

Meta-Analysis of the Descriptive Video Literature

Technical Report

Kay Alicyn Ferrell

American Foundation for the Blind and the University of Northern Colorado

Megan Finnerty and Martin Monson

University of Northern Colorado

In 2006, the National Association of the Deaf (NAD) received entered into a new five-year \$7.5 million cooperative agreement with the U.S. Department of Education (ED) for management of the Described and Captioned Media Program (DCMP). The American Foundation for the Blind has partnered with NAD on this project and leads an activity to develop and validate guidelines for creating educational video description. Video description refers to an additional narration track for blind and visually impaired viewers of educational media that supplements the audio track with explanatory information about characters, plot, scenery, and action.

An extensive literature review was the first step in developing guidelines and documenting best practice in video description. This report presents the results of that review and documents the scientifically-based evidence available to support descriptive video practices with children and youth who are visually impaired.

Scientifically-Based Research

The No Child Left Behind Act (2002) requires the application of scientifically-based research to educational practice and defines it as "research that involves the application of rigorous, systematic, and objective procedures to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs," including research that:

- (i) employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment;
- (ii) involves rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn;
- (iii) relies on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators;

(iv) is evaluated using experimental or quasiexperimental designs in which individuals, entities, programs, or activities are assigned to different conditions and with appropriate controls to evaluate the effects of the condition of interest, with a preference for random-assignment experiments, or other designs to the extent that those designs contain within-condition or across-condition controls;

(v) ensures that experimental studies are presented in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at a minimum, offer the opportunity to build systematically on their findings; and

(vi) has been accepted by a peer-reviewed journal or approved by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review. (20 USC 7801, Sec. 9101(37)(B))

In the education of students with visual disabilities, it is not always possible to meet these strict criteria when conducting research. When strong scientifically-based research does not exist, Valentine and Cooper (2004) suggest that researchers produce syntheses of research summarizing the evidence pertaining to the effectiveness of educational interventions and approaches. The What Works Clearinghouse was established in 2002 by the US Department of Education to identify and disseminate the effectiveness of various educational interventions, primarily by conducting meta-analyses of the literature. The low prevalence of blindness and visual impairment makes it unlikely that the Clearinghouse will examine the body of literature in visual disabilities, and in fact, none of the topics currently under study involve students who are blind or visually impaired (see http://www.whatworks.ed.gov/topics/current_topics.html).

Meta-analysis is a statistical procedure used to identify trends in the statistical results of a set of existing studies concerning the same research problem (Gall, Borg, & Gall, 2006). Through such a procedure, effects, which are hard or impossible to discern in the original studies because of too-small sample sizes, can be made visible, as the meta-analysis is equivalent to a single study with the combined effect size of all original studies. Meta-analytic reviews go beyond narrative reviews in the sense that they are systematic, explicit, and utilize quantitative methods of analysis (Rosenthal, 1991). Because of these features, meta-analytic reviews are considered to provide more thorough, comprehensive, and precise summative evaluations that entail greater objectivity than narrative reviews. Moreover, meta-analysis is consistent with American Psychological Association guidelines that call for use of effect sizes, which allows for an evaluation of the practical significance of differences. Consequently, the American Foundation for the Blind sought to conduct an exhaustive review of the literature and a meta-analysis of descriptive video research in the education of children and youth with blindness and low vision.

Study Selection Criteria

The literature search began with electronic databases at the University of Northern Colorado's Michener Library, using the search terms "described video," "video description," "audio description," and "descriptive video." This was followed by Internet

searches using the same terms. These searches yielded a number of documents, articles, and reports that were added to the literature pool. The reference list of every document was also examined to make sure all possible references had been identified. This process resulted in the identification of 146 documents.

These 146 documents were then subjected to the following criteria to determine if they were qualified for inclusion in this meta-analysis:

1. Publication in a peer reviewed journal published in English.
2. Participants were children and youth with a visual impairment of any degree (partial vision, low vision, partially sighted, blind) between 3 and 21 years of age.
3. The topic addressed was some form of audio or video description.

In order to conduct the meta-analysis, additional criteria addressing the No Child Left - Behind standard of scientifically-based research were applied:

1. A description of an intervention (which we defined as a systematic application of any program, product, practice, or policy with the intent of affecting an outcome);
2. A comparison group of some type; and
3. Data related to some aspect of descriptive video as a dependent variable.

Table 1 summarizes the end result of this selection process. The electronic searches located 80 articles or short reports dealing with video or audio description. An additional 66 documents were found on various websites, and 19 websites were identified. Forty (40) reference citations could not be located, and 16 articles were deemed not relevant to audio or video description. Four research studies were excluded from the meta-analysis because the study participants were adults. Eighty-six (86) items were not research according to the definition above. Fifty-three (53) items were not published in peer-reviewed journals. Only one article met all of the criteria for inclusion in this meta-analysis, and because there was only one qualifying article, a meta-analysis could not be conducted.

