

This article is downloaded from



<http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au>

It is the paper published as:

Authors: Philip Hider and Ying_Hsang Liu

Title: The Use of RDA Elements in Support of FRBR User Tasks

Journal Title: ISSN: 0163-9374

Year: 2013 **Volume:** 51 **Issue:** 8 **Pages:** 857-872

Abstract: Resource Description and Access (RDA) stipulates that certain "core" elements should always be included, where applicable, in bibliographic and authority records, due to their importance in supporting the user tasks defined in Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records. However, the elements' relative importance has not been empirically tested. This study investigates which elements in bibliographic records are currently most used in a university library catalog, by means of think-aloud sessions conducted by expert and non-expert users, who were assigned sets of typical bibliographic tasks. The results indicate that, in this context at least, the most utilized elements are not all core.

DOI/URLs: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01639374.2013.825827>

http://researchoutput.csu.edu.au/R/-?func=dbin-jump-full&object_id=54266&local_base=GEN01-CSU01

Author Address: phider@csu.edu.au

CRO Number: 54266

The Use of RDA Elements in Support of FRBR User Tasks

ABSTRACT

Resource Description & Access (RDA) stipulates that certain ‘core’ elements should always be included, where applicable, in bibliographic and authority records, due to their importance in supporting the user tasks defined in *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records*. However, the elements’ relative importance has not been empirically tested. This study investigates which elements in bibliographic records are currently most used in a university library catalog, by means of think-aloud sessions conducted by expert and non-expert users, who were assigned sets of typical bibliographic tasks. The results indicate that, in this context at least, the most utilized elements are not all core.

Keywords: RDA, FRBR, core elements, catalog use

Introduction

The new cataloging standard, *Resource Description & Access* (RDA), departs from the *Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules* (AACR) in a number of important ways. It is based on a more comprehensive set of principles, and has been developed in consultation with a much larger and heterogeneous metadata community. Although certain details of the new code remain controversial, the principles which underpin it are widely accepted, including those it adopted from the *Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records* (FRBR) and *Functional Requirements for Authority Data* (FRAD) reports. The development of the FRBR and FRAD models of an effective catalog has, in turn, been profoundly influenced by the broader metadata community, particularly by members of the “Semantic Web” movement.¹

The result is a code which defines elements of bibliographic and authority data much more specifically and systematically. For example, RDA defines copyright date as an element in its own right, whereas AACR treats it as a variation of “publication date”. In addition, RDA’s much broader scope accommodates various attributes of information resources and their associated agents not dealt with by AACR, which closely mirrors those elements covered by International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD). According to the Open Metadata Registry (<http://metadataregistry.org>), RDA allows for a total of 463 elements and sub-elements for bibliographic records, and 59 for authority records.

The RDA/FRBR/FRAD model is based on the principle that the catalog exists to meet certain *user tasks*. The FRBR and FRAD user tasks serve as the basis for the elements covered in RDA, so that each RDA element is deemed to support one or more user task. The FRBR user tasks are: to find, identify, select and obtain resources. The FRAD user tasks are: to find and to identify persons, corporate bodies and families associated with resources; to contextualize persons, corporate bodies and families amongst similar entities; and to justify the preferred name for a person, corporate body or family. Although it has been suggested that the library catalog performs additional functions, such as to facilitate the navigation of a collection, the FRBR and FRAD tasks are generally regarded as ones basic to most catalogs’ purpose.²

What is less clear, however, is the *extent* to which each RDA element supports these tasks. Since the inclusion of all applicable elements would be very expensive, RDA indicates, in section 0.6, which elements *must* be included, and which elements are optional. The former represent a small minority and are referred to as “core”. If the Pareto principle applies to catalog use, then records with only these core elements might still produce quite effective catalogs. Yet whether these elements are indeed the most useful, in terms of their facilitation

of the FRBR and FRAD user tasks, has not been empirically investigated. Instead, they were originally determined, in the FRBR report, through a survey of cataloging experts; not surprisingly perhaps, they are broadly aligned with the minimal cataloging standards of existing practice. RDA has prioritized those elements that most support the four FRBR user tasks and the “find” and “identify” FRAD user tasks.³ Again, as Hider and Tan point out, this prioritization lacks an empirical basis; rather, it represents the *opinion* of committee members and the wider professional community.⁴ Hider and Tan also criticize the FRBR analysis for the way in which the experts’ ratings of “none”, “low”, “medium” and “high” importance were converted to scores (0, 1, 2 and 3) and then aggregated.⁵ The study reported here investigates the validity of the RDA core elements with reference to how patrons actually use a particular library catalog.

