

# **The Impact of Findability on Student Motivation, Self-Efficacy, and Perceptions of Online Course Quality**

Bethany Simunich  
Office of Continuing and Distance Education  
Kent State University  
United States  
bsimunic@kent.edu

David B. Robins  
School of Library and Information Science  
Kent State University  
United States  
drobins@kent.edu

Valerie Kelly  
Office of Continuing and Distance Education  
Kent State University  
United States  
vkelly@kent.edu

**Abstract:** This study investigated whether “findability”, an aspect of usability, is an important component in student perceptions of/satisfaction with online courses and, as such, should be considered more heavily in online course design. Using standard usability testing measures, such as eye-tracking, time-on-task, and think-alouds, participants were asked to find essential course components in either a course with high findability or a modified version of the course with low findability, in order to determine the impact on student perceptions of course quality and experience. Participants rated those courses with high findability as a better overall experience (based on five dimensions). Additionally, this study was intended to begin the process of linking findability to student achievement of learning outcomes, by using pre and post-test measures of motivation and self-efficacy, and evaluating how they are affected by findability. Students reported lower levels of self-efficacy and motivation after interacting with courses rated low in findability. Additionally, a negative, linear relationship was found between findability and both self-efficacy and motivation. The researchers believe this study to be the first in a series of studies that will eventually lead to determining if findability and/or usability have a direct impact on student learning outcomes and, if so, what are the standards in these areas that should be set forth for online courses.

## Introduction

Findability, as defined by Peter Morville, is “the degree to which a particular object is easy to discover or locate, [as well as] the degree to which a system or environment supports navigation and retrieval” (Morville, 2007, pg. 3). Or, as his more colloquial catch phrase puts it, “you can’t use what you can’t find.” Findability is present in the concept of usability – the idea that when something is truly usable, “the user can do what he or she wants to do the way he or she expects to be able to do it, without hindrance, hesitation, or questions” (Rubin, Chisnell & Spool, 2008, pg. 4). For online students, findability is paramount – if they cannot find important course components, they cannot “use” them; having to search for assignment instructions or a course introduction may likely result in frustration, lowered motivation, and decreased self-efficacy -- all of which could impact both student learning and course attrition. Both self-efficacy and motivation have been shown to have an effect on student success in online courses (Irizarry, 2002; DeTure, 2004; Zimmerman, 2000).

There are several important course components that are imperative for students to locate early on in the course, such as instructions for getting started, a self-introduction by the instructor, and a place for student introductions. All of these components may be present and written in a clear manner, but are they easily findable? This project is a first step in determining whether this “search time”, or ease of findability, impacts student learning. For example, if students need to search for course essentials, how does their frustration level impact their motivation? At what point do they stop searching? Further, “essential items” that students need early on in a course, such as the syllabus, are hard to find, how does that influence student perception of course or instructor quality? It is important to investigate the potential barrier it poses to students if they have to spend time interpreting the learning environment. Logically, if students need to spend time finding essential course components, this may result in spending less time learning the course content or engaging in course participation. Perhaps more notably, low findability and the frustration that accompanies it may not only impact student learning, but also course attrition.

Unfortunately, as noted by Fisher and Wright (2010), “...there is little research regarding the implementation of usability testing in academia, especially in online course development.” While past research has shown a direct effect of “system usability” (i.e., LMS software usability) on student performance (Tselios, Avouris, Dimitracopoulou, & Daskalaki, 2001), there is a paucity of research on the effect of usability in the e-learning environment, and apparently no research on findability specifically. This study attempts to address that gap, and to investigate findability and its relation to student perception of course quality and overall experience. The opportunity to improve online learning with such a study is substantial, as there is the opportunity to discern if best practices in user-centered design, such as findability, are specifically correlated with increased student learning.

