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# *Abstract*

***Background:*** *Resource Description and Access (RDA) is a new cataloguing standard designed to replace the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd Edition Revised (AACR2). RDA is intended to better support description of resources in the digital environment and to provide clustering of bibliographic records. The senior management of the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Medicine established a Coordinating Committee to spearhead a national testing of RDA in the library environment to assess its technical, operational, and financial implications.*

***Objectives:*** *The purpose of this Associate Fellowship Project was to provide assistance to the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee through analysis of data collected during the test. Specifically, Associates assisted with data clean-up, record comparison analysis, evaluative factor analysis, non-MARC record analysis, and readability analysis.*

***Methodology:*** *Different methods were used for each section of data and point of analysis. For record comparison analysis, standardized spreadsheets were used to record differences and omissions between benchmark and test records. For evaluative factor analysis, analysis strategies outlined by the Coordinating Committee were utilized. For non-MARC record analysis, records were reviewed for inclusion or exclusion of RDA Core Elements and inconsistencies in rule interpretation. For the readability analysis, four cataloging training manuals were sampled and analyzed according to the Flesch Reading Ease and Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level readability scores.*

***Results:*** *The data gathered and recorded in the record comparison analysis were folded into the data of the larger group of records and included in the Coordinating Committee’s final report. Descriptions of the results of both non-MARC and readability analysis were also included in the Committee’s final report and contributed to the recommended action items to be undertaken prior to official implementation of RDA.*

*Introduction*

*RDA Background  
  
Resource Description and Access (RDA) is a new cataloguing standard designed to replace the Anglo-American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd Edition Revised (AACR2), which have been in use by the Anglo-American community since 1983. RDA was developed by the Joint Steering Committee for the Development of RDA between the years of 2005-2009, and was published in the RDA Toolkit in 2010. RDA is intended to better support description of resources in the digital environment, in contrast to AACR2, which was developed in a print-oriented environment. Based on the conceptual models expressed in Functional Requirements for Bibliographic Records (FRBR) Functional Requirements for Authority Data (FRAD), and Functional Requirements for Subject Authority Records (FRSAR), RDA is designed to express relationships between works and their creators, allowing for clustering of bibliographic records. This foundation makes it possible for users to easily retrieve and view a work’s different editions, translations, and physical formats. Furthermore, RDA is designed to be implementable in many different encoding schema, including Dublin Core, MARC 21, MODS, and potentially others that may be developed in the future. This makes it applicable both within and outside library communities, making it possible for library records to be used outside of traditional catalogs.*

## *U.S. RDA Test Background*

*The U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee is composed of members from the Library of Congress, the National Agricultural Library, and the National Library of Medicine. The senior management of the three national libraries charged this Coordinating Committee to spearhead a national testing of RDA. According to the Committee’s Final Report, they were to “evaluate RDA by testing it within the library and information environment, assessing the technical, operational, and financial implications of the new code”[[1]](#footnote-1). To do this, the Coordinating Committee recruited 23 additional libraries, for a total of 26 libraries, from different specialties (i.e., public, school, academic, special) to create a set of original bibliographic records for 25 assigned titles, copy bibliographic records for 5 assigned titles, and original bibliographic records for at least 25 additional records from each institution’s normal workflow. Test libraries also had the option of creating name authority records if that was part of their normal workflow. Each cataloger involved in the project completed a demographic survey as well as surveys about each bibliographic record created through Survey Monkey. Eight surveys were used, as shown below:*

* *US RDA Test Partners Institutional Questionnaire (IQ)*
* *RDA Test Record Creator Profile (RCP)*
* *US RDA Test Record Use Questionnaire (RU)*
* *Informal US RDA Testers Questionnaire (IT)*
* *RDA Test Record by Record Survey: Common Original Set (COS)*
* *RDA Test Record by Record Survey: Extra Original Set (EOS)*
* *RDA Test Record by Record Survey: Common Copy Set (CCS)*
* *RDA Test Record by Record Survey: Extra Copy Set (ECS)*

*The Coordinating Committee compiled, sorted, and analyzed the data from these surveys to evaluate RDA.*

## *Project Purpose*

*The purpose of this Associate Fellowship Project was to provide assistance to the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee through analysis of data collected during the test. Two Associate Fellows, Julie Adamo and Kristen Burgess, participated in the project. Appendix A: Original Project Proposal and Appendix B: Project timeline provide additional information.*

*Procedures  
  
As the data analysis was being performed simultaneously by all members of the Coordinating Committee, the Associates worked on several different pieces of data at different points in the process, that were not necessarily contiguous or directly related to each other. Each process is therefore discussed individually in this procedures description.*

*Data clean-up*

*Before analysis could occur on survey data, responses to several survey questions required extensive clean-up. The Associates completed clean-up on responses for survey questions IQ13 and RU1.*

