

Studies of Search Task Complexity or Difficulty

SILS Technical Report 2014-01

by

Barbara M. Wildemuth

School of Information & Library Science, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Luanne Freund

School of Library, Archival and Information Studies, University of British Columbia

Elaine G. Toms

Information School, University of Sheffield

This technical report serves as an online appendix for:

Wildemuth, B.M., Freund, L., & Toms, E.G. (2014). Untangling search task complexity and difficulty in the context of interactive information retrieval studies. *Journal of Documentation*, under review.

The document consists of a bibliography of the 106 studies that were the basis of the analysis reported in the *Journal of Documentation* article. They were identified from searches, conducted in 2013, of the Repository of Assigned Search Tasks (RepAST, <http://ils.unc.edu/searchtasks/search.html>). The searches incorporated the following search strategies:

difficult*
complex*
simpl*
easy
basic
hard

The 239 items retrieved with these searches were further evaluated, in terms of their relevance to the focus of the planned study. Only the 106 studies that discussed search task complexity or difficulty or assigned search tasks of varying complexity or difficulty were analyzed further. They are listed here.

1. Ageev, M., Guo, Q., Lagun, D., & Agichtein, E. (2011). Find it if you can: A game for modeling different types of Web search success using interaction data. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development of Information Retrieval*, 345-354.

2. Albertson, D. (2010). Analyzing user interaction with the ViewFinder video retrieval system. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, 61(2), 238-252.
3. Albertson, D., & Meadows, C., III. (2011). Situated topic complexity in interactive video retrieval. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 62(9), 1676-1695.
4. Arapakis, I., Jose, J.M., & Gray, P.D. (2008). Affective feedback: An investigation into the role of emotions in the information seeking process. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development of Information Retrieval*, 395-402.
5. Arguello, J., Wu, W., Kelly, D., & Edwards, A. (2012). Task complexity, vertical display and user interaction in aggregated search. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 435-444.
6. Aula, A., Khan, R., & Guan, Z. (2010). How does search behavior change as search becomes more difficult? *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 35-44.
7. Bailey, E.W., Kelly, D., & Gyllstrom, K. 2009. Undergraduates' evaluations of assigned search topics. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 812-813.
8. Barsky, E., & Bar-Ilan, J. (2012). The impact of task phrasing on the choice of search keywords and on the search process and success. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 63(10), 1987-2005.
9. Bell, D. & Ruthven, I. (2004). Searcher's assessments of task complexity for Web searching. *Advances in Information Retrieval, 26th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2004*, 57-71.
10. Bilal, D. (2001). Children's use of the Yahoo!igans! Web search engine: II. Cognitive and physical behaviors on research tasks. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 52(2), 118-136.
11. Borgman, C.L. (1986). The user's mental model of an information retrieval system: an experiment on a prototype online catalog. *International Journal of Man-Machine Studies*, 24(1), 47-64.
12. Borgman, C.L., Hirsh, S.G., Walter, V.A., & Gallagher, A.L. (1995). Children's search behavior on browsing and keyword online catalogs: The Science Library Catalog Project. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 46(9), 663-684.
13. Browne, G. J., Pitts, M. G., & Wetherbe, J. C. (2007). Cognitive stopping rules for terminating information search in online tasks. *MIS Quarterly*, 31(1), 89-104.

