulty with the amount of content on the site and with getting plenty of hits from search results. Comments on how Europeana handles multilinguality were:

- They said that they would have expected to get only English language records from their searches.
- They could appreciate that the situation would be more serious for non-English speakers would be an issue. Those of a more technical background suggested that automatic translation might be of use.
- They thought that the language facet could be misleading, especially the term ‘mult’[iligual].

**Period, date and related content searching:**

Date and period searching was frustrating to users. The results were not what were being expected. Users said the Date facet should be in date order not number of hits.

Professional users (from museums) were surprised (some laughter!) to be told that date ranges were not possible and dates BCE were not possible. They were especially negative about a text string “1600-1645” only been able to be found by either a search for ‘1600’ or ‘1645’. Both these issues were seen as important to address.

Having a time line was seen as useful, but the implementation was not given a ‘thumbs-up’. It was very slow in populating with images (the connection was not slow) and slow to use. Again results seemed strange with some results looking strange (e.g. “Why does a search for ‘medieval’ produce images dated 1947?”). Periods are more like a subject search.

The ‘related content’ displayed was seen as an interesting feature, but it was often unclear why something was related.

The overall reaction was that it would better not to have a feature which produced misleading or ‘wrong’ results.

**“My Europeana”:**

There was resistance to the concept of having “My Europeana”. The first reason, from both professional and general users, was that clicking on the tab just arrives gives a login or sign
option. It does not explain what the feature is for. Trying to register just asks for your e-mail. Much more work needs to be done to persuade anybody to sign up.

After explanation of possible functionality general users said they would not join it because ‘it’s not something we would do’. They also if it was trying to be a ‘social network’ then it would probably fail due to general competition, i.e. Facebook.

Professional users were also sceptical for similar reasons to general users. They were much more interested in using APIs and other ways of using the data.

5. Lasting impressions of Europeana

**Intend to use Europeana in the future?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>42.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Positive statements:

- *It might have interesting information.*
- *I need art & design, photographs of objects and moving image content; date and location important.*
- *It might help me locate and view content of interest to me.*
- *It has links to literature relating to natural history collections.*
- *I am interested in searching for cultural material from one website.*
- *It has lots of useful stuff.*
- *Of general interest.*
- *I need to understand it better for work purposes.*
- *I enjoy exploring other countries' material.*
- *To get updated info on biodiversity issues.*
- *It provides easier access to European cultural resources.*
- *There are many different images in one place which can be searched by theme.*
- *I'm interested in other cultures*
Negative statements:

• I don’t always have time to look at such sites.
• More likely to use Google and Wikipedia.
• At the moment it does not have any natural history specimen data.
• It is not easy to find stuff.
• I like using Google.
• I do not think it is very effective at finding specific things.
• It is just not something I would do.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements

There were 12 responses to the question

I think Europeana can be improved by

• Making the website more intuitive.
• Showing more examples of content on the homepage. Featuring higher on Google.
• Smaller logo on home page. Improve transition on homepage slideshow - too jerky. Better quality images.
• Content from a greater variety of institutions.
• Drawing more attention to the search function.
• A better designed website.
• Showing more images on each page.
• Less ‘white space’. Greater prominence to search functionality. Text available in different languages.
• Making it more dynamic and less passive.
• Making the search results more relevant to the search term. Often I cannot see why I get something.
• The first page is a lot of reading, not sure everyone would persevere, perhaps the text could be in shorter sections.
• Having a clear button back to the homepage.

Most of these comments came from professionals.

There were 6 responses to the question:

I would like Europeana to include more

• Quality images, not grainy or badly lit / scanned. Tag clouds (e.g. Aquabrowser).
• Natural history specimen data.
• Museum collections.
• More developed search terms to make it easier to find specific things.
• Videos and new materials.
• Audio visual material and 'guides' to what it has.