Table 2 provides citations to the 146 documents and 19 web sites found during the search process and indicates how each met the selection criteria. Table 2 also contains a source key for each entry that is used in the draft guidelines to document when a recommendation or promising practice was supported by a particular piece of literature, whether it was research or not.

Data Analysis

Because only one study qualified, the only data analysis feasible was to establish effect size. The effect size statistic is helpful in judging the practical significance of a research study. An effect size of 1.0 indicates that the treatment group mean was one standard deviation higher than the control group mean. Thus, the average participant in the experimental group performed at a level that was higher than approximately 84% of

all participants in the control group. An effect size of 0 indicates that the treatment and control group means were identical, revealing the training had no effect. An effect size of 0.2 is considered small; an effect size of 0.5 is moderate; and an effect size of 0.8 or above is large (Cohen, 1992).

The formula used to calculate an effect size for the one study that qualified was $Cohen's\ d = \frac{\bar{M}_T - \bar{M}_C}{S_{pooled}}$, where the mean of the control group is subtracted from the mean of

the treatment group, and the result is divided by the standard deviation of the two conditions (Thalheimer & Cook, 2002). In calculating effect size estimates for this one study, the average scores were weighted by sample size according to procedures recommended by Hedges and Olkin (1985). Weighting was conducted because of the general tendency for treatment effects to be inversely related to sample size. We

corrected for small sample sizes utilizing the following formula: $d' = \left(\frac{d}{\sqrt{1 + \frac{3}{N}}} \right)$,

where d is Cohen's d , above, and N is the number of study participants.

The Qualifying Study

The qualifying study was:

Ely, R., Emerson, R. W., Maggiore, T., O'Connell, T., & Hudson, L. (2006). Increased content knowledge of students with visual impairments as a result of extended descriptions. *Journal of Special Education Technology*, 21(3), 31-43.

In Ely *et al.*'s study one, designed to "evaluate the impact of description, vocabulary, length, placement of descriptions with the primary material, and variations in narrative voice between primary material and added descriptions" (p. 34), eDescription proved successful (*Cohen's d* = 2.02; $d' = 1.91^1$) with a relative change of 23% (medium) from pretest to posttest in fourth grade students with visual impairments.

Ely *et al.*'s Study Two examined the effect of different placement of eDescriptions under four conditions: inserted before the relevant content; inserted after the relevant content; mixed before and after insertions; and no description at all. The effect size (*Cohen's d* = 2.87, $d' = 2.71$; 125% increase from pretest to posttest) was huge under the condition where eDescriptions were inserted prior to the relevant content in the video. All other conditions resulted in about the same performance, although the effect size was considered medium (*Cohen's d* ranged from 0.40 for insertions after relevant content, to .46 for no description at all, to .48 for mixed before and after insertions).

This study thus leads us to one potential guideline: Descriptive video may work best when the description is inserted prior to the relevant content. However, the study

¹ Cohen's d is the effect size; d' is the effect size with a statistical correction applied for small sample sizes.

has never been replicated, and one result from one study is insufficient to establish fact. Rather than calling eDescriptions inserted before relevant content as a proven practice, we are much safer referring to it as a *promising* practice. We may wish to investigate this practice further as part of our field trials.

Table 1. Classification of the Video Description Literature

<u>Criterion</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Proportion</u>
Total pieces of literature	146	
Could not locate	40	.27
Not relevant to video or audio description	16	.11
Informational pieces, not research	75	.51
Guidelines, not research	11	.08
Did not examine students between 3 and 21 years	4	.03
Qualified for this analysis	1	< .01
	Total: 146	1.00
Not in peer-reviewed journals	53	.36

Table 2. Literature Reviewed

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
Sources found through Electronic Databases							
1	Abel, G. L., et al. (1973). <i>Learning through listening: Applying listening skills to the curriculum</i> . Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, Division of Special Education.		x		x		
2	Access. (2003). <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 97(5), 306.		x				
3	An FCC plan to require broadcasters and cable programmers to provide audio descriptions for the blind would initially be limited to stations affiliated with the big four networks and located in the top 25 TV markets. (1999). <i>Broadcasting & Cable</i> , 129(48), 61.		x				
4	Anderson, W. A. (1974). Emerging auditory systems: Implications for instructing handicapped children. <i>Auditory Learning Monograph Series 7</i> . East Lansing, MI: Consortium on Auditory Learning Materials for the Handicapped.		x		x		
5	Audiodescription. (1996). <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 90(2), 24.		x				
6	Barron, A.E., Fleetwood, L., & Barron, J. (2004). E-Learning for everyone: Addressing accessibility. <i>Journal of Interactive Instruction Development</i> , 16(4), 3-10.		x				

