



The Art Museum Image Consortium  
<http://www.amico.org>

**Focus Group Study  
of Users and Uses of  
the AMICO Library**

**Final Report of a grant provided by the J. Paul Getty Trust**

Submitted by Jennifer Trant  
Executive Director, Art Museum Image Consortium  
December, 1999



## Focus Group Study of Users and Uses of the AMICO Library and Follow Up

### Contents

#### Contents

1.	Introduction.....	1
2.	Focus Groups Findings.....	2
2.1	Art Historians and Image Users.....	2
2.2	Image Collection Managers .....	4
2.3	Analysis and Reporting .....	5
3.	Results.....	6

### Appendices

Appendix I: AMICO Members

Appendix II: AMICO Users and Uses Committee Members

Appendix III: Moderator's Guide for Focus Groups

Appendix IV. Full Transcripts of Focus Group Discussions

Appendix V. Sample products developed to respond to user needs  
FAQ  
Introducing the AMICO Library brochure  
Overview of the Library

Appendix VI Financial Report

## 1. Introduction

In March, 1999, the Grant Program of the J.Paul Getty Trust awarded \$20,000 to the Art Museum Image Consortium to study users and uses of the AMICO Library, a collection of multimedia documentation of works of art which AMICO had compiled. The AMICO Library, at that time consisted of 20,000 works, and was being used in universities engaged with AMICO in a “testbed” project prior to the launch of a subscription-based service. AMICO proposed to study users and uses to identify ways the Library could be improved for users in the future and, by identifying the kinds of questions users had, to determine how best to explain the form and nature of the AMICO Library to potential users.

AMICO realized that despite considerable anecdotal evidence and a few systematic studies, those creating multimedia reference databases had little information about how or why scholars use or don't images, or about what they felt would be required to encourage use of digital images on their campuses. The members of AMICO were, from the first, extremely interested in learning what they could about user needs, requirements and expectations, as these are critical to the successful development and deployment of a system (legal, technological, social and economic) to provide digital museum documentation to universities. As a first step, AMICO enlisted universities and the major provider of scholarly information to research universities Research Libraries Group (RLG) to participate in a year-long study; we designed the “University Testbed Project” to build understanding of this sector's needs. Testbed participants acquired the AMICO Library a year early in order to help answer a number of questions keyed to a published set of Research Objectives (available online at <http://www.amico.org/projects/u.objectives.html>). These included conducting studies of users and uses by a number of different methods: survey, statistical analysis of use patterns, focus groups, and individual interviews.

The Art Museum Image Consortium proposed to build upon the institutionally-based research during the University Testbed Project, with a series of coordinated activities designed to develop a shared understanding of the needs of users and issues in the uses of digital images in the arts and humanities. During the second semester of the academic year 1998/99 (January 1999 through May 1999), AMICO staff and members analyzed and documented users and uses of the AMICO Library. Contracted researchers at Cornell University conducted surveys and quantitative research. University teams at many of the testbed sites conducted interviews and surveys, and did in depth assessments of uses in particular classrooms. With the support of the Getty Grant Program, AMICO staff conducted two in-depth focus groups with academic users and image managers to identify their anticipated needs and expected requirements.

During the spring of 1999, AMICO members of the Users and Uses Committee met on several occasions. The entire membership of AMICO discussed the findings of the users studies at its meeting in June 1999, and invited to that meeting participants in the University Testbed Project who had conducted user studies of their own. Two days were devoted to discussing ways of meeting user expectations. A summer intern with experience in marketing and client services was brought into the process to follow up on the user research. AMICO members decided to focus her activity on providing an online FAQ (Frequently Asked Questions) brochure, creating overviews of the AMICO Library, developing Guidelines for citing works from the AMICO Library, and developing a brochure addressed at educators which answered AMICO questions raised by the focus groups and explored the experiences

of those users in the University Testbed project who had successfully employed the AMICO Library in their research and teaching.

This report examines in greater detail the reactions of the focus groups and the way in which AMICO responded to their and other user evaluations. Specifically it summarizes some areas of user concern, highlights the differences in perspectives between faculty and resource providers, and explain the background to AMICO's summer project to follow up on the findings of its users and uses studies, which culminated in publishing the "Introducing the AMICO Library" brochure.

## **2. Focus Groups Findings**

AMICO conducted two user group meetings, one of instructors and one of visual resource curators, in conjunction with the College Art Association (CAA) and Visual Resources Association (VRA) annual meetings in Los Angeles, in February 1999. The two groups, had quite different views of the need and uses for the AMICO Library as well as for the ways in which it could most be enhanced for their use.

Focus groups research was selected as the best method for obtaining in-depth, comparable, qualitative data from a target population. The focus groups were facilitated by Jennifer Trant and David Bearman; and selected members of the AMICO Users and Uses Committee attended to provide a members perspective. Each user group met for a three hour session. They received a brief introduction to the AMICO Library, and then were asked to address specific questions bearing on concrete decisions facing AMICO members in the evolution of the AMICO Library.

Sessions were be videotaped and a court reporter created a full transcript for subsequent review. Full transcripts are provided as Appendix IV of this report.

### **2.1 Art Historians and Image Users**

AMICO invited twelve art history faculty - six with experience of the AMICO Testbed Library and six without - to the CAA focus group. Of these, six were able to attend.