*IQ-13. The Institutional Questionnaire number 13 (IQ13) asked the question “What training did your institution’s testers receive before they began producing records for the US RDA test?” As several respondents answered “other” in cases where their answer was classifiable into one of the other defined answers, it was necessary to reclassify them accordingly. This was done manually using a spreadsheet.*

*RU-Q01. The RDA Test Record Use Survey (RU) requested the following in its first question (RU1) “Please identify yourself from one or more of the following categories. The categories are intended to denote functional areas rather than organizational ranking. Please check all that apply to you (or to the group for whom you are submitting the survey”. A number of respondents chose “Other (please specify)”. Upon review, many of the “Other” responses could actually be classified within one of the specified options. Therefore, additional cleanup was required to reclassify these responses into the correct categories or to create new categories when necessary. This process was done manually using an Excel spreadsheet.*

## *Comparative Record Evaluation (COS)*

*The record creation portion of the RDA test included several different sets of records. The Associate Fellows worked on the Common Original Set (COS), a set of 25 titles, representing a variety of item types that each participating institution catalogued twice; once using RDA and once using AACR2. Each of the COS titles had a “benchmark,” or gold standard, record in both AACR2 and RDA. These were used as the main point of comparison. Systematic comparison of the AACR2 and RDA records describing the same item was conducted to look for similarities, differences, and omissions between them. The Associates were responsible for the comparison of Common Original Sets D and G. All COS records were compared using the same spreadsheet and procedures. The spreadsheet was organized according to the institution who created each record, and columns were created for each MARC21 field included in the benchmark records. The Associates noted whether the MARC21 fields were identical (code= “A”), contained an acceptable variation (code= “AA”), or were missing (code= “M”) in each column. Additionally, a column was added for each instance that a COS record added a field that was not in the benchmark record.  
  
Common set D. Common Set D was comprised of all records describing the print monograph “Barbie Sogna Caterina de’Medici. Barbie Dreams of Caterina de’Medici.” This title was included because it has multiple creators, has a parallel title, and is multilingual.*

Common Set G. *Common Set G included all records for the print monograph “The Aunt Lute Anthology of US Women Writers, Volumes 1 and 2”. The title was included because its title is misspelled on the preferred source, it is a multi-volume set, and has multiple editors.*

*Evaluative Factors  
  
As the driving force behind the surveys and test as a whole, the Coordinating Committee created a list of factors that needed to be evaluated by the test. There were eight categories for the evaluative factors, including:*

* *record creation*
* *record use*
* *training and documentation needs*
* *use of the RDA Toolkit/RDA content*
* *systems and metadata*
* *technical feasibility (later merged with systems and metadata)*
* *local operations*
* *costs and benefits*

*The factors, and strategies devised for evaluating them, aided in determining how well RDA met its goals. Survey questions were designed to gather information related to the evaluative factors. The groups of survey questions designed to address each Evaluative Factor are referred to as Analysis Strategies. The Associates performed analysis in two of the eight categories of evaluative factors, including Evaluative Factors C1 and C1a, which pertained to training on RDA, and factors D5 and D6 that evaluated how well users could understand, interpret, and apply the RDA rules.*

### *Evaluative Factors C1 and C1a.*

*An Associate examined responses to survey questions that addressed Evaluative Factors  C1 and C1a, which inquire on what impact the type of RDA training received had on reported difficulties and need for consultation for both library employees and library and information science students. The following survey questions were devised to gather information on these Evaluative Factors:*

* *Institutional Questionnaire (IQ), Question 13: What training did your institution’s testers receive before they began producing records for the US RDA Test?*
* *Informal US RDA Testers Questionnaire, Question 8: What training did you, your group, or your institution’s testers receive?*
* *Record Creator Profile (RCP), Question 10: Did your training in RDA consist of: [check all that apply]*

*Kelly Quinn, Technical Services Division, cross-tabulated answers from RCP Question 10 and COS question 10 to support analysis of the relationship of consultation time to type of training received. The Associate reviewed the data to look for trends.*

### *Evaluative Factors D4, D5, and D6*

*An Associate Fellow also analyzed responses from several survey questions to determine whether professional and support staff found the text of RDA Online readable, understood concepts in the text and could interpret and apply the rules. The specific evaluative factors that addressed these were:*

* *D4: Is the text of RDA Online readable?*
* *D5: Can staff (professional and support) understand concepts in the text?*
* *D6: Can staff (professional and support) interpret and apply the rules?*

*Participants were asked questions about areas where they encountered difficulties in multiple surveys. For evaluative factor D4, an Associate Fellow analyzed survey question RCP2: Please supply your overall opinions about RDA, if you wish. The Associate categorized comments as Positive Opinion (overall), Negative Opinion (overall), Mixed Opinion, and Suggestions for Improvement. The Associate also noted if readability or the Toolkit’s usability were specifically mentioned.*

*Many questions were reviewed and analyzed for evaluative factors D5 and D6 and they are outlined Table 1: D5 and D6 Questions. In order to determine if participants understood the concepts in the text and could interpret and apply the rules, analysis was conducted on questions that asked participants where they encountered difficulties and focused on the following options when available:*

