

**Assessing iCONN:
Patrons' Uses, Perceptions, and Recommendations**

**Commissioned by
The Connecticut State Library**

**Prepared by
The Center for Public Policy and Social Research
Central Connecticut State University
New Britain, CT 06050**

Principal Investigator:

John R. Mitrano, Ph.D.
Professor and Chairman
Department of Sociology

March 23, 2007



Table of Contents

Executive Summary	p. 3
Purpose and Procedures	p. 4
Results and Findings: Focus Groups	p. 5
•1) Resources Accessed via iCONN	p. 6
•2) Interface, Design, and Access Issues	p. 9
•3) Google vs. iCONN	p. 10
•4) Breadth, Accuracy, and Timeliness of Holdings: iCONN vs. Individual Libraries	p. 12
•5) Spreading the Word: Promoting & Marketing the Use of iCONN	p. 13
•6) The Mission of iCONN and its Intended Users	p. 16
Results and Findings: On-Line Survey	p. 17
Summary and Recommendations	p. 22

Executive Summary

In an effort to gauge citizen use, perception, and satisfaction with the Connecticut State Library's iCONN search engine, two focus groups were conducted in December of 2006. One focus group consisted of adult users of iCONN; the second consisted of high school users of iCONN. Additionally, in February and March of 2007, iCONN users were invited to participate in an on-line survey based on their use of the search engine on that particular day.

An examination of the themes that emerged from the focus groups and the responses of patrons on the survey reveal the following major findings:

- An overall general satisfaction and appreciation for the depth, breadth, and utility of information provided (and accessed) by iCONN.
- The use of iCONN generally for educational purposes related to school and/or work.
- The perception of iCONN searches as secure, reliable, and anonymous.
- Some concern with iCONN's log-in process, the speed of the search process, and the presentation of search results, especially when compared to that of Google.
- Some confusion regarding the accuracy and availability of holdings accessed by iCONN.

- Librarians and teachers play an integral role in introducing iCONN to patrons.
- The generally positive experiences patrons have using iCONN results in them publicizing iCONN via word of mouth.

Purpose and Procedures

In September, 2006, the Connecticut State Library entered into agreement with the Center for Public Policy and Social Research to conduct focus groups and an on-line survey in an effort to assess citizens' uses, perceptions, and satisfaction with the iCONN library search engine.

A total of two (2) focus groups were held: one on December 5, 2006 from 7:00-8:30 pm. at the Newington Town Library, and the second one on December 12, 2006 from 2:00-4:00 p.m. at the Middletown High School Library. The Connecticut State Library had the responsibility of identifying and inviting guests to attend the scheduled focus groups. A wide variety of users of iCONN participated in these focus groups, ranging from a high school student only recently introduced to the search engine to an adult who had been using it since its inception several years ago.

The focus groups were conducted in a quiet, private room in each setting. Interviewees were invited to candidly respond to the questions that were posed, as well

as to raise any additional comments or concerns they wished to share with the group. Their answers were tape recorded with the understanding and assurance that they would not be identified by name in any subsequent report or publication. Similarly, names of Connecticut State Library or specific town library employees mentioned by focus group members have not been singled out or identified in the discussion of findings.

In addition to the focus groups, an on-line survey of iCONN users was created and posted to the iCONN website for a two-week period in March, 2007. It consisted of several closed-ended questions intended to gauge patron uses of iCONN, their satisfaction with it, and their introduction to the site. While a number of patrons responded to the survey, the sample size was relatively low (N=94). Hence, it is impossible to discern how representative their responses are to the larger population of all iCONN users. The survey results, then, are exploratory in nature and should not be interpreted as generalizable of all iCONN users.

Results and Findings: Focus Groups

In the focus groups, participants were asked a variety of open-ended questions, including: how they search for information in general; how they use iCONN specifically; which resources provided by iCONN they accessed; their perceptions of

the overall strengths and weaknesses of iCONN; their introduction to iCONN; and finally, ideas for better promoting iCONN to state residents. The principal investigator crafted a preliminary set of questions to guide the discussions but invited participants to raise whatever issues they cared to address at any time. Participants were also invited to contact the principal investigator should they have additional comments to add at a later date.

Before delving into the specific findings, it must be noted that several of the interviewees commented on how impressed they were that the Connecticut State Library had commissioned this study. They commended the use of focus groups and claimed that this initiative signaled to them that the Connecticut State Library system was genuinely concerned with better meeting the needs and addressing the concerns of their constituents.

