

What's In A Word? Rethinking Facet Headings in a Discovery Service

David Nelson and
Linda Turney

ABSTRACT

The emergence of discovery systems has been well received by libraries who have long been concerned with offering a smorgasbord of databases that require either individual searching of databases or the problematic use of federated searching. The ability to search across a wide array of subscribed and open-access information resources via a centralized index has opened up access for users to a library's wealth of information resources. This capability has been particularly praised for its "Google-like" search interface, thereby conforming to user expectations for information searching. Yet all discovery services also include facets as a search capability and thus provide faceted navigation that is a search feature for which Google is not particularly well suited. Discovery services thus provide a hybrid search interface. An examination of e-commerce sites clearly shows that faceted navigation is an integral part of their discovery systems. Many library OPACs also now are being developed with faceted navigation capabilities. However, the discovery services faceted structures suffer from a number of problems that inhibit their usefulness and their potential. This article examines several of these issues and offers suggestions for improving the discovery search interface. It also argues that vendors and libraries need to work together to more closely analyze the user experience of the discovery system.

INTRODUCTION

The emergence of Google as the premier search engine¹ has had a very profound effect on searcher expectations regarding information.² By virtue of its simplicity and the remarkably powerful search algorithms that enable its highly relevant results, the simple search box of Google has clearly triumphed as the preferred way to find information.

But is the Google search model really the panacea that libraries need to resolve their search interface requirements? The nature of search engine and search interface design is a very complex issue. Unfortunately for academic libraries, Google has dominated discussions and thinking about search engine interfaces: "Just Google it!" Is a simple Google search box really the preferred vehicle with which libraries should be delivering their content, both licensed and unlicensed?

The assumption librarians make to justify the use of a Google model is that library users are essentially Google users,³ or that they have the same information searching needs.⁴ This is a

David Nelson (David.Nelson@mtsu.edu), is Chair, Collection Development and Management, and **Linda Turney** (Linda.Turney@mtsu.edu) is Cataloging Librarian, James E. Walker Library, Middle Tennessee State University, Murfreesboro, Tennessee.



flawed assumption. As an academic library, we are tasked with making discoverable not simply digital-only information, but information objects with discrete characteristics that often constitute the object of a search, e.g., an audio book, a film, or even a book on a shelf. Google has put the emphasis on the keyword, with remarkably gratifying results for the average lay user. However, a recent Project Information Literacy study concluded that “Google-centric search skills that freshmen bring from high school only get them so far—but not far enough—with finding and using the trusted sources they need for fulfilling college research assignments.”⁵ Until now, the library web development focus on providing a “Google-like” search has, unfortunately, diverted attention from an appreciation of the developments in other areas of the Internet world, such as e-commerce, where searching for information is an integral component of the buyer–seller relationship.

Commercial entities have a vested interest in developing their websites to enable each user to have a successful search outcome. While the search interfaces routinely encountered at various e-commerce sites may seem obvious, it is important to remember that one is looking at a series of deliberate decisions made with regard to the interface organization and structure. For companies, the search interface represents millions of dollars in investment, and the design is part of their search engine optimization strategy.⁶ In this way, companies and other organizations create robust search interfaces that enable visitors to effectively and efficiently find what they want in the company “knowledgebase.”

It is clear that the product search industry has arrived at some very significant conclusions about user search behavior, and that they strive to optimize their interfaces to accommodate those conclusions. Three features stand out: (1) the importance of facets as a key component in the search design; (2) the personalization of the text that instructs the user; and (3) intelligibility of facet labels. In a blog article on facets in e-commerce websites, Scharnell advises that, when determining what the facets are, there are two rules to follow: (1) keep it simple; and (2) create an intuitive structure.⁷

The primary goal of a commercial website is to bring about what is called conversion—that is, getting someone to the site (driving traffic) and, ultimately, making a sale (the conversion). Companies have discovered that facets are the key to enabling their potential customers to locate discrete pieces of information (e.g., a product) almost intuitively. Broughton observes that “there is an evident faceted approach to product information in many commercial websites.”⁸ An important characteristic of the faceted structure is that it enables the user to have the ability to browse a collection. Thus the goals of a commercial site successfully employing faceted navigation is not that different from the objectives which a library discovery layer seeks to accomplish. While the literature on information literacy is now vast, very few articles deal with the role that facets play in the discovery process for student searchers. Fagan is an author who has addressed this issue of facets.⁹ Ramdeen and Hemminger discuss the role of facets in the library catalog.¹⁰ To date, reviews of discovery systems or catalog interfaces tend to place emphasis on helping patrons

to search our demonstrably flawed systems rather than considering the interfaces as the actual source of problems for users.¹¹

