

## Evaluating Best Practices for Video Tutorials: A Case Study

Thomas Weeks

Jennifer Putnam Davis

University Libraries

Augusta University

This paper will explore one library's experience creating best practices for the creation of video tutorials. First, a literature review establishes the best practices other creators have used. Then, the authors apply these best practices to the creation of their first video tutorial. Finally, they evaluate the usefulness of each practice in context. This study is helpful for all those starting to make video tutorials or reinvigorate their tutorial creation.

This is an electronic version of an article published in

Weeks, T. & Putnam-Davis, J. (2017). Evaluating best practices for video tutorials: A case study. *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, 11(1-2), 185-197.

The final version of record is available online at:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1533290X.2016.1232048>

## Introduction

Multimedia tutorials have been a source of instruction for many years and much has been written about the process of creating these tutorials, including the establishment of best practices for various aspects of the project. During the creation of the first multimedia tutorial for Reese Library, however, the authors realized that not all established best practices are pragmatic to every instructional situation. The online multimedia screencast tutorial entitled “How to place a GIL Express request” was a collaborative project between two staff members (the authors) of the Access Services and Reference and Education departments of Reese Library. The tutorial as created shows step-by-step instructions on how to locate and place a request for a book using GALILEO Interconnected Library (GIL) Express, the universal borrowing service for the University System of Georgia institutions.

The need for this tutorial became evident when statistics generated from Springshare’s RefAnalytics reflected that in the 2014 Fiscal Year, (July 2013-June 2014), 30% of the questions asked by users regarded GIL Express, despite the readily available paper handout located at the Reese Library Information Desk (a combined circulation and reference service point). This statistic suggested that perhaps the handout was not helpful, and prompted the authors to re-evaluate how users receive information about the service. They concluded that the handout included too much information and its availability was too limited because users had to physically be in the library in order to obtain it. As a solution, the authors created an online video tutorial in which the steps of using GIL Express are visually shown through video screen captures and are audibly explained through narration.

The creation of the GIL Express tutorial was a new project for GRU’s Reese Library, and the authors conducted extensive research on tutorial creation before beginning production. They identified best practices based on their literature review, and then created their tutorial following these practices. As expected, this project was arduous. Planning time around two department schedules proved most challenging. Learning how to use screencapture software was also a demanding aspect of the project due to the limited knowledge of such software. Implementing some of the best practices into the project was not an expected issue prior to starting the project. The authors hoped that by following the best practices, the creation of the GIL Express tutorial would have been more straightforward. Instead, they found some practices to cause more obstacles, impeding production rather than expediting it.

## Identifying Best Practices: A Literature Review

Interest in best practices for tutorial creation has considerably increased in the last decade due to significant advances in technology and the more frequent use of multimedia tutorials in academic libraries. One of the earliest researchers to identify best practices is Nancy Dewald (1999), who discusses transporting the library instruction of the classroom into the web environment. She proposes seven fundamentals for effective tutorials: the content should be course or assignment related; the content should include active learning; the content should also include collaborative learning; the content should be available in multiple mediums; objectives should be clarified early; concepts should be taught; and contact information for further assistance should be provided.

Since this early article, scholars have evolved Dewald's fundamentals to incorporate changes in academia. For example, Rachel Viggiano (2004) created best practices while assessing online tutorial support for distance learning. Paul Betty (2008) discusses a set of best practices while describing how to create tutorials using screencast technology. More recently, Scales, Nicole, and Johnson (2013) recognize several best practices while creating tutorials based on established learning theories. During the literature review process, publications on best practices were not always easily identifiable. To remedy this, the authors consulted articles about the process of creating tutorials, as well as several case studies to determine what practices worked best for other creators. The authors identified a total of twelve best practices. They have segmented the best practices into different phases of tutorial creation for the purpose of this review. These include: planning, creating, publishing, promoting, and assessing.