14. Byström, K. & Järvelin, K. (1995). Task complexity affects information seeking and use. *Information Processing & Management*, 31, 191-213.
15. Campbell, D. (1988). Task complexity: a review and analysis. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 40-52.
16. Capra, R., Marchionini, G., Oh, J. S., Stutzman, F., & Zhang, Y. (2007). Effects of structure and interaction style on distinct search tasks. *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries*, 442-451.
17. Chen, H., & Dumais, S. (2000). Bringing order to the Web: Automatically categorizing search results. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 145-152.
18. Cole, M.J., Gwizdka, J., Liu, C., & Belkin, N.J. (2011). Dynamic assessment of information acquisition effort during interactive search. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, n.p.
19. Debowski, S. (2001). Wrong way: Go back! An exploration of novice search behaviours while conducting an information search. *The Electronic Library*, 19, 371-382.
20. Dennis, S., Bruza, P., & McArthur, R. (2002). Web searching: A process-oriented experimental study of three interactive search paradigms. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 53(2), 120-133.
21. Dimitroff, A., & Wolfram, Z. (1995). Searcher response in a hypertext-based bibliographic information retrieval system. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 46, 22-36.
22. Ding, R., & Ma, F. (2013). Assessment of university student web searching competency by a task-based online test: A case study at Wuhan University, China. *The Electronic Library*, 31(3), 359-375.
23. Edyburn, D.L. (1988). Examining the successful retrieval of information by students using online databases. *School Library Media Quarterly*, 16, 256-259.
24. Egan, D.E., Remde, J.R., Gomez, L.M., Landauer, T.K., Eberhardt, J., & Lochbaum, C.C. (1989). Formative design-evaluation of SuperBook. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 7(1), 30-57.
25. Elswailer, D. and Ruthven, I. (2007). Towards task-based personal information management evaluations. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 23-30.
26. Evans, B. M., Kairam, S., & Pirolli, P. (2010). Do your friends make you smarter?: An analysis of social strategies in online information seeking. *Information Processing & Management*, 46(6), 679-692.

27. Feild, H. A., Allan, J., & Jones, R. (2010). Predicting searcher frustration. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 34-41.
28. Ford, N., Miller, D., & Moss, N. (2002). Web search strategies and retrieval effectiveness: An empirical study. *Journal of Documentation*, 58(1), 30-48.
29. Ford, N., Miller, D., & Moss, N. (2005). Web search strategies and human individual differences: Cognitive and demographic factors, Internet attitudes, and approaches. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 56(7), 741-756.
30. Foss, E., Druin, A., Brewer, R., Lo, P., Sanchez, L., Golub, E., & Hutchinson, H. (2012). Children's search roles at home: Implications for designers, researchers, educators, and parents. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 63(3), 558-573.
31. Foss, E., Druin, A., Yip, J., Ford, W., Golub, E., & Hutchinson, H. (2013). Adolescent search roles. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 64(1), 173-189.
32. Fraser, L., & Locatis, C. (2001). Effects of link annotations on search performance in layered and unlayered hierarchically organized information spaces. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 52(14), 1255-1261.
33. Gwizdka, J. (2008). Revisiting search task difficulty: Behavioral and individual difference measures. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, 45, n.p.
34. Gwizdka, J., & Lopatovska, I. (2009). The role of subjective factors in the information search process. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 60(12), 2452-2464.
35. Gwizdka, J., & Spence, I. (2006). What can searching behavior tell us about the difficulty of information tasks? A study of web navigation. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, n.p.
36. Hansen, P. (1999). User interface design for IR interaction: A task-oriented approach. *CoLIS 3. Proceedings of the Third International Conference on the Conceptions of the Library and Information Science, Dubrovnik, Croatia (23-26 May 1999)*, 191-205.
37. He, D., Wu, D., Yue, Z., Fu, A., & Vo, K.T. (2012). Undergraduate students' interaction with online information resources in their academic tasks. *Aslib Proceedings: New Information Perspectives*, 64(6), 615-640.
38. He, J., Bron, M., & de Vries, A. P. (2013). Characterizing stages of a multi-session complex search task through direct and indirect query modifications. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 897-900.