Literature Review

Although the Joint Steering Committee for Development of RDA has called for user studies to support its work, most RDA-related research has been of a conceptual, rather than empirical, nature. For example, there has been a considerable amount of work carried out to map RDA elements to other schemas. Likewise, Riva reviewed the alignment of RDA with the models of FRBR and FRAD, identifying some terminological differences in user tasks.⁶ The main “user” study that has been undertaken involved not end-users, but catalogers.⁷ The library community is naturally concerned with how usable RDA is for its staff; but the fundamental question remains: *how useful is its output for library patrons?*

No empirical research appears to have been published on this topic, although some recent studies by Hider and Tan,⁸ and by Hider,⁹ have examined the relative value to end-

users of various elements (and possible elements) of bibliographic records based on AACR and other standards. In the earlier studies by Hider, patrons at the National Library of Australia and at the State Library of Victoria were asked to rate the usefulness of various elements included in the libraries' catalogs. In the later study, a large sample of patrons of the National Library Board (NLB) system in Singapore was surveyed to elicit their views on elements' usefulness in more depth; some think-aloud sessions with end-users were also conducted to triangulate the survey's findings.

The surveys employed in the three studies were based on the particular catalog's interface and functionality. Therefore, the bibliographic elements evaluated varied across the studies. Moreover, they were dependent on *perceived* usefulness, and on respondents' interpretations of the scale used ("seldom useful", "sometimes useful", etc.). It is possible that respondents overestimated the usefulness of particular elements for their *actual* searching, considering in addition the elements' *potential* usefulness. Nevertheless, ratings were aggregated and tables of relative value derived; in the case of the Singapore study, these tables were used as a means of weighting the seriousness of particular cataloging errors and omissions.¹⁰ The think-aloud sessions broadly reflected the findings from the survey, but some doubt remained as to whether the participants had always verbalized their interaction with particular elements. Although a fair degree of correlation with the results of the Australian studies was found, it was by no means perfect, pointing to the importance of local policies based on local use. Further, correlation with those elements which existing local policy stipulated as mandatory was also imperfect. Since these elements align fairly closely with the RDA core elements, the studies point to the need for further investigation of their relative importance.

Other related studies include investigations by Zumer, Salaba and Zhang, and by Pisanski and Zumer, into users' mental models of the bibliographic universe, with reference to the FRBR model.¹¹ Overall the findings suggest that the FRBR model is reasonably intuitive, although the relationship between the model and optimal catalog design remains unclear. Meanwhile, to inform the development of RDA sections on subject access, Zavalina analysed the user search queries from a large digital library, and compared the categories of search queries with the subject entities and relationships of the FRBR models.¹² The findings indicated that the relationships of objects to other entities are commonly observed in user search queries. However, the results cannot provide insights into user search intentions and how different elements were used to complete search tasks within each search session. Earlier, Zhang and Li reported a series of studies designed to assess the usefulness of metadata schema in support of FRBR user tasks for moving image collections.¹³ One of the main findings was that there is a consistent relationship between highly rated fields and specific kinds of user tasks.

The need for more research in this area is also reflected in the report of the Task Force on Cost/Value Assessment of Bibliographic Control, established following the *On the Record* report by the Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control.¹⁴ The task force's report suggested a research agenda that addresses various aspects of bibliographic data use, including direct and indirect observations of search log and click through data, user understanding of bibliographic data and search interface design, and the support of FRBR user tasks.¹⁵ One of the suggested research directions was "... usability research to determine if, in fact, these elements do provide value towards facilitating the user tasks."¹⁶

Research Design

An evaluation of the *relative* importance of the RDA core elements entails an evaluation of those other elements that might also be contenders for prioritization. An exhaustive study might create “full” RDA-based records for a particular collection, so that all RDA elements could be evaluated. However, in order to study how elements are used in “real life”, this would require the re-cataloging of many thousands of resources, which was not a practical proposition for the authors. Instead, existing catalog records were used: although they were not based on RDA, and did not cover all the elements dealt with even in AACR, they did contain, and quite consistently so, a significant number of elements outside of the RDA core. They also contained most of the elements inside the RDA core. Thus a preliminary comparison could be made, in the context of a particular catalog, between the use of core and non-core elements.