#### **2.1.1 Background**

The College Art Participants, including those who had nominally had access to AMICO as subscribers, did not have great familiarity with the AMICO database prior to coming to the Focus group meeting. They reported an average of 3 on a scale of 1-5 (I've explored the AMICO Library myself before coming here), but some commented that this experience consisted of as little as ten minutes.

#### **2.1.2 RLG Application**

As a consequence of having little experience with the Library, and probably also of having less experience with on-line systems in general, the faculty had little to say about the RLG application appearance or functionality. Where they did rank features, there was little consensus among them. Perhaps the single issue that attracted attention was the perceived need for an improved Notebook function (ranked 2.25 on a scale of 1-high to 3-low and commented on elsewhere under saving previous search sets. (RLG, which sat in on the

meeting, subsequently implemented their suggestions and other added functionality before the AMICO Library was formally released).

### 2.1.3 Use

Somewhat surprisingly, CAA participants ranked the Library as first in places AMICO would be used by themselves and their students, followed by the Visual Resources Collection, Home and Office. Only one art historian thought the AMICO Library would be used most in the Classroom, and saw this as relevant only to students, not to faculty.

CAA participants saw links to Art History textbooks, course web sites and local slide libraries as valuable. Links to encyclopedias, on-line library catalogs, personal databases were ranked lower. After further discussion, they concurred that AMICO need not link the material to Art History texts, as this was a role they envisioned for themselves.

It was clear in discussions that art historians needed to learn about how other art historians were using the AMICO Library in order to imagine using it themselves. Those who had little experience of digital images in particular needed to learn about how other faculty had coped and how students respond to these resources.

### 2.1.4 Content

When asked to indicate percentages of the AMICO Library of particular genres, sources, cultures, or historical periods, CAA participants were unable to suggest targets. Not surprisingly they expressed the view that breadth was preferable. But surprisingly, they *felt under-represented and hard to get works and collections* should be sought for inclusion in the AMICO Library. Indeed, they agreed that works that we would not expect from known collections, and works from relatively unknown collections, were preferred. Also, a significant representation of modern and contemporary work was seen as a positive.

Faculty were interested in being able to provide suggestions about content to AMICO, but in a more general fashion rather than requesting specific works. If there were mechanisms for requesting specific works, they would expect to have those works provided.

### 2.1.5 Rights

CAA participants would like to see works included in the AMICO Library even if full rights are not available - in general with rights enumerated at the item level. They would be interested in having links to where other rights can be obtained and possibly links to agreements offered by rights holders, but do not feel this should be incorporated at an extra cost. Fundamentally their reaction suggested that they did not see the value of AMICO in its being a compilation of multimedia resources with known, and available, educational use rights but just as a collection of resources. In part, this may reflect the unfamiliarity of faculty with issues relating to intellectual property rights for digital material and the barriers to use this may entail.

### 2.1.6 Users

In general, the CAA participants felt it was desirable for almost anyone to be a user; they agreed that it was essential to include Distance Education students.

- Currently allowed uses: CAA participants were adamant that viewing, use on course web sites, and research uses be permitted but were willing to give up (or probably to sometimes not have) copying to CD or slides, overlaying images, manipulating them, or incorporating them into one's own art work.
- Currently prohibited uses: Not surprisingly CAA participants were interested in having the right to publish in academic journals and in retaining rights for educational use after the expiration of the license term. When asked for the value of such a post-use copy, however, they felt it was less than \$5 (our lowest number) - possibly only \$1 per image. All thought that faculty being able to retain copies for research was an important extension of the existing rights.

### 2.1.7 Reporting

By and large, CAA participants were not willing to report on use, though two felt that reporting on copying would be ok. Some of the resistance was philosophical; some was practical. In part it reflected also that the rights to alter images was not seen as being of great value, hence not worth the hassle of reporting.

## 2.2 Image Collection Managers

AMICO invited Visual Resource Curators from twelve different universities to the VRA focus group. Of these eight were able to attend. As with the art historians, the initial invitees were drawn half from institutions with access to the AMICO Library and half from institutions without.

Full details of the questions to be asked and issues to be explored can be found in Appendix IV, the Moderators' Guide. A full transcript of this session is also appended

The VRA participants had a fairly high degree of familiarity with the AMICO database. Most had used it extensively and some had developed AMICO applications.

### 2.2.1 RLG Application

The overall appearance and functionality of the RLG application was rated very highly by these participants. A few exceptions, or observations of note, were:

- the new image frames should be correctly sized and perhaps have a fixed location
- the pick lists as implemented might not scale well (indirectly this translated into a request for more authority control and fewer variants)
- image only views needed at least a creator, and perhaps a creator/title caption
- there might be one too many sizes of images (full screen?)
- saving the notebook will be a good innovation (as noted, RLG subsequently implemented these suggestions)

### 2.2.2 Priorities for Authority Files

The Visual Resources Curators overwhelmingly ranked linking to/or incorporating AAT/ULAN as their highest priority. Abstracting and indexing services ranked second, but considerably below AAT/ULAN. All other secondary and tertiary targets, including

textbooks, encyclopedias, and journals, ranked lower than primary sources from archives or museums.

### **2.2.3 Delivery Options**

Generally existing AMICO delivery strategies were endorsed. VRA participants favored separate media files rather than authored multimedia; 1024x768 lower boundaries for images, with black and white only for items which are b/w in their originals. However, they were happy to accept watermarks on higher resolution images. In generally they felt that cataloging in the language of the repository should be accompanied by indexes in English.