1. *content of cataloging instructions,*
2. *selecting from options in the cataloging instructions,*
3. *what elements to update, and*
4. *how to update the elements.*

*While other options relating to other areas of evaluation were available, the four options above were chosen because they specifically relate to whether participants understood concepts in the text and could interpret and apply the rules. When available, analyses of the number of professional and support staff who responded to each question were provided.*

*Table: D5 and D6 Questions*

| ***Common Original Set (COS)*** |
| --- |
| *COS 10: In creating this record, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply.* |
| *COS 11: How many minutes did you spend in consulting others as you completed this bibliographic record? Exclude time spent in consultation regarding authority records. Record only your own time, not the time of others whom you consulted. Express your answer as a whole number, e.g., not “1.6 hours” or “96 minutes”, but simply “96”. If you did not consult others, record a zero.* |
| *COS 15: In creating authority records for this item, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply.* |
| ***Extra Original Set (EOS)*** |
| *EOS 15: In creating/completing this record, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply.* |
| *EOS 16: How many minutes did you spend in consulting others about the RDA cataloging instructions as you completed this bibliographic record? Exclude time spent in consultation regarding authority records or subject aspects of the bibliographic record. Record only your own time, not the time of others whom you consulted. Express your answer as a whole number, e.g., not “1.6 hours” or “96 minutes”, but simply “96”. If you did not consult others, record a zero.* |
| *EOS 22: In performing authority work related to this item, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply.* |
| ***Common Copy Set (CCS)*** |
| *CCS 10: In updating/completing this record, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply.* |
| *CCS 11: How many minutes did you spend in consulting others as you updated this bibliographic record? Record only your own time, not the time of others whom you consulted. Express your answer as a whole number, e.g., not “1.6 hours” or “96 minutes”, but simply “96”. If you did not consult others, record a zero.* |
| ***Extra Copy Set (ECS)*** |
| *ECS 16: As you completed/updated this copy record, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply.* |
| *ECS 23: As you created/updated authority records associated with this item, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply.* |
| *ECS 17: How many minutes did you spend in consulting others as you updated/completed this bibliographic record? ? Exclude time spent in consultation regarding authority records or subject aspects of the bibliographic record. Record only your own time, not the time of others whom you consulted. Express your answer as a whole number, e.g., not “1.6 hours” or “96 minutes”, but simply “96”. If you did not consult others, record a zero.* |
| ***Record Creator Profile (RCP)*** |
| *RCP 2: Please supply your overall opinions about RDA, if you wish.* |

*The following strategies, developed by Tina Shrader from the National Agricultural Library, were used to analyze the data according to staff level:*

1. *Kelly Quinn filtered and cross-tabulated responses from COS, CCS, and EOS questions according to staff level (librarian, professional, student, etc.). Kelly obtained the data from RCP4 and used the staff IDs available in RCP1 and EOS1, CCS1, and COS1.*
2. *The Associate Fellow then noted the percentage of respondents that indicated each of the areas, with a particular focus on:*
   1. *Content of Cataloging Instructions*
   2. *Selecting from Options in the Cataloging Instructions*
3. *Additional text analysis was conducted on the “other” responses for each question in order to determine if respondents found other areas difficult.*
4. *Next, the Associate used the data from Kelly Quinn to try and determine the percent of respondents that had to consult others. This was done by subtracting all the “0” responses and then calculating the percentage of the total that noted consultation.*
5. *Lastly, the mean, mode, and range were analyzed for each of the questions, especially those dealing with time.*

## *Non-MARC records*

*Data relating to non-MARC RDA records was very sparse and therefore the variety and extent of analysis that could be performed on them was limited. However, it was possible to begin ascertaining trends in how catalogers are interpreting and expressing RDA in non-MARC environments. The non-MARC records included in the test were either in Dublin Core, Metadata Object Description Schema (MODS), or Encoded Archival Description (EAD) metadata schemes. There were five non-MARC records in the COS, and 55 in the EOS. A sample including 29 of these records was reviewed for presence or absence or RDA Core Elements, which are a series of fields that are minimally required for adequate description of a resource in RDA. Variations in how the RDA Core element fields were interpreted were examined. Additionally, the free-text commentary provided in the Record-by-Record surveys for the non-MARC records was reviewed, and each comment was classified as positive, negative, or a suggestion for improvement.*

## ***Readability Analysis***

*The Coordinating Committee was interested in the usability and readability of the RDA Content. Several survey questions provided focused and subjective feedback on these questions. In addition, the Coordinating Committee attempted to objectively analyze the readability of the RDA rules by determining two commonly used readability scores for a sample of the RDA rules as well as other common cataloging texts. Four training manuals were selected for readability comparisons by the national libraries involved in the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee: RDA, AACR2, the CONSER Cataloging Manual (CCM) and the International Standard for Bibliographic Description, Consolidated ed. (ISBD). The Associate Fellow was given hard copies of each text as well as access to the Cataloger’s Desktop, an integrated, online system that provides access to cataloging rules and documentation.*