The context for this study was different from the previous studies carried out by the author, but no less typical. The Charles Sturt University (CSU) library catalog serves a medium-sized academic user community; the vast majority of its MARC21 records are derived from large bibliographic databases; its library management system is supplied by Ex Libris. If the most useful elements of its records do not strongly correlate with the RDA core elements, it is very possible that they also do not for users of many other catalogs. This is not to say, however, that the findings would be *exactly* the same, necessarily, for any other catalog.

Think-aloud protocol analysis was carried out to investigate the extent to which particular record elements were utilized by users of the CSU catalog.¹⁷ First, typical bibliographic tasks were derived from the responses to a questionnaire survey disseminated to end-users via the library home page. The survey also provided the researchers with an

opportunity to replicate the author's earlier studies' method of assessing the value of record elements, collecting responses to general questions of usefulness. There were a total of six questions, listed in appendix A. Respondents who completed the questionnaire were invited to enter a draw for the chance to win one of two Apple iPads. The survey was administered in August and September 2010.

A total of 20 participants took part in the think-aloud sessions over a seven-month period, from October 2010 to May 2011. Six of the participants were recruited as expert catalog users: they received personal invitations as members of library staff and adjunct LIS faculty. The other 14 participants were students recruited from flyers in public places and the library on site. The sessions were conducted in CSU's Digital Library Usability Laboratory located in the library building on the Wagga Wagga campus. A set of ten tasks derived from the survey was given to each of the non-expert participants; two sets were given to the expert searchers. The participants were asked to verbalize their thoughts pertaining to their use of the catalog as they performed the tasks, and specifically their thoughts relating to their use of record elements.

At the beginning of their session, participants received instruction and coaching in verbalizing their thoughts as they interacted with the catalogue; they were shown an example of what was required, and allowed a practice run. The participants were then asked to complete the tasks at their own pace and in their usual style. Alongside their verbalizations, the participants' online interactions with the catalog, as shown on the screen, were recorded using TechSmith's Morae software. Each participant was rewarded with an iTunes Gift Card.

The *usage* of record elements does not necessarily equate to their *usefulness*, of course, nor even the extent to which they were *found* to be useful. In the subsequent analysis, however, no attempt was made to evaluate how important the use of an element was to

achieving a successful outcome, for two reasons. First, the verbalization did not consistently indicate such (reported) values, which would, in any case, be very subjective; second, the extent to which an outcome was “successful” is itself very hard to determine, particularly in the case of subject searches. Instead, the analysis looked at how frequently a particular element was used, or, more precisely, for how many of the bibliographic tasks it was used for, by each participant, with use split into the two categories: to find, and to identify *or* select. Thus it was assumed that the content of the catalog would be used in a reasonably optimal manner (particularly in the case of expert users).

Although in many cases an element might be used more than once when carrying out a bibliographic task (for example, the titles of two resources might both be used for their selection), the verbalization was not always sufficiently fine grained to accurately determine the number, while in other cases repeated use of an element was due to initial misuse (e.g., spelling errors) or a decision to check initial use (e.g., reconfirm a standard number). Further, multiple counts would likely emphasize extrinsic factors, such as physical location. It was assumed, therefore, that counting an element only once per finding and identifying/selecting task would not make for a significantly different *order* of elements, even if it resulted in a reduction in their relative *scale*.