While it can be argued that comparing an academic site and a commercial site compares apples and oranges, there being little connection between the complex, open-ended subject/research questions and searching a company's inventory of goods. However, there are elements of commonality at the higher level of an information need that drive an individual to perform any kind of information search. In both the subject/topic search and the product search there is a need to evaluate results as they appear and to make various decisions while going through a search process to limit and narrow a search. That is, for the information that libraries seek to make discoverable, it is often their extratextual characteristics that are every bit as important as the content itself.

This leads to a discussion of facets, the various attributes by which we can further describe the "manifestation" and the "expression" (using the FRBR sense here) of an intellectual creation. We need to pay more attention to the importance of facets as a critical component of the search process. That is, we must begin to move away from the mantra that our single search box will provide a successful result without additional considerations, with the idea that the facets are of secondary, even tertiary importance. Badke observes "that users of Google actually need a deeper level of information literacy because Google offers so little opportunity to nuance or facet results."¹²

Yet facets *are* a key part of our discovery interface design. However, a full and successful exploitation of their possibilities has been significantly hobbled by a use of jargon-heavy terminology that assumes users will immediately and instinctively grasp the concept of a faceted term. Even a superficial study of many successful commercial websites quickly leads the thoughtful observer to the conclusion that their web developers and designers have been making excellent use of focus groups and surveys to make the search process as easy as possible. While businesses have an obvious monetary incentive to make sure their users do not leave a site because the site itself presented a problem, libraries have the same interest in making sure our users are equally able to easily search our site. A library's site should not, by its assumptions about the user, present obstacles to their search success.¹³

With the growing use of discovery systems,¹⁴ academic libraries are entering into a new phase of search engine deployment.¹⁵ By making use of a preindexed database rather than the more restrictive federated search process, the discovery service interface allows a user to search for content in a wide variety of publication and media types (e.g., journals, books, dictionaries, audio books, videos, manuscripts, newspapers, images, etc.). To assist searchers, discovery systems provide faceted navigation along with the search box interface. Several studies have shown that the use of facets in the library environment has proven effective in assisting searchers.¹⁶ However, it is equally clear that library vendors have not thought deeply about the facet category labels, and libraries, which can do a certain amount of customization, tend toward unquestioning acceptance

of the vendor-supplied labels. This is a critical area involving both the user interface and the user experience; libraries *and* vendors need to spend far more time and effort on ensuring the intelligibility of the facet labels *and* on finding effective ways to encourage their use.

The presence of facets is a standard feature for all library discovery systems.¹⁷ However, as we will show below, facet labels are not easily understandable for the average user and our search systems tend toward emphasizing our users as “anonymous service recipient(s).”

What are facets? A review of various discussions of facets in information retrieval literature reveals the elasticity of the term, along with related terms.¹⁸ Will observes that “what a facet is has been stretched . . . and the term is used loosely to mean any system in which terms are selected from pre-defined groups at the time of searching.”¹⁹ It is probably easiest to understand the use of the term *facet* in information retrieval systems as categories derived from the universe of objects that one is seeking to discover, whether we are dealing with manufactured products at Home Depot or Greek manuscripts in a library collection.²⁰ What adds to the problem of definition is the number of synonyms: “The term facet is commonly considered as analogous to category, attribute, class and concept.”²¹ How objects are grouped would most logically determine the facets that are necessary for the classification scheme. It is the objects that are under a facet that present a problem in understanding. NISO Z39.19 defines facets as “attributes of content objects encompassing various *non-semantic* aspects of a document,”²² thus including such things as author, language, format, etc. The terms that are indexed are not the facets but rather concepts that exist in a unique relationship to the facet. “Homer” is indexed under a facet “author,” but indexing the term *author* is meaningless.

Another source of confusion is the failure to distinguish between facets and filters, both of which are used to refine or narrow a search.²³ When a search interface states that it is using “faceted navigation,” usually both facets *and* filters are present.