After conducting the focus groups and survey, and poring over the interviewees' and survey participants' responses, several strong patterns of responses emerged which may be of significant use to the Connecticut State Library. A discussion of each is in order.

1) Resources Accessed via iCONN

When asked about the types of resources they accessed using iCONN, focus group members' responses centered on a few resources and databases they found particularly useful. They included:

Newspapers and Magazines

Adult focus group members expressed their general satisfaction with sources such as ProQuest (for newspapers) and InfoTrac (for magazines). While immediate access to that day's full newspaper would be desirable, respondents seemed to understand the slight delay, especially for out-of-town newspapers. Some mentioned a desire for an expanded selection of newspapers, especially smaller daily and weekly newspapers from around the state of Connecticut (e.g., *New Britain Herald*, *Waterbury Republican*, *West Hartford News*, etc.). Some smaller out-of-state city newspapers were also mentioned for possible inclusion (e.g., Syracuse, NY), though patrons questioned how much interest-- outside their own-- such access would garner among state residents. Even with newspapers accessed by iCONN, such as the *Hartford Courant*, patrons mentioned a desire to access different editions of these newspapers. For example, a patron noted that the *Hartford Courant* has several different local editions. Another noted that she would like to be able to have access to the entire production run of the *Hartford Courant*, and not just limited years. Despite some rather specialized articulated desires, patrons seemed generally satisfied with the timeliness and breadth of newspapers and magazines offered via iCONN.

Academic/Research Journals

Another area mentioned by focus group members as being particularly useful was access to scholarly academic journals. For example, a graduate student participant

with two young children noted how accessing journals on-line from home was “quite convenient.” She explained that while access to abstracts of articles was “o.k.”, she would much rather have access to full-text articles even more. However, as she and the others also noted, it may be difficult and expensive for the State of Connecticut Library system to provide full-text access to thousands of journals. Nonetheless, this is a resource they seem to enjoy and would like to see expanded in the future.

Children's Resources

There was some concern expressed by a couple of focus group members that there were limited materials for younger children and that those available are not “attractive” enough to “hook” young children into using iCONN. For example, one participant mentioned the database, “What Do I Read Next?” and her students’ frustration in navigating it, indicating that the children were “overwhelmed” with the number of boxes to check, windows to navigate, and choices to make. Some focus group members believed it to be important to draw young users to iCONN but felt that the resources currently provided do not do that. They noted that iCONN’s long-term success and utility is integrally tied into attracting users at a young age and then constantly adapting iCONN to grow with their needs.

Other Desired Resources

A couple of patrons expressed a desire for access to such media as downloadable music, downloadable e-books, and audio books. High school students were particularly interested in iCONN's ability to help them research music. As one student mentioned, "I'd like to be able to type in bands and artists and then have it (iCONN) find articles on those bands I like and recommend other bands similar to them... it would be great if iCONN could serve as a clearinghouse for music: biographies, upcoming tour dates, discography..." However, she and another high school student were skeptical that this would ever happen, as they imagined that teachers would view provision of such resources as a "distraction" to the learning process.

Another focus group participant mentioned a desire to be able to conduct nationwide obituary searches. In general, however, participants were hard-pressed to identify other resources not provided by iCONN that they would like to see offered. They generally believed iCONN to be comprehensive as is.

Resources Provided That Are Not Accessed As Much

There were a few sources and databases that focus group participants identified as not being particularly useful to them. The Associated Press Photo Archive was one of them. Another was Heritage Quest, which one participant summarized as being "a bit disappointing" and "not as comprehensive as the website Ancestor.com." A couple of interviewees claimed that the Business and Company Resource Center was "slow and inconsistent with timeliness and completeness" when it came to the information it

provided. As one member stated, "I now go to Yahoo Finance or Investor Services for annual reports that I am looking for."

2) Interface, Design, and Access Issues

A second area of discussion centered on iCONN's design and the mechanics of using iCONN. An area of major concern expressed by focus group participants was iCONN's interface with the end user. The first specific area of concern was the actual logging in process, especially from home computers. Several mentioned that they had to type their library card number or username several times in one sitting to access various databases. As one commented, "It's like each door to information is locked." Patrons were uniform in their desire to obtain access to all sites with one password/log-in procedure.