## **The Study**

This exploratory, theory-building study attempted to address the following research question:

**RQ1:** *Do courses that have higher quality course design and meet navigation standards have higher findability than courses that do not?*

**RQ2:** *Do students report lower levels of self-efficacy and motivation after interacting with courses that have findability and navigation issues?*

**RQ3:** *Do students' overall impressions of an online course differ between courses that have high findability and those that do not?*

**RQ4:** *Is findability a predictor of self-efficacy or motivation in online courses?*

### **Process and Procedures**

For purposes of the study, two courses were selected for the control group. Both courses were English writing courses, to minimize the possible confounding variable of course discipline. Both courses underwent Quality Matters™ review by four independent Certified Peer Reviewers and met expectations. Quality Matters™ (QM) is a faculty-centered, peer review process that focuses on the design of online and hybrid courses and is intended to certify their quality. The process utilizes an extensive rubric, organized under eight general standards and 41 specific standards; the review is conducted by three Certified Peer Reviewers. The researchers used Quality Matters™ as a baseline indication of course quality, as it is a nationally recognized evaluative measure for online courses.

The two control courses, collectively labeled “Course Type 1”, were then altered, in an attempt to *not* meet Standard 6.3 of Quality Matters™, a standard that is concerned with ease of navigation and overall findability. All content in the course remained the same; the only difference was the layout/navigation of the course. Navigation was altered in two distinctly different ways for each course, and each type of alteration was based both on violating usability standards and also with actual course layout/design issues as experienced by one of the researchers in her role as a Certified Peer Reviewer for Quality Matters™.

For the first course, the navigation was altered such that all material originated from one central folder, labeled “Content”, on the Course Home Page. To find important items (such as the syllabus) in the course, one would have to “click in” anywhere from 3 – 5 levels. Additionally, while all folders and items were named in such a way that related to their content, the names and locations were not necessarily intuitive. For example, the syllabus was found in the folder “Information”. No item, however, was intentionally mislabeled or labeled something that did not pertain in some way to its content. Further, while the location of items may not have been intuitive, no items were placed in an entirely illogical place (i.e., the Syllabus was not placed in a folder labeled “Media” or “Course Calendar”).

For the second course, the navigation was altered so that all material appeared in an icon and text list on the Course Home Page. Anyone in the course would have to scroll to find items, and some files were placed in folders in a non-intuitive or illogical way. For example, the Course Schedule was in an item labeled “Assignments”. The four Certified Peer Reviewers reviewed these two courses, collectively labeled Course Type 2, and all independently reported that Standard 6.3 was

not met in either course. Therefore, there were a total of four courses used for the study: two courses that met QM™ standards, and versions of those same two courses where the only alteration made was that the courses did not meet Standard 6.3.

Students were randomly assigned to either the eye-tracking group or the focus group, and were also randomly assigned one of the four courses. In the eye-tracking group, students used a computer with special eye-tracking software/capabilities. They were instructed to think-aloud (i.e., talk out loud about their thoughts while trying to find items in the course). Students in the focus group did not do the think-aloud portion, but did participate in a group discussion held after the session. Prior to beginning the study, students were told that they would be looking at an online course, and that the researchers might consider the course to either be well-designed, or have some design issues.

Students were told that the researchers were interested in student feedback about the design of online courses and that they should actually put themselves in the scenario that the course they will be looking at was one they had signed up for and paid for, and that it is the first day of the online class. Participants first completed a pre-test measure composed of demographic questions, experience with technology/online courses and feelings of self-efficacy and motivation in online courses in general. The self-efficacy (7 items) and motivation (8 items) questions were gleaned from the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ) developed by Pintrich, Smith, Garcia & McKeachie (1991). The MSLQ is a comprehensive, 81-item questionnaire that examines college students' motivational orientations. All eight items specifically targeting self-efficacy were used; the seven motivation items were gathered from the 23 remaining motivation questions, including intrinsic and extrinsic goal motivation (see Appendix 1 for a list of the selected questions). Responses were given on a four-point Likert type scale (1 = Not True at All, 4 = Very True).