### **2.2.4 Rights**

VRA participants were uniformly willing to accept item-level rights limitations; only two felt we should continue to exclude everything that did not have full rights. Only one participant was willing to accept text without images. While they felt that links to rights holders, and perhaps to agreements, were desirable they were not interested in paying for them. On the other hand, they felt that an AMICO Library with substantial contemporary art content was worth 10-20% extra.

### **2.2.5 Users and Uses**

VRA participants did not think any new categories of users were necessary. They agreed that downloading, classroom projection, research and course web site mounting uses were essential and showed considerable willingness to give up overlay, manipulation and incorporation into new works. On the other hand, they strongly felt that retaining access after the license was important and were willing to pay an average of \$10 per image for that right. They accepted all other prohibitions on use that are currently in place.

### **2.2.6 Reporting**

Surprisingly those who responded were willing to report on modification as a condition of receiving rights to modify.

### **2.2.7 Location of Use**

Interestingly, VRA curators agreed that heaviest use would take place in Libraries, with home as second. Visual Resources Collections, classroom, and offices ranked third.

### **2.2.8 Linkage with other resources**

VRA curators ranked links to local slide holdings as most important, followed by course web sites. They overwhelmingly ranked ULAN "interoperability" highest in the metadata links, with AAT a distant second and MARC, VRA core and DC as "also rans".

### **2.2.9 Documentation**

VRA curators believed almost uniformly that exhibition history was the most important new content to add to AMICO. Scholarly essays came second.

## **2.3 Analysis and Reporting**

The AMICO Users and Uses Committee met, in conjunction with the Museums and the Web Conference and the American Association of Museums Annual Meeting to review

preliminary results. Specific suggestions about AMICO Library content were referred to a newly created Editorial Committee – an outcome of the user studies. The User and Uses Committee recommended employing a summer intern to work with members of AMICO at their annual meeting and during the summer to address the issues raised by the focus groups and other user studies – especially to explain the AMICO Library and its uses to the audiences which had been involved in these studies – faculty and visual resources curators. It was recognized that since the AMICO Library is the only service in operation, it risks high user expectations and the demand that it be "all things to all people".

The results of these focus groups were reported (all data made anonymous) both to AMICO Members and University Testbed Participants. At the AMICO Members/Users meeting in June, these and other user studies were reported and discussed as many facets of a complex situation. A summary of the focus group findings and of the University Testbed meeting were published for the general community, and made available online as part of the University Testbed meeting Report (<http://www.amico.org/projects/u.mtg.99/fg.sum.pdf>)

### **3. Results**

As a consequence of this first round of users and uses studies, AMICO defined a concrete response to Users' expressed needs. We made information available which users felt was needed to understand the AMICO Library and its uses. We also obtained some baseline data that we expect will be even more interesting once the use of digital image resources becomes widespread in the future. Since the conduct of user studies and focus groups will be an on-going activity of AMICO, it is hoped that we will be able to build on the findings of the first year in the future.

These user studies helped to lay concrete groundwork for future activities. By identifying the priorities of one of our prime user populations – the academic and research community – we are better able to schedule the developments and enhancements of the AMICO Library and the its distribution systems, to meet their needs.

The feedback of users was less helpful in identifying priorities for the AMICO Technical Committee. AMICO continues to feel that we should not develop digitization guidelines and best practices in a producer-led fashion. However, focus groups of end users do not seem to be able to define real requirements – both because they do not have enough experience in using digital resources and because they are not trained to identify the fundamental technical problems that might be interfering with their use. In the coming year, we hope to develop guidelines (Best Practices for Museum Digital Documentation and Image Digitization), but will do so more by critical analysis conducted by expert groups from within AMICO membership than by user studies. Subsequent research may compare user satisfaction with the products created by best digital practices to those of resources created by historical methods without reference to such guidelines.

While the focus group study reported here was only one of several research efforts that will be needed to provide background information to ensure that museum digital documentation is captured and delivered in manners suited to the needs and desires of educational users, it made a significant contribution to AMICO's efforts to fulfill its mission of enabling educational use of museum multimedia.



## Appendix I

### Art Museum Image Consortium Members

(as of December 1999)

1. Albright-Knox Art Gallery, Buffalo, NY
2. Art Gallery of Ontario, Toronto, Ontario
3. Art Institute of Chicago, Chicago, IL
4. Asia Society Gallery, New York, NY
5. Center for Creative Photography, Tucson, AZ
6. Cleveland Museum of Art, Cleveland, OH
7. Davis Museum and Cultural Center, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA
8. Detroit Institute of the Arts, Detroit MI
9. Fine Arts Museum of San Francisco, San Francisco, CA
10. The Frick Collection, New York, NY
11. International Museum of Photography, George Eastman House, Rochester, NY
12. J. Paul Getty Museum, Los Angeles, CA
13. Library of Congress, Washington, DC
14. Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, CA
15. McMichael Canadian Collections, Kleinberg, Ontario, Canada
16. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York, NY
17. Minneapolis Institute of Arts, Minneapolis, MN
18. Montreal Museum of Fine Arts, Montréal, Québec
19. Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal, Montréal, Québec
20. Museum of Contemporary Art, San Diego, CA
21. Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, MA
22. National Gallery of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario
23. National Museum of American Art, Washington, DC
24. Philadelphia Museum of Art, Philadelphia, PA
25. San Francisco Museum of Modern Art, San Francisco, CA
26. San Jose Museum of Art, San Jose, CA
27. Walker Art Center, Minneapolis MN
28. Whitney Museum of American Art, New York, NY