Once in iCONN, several mentioned that trying to navigate through the site was counter-intuitive and that they tended to "overwhelmed" and "intimidated" by the number of links and subcategories presented to them on any given search. And as they pointed out, many in the focus groups tended to be either younger or frequent users of iCONN. Several indicated they "could not imagine" what it must be like for an elderly user or someone new to iCONN. They surmised that the interface most likely was a "huge barrier" to attracting new users and probably resulted in discouraging potential

users. With that said, more familiar users cautioned about changing the design and output of iCONN too frequently. As one participant succinctly concluded:

“They (State of Connecticut Library) need to find an interface that works and stick with it. They shouldn’t change it all the time. Familiarity is important. I don’t want to have to re-learn how to use iCONN every time I log on. I want to be able to recall where the buttons and icons are... I guess what I am saying is that it needs to be intuitive and then consistent.”

Repeatedly, iCONN was being compared to another search engine: Google.

This comparison is the focus of the next section of findings, for which we will now turn.

3) Google vs. iCONN

In examining focus group responses, it was clear that the perceived strength of iCONN is also its perceived weakness. For example, patrons noted that searching a topic using iCONN is much more discriminating. Search results are limited to published material in “reputable sources” and iCONN sorts the search results into the various database categories and provides the number of articles/sources for that search term in each database. Google, on the other hand, provides a two or three sentence description underneath the various website links identified in which the search term appears. These websites tend to be listed in hierarchical relevance to the search term provided by the patron, but are not categorized at all.

Interviewees indicated that they found Google and its web design to be much more desirable when compared to that of iCONN. They repeatedly described Google as being “more intuitive”, “user friendly”, “simple”, “easy”, and “clean” in its design, organization, and presentation of information. They greatly preferred its provision of a brief description of the search finding so that they could quickly discern its utility to them. iCONN’s categorization of information was perceived to be “too diffuse”, “vague”, and “overwhelming” in its presentation. With that said, however, patrons seemed to appreciate its discriminating quality which limited findings to what they referred to as “reputable sources.”

High school student focus group members were particularly concerned about iCONN’s presentation of search results. They noted that they often feel “paralyzed” as to where to go next after the initial search term is submitted and results are presented.

As one student stated:

“There are too many sub-categories presented when the search results are presented.... I’m not sure which area to go to, or which one is going to be most relevant. iCONN does not give titles, context, or any other information on that initial screen following the search.”

While this was problematic for some students, others noted that they generally liked the presentation of search results placed in the larger categories. However, all agreed that it made little sense to include sub-categories and databases, especially when there were no results in those categories or databases. As one exasperated student exclaimed, “Why do they have to include all those categories with zeroes!?”

Another distinction between iCONN and Google that focus group participants mentioned was search speed. They found iCONN to be significantly slower in providing search results as compared to Google, but acknowledged that search speeds using iCONN at a town library was faster than those speeds experienced while accessing iCONN in their homes or places of employment.

One particular area of concern regarding iCONN's design and architecture was the remote log-on process and necessity of navigating several windows before one could conduct a search and access findings. Several participants also mentioned their displeasure with having to enter their password several times when conducting particular searches from home.

In sum, while there clearly were some issues with the design and log-in process associated with iCONN, many participants indicated that they, nonetheless, end up using both search engines for finding information. They typically use Google first to gauge the scope/breadth of material available or attain a "quick" or "timely" answer to a query. To acquire more "in-depth" or "serious" information on that same topic, they then will navigate iCONN's databases.

4) Breadth, Accuracy, and Timeliness of Holdings: iCONN vs. Individual Libraries

Another issue raised by some patrons centered on their perceptions of iCONN's ability to access library holdings. They expressed a degree of doubt in iCONN's ability

to access all holdings in the participating town libraries via reQuest. They also believed that iCONN was slower than individual libraries in updating information on materials that had been loaned out or returned. The perceived lag time in updating information had the unintended consequence of citizens preferring to travel to individual libraries to search for the availability of a book they desired, rather than requesting it via inter-library loan on iCONN.

Related to this topic was an articulated belief that there also may be “territoriality issues” at play when it comes to iCONN. A couple of patrons believed that there needed to be better coordination between individual libraries and iCONN, with more integration and sharing of information on resources. As one focus group member succinctly stated: “There needs to be a little less kingdom and a little more community.” While the veracity of these perceived relationships among various libraries is beyond the scope of this report, awareness of such perceptions may be beneficial in future marketing efforts for the State of Connecticut Library system.