Then, students completed a list of seven "tasks", each task asking them to find 1 – 2 items in an online course. The tasks were scenario-based and items that students were asked to find were based on items that most students would be looking for in the first few days of an online course, such as the grading policy and syllabus (see Appendix 1 for the complete task list). Students were asked to highlight the item after they found it, so researchers could compare if what they found was actually the item the task was asking them to find. After each task, students were asked 3 questions: 1) Did they find the item?, 2) How difficult was it to find the item?, and 3) How frustrated were they when trying to find the item? Students were told in the introductory script that they were to give each task an honest effort, but that they could choose to move on to the next item or task if they truly felt that they could not find the item and/or would stop looking at this point if they were actually a student in the course. After completing the task list, students were asked five questions related to student perceptions of course quality and overall experience. For those in the focus group, a focus group discussion was held after all students completed the task list and answered the five "experience" questions. Lastly, students completed a post-test measure composed of the same self-efficacy and motivation questions, prefaced with a scenario that asked them to think of the questions in relation to the course they just interacted with, not with online courses in general.

## Findings

Participants were undergraduate and graduate students from a mid-size, Midwestern university, and were recruited from a variety of classes and majors. Students received extra-credit from their professor in exchange for their participation. Data was collected from 81 participants -- 40 combined for the two courses in Course Type 1 (QM™ “quality” courses, with a focus on findability) and 41 combined for the two courses in Course Type 2 (low findability). Fifty-seven percent of participants were either juniors (27%) or seniors (30%), and the rest were fairly equally distributed between freshman (12%), sophomores (16%) and graduate students (15%). Most (72%) were between 18 – 22, though older/adult students were represented as well. Most (77%) had a GPA above 3.0, and most (92%) either agreed or strongly agreed that they were comfortable using a computer.

**RQ1:** *Do courses that have higher quality course design and meet navigation standards have higher findability than courses that do not?*

First, the researchers wanted to see if students confirmed what the Certified Peer Reviewers felt: that the Course Type 2 courses had lower findability than Course Type 1. An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare time-on-task for Course Type 1 and Course Type 2, as time-on-task is one measure of findability. Time-on-task is quantified as the total number of seconds it took the participant to find the item. Time-on-task for all seven tasks was higher for Course Type 2. Additionally, there was a statistically significant difference between the two course types for all seven tasks. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests. See Table 1, below.

Findability was also measured using the questions that participants answered after each task, including : 1) How easy was it to find the items you were looking for in this task? (3-point Likert scale item, 1 = Easy, 2 = Neither Difficult nor Easy, 3 = Difficult), and 2) How frustrating were you when trying to find the items in this task? (5-point Likert scale item, 1 = Not at all Frustrating, 5 = Very Frustrating). Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare difficulty level and frustration level for the two Course Types. For each question, students in Course Type 2 reported greater difficulty and higher frustration in finding the items for all seven tasks. Results were statistically significant for all tasks except Task #5. See Tables 2 and 3, below. In sum, results show that the Course Type 1 (QM™-recognized) courses did indeed show higher findability (in terms of time-on-task, degree of difficulty in finding items, and degree of frustration in finding items) than Course Type 2 (did not meet QM™ standards, including standard 6.3).

**Table 1: Time on Task**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b><i>t</i></b>	<b><i>p</i></b>
<b>Course Type 1, Task 1</b>	71.40	67.05	-3.49	.001*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	144.78	107.59		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 2</b>	87.94	56.69	-4.45	.000*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	171.86	98.72		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 3</b>	45.57	32.07	-4.91	.000*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	102.68	62.63		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 4</b>	36.80	37.82	-2.07	.042*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	54.16	33.26		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 5</b>	74.60	47.84	-1.95	.050*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	100.62	63.88		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 6</b>	64.91	41.89	-2.82	.007*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	102.43	68.61		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 7</b>	54.56	51.56	-4.21	.000*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	128.38	92.13		

\* denotes significant *p* value at  $\alpha = .05$

**Table 2: Degree of Difficulty**

	<b>Mean</b>	<b>Std. Dev.</b>	<b><i>t</i></b>	<b><i>p</i></b>
<b>Course Type 1, Task 1</b>	1.37	.646	-4.04	.000*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	2.03	.726		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 2</b>	1.17	.514	-4.59	.000*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	1.95	.880		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 3</b>	1.38	.697	-3.92	.000*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	2.08	.795		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 4</b>	1.23	.426	-2.29	.025*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	1.54	.691		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 5</b>	1.60	.695	-1.07	.285
<b>Course Type 2</b>	1.78	.750		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 6</b>	1.46	.701	-2.73	.020*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	1.89	.843		
<b>Course Type 1, Task 7</b>	1.47	.706	-3.99	.000*
<b>Course Type 2</b>	2.22	.854		