Because both a facet and a filter are part of retrieval, it is often difficult to separate the two. Once again, we encounter a terminological problem. For example, one can speak of how a facet itself is used to filter a search in the sense that it refines or narrows a search to a smaller segment of the universe of objects. Here the term *filter* refers to the process of narrowing a search. But we also have filters that deal with ranges. Thus, the filter “date” covers a range of time, from say one month or one year, to a range over a specific period of time. The same can be seen for the filter “price,” used to specify only one amount, say \$5, or a range from \$100 to \$299. The critical difference between a facet and a range filter is that the terms found in a facet are indexed while a range filter (e.g., date or price) is not an indexed term. It is important to maintain a clear distinction between a facet and a range filter because the underlying metadata is different. A range filter sorts the content in a specific way and at the same time narrows the results.

Our examples, along with the closer analysis of the EBSCO EDS discovery system below, will amply demonstrate that facets and filters are extremely effective in information retrieval systems. The

challenge that libraries face is the need to make sure that users are aware of their presence on a search interface rather than relying exclusively on keywords alone and solely on the algorithmically based result.²⁴ The value of the faceted/filtered search is the ability to *lead* the searcher quickly and efficiently to the desired result, a result that will too often elude the user even with a powerful Google search, unless that user gets most of the terms exactly right.

We chose various e-commerce websites because they have extremely large numbers of site visits or because they were smaller specialty sites that reflected a more highly optimized use of facets. A wide range of product types was in the selection. The frequency of visits indicates that large numbers of users are exposed to a search page structure and terminology, which in turn establishes a standard for a set of user expectations. Best Buy, Target, and Home Depot are among the top on hundred accessed websites, a fact richly indicative of the type of influence they will have in setting user search expectations. An examination of these websites reveals an underlying set of best practices for making use of faceted navigation with text searching.

Linguistic Personalization

With the advent of Web 2.0 there are several forms of interaction an individual can have with a website. These can be considered forms of personalization of websites.²⁵ Usually, personalization is “largely about filtering content to satisfy an individual’s particular” information needs.²⁶ We see personalization at its most complex in the algorithmically adjusted results to a search based on previous searches. There we find the feature of suggestions that are offered to an individual on the basis of search results, a feature offered by Amazon and Netflix. While we will not be able to personalize our discovery services in a manner similar to Netflix or Amazon, we can improve the quality of the interaction in other areas of “personalization.” We should be seeking ways we can more directly speak to individual searchers, for example, by selecting words and phrases that speak directly to a person’s needs.

Our examination of many e-commerce sites reveals a robust use of linguistically personalized features as an intrinsic part of their website design and enhancement. That is, e-commerce sites make use of their interface itself to directly communicate with their customers in a way that makes use of certain linguistic features that can be easily adopted by library sites. Combined with faceted searching, adding certain linguistic features should prove effective in encouraging the use of the facets, and in the process improve both the search results and the user experience. This constitutes the fundamental challenge for the academic library—to help shape the mental model with regard to the universe of content that we provide through our search interface. Finally, there is what we can consider a form of linguistic personalization with which language is used to “speak” more directly to a searcher. It is this third feature of linguistic personalization that libraries can more easily control and customize with the discovery services, as well as at other places on the library website.

There is, of course, the personalization that is intended primarily for those who register and then set up their own accounts. However, there is also the personalization in terms of text communication in which the website uses both pronouns and verb forms that directly address the searcher. This is seen in the use of the second-person pronoun, either the subject or the possessive, “*you*” or “*your*,” and for verbal forms, the use of the second-person imperative (usually the same as the infinitive in English). This type of personalization is a web design decision. The search box now frequently contains text, ranging from simple noun lists to sentences, all of which are intended to encourage the user to make use of the search capabilities. After a search has occurred, the results are also indicated with text that speaks directly to a person by means of the use of pronouns and verbs. We find the following interesting examples in table 1:

Pronoun	Site	Notes
What are you looking for today?	Kroger	Search box
What can we help you find?	Home Depot	Search box
What are you looking for?	Lowe’s	Search box
Your selections	Target	Post-search
We found x results for [search term]	Target	Post-search
Narrow your results	Tigerdirect	Post-search

Table 1. Linguistic Personalization Examples

In examining the features that are found at these e-commerce sites, it is interesting to note the use of either of two words for the facet instructions: **Refine** or **Narrow**, two words our users will routinely encounter in nonlibrary searching.

The various sites all have the following elements:

1. search box
2. search results outcome clearly shown
3. facet instruction [“refine,” “narrow,” “show”]
4. facets

Major Problems with Library Discovery Interfaces

We can identify three important areas that need to be considered with the discovery interface design:

1. the search box itself
2. the facet labels and their intelligibility
3. getting the user to the facets area

The Library Search Box

The search box makes an excellent point of departure for implementing improvements of the library's discovery interfaces. Note that companies do not assume prior search knowledge on the part of their potential market; they explicitly tell people what they can do in the search box. As we see in table 1, many companies (e.g., Home Depot and Lowe's) are choosing to use entire sentences, not merely clipped phrases or strings of nouns.