Several other methodological issues were resolved prior to coding the verbalizations. Identification was considered an extreme form of selection, and so the two functions were coded as one for the purposes of the analysis. (The fourth FRBR function, obtaining, was not carried out as part of the tasks assigned to the participants.) The relative importance of the finding function, on the one hand, and the identifying/selecting function, on the other, could not be ascertained through analysis of the protocol, and so element use for the two purposes was examined separately, and then simply aggregated. In the case of the finding function,

whether an element was *intended* to be used was not always clear. For instance, participants might not *deliberately* have searched on former titles when performing a title keyword search, but the fact of the matter is that they did, as former titles were included in the title index. When the outcome (e.g., the selection of a resource retrieved via a former title) indicated the use, even if unintentional, of a particular element, then it was coded as such. If, however, the use of a particular element or sub-element was unclear from the outcome, it was not (in some cases, the use of the super-ordinate element was recorded; in other cases, as with many general keyword searches, nothing was recorded).

The analysis was based on the RDA element sets, so that comparison could be made directly with the RDA core. This meant that the elements in the AACR- and MARC-based catalog records that the verbalizations pointed to had to be mapped to the RDA schema, which in some cases resulted in a loss of precision.

Results

Survey questionnaire

One hundred and eight-two responses were collected before the survey was closed. One hundred and fifty-eight of the respondents indicated an intention to use the catalog immediately afterwards, validating the answer to question 3; their responses are reported below.

The frequency of use of the CSU library catalog amongst respondents is shown in table 1.

Table 1. Frequency of catalog use

Frequency	n	%
This is my first time	12	7.6
About once a month	37	23.4
About once a week	47	29.7
Two or three times a week	39	24.7
Most days	23	14.6
	158	100.0

Of the 158 respondents, therefore, 146 were *not* (or did not report to be) first time-users. Of these, 124 responded to the fifth question in the survey, namely, “When you use the CSU library catalogue, how often do you search for” the following types of resource, as shown in table 2.

Table 2. Type of search catalog used for

Search type	never	occasionally	sometimes	often	always
a specific item	3	16	26	65	14
resources on a particular topic	1	6	9	78	30
resources by a particular author or organisation	5	34	36	38	11

The median frequency stated for both specific-item and subject searches is “often”, and for author/organization searches it is “sometimes”, suggesting that support for all three kinds of search is important, with support for subject searches being particularly important.

The same number of respondents, 124, answered the final question, as shown in table 3. This question asked respondents to indicate the usefulness of each of a list of “fields” commonly encountered in the catalog, which was derived from record displays.

Table 3. Usefulness of catalog fields

Field	Not useful	Slightly useful	Moderately useful	Very useful	Extremely useful
Title	2	9	9	52	52
Author	4	9	15	45	51
Subject	2	14	21	37	50
Call number	51	35	21	8	9
ISBN/ISSN	53	37	21	10	3
Language	54	32	18	12	8
Year	16	19	29	36	24
Material type	16	17	34	41	16
Edition	21	22	36	30	15
Publisher	42	39	25	13	5
Physical details	47	28	29	16	4
Series title	36	27	38	20	3
Table of contents	22	25	24	30	23
Co-author	24	32	32	23	13

The median rating for each field is shown in table 4.

Table 4. Median usefulness ratings

Element	Median rating
Title	Very useful
Author	Very useful
Subject	Very useful
Year	Moderately useful
Material type	Moderately useful
Edition	Moderately useful
Table of contents	Moderately useful
Co-author	Moderately useful
Call number	Slightly useful
ISBN/ISSN	Slightly useful
Language	Slightly useful
Publisher	Slightly useful
Physical details	Slightly useful
Series title	Slightly useful

Comparison with RDA core element set

Many of the fields listed in table 4 correspond to several RDA elements; for the purposes of comparison, a field was defined as core in RDA terms if any associated element is specified as core in RDA. Conversely, if no associated element is specified as core, then the field was considered non-core in RDA terms. The two ratings are compared in table 5.

Table 5. User and RDA ratings

Field	Median user rating	RDA rating
Title	Very useful	Core
Author	Very useful	Core
Subject	Very useful	Core
Year	Moderately useful	Core
Material type	Moderately useful	Core
Edition	Moderately useful	Core
Table of contents	Moderately useful	Non-core
Co-author	Moderately useful	Non-core
Call number	Slightly useful	N/A
ISBN/ISSN	Slightly useful	Core
Language	Slightly useful	Core
Publisher	Slightly useful	Core
Physical details	Slightly useful	Core
Series title	Slightly useful	Core

Even at this broad level of comparison, there is some notable non-alignment between users' assessments and RDA. The two fields not associated with core elements, "table of contents" and "co-author", are both rated as "moderately useful" by the median survey respondent, ahead of almost half of the fields associated with core elements, i.e., those rated by users as "slightly useful". A more detailed comparison (as reported below) may reveal more discrepancies.