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
7	Bischoff, R. W. (1979). Listening: A teachable skill for visually impaired persons. <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 73(2), 59-67.		x				
8	Blos, J. W. (1974). Traditional nursery rhymes and games: Language learning experiences for preschool blind children. <i>New Outlook for the Blind</i> , 68(6), 268-75.		NR ²				
9	Bolnick, D., & Freed, G. (1998). <i>New developments in web-based accessible multimedia</i> . Retrieved from http://www.dinf.ne.jp/doc/english/Us_Eu/conf/csun_98/csun98_120.htm				x		
10	Brothers, R. J. (1971). Learning through listening: A review of the relevant factors. <i>New Outlook for the Blind</i> , 65(7) 224-31.		x				
11	Bush, M., Melby, A., Anderson, T., Browne, J., & Hansen, M. (2004). Customized video playback: Standards for content description, customization, and personalization. <i>Educational Technology</i> , 44(4), 5-13.		x			x	
12	Carlson, N. A. (1974). Auditory learning: Some observations. <i>Auditory Learning Monograph Series 4</i> . East Lansing, MIL Consortium on Auditory Learning Materials for the Handicapped. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED102752)		x		x		
13	Chiari, A. (2004). Ten things TLs should know about video description. <i>Teacher Librarian</i> , 32(1), 35.		x				

² NR = not relevant

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
14	Cobb, E. S. (1977) Learning through listening: A new approach. <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 71(7), 302-308.		x				
15	Coded videos for the blind or deaf. (1993). <i>New Scientist</i> , 139(1888), 18-23.		x				
16	Cronin, B. J., & King, S. R. (1990). The Development of the descriptive video service. <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 84(10), 503-506.		x				
17	Daugherty, K. M. (1974) Listening skills: A review of the literature. <i>New Outlook for the Blind</i> , 68(8), 363-369.		x				
18	Dean, P. (1992, August 29). U.K.'s first 'audio-description' video set. <i>Billboard</i> , 104(35), 39.		x		x		
19	Described film and television. (2003). <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 97, 306.		x				
20	Duke, R. A., & Simmons, A. L. (2006). The nature of expertise: Narrative descriptions of 19 common elements observed in the lessons of three renowned artist-teachers. <i>Bulletin of the Council for Research in Music Education</i> , 170, 7-19.		NR				
21	Dunham, J., & Shelton, H. (1973). Machine presented audible programmed instruction for the blind. <i>Education of the Visually Handicapped</i> , 5(4), 117-119.		NR				
22	Ely, R., Emerson, R. W., Maggiore, T., O'Connell, T., & Hudson, L. (2006). Increased content knowledge of students with visual impairments as a result of extended descriptions. <i>Journal of Special Education Technology</i> , 21(3), 31-43.	x					

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
23	FCC studies audio service. Federal Communications Commission proposes new law to make audio technology accessible for visually impaired television viewers.(1999, November 29). <i>Multichannel News</i> , 20(49), 50.		x				
24	Fels, D. I., Udo, J. P., Diamond, J. E., & Diamond, J. I. (2006). A comparison of alternative narrative approaches to video description for animated comedy. <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 100(5), 295-305.	x					
25	Fish, R. M., & Fish, R. C. (1976). An electronically generated audio display for the blind. <i>New Outlook for the Blind</i> , 70(7) 295-298.		NR				
26	Foulke, E. (1964). <i>The comprehension of rapid speech by the blind, Part II</i> . Louisville, KY: University of Louisville. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED003264)						x
27	Foulke, E., & Robinson, J. (1970). <i>The development of accelerated speech as a useful communication tool in the education of blind and other handicapped children. Progress Report</i> . Louisville, KY: University of Louisville. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED041431)						x
28	Gagnon, L., Foucher, S., Laliberté, F., Lalonde, M., & Beaulieu, M. (2006). Toward an application of content-based video indexing to computer-assisted descriptive video. Proceedings of the 3rd Canadian Conference on Computer and Robot Vision (pp. 8-8).		x			x	

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
29	Gay, G., & Harrison, L. (1999). SNOW: Special needs opportunity windows: Just-in-time, on-line information for educators. <i>Information Technology and Disabilities</i> , 6(1). Retrieved from http://www.rit.edu/~easi/itd/itdv06n1/article4.htm .		x				
30	Gearreald, K. (1969) A world of knowledge through sound; The audio program of the Hadley School. <i>Audiovisual Instruction</i> , 14(9), 31-33.		x				
31	Goldstein, L. (2004). Federal panel's captioning choices stir ire. <i>Education Week</i> , 23(26), 24,26.		NR		x		
32	Gore, G. V., III. (1970). The effects modes of oral presentation have on certain cognitive skills. <i>New Outlook for the Blind</i> , 64(3) 86-88.		x				
33	Grumpelt, H. R., & Rubin, E. (1968). Speed listening skill by the blind as a function of training. Final Report. Chestertown, MD: Washington College. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED025092)						x
34	Hansen, C. E., & Williams, M. R. (2003). Comparison of cross-cultural cours changes: From traditional lecture course to contemporary with biblio-learning, video-learning and experiential exercises. <i>Journal of Instructional Psychology</i> , 30(3), 197-206.		NR				
35	Hasselbring, T. S., & Glaser, C. H. W. (2000). Use of computer technology to help students with special needs. <i>The Future of Children</i> , 10(2), 102-122.		x				
36	Hinton, D. E. (1992). EXamining advanced technologies for benefits to persons with sensory impairments. Final Report. Arlington, VA: Science Applications International Corp., Arlington, VA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED354684)						x