*The sample size was based on the number of instructional pages in each text, excluding prefaces, appendices and indexes. The sample size for each text was determined using a 10% margin of error, a 95% confidence level, and a 50% response distribution. The Associate Fellow used the Raosoft Sample Size Calculator[[2]](#footnote-2) to obtain these values. The following sample sizes were obtained using the physical copies of each text:*

* *RDA sample size: 86 pages,*
* *AACR2 sample size: 82 pages,*
* *CCM sample size: 87 pages,*
* *ISBD sample size: 71 pages.*

*A random order generator from StatTrek[[3]](#footnote-3) was used to determine the pages for analysis across each text, excluding prefaces, appendices, and indexes. The first 10 lines from each randomly selected page of text, beginning with the first complete sentence, were analyzed. The Associate Fellow found the lines within the physical text, then identified the corresponding text in Cataloger’s Desktop. These lines were then copied from Cataloger’s Desktop to Microsoft Word. In order to use complete sentences for the reading tests, some samples contain slightly more than 10 lines in order to include the entire last sentence. If a page did not have any text or it did not have the full 10 lines necessary for the sample, text was taken from the page before or after the randomly selected page.*

*After determining that the NLM Readability Analyzer was no longer under development or available, the team decided to use the freely available readability analyzer used for Microsoft Word. Microsoft Word’s built-in tools provide readability scores using the Flesch Reading Ease and the Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level tools. These 10 lines were inserted into Microsoft Word and analyzed to determine the Flesch Reading Ease score and the Flesh-Kincaid Grade Level. The scores were averaged to create an overall score for the text.*

*Results or Outcomes*

## *Comparative Record Evaluation (COS)*

*While the Associates performed the comparison analysis for Common Original Sets D and G, the results of these analyses were folded into the larger pool of data including all of the COS Comparative Record Evaluation data and calculated by the coordinating committee. Ultimately, the committee found that “records created for the Common Original Set were comparably consistent [between AACR2 and RDA records] in terms of the number of rule errors and MARC errors present in the records.”[[4]](#footnote-4)A complete discussion of the results and this section can be found in the final Report and Recommendations of the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee[[5]](#footnote-5).*

## *Evaluative Factors C1 and C1a Results*

*Although an Associate performed preliminary analysis on these evaluative factors, the Coordinating Committee ultimately determined that conclusions correlating types of training to levels of difficulty and consultation time could not be made because respondents were allowed to select as many types of training methods they had received, making it impossible to determine the effectiveness of a single method. Ultimately, the Committee opted to include in the final report a chart showing types of training and the percentage of testers who received each type of training. The preliminary analysis performed by Associate is provided in Appendix E: Preliminary Analysis of Evaluative Factors C1 and C1a although this was not included in the official report due to the non-viability of the data related to training.*

## *Evaluative Factors D4, D5, and D6 Results*

*Results from Evaluative Factors D4, D5, and D6 were integrated within the overall U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee’s Final Report. A full analysis of the results is available in Appendix C: Results from Evaluative Factors D5 and D6 and Appendix G: Partial analysis of Evaluative Factor D4.*

## *Non-Marc Records Analysis Results*

*The non-MARC analysis results were included within the Findings: Record Creation section of the final report.[[6]](#footnote-6) The results are also available in Appendix F: Non-MARC Analysis Results in this report.*

## *Readability Analysis Results*

*The readability analysis results were included within the Findings: RDA Content section of the final report[[7]](#footnote-7) and the results were used, in combination with comments made by survey participants regarding RDA’s readability and ease of use, to influence one of the Committee’s final recommendations to “Rewrite the RDA instructions in clear, unambiguous, plain English”[[8]](#footnote-8). The full readability analysis results are available in Appendix D: Readability Analysis.*

*Discussion*

*Participating in this extensive, nationwide survey analysis provided good insight into the process required for the creation of a survey method and tool and the ultimate process of survey development, application, and analysis. The project reinforced the need for excellent survey design and the importance of developing the final evaluative factors before finalizing and administering the survey. This will ensure that the survey ultimately provides answers to the desired evaluative factors. Additionally, the importance of a statistician was highlighted both during the development of the survey, as well as during the final evaluative stages. As young researchers, the chance to observe and participate in the RDA survey analysis was instructive and will influence our future design of surveys. This was an invaluable aspect of the project.*

*Additionally, the process of gathering and analyzing data across a group of many individuals in three national libraries provided an excellent opportunity to gain an appreciation for the importance of careful communication and clear delegation of responsibilities between participants. It also made very clear the necessity of effective collaboration tools that manage collective documents and data that can be accessed by many users in different locations.*

# *Conclusion*

*The final conclusions and recommendations from the Coordinating Committee are available in the Recommendations section of the final report. In brief, the Committee recommends RDA’s adoption pending the completion of specified improvements and action items determined through the testing process.*

