VitroLib Usability Testing

Round 3 Summary - June - July 2017

- 7 participants (4 Cornell, 1 Princeton, 1 Columbia, 1 Harvard)
- All sessions recorded with a mix of in-person (for Cornell) and remote (external to Cornell)
- 4 tasks, followed by card sorting exercise reviewing subset of ontology property names, with follow up questions and optional review of lookup with context mockups based on time
- Tasks: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1X6-PLcLcnwBxVVNoYZkFTqO-X2DZyNf2koU-tbxel5c/edit?usp=sharing
- Remote usability instructions: https://docs.google.com/document/d/1HI2Ey7Wd7M9O7nKuTWg7YNeuCZ2A8YVeh6kWj063b_U/edit?usp=sharing
- Participants completed all the tasks and cataloged the information provided using the new work creation form.
- When asked if these tasks were like the ones they would normally perform, the participants replied either the tasks were similar or that they would do these tasks plus additional ones.

Corrections to be made for terminology/grouping of fields

- "Statement of responsibility" field should be included at the instance level and not at the work level.
- "Catalog number" was not the correct term to use for the record label number. Also, this should be placed at the instance and not work level.

Observed Patterns of Behavior/Feedback results

1. **Most users' first inclination is still to search for existing information, whether by performer or name of work.**
    - ACTION (as indicated in prior round of usability testing) : Link to data creation/input from search results
    - ACTION: Explore and evaluate designs for incorporating existing works/instances/people information into the creation or editing of a new work/instance/item
2. **Users were able to find options within drop-downs but, when asked, gave feedback regarding how current systems often enable quicker selection by using more commonly used terms or suggested easier navigation.**
    - ACTION: Explore where grouping based on content or commonly used terms may be helpful, e.g. Languages can be organized by more commonly used at the top or activities may be grouped in more conceptually meaningful ways.

3. **When asked, users gave feedback regarding LCNAF search and their current practices which enable them to narrow further down by type of result.**
    - ACTION: In autocomplete search, either enable option to pick personal, corporate, or all or enable distinguishing between types of search results.
4. **Users exhibited confusion at various predicate labels, such as “has activity” or covers or “instance for work”.**
    - Property labeling needs to be explored further, as both card sorting exercises as well as feedback on predicate labels such as “has activity” showed areas of confusion and inconsistent responses regarding what the terms mean
    - For example, “covers” which is meant to indicate temporal/location coverage for a particular work was sometimes misinterpreted as referring to the physical album cover. “Has activity” was not a clear property label, but “roles” seemed a little easier to understand. That said, there were no unanimous suggestions regarding what the term should be called.
    - Property groupings were also not consistent, although some groups emerged.
    - ACTION: Further exploration of existing RDA terms to use for labeling and reviewing property groupings.
5. **When reviewing the lookups with context mockups, some users still expressed desire to look at actual Name Authority File in addition to the context displayed.**
    - The context was generally considered helpful, but some participants still wished to be able to open up the actual authority record in addition to reviewing context. The mockups do indicate links that can open up the original record.
    - ACTION: In any implementation of lookups, ensure users can access and open original authority record.
6. **For Audio work, some catalogers mentioned using Genre Terms**
    - Genre Terms included within the Cornell audio constant record template
    - ACTION: Include LC Genre Forms in form
7. **For Audio, some catalogers mentioned Discogs as an important search source**
    - ACTION: Explore options for incorporating or accessing Discogs info
8. **Some users indicated verify this match should open up the authority record for the item selected (in the case where a person/entity was selected from LCNAF)**
    - ACTION: Have the verify match link open up to the actual record and not just the item locally stored within VitroLib. (Currently, verify match links assume the URI being opened up is within VitroLib).

Next Steps

- In addition to action items above, review design for adding instances to an existing work.
- Additionally, as indicated in previous usability sessions, explore keyboarding and the use of macros in current cataloging workflows in order to assess how to design for these tasks/design for shortcuts that can cut down on the amount of mouse use and typing.
- Design and implement possible lookup with context solutions, exploring which columns to include and how lookup can be integrated into the remaining tasks.