### *Planning*

1. Several scholars have suggested that learning objectives should be established early on when designing video tutorials (Dewald, 1999; Reece, 2007; Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009; Oud, 2009; Sledobnik & Riehle, 2013; Mestre, 2012; Hess, 2013; Kern, 2013). Sledobnik and Riehle (2009) found that this helps avoid wasting time and effort. Dewald (1999) and Oud (2009) say creators can develop, outline, and organize the instructional content more easily when objectives are established. This includes deciding what content is essential and what is not, which keeps the project focused (Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009). In turn, Hess (2013) believes tutorials that are focused demonstrate consideration for the learning objectives and the learners by limiting what is being taught.
2. Another suggestion is to identify the tutorial's potential audience and their pre-existing knowledge of the tutorial content (Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009; Oud, 2009; Hess, 2013; Wyant, 2013). This may increase the likelihood that the tutorial will be viewed, and may determine the strategies used in presenting the instructional content (Oud, 2009). More advanced viewers, for example, will require less direction than those learning the material for the first time. Sometimes identifying the audience is difficult, however. Blummer and Kritskaya (2009) suggest focus groups, faculty collaboration, and conducting needs assessments as ways to determine the tutorial's audience.
3. Some scholars stress the importance of researching creation software prior to beginning a project (Blevins and Elton, 2009; Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009; Evans, 2014). Blummer and Kritskaya (2009) advise creators to select the program that best meets the needs of the tutorial. Evans (2014) explains how this choice depends on the type of content the tutorial will show. She offers a comparative chart listing advantages and disadvantages of several software programs. Blevins and Elton (2009) provide a set of criteria for evaluating different software programs. Usability, accessibility, cost, and time required to create the tutorial are all considered when making a decision.
4. Examining tutorials created by other institutions is also a possible step in planning, although this is discussed less in the literature. Only Blummer and Kritskaya (2009) suggest that creators search library websites to help generate ideas. Clossen (2013) mentions PRIMO, ALA's database of peer-reviewed online learning objects, but does not discuss its value in creating tutorials. Moreover, of the many case studies consulted, only Thornton and Kaya (2013) discuss how they surveyed what kinds of tutorials have been produced by other libraries.

## Creating

5. Most scholars advise to write a script (Dewald, 1999; Balin & Pena, 2007; Reece, 2007; Oud, 2009; Slebodnik & Riehle, 2009; Bowles-Terry, Hensley, & Hinchcliffe, 2010; Hess, 2013; Kern, 2013; Wyant, 2013; Clossen, 2014; Evans, 2014). Kern (2013) suggests this adds professional quality to the tutorial; others say it provides structure and clarity (Balin & Pena, 2007; Hess, 2013; Evans, 2014). Scripts can also easily be used to caption tutorials (Kern, 2013). It is good practice to state the established learning objectives in the script's introduction so viewers are informed of what they will be watching (Dewald, 1999). This helps orient the viewers and enables them to determine the tutorial's value for their learning needs (Hess, 2013; Evans, 2014). Either the tutorial will be helpful for the viewer, or the viewer will not waste time if it does not pertain to his/her needs. The remaining portions of the script should be organized so that the main points are emphasized, which minimizes cognitive overload (Oud, 2009) and keeps viewers' attention (Bowles-Terry, et al., 2010). Some scholars suggest eliminating points of confusion by cleaning up unclear terminology, including library jargon, as viewers will most likely be unfamiliar with this vocabulary (Sleobodnik & Riehle, 2009; Wyant, 2013; Clossen, 2014). Reece (2007), however, disagrees with eliminating terminology that would help the viewer associate the instructional content with the scholarly product. Finally, Kern (2013) suggests reading the script aloud to determine whether what has been written is easy to say.
6. Many scholars suggest limiting tutorials to no more than two minutes in length (Betty, 2008; Oud, 2009; Bowles-Terry, et. al, 2010; Mestre, 2012; Hess, 2013; Kern, 2013; Wyant, 2013; Scales, et al., 2013; Clossen, 2014; Evans, 2014). This helps keep the viewers engaged (Bowles-Terry, et. al, 2010; Wyant, 2013). Shorter tutorials are also more likely to be viewed in their entirety (Betty, 2008), and are more manageable to update and maintain (Hess, 2013). Some suggest that longer tutorials should be broken into smaller tutorials (Betty, 2008; Bowles-Terry et al., 2010; Mestre, 2012). This can reduce cognitive overload (Oud, 2009; Hess, 2013), the point at which the presented information is too excessive and prohibits learning, and keeps the tutorial focused on one learning objective at a time (Clossen, 2014). Scales et al. (2013) find that "chunking" information supports better retention.
7. Some scholars advise using video and audio cues (Reece, 2007; Oud, 2009; Plumb, 2010; Mestre, 2012; Kern, 2013; Scales et al., 2013; Clossen, 2014; Evans, 2014). This can help direct viewers' attention to the most important parts on screen (Mestre, 2012; Kern, 2013; Scales et al., 2013). Visual cues can include using an arrow, circle or other shape, zooming features, and graphics. Audio cues can include sound effects, music clips, using tone for emphasis, and closed-captioning. Some suggest these cues, however, should not be over used so that they distract or overwhelm the viewer from the content (Oud, 2009; Scales et al., 2013; Evans, 2014). Busy screens should also be avoided to keep the tutorial focused (Clossen, 2014) and graphics should be consistent in style and format (Reece, 2007; Oud, 2009; Plumb, 2010). Scales et al. (2014) discuss in great detail how these cues decrease the possibility of cognitive overload. In contrast, Bowles-Terry, et al. (2010) and Hess (2013) say that tutorials should focus on the task and not its entertainment value.
8. A few scholars suggest providing contact information for users to ask for help at any future time (Dewald, 1999; Reece, 2007; Betty, 2008; Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009). This can help engage viewers (Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009).