Many libraries are beginning to populate the search box with text. However, that text is often simply a noun list of types of formats, e.g., articles, books, media, etc. It is important to point out that there is an implicit expectation of an action present in a search box. But too often when our library websites supply a list of nouns, we are assuming that we are answering the question in the mind of the searcher—they are looking for a subject or topic—and we supply a string of nouns that enumerate formats. So right from the beginning, we find a mismatch between the user's purpose when coming to a library's search box and our arbitrary enumeration not of topics, but of types of information sources.

Once we recognize this problem, we have some very good options to choose from in terms of personalizing the search box in a way that is more analogous to what Home Depot and Lowe's offer:

1. What are you looking for?

The sentence above is colloquial; it is exactly what a person would expect to hear when approaching a reference librarian or from a service counter experience in a variety of settings.

2. What are you searching for?

This is a more complex concept because it includes what can be considered a technical term ("search"), a word now commonly understood within the context of searching for information and not only applicable to a lost dog or strayed notebook.

This simple adjustment matches the user's intent with a clearly stated purpose in the search box. There are additional ways we can enrich the search box that will assist the users in their queries.

Both examples use the pronoun *you* so that the sentence speaks directly to the individual searcher. There is, of course, the option to just use a verb in the imperative: “Search for . . .” or “Enter [keywords, terms, etc.]”. However, the added feature of the pronoun *you* promotes the involvement of the participant-searcher. See also the interesting article by Thompson on the use of personal pronouns in social media communications by university students.²⁷

Facets Column

All library discovery services make use of facets. Since the facets column does constitute a far more challenging area of linguistic personalization for the discovery interface, the incorporation of specific types of design features should be employed to immediately attract the attention of the user to the facets column. This is a very complicated area that deals with user behavior, interface design, etc. How do we direct the user’s attention to the facets column, let alone to be aware of the facets on the lefthand side? We can add a note after a search that says something to the effect of “too many results/hits? Try narrowing your search with the facets below.” Although this involves difficult interface design issues, it is very important that we begin to think more seriously about ways to draw our users into the search process more intuitively and effectively. If we don’t, we will find the continual underutilization of an incredibly powerful searching feature.

We also know that users routinely ignore advertising banners so often that the literature has christened this tendency “banner blindness”; in the same way, if our facet labels are meaningless, they will be overlooked.²⁸ We condemn the discovery service interface to the same fate if we are not careful to choose meaningful labels that make sense when the “average” student or faculty user encounters them. Currently, we are also assuming knowledge on the part of our users that is clearly misplaced or we anticipate a much greater success with instruction than is usually warranted. There are several studies that show the disparity between the searcher’s self-assessment and the reality of the actual skill possessed.²⁹

One of the main problems users experience with search engines is their inability to narrow their searches, especially because we are now dealing with such a large array of information source types.³⁰ This is where the use of facets comes into its own. As we seek to make the discovery interface the first and, eventually, probably the only primary interface to our selected resources, the user needs to know how to easily find a video or a sound recording as well as a pertinent article. This should be done through an easily accessible and understandable search interface. The success of the e-commerce sites in making effective and profitable use of facets amply demonstrates the value of facets even for complex research questions and topics.

This brings up the matter of naming conventions for the facets. It is clear that, despite the newness of discovery services, the facet labels simply continue the naming conventions that are used in databases. We know from usability studies that library jargon is a stumbling block for our users.³¹ When we do not pay close attention to the appropriateness of each facet category label, we simply continue the utilization of a terminology that is foreign to the understanding of many of our

users,³² undermining the use of a powerful searching feature merely because of user ignorance of the terms. An honest appraisal of the discovery interface will bring us immediately face-to-face with one of our primary legacy library problems, our heavily jargon-laden vocabulary. In fact, we are actually dealing simultaneously with two problems—the facet labels that are chosen and the complexity of the information universe that discovery systems expose. At a presentation on discovery services at the 2014 ALA Annual Conference, one speaker went so far as to say that facets are not used in discovery searches.³³ This underscores the unpleasant reality that we are dealing with both a design problem and an intelligibility problem, not the failure of facets as a navigational feature. At a recent LOEX presentation, one school had already thrown in the towel and will concentrate on teaching Academic Search Premier over the discovery service Primo.³⁴ Again, this reveals that users are having a problem with the interface and its display content.