39. Hirsh, S.G. (1996). Complexity of search tasks and children's information retrieval. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, 47-51.
40. Hirsh, S.G. (1996). *The Effect of Domain Knowledge on Elementary School Children, Information Retrieval Behavior on an Automated Library Catalog*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Library and Information Science, University of California, Los Angeles.
41. Hirsh, S.G. (1997). How do children find information on different types of tasks? Children's use of the Science Library Catalog. *Library Trends*, 45(4), 725-745.
42. Hughes-Morgan, K. & Wilson, M. L. (2012). Information vs interaction: Examining different interaction models over consistent metadata. *Proceedings of the Information Interaction in Context (IiX) Symposium*, 72-81.
43. Iivonen, M. (1995a). Consistency in the selection of search concepts and search terms. *Information Processing & Management*, 31, 173-190.
44. Iivonen, M. (1995b). Factors lowering the consistency in online searching. *Online Information 95: Proceedings*, 101-107.
45. Jansen, B.J., Booth, D., & Smith, B. (2009). Using the taxonomy of cognitive learning to model online searching. *Information Processing & Management*, 45(6), 643-663.
46. Joho, H., & Jose, J. M. (2006). Slicing and dicing the information space using local contexts. *Proceedings of the Information Interaction in Context (IiX) Symposium*, 66-74.
47. Józsa, E., Köles, M., Komlódi, A., Hercegfı, K., & Chu, P. (2012). Evaluation of search quality differences and the impact of personality styles in native and foreign language searching tasks. *Proceedings of the Information Interaction in Context (IiX) Symposium*, 310-313.
48. Kammerer, Y., Nairn, R., Pirolli, P., & Chi, E.H. (2009). Signpost from the masses: Learning effects in an exploratory social tag search browser. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 625-634.
49. Kelly, D., Wacholder, N., Rittman, R., Sun, Y., Kantor, P., Small, S., & Strzalkowski, T. (2007). Using interview data to identify evaluation criteria for interactive, analytical question-answering systems. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 58(7), 1032-1043.
50. Khan, K., & Locatis, C. (1998). Searching through cyberspace: The effects of link cues and correspondence on information retrieval from hypertext on the World Wide Web. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 49(14), 1248-1253.

51. Kim, J. (2005). Finding documents in a digital institutional repository: DSpace and Eprints. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, 42, n.p.
52. Kim, J. (2006). *Task as a Predictable Indicator of Information Seeking Behavior on the Web*. Unpublished dissertation, Rutgers University.
53. Kim, J. (2006). Task difficulty as a predictor and indicator of web searching interaction. *ACM CHI '06 Extended Abstracts on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 959-964.
54. Kim, J. (2008). Task as a context of information seeking: An investigation of daily life tasks on the web. *Libri*, 58(3), 172-181.
55. Kim, J. (2009). Describing and predicting information-seeking behavior on the Web. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 60(4), 679-693.
56. Kim, Y.-M., & Rieh, S. Y. (2005). Dual-task performance as a measure for mental effort in library searching and web searching. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, 42, n.p.
57. Kumpulainen, S., & Jarvelin, K. (2010). Information interaction in molecular medicine: Integrated use of multiple channels. *Proceedings of the Information Interaction in Context (IiX) Symposium*, 95-104.
58. Large, A., Beheshti, J., Breuleux, A., & Renaud, A. (1994). A comparison of information retrieval from print and CD-ROM versions of an encyclopedia by elementary school children. *Information Processing & Management*, 30(4), 499-513.
59. Lazonder, A.W., Biemans, H. J.A., & Wopereis, I.G.J.H. (2000). Differences between novice and experienced users in searching information on the World Wide Web. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 51(6), 576-581.
60. Li, Y. (2009). Exploring the relationships between work task and search task in information search. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 60(2), 275-291.
61. Li, Y., & Belkin, N.J. (2010). An exploration of the relationships between work task and interactive information search behavior. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 61(9), 1771-1789.
62. Li, Y., Chen, Y., Liu, J., Cheng, Y., Wang, X., Chen, P., & Wang, Q. (2011). Measuring task complexity in information search from user's perspective. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, n.p.