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
37	Horwitz, R. A. (2002). <i>Video descriptors white paper</i> . Retrieved from http://tblr.ed.asu.edu/pt3/NETSdvlActivities/publication/WHITE/Vid-descr.pdf		x		x		
38	Janson, E. L. (1978). Teaching typing by transcription. <i>Education of the Visually Handicapped</i> , 10(4), 115-117.		NR				
39	Jones, W. (2005). I hear what you're seeing: audio services describe the action for visually impaired theatre patrons. <i>Back Stage West</i> , 12(34), 10.		x		x		
40	Kukla, D., & Connolly, T. T. (1974). Assessment of auditory functioning of deaf-blind multihandicapped children. Dallas, TX: South Central Regional Center for Services to Deaf-Blind Children, Dallas, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED171016)		NR		x		
41	Landau, S., Russell, M., Gourney, K., Erin, J. N., & Cowan, J. (2003). Use of the talking tactile tablet in mathematics testing. <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 97(2), 85.		NR				
42	Landau, S., Wiener, W., Naghshineh, K., & Giusti, E. (2005). Creating accessible science museums with user-activated environmental audio beacons (Ping!). <i>Assistive Technology</i> , 17(2), 133-143.		x				
43	Leavitt, G. (1973). Teaching oral-aural communication skills in a rehabilitation center for the blind. <i>New Outlook for the Blind</i> , 67(10) 448-453		NR				
44	Lightbrown, P. M., Halter, R. H., White, J. L., & Horst, M. (2002). Comprehension-based learning: the limits of 'do it yourself'. <i>Canadian Modern Language Review</i> , 58(3), 427-464.		NR				

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
45	Lodge, N. K., & Slater, J. N. (1992). Helping blind people to watch television-the AUDETEL project (pp. 86-91). Retrieved from http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/1pl/freeabs_all.jsp?tp=&arnumber=160418&isnumber=4203		x		x		
46	Loiacono, E. T., McCoy, S., & Romano, N. C. (2005). Information technology systems accessibility. <i>Universal Access in the Information Society</i> , 5, 1-3.		x				
47	Maddalena, M. (2003). Improving access: theatres can reach out to visual- and hearing-impaired. <i>Film Journal International</i> , 106(10), 40(42).		x		x		
48	D'Agata, J. (1997). Martha Graham, audio description of. <i>Georgia Review</i> , 51, 318.		NR				
49	McConnell, B. (2000). FCC seen blind to sight-impaired. <i>Broadcasting & Cable</i> , 130(9), 19.		NR				
50	McConnell, B. (2000). More time for audio description. <i>Broadcasting & Cable</i> , 130(3), 34.		x				
51	McNulty, T. (1996a). Descriptive video service (DVS) makes television programming and video available to blind and visually impaired viewers. <i>Library Hi Tech News</i> , 132, 15.		x				
52	McNulty, T. (1996b). <i>Information technology and disabilities, 1996</i> . Washington, DC: TLT Group. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/000000b/80/10/af/0e.pdf						x

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
53	Meinertz, A. (2003). A new vision of dance. (Dance Matters)(charity organization Vocaleyes works with Sadler's Wells Theatre to make dance accessible to blind and partially sighted individuals). <i>Dance Magazine</i> , 77(11), 65.		NR				
54	Menlove, M., & Hammond, M. (1998). Meeting the demands of ADA, IDEA, and other disability legislation in the design, development, and delivery of instruction. <i>Journal of Technology and Teacher Education</i> , 6(1), 75-85.		x				
55	Miller, J. W. (1982). Geography for the blind: Developing audio-tutorial map material. <i>Social Studies</i> , 73(6), 263-267.		x				
56	Morris, J. E. (1976). Facilitating the education of the visually handicapped through research in communications: Final Report. Part one: Facilitating listening as a medium for education of the visually impaired. Louisville, KY: American Printing House for the Blind. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED133924)				x		x
57	Morris, J. E., & (1973). Aural study systems for the visually handicapped. Interim Progress Reports No. 9, Description of the aural study system-No. 10. Field trial of the aural study system. Louisville, KY: American Printing House for the Blind. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED078620)						x
58	Myers, J. A. (1978). Compressed speech increases learning efficiency. <i>Education of the Visually Handicapped</i> , 10(2) 56-64.		x				
59	News. Audio described films. (2001). <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 95(7), 445-445.		x				