Appendix II:  
Art Museum Image Consortium  
Users and Uses Committee

Albright-Knox Art Gallery	Karen Lee Spaulding
Art Gallery of Ontario	Jane Rhodes
Art Institute of Chicago	Jack Perry Brown
Asia Society Galleries	Helen Abbott
Cleveland Museum of Art	Stephanie A. Stebich
Davis Museum and Cultural Center, Wellesley College	Peter Walsh
Frick Collection	Amy Herman
	Inge Reist
George Eastman House.	Roger Bruce
International Museum of Photography	Marianne Fulton
J. Paul Getty Museum	Erin Coburn
	Ken Hamma
Los Angeles County Museum of Art	Diana Folsom
Metropolitan Museum of Art	Deborah Howes
	Kent Lydecker
	Julie ZefTel
Minneapolis Institute of Arts	Tammy Sopinski Perlman
Museum of Fine Arts, Boston	Nancy Allen
Musée d'art contemporain de Montréal	Benoit Bissonnette
National Gallery of Canada	Daniel Amadei
National Museum of American Art	Virginia Mecklenburg
San Francisco Museum of Modern Art	Peter Samis
San Jose Museum of Art	Thom Sempere
Walker Art Center	Patty Hickson
	Steve Dietz

**Appendix III:  
Art Museum Image Consortium  
Moderators' Guide for Focus Groups**

**Contents:**

1.	Format of the Groups.....	1
2.	The Research Questions .....	2
2.1	Introductory Session .....	2
2.2	Content of the AMICO Library .....	2
2.3	Rights .....	9
2.4	Delivery Service.....	13
2.5	Tools and Future Uses .....	17
2.6	Expectations, Experiences, Opportunities and Barriers .....	18

**1. Format of the Groups**

Two focus groups, of Art Historians/Researchers and Visual Resource professionals for 3 hours. During this time, 10-12 individuals will engage in a discussion that will be structured and directed (through suggestion) by the moderators. A structured methodology is essential to ensure that the group addresses each of identified research areas. Prior focus groups on this subject<sup>1</sup> have been far less structured. As a result, while they provide general insights into positions and attitudes, they did not yield the concrete information needed to help AMICO direct the development of its programs.

Prior to each Section of the discussion, each member of the group will individually complete a set of survey questions on that topic. This will both provide the researchers with an additional data source that can be correlated with the opinions expressed in the group (providing a check on group dynamics that might lead the discussion). It has also been cited as a way to help focus participants and improve involvement and motivation.<sup>2</sup> Open discussion on the more general topic will then follow, with the survey questions serving as a guide for the moderator to topics they would like to see covered.

A significant amount of time, at the end of each session, will be provided for a more free-wheeling discussion that is led, or directed by the participants. We want to facilitate the introduction of new ideas and perspectives, and provide an open environment within which experiences, ideas or concerns can be raised, discussed and explored by the group.

---

<sup>1</sup> Such as those conducted by the Mellon Foundation funded Study of the Costs of Digital Image Distribution” cited above.

<sup>2</sup> “There is something about the process of writing things down that reinforces a person’s commitment to contributing these thoughts to the group, even in the face of apparent disapproval. Having written statements available also gives the moderator a legitimate basis for asking for input from those who have not said anything yet.” David L. Morgan. *Focus Groups as Qualitative Research*. Second Edition. Qualitative Research Methods Series, No. 16, A Sage University Paper, Sage publications, 1997, p. 50

## 2. The Research Questions

The discussion will be organized into four broad sections, each of which explores particular themes and issues in the creation and use of the AMICO Library.

### 2.1 Introductory Session

#### A. Participants and Facilitators Introductions

#### B. A Brief Introduction to what the AMICO Library is...

- multimedia information about works of art in collections of member institutions
- A collection growing in breadth, depth and richness of indexing in response to user needs
- Content delivered by annual subscription to different users, by different distributors

#### and isn't...

- An online slide library - it contains important definitive and interpretive text and multimedia
- A directory of where images are or where to obtain rights - it comes with rights
- An encyclopedia or Art 101 text - it can help illustrate these with examples
- An exhibition or piece of courseware - the focus is on individual works
- A biographical/bibliographical reference tool - it is not comprehensive
- A specific set of software functions - these differ by distributor, and will develop, we hope

#### C. AMICO and the AMICO Library

Using the Research Libraries Group (RLG) delivery service, we will explore the AMICO testbed library and explain its purposes and the functions of the RLG delivery service.

#### D. Conclusion of Section 1: General Discussion of AMICO

### 2.2 Content of the AMICO Library

Overall framing - AMICO needs to make numerous decisions about collections development and documentation for the AMICO Library, almost all of which have financial consequences and require time commitments. Understanding the relative importance of possible choices to our users is, therefore, critical to improving the Library in ways that will be valued. A schema illustrating the content of the testbed library, the content of the 1999-2000 year library, and plans for future growth will be shared with participants.

#### A. Collections development - Genre Balance

Framing: AMICO currently includes works in any medium held by member institutions which are largely fine arts museums. By changing membership criteria or

**AMICO User Studies: Final Report**  
**Appendix III: Focus Group Moderators' Guide**

---

pursuing other options for contribution of content, AMICO could extend to other media.

*Options: Please indicate the percentage of works in each genre that you would consider ideal:*

- Painting
- Prints and Drawings
- Photography
- Sculpture
- Decorative Art & Design
- Architecture
  - photographs
  - drawings
- Other, please elaborate

**B. Collections Development – Sources**

Framing: AMICO members are non-profit institutions with collections of art - principally museums. Other sources could be pursued.