Suggestions for Improving Facets and the Facet Labels

Currently, the facet labels in library discovery service interfaces are limited to a list of nouns that designate the facets that can be used for narrowing or limiting a search. However, the labels that we use may not be meaningful to our users and are simply a list of nouns that are, by and large, not really understood.³⁵ Second, a facet label is also intended to have the user do something, hence a verb of action is implied. In standard classification taxonomies, the facet is used for organizing and grouping the objects that will be included in the facet. For a discovery system, the facet is there to lead the searcher to content on the basis of the content's differing characteristics as expressed through a facet. One has to ask the question, exactly why would a student do something simply because that student sees a noun on the lefthand side? We need to provide more context during the search process.

Below we make recommendations that we think will enhance the intelligibility and the usability of facets.³⁶ It will be important for libraries and vendors to do substantial user experience investigations into the various options that are available for use on a discovery page. Our goal is to draw attention to the current inadequacies in how facets have been implemented in discovery services and to encourage a more systematic approach to this important area of our library information delivery capabilities.

1. As observed above, in the e-commerce sites, the facet is indicated by the presence of an icon marker that allows for the facet to expand and contract. In our sample of sites, there was a parity between using the +/- sign or a triangle (a full triangle, not a right and downward chevron). EDS made the decision to go with the chevron symbol. This is a user interface issue and one that needs further examination and testing. We think that the +/- sign is a more suitable visual icon indicator for a user to take a specific action. +/- also have a value attached to them that says to a user “yes” for the + sign and “no” for the - sign, thereby signaling a user to expand (+) or contract (-) a list. We want to attract users to the facets and to take an action.

-
2. Make sure that only facets and filters are collapsible and expendable and that the design interface makes this clear.
 3. The term *limit* is often found in discovery systems. This is a term that was not found in our sample of e-commerce sites. The two primary terms are *refine* and *narrow*. The advantage of using these terms is that one can more easily personalize this feature, “Narrow your results to” [Full text] [Scholarly . . .] [Date]; these are two words that users normally see when searching e-commerce sites.
 4. The facet “source types” is a common facet label. This is obscure terminology that users, especially students, tend not to know. A suitable option to personalize this category could be, “What type of information do you need?” and then list the types. At least by asking the question, a user will be encouraged to look at the possibilities available, e.g., academic journals, trade publications, magazines, etc.

In the following list of facets, we can see that the facets themselves are inherently contradictory or do not actually represent what they purport to be. This is not an argument against facets; rather, we need to rethink exactly what we do want our metadata to do. To simply take up space on the facets column does not serve any purpose. It is also clear that we need to systematically monitor the use of facets, and for this we need analytics. At this point, it is difficult, if not impossible, to know whether facets have been used for searches and, if so, which facets have been used. Until we routinely gather this sort of data, we will not have the appropriate data to make suitable decisions about facets and their use.

1. *Language*—This facet represents the language (both written and spoken content) of the work. While the term *language* is understood by users, we need to consider whether the word alone triggers a response. Since users most likely want only English, the facet label can ask that question, and then the selection of language choices will appear, making it clear that there are other choices as well.

A question like “do you want English only?” will then elicit a response to narrow the results by language. With the majority of the materials in English, this may be moot, but it does encourage the searcher to think about the language.

The discovery layer adds the facet term “undetermined” when the provided metadata does not specify the language of a work. In a sense, the metadata has holes and a user that is searching for a particular language will inadvertently exclude relevant search results if the facet is used too soon to filter out undesired languages. We recommend that filtering by language should be used only as necessary and only when overwhelmed by a large number of unwanted languages.

2. *Publisher*—This facet represents the entity or the issuer of a published work. This applies across both serial and nonserial materials. The user most likely understands this term. But the question is, what is the value of this facet? While we do have the

metadata for this, it is difficult to understand the circumstances under which one will actually limit a search by the publisher. We suggest not displaying this facet.