Protocol analysis

Of the set of bibliographic tasks the survey participants reported they were about to carry out, a few were deemed non-bibliographic (e.g., looking at one's loans record), while some others unintelligible or duplicate. These were discarded, leaving a total of 90, which were classified according to whether or not they were subject searches and whether or not they specified a particular resource "type". The breakdown is shown in table 6.

Table 6. Nature of bibliographic tasks

	No subject	Subject
No type	0	37
Type	16	37

From the 90 tasks, six stratified sample sets of ten tasks each were compiled, representative of the subsets shown in table 6. Some of the task descriptions were altered so as to make them clearer to the think-aloud participants. One of the sets of tasks is provided in appendix B.

A total of 260 bibliographic tasks were carried out by the participants. Thus, if an element was indicated as being used for both finding and identifying/selecting for every task, it would be used a total of 520 times. In the event, the most used element was the title proper, which was recorded 244 times. On the other hand, most RDA elements were never used, which is not surprising, of course, since many would rarely, if ever, be represented in the catalog. A total of 37 RDA elements, however, were used, according to the protocols. They are listed in table 7.

Table 7. RDA elements used

RDA element	<i>Finding</i>			<i>Identifying/selecting</i>			<i>Total</i>		
	Experts	Students	Total	Experts	Students	Total	Experts	Students	Total
Title proper	18	35	53	87	104	191	105	139	244
Term for the concept	53	52	105	53	32	85	106	84	190
Other title information	6	23	29	62	79	141	68	102	170
Mode of issuance	24	32	56	0	0	0	24	32	56
Related work	0	0	0	14	35	49	14	35	49
Preferred name for the person	8	6	14	10	17	27	18	23	41
Date of publication	0	10	10	5	25	30	5	35	40
Related manifestation	0	2	2	0	32	32	0	34	34
Summarization of the content	0	0	0	7	17	24	7	17	24
Publisher's name	0	0	0	3	15	18	3	15	18
Designation of edition	0	0	0	4	8	12	4	8	12
Preferred name for the corporate body	0	0	0	5	7	12	5	7	12
Supplementary content	0	0	0	0	9	9	0	9	9
Related work	0	0	0	7	1	8	7	1	8
Extent of text	0	0	0	0	7	7	0	7	7
Statement of responsibility relating to title proper	0	0	0	2	4	6	2	4	6
Title proper of series	0	0	0	1	5	6	1	5	6
Other person, family, or corporate body associated with a work	0	0	0	0	6	6	0	6	6
Title	0	5	5	0	0	0	0	5	5
Place of publication	0	0	0	1	4	5	1	4	5
Preferred title for the work	0	1	1	1	3	4	1	4	5
Creator	1	2	3	0	2	2	1	4	5
Earlier title proper	2	1	3	1	0	1	3	1	4
Uniform Resource Locator	0	0	0	0	4	4	0	4	4
Note	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	2
Note on edition statement	0	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	2
Name of the	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	2	2

person									
Variant title	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Later title proper	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Edition statement	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	1
Numeric and/or alphabetic designation of first issue or part of sequence	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Numeric and/or alphabetic designation of last issue or part of sequence	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Statement of responsibility relating to series	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Identifier for the manifestation	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	1
Note on issue, part, or iteration used as the basis for identification of the resource	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Duration	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1
Cataloguer's note	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1

As we might expect, there is a significant difference in these elements' relative use for finding and identifying/selecting. What is perhaps more surprising, or encouraging, is that the relative use of elements by experts and non-experts does not differ very much. That is, there is strong correlation between expert and non-expert use of elements both to find and to identify or select resources (Spearman's rank correlation coefficient = 0.93 and 0.92 for finding and identifying/selecting respectively). Given this strong correlation, the overall totals were used to compare the use of RDA elements in the think-aloud sessions with their status as core or non-core. Table 8 lists the 37 elements used by the participants, in descending order of use, and their respective core/noncore designation.