*Options (ranked with 1 as highest):*

Area	Rank
archives	
libraries	
Private collectors	
contemporary artists	
outdoor sculpture	
public architecture	
other, please elaborate	

**C. Collections Development - Cultural Balance**

Framing: Members of AMICO choose the works contributed to the AMICO Library. This may result in cultural bias, especially in early years while the collection is growing. Ideally, what do you think the proper balance should be?

*Options: Indicate percentage of works from::*

Area	Percentage
Europe	
• Northern	
• Southern	
North America	
• Canada	
• US	

• Mexico	
Latin & South America	
Africa	
• Sub-Saharan	
• Saharan	
Asia	
• Middle East	
• Far East	
• Indian Sub-Continent	
Oceania & Australia	

**D. Collections Development - Historical Balance**

Framing: The distribution of works by date raises the same kinds of balance issues as the distribution by geography, but it also raises issues about the kinds of museums that should be encouraged to participate in AMICO, the kinds of documentation they will create, and the nature of AMICO's program, particularly with respect to modern and contemporary works.

*Options: What percentage of Western art works do you think should come from::*

Period	Percentage
Pre -history	
Ancient World	
Early Christian era	
Middle ages	
Renaissance	
16 <sup>th</sup> &17 <sup>th</sup> c.	
18 <sup>th</sup> c.	
19 <sup>th</sup> c.	
20 <sup>th</sup> c.	

**E. Collections Development Depth vs. Breadth**

Framing: Different types of courses and research require different degrees of depth and breadth. AMICO member institutions find themselves asking whether to document several hundred works by the same artist, or works by several hundred artists; whether to provide multiple impressions of prints and photographs supplied also by other AMICO members or drawings related to paintings already in the Library.

*Options: . For the next two years there will be 50-100,000 works in the AMICO Library. Given this:*

**AMICO User Studies: Final Report**  
**Appendix III: Focus Group Moderators' Guide**

---

1a) AMICO should aim to build depth (>1000) works for particular:

- artists
- school
- style/period

1b) If so, which?

2) AMICO should encourage multiple impressions of a print/photograph? Yes / No

**F. Collections Development - Museum Representation**

Framing: AMICO was formed by North American museums. Its membership is open to institutions worldwide but bringing such institutions in involves substantial investments in accommodating different legal, linguistic, social and institution traditions, all of which will significantly impact AMICO.

*Options (ranked with 1 as highest):*

<i>Policy</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Maintain current policy - Encourage institutions worldwide to join if they are prepared to accept terms applied to current members.	
Make substantial effort to bring in European museums	
Make substantial effort to bring in Asian museums	
Make substantial effort to bring in African museums	
Make substantial effort to bring in Latin American museums	
Make specific effort to bring in the following institution(s):	

**H. Collections Development - Specific Works/Subjects**

Framing: The AMICO Library will grow annually, but at any size it will not have everything that a particular scholar or student might want. Currently the philosophy is to encourage museums to include those works with which they are involved in any given year - new acquisitions, items going on loan or exhibition, items being published or requested photography - on the grounds that these will prove also to be of greatest interest. Other options have been proposed.

*Options (ranked with 1 as highest):*

<b>Policy</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Continue current practice	
Provide mechanisms for users to request specific works as a "popularity" contest only	
Provide mechanisms for users to request specific works with payment by the individual to enable the work to be included	
Provide mechanisms for users to request more works of a particular	

AMICO User Studies: Final Report  
 Appendix III: Focus Group Moderators' Guide

---

sort, topic or artist	
Provide mechanisms for users to "seamlessly" incorporate their own content locally	
Provide mechanisms for users to "seamlessly" incorporate their own content to contribute content to the AMICO Library for use by other subscribers	
other, please elaborate	

**I. Documentation - Integration**

Framing: AMICO data could be tightly linked to other museum data through editorial efforts and tool development. Each of these would doubtless enhance the value of the AMICO Library.

*Options (ranked with 1 as highest):*

Policy	Rank
Focus on links to more internal museum resources represented in the multimedia in the Library	
Enable links to abstracting/indexing of art literature - citation references	
Enable links to encyclopedias of art and culture - contextual background	
Enable links to full texts of scholarly writing represented in JSTOR etc.	
Enable links to textbooks - such as the standard "Art 101" texts	
Enable links to internal resources at licensee institutions - local digitized slides, course material	
other, please elaborate	

**J. Documentation - Interactivity**

Framing: AMICO data could be a set of loosely linked resources or tightly authored multimedia content. It could be delivered with specific tools for multi-media authoring or without such tools.

*Options (ranked with 1 as highest):*

Policy	Rank
Keep the collection as independent files of content in various modalities (text, image, sound)	
Promote development of integrated multimedia programs as one of the types of content, recognizing that this will reduce the number of independent elements in the Library	
Promote delivery of tools for editing multimedia elements into interactives, recognizing that this could add to the cost of delivery	



other, please elaborate	
-------------------------	--

**K. Documentation - Depth vs. Breadth**

Framing: AMICO could encourage, discourage, or even prohibit certain amounts of depth/breadth. Currently the "minimum" contribution of an AMICO member is 500 works of art with at least a catalog record and one image for each. We could, for instance, encourage deeper multi-media documentation of particular works by substituting a minimum contribution of a fixed number of digital "files" for a minimum contribution of a number of "works".