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
60	Nolan, C. Y. (1976). Facilitating the education of the visually handicapped through research in communications: 15 November 1972 - 30 April 1976. Final Report. Part Two: Indexes for tape recordings. Louisville, KY: American Printing House for the Blind. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED133925)						x
61	Nolan, C. Y., & Morris, J. E. (1973). Aural study systems for the visually handicapped. Final Report. Louisville, KY: American Printing House for the Blind. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED087154)						x
62	Nolan, C. Y., & Morris, J. E. (1974). Program for facilitating the education of the visually handicapped through research in communications. The American Printing House aural study system as a reference source. Interim Progress Report No. 1. Louisville, KY: American Printing House for the Blind. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED108425)						x
63	Peli, E., Fine, E. M., & Labianca, A. T. (1996). Evaluating visual information provided by audio description. <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 90(5), 378-385.			x			
64	Peters, T., & Bell, L. (2006). Audio description adds value to digital images. <i>Computers in Libraries</i> , 26(4), 26-28.		x				
65	Pfanstiehl, M. (1997). Accessible opera for blind and low-vision audiences. <i>American Music Teacher</i> , 46(6), 30.		x				

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
66	Piety, P. J. (2003). Audio description, a visual assistive discourse: An investigation into language used to provide the visually disabled access to information in electronic texts: Washington, DC: Georgetown University.		x		x		
67	Piety, P. J. (2004). The language system of audio description: An investigation as a discursive process. <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 98(8), 453-469.		x				
68	Research study on video description. (1996). <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 90(1), 77.		x				
69	Richards, L. V., Coventry, K. R., & Clibbens, J. (2004). Where's the orange? Geometric and extra-geometric influences on English children's descriptions of spatial locations. <i>Journal of Child Language</i> , 31(1), 153-175.		NR				
70	Rothberg, M., & Wlodkowski, T. (1998). Multimedia: Making it accessible to blind users. Boston, MAL CPB/WGBH National Center for Accessible Media.		x		x		
71	Schmeidler, E., & Kirchner, C. (2001). Adding audio description: Does it make a difference? <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 95(4), 197-212.			x			
72	Schreier, E. M. (1990). The future of access technology for blind and visually impaired people. <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 84(10), 520-523.		x				
73	Silver, L. (2001). Picture This. <i>WeMedia</i> , 5(4), 44.						x

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
74	Snyder, J. (2005). Audio description: The visual made verbal. <i>International Congress Series, 1282</i> , 935-939.		x		x		
75	Snyder, J. (2004, September-November). Audio description: Access for all. <i>Disability World</i> , (25). Retrieved from http://www.disabilityworld.org/09-11_04/access/audio.shtml		x		x		
76	Turner, J. M. (1998). Some characteristics of audio description and the corresponding moving image. <i>Proceedings of the ASIS Annual Meeting</i> , 35, 108-117.		x		x		
77	Martin, H. C. (2002, May 1). Video description rules in place. <i>Broadcast Engineering</i> , NA.						x
78	Weeks, J. (2002). Bringing ballet to the blind. (News).(audio-description at the Kentucky Center for the Arts). <i>Dance Magazine</i> , 76(6), 23-24.		NR				
79	White, K. (1996). 25 years of accessible television. <i>The Exceptional Parent</i> , 26, 83-84.		x		x		
80	Whitehead, J. (2005). What is audio description. <i>International Congress Series, 1282</i> , 960-963.					x	
Sources from the OFCOM Literature Review							
81	BBC. (2005). <i>Subtitles and audio description on TV</i> . Retrieved from www.bbc.co.uk		x		x		

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
82	BBC. (n.d.). <i>BBC guidelines for visually impaired television audiences</i> . Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/						x
83	BBC R&D. (1999). Subtitling and audio description. Retrieved from: http://www.bbc.co.uk/rd/index.shtml		x		x		
84	Department for Culture, Media and Sport, Broadcasting Policy Division. (2004). <i>Television access for people with sensory impairments</i> . [no further citation available]		x		x		
85	Department of Health. (2004). <i>Research and development work relating to assistive technology 2003</i> . [no further citation available]						x
86	Evans, D. (1998). Going digital: What's happening? <i>New Beacon</i> , 82(969), 36- 37.		x		x		
87	Greening, J., & Whitehead, J. (2005). <i>Inclusive leisure provision through audio description</i> . Paper presented at Vision 2005, London. Retrieved from http://www.nib.ork.uk						x
88	Hyks, V. (1993). <i>Audetel. Guidelines on how to do audio description as part of the AUDETEL project</i> . [no further citation available]						x
89	OFCOM. (2000). <i>Guidance on standards for audio description</i> (based on ITC Guidance Description -May 2000). Retrieved from http://www.ofcom.org.uk/tv/ifi/guidance/tv_access_serv/audio_descripti on_stnds/#content				x	x	
90	Pettitt, B., Sharpe, K. & Cooper, S. (1996). AUDETEL: Enhancing television for visually impaired people. <i>The British Journal of Visual Impairment</i> , 14(2), 48-52.			x			