\* denotes significant *p* value at  $\alpha = .05$

**Table 3: Degree of Frustration**

	Mean	Std. Dev.	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Course Type 1, Task 1	1.83	1.18	-3.03	.003*
Course Type 2	2.70	1.23		
Course Type 1, Task 2	1.40	1.01	-3.75	.000*
Course Type 2	2.62	1.69		
Course Type 1, Task 3	1.41	.857	-5.69	.000*
Course Type 2	2.92	1.34		
Course Type 1, Task 4	1.23	.646	-2.80	.007*
Course Type 2	1.81	1.08		
Course Type 1, Task 5	1.94	1.06	-.835	.407
Course Type 2	2.16	1.17		
Course Type 1, Task 6	1.80	1.02	-2.63	.011*
Course Type 2	2.51	1.26		
Course Type 1, Task 7	1.59	.957	-6.07	.000*
Course Type 2	3.30	1.40		

\* denotes significant *p* value at  $\alpha = .05$

**RQ2:** Do students report lower levels of self-efficacy and motivation after interacting with courses that have findability and navigation issues?

A paired samples t-test was conducted to compare pre and post-test self-efficacy and motivation aggregated scores for both course types. Self-Efficacy and Motivation items were aggregated from questions in the pre and post-test survey, selected from the MSLQ (seven questions total related to self-efficacy and eight questions total related to motivation). Responses used a four-point Likert type scale (1 = Not True at All, 4 = Very True). Therefore, for aggregated responses, the highest self-efficacy “score” would be 28, while the highest motivation “score” would be 32.

For Course Type 1 (QM™-recognized courses), there was no significant difference in the pre-test self-efficacy scores ( $M = 23.32$ ,  $SD = 2.63$ ) and the post-test self-efficacy scores ( $M = 23.59$ ,  $SD = 2.56$ );  $t(33) = -.801$ ,  $p = .429$ ). Likewise, there was no significant difference in the pre-test motivation scores ( $M=24.88$ ,  $SD = 3.36$ ) and the post-test motivation scores ( $M = 24.79$ ,  $SD = 3.17$ );  $t(33) = .146$ ,  $p = .885$ ).

However, there was a significant difference in pre and post-test scores for Course Type 2 (QM Std 6.3 not met). There was a significant difference in the pre-test self-efficacy scores ( $M = 24.08$ ,  $SD = 2.78$ ) and the post-test self-efficacy scores ( $M = 20.63$ ,  $SD = 5.04$ );  $t(37) = 3.62$ ,  $p = .001$ . Also, there was a significant difference in the pre-test motivation scores ( $M=24.41$ ,  $SD = 3.68$ ) and the post-test motivation scores ( $M = 21.86$ ,  $SD = 4.39$ );  $t(36) = 2.71$ ,  $p = .010$ ). In both

cases, aggregated self-efficacy and motivation scores decreased after students completed the tasks.

In sum, results show that students do report lower levels of self-efficacy and motivation after interacting with courses that do not have high findability (QM™ Standard 6.3.)

**RQ3:** *Do students’ overall impressions of an online course differ between courses that meet Standard 6.3 and those that do not?*

There were five additional items included in the post-test survey that were not included in the pre-test survey; these items were designed to gain an overall impression of the participants’ experience, looking at five facets. The questions used a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree), and were as follows: 1) It was easy to find items in this course, 2) I enjoyed my experience using this course, 3) I would recommend a course like this to my friends, 4) I feel like the instructor in this course would be a good one, and 5) I think this would be a frustrating course to take for an entire semester.

Independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare these five “experience” questions for Course Type 1 and Course Type 2. Results showed that students interacting with Course Type 1 had a better “experience” (for all five “facets”). Additionally, there was a statistically significant difference between the two course types for all five facets. See Table 4, below.

In sum, students in Course Type 1 reported that items in the course were easier to find, they enjoyed their experience more than participants in Course Type 2 and were more likely to recommend the course to their friends. Additionally, students in Course Type 1 reported higher agreement that the course instructor would be good, and reported lower agreement that the course would be frustrating to take for an entire semester.