*Options: Kinds of multi-media documentation of particular interest (ranked with 1 as highest):*

Option	Rank
scholarly essays	
curriculum materials from education offices	
conservation reports	
exhibition and publication texts	
interactive programs	

**L. Documentation - Images**

Framing: Providing high resolution images presents a number of technical and social challenges and if certain thresholds of minimum resolution are adopted may keep some works out of the AMICO Library altogether. Some documentation only exist in black and white. There are some works for which it is not possible to obtain rights or create new images. Should minimum thresholds be established? If so, what levels?

*Options (ranked with 1 as highest): (Y/N)*

AMICO User Studies: Final Report  
 Appendix III: Focus Group Moderators' Guide

---

	<i>Y/N</i>	<i>Rank</i>
Establish an absolute minimum resolution below which no image should be included in the AMICO Library:		
800x600 dpi		
1024x768 dpi (full screen 17" monitor/max for most projectors)		
1600x1440 dpi (full screen 19" + monitors)		
no minimum, encourage best possible		
Encourage contribution of extremely high resolution images (5MB+) in addition to projection		
only if not watermarked		
even if watermarked		
Establish an upper limit for images that can be easily accessed by most browsers and projected by most digital projection equipment. As this standard moves in the coming years, move the bar		
Permit black and white photography		
Yes?		
Never		
Only if the original is black & white?		
No, unless the existing photography is b/w and it is not possible to obtain other photographs		
Permit text only		
Yes?		
Never?		
Only if rights to the image cannot be secured?		

**M. Documentation – Language**

Framing: As we obtain documentation from museums world-wide, it will necessarily be in numerous languages.

*Options (rank preference, recognizing likely cost and or inclusiveness implications):*

<b>Option</b>	<b>Rank</b>
Leave all documentation in original languages	
Index all documentation in English	
Index all documentation in all the languages of contributing institutions	
Translate documentation into one of several European languages	
Translate documentation into English	

**N. Conclusion of Section 2: General Discussion of AMICO Content development strategies and documentation requirements**

**2.3 Rights**

Overall Framing: A large part of the value of the AMICO Library to users is that they do not have to research rights for works of art and documentation that they find - they may use the material for education purposes without further permission. The job of obtaining these rights falls on AMICO members. But the nature of rights holding in the contemporary world makes this a difficult job for the museums and various trade-offs are often proposed.

**A. Uniform rights**

Framing: If all items in the AMICO Library are licensed to subscribers with the same rights, then works or documentation for which AMICO members cannot obtain these rights must be excluded from the Library.

*Where uniform rights cannot be obtained, should AMICO:*

- 1) exclude the items from the library
- 2) include them in a special subset of the library for which there are different restrictions
- 3) document rights at the item level, restricting tools/views as appropriate for the specific rights that have been obtained
- 4) other, please elaborate

**B. Additional rights**

Framing: While the AMICO license provides substantial educational use rights (far beyond those permitted under fair use), it excludes commercial uses and republication. Ease of acquiring these and other rights is something that AMICO could assist with, though it involves implementing systems (human and machine) and resource commitments.

*On a scale of 1-10, where 1 is absolutely critical and 10 is of no importance, how important is it to you that AMICO help you acquire these additional rights? On a scale in which the cost to the additional subscribing institution is in parentheses, indicate the added amount you would be willing to pay p.a..*

- |  |       |       |       |        |        |        |
|--|-------|-------|-------|--------|--------|--------|
| 1) provide name/address of rights holders and electronic link/mail-to if known | \$100 | \$200 | \$500 | \$1000 | \$2000 | Other: |
| 2) provide link to in on-line form agreements, if they exist                   | \$100 | \$200 | \$500 | \$1000 | \$2000 | Other: |
| 3) provide standard forms of agreements  | \$100 | \$200 | \$500 | \$1000 | \$2000 | Other: |
| 4) provide standard pricing  | \$100 | \$200 | \$500 | \$1000 | \$2000 | Other: |

AMICO User Studies: Final Report  
 Appendix III: Focus Group Moderators' Guide

---

- 5) administer standards pricing and agreements      \$100   \$200   \$500   \$1000   \$2000   Other:

**C. Contemporary and Modern Art**

Framing: Much of the art of the twentieth century is covered by copyright owned by artists and their estates rather than by the museums which own the physical works. Museums would like to make these works available in the AMICO Library but they often have to pay royalties to the copyright owners on an annual basis to do so. Should the AMICO library contain works licensed from contemporary artists and their estates?

*How much additional cost for including your preferred ratio of works of the twentieth century (indicated in answer to Collections Development earlier), would you consider a good investment?*

None                      5%                      10%                      20%                      50%

**D. User Community**

Framing: The broader, or more loosely defined, the user community which is permitted to access the AMICO Library, the more difficult it is to persuade rights holders to provide AMICO with the right to relicense their works for educational uses. Recognizing that the consequences could be the withdrawal of some works, which if any of the following groups of users beyond the currently Designated Users (enrolled in/employed by educational institutions) do you feel are:

- Essential to include among AMICO Designated Users
- Desirable to include among AMICO Designated Users
- Optional to include among AMICO Designated Users

*Options, please rank in order of desirability/importance:*

	Essential	Desirable	Optional	Rank
1) Walk-in visitors to the University/school library	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
2) Families of the designated users	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
3) Alumni of schools (which are subscribing institutions)	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
4) Members of museum (which are subscribing institutions)	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
5) Non-degree students	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
6) Students in distance education or life-long learning programs	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
7) Any public library cardholder, through their public library	Essential	Desirable	Optional	
8) Other, please elaborate	Essential	Desirable	Optional	

**E. Uses During the License Period**

Framing: Some practices are permitted and others prohibited under the terms of the current AMICO license. These are always enumerated explicitly so that the boundaries are clearly understood by all parties. Sometimes rights holders turn down requests from AMICO to include works to which they hold rights because AMICO permits uses to which the rights holder objects.

