

Slide 2:

We've long hated online library catalogs

Christine Borgman complained in 1986 and 1996 that library catalogs were difficult to use because they don't have an understanding of how people actually search

Roy Tennant looked at one catalog redesign in 2005 and described it as "Putting lipstick on a pig". Who knew Palin agreed with him?!

A new generation of librarian started to graduate in the mid 2000's who spent their college careers on Google and Amazon and thought OPACs were hopelessly outdated, making academic libraries irreverent to users

Slide 3:

Then in January of 2006, NC State spent a lot of money and a lot of man power on integrating its catalog data with the enterprise search provider, Endeca

This was a very in your face declaration to library companies that we're sick of their catalogs and showed librarians what capabilities there were with search

The biggest benefit Endeca had was that it enabled users to enter a broad term and narrow down, a sort of "Discovery" system (or as Endeca calls it, "Guided Navigation")

After this, there was a scramble by many library content providers to be more "Web 2.0" in feel with new interfaces, though actual search function eventually changed course

Federated Searching then first came on the market, allowing users to discover resources across multiple platforms

OPAC companies scrambled to keep up and by 2007, most had developed "a product"

Slide 4:

By 2007, most of the major vendors had something out that was all Web 2.0 ish

AquaBrowser (Serials Solutions): U of Chicago: <http://lens.lib.uchicago.edu/>

Encore (Innovative): Mobius: <http://mobius.missouri.edu/>

Enterprise (SirsiDynix): Alexandria PL VA: <http://opac.alexandria.lib.va.us/>

Primo (Exlibris): NYU: <http://www.bobcat.nyu.edu>

Blacklight (Open Source): UVA: <http://virgobeta.lib.virginia.edu/>

Still, it is putting lipstick on a pig because the underlying data isn't so great. This brings up the metadata discussion, which I won't go into.

Slide 5:

Villanova: <https://library.villanova.edu/Find/>

Yale: <http://yufind.library.yale.edu>

Survey (150 users) & Usability Testing (5 faculty, 5 undergrad, 5 grad):

Majority liked it over Web Voyage, for most it would become primary catalog

54% used facets; 63% thought facets were helpful; more mixed than we expected; usability testing showed this was a metadata issue

2/3 said they were confident searching with VuFind

Less intimidating than Voyager and more user friendly interface

Liked that it was more visual

Similar to local public libraries

Could use a little more polish

Facets were somewhat confusing

Wanted to use it to find articles too

Wanted additional data about an item

Not sure about relevancy of user added content (where to reviews come from?)

Want it more integrated-Refworks, iShare, databases

Liked term "Keyword" rather than all fields search

Requesting items more straightforward

About half knew what tagging was, but almost all said they had potential to be useful

All loved VuFind and thought it met what they needed to search for books, but one still preferred Amazon due to star ratings

Others preferred it over Amazon because it didn't try to sell you anything

Quotes:

“...because VuFind has the look and feel of Amazon, I only focused on the book listings, choosing instead to ignore the screen areas usually laden with advertising.”

“I expected to find articles when clicking journals/magazines, like WorldCat.”

“I think it helped by narrowing down the results, sort of like Google does these days.”

“The results were not what I expected, but it was a pleasant surprise. I found things in my research that I didn’t know we had.”

“...the most useful part of the groupings for me was helping me sort of mentally focus what I was looking for.”

Sample searches:

James Joyce

Gone with the Wind (for tags)

Slide 6:

WorldCatLocal Uses WorldCat Data, so metadata problem is not an issue

Ideally, links up with data from databases, openURL, and ILL. Didn’t work so well at Illinois

Used similar test as for VuFind, created to do usability tests all over Illinois

Users really really liked it, better overall experience than with VuFind

More polished, extremely easy to use, and very visual

Thought it worked “like a search engine” and was official enough looking that users thought it was very authoritative

Liked how it linked up with other libraries’ holdings

Liked account features, especially lists

Though added content came from good, authoritative sources

Slide 7:

1. Exemplified by confusion over sidebars headings and content
2. Users don’t understand authority and want search to choose for them; would love things to be ranked-think higher up in results is better (Google!)
3. If it is not in full text and linked, it is not there for most users

4. Users see number of results, get overwhelmed, and then try to limit before looking at results; Loved being able to search first, limit later (discovery)
5. No one used Boolean
6. No one bothered to look at more than one page of results; had little time to drill down further
7. Undergrads will not wait and scanned results a lot faster
8. Undergrads search literally: ie “audio recording by Prince”

Slide 8:

Goals: Gain a better understanding of the information needs and behaviors of undergraduate students.

Identify ways that library services and collections can be represented virtually to engage undergraduate students.

Learn connections among affective and cognitive behaviors and their implications for developing library services and resources.

Did individual ethnographic interviews with undergrad students to see how they do research. Also looked at other data sources—internal surveys, other usability projects, LibQUAL+, Easy Search research

Students do go to Google and Wikipedia first for background info even if they don't use it in the actual assignment, only some had a librarian in their “personal information sphere”

They scan, not read in depth

Have a vague concept as to what scholarly research is. If it looks scholarly, then it is

Good at reformulating keywords, but nothing more advanced (subject headings, phrase searching)

Use wikipedia to find “good citations”

If use a single search (federated) box, they don't have a concept as to what they are searching

Prefer to have one resource to search, not a ton like we have now

Physical library not an information space, but a meeting/study space

They perceive librarians could help them, but guess that they can't help them with their specific problem, are too busy, or there for the faculty

Want direct answers from librarians. When we teach them how to search and not search for them, they get frustrated

When they aren't confident with their own strategies, they're afraid of feeling incompetent and are afraid to ask; asking a librarian is a symbol of failure

They will follow links provided to them by instructors (ie tutorials, library resources)

Slide 9:

Thank you cornify!

Single search box?

Summon? <http://wmich.summon.serialssolutions.com>

eXtensible Catalog?

Need to address metadata issues