63. Linde, L., & Bergstrom, M. (1988). Impact of prior knowledge of informational content and organization on learning searching principles in a database. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 13, 90-101.
64. Liu, C., Gwizdka, J., & Liu, J. (2010). Helping identify when users find useful documents: Examination of query reformulation intervals. *Proceedings of the Information Interaction in Context (IIX) Symposium*, 215-224.
65. Liu, C., Gwizdka, J., Liu, J., Xu, T., & Belkin, N. (2010). Analysis and evaluation of query reformulations in different task types. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, n.p.
66. Liu, C., Liu, J., Cole, M., Belkin, N. J. & Zhang, X. (2012). Task difficulty and domain knowledge effects on information search behaviors. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, 49, 1-10.
67. Liu, J., Belkin, N. J., Zhang, X., & Yuan, X. (2013). Examining users' knowledge change in the task completion process. *Information Processing & Management*, 49(5), 1058-1074.
68. Liu, J., Cole, M., Liu, C., Bierig, R., Gwizdka, J., Belkin, N., Zhang, J., Zhang, X. (2010). Search behaviors in different task types. *Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries*, 69-78.
69. Liu, J., Gwizdka, J., Liu, C., Belkin, N. (2010). Predicting task difficulty for different task types. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, n.p.
70. Liu, J., Liu, C., Cole, M., Belkin, N.J., & Zhang, X. (2012). Exploring and predicting search task difficulty. *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM)*, 1313-1322.
71. Liu, J., Liu, C., Gwizdka, J., and Belkin, N. J. (2010). Can search systems detect users' task difficulty?: Some behavioral signals. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 845-846.
72. Liu, J., Liu, C., Yuan, X., & Belkin, N.J. (2011). Understanding searchers' perception of task difficulty: Relationships with task type. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, n.p.
73. Lopatovska, I. (2009). Searching for good mood: Examining relationships between search task and mood. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, 46, 1-13.
74. Mack, T., Manoff, M., Miller, T.J., & Smith, A.D. (2004). Designing for experts: How scholars approach an academic library Web site. *Information Technology & Libraries*, 23, 16-22.

75. Madden, A.D., Eaglestone, B., Ford, N. J., & Whittle, M. (2007). Search engines: A first step to finding information: preliminary findings from a study of observed searches. *Information Research*, 12(2), Paper 294. <http://www.informationr.net/ir/12-2/paper294.html>.
76. Mana-Lopez, M.J., de Buenaga, M., & Gomez-Hidalgo, J.M. (2004). Multidocument summarization: An added value to clustering in interactive retrieval. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems*, 22(2), 215-241.
77. Marchionini, G., & Liebscher, P. (1991). Performance in electronic encyclopedias: Implications for adaptive systems. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science & Technology (ASIST) Annual Meeting*, 39-48.
78. Maynard, D.C., & Hakel, M.D. (1997). Effects of objective and subjective task complexity on performance. *Human Performance*, 10(4), 303-330.
79. Mead, S.E., Sit, R.A., Rogers, W.A., Jamieson, B.A., & Rousseau, G.K. (2000). Influences of general computer experience and age on library database search performance. *Behaviour & Information Technology*, 19(2), 107-124.
80. Meadow, C. T., Wang, J., & Yuan, W. (1995). A study of user performance and attitudes with information retrieval interfaces. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 46(7), 490-505.
81. Mirel, B., Tonks, J.S., Song, J., Meng, F., Xuan, W., & Ameziane, R. (2013). Studying PubMed usages in the field for complex problem solving: Implications for tool design. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 64(5), 874-892.
82. Pansanato, L.T.E., & Fortes, R.P.M. (2007). System description: An orienteering strategy to browse semantically-enhanced educational wiki pages. In *The Semantic Web: Research and Applications, 4th European Semantic Web Conference, ESWC 2007, Innsbruck, Austria, June 3-7, 2007. Proceedings. Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 4519, 809-818.
83. Pharo, N. (2002). The SST Method Schema: A Tool for Analysing Work, Task-Based Web Information Search Processes. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Tampere (Finland). <http://urn.fi/urn:isbn:951-44-5355-7>.
84. Pharo, N. (2004). A new model of information behaviour based on the Search Situation Transition schema. *Information Research*, 10(1), Paper 203. <http://www.informationr.net/ir/10-1/paper203.html>.
85. Pirolli, P., Card, S.K., & van der Wege, M.M. (2003). The effects of information scent on visual search in the Hyperbolic Tree Browser. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 10(1), 20-53.
86. Pirolli, P., Schank, P., Hearst, M., & Diehl, C. (1996). Scatter/gather browsing communicates the topic structure of a very large text collection.