*If you would be willing to see any of the permitted practices prohibited in the future, please rank the top 3 in order of their acceptability to you (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>).*

Permitted Uses	Rank willingness to prohibit (top 3)
Downloading	
Viewing from any place	
Placing on (non-public) course web-site	
Copying to CD/slides for educational use	
Retaining in professional portfolio (CV) for life	
Displaying in class/conference papers	
Showing artists image with overlays	
Incorporating image in work, with credit	
Classroom presentation	
Use in any research context, with collaborators	
Any "fair use" under copyright law	

**AMICO User Studies: Final Report**  
**Appendix III: Focus Group Moderators' Guide**

---

*If you would like to see any prohibited practices permitted in the future, rank the top 3 in order of importance to you (1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup>, 3<sup>rd</sup>).*

<b>Prohibited Uses</b>	<b>Rank desire to Permit (top 3)</b>
Systematic copying	
Providing access to non-designated users	
Placing on Public Web Site	
Reproducing for distribution to non-designated users	
Retaining for educational use after license	
Publishing in academic journal or online	
Reposting modified images	
Incorporating image without credit to original	
Public exhibition	
Use in any fundraising context	
Any commercial use	

**F. Practices Permitted with Reporting Only**

Framing: Universities in the Museum Educational Site Licensing project report a desire to do some things with digital representations of works of art which made museums very nervous. A compromise was reached to permit universities to engage in these practices in return for their reporting on them annually. This would permit the museums to assess if they really had any reason to fear these practices and give them a basis on which to decide whether to permit them in the future.

*If you were making the decision, would you accept the following permissions, assuming the associated reporting burden? (Y/N)*

<b>Permission</b>	<b>IF</b>	<b>Reporting Burden</b>	<b>Accept (yes or no)</b>
1) Local Mounting of Records	IF	Annual Report of which records in what applications	
2) Copying to CD/other Media	IF	Annual Report of which works/How many CD's,	

AMICO User Studies: Final Report  
 Appendix III: Focus Group Moderators' Guide

		slides, etc. /Uses	
3) Modifying/adapting works of art	IF	Annual report of which works/what kind of modification and what educational purpose where served	

**G. After the License Expires**

Framing: as long as institutions maintain their subscription to the AMICO Library, Designated Users in those institutions have the rights extended under the license. If the institution ceases to subscribe, certain rights will be taken away, others may be granted in perpetuity.

*Please rank how important these extended rights are to you personally.*

Rank	
	1) Students can keep AMICO works referenced in their papers/exams/or own art within their portfolio's, in perpetuity
	2) Museums may retain AMICO works in the documentation of related works in their own collections, in perpetuity
	3) University subscribers may ask for rights to use works assigned in classes in the first semester following the end of subscription so as not to disrupt class preparations/expectations, without charge

AMICO is considering allowing university subscribers to acquire an unlimited term license to works already mounted locally, for a price (\$x per work). Some works, where rights are owned by living artists or their estates, would need to be excluded. What do you believe would be the value (per work) of such a license?

\$5                      \$10                      \$15                      \$20                      Other:

**H. Conclusion of Section 3: General Discussion of Intellectual Property and Rights Administration issues.**

**2.4 Delivery Service**

Overall Framing: AMICO has decided that museums are better at creating content than at delivery so it is using existing non-profit and governmental data delivery services to provide subscribers with access to the AMICO Library. In this testbed year, all access to the AMICO Library is provided through the Research Libraries Group (RLG), but in future years we hope to see numerous sources for the AMICO Library. While different services can develop different features for their client communities, we would like your reactions to the RLG service to help rank the features important to you.

AMICO User Studies: Final Report  
 Appendix III: Focus Group Moderators' Guide

---

**A. Access/Security**

Framing: How users security is administered will determine where users can use the library. Different strategies have different costs, but AMICO can require its distributors to provide methods that will satisfy users needs.

*By %, from where do you believe you and your students/clients would want to access the library?*

Location	Rank
office	
library or VR collection	
laboratory	
classroom	
home	
other, please elaborate	

**B. Interface**

Framing: Usability of the application depends on its interface.

*Please give us your feedback on the following aspects of the RLG Service, ranking your opinion of various features low, medium and high.*

Feature	Rank	Comments
<b>Overall Appearance</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Look and feel (first impressions)</li> <li>Location of frames/buttons</li> </ul>		
<b>Options</b> (customizing your environment)		
Maximum image dimensions		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Inspection (640w x 480h pixels)</li> <li>Presentation (1024w x 768h pixels)</li> </ul>		
<b>Sort order</b>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Creator</li> <li>Title</li> <li>Owner</li> </ul>		



AMICO User Studies: Final Report  
 Appendix III: Focus Group Moderators' Guide

<b>Items in each search result screen</b>		
• Five		
• Ten		
• Fifteen		
• Twenty		
<b>Search result formatting</b>		
• Images and text		
• Text only		
• Images only		
<b>Full display viewing</b>		
• Image borders and menu background		
• No borders or background		
<b>Notebook</b>		
<b>Print</b>		
<b>Comments</b>		
<b>Help</b>		
<b>Other, please elaborate</b>		

C. Search functionality

Framing: Satisfaction with searches of the database depends on the quality, consistency and depth of the information content and the functionality and ease of use of the searching features.