9. Most scholars advise that tutorial content should be available through multiple formats (Betty, 2008; Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009; Bowles-Terry et al., 2010; Mestre, 2012; Hess, 2013; Kern, 2013; Scales et al., 2013; Wyant, 2013). This makes tutorials accessible to all users (Wyant, 2013). Users should be given the option to watch, listen, or read the text of the tutorial, or in any combination of the three. Closed-captioning should be included to not only serve those users with hearing disabilities (Mestre, 2012; Kern, 2013; Wyant, 2013), but also those users whose native language is not English (Bowles-Terry et al., 2010; Mestre, 2012). Closed-captioning is also an option for students who do not have the equipment to hear audio, or who prefer to read the narrative text (Scales et al., 2013). Providing the tutorial in multiple formats also supports various learning styles (Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009; Bowles-Terry et al., 2010).

### *Publishing*

10. Scholars also suggest tutorials should be linked at the point-of-need (Bowles-Terry et al., 2010; Thornes, 2012; Hess, 2013; Wyant, 2013). This ensures that users will become aware of the tutorial and increases the chance that they will watch it. Linking at point of need can also enhance the tutorial's findability and ease the time spent searching for relevant tutorials (Hess, 2013). Bowles-Terry et al. (2010) found in their user study that students might not think to search for a page just for tutorials. Thornes (2012) and Wyant (2013) suggest tutorials should also be made available for further embedding, which permits librarians to incorporate the tutorial in their own instruction classes and subject guides. Most host sites, like YouTube, allow permissions to be made by the tutorial creators (Kern, 2013). Embedding tutorials into a course management system is also an option that allows for subject faculty collaboration (Thornes, 2012; Wyant, 2013).

### *Promoting*

11. Additionally, scholars point out that a tutorial will only be used if users are aware of its existence (Betty, 2009; Thornes, 2012; Evans, 2014). Announcements can be made via library publications such as blogs, newsletters, and social media sites. Betty (2009) found that announcements made on the news section of the library's website were most effective in catching the attention of faculty and administration. Simple flyers and signs can also be placed around the library, as well as distributing bookmarks at the circulation desk (Betty, 2009; Evans, 2014). Evans (2014) further suggests using QR codes at places where users may need to access the tutorial. Librarians and staff should also be encouraged to show the tutorial whenever possible (Betty, 2009).

### *Assessment*

12. Many also think a key component of tutorial creation is its assessment (Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009; Slebodnik & Riehle, 2009; Plumb, 2010; Thornes, 2012; Hess, 2013; Evans, 2014). Thornes (2012) argues evaluation and feedback are essential to accurately judge whether tutorials are meeting viewers' needs. Evaluation techniques can include usability tests, pilot studies, surveys, usage statistics, student achievement, and anecdotal observations (Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009; Slebodnik & Riehle, 2009; Evans, 2014). Blummer & Kritskaya (2009) believe one of the easiest methods to collect user comments is by creating a survey after the end of the tutorial for users to provide feedback. They suggest