**Users' favourite sites**

• BBC [including News and IPlayer] (11 occurrences)
• Google (8)
• Facebook (6)
• Amazon (2)
• Guardian [newspaper] (2)
• Hotmail (2)
• Victoria and Albert Museum (2)
• Wikipedia (2)
• Ancestry [family history] (1)
• Blogger (1)
• British Film Institute (1)
• British Library (1)
• British Museum (1)
• Cineworld [cinema chain] (1)
• Collections Trust (1)
• Flickr (1)
• HowStuffWorks (1)
• International Movie Database (1)
• Matazone [animation] (1)
• Microsoft [technology content] (1)
• Museums Association (1)
• National Archives (1)
• National Archives of Scotland (1)
• National Library of Scotland (1)
• National Library of Wales (1)
• National Media Museum (1)
• People's Collection Wales (1)
• Saint FM [radio] (1)
• TopTable [restaurants] (1)
• Yahoo [e-mail] (1)

**Where Users get information online**

• Google [including Google Maps, iGoogle and Google Reader] (16 occurrences)
• Wikipedia (6)
There were 9 responses to the question:

*I think Europeana will be of help to me because*

- It amalgamates a lot of useful information in one place.
- I may be able to source images related to projects I’m developing.
- It brings together resources from all over Europe.
- I can access significant material from across Europe for personal and professional interest.
- It does have some stuff that I am looking for.
- It has lots of potential to be a tool for discovery, to find out where objects are.
- It has a lot of material.
- I can get up to date news.
- It will be a 'one stop shop'

There were 13 responses to the question:

*I think, in my personal opinion, that Europeana*

Positive statements:

- Is interesting and useful.
- Is an interesting concept.
- Is a wide ranging site, I will be telling my map crazy friend about the cartography pages, and the natural world pages to the Nature Reserve supporters of a local group.
- Is very educational and something I would use more often.

Negative statements:

- Is uninspiring, but content is clearly of interest.
- Will improve when it has been populated with more data.
• *Is not as exciting as it could be.*
• *Needs more stuff.*
• *Is more useful for people working in museums than me.*
• *Needs some thorough user evaluation and to ensure the outcomes are clearly communicated to providers.*
• *Needs a clearer purpose.*
• *Needs to be more visual in its presentation - maps, present timeline is very slow and not clear what it means.*

7. **Comments of the moderator**

The message of about what Europeana is about is definitely got across once a user gets to the website. However it is not the first port of call for a user looking for information. Even professional cultural users are not significantly different from the general user – Google and Wikipedia ‘rule’.

It is worth mentioning the significance of the BBC in the UK, which we suspect is not similar to other countries. There is a lot of cultural and learning content on its website often, but not always, connected to television and radio output. An example would be *A History of the World* ([http://www.bbc.co.uk/ahistoryoftheworld/](http://www.bbc.co.uk/ahistoryoftheworld/)).

Suggestions for technical improvements of the website were mostly from professional users. General users expected Europeana to behave in a similar way to other search engines they use (i.e. Google) and were surprised that it did not.
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1. Objective
The objective of Test Phase 2 (TP2) is to:

- Test the content provided by EuropeanaLocal;
- Test Europeana portal (after Rhine release) by end-users of different target and age groups from all Member States and Norway in order to provide necessary feedback for Danube release and further.

2. Target groups
For testing purposes EuropeanaLocal partners need to assemble test groups covering at least 80% of the below mentioned 7 target groups which means that representatives of at least 6 target groups should be involved in testing. However, partners can chose a different approach and focus on some specific target group, in which case they need to inform EuropeanaLocal EWG (Olga McHenry).

Following end-user groups were identified by Europeana (EDLnet, WP 3) and lay a foundation for D3.1. Functional Specifications for Rhine release (Europeana v 1.0):

1. General user

   The general user has a generic interest in culture or history. He is familiar with basic search functionalities, has no specific domain knowledge, is ‘google-minded’ and visits sites such as YouTube and Wikipedia that have large volumes of content to offer.

2. Schoolchild

   The schoolchild will make use of the service as part of their schoolwork. Given that culture and heritage are incorporated in many school curricula, Europeana could be used in a variety of educational contexts. The school child will expect the service to be easily accessible, immediately appealing, visually attractive or even playful, free of jargon and easy to use while doing their schoolwork.