# *Appendices*

## *Appendix A: Original Project Proposal*

***Project title:*** *Analysis of data from US RDA Test*

***Submitted by:*** *Diane Boehr and Barbara Bushman, Cataloging Section, Technical Services Division, LO*

***Date Submitted:*** *Jan. 24, 2011*

*Background*

*The National Library of Medicine, along with the Library of Congress and the National Agricultural Library make up the US RDA Coordinating Committee which is spearheading a national project to test RDA (Resource Description and Access), new cataloging rules designed to replace AACR2 (Anglo-American Cataloging Rules).*

*The formal portion of the test was completed on Dec. 31, 2010, and the Coordinating Committee is now responsible for analyzing the large amounts of data which were collected during the test.*

*Each of the 26 participating libraries created original bibliographic records for the same artificial set of 25 titles (common original set), using both AACR2 and RDA. Many also provided records for 5 common copy set titles, to see what effects RDA would have on copy cataloging. Additionally, each participating library created at least 25 original records from their normal cataloging work. Each record created as part of the test has an accompanying survey filled out by the cataloger detailing the time spent on record creation, consultation, and detailing what they liked or disliked about RDA and the online interface (RDA Toolkit) among other data. In addition, one survey was completed by each cataloger, giving demographic information about the person, including experience, training received on RDA, etc.; one survey was completed by each institution summarizing their experience and recommendations, and surveys were completed by end- users providing their reactions to records created using the new rules.*

*Project:*

*The proposed project is to provide assistance to the US RDA Test Coordinating Committee in collecting, sorting, and analyzing the data that has been collected during the test. Tasks to be performed are expected to include:*

*• Transferring data from Survey Monkey into Excel spreadsheets for sorting and analysis*

*• Matching record-by record surveys with their associated common set bibliographic and authority records*

*• Categorizing free-text survey comments into broad categories*

*• If time permits, correlate opinions by type of library, experience of cataloger, amount and type of RDA training*

*• Comparison of common set records created by test participants with baseline records created by the Committee (using ExamDiff Pro software available at NLM)*

***DURATION (Months)****: 3 months FTE*

***EXTERNAL SCHEDULES / DEADLINES****: A final decision on adoption of RDA is to be released to the US Community by ALA Annual (June 2011). A preliminary report is to be distributed to the management of the three national libraries in late March or early April 2011. The majority of data collection and analysis is expected to take place from now through early April. Additional data analysis could be needed by the libraries senior management April-May.*

***PRIMARY LEARNING OBJECTIVES AND PROJECT EXPERIENCES FOR ASSOCIATE****:*

*• Learn to use Survey Monkey and transfer data into Excel*

*• Learn to sort and analyze data using Excel spreadsheets*

*• Learn the primary differences between AACR2 and RDA for cataloging*

*• Participate in what may be the first nation-wide evidence-based testing of a proposed standard*

*• Understand how libraries make cost-benefit determinations when faced with major changes to their operations*

***SOFTWARE REQUIRED OR SERVER ACCESS:***

*• Access to LC Survey Monkey site*

*• Access to RDA toolkit*

***SKILLS REQUIRED****: Detailed cataloging knowledge is not required to complete this project, but a basic knowledge of MARC tags is useful.*

***EXPECTED OUTPUTS / PRODUCTS****:*

*• Set of Excel spreadsheets for common set surveys, edited to remove extraneous data.*

*• Document providing broad categorization of comments from particular surveys, with numbers of comments in these categories and representative samples of actual comments belonging to these categories.*

*• Report identifying the number of common set records missing critical elements as identified by the project leaders.*

*• Report with a summary analysis of the types of additional elements supplied in the common set records.*

***SUGGESTED METHODOLOGIES****:*

*• Look at the RDA toolkit and some online webinars to get some background of the basic differences between AACR2 and RDA.*

*• Work with TSD Systems Office staff to learn basic procedures for transferring Survey Monkey data into Excel.*

*• Work with TSD Systems Office staff to learn basic procedures for using ExamDiff Pro software.*

*• The project leaders will work with the Associate to identify which surveys and common records they should focus on.*

*• Attend one or more meetings of the Steering Committee held at the Library of Congress.*

***BENEFITS TO NLM****: Having accurate information from the RDA test will greatly assist NLM, LC and NAL in making its final decision on whether or not to adopt RDA.*

***PROJECT LEADERS****: Diane Boehr, TSD & Barbara Bushman, TSD*

***OTHER RESOURCE PEOPLE:***  *Jennifer Marill, TSD, Kelly Quinn, TSD, Iris Lee, TSD, David Reser, LC*

***ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:*** [*http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/*](http://www.loc.gov/bibliographic-future/rda/)

## *Appendix B: Project Meeting Timeline*

***FEBRUARY 2011***

*February 11: Initial email confirming that Julie Adamo and Kristen Burgess will be working on the RDA Spring Project.*

*February 11 – 28: Initial setup with Survey Monkey, RDA Toolkit, RDA tutorials.*