creating a space after the completion of the tutorial for users to provide feedback. However, some scholars have found it difficult to generate responses this way. Thornes (2012), for example, gained only one response from her survey. Other scholars argue that usability tests can be a better method of assessment, but require more time commitment (Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009; Mestre, 2010; Mestre, 2012). Permission from the institution's review board is often required and participants must be carefully selected based on what it is that is being evaluated. Blummer & Kritskaya (2009) believe pre- and post-tests are a good method to determine whether students are learning from the tutorial. Qualitative data such as observations from library staff and faculty can also help evaluate tutorials by determining whether students appear less confused over performing tasks. The frequency in which certain questions are being asked is also a good indicator of the tutorials' usefulness (Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009). Plumb (2010) and Evans (2014) support obtaining feedback at continuous stages, with Evans (2014) further stating that this can help direct the project during the creation process. According to Hess (2013), co-workers and supervisors can also be a good source for feedback. However, Plumb (2010) considers this feedback limited.

### Creating the GIL Express Tutorial: Following Best Practices

Once the authors decided to create a video tutorial, they first established learning objectives. The project's learning objectives seemed straight forward at first, but the authors quickly learned that word choice is significant when writing learning objectives. Their first attempt at establishing a learning objective, *to effectively instruct users on how to use the GIL Express service*, was too vague. The authors then described exactly what the tutorial will instruct the users to do in two objectives: *the tutorial will effectively demonstrate how to locate a book using the universal catalog* and *the tutorial will effectively demonstrate how to place a GIL Express request on these needed items*. Although more detailed, these objectives are clear enough for the authors to outline the specific directions required to show each step. It also provides points of reference to eventually evaluate the effectiveness of the tutorial. It can be evaluated whether viewers can successfully locate a book using the universal catalog, and also whether viewers can successfully place a GIL Express request.

The authors then identified the audience of the GIL Express tutorial as those users who are unaware of the GIL Express service or those who have never used it. Oftentimes these are freshman undergraduates, transfer students, or international students, all who are new to using Reese Library. Other viewers may also include those users who have only seldom used GIL Express and need reminders of key steps in the process. These users include upperclassmen, graduate students, and faculty. The viewers' pre-existing knowledge of the GIL Express service, therefore, is very little to none, which means that the tutorial must be thorough, with all steps explicitly shown. Some explanation of GIL Express, such as its purpose, may need to be included, as well.

Next, the authors wrote their script. They began by stating the learning objectives of the tutorial in an attempt to orient the viewer to the learning experience. An explanatory sentence about what the GIL Express service is was then included for those unfamiliar with the service. Although this does not comply with what Bowles-Terry et al. (2010) suggest about limiting conceptual introductory information, the authors decided to include it because most of the target audience will have no pre-existing knowledge. The script then transitions into the procedural directions, but where to begin the demonstration became an immediate problem to solve. Rather

than starting with a generic instruction on opening the web browser, the authors decided to begin the tutorial from the library's website, because viewers will either already be on the site, or will be referencing a research guide.

Step-by-step instructions of where to find the universal catalog on the library's homepage, how to find a book, how to log in to a personal GIL account, and finally, how to place the request for borrowing were detailed in common language so as not to confuse viewers who may not understand library terms. For example, "results" was used instead of "records," and the phrase "bibliographic information" was carefully avoided. The authors chose a book that they knew Reese Library did not own for demonstrating how to search the universal catalog. They also created a fake user record for the demonstration of requesting the book, so as not to show any personal information from their own or others GIL accounts. They concluded the script with a sentence regarding how long it normally takes for requests to arrive and how the user will be notified of arrival, since these are frequent questions asked by users.

The script proved to be too long during the creation process when it resulted in a tutorial almost four minutes long. To shorten the tutorial's length to less than two minutes, the authors eliminated the "need to know" information. After this, the introduction included just the learning objective statement, and the end of the tutorial concluded with the generic "contact the library for any additional information needed." While the literature suggested researching tutorial creation software as a possible step in the creation process, since Reese Library already had a license for Camtasia, a popular screen-capture software, they elected to use that application.

During the editing process, visual cues were added to parts of the tutorial to help direct the viewer's attention to specific areas of the screen, particularly in places that include "click here" directions. This was achieved mostly with zoom and pan features. The use of the mouse arrow was also used in each screen capture so viewers can easily follow along and be able to model the steps being shown using their own screen and mouse. Slides were added at the beginning and end of the tutorial to serve as openers and closers. Text was used to title the tutorial on the opening slide and to list the library's contact information on the concluding slide. No pictures or audio effects were added as the authors deemed them unnecessary. Lastly, captions were added in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA).