**Table 4: Five Facets of Experience**

	Mean	Std. Dev.	t	p
<b>Course Type 1, “Easy to Find Items”</b>	4.10	.871		
<b>Course Type 2</b>	2.66	1.24	6.08	.000*
<b>Course Type 1, “Enjoyed the Experience”</b>	3.75	.809		
<b>Course Type 2</b>	2.61	1.05	5.50	.000*
<b>Course Type 1, “Would Recommend Course to Friends”</b>	3.80	1.02		
<b>Course Type 2</b>	2.49	1.05	5.70	.000*
<b>Course Type 1, “Course Instructor would be Good”</b>	3.88	.911		
<b>Course Type 2</b>	2.80	.928	5.23	.000*
<b>Course Type 1, “Course would be Frustrating to take”</b>	2.28	1.01		
<b>Course Type 2</b>	3.44	1.31	-4.49	.000*

\* denotes significant p value at  $\alpha = .05$

**RQ4: Is findability a predictor of self-efficacy or motivation in online courses?**

To address this research question, a “findability score” was calculated for each respondent, based on a combination of self-reported difficulty level in finding the items, self-reported frustration level in finding the items, and the objectively-measured time on task for items (calculated in seconds). Students received a low, medium or high findability factor after the above items were recoded into low, medium or high values. Overall findability scores ranged from 21 (lowest possible) to 58 (highest possible was 63).<sup>1</sup>

Results showed that findability was a significant predictor of both self-efficacy and motivation, and that there was a negative, linear correlation for each as well. Findability significantly predicted self-efficacy scores  $b = -.564$ ,  $t(58) = -5.29$ ,  $p = .000$ . Findability also explained a significant proportion of variance in self-efficacy scores,  $R^2 = .318$ ,  $F(1, 58) = 28.00$ ,  $p = .000$ . Findability also significantly predicted motivation scores  $b = -.231$ ,  $t(58) = -4.27$ ,  $p = .000$ . Findability also explained a significant proportion of variance in motivation scores,  $R^2 = .228$ ,  $F(1, 58) = 17.70$ ,  $p = .000$ .

The researchers also considered whether self-reported difficulty level and frustration level on their own would be significant predictors of findability. After all, time-on-task, while an accepted measurement in usability research, could have inaccurate moments if, in fact, a participant stopped to read something, while not continuing their “finding”, or search for task-list items. Therefore, linear regression was also run using only these two factors (difficulty and frustration) only as the “findability score”. Results showed that findability was a significant predictor of both self-efficacy and motivation, and that there was a negative, linear correlation for each as well. Findability significantly predicted self-efficacy scores  $b = -.438$ ,  $t(58) = -6.48$ ,  $p = .000$ . Findability also explained a significant proportion of variance in self-efficacy scores,  $R^2 = .412$ ,  $F(1, 58) = 42.04$ ,  $p = .000$ . Findability also significantly predicted motivation scores  $b = -.331$ ,  $t(58) = -4.63$ ,  $p = .000$ . Findability also explained a significant proportion of variance in motivation scores,  $R^2 = .264$ ,  $F(1, 58) = 21.51$ ,  $p = .000$ .

It should be noted that no other single variable was found to be a significant predictor of self-efficacy or motivation, including age, rank/year in school, GPA, or level of comfort with using a computer. However, adding the total number of online courses that a participant had taken to the equation was found to significantly predict additional variance in both self-efficacy and motivation.

In sum, there is a negative, linear relationship between findability and both self-efficacy and motivation; results show that findability was found to be a significant predictor of both self-efficacy and motivation in online courses.

---

<sup>1</sup> Difficulty level was already categorized as 1 – 3 (low – high). Frustration level was recoded from a 5-point Likert scale to a 3-point Likert scale. Time-on-task was visually binned into 3 groups, using equal percentiles as cut points. Since higher ratings in each of the three areas would indicate lower findability, the scores were then reverse-coded. A “findability score” was calculated for each task, and from that an overall findability score was calculated (the highest possible findability score would be 63, and the lowest would be 21). Overall findability scores ranged from 21 – 58.