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
91	Marriott, J. (2001). Get the picture: Making sure that blind and partially sighted people aren't left out of the digital revolution. <i>New Beacon</i> , 85(1001), 32-35.		x		x		
92	Marriott, J., & Vale, D. (2002). <i>Get the picture: Making television accessible to blind and partially sighted people. RNIB campaign report.</i> [no further citation available]						x
93	Packer, J., & Kirchner, C. (1997). <i>Who's watching: A profile of the blind and visually impaired audience for television and video.</i> New York: AFB Press.		x		x		
94	Perera, S. (2003). <i>Interactive digital television services for people with low vision.</i> London: RNIB.		x		x		
95	Petre, L. (2004). The si1 key issues for blind and partially sighted people in relation to digital switchover. [no further citation available]		x		x		
96	Petre, L. (2005). <i>Briefing paper: User feedback on audio description and the case for increasing audio description targets.</i> London: RNIB.				x	x	
97	Petre, L. (n.d.). <i>Access to digital television for blind and partially sighted people.</i> London: RNIB/Academic conference slides.						x
98	Raffery, M. (1995). Audio description: The first European conference. <i>New Beacon</i> , 79(937), 10-13.		x		x		
99	Rice, M. (2003, April). A study of television and visual impairment: prospects for the accessibility of interactive television. <i>Proceedings of the First European Conference on Interactive Television: 'From Viewers to Actors?'</i> Brighton, UK.						x

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
100	RNIB. (2004). Audio description news - Winter 2004. Retrieved from www.rnib.org.uk [no further citation available]						x
101	RNIB. (2005). <i>Audio description on freeview</i> . Retrieved from http://www.rnib.org.uk						x
102	RNIB. (2004). a-TV: the first inclusive digital TV technology - Techshare presentation. Retrieved from http://www.rnib.org.uk						x
103	RNIB. (2004). <i>Royal National Institute of the Blind's response to Ofcom's consultation on the draft code of providing television access services</i> . London: Author.						x
104	RNIB. (2005). Making television easier to see. Retrieved from www.rnib.org.uk		x		x		
105	Salway, A. (2005). <i>TIWO: Television in Words: Final Report</i> (EPSRC project (GR/R67194/01). Guildford, Surrey, UK: University of Surrey.		x		x		
106	Salway, A., Tomadaki, E., & Vassiliou, A. (2004). <i>TIWO: Television in Words: Report on Workpackage 2 - Building and Analysing a Corpus of Audio Description Scripts</i> EPSRC project (GR/R67194/01). Guildford, Surrey, UK: University of Surrey.		x		x		
107	Tanton, N., Ware, T., & Armstrong, M. (2004). <i>Audio description: What it is and how it works</i> (rev'd) (BBC R&D White Paper, WHP 051). Retrieved from http://www.bbc.co.uk/rd/pubs/whp/whp051.shtml		x		x		

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
108	Tanton, N., Ware, T., & Armstrong, M. (2000). <i>Access services for digital television: Matching the means to the requirement for audio description and signing</i> . Paper presented at the International Broadcasting Convention. [no further citation available]		x		x		
109	ViSiCAST .(2000-2002). <i>ViSiCAST project synopsis</i> (EC IST (5th framework) funded project). Retrieved from http://www.visicast.cmp.uea.ac.uk/eSIGN/Summary/Summary.htm						x
110	Wakefield, M. (2002). <i>ViSiCAST Final Report</i> (EC IST (5th framework) funded project). Retrieved from http://www.visicast.cmp.uea.ac.uk/eSIGN/Summary/Summary.htm						x
111	WeSee TV. (2005). <i>How to hear video description</i> .Retrieved from http://www.weseetv.com/pages/howToHear.php				x	x	
112	WeSeeTV. (2005). <i>Standards for audio description</i> .Retrieved from www.weseetv.com/pages/intro.php				x	x	
113	WeSeeTV. (2005). <i>Television accessibility for persons with visual impairments provided by professionals with visual impairments!</i> Retrieved from http://www.weseetv.com/pages/intro.php		x		x		
114	Whitehead, J. (2005). <i>Audio description on digital television</i> . London: RNIB. Retrieved from http://www.rnib.org.uk/1pedio/groups/public/documents/publicwebsite/public_audiodescriptionontv.hcsp		x		x		