Although only some of the literature discusses gathering feedback before publishing and promoting tutorials, the authors decided to solicit several co-workers to view the tutorial and provide feedback, particularly because it was a new project for Reese Library. Overall, the feedback was positive, but two issues were repeatedly mentioned. The first regarded the audio portion of the tutorial. Several comments stated that the narration sounded "unnatural" or "robotic" and could distract the viewer. Upon review, the authors agreed that the narration was not fluid and sounded too much like reading a script. To rectify this, the authors asked a co-worker who spoke more softly and more naturally to record the narration. The second issue involved the visual components of the tutorial. Co-workers noted that when the video zoomed out, the video became blurry. This was a difficult problem to solve, as changing the resolution resulted in a large file that slowed downloading time, which could frustrate viewers. With help from a staff member of Reese Library's Systems Department, the authors were able to slightly increase the resolutions of the zooming stages to help focus screen images without drastically affecting the file size.

Other notable comments included adding more content at points in the tutorial for better clarification. This information was previously omitted by the authors because it was not procedural, and the tutorial's length was almost four minutes long. By intentionally re-writing the original script, the authors were able to reduce this information to one sentence. They also included this information in a text box at the relevant point in the tutorial to visually compliment the auditory explanation. Although this addition caused the tutorial to become longer than the suggested time limit, the authors agreed the addition also clarified the content and answered some potential follow-up questions about the service.

Additional content-related feedback included comments about frequently asked questions about the GIL Express service. Again, this information was eliminated by the authors to keep the tutorial's length to a suitable time. Yet this information was important and the authors agreed it needed to be included somewhere. Rather than incorporate it into the tutorial itself, because it was not directly related to the procedural steps, the authors created a LibGuide in which the tutorial was embedded, and added an adjoining text box that presented the "need to know" information.

The tutorial was officially launched after six weeks of production time. The authors and the Systems Department debated on the link text because space was limited. It was agreed that the link had to be descriptive enough for viewers to know what it contained; otherwise, the tutorial might not be viewed. The author's first proposal, "Click here for information on how to use GIL Express," was too long to use, so they then proposed the title "How to Use GIL Express," and the Systems Department finalized it as "Get Help with GIL Express." A second link to the tutorial was placed under the "Get Help" dropdown menu located on the homepage. This was simply titled "GIL Express Video." The link to the LibGuide was placed on the library's website in two appropriate locations by the System's Department. The first location is with the universal catalog and GIL Express links on the homepage. A PDF file of the tutorial's transcript was created and attached in the LibGuide for viewers who would rather read the information. A simple assessment component of a two-part questionnaire was also included in the guide. The first question asks, "Did you find this tutorial helpful?" with "yes," "no," or "don't know" response choices. The second question asks, "How helpful did you find this information?" on a Likert-scale of one to five, with one being not at all and five being very helpful. A place for comments was also included.

Once the tutorial was published and available online, the authors promoted it on the library's website, the library blog and social media sites, and through e-mails. Librarians were also granted permission to access the tutorial so they could include it in their own research and subject guides.

### Evaluation of Best Practices Application

The final product resulted in a two minute and thirty-seven second video. In the literature review, the authors identified the twelve best practices for tutorial creation. In the second section of this paper, the authors described how the GIL Express tutorial was made following those best practices. The authors will now assess the best practices the used based on their experience with creating the GIL Express tutorial.

### ***Establish Clear Learning Objectives and Identify the Audience***

Like previous scholars, the authors found that establishing clear learning objectives and identifying the audience and their pre-existing knowledge helped in guiding the direction of the GIL Express project (Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009; Oud, 2009; Hess, 2013; Kern, 2013; Wyant, 2014). This was to be expected, as the authors believe that these two practices are beneficial to any instructional project. Learning objectives must be clearly defined, but can be uninformative if written too simply. The authors found that using precise language to state what information the tutorial will teach, even breaking it down into multiple objectives if necessary, made outlining the project easier, even if it made the objectives themselves more detailed.

### ***Write a Clear and Simple Script***

Writing a clear and simple script is a balancing act, as it is time consuming and can require multiple edits. The authors agree with previous literature that keeping a script uncomplicated will help keep viewers' attention (Betty, 2008; Bowles-Terry et al., 2010; Kern, 2013), particularly Wyant's (2013) and Clossen's (2014) suggestion to eliminate library jargon. However, the authors disagree with Bowles-Terry et al.'s (2010) suggestion of including only procedural directions, as this script was received negatively by coworkers as being unclear. Scripts should be simple, but clear enough so as not to limit the information given so much that it creates more questions than answers. Because of this, the authors believe it is good practice to include some "need to know" information at appropriate places in tutorials, even those of a procedural nature.