3. *Publication*—This facet represents the source title of the published work, such as a journal, trade magazine, or newspaper. This applies primarily to articles, book reviews, columns, etc., and not to publications like books, sound recordings, and videos. The user must be made aware that the use of this facet should be used for serial-type materials only. Alternatives to “publication” can be “article source.” This facet answers the implicit search query and could be a pop-up window: “What journal or magazine are you looking for?”
4. *Content providers*—This is a very problematic facet. It is not difficult to surmise that most users when encountering this term would not know what it means and, more significantly, why it is important. In fact, the term itself is not accurate—another interesting issue that must be dealt with. The “content providers” may not be the actual providers of content but rather providers of the metadata content, which is something altogether different. For example, Emerald is the actual content provider for an article, yet a different provider, the metadata provider, is listed as the content provider. A suggested replacement for this term is “sources.” Wordings for a pop-up window could be, “To narrow your search, choose from a source that most closely matches your topic. The sources are from different types of subject databases.”
5. *Subject*—The use of the facet “subject” may seem to be obvious, yet, upon closer inspection, the nature of this facet is problematic. What is the cognitive connection between first doing a keyword search and then seeing on the lefthand side the facet label “subject?” Why should a user assume he or she should now click on a link called “subject,” since they just finished doing a subject search? We need to provide the context for an action that takes into account the most common experience of the user. Using the term “topic” rather than “subject” would allow us to offer a term that is more congruent with the familiar vocabulary of a student’s classroom experience because generally students are directed to research topics.

A University of Washington Libraries usability study from the pre-discovery era (2004) found that users preferred “browse subjects” to “by subject.”³⁷ Here we see the presence of a verb specifying an action. The significant finding for our purposes from this earlier study is the fact that users found the phrase with a verb more meaningful than the phrase with a preposition. We suggest making it clear that the user can further refine the search by the suggested subjects that are listed in the facets by using the phrase “narrow your topic” or “further narrow your topic.” The pop-up window could say, “To narrow your search, choose from this list of possible topics that most closely match your search terms.”

The conclusion reached by the University of Arizona study is even more relevant for the discovery layer interface: “We learned that if students have no idea why or when they should use an index, they will not choose a link labeled index, no matter how well designed the web page is.”³⁸ This is the situation with facet labels. If they are not intelligible, or at least provoke some response to a question posed, they will be ignored, and if ignored, their potential value goes completely unused.

CONCLUSION

E-commerce has concluded, in the face of overwhelmingly positive evidence, that facets are an essential aspect of the successful (i.e., profitable) user experience and that they have been almost universally adopted by companies who sell products, have very large product lines, and need to lead their customer to exactly the type of product they want. In our discovery layers, we also need to develop the kinds of features that promote the effective use of the resources we offer our academic users, and build in, where feasible, appropriate features. Modifications can and should be made as libraries work with their discovery-services vendor to rationalize an interface page that should include natural language, easily understandable navigation, logical taxonomic ordering of the facets, etc. In essence, both product searches and academic information searches present the same scenario: we begin with an information need, a retrieval system, and the need to achieve recall, precision, and relevance.

Discovery services allow for an information search to be carried out essentially as a Google search while limiting the scope of facets to assistance in refining it. We can be confident that our users, many (or even most) of whom also use e-commerce faceted search sites, are able to recognize a similar search interface. Thus we are dealing with an important design issue. But to what extent do our users take advantage of faceted searches? As it stands at this writing, the link between the facets and their corresponding content “documents” (articles or video) is simply not clear. The characteristics of our discoverable objects must be tied in with what a user would be likely to understand.

We need analytics capable of supplying this sort of critical user-experience information. It may be that we are perhaps dealing with conflicting mental models about information searching. Students and other members of the academic community may simply not be adequately cognizant of the implicit faceted nature of their query, and this becomes a new opportunity for improvements in our approach to user instruction.

It is clear that libraries and vendors need to work together to properly evaluate the facet labels if facets are to begin to achieve their potential as an essential search function. Disheartening statements to the effect that no one uses them, or that the discovery system itself is already branded a failure, demonstrates that the discovery layer, while clearly a powerful tool for integrating a range of accessible resource, is still in its infancy. Our purpose in this paper was to draw attention to both the proven value of faceted navigation and the ongoing problem of

confusing or inadequately understood library terminology that is presently hindering what should be a powerful tool in our information discovery warehouse.