*In each case, identify up to two positive and two negative features. Then rank all features according to importance to you.*

AMICO User Studies: Final Report  
 Appendix III: Focus Group Moderators' Guide

---

Function	Positive?	Negative?	Rank
Simple search			
Advanced search			
Pick lists			
Previous searches			
Save sets/combine in new query			
Save items to Notebook			
Other, please elaborate			

**D. Interoperability**

Framing: The AMICO Library does not exist in a vacuum and will never be the only resource a student or scholar would need. Given this, there are advantages to sharing information content with other arenas.

*Rank the importance to yourself/your users of whether the AMICO Library has:*

	Rank
Dublin Core metadata	
MARC compatibility	
AAT index terms	
Library of Congress Subject terms	
ULAN artist names	
EAD compatibility	
VRA Core metadata	
other, please elaborate	

**E. Linkage**

Framing: AMICO cannot create links to other local resources, but knowing what kinds of local resources users want to link to could enable us to promote tools that make such linking possible.

*Rank the importance of links to the following:*

	Rank
Basic (Art 101) textbook indexes	
Course homepages	
Encyclopedias (Grove, etc.)	
Local library OPAC	
Local slide collection	
Personal databases	
Other, please identify	

## **F: Conclusion of Section 4: General Discussion of Delivery Issues**

### **2.5 Tools and Future Uses**

Overall Framing: Any data will be valuable to the extent that it can be used, and its value will increase to any group of users if the uses they most want to make are easily enabled. Enabling the use of digital information requires software tools. Determining which software tools are most desirable to whom, and finding ways to create tools which are sufficiently general to be used by a variety of users for their purposes while sufficiently specific to support complex and specialized needs, is always a challenge. Needless to say, developing software tools requires investment - in some cases it is preferable to use tools developed for more general purposes in order to save resources to make tools that would otherwise not be available at all.

#### **A. Envisioning the AMICO Library in 2004**

Framing: If you are subscribing to the AMICO Library in 2004, when we hope to have 250,000 works of art documented in rich multimedia, what would you imagine would be 5-10 highly desirable functions (by functions, we mean capabilities of a general sort, such as supporting creation and delivery of examinations, supporting dialogue between groups of students engaged in a common assignment, supporting sequenced presentation of works based on instructors curriculum plan, supporting presentation of works in contexts and presentation of works in relation to each other, with appropriate time/space contextualization and sizing, etc.)?

*Activity: List (and briefly describe) the desirable characteristics of the AMICO library in 2004 in the order you think of them.*

#### **B. Ranking the Processes that the AMICO Library should support**

Framing: As a group exercise, we will collate the functions proposed by participants on a white board. We will then classify the functions described into broad categories based on the process (research, teaching, studying, administration, etc.) they support.

*Activity: Each individual will be asked to rank the Broad Categories in order of importance to them.*

#### **C. Ranking functions within processes**

Framing: As a Group exercise, we will try to establish relative importance of individual functions within each category. We will use the Delphi method - each individual first ranking them for themselves, and the discussing in the group the reasons for the outlying assessments. We will keep track of which features weighed particularly heavily in arriving at any consensus about importance.

#### **D. Features of these functions**

Framing: Each of the functions we have ranked as significant will have many interrelated features. In your mind's eye, some of these features are being envisioned as essential. For

the three functions that are most important to you (not necessarily those ranked by the group), please imagine the three features that would make them really work for you?

*Activity: List three key functions and their three key features*

## E. General Discussion of Library Development and Tools

### 2.6 Expectations, Experiences, Opportunities and Barriers

Framing: The Focus Group will close with a general discussion of the issues and opportunities facing visual resource curators or art historians as they adopt new technologies for their teaching, research and other professional activities. This section of the Focus Group will be relatively unstructured. Where necessary, the moderators will stimulate the discussion by raising points from the outline below that have not been addressed.

#### A. Questions put by MESL Cost Assessment Focus Groups (Mellon Study)

##### Experience & Expectations:

Do you have experience using digital images in teaching/in your visual resource collection?

If yes, answer the following in terms of your experience.

If no, answer in terms of your expectations.

How many slides/digital images would you usually use in a course?

Have you created some digital images yourself?

Have you used digital images:

In classroom projection?

Assigned them for viewing?

Displayed in individual lab setting?

In your experience, which methods of using the digital images are most valuable?

Did you expect anything that didn't occur/did things occur that you did not expect?

What advantages did you anticipate? Were they realized? If not, why?

What disadvantages did you anticipate? Did they come about? If not, do you know why?

**Opportunities & Barriers:**

What differences do you perceive between digital images and other visual resources?

Advantages/disadvantages of slides

Advantages/disadvantages of books, prints

Advantages/disadvantages of videos, CD's

Advantages/disadvantages of digital images online

Rank the following factors in your decision to use/not use digital images in teaching:

Image selection

Image quality

Text data

Cost of acquiring images

Delivery speed

Equipment/technical support

Tools

Expertise with the technology

Student opinion

Support

Copyright issues

Search functionality

Ease of access

Manipulability