3. Academic user (both students and teachers)

   The academic user represents the other end of the educational spectrum. He may have excellent domain knowledge, or aspires to achieve that. He will expect the information offered to be comprehensive, accurate, representative if not complete, and easy to reuse in the context of educational assignments.
4. Expert researcher

The expert researcher looks for specific information on a specific topic. He is to a certain degree skilled in using retrieval services and may make use of the advanced search button to get the most out of the system. As this group is most likely to publish the results of the research, it will include users who are prepared to buy something or travel to visit the contributing institutions.

5. Professional user (e.g. librarian, archivist)

The professional user is most likely to be a staff member of a cultural heritage organisation. He is skilled in using information systems, but has a different perspective from the expert researcher. He may be interested in details as well as very generic information, for instance with a view to improving the information services offered by his own institution.

**Additional target groups proposed by EuropeanaLocal:**

EuropeanaLocal suggests to include additional end-user groups which are not mentioned in D 3.1 of Europeana v 1.0, but appear to be important potential users of Europeana service:

6. Tourist authorities

Promotion of tourist destinations through online presentation of existing cultural heritage, branding of national/regional/local cultural heritage and presentation through Europeana for access and re-use, etc.

7. Governments (national, regional, local)

Europeana service could be used by different levels of government, for example, for regional development, promotion of tourism, promotion of country/region/locality as a place with rich cultural heritage, etc.

3. Age groups

As it logically follows from point 2 “Target groups”, all age groups will be represented at TP2 - from school children to grownups of all ages. Assembling test groups EuropeanaLocal partners need to ensure that majority of age groups are represented in the selected test pull. However, partners can chose a different approach and focus on some specific age group, in which case they need to inform EuropeanaLocal EWG (Olga McHenry).
4. **Size of test groups and number of testing events**
Total amount of people that need to undergo testing in each partner country/region is 18-20 people. This, however, does not limit EuropeanaLocal partners to only one testing event with 18-20 people involved in it. EuropeanaLocal partners are free to choose how many test events they want to conduct and how many people to involve in each.

5. **Timeframe**
All EuropeanaLocal partners need to conduct end-user testing in its respective country and region between September 2010 and 31 January 2011. There are several reasons for this:

1. EuropeanaLocal provides 3 mio items for Rhine release (critical mass of content will be reached).
2. Testing of the new Europeana portal (coming out for Rhine).
3. To be in time with recommendations for Danube release.

6. **Testing methodology**
EuropeanaLocal will apply testing methodology similar to one Europeana uses itself (described in the draft report from January 2010 “User and Functionality Testing” prepared within Europeana v 1.0) in order to ensure synergy and comparability of the results. The main points of methodology described below.

1. Introduction by the group moderator.
2. Completion of a pre-questionnaire providing basic demographic information, indication on familiarity with Europeana, online search experience and cultural attitudes (Template is attached in the Annex 1).
3. A concise introduction to Europeana provided by the group moderator.
4. Discussion 1. Objective: to gather first impressions of Europeana following a brief look at the site and its key features.
5. Completion of questionnaire 2 in order to provide written feedback of first Impressions (Template attached in Annex 2).
6. Assignment (Described in the Annex 3).
7. Discussion 2. Objective: to gather deeper impressions of Europeana following approximately 30 minutes’ interaction with the resource.
8. Completion of questionnaire 3. Objective: to provide written feedback on deeper
impressions of Europeana (Annex 4).

9. Conclusion by the moderator.

All feedback forms (Annexes 1, 2, 4) should be collected by each EuropeanaLocal partner. These forms together with the feedbacks received during the discussions will lay a foundation for the Country Test Reports (Template attached in the Annex 5). Each EuropeanaLocal partner will have to prepare a Country Test Report and send it to Olga McHenry no later than 31 January 2011.
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Questionnaire part 1

Country of origin: ______________  Sex  □ M  □ F

What is your age?  □ Under 15  □ 15-18  □ 19-24

Have you seen this logo before?
□ Yes
□ No
□ Not sure.