*Feb 14 – 23: Kristen Burgess practicum at University of Utah.*

*February 28: RDA Test Steering Committee meeting. Discuss specific questions we will be asked to provide answers to using the data collected during the test and strategies for manipulating the data.*

***MARCH 2011***

*March 1: Diane sent 3 documents to review: Lessons Learned from the RDA Test [draft], RDA Report Methodology Section [draft], RDA Test Background [draft].*

*Learned that the NLM’s Readability Analyzer prototype is no longer available.*

*March 2: Project kick-off meeting. Discussed RDA kickoff meeting agenda and project charter.*

*March 4: eXtensible Catalog Software (http://www.extensiblecatalog.org) presentation at the Library of Congress.*

*March 8: Initial discussion of readability analysis with Kristen Burgess, Diane Boehr, and Barbara Bushman. Decided to analyze 3 chapters from each document.*

*March 11: RDA Test Steering Committee meeting. Access granted to Cataloger’s Desktop.*

*March 11 - 25: Adjusting of record comparison requirements and spreadsheets.*

*March 21 – 23: Julie Adamo and Kristen Burgess at Computers in Libraries conference.*

*March 24: Submitted data clean-up for question RU1.*

*March 29: RDA project meeting with Kristen, Julie, Diane, and Barbara.*

*March 30: Kristen Burgess submits Initial Readability analysis for AACR2 Chapters 1, 21 ; RDA Chapters 1, 6, 17.*

*March 31: Initial evaluative factor analysis for C1, C1a, D5, and D6 submitted to Diane and Barbara.*

***APRIL 2011***

*April 7: RDA project meeting with Kristen, Julie, Diane, and Barbara.*

*Record comparison submitted to Diane and Barbara.*

*April 11: Changed methodology for readability analysis.*

*April 12: Kristen Burgess met with Barbara Rapp to discuss statistical sampling and analysis of text.*

*Kristen Burgess submitted initial review of RCP2 to Diane and Barbara.*

*April 14: Submit drafts evaluative factor analysis and individual projects (non-Marc records and readability analysis plan) for approval from committee.*

*April 18 – 22: Julie Adamo practicum at University of Arkansas*

*April 22: Kelly alerted team that the data sent was incorrect. Corrected data sent and applied to final report.*

*New version of D5/D6 as well as requested additions (RCP4 numerical analysis and government plain language information) sent to Diane and Barbara.*

*April 26: Updated deadlines for project sent from Diane and Barbara.*

*April 27: Initial readability work submitted.*

*Elizabeth Lilker help with ISBD.*

*April 28: Readability analysis submitted for review and comment.*

***MAY 2011***

*May 5: Feedback received from Test Committee on two sections submitted.*

*May 6: New tables submitted to Barbara and Diane.*

*May 20: Mid-Project Check-In with Kathel Dunn, Diane Boehr, and Barbara Bushman.*

***AUGUST 2011***

*August 26: Final written report due*

## *Appendix C: Results from Evaluative Factors D5 and D6*

***Results from Evaluative Factors D5 and D6***

***Common Original Set (COS 10, 11, 15 ; 1200 surveys received)***

*1137 people answered question 10 (COS 10) regarding difficulties encountered while creating their records and 63 people skipped COS 10. As shown in Table 1: COS 10, responses for content of cataloging instructions totaled 367 and responses for selecting from options in the cataloging instructions totaled 249. Combined, 54.2% of respondents reported difficulty with one or both categories.*

*Table 1: COS 10 (In creating this record, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply)*

| ***Category\**** | ***Response Count*** | ***Percentage*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Did not encounter any difficulties* | *454* | *39.9%* |
| *Online tool (RDA Toolkit)* | *272* | *23.9%* |
| *Content of cataloging instructions* | *367* | *32.3%* |
| *Selecting from options in the cataloging instructions* | *249* | *21.9%* |
| *Coding/tagging or communication formats* | *198* | *17.4%* |
| *Other* | *279* | *24.5%* |

*\*Respondents could choose multiple categories.*

*Table 2: COS 10 Professional and Support Staff shows the number of Professional or Support staff members that encountered difficulty in the two categories of interest. 243 professional staff and 41 support staff encountered difficulties with content of cataloging instructions and 157 professionals and 31 support staff members indicated difficulties with selecting from options in cataloging instructions.*

*Table 2: COS 10 Professional and Staff*

| ***Staff role: Professional or Support*** | ***Content of Cataloging Instructions*** | ***Selecting from options in cataloging instructions*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Professionals: Number* | *243* | *157* |
| *Professionals: % of total number COS10 responses* | *21.37%* | *13.8%* |
| *Support: Number* | *41* | *31* |
| *Support: % of total number COS10 responses* | *3.6%* | *2.7%* |

*Question 11 (COS 11) asked how many minutes respondents spent consulting others while completing the bibliographic record. 39.3% of respondents had to consult others while completing the bibliographic record. The results are reflected in Table 3: COS 11 Consulting Time in Minutes.*