Table 8 Used elements' status

RDA element	Core/noncore
Title proper	C
Term for the concept	C
Other title information	NC
Mode of issuance	NC
Related work	NC
Preferred name for the person	C
Date of publication	C
Related manifestation	NC
Summarization of the content	NC
Publisher's name	C
Designation of edition	C
Preferred name for the corporate body	C
Supplementary content	NC
Related work	NC
Extent of text	C
Statement of responsibility relating to title proper	C
Title proper of series	C
Other person, family, or corporate body associated with a work	C
Title	C
Place of publication	C
Preferred title for the work	C
Creator	C
Earlier title proper	NC
Uniform Resource Locator	NC
Note	NC
Note on edition statement	NC
Name of the person	C
Variant title	NC
Later title proper	NC
Edition statement	C
Numeric and/or alphabetic designation of first issue or part of sequence	C
Numeric and/or alphabetic designation of last issue or part of sequence	C
Statement of responsibility relating to series	NC
Identifier for the manifestation	C
Note on issue, part, or iteration used as the basis for identification of the resource	NC
Duration	NC

Cataloguer's note	NC
-------------------	----

The table shows a clear *lack* of correlation between use and core status. There are 17 non-core elements, yet a majority of RDA core elements did not make it onto the list. Of course, some of these core elements might have been missing from records in the catalog, despite their applicability, but many of the core elements listed would have been included as mandatory elements under the existing code, and most of these elements also appear below non-core elements. Of the ten most used elements, half are non-core.

Of particular note are the following non-core elements: *other title information* was used extensively, especially for identifying and selecting resources; *mode of issuance* (e.g., serial) was often used for finding particular resources; *related work*, *related manifestation* and *summarization of content* were all frequently used to identify and select resources.

Discussion

The extent to which users use bibliographic data in a catalog is obviously dependent on what bibliographic data is there, as well as on the catalog's functionality and interface design. Given that RDA's core elements are generally given priority by existing cataloging practice, one might expect the think-aloud study to be something of a self-fulfilling prophecy: users use the data they are given. The results, however, suggest that there may be other elements that are just as useful, if their *use* is anything to go by. Without being particularly pervasive, relative to some of the core elements also featured in the catalog, several non-core elements would appear to be highly useful, including other title information, mode of issuance, related work, related manifestation and summarization of content.

It should be noted that an element's usefulness might not always qualify it for core status, as it may be comparatively expensive (e.g., time consuming) to record. However, an economic argument that flew in the face of a significant amount of use would need to be a very strong one. It should likewise be noted that certain elements (e.g., identifier for the manifestation) might be more useful for librarians than for *end-users*. The bibliographic tasks tested in this project were those typically carried out by the latter; those typically carried out by the former also need to be investigated. Furthermore, a thorough evaluation of the full set of RDA elements would require a catalog containing all the RDA elements wherever they were applicable, and users conversant with all these elements.

The analysis reported here looked at only a small number of searches, relative to the number carried out of the CSU library catalog every day. No doubt other elements that did not feature in the protocols are also used on occasion, sometimes critically. On the other hand, with library budgets as they are, a line must be drawn somewhere, between what *must* be included in a catalog record, and what *can* be. The point of this article is to question whether RDA, and the cataloging community that is adopting it, has got the right elements on either side of this line. In any case, these elements may vary for different catalogs and different libraries. More empirical research is required.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank Carla Daws for her assistance on this project.

References

1. Gordon Dunsire, "UNIMARC, RDA and the Semantic Web," *International Cataloging & Bibliographic Control* 39, no. 2 (2010): 37-40.
2. Elaine Svenonius, *The Intellectual Foundation of Information Organization* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2000).
3. Deidre Kiorgaard, "RDA Core Elements and FRBR User Tasks" (5JSC/Chair/15) (2008), <http://www.rda-jsc.org/docs/5chair15.pdf>.
4. Philip Hider and Kah-Ching Tan, "Constructing Record Quality Measures Based on Catalog Use," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (2008): 338-361.
5. Ibid.
6. Pat Riva and Chris Oliver, "Evaluation of RDA as an Implementation of FRBR and FRAD," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 50, no. 5-7 (2012): 564-86.
7. US RDA Test Coordinating Committee, "Report and Recommendations" (2011), <http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/source/rdatestingfinalreport-20june2011.pdf>.
8. Philip Hider and Kah-Ching Tan, "Constructing Record Quality Measures Based on Catalog Use," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (2008): 338-61.
9. Philip Hider, "Catalogue Use at the State Library of Victoria," *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 39, no. 1 (2008): 14-25.