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
115	Whitehead, J. (2005). Audio description on television explained. London: RNIB.		x		x		
116	Whitehead, J., & Miller, C. (2004). Digital television: An overview. <i>New Beacon</i> , 88(1027), 38-41.						x
117	Wiesen, M. (1992). Audio description: present state and future prospects. <i>Viewpoint</i> , 46(208), 72-74						x
118	Wiesen, M. (1992). Audio description on television: New prospects for Europe. <i>New Beacon</i> , 76(898), 206-209.		x		x		
Sources from WeSeeTV Standards							
119	American Foundation for the Blind. (1997), <i>Project to conduct research on described video's audience and methods of distribution</i> (U.S. Department of Education Grant #H026G400011). New York: Author.						x
120	Association of Science-Technology Center (ASTC). (2006). , Accessible practices: Live and recorded media. Retrieved from www.astc.org/resource/access/medmain.htm		x		x		
121	ITC. (2000). <i>ITC guidance on standards for audio description</i> . London: Ofcom.				x	x	
122	Metropolitan Washington Ear. (2007). <i>A very brief chronology of description services for low vision and blind people</i> . Retrieved from http://www.washear.org/chronology.htm		x		x		

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
---------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	--------------------	-------------------	------------	----------------

Sources from WGBH EDescription

123	Audio Description International. (2001). Retrieved from http://www.lib.ohiostate.edu/OSU_profile/triweb/news/audio.html Available: <audiodescl@lists.acs.ohio-state.edu> [no further citation available]						x
124	Corn, A. L., & Wall, R. S. (2002). Access to multimedia presentations for students with visual impairments. <i>Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness</i> , 96, 197-211.		x				
125	Ellis, F. (1991). <i>A picture is worth a thousand words for blind and visually impaired persons too!</i> New York: American Foundation for the Blind. [Brochure]						x
126	Everett, L. A. (1994). <i>What is DVS</i> . Paper presented at OSERS Technology Conference, Rochester, NY. [no further citation available]						x
127	Frazier, G., & Coutinho-Johnson, I. (1995). <i>The effectiveness of audio description in providing access to educational AV media for blind and visually impaired students in high school</i> . San Francisco: Audiovision.						x
128	Katz, A., & Turcotte, J. (1993). <i>Measurement of comprehension changes in television viewing of visually impaired persons using descriptive video study</i> (Research report). Boston: New England College of Optometry.						x
129	Kuhn, D. (1992). <i>The use of descriptive video in science programming study</i> (Research report). Boston: WGBH Educational Foundation.						x

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
130	Kuhn, D., & Kirchner, C. (1992). <i>Viewing habits and interests in science programming of the blind and visually impaired television audience</i> (Research report). Arlington, VA: National Science Foundation.						x
131	Miers, J. (1998). <i>Audio description: Seeing theater with your ears</i> . Paper presented at the First Annual National Conference on Audio Description, Washington, DC. [no further citation available]						x
132	Packer, J. (1995). Psychosocial benefits of accessible television for blind/visually impaired persons. Paper presented at the American Psychological Association, New York. [Quoted in Project to Conduct Research on Described Video's Audience and Methods of Distribution, Volume 2, Appendi1 J (1997). New York, NY: American Foundation for the Blind.]						x
133	Schmeidler E. (1996). Adding audio description to television science programs: What is the impact on visually impaired viewers? In T. McNulty (1996b). <i>Information technology and disabilities</i> , 1996. Washington, DC: TLT Group. Retrieved from http://www.eric.ed.gov/ERICDocs/data/ericdocs2/content_storage_01/000000b/80/10/af/0e.pdf		x				
Serendipitous References							
134	Dreeszen, C. (2002, March). <i>Standards, training, and certification</i> . Panel presented at the Audio Description International Conference, Washington, DC.				x	x	

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
135	Salway, A. (in press). <i>A corpus-based analysis of the language of audio description</i> . Selected Proceedings of Media for All, Rodopi.		x		x		
136	Salway, A., & Graham, M. (2003, November). EXtracting information about emotions in films. Proceedings of the 11th ACM Conference on Multimedia 2003 (pp. 299-302). Retrieved from http://www.computing.surrey.ac.uk/personal/pg/A.Salway/pdfs/Extracting_Information_about_Emotions_in_Films.pdf						x
137	Salway, A., Graham, M., Tomadaki, E., & Iu, Y. (2003, March). Linking video and text via representations of narrative. Paper presented at the AAAI Spring Symposium on Intelligent Multimedia Knowledge Management, Palo Alto, California. Retrieved from http://www.computing.surrey.ac.uk/personal/pg/A.Salway/pdfs/linking_video_and_text.pdf						x
138	Salway, A., & Tomadaki, E. (2002). Temporal information in collateral texts for indexing moving images. In A. Setzer & R. Gaizauskas (Eds.), Workshop on annotation standards for temporal information in natural language (pp. 36-43). Retrieved from http://www.computing.surrey.ac.uk/personal/pg/A.Salway/pdfs/temporal_information.pdf		x		x		
139	Salway, A. & Iu, Y. (2005), Navigating stories in films (Dept. of Computing Technical Report CS-05-04). Guildford, Surrey, UK: University of Surrey. P		x		x		