*Table 3: COS 11 Consulting Time in Minutes*

*1077 people answered question 15 (COS 15) after creating authority records. 123 people skipped this question. There were 73 responses for content of cataloging instructions and 48 responses for selecting from options in the cataloging instructions, as shown in Table 4: COS 15. 11.3% of respondents indicated difficulty with one or both categories.*

*Table 4: COS 15 (In creating authority records for this item, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply)*

| ***Category\**** | ***Response Count*** | ***Percentage*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Did not create authority records* | *525* | *48.7%* |
| *Created authority records but did not encounter difficulties* | *398* | *37.0%* |
| *Online tool (RDA Toolkit)* | *48* | *4.5%* |
| *Content of cataloging instructions* | *73* | *6.8%* |
| *Selecting from options in the cataloging instructions* | *48* | *4.5%* |
| *Coding/tagging or communication formats* | *28* | *2.6%* |
| *Other* | *58* | *5.4%* |

*\*Respondents could choose multiple categories.*

***Extra Original Set (EOS 15, 16, 22 ; 5908 surveys received)***

*5813 people answered question 15 (EOS 15). As noted in Table 5: EOS 15, there were 563 responses for encountered difficulties with content of cataloging instructions and 279 responses for selecting from options in the cataloging instructions. 14.5% of respondents reported difficulty with one or both of the categories.*

*Additionally, people who responded that they encountered difficulties with the content of cataloging instructions and selecting from options in the cataloging instructions left 67 comments in the EOS 15 “Other” comment section. Several comments were made about the need for better instructions (“there is not enough instruction about what to do when cataloging the extra set records” , “many instructions in RDA were not written clearly”, and “need more specialized instructions for cataloging moving images; existing RDA rules for MI are confusing and incomplete”), authority work, and the organization of cataloging rules.*

*Table 5: EOS 15 (In creating/completing this record, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply)*

| ***Category\**** | ***Response Count*** | ***Percentage*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Did not encounter any difficulties* | *4759* | *81.9%* |
| *Online tool (RDA Toolkit)* | *378* | *6.5%* |
| *Content of cataloging instructions* | *563* | *9.7%* |
| *Selecting from options in the cataloging instructions* | *279* | *4.8%* |
| *Coding/Tagging or Communication formats* | *147* | *2.5%* |
| *Other* | *316* | *5.4%* |

*\*Respondents could choose multiple categories.*

*Table 6: EOS 15 Professional and Support Staff shows how many respondents who identified themselves as professional staff or support staff responded to the two categories of interest. 464 of the professional staff encountered difficulties with content of cataloging instructions and 197 indicated difficulties with selecting from options in cataloging instructions. Only 69 support staff indicated issues with either of the categories analyzed.*

*Table 6: EOS 15: Professional and Support Staff*

| ***Staff role: Professional or Support*** | ***Content of Cataloging Instructions*** | ***Selecting from options in cataloging instructions*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Professionals: Number* | *464* | *197* |
| *Professionals: % of total number EOS15 responses* | *7.98%* | *3.4%* |
| *Support Staff: Number* | *37* | *32* |
| *Support Staff: % of total number EOS15 responses* | *0.62%* | *0.54%* |

*Question 16 (EOS 16) asked how many minutes respondents spent consulting about RDA cataloging instructions while completing the bibliographic record. 11% of respondents had to consult others while completing the bibliographic record. The results are reflected in Table 7: EOS16 Consulting Time in Minutes.*

*Table 7: EOS16 Consulting Time in Minutes*

*4879 people completed question 22 (EOS 22) and 1029 skipped the question. As shown in Table 8: EOS 22, 290 people encountered difficulties with content of cataloging instructions and 115 people encountered difficulties selecting from options in the cataloging instructions. 8.3% of respondents reported difficulties with one or both categories.*

*Table 8: EOS 22 (In performing authority work related to this item, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply)*

| ***Category\**** | ***Response Count*** | ***Percentage*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Did not create or update any authority records* | *898* | *18.4%* |
| *Performed authority work, but did not encounter difficulties* | *3450* | *70.7%* |
| *Online tool (RDA Toolkit)* | *133* | *2.7%* |
| *Content of cataloging instructions* | *290* | *5.9%* |
| *Selecting from options in the cataloging instructions* | *115* | *2.4%* |
| *Coding/tagging or communication formats* | *65* | *1.3%* |
| *Other* | *231* | *4.7%* |

*\*Respondents could choose multiple categories.*

*People who selected “content of cataloging instructions” or “selecting from options in the cataloging instructions” also added 50 comments to EOS 22’s “Other” option. “Time” was listed as a difficulty encountered several times.*