5) Spreading the Word: Promoting & Marketing the Use of iCONN

When asked how they first heard about or discovered iCONN, patrons noted a variety of different sources. In their responses, it was evident that there were both formal and informal mechanisms in place for publicizing its use.

Formal Mechanisms

• **Teachers and school library staff.** Some student focus group participants noted how various teachers incorporated its use in their classroom and the kinds of assignments they would require of students. Teachers whose courses stressed student research projects were particularly likely to expose students to iCONN. Other students cited school librarian staff as introducing them to iCONN, especially during a freshman orientation tour of the library.

• **Library Advertising.** Adult focus group participants, while also noting the role that town librarians played in publicizing iCONN, additionally cited the effects of advertising at the library itself. Examples of effective advertisements included iCONN ads on the desktop screen of a library computer; large “advertising cards” posted on display at the library; and pamphlets, cards, and/or brochures handed out at their home library. Still others were introduced through library forums (e.g., meeting held by the Friends of the Library).

While formal mechanisms were clearly a source of exposure, it was also evident that informal mechanisms were used to publicize and introduce iCONN to potential new users.

Informal Mechanisms

• **Word of mouth from student peers/ peer counseling.** In this mechanism, older students responsible for orienting and socializing younger students inform them that using iCONN “looks good” to their teachers when writing papers for classes. Hence, it

is being used by students as a way to manage impressions of them formed by teachers. Use of iCONN is a way for students to signal to teachers that they are “serious”, “scholarly”, and that they “put in a lot of effort” on their assignments.

•**Word of mouth from workplace colleagues/peers.** A couple of patrons indicated that co-workers and/or friends who had successfully used iCONN informed them of the search engine and encouraged them to try it for themselves. After having had a successful trial use, they became converts to its utility and, in turn, have told others about it.

While these formal and informal mechanisms were effective advertising tools for attracting these particular focus group patrons, there are nonetheless a wide variety of potential mechanisms and strategies for promoting iCONN’s use for others. Focus group members identified many other possible means of marketing and promoting iCONN. They included the following suggestions:

- Traditional media (e.g., more television and radio advertising)
- Printed Advertisement accompanying State of Connecticut tax bills that are mailed to each household.
- Middle school and high school media specialists and librarians.
- MySpace.com website profile

The focus group participants viewed school media specialists and librarians as particularly crucial in publicizing iCONN. They believed that if students were exposed

to iCONN early on in life, they would embrace it and continue to be users well into their adulthood. A couple of patrons expressed their concerns that it “may be too late” to attract older new users, and that iCONN, like foreign languages, is best introduced at a young age.

Younger focus group participants were enthusiastic about the possibility of iCONN creating a profile on the MySpace.com website and then requesting people add it to their profiles as a “friend”. They believed that such requests would compel young users to “check out” who/what this “iCONN person” is requesting their friendship and, hence, gain exposure in this fashion.

While there were a variety of possible avenues for further publicizing iCONN, many of the focus group participants were in agreement that any future marketing campaigns (especially those involving larger sums of money) should be put on hold until the website is redesigned for easier use and navigation. They believed that increasing traffic to iCONN-- via greater advertising today-- would actually be detrimental in the long run, as people would be discouraged by the current complexity of navigating the website.

The last suggestion patrons made concerning advertising and publicizing iCONN was that the State of Connecticut Library needs to better publicize the new databases and resources that are added to iCONN periodically. However, there was no consensus on how, exactly, this should be done.

One final note: Focus group members suggested that no matter what advertising vehicle is used, it should emphasize that the sites patrons access via iCONN are secure

and reliable and that the user cannot be linked to articles being searched and/or read.

They also suggested that the State of Connecticut Library emphasize that identity linked to searches will not be saved or archived in some fashion.

6) The Mission of iCONN and its Intended Users

Most telling, perhaps, of all the topics mentioned by focus group participants was an expressed confusion regarding the goals, mission, purpose, and intended audience of iCONN. Some patrons perceived its primary users as educators and students; others believed it was intended for the general public. Some focus group members viewed iCONN as primarily a search engine to direct users to where they could find information; others considered it a primary source of information. In sum, there was no clear consensus regarding the answers to these questions raised by patrons. The breadth of databases and resources available to iCONN users, while impressive, nonetheless left some patrons with a sense of bewilderment. It also led one focus group participant to ask the rhetorical question: “Can iCONN be all things to all people?” and another to reply, “Jack of all trades, master of none.”