### ***Limit Tutorials to 1-2 minutes***

This best practice was impossible for the GIL Express tutorial. As stated above, limiting the content of the tutorial generated negative feedback, even though the length of the tutorial was just over two minutes long. The authors did consider dividing the material into two tutorials, as the literature suggested (Betty, 2008; Bowles-Terry et al., 2010; Evans, 2014; Warfel, 2014). One tutorial would instruct viewers how to access and use the universal catalog, and the other would demonstrate accessing GIL accounts and placing GIL Express requests. However, this was quickly dismissed, as it did not make procedural sense since both necessitate the other. Therefore, limiting tutorials from one to two minutes in length is sensible in theory, but is not always practical (Bowles-Terry et al., 2010; Hess, 2013; Kern, 2013).

### ***Review Creation Software and View Other Tutorials***

If you are just starting creating tutorials, or are branching out into different kinds of tutorials, it may be necessary to review the various software options available. However, like the authors, many institutions already have programs available that can be used for such projects, even if they are unaware. In addition, programs like Quicktime for OS X and freeware like Jing or TinyTake can be used at no cost, although they offer less functionality.

Although the authors did not view other tutorials before beginning due to the niche topic, this can be a useful practice to garner ideas for how others have approached a topic or for ideas on visual and audio cues. Seeing how others have built integrated tutorials into instructional situations, including how the tutorials are embedded into the website, can also be useful.

### ***Use Visual and Audio Cues***

The authors decided that only simple cues were needed for the GIL Express tutorial. The authors feel that using such cues is less important than the clarity of the actual tutorial content, and should only be sporadically used in order to enhance the instructional content. In other words, the authors view these cues, like Bowles-Terry et al. (2010), as secondary support to direct viewers through the tutorial, rather than as a primary contribution to learning, like Scales et al. (2014).

### ***Provide Contact Information***

It is anticipated that the majority of questions being asked about the GIL Express service will be answered by the tutorial. The authors agree, however, that it is a best practice to provide contact information on any project (Dewald, 1999; Betty, 2008; Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009). This allows users the opportunity to pursue additional questions without burdening them with the retrieval of the contact information.

### ***Provide Multiple Formats***

Providing multiple formats allows the tutorials to serve a larger audience of users. For example, those with special needs or limited access to internet connectivity may be better served by either closed captioning or a transcript. The more formats available for the tutorial, the wider an audience it can reach.

### ***Link at all Points of Need***

Above all other best practices, the authors believe this practice to be the most important. Creating tutorials takes a great effort, but where it is placed ensures that users will more likely view it. The authors argue that only linking the tutorial into a tutorial page is ineffective, because new users will most likely not think to search for a tutorial page. Moreover, users who need help will probably want immediate answers to their questions and will feel frustrated if they have to go searching for them.

### ***Promote the Tutorial***

The authors put less emphasis on promoting tutorials than the previous literature does, believing that the links at the points of need will promote the tutorial itself because users who have questions will see the available tutorial directly. However, the authors do agree that promoting the tutorial among library co-workers is beneficial. For example, when the Access Services staff is asked about GIL Express by users, they can direct them to watch the tutorial. Moreover, librarians can incorporate the tutorial during instruction sessions since these sessions typically include the tutorial's target audience. Future usage statistics will allow the authors to determine how many users are watching the tutorial and whether different approaches to promoting the tutorial should be addressed.

### ***Assess the Tutorial***

More literature should address getting feedback from co-workers before publishing and promoting tutorial projects, as the authors found this part of their project most valuable. Gathering feedback helps perfect the presentation of the tutorial in many ways. It is particularly useful for the creators because viewers can comment on how effective the content is presented

(Does it make sense?), and how the tutorial looks (Does it appear to be too busy?). Oftentimes, viewers will comment on aspects of the tutorial that have been overlooked by the creators. Overall, feedback allows for effective development and helps the tutorial creators establish their own best practices for future projects.