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
140	Tomadaki, E., & Salway, A. (2005). Matching verb attributes for cross-document event co-reference. In Erk, Melinger and Schulte im Walde (Eds.), <i>Proceedings of the interdisciplinary workshop on the identification and representation of verb features and verb classes</i> (pp. 127-132). Retrieved from http://www.computing.surrey.ac.uk/personal/pg/A.Salway/pdfs/Tomadaki_Salway.pdf		x		x		
141	Tomadaki, E., & Salway, A. (2006). Cross-document coreference for cross-media film indexing. LREC 2006 Workshop on Crossing Media for Improved Information Access.		x		x		
142	Vassiliou, A., Salway, A., & Pitt. (2004, June). Formalising stories: Sequences of events and state changes. IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo, ICME 2004, Taiwan.		x		x		
Web Sites							
143	American Foundation for the Blind. Video description in North America http://www.afb.org/Section.asp?DocumentID=1231&Mode=Print		x		x		
144	APH Educational Research: Guidelines for Design of Tactile Graphics http://sun1.aph.org/edresearch/guides.htm				x	x	
145	Audio Description Associates: (Joel Snyder, CEO) http://www.audiodescribe.com/index2.html				x	x	
146	BBC Standards and Guidelines, Accessibility Guidelines http://www.bbc.co.uk/guidelines/newmedia/accessibility/				x	x	

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
147	CaptionMax Inc Audio Description Guidelines				x		
148	Described and Captioned Media Program (NAD) www.dcmp.org		x		x		
149	Descriptive Video Fact Sheet from ACB http://www.acb.org/nebraska/dvs/fact-sheet.html		x				
150	Guidelines for Audio Description, last updated November 26, 2005 drafted by ADI, AD Guidelines committee in 2003. http://adinternational.org/ADIGuidelines.html				x	x	
151	Media Access. Clark, J. Comments on U.K. Guidelines on Audio Description http://joeclark.org/access/description/ukad.html				x	x	
152	Narrative Television Network: Tulsa, Ok. http://www.audiodescribe.com/index2.html		x		x		
153	Ofcom: Television Access Services-Literature Review (March 2006) http://www.ofcom.org.uk		x		x		
154	Open & Closed Project; Toronto, CA. (developing standards/guidelines) http://openandclosed.org/		x		x		
155	Report of the National Coalition of Blind and Visually Impaired Persons for Increased Video Access http://www.washear.org/fccc.htm		x		x		
156	RNIB: Audio Description for Children				x	x	

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
	http://www.rnib.org.uk/1pedio/groups/public/documents/publicweb/site/public_ADfor children.doc						
157	Skills for Access. How to provide audio description for video or animated content. http://www.skillsforaccess.org.uk/howto.php?id=104				x	x	
158	Standardisation Requirements for Access to Digital TV and Interactive Services by Disabled People (November 2003) http://server.cenelec.be/NR/rdonlyres/5C6E5124-6034-422A-AICC-62132229746C3/664/Finalreport				x	x	
159	Video Description Restoration Act (2003) http://www.washear.org/restoration_act.htm		x		x		
160	WeSeeTV: Turning pictures into words; What is Enhanced Description? http://www.weseetv.com/pages/enhanced.php				x	x	
161	WGBH Boston (Media Access Group; NCAM) http://ncam.wgbh.org/index.html		x		x		
New Articles Found							
162	Fels, D. I., Udo, J. P., Ting, P., Diamond, J. E. (2006). Odd Job Jack described: A universal design approach to described video. <i>Universal Access in the Information Society</i> , 5, 73-81.		x				x

Source Key for Draft Guidelines	Reference	Met Criteria	Informational	Adult Participants	Not Peer Reviewed	Guidelines	Could Not Find
163	Schmeidler E., & Kirchner, C. (1996). Adding audio description to television science programs: Impact on legally blind viewers (Final report of Grant ESI-9253447). New York: American Foundation for the Blind. [bound copy]			x	x		
Material from DCMP							
164	Described and Captioned Media Program, National Association of the Deaf. (2007, April). <i>DCMP description evaluation checklist and notes</i> . Spartanburg, SC: Author.				x	x	
165	Described and Captioned Media Program, National Association of the Deaf. (2007, April). <i>Overview and analysis of guidelines for description</i> [draft]. Spartanburg, SC: Author.				x	x	