Results and Findings: On-Line Survey

For a period in February and March of 2007, a survey was posted on the iCONN website. Visitors were invited to take the survey and share their experiences using iCONN on that particular day. The first twenty (20) respondents received a stipend of \$25.00 for answering the survey. A total of 94 people participated in the survey during that time period. Percentages have been rounded to the nearest whole number.

1) How satisfied are you with the following aspects of iCONN?				
	Very Satisfied	Somewhat Satisfied	Somewhat Dissatisfied	Very Dissatisfied
Appearance of search page	47%	27%	13%	13%
Ease of search process	33%	45%	7%	16%
Ability to understand search results	49%	27%	11%	13%

It is apparent that survey respondents were generally satisfied with the appearance, search process, and search results of iCONN. Approximately 74% were either “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with the appearance, 78% answered similarly regarding the ease of the search process, and 76% of respondents were “very satisfied” or “somewhat satisfied” with their ability to understand the search results.

2) How satisfied are you with iCONN 's presentation of search results compared to that of Google?

Prefer iCONN's presentation	Prefer Google's presentation	No preference
28%	39%	33%

Survey respondents indicated that they were somewhat more likely to prefer Google's presentation of search results (39%) compared to that of iCONN (28%). A full third of respondents (33%) expressed no preference for either.

3) How satisfied are you with the information you found in iCONN compared to that of Google?

iCONN information more useful	Google information more useful	No preference
52%	21%	27%

Respondents overwhelmingly found iCONN's information (52%) more useful than that information found using Google (21%). A little over a quarter of the respondents (27%) expressed no preference.

4) How often do you search iCONN for the following purposes?

	Frequently	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
School/homework assignments	31%	19%	7%	42%
Job/career/workplace	24%	17%	18%	42%
Personal health and wellness	18%	26%	18%	39%
Current events/news	16%	19%	21%	44%
Information on family history	15%	7%	13%	65%

Other (please specify)	•Books (12)	•Academic articles/research (6)
	•Film/Audio/Video (3)	•History (2)

In examining the results of the survey, it appears that iCONN is being used most often for educational purposes. Approximately 50% of the respondents indicated that they “frequently” or “sometimes” used iCONN for school and homework assignments. The next most popular reasons for using iCONN were personal health and wellness (44%), job/career/work (41%), and current events/news (35%). Several other reasons were mentioned. Those with multiple answers are listed above, with the number of respondents mentioning them provided in parentheses.

5) For today, what was/is the main purpose of your search on iCONN?		
School/homework assignments	47%	
Job/career/workplace	19%	
Personal health and wellness	11%	
Current events/news	10%	
Information on family history	13%	
Other (please specify)		
	•Books (8)	•Research (3)
	•Film/Audio/Video (3)	

When asked their reason for using iCONN during this particular day, nearly half (47%) indicated it was related to educational purposes. This was by far the most popular response, as indicated above.

6) For today, have you been able to find the information you were looking for?		
Yes, exactly what I was looking for	49%	
Not exactly what I was looking for, but something very close	26%	

Something related but not very close	7%
No, nothing what I was looking for	12%
Not applicable	6%

Approximately three-quarters (75%) of respondents indicated that they were able to find either the exact information they were searching for, or something at least very close to it.

7) How likely would you be to recommend iCONN to a friend?	
Very likely	64%
Somewhat likely	13%
Unsure	10%
Somewhat unlikely	5%
Very unlikely	9%

Over three-quarters (77%) of the survey respondents indicated they were “somewhat likely” or “very likely” to recommend iCONN to a friend. This is a relatively high figure and a good indicator of the general overall satisfaction with iCONN.

8) How did you first learn about iCONN? (Please check one)	
Teacher	17%
Word of mouth/friend	6%
Librarian	52%
Advertisement in a newspaper or magazine	3%
Advertisement on the radio	0%
From a link on a webpage	12%
Other (please specify)	10%
•Advertisement in library (2)	

It is quite clear that librarians currently are playing an integral role in exposing patrons to iCONN. Over half of the respondents (52%) indicated that a librarian was responsible for their exposure to iCONN, followed by a teacher (17%). The results suggest that, despite traditional advertising and the use of technology such as the Internet, it is via personal contact with fellow human beings that word about iCONN is largely being disseminated.

ON-LINE SURVEY DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

9) How old are you?

Under 18 years old	15%
18 years old or older	85%

10) Are you currently enrolled as a student?

Yes	38%
No	62%

11) If you answered "yes" to Q9, what best describes the school you are attending?