## **Event Analysis Results**

Participants were observed searching for items that, in the case of broken navigation, caused them much frustration. Besides the obvious factor of time-on-task (longer time, more frustration), participants could be observed moving their eyes across a page looking for a link. From the eye tracking data, gaze plots could be directly observed that showed participants actually fixating on links they needed to finish the task.

When the link was buried in a list of file names, however, participants had trouble distinguishing among the choices. The researchers observed fixations directly on the target link, and yet they still did not select it and would move on to another page. This problem highlights the importance of navigation design and visual design. Problems of this type may be caused by:

- Lack of chunking, (the navigation items were not grouped into logical categories so that the user can more quickly jump to the appropriate links)
- Poor labeling (in some cases using file names as labels rather than specific language)
- Poor categorization (placing needed links in non-logical locations)
- Deeply buried content (placing a syllabus, for example, in a folder four levels deep)
- Lack of visual contrast among page elements (if you want someone to see something, contrast it from the other content on a page, don't bury it visually)

## **Conclusion and Future Directions**

This exploratory study produced some interesting results that prompt further investigation into the connection between findability and self-efficacy and motivation. Future studies could focus on what design aspects most impact findability, and whether findability is of greater impact for certain items in an online course. Additionally, longitudinal studies could attempt to determine the effects of findability issues in online courses over the duration of an entire semester. Future research could also look more closely at other factors that influence student feelings of self-efficacy and motivation in online courses, as well as exploring the linkages between these two factors and student learning. Research focused on the latter could serve to possibly link findability to student learning which, if found, would perhaps increase the importance of findability in online courses.

This project and its findings will be useful to both designers and reviewers of online courses, and will additionally have broad implications for online students and online learning. Results of the study contribute to the currently small body of knowledge on findability, student motivation, and self-efficacy in online courses and is a significant step made towards determining both the effect of findability in online courses and minimum findability standards. This project could be replicated by any other institution offering courses that meet QM standards, and would also be the first step in possibly establishing a standard measure for findability in online courses. The ease with which this study could be replicated using the developed measure would further the validity and generalizability of the study results.

For Quality Matters™, however, this study lays the groundwork for demonstrating the importance of Standard 6.3. This standard already has prominence and emphasis in the Quality Matters™ rubric, simply by its being an Essential Standard. However, given the condition that a course must meet a particular standard to the level of 85% or more, perhaps peer reviewer and

designer attention should consider this standard in relation to what is not findable in a course, or what items are illogically placed, etc. For example, if items reflected in other Essential Standards, such as the Instructor Welcome, are not easily findable, is that fundamental enough of an issue for the faculty developer to address? In the end, this study was able to make some important, first steps into looking specifically at Standard 6.3, as well as making groundwork in potentially linking navigation issues to student feelings of self-efficacy and motivation, both of which can impact student learning.

Further, the study provides information that could potentially inform future revisions of the Quality Matters™ rubric. Considering how important findability may be for student learning, perhaps future annotations of Standard 6.3 could give some minimal guidelines to help Peer Reviewers determine findability of important items, especially those reflected in Essential Standards, such as Learning Objectives, Module Objectives, Instructor Welcome, Grading Policy, etc. Considerations such as a “three-click” heuristic, or amount of minutes to find an item, could help Peer Reviewers note findability issues to faculty developers.

