



from an average of 3.38 pre-presentation to 4.36 post-presentation, regardless of whether the answers were correct

In post-test interviews, some participants expressed preference for a particular format. To some, the type of term being explained made a difference. The idea that graphics and animations are especially useful when there is an action or process involved is consistent with research suggesting that animation can be unnecessary or annoying unless there is a movement or process to be expressed. Speed of presentation was also mentioned, especially for animations. One thought the animation went by too quickly, others thought that it took too long for the amount of information delivered. Text was seen as being faster, and perhaps more efficient. Many people commented that the graphics or animations grabbed their attention, whereas text was “simple and basic”.

Most participants found the presentations helpful, and their confidence either stayed the same or increased. However, viewing a SIG presentation is not a guarantee that people will then understand the term. If people believe that they know what the term means, then it may take more than a brief explanation to change their minds. In actual use, they are unlikely to look at the presentation at all. People who are uncertain about their understanding are probably more likely to view help, and whether their initial understanding is confirmed, or they learn something different, their post-presentation confidence may increase. A crucial issue is how to motivate people who need help to view it.

The third criterion was that the presentations should be perceived as being effective, helpful, informative, attractive, etc. Positive comments outweighed the negative on all aspects, and provide guidance for presentation design. For example, people often claim to want control over the operation of animated presentations. A related study [6] that examined the animated presentations with various controls found little actual difference in effectiveness or use of the controls. This is likely to be attributable in part to the brevity (30-60 seconds) of the presentations; controls may be more important in longer animations.

The dynamics between semantic characteristics of the term being explained, the format in which it is explained, and individual preferences are difficult to tease apart. One factor seems to be the efficiency with which people perceive the information is communicated. But perceived efficiency is not just a matter of the length of the explanation takes; it is affected by the nature of the information. The cognitive effort of understanding a textual description of a procedure may be greater than viewing an illustrative animation, and thus the text may feel more inefficient.

If a term can be explained with a relatively straight-forward definition, even those who claim to prefer graphics or animation may find that a text explanation is sufficient and feels most efficient. If the term’s meaning contains active or procedural elements, graphics or animation may represent them more clearly, thus trumping expressed preferences for text; the animation seems more integral to expressing the term’s meaning. Members of our research team echo this notion, finding it difficult to “add” motion to the definition of some terms (e.g., race and ethnicity).

The import of these findings for content providers such as the federal statistical agencies is significant, because of the issues involved in providing animated glossary definitions. The design

effort is greater for animations than for graphics, and greater for either than for text definitions. Agencies prefer to minimize hardware and software requirements for their users. Our findings suggest they could reserve animated explanations for those terms that contain elements of action, activity or process and thus will really benefit from animated explanations. Criteria for identifying such terms would be valuable.

There is another dimension to this discussion, however; the best help in the world is useless if people don’t use it. Participants indicated that they found the animations attractive: “really cool, visually stimulating”, “more cheerful”. Understanding the factors that determine the interplay between attraction and perceived efficiency requires more research.

We want to emphasize the effectiveness of the SIG presentations. Users can learn enough about a term or concept to proceed with their task without having to shift their attention from their task. “Just-in-time” help such as the SIG presentations deliver a brief, focused nugget of help at the time and place when it is needed, reducing the gap (perceived and actual) between users’ tasks, the information they need, and information that will help them complete their tasks. Closer integration between information and help should increase people’s benefit from help.

#### 4. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was supported by NSF Grant EIA 0131824. We would also like to thank the GovStat team and participants in the GovStat symposium on help (January 20-21 2005) for helpful comments and discussions.

#### 5. REFERENCES

- [1] Denn, S., Haas, S. W. & Hert, C. A. (2003). Statistical metadata needs during integration tasks. In *DC-2003: Proceedings of the International DCMI Metadata Conference and Workshop*, 81-90. [http://www.siderean.com/dc2003/301\\_Paper50.pdf](http://www.siderean.com/dc2003/301_Paper50.pdf)
- [2] Haas, S. W., Brown, R., Cao, L. & Wilbur, J. (in preparation). Evaluation of the effectiveness of the Statistical Interactive Glossary.
- [3] Haas, S. W., Pattuelli, M. C., & Brown, R. T. (2003). Understanding statistical concepts and terms in context: The GovStat Ontology and the Statistical Interactive Glossary. *Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 193-199.
- [4] Hert, C. A., Liddy, E. D., Shneiderman, B., Marchionini, G., Supporting statistical electronic table usage by citizens, *Communications of the ACM* 46(1), 52-54.
- [5] Marchionini, G., Haas, S. W., Plaisant, C., Shneiderman, B. & Hert, C. (2003). Toward a Statistical Knowledge Network. *Proceedings of the National Conference on Digital Government Research, dg.o2003*. Digital Government Research Center, 27-31.
- [6] Wilbur, J. D. (2004). *The GovStat Glossary Animations: An Evaluation of Control, Learning, Time, and Satisfaction* Masters paper, School of Information and Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. <http://jdwilbur.org/sils/govstatglossaryanimations.pdf>.