REFERENCES

1. Google is ranked number 1 according to Alexa, a traffic-ranking website. "The top 500 sites on the web," Alexa, accessed May 9, 2014, <http://www.alexa.com/topsites>.
2. Irene Lopatovska, Megan R. Fenton and Sara Campot, "Examining Preferences for Search Engines and Their Effects on Information Behavior," *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology* 49, no. 1 (2012): 1–11.
3. Betsy Sparrow, Jenny Liu and Daniel M. Wegner, "Google Effects on Memory: Cognitive Consequences of Having Information at Our Fingertips," *Science* 333, no. 6043 (2011): 776–78; Daniel M. Wegner and Adrian F. Ward, "How Google Is Changing Your Brain," *Scientific American* 309, no. 6 (2013): 58–61; Robin Marantz Henig and Samantha Henig, *Twentysomething: Why do Young Adults Seem Stuck?* (New York: Hudson Street, 2012), 139–43; Matti Näsi and Leena Koivusilta, "Internet and Everyday Life: The Perceived Implications of Internet Use on Memory and Ability to Concentrate," *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 16, no. 2 (2013): 88–93.
4. Alison J. Head, *Learning the Ropes: How Freshmen Conduct Course Research Once They Enter College* (Project Information Literacy, December 5, 2013), http://projectinfolit.org/images/pdfs/pil_2013_freshmenstudy_fullreport.pdf.
5. Ibid. 2.
6. Joshua Steimle, "What Does SEO Cost? [Infographic]," *Forbes*, September 12, 2013, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/joshsteimle/2013/09/12/what-does-seo-cost-infographic/>.
7. Frank Scharnell, "Guide to eCommerce Facets, Filters and Categories," *YouMoz* (blog), April 30, 2013, <http://moz.com/ugc/guide-to-ecommerce-facets-filters-and-categories>
8. Vanda Broughton, "Meccano, Molecules, and the Organization of Knowledge: The Continuing Contribution of S. R. Ranganathan" (presentation, International Society for Knowledge Organization UK chapter, London, November 5, 2007), 2, http://www.iskouk.org/presentations/vanda_broughton.pdf.
9. Jody Condit Fagan, "Discovery Tools and Information Literacy," *Journal of Web Librarianship* 5, no. 3 (2011): 171–78.
10. Sarah Ramdeen and Bradley M. Hemminger, "A Tale of Two Interfaces: How Facets Affect the Library Catalog Search," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology* 63 (2012): 702–15.



-
11. Amy F. Fyn, Vera Lux and Robert J. Snyder, "Reflections on Teaching and Tweaking a Discovery Layer," *Reference Services Review* 41, no. 1 (2013): 113–24. See also the various presentations at recent LOEX conferences.
 12. William Badke, "Pushing a Big Rock Up a Hill All Day: Promoting Information Literacy Skills," *Online Searcher* 37, no. 6 (2013): 67.
 13. See the following blog entry on library jargon, which makes observations on terms such as "periodicals" and "databases": "Periodicals and Other Library Jargon," *Mr. Library Dude* (blog), March 18, 2011, <http://mrlibrarydude.wordpress.com/tag/library-jargon/>. This presentation on library jargon is a very helpful contribution to the discussion: Mark Aaron Polger, "Rethinking Library Jargon: Maintaining Consistency and Using Plain Language," (slideshow presentation, February 5, 2011), <http://www.slideshare.net/markaaronpolger/library-jargon-newestjan2010feb2010-6815908>.
 14. We are referring here to systems such as EBSCO EDS, ProQuest Summon, Ex Libris Primo.
 15. Beth Thomsett-Scott and Patricia E. Reese, "Academic Libraries and Discovery Tools: A Survey of the Literature," *College & Undergraduate Libraries* 19, no. 2–4 (2012): 123–43; Helen Dunford, review of *Planning and Implementing Resource Discovery Tools in Academic Libraries*, by Mary Pagliero Popp and Diane Dallis, *The Australian Library Journal* 62, no. 2 (2013): 175–76.
 16. Sarah Ramdeen and Bradley M. Hemminger, "A Tale of Two Interfaces: How Facets Affect the Library Catalog Search," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology* 63 (2012): 713; Kathleen Bauer and Alice Peterson-Hart, "Does Faceted Display in a Library Catalog Increase Use of Subject Headings?," *Library Hi Tech* 30, no. 2 (2012): 354; Jody Condit Fagan, "Usability Studies of Faceted Browsing: A Literature Review," *Information Technology & Libraries* 29, no. 2 (2010): 62, <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ital.v29i2.3144>.
 17. William F. Chickering and Sharon Q. Yang, "Evaluation and Comparison of Discovery Tools: An Update," *Information Technology & Libraries* 33, no. 2 (2014), <http://dx.doi.org/10.6017/ital.v33i2.3471>.
 18. Vanda Broughton, "The Need for a Faceted Classification as the Basis of All Methods of Information Retrieval," *Aslib Proceedings* 58, no. 1/2 (2006): 49–72.
 19. Leonard Will, "Rigorous Facet Analysis as the Basis for Constructing Knowledge Organization Systems (KOS) of All Kinds" (paper presented at 2013 ISKO UK Conference, London, July 8–9, 2013): 4, <http://www.iskouk.org/conf2013/papers/WillPaper.pdf>.
 20. Marti A. Hearst, "Design Recommendations for Hierarchical Faceted Search Interfaces," in *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Workshop on Faceted Search* (2006), <http://flamenco.sims.berkeley.edu/papers/faceted-workshop06.pdf>.