## References

- Barnum, C.M. (2002). *Usability testing and research*. New York: Longman.
- DeTure, M. (2004). Cognitive style and self-efficacy: Predicting student success in online distance education. *The American Journal of Distance Education*, 18(1), 21-38.
- Fisher, E.A. & Wright, V.H. (2010). Improving online course design through usability testing. *Journal of Online Learning and Teaching*, 6(1), 228-245.
- Irizarry, R. (2002). Self-efficacy and motivation effects on online psychology student retention. *United States Distance Learning Association Journal*, 16(12), 55-64.
- McAuley, E., Duncan, T.E., Wraith, S. (1991). Self-efficacy, perceptions of success, and intrinsic motivation for exercise. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 21, 139-155.
- Morville, P. (2005). *Ambient Findability*. Sebastopol, CA: O'Reilly.
- Pintrich, P.R., Smith, D.A., Garcia, T., & McKeachie, W.J. (1991). A manual for the use of the Motivated Strategies for Learning Questionnaire (MSLQ). National Center for Research to Improve Postsecondary Teaching and Learning. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan.
- Rubin, J., Chisnell, D. & Spool, J. (2008). *Handbook of usability testing: How to plan, design, and conduct effective tests*. Indianapolis, IN: Wiley.
- Tselios, N., Avouris, N., Dimitracopoulou, A., & Daskalaki, S. (2001). *Evaluation of distance-learning environments: Impact of usability on student performance*. *International Journal of Educational Telecommunications*, 7(4), 355-378.
- Zaharias, P. & Poylymenakou, A. (2009). Developing a Usability Evaluation Method for e-Learning Applications: Beyond Functional Usability. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 25(1), 75-98.
- Zimmerman, B.J. (2000). Self-efficacy: An essential motive to learn. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25, 82-91.

## Appendix 1: Task List

**Task 1:** This is the first time you've ever logged into this course. You have no idea what to do, so you're looking for clues. See if you can find these two items that can help you get started:

1. The video entitled, "How to navigate and interact with your course"
2. The course syllabus (just find it, don't open)

**Task 2:** Now that you've had a little introduction to the course, you're looking for some more detailed information on what this course is all about. Find the:

1. Course schedule
2. Instructor welcome

**Task 3:** You now have sort of a feel for what you'll be doing in this course. Now you want to know what you'll get out of this course. Find the:

1. Learning outcomes

**Task 4:** Now you're ready to get started in the course. There are learning outcomes for each module in the course. Those outcomes tell you what you're supposed to have learned by the end of each module. Find the:

1. Learning Outcomes for Module 1 of the course.

**Task 5:** Module 1 Outcomes are spread out over three weeks. In looking at your schedule, you notice there's a great concert in New York City during the third week of the course you want to attend, so you want to get a head start. Find information on what you will be doing in Week 3 that supports the Module 1 Outcomes, specifically:

1. What you will be reading
2. What 2 assignments you will be completing

**Task 6:** Now that you've had a look at some of the assignments, you want to know what you have to focus on to get the grade you want. Find the:

1. Course grading policy that also includes a list of projects/activities and their associated point values.

**Task 7:** One of your friends just finished an online course and had some technical difficulties. Although you don't think there will be technical problems in this course, you might ask yourself, "What happens if there is one?" Find:

1. A link to technical support available to you
2. A phone number you would call in the event of a technical problem

## Appendix 2: MSLQ Self-efficacy and Motivation pre-test/post-test

MSLQ Part A. questionnaire (using Qualtrics online survey tool)

Authors: Pintrich, Smith, Garcia & McKeachie, (1991).

Items are scaled as:

1 = Not true at all; 2 = Hardly ever true; 3 = Often true; 4 = Very true

1. In a class like this, I prefer course material that challenges me so I can learn new things.
2. If I study in appropriate ways, then I will be able to learn the material for this course.
3. I believe I will get an excellent grade in this class.
4. I'm certain I can understand the most difficult material presented in the readings for this course.
5. I'm confident I can do an excellent job on the assignments and tests in this course.
6. The most important thing for me right now is improving my overall grade point average, so my main concern in this class is getting a good grade.
7. I'm confident I can learn the basic concepts taught in this course.
8. I am very interested in the content area of this course.
9. I expect to do well in this class.
10. The most satisfying thing for me is to try and understand the content in my courses as thoroughly as possible.
11. I like the subject matter of this course.
12. Understanding the subject matter of this course is very important to me.
13. I want to do well in this class because it is important to show my ability to my family, friends, employer, or others.
14. Considering the difficulty of this course, the teacher, and my skills, I think I will do well in this class.
15. I think the course material in this class is useful for me to learn.

### Scenario for the POST-TEST MSLQ questionnaire:

Now that you have viewed the syllabus and some of the course materials for the class, please take a moment to think about your experience using the course system and seeing the materials and syllabus. With those thoughts and feelings in mind, please answer the following questions.