Proceedings of the ACM SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 213-220.

87. Poddar, A., & Ruthven, I. (2010). The emotional impact of search tasks. In *Proceeding of the Information Interaction in Context (IiX) Symposium*, 35-44.
88. Sahib, N. G., Tombros, A., & Stockman, T. (2012). A comparative analysis of the information-seeking behavior of visually impaired and sighted searchers. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 63(2), 377-391.
89. Saracevic, T., & Kantor, P. (1988). A study of information seeking and retrieving. II. Users, questions, and effectiveness. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 39(3), 177-196.
90. Schacter, J., Chung, G.K.W.K., & Dorr, A. (1998). Children's Internet searching on complex problems: Performance and process analyses. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 49(9), 840-849.
91. Sharit, J., Hernandez, M.A., Czaja, S.J., & Pirolli, P. (2008). Investigating the roles of knowledge and cognitive abilities in older adult information seeking on the Web. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction*, 15(1), Article 3.
92. Shiri, A.S., & Revie, C. 2003. The effects of topic complexity and familiarity on cognitive and physical movies in a thesaurus-enhanced search environment. *Journal of Information Science*, 29(6), 517-526.
93. Sihvonen, A., & Vakkari, P. (2004). Subject knowledge improves interactive query expansion assisted by a thesaurus. *Journal of Documentation*, 60(6), 673-690.
94. Singer, G., Norbistrath, U., & Lewandowski, D. (2012). Ordinary search engine users assessing difficulty, effort, and outcome for simple and complex search tasks. *Proceedings of the Information Interaction in Context (IiX) Symposium*, 110-119.
95. Singer, G., Norbistrath, U., & Lewandowski, D. (2013). Ordinary search engine users carrying out complex search tasks. *Journal of Information Science*, 39(3), 346-358.
96. Topi, H., & Lucas, W. (2005). Searching the Web: Operator assistance required. *Information Processing & Management*, 41(2), 383-403.
97. Vakkari, P., & Huuskonen, S. (2012). Search effort degrades search output but improves task outcome. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 63(4), 657-670.
98. Villa, R., Cantador, I., Joho, H., and Jose, J. M. (2009). An aspectual interface for supporting complex search tasks. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 379-386.

99. Villa, R., Gildea, N., & Jose, J.M. (2008). FacetBrowser: A user interface for complex search tasks. *Proceedings of the ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 489-498.
100. Wacholder, N., & Liu, L. (2006). User preference: A measure of query-term quality. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 57(12), 1566-1580.
101. White, R., & Ruthven, I. (2006). A study of interface support mechanisms for interactive information retrieval. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology*, 57(7), 933-948.
102. White, R. W., Ruthven, I., & Jose, J. M. (2005). A study of factors affecting the utility of implicit relevance feedback. *Proceedings of the ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, 35-42.
103. Williams, M.E., Kinnucan, M., Smith, L.C., Lannom, L., & Cho, D. (1986). Comparative analysis of online retrieval interfaces. *Proceedings of the American Society for Information Science (ASIS) Annual Meeting*, 365-370.
104. Wood, R. E., George-Falvy, J., & Debowski, S. (2001). Motivation and information search on complex tasks. In M. Erez, U. Kleinbeck & H. Thierry (Eds.), *Work Motivation in the Context of a Globalizing Economy*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum, 27-48.
105. Wu, W., Kelly, D., Edwards, A., & Arguello, J. (2012). Grannies, tanning beds, tattoos and NASCAR: Evaluation of search tasks with varying levels of cognitive complexity. *Proceedings of the Information Interaction in Context (IiX) Symposium*, 254-257.
106. Zhang, Y. (2012). The impact of task complexity on people's mental models of MedlinePlus. *Information Processing & Management*, 48(1), 107-119.