-
21. Kathryn La Barre, "Traditions of Facet Theory, or a Garden of Forking Paths?," in *Facets of Knowledge Organization: Proceedings of the ISKO UK Second Biennial Conference, 4th–5th July, 2011, London* (Bingley, UK : Emerald, 2012), 96.
 22. Barre, "Traditions of Facet Theory, or a Garden of Forking Paths?," 98.
 23. Frank Scharnell, "Guide to eCommerce Facets, Filters and Categories."
 24. Andrew D. Asher, Lynda M. Duke, and Suzanne Wilson, "Paths of Discovery: Comparing the Search effectiveness of EBSCO Discovery Service, Summon, Google Scholar, and Conventional Library Resources," *College & Research Libraries* 74, no. 5 (2013): 464–88.
 25. Saverio Perugini, "Personalization by Website Transformation: Theory and Practice," *Information Processing & Management* 46, no. 3 (2010): 284; Elizabeth, F. Churchill, "Putting the Person Back into Personalization," *Elizabeth F. Churchill* (blog), July 24, 2013, <http://elizabethchurchill.com/uncategorized/putting-the-person-back-into-personalization/>.
 26. Churchill, "Putting the Person Back into Personalization."
 27. Celia Thompson, Kathleen Gray, and Hyejeong Kim, "How Social are Social Media Technologies (SMTs)? A Linguistic Analysis of University Students' Experiences of Using SMTs for Learning," *The Internet & Higher Education* 21 (2014): 31–40, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.iheduc.2013.12.001>.
 28. "Banner Blindness Studies," BannerBlindness.org, accessed April 7, 2014, <http://bannerblindness.org/banner-blindness-studies/>.
 29. Melissa Gross and Don Latham, "Undergraduate Perceptions of Information Literacy: Defining, Attaining, and Self-Assessing Skills," *College & Research Libraries* 70, no. 4 (2009): 336–50.
 30. See the section "Most internet users say they do not know how to limit the information that is collected about them by a website," Pew Report 2012, <http://www.pewinternet.org/2012/03/09/main-findings-11/#most-internet-users-say-they-do-not-know-how-to-limit-the-information-that-is-collected-about-them-by-a-website>.
 31. Chris Jasek, "How to Design Library Websites to Maximize Usability," *Library Connect, Pamphlet* 5 (2007): 4, <http://libraryconnectarchive.elsevier.com/lcp/0502/lcp0502.pdf>. See also the results compiled in this paper of fifty-one intelligibility studies, John Kupersmith, "Library Terms that Users Understand" (University of California, 2012), <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/3qq499w7>.
 32. Paige Alfonzo, "My Library Usability Study Stage 1," *Librarian Enumerations* (blog), June 19, 2013, <http://librarianenumerations.wordpress.com/2013/06/19/library-usability-study/>.
 33. "Discussing Discovery Services: What's Working, What's Not and What's Next?" (discussion forum, ALA 2014 Annual Conference, Las Vegas, Nevada, June 29, 2014).



-
34. Susan Avery and Lisa Janicke Hinchliffe, "Hopes, Impressions, and Reality: Is a Discovery Layer the Answer?" (program, LOEX 2014 Annual Conference, Grand Rapids, Michigan, May 8–10, 2014),
http://www.loexconference.org/2014/presentations/'LOEX2014_'Hopes%20Impressions%20and%20Reality-AveryHinchliffe.pdf.
 35. Kupersmith, "Library Terms that Users Understand."
 36. We are taking our examples from EBSCO EDS with which we are most familiar. The issues discussed are common to all discovery systems.
 37. Kupersmith, "Library Terms that Users Understand."
 38. Ruth Dickstein and Vicki Mills, "Usability Testing at the University of Arizona Library: How to Let the Users in on the Design," *Information Technology and Libraries* 19, no. 3 (2000): 144–51.