

Strength of Evidence Scale

The following scale was used to evaluate each guideline. It is a modified version of the scale used by the NCI for their web design guidelines published at www.usability.org.

Rating	Description
●●●●●	A universally-accepted foundation principle supported by numerous usability tests and/or studies and published in multiple peer-reviewed sources.
●●●●○	A strongly established recommendation based on a well-controlled usability study with numerous test subjects or multiple usability tests and/or studies validated by multiple researchers. Published in at least one peer-reviewed source.
●●●○○	A well-established recommendation based on a usability study or more than one usability tests and/or studies. Published in (or in press for) at least one source.
●●○○○	A recommendation supported by a small or non-rigorous usability test or study that is not well known or needs more supporting evidence. Unpublished but available, often through the Web.
●○○○○	A recommendation from an industry expert, style guide, or common practice, that has not been confirmed by usability tests or studies.
○○○○○	Relatively common practices that have not been validated by research.

References

- Aleven, V., McLaren, B. M., & Koedinger, K.R. (2006). Towards computer-based tutoring of help-seeking skills. in *Help Seeking in Academic Settings: Goals, Groups, and Contexts*, Lawrence Erlbaum, San Francisco.
- Baker, R. S., Corbett, A. T., & Koedinger, K. R. (2004). Detecting student misuse of intelligent tutoring systems. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Intelligent Tutoring Systems*. Berlin: Springer Verlag. 531-540.
- Bailey, R. W., Koyani, S. & Nall, J. (2000). Usability testing of several health information Web sites, *National Cancer Institute Technical Report*, September: 7-8.
- Bernard, M., Liao, C.H., & Mills, M.M. (2001). The effects of font type and size on the legibility and reading time of online text by older adults. *Proceedings of ACM CHI 2001, vol. II*. ACM Press. 175-176.
- Bernard, M., Mills, M., Frank, T., & McKown J. (2001). Which font do children prefer to read online? *Usability News* 3.1. Available at: <http://psychology.wichita.edu/surl/usabilitynews/3W/fontJR.htm>.
- Bernard, M., Mills, M., Peterson, M., & Storrer, K. (2001). A comparison of popular online fonts: which is best and when? *Usability News* 3.2. Available at: <http://psychology.wichita.edu/surl/usabilitynews/3S/font.htm>.
- Byren, M.D., Anderson, J.R., Douglass, S. & Matessa, M. (1999). Eye tracking the visual search of click-down menus. *CHI 99 Conference Proceedings*. 402-409.
- Fukuda, R. & Bubb, H. (2003). Eye tracking study on web-use: comparison between younger and elderly users in case of search task with electronic timetable service. *Psychology Journal* 1(3):202- 228.
- Große, C. S. & Renkl, A. (2006). Learning from worked examples: what happens if errors are included? In P. Gerjets, J. Elen, R. Joiner, & P. Kirschner (Eds.). *Instructional design for effective and enjoyable computer-supported learning*. Knowledge Media Research Center, Tübingen.
- Kalbach, J. & Bosenick T. (2000). Web page layout: a comparison between left- and right-justified site navigation menus. *Journal of Digital information*. 4(1).
- Kalyuga, S., Ayres, P., Chandler, P., & Sweller, J. (2003). The expertise reversal effect. *Educational Psychologist*. 38(1): 23-31.
- Kardash, C. M., & Noel, L. K. (2000). How organizational signals, need for cognition, and verbal ability affect text recall and recognition. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*. 25(3): 317-331.
- Martin, A. P., Ivory, M. Y., Megraw, R., & Slabosky, B. (2005). Exploring the persistent problem of user assistance. *Technical Report IS-TR-2005-08-01*. University of Washington Information School.
- McCarthy, J. D., Sasse, M. A., Riegelsberger, J. (2003). Could I have the menu please? An eyetracking study of design conventions. *Proceedings of HCI 2003*. 401-414.
- McElwain, S, Hogan, M. & Barry, C. (2002). An experimental study of navigational guidelines and their contribution to the usability of a website. *Proceedings Of The Irish Academy Of Management Annual Conference*. Waterford, Ireland. 5-6.
- Miller, C. S., & Remington, R. W. (2004). Modeling information navigation: implications for information Architecture. *Human-Computer Interaction*. 19: 225-271.

Moallem, A. (2003). Usability of software online documentation: A user study. *Proceedings of HCI 2003*. 549-553.

Ownby, R. L., Czaja, S., Gray, J. T., & Carmin, C. H. (2003). Problems in healthcare website designs: implications for usability and comprehension in the elderly. *Universal Access in HCI: inclusive design in the information society, Volume 4 of the Proceedings of HCI International 2003*. 241-245.

Paas, F., Renkl, A., & Sweller, J. (2003). Cognitive load theory and instructional design: recent developments. *Educational Psychologist*. 38: 1-4.

Renkl, A. (2002). Learning from worked-out examples: instructional explanations supplement self-explanations. *Learning & Instruction*. 12: 529-556.

Reuning, S. (2004). Giving navigation a hand: laterality and menu placement. Master's thesis. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill + School of Information and Library Science. 44 pages.

Schmidt, E., Bauerly, M., Liu, Y., and Sridharan, S. (2003). Web page aesthetics and performance: A survey and an experimental study. In *Proceedings of the 8th Annual International Conference on Industrial Engineering - Theory, Applications and Practice*, Las Vegas.

Spool, J. A., Scanlon, T., Schroeder, W., Snyder, C. & DeAngelo, T. (1998). *Web Site Usability: A Designer's Guide*, Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco.

Wood, D. (2001). Scaffolding, contingent tutoring, and computer-supported learning. *International Journal of Artificial Intelligence in Education*. 12: 280-292.

Wood, H. A., & Wood, D. J. (1999). Help seeking, learning and contingent tutoring. *Computers and Education*. 33: 153-169.