Elementary/Middle School	20%
High School	20%
2-year or 4-year College	34%
Graduate School	20%
Other (please specify)	6%

•Continuing education (2)

ON-LINE SURVEY QUALITATIVE COMMENTS

12) Any additional comments you would like us to know concerning iCONN?

- iCONN has saved me countless hours of searching the library stacks for the books I want and from driving to many libraries to get what I want. Thanks!
- I very much like the categories of the different search results.
- Would like to view lists of media items with sorting by many options (e.g., DVD, drama, jazz, the year...)
- iCONN is a great resource. I am very, very, very happy that the state provides this. I find the interface complicated and confusing though. I wouldn't necessarily use Google as a model. Academic libraries have interfaces for multiple databases. You should look at those.
- VHS film noir category could be organized better; but it has been a great resource for me!
- As mentioned, I'm usually searching for books and other media that I could request via ILL. I'd love for iCONN to be able to remember "search all ILL libraries" as my default. Searching for book titles tends to generate vast quantities of results. I don't use the newspaper archives or other databases much so I don't have a lot of opinions about that.
- I feel this is a fantastic opportunity to read books I would not be able to acquire through any other means.
- I used to be able to go to census on Heritage Quest and with the new format can't find it.
- Need highlighted keyword in Historical New York Times page find; Need Hartford Courant cover 1922 to present; Need 1930 Census index for other states.
- Thank you. It's a great resource.
- Would like to see more peer reviewed journals.
- Please add more historic newspapers - Chicago, LA, Boston, DC, etc. - they are available through Proquest.

Summary and Recommendations

In taking into account both the focus group members' responses and those of the survey respondents, it is clear that the vast majority of iCONN users appear to be generally satisfied with the resources provided and the databases accessed. They tend to use iCONN for educational purposes related to school and/or work. Respondents generally find what they are searching for, and overwhelmingly perceive iCONN's information to be more useful than that information found using a search engine such

as Google. Their perception is that iCONN searches are secure, reliable, and anonymous, providing comfort and peace of mind to remote users and users on-site in libraries.

While there is a great deal of expressed satisfaction overall, there are nonetheless a few areas of concern with which to be aware. A number of users expressed some dissatisfaction with iCONN's log-in process, the speed of the search process, and the presentation of search results, especially when compared to that of Google. Some also questioned the breadth, accuracy, and timeliness of holdings accessed by iCONN and their availability. Nonetheless, most users would recommend iCONN to others.

In terms of introduction to iCONN, there are several formal and informal mechanisms in place to publicize it. However, it is clearly evident that librarians and teachers play an integral part in introducing it to patrons. Additionally, the generally positive experiences patrons have using iCONN results in them publicizing iCONN via word of mouth.

While it is usually beyond the scope of a third-party evaluator to offer recommendations for change, I nonetheless pose some possible suggestions for the Connecticut State Library's consideration, based on the aforementioned findings. The recommendation include:

Recommendations

- Merge the best of iCONN and Google search techniques, design, and presentation of findings. Limit information to the reputable sources and databases linked to iCONN but present the findings in the style of Google (i.e., with an informative yet succinct 2-3

sentence description). Eliminate the use of zeroes for databases/categories in which no information is found for a particular search. This will eliminate visual clutter and lessen confusion.

- Publicize that updates from each individual library occur in “real time” (if this is the case) on iCONN as well. Let the public know that there is no lag time and that holdings identified by iCONN searches are timely and accurate. Also, emphasize the cooperation, integration, and sharing of all the resources of all the participating libraries.

- Continue to publicize iCONN through formal and informal mechanisms, especially employing the use of librarians and teachers. Expose students to iCONN early in their academic career, and have students and librarians reinforce its use throughout elementary and secondary school.

- More clearly articulate the market i.e., intended user of iCONN’s resources. If it is intended for all residents of Connecticut, perhaps create different initial home webpages/portals for users of different age groups. Perhaps limit searches to particular databases depending on age or expertise of user.

- Place a greater emphasis on specialized/tailored searching. Some patrons proposed that iCONN first ask users to provide some basic demographic information on an initial webpage/portal. Then, based on that information, iCONN would offer the patron tailored databases, font sizes, levels of vocabulary, etc. In essence, the “look and feel” of an iCONN search by a 75 year-old interested in the history of quilting techniques would be dramatically different from an iCONN search by a 7 year-old interested in why earthquakes occur.