Assessing tutorials is an ongoing topic of research. The authors of this paper, however, agree with the literature on the importance of evaluation for tutorials, as well as any instructional project (Lindsay, Cummings, Johnson, & Scales, 2006; Blummer & Kritskaya, 2009; Bowles-Terry et al., 2010; Thornes, 2012; Mery, DeFrain, Kline, & Sult, 2014). In their opinion, user studies are the best method to gain how and why users view tutorials and what can be done to better serve their needs.

### Conclusion and Further Directions

While best practices are useful for framing a project, they must be adapted to your needs and the needs of your users. The best way to know what works is to continually interact with the creation of tutorials and find what makes the most sense in your instructional context. Creation is always situational and the needs of the users must always be foremost. Best practices can act as a guide and a way to pinpoint areas of improvement.

In the future, the authors would like to explore more facets of how tutorials act as instructional objects. For the GIL Express project specifically, tracking the correlation between the number of views and the number of questions asked about the service could prove useful in seeing if users are accessing the tutorial. This may also give some insight into how users are applying the knowledge from the tutorial. Another possible project is a user study to test how various tutorial types (video, static, multimedia interactive, etc.) affect student learning.

## References

- Betty, P. (2008). Creation, management, and assessment of library screencasts: The Regis Libraries animated tutorials project. *Journal of Library Administration*, 48(3/4), 295–315. doi:10.1080/01930820802289342
- Blummer, B. A. & Kritskaya, O. (2009). Best practices for creating an online tutorial: A literature review. *Journal of Web Librarianship*, 3(3), 199-216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/19322900902050799>
- Bowles-Terry, M., Hensley, M.K., & Hinchliffe, L.J. (2010). Best practices for online video tutorials in academic libraries. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 4(1), 17-28. <http://www.comminfolit.org/index.php?journal=cil>
- Clossen, A. S. (2014). Beyond the letter of the law. *Pennsylvania Libraries: Research & Practice*, 2(1), 27-37. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5195/palrap.2014.43>
- Evans, R. (2014). Cooking up cauldron content: Recipes for video tutorials. *Computers in Libraries*, 34(7), 11-5. <http://www.infotoday.com>
- Kern, V. (2013). Actions speaking louder than words: Building a successful tutorials program at the University of Washington. *Fontes Artis Musicae*, 60(3), 155-162. <http://www.iaml.info/en/publications/fontes>
- Hess, A.N. (2013). The magic of web tutorials: How one library (re)focused its delivery of online learning objects on users. *Journal of Library & Information Services in Distance Learning*, 7(4), 331-48. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1533290X.2013.839978>
- Lindsay, E.B., Cummings, L., Johnson, C.M., & Scales, J.B. (2006). If you build it, will they learn?: Assessing online information literacy tutorials. *College & Research Libraries*, 67(5), 429-445. <http://crl.acrl.org/>
- Mery, Y., DeFrain, E., Kline, E., & Sult, L. (2014). Evaluating the effectiveness of tools for online database instruction. *Communications in Information Literacy*, 8(1), 70-81. <http://www.comminfolit.org/index.php?journal=cil>
- Mestre, L.S. (2010). Matching up learning styles with learning objects: What's effective? *Journal of Library Administration*, 50(7/8), 808-29. <http://www.doi.org/10.1080/01930826.2010.488975>
- (2012). Student preference for tutorial design: A usability study. *Reference Services Review*, 40(2), 258-276. <http://www.doi.org/10.1108/00907321211228318>
- Oud, J. (2009). Guidelines for effective online instruction using multimedia screencasts. *Reference Services Review*, 37(2), 164–177. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/00907320910957206>

- Scales, J.B., Nicole, E., & Johnson, C.M. (2014). Redesigning comprehensive library tutorials. *Reference & User Services Quarterly*, 53(3), 242-52.  
<http://www.ala.org/rusa/communications/rusqinfo>
- Thornes, Sara L. (2013). Creating an online tutorial to support information literacy and academic skills development. *Journal of Information Literacy*, 6(1), 81-95.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.11645/6.1.1654>
- Warfel, D.K. (2014). Teaching by Tutorial. *TD&T: Theatre Design & Technology*, 50(2), 62-71.
- Wyant, N. (2013). The effectiveness of online video tutorials as supplemental library instruction. *Kansas Library Association College and University Libraries Section Proceedings*, 3(1), 39-43. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4148/culs.v1i0.1835>