Philip Hider, "Catalogue Use by the Petherick Readers of the National Library of Australia," *Australian Academic & Research Libraries* 38, no. 1 (2007): 40-60.
10. Philip Hider and Kah-Ching Tan, "Constructing Record Quality Measures Based on Catalog Use," *Cataloging & Classification Quarterly* 46, no. 4 (2008): 338-61.

11. Maja Zumer, Athena Salaba and Yin Zhang, "User Verification of the FRBR Conceptual Model and Testing of FRBR Prototypes," chap. 20 in *The Outreach of Digital Libraries: A Globalized Resource Network* (Berlin: Springer, 2012).

Jan Pisanski and Maja Zumer, "User Verification of the FRBR Conceptual Model," *Journal of Documentation* 68, no. 4 (2012): 582-92.
12. Oksana L. Zavalina, "Subject Access: Conceptual Models, Functional Requirements, and Empirical Data," *Journal of Library Metadata* 12, no. 2-3 (2012/04/01 2012): 140-63.
13. Ying Zhang and Yuelin Li, "A User-Centered Functional Metadata Evaluation of Moving Image Collections," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science & Technology* 59, no. 8 (2008): 1331-46.
14. Erin Stalberg and Christopher Cronin, "Assessing the Cost and Value of Bibliographic Control," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 55, no. 3 (2011): 124-37.

The Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control, "On the Record: Report of the Library of Congress Working Group on the Future of Bibliographic Control," (2008), <http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/news/lcwg-ontherecord-jan08-final.pdf>.
15. Erin Stalberg and Christopher Cronin, "Assessing the Cost and Value of Bibliographic Control," *Library Resources & Technical Services* 55, no. 3 (2011): 124-37.
16. Ibid, 132.
17. Anders K. Ericsson and Herbert A. Simon, *Protocol Analysis: Verbal Reports as Data*. Rev. ed. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1992).

Appendix A. User Questionnaire Survey

1. How often do you use the CSU Library Catalogue?

This is my first time
About once a month
About once a week
Two or three times a week
Most days

2. Will you be using the catalogue immediately after you fill in this survey?
3. What are you about to search for on the CSU catalogue? Please give as much detail as you can.

4. Please describe THREE searches you have recently conducted using the CSU catalogue, indicating the reasons for them (e.g., for an assignment).

5. When you use the CSU library catalogue, how often do you search for

a specific item
resources on a particular topic
resources by a particular author or organisation

6. Please indicate how useful the following fields in the CSU catalogue are for your purposes.

Title
Author
Subject
Call number
ISBN/ISSN
Language
Year
Material type
Edition
Publisher
Physical details
Series title
Table of contents
Co-author

Appendix B. A Set of Tasks for Protocol Analysis

1. A journal paper from the *Child Abuse Review*, entitled 'Multi-type maltreatment and the long-term adjustment of adults', by Higgins & McCabe, and published in 2000.
2. A journal paper from the journal, *The Environmental Professional*, in volume 13, pages 207-215.
3. Resources on the topic: motor neurone disease and asthma.
4. Information about world heritage listing in Australia.
5. Resources about multi-literacy strategies in the classroom.
6. Materials for an essay assignment in a psychology subject, due next week, on the theory of planned behavior.
7. A source (journal article, book or report) to use as a citation to explain the myth of 'stranger danger' in the context of child sexual abuse for a research paper. (The concept is known and taken for granted, but I need to cite something and I hope the library catalogue can help me so I don't have to hunt out all my old feminist books at home!)
8. Journal articles and books about women's health and the way it has been medicalized.
9. Information for an assignment around the biblical book of Judges from the perspective of feminist and queer theology criticism.
10. Full-text access to the journal, *Environmental Values* (to retrieve a particular paper).