Have you used Europeana before?
□ Yes, for my personal interests
□ Yes, for my studies
□ No
□ Not sure

If you have used Europeana before, how did you find out about it?
□ Someone told me about it
□ Someone sent me a link
□ Read about it in paper/journal
□ Link from another web site
□ Link on a blog
□ I can’t remember
□ Other

How many times have you visited Europeana?
□ This will be my first visit
□ 2-4
□ 5-9
□ 10-19
□ 20-29
□ 30-39
□ 40-49
□ 50-99
□ 100+
How often do you search for information online?

- Never
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month)
- Often (once a week)
- Very often (almost every day)

How often do you use advanced search features offered by search engines?

- Never
- Rarely (perhaps only once per month)
- Often (once a week)
- Very often (almost every day)

If you use advanced search features, which of these features are you confident in using?

- Searching by phrase, e.g. “European capital cities”
- Searching by date
- Searching using Boolean operators, e.g. “Amsterdam AND Paris” or “Berlin OR London”

If you were searching for images online, which of the following would you use?

- A search engine such as Google
- An image sharing site such as Flickr
- A specialist site such as artcyclopedia.com for art images or actionplus.com for sport images

What objects do you search for most often?

- Texts
- Images
- Audio
- Video
- Others – please specify __________________________

Are you interested in links between different cultures?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Have you studied about any foreign culture in depth?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure
Do you think that in the modern world people are losing their cultural identity?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure

Have you been involved in any projects related to preservation of local traditions and customs?

- Yes
- No
- Not sure
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Questionnaire part 2

How would you rank the Europeana website:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNATTRACTIVE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>ATTRACTIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BORING</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>FUN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BADLY ORGANISED</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>WELL ORGANISED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DULL</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>EXCITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DIFFICULT TO USE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>EASY TO USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNINTERESTING</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>INTERESTING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIMILAR TO OTHER SITES</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>UNIQUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
2. Fill in the bubbles.

Europeana is about...
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Exercise 1

Search in English for content related to discovery of America. Then search in Spanish for the same “descubrimiento de America”. Based on the search please indicate how many hits are presented for texts, images, videos and sounds. Open 3 most interesting images with the sources of content “Biblioteca Nacional de España”. Make an advance search and look for a map of America in English and Spanish (‘mapa de America’). Compare the results. Does the language appear to be an issue?

Exercise 2

Search for content related simultaneously to Islas Baleares and Granada. Make a new search related only to Islas Baleares for the period covering years 1780-1880. Is it easy to find the content related to specific period?

Exercise 3

Search for content related to Peter Paul Rubens. Find all content related to Rubens provided by Erfgoedplus.be. Chose ‘Jezus aan het Kruis’. See the picture and related content. Is it easy to find? Is the content logically linked?

Exercise 4

Register as a user of Europeana.

Exercise 5

When logged-in, search for content related to Ibsen and save your search (in English and Norwegian). Logout and login again. Go back to your saved search. In the saved search make an advanced search and look for content related to Ibsen only on English. Are you able to perform such search? Is it easy to do?

Exercise 6

Chose settings of ‘My Europeana’ best fitting your needs. Save them. Anything missing?

Exercise 7 (Optional)

Additional exercises proposed by the moderator.
Complete these sentences:

- I think Europeana can be improved by .................................................................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................

- I think I will use/not use (delete as appropriate) Europeana because ............
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................

- I would like Europeana to include more .........................................................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................

- For my home assignments, Europeana will be of help because ..................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................

- In my personal opinion, Europeana ..............................................................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................

- What are your favourite sites for school work? ...........................................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................
  .................................................................................................

- Where do you normally get information online? ...........................................
  .................................................................................................
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Country Test Report Template

1. Descriptions of test events (number of the events, dates, location, number of participants, etc.)

2. Statistics of the group (demographical, age, etc.)

3. First impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.

4. Deeper impressions of Europeana (summary). Please include the data from collected questionnaires.

5. Lasting impressions (intention to use Europeana). Where necessary please use the quotes from the questionnaires or verbal comments of participants.

6. Comments and recommendations for improvements suggested by the test-group participants (summary). Please include 5-6 main suggestions.

7. Comments of the moderator (Optional)