***Common Copy Set (CCS 10 & 11 ; 111 surveys received)***

*106 people answered question 10 (CCS 10). In responding to the areas where they encountered difficulties, there were 14 responses for content of cataloging instructions, 7 responses for selecting from options in the cataloging instructions, 19 for which elements to update, and 24 for how to update the elements (see Table 9: CCS10). Combined, 60.3% of respondents reported difficulties with one or several of these categories. These responses indicate that users struggled to understand concepts in the text and interpret and apply the rules.*

*Table 9: CCS 10 (In updating/completing this record, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply)*

| ***Category\**** | ***Response Count*** | ***Percentage*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Did not encounter any difficulties* | *44* | *41.5%* |
| *Online tool (RDA Toolkit)* | *29* | *27.4%* |
| *Content of cataloging instructions* | *14* | *13.2%* |
| *Selecting from options in the cataloging instructions* | *7* | *6.6%* |
| *Coding/tagging or communication formats* | *17* | *16.0%* |
| *Which elements to update* | *19* | *17.9%* |
| *How to update the elements* | *24* | *22.6%* |
| *Other* | *11* | *10.4%* |

*\*Respondents could choose multiple categories.*

*2 responses from people who encountered difficulties in the categories mentioned above also noted “Other” areas of difficulty in CCS10. One dealt with the test and saving the file while the other noted confusion with the 240 field.*

*Table 10: CCS10 Professional and Support Staff shows how respondents who identified themselves as professional staff or support staff responded to the two categories of interest. 4 of the professional staff encountered difficulties with content of cataloging instructions and 3 indicated difficulties with selecting from options in cataloging instructions. 3 support staff indicated issues with content of cataloging instructions and none with selecting from options in cataloging instructions.*

*Table 10: CCS 10: Professional and Support Staff*

| ***Staff role: Professional or Support\**** | ***Content of Cataloging Instructions*** | ***Selecting from options in cataloging instructions*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Professionals: Number* | *4* | *3* |
| *Professionals: % of total number CCS10 responses* | *3.77%* | *2.83%* |
| *Support Staff: Number* | *3* | *0* |
| *Support Staff: % of total number CCS10 responses* | *2.8%* | *0%* |

*Question CCS11 asked how many minutes participants spent in consulting others updated the bibliographic record. 45.0% of respondents to question CCS 11 consulted others while completing the Common Copy Set record. The results are reflected in Table 11: CCS11 Consulting Time in Minutes.*

*Table 11: CCS11 Consulting Time in Minutes.*

***Extra Copy Set (ECS 16, 23, 17 ; 801 surveys received)***

*Two Extra Copy Set (ECS) questions, ECS 16 and ECS 23, asked about where participants encountered difficulties when working on copy records and authority records. Participants could select multiple options. 781 people answered question 16 (ECS 16) and 20 people skipped the question. As noted in Table 12: ECS 16, there were 114 responses to content of cataloging instructions, 114 responses to selecting from options in the cataloging instructions, 75 responses to what elements to update, and 75 responses to how to update the elements.*

*While the majority of responses (67.3%) to ECS 16 indicated that many did not encounter difficulties, a number of responses indicated that professional staff and support staff encountered difficulties understanding concepts and interpreting and applying the rules (Table 13: ECS 16 Professional and Support Staff). 64 professionals encountered difficulty with content of cataloging instructions and 52 professionals encountered difficulty selecting from options in the cataloging instructions. 28 support staff encountered difficulty with content of the cataloging instructions and 31 encountered difficulties selecting from options in the cataloging instructions.*

*Table 12: ECS 16 (As you completed/updated this copy record, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply)*

| ***Category\**** | ***Response Count*** | ***Percentage*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Did not encounter difficulties* | *526* | *67.3%* |
| *Online tool (RDA Toolkit)* | *138* | *17.7%* |
| *Content of cataloging instructions* | *114* | *14.6%* |
| *Selecting from options in the cataloging instructions* | *114* | *14.6%* |
| *Coding/tagging or communication formats* | *57* | *7.3%* |
| *What elements to update* | *75* | *9.6%* |
| *How to update the elements* | *75* | *9.6%* |
| *Other* | *36* | *4.6%* |

*\*Respondents could choose multiple categories.*

*Table 13: ECS 16 Professional and Support Staff*

| ***Staff role: Professional or Support*** | ***Content of Cataloging Instructions*** | ***Selecting from options in cataloging instructions*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Professionals: Number* | *64* | *52* |
| *Professionals: % of total number ECS16 responses* | *8.19%* | *6.6%* |
| *Support Staff: Number* | *28* | *31* |
| *Support Staff: % of total number ECS16 responses* | *3.6%* | *4.0%* |

*There were 18 general comments in ECS 4 from people who answered one of the options in ECS 16. A number of questions about the 710 field were included. In addition, one person noted in the ECS 16 “Other” field a “lack of good and clear examples” and there were several questions about specific fields where people struggled.*

*ECS 17 asked about the amount of time spent in consulting others while completing the bibliographic record. 21.2% of respondents to ECS 17 had to consult others while completing the bibliographic record. The results are shown in Table 14: ECS 17 Consulting Time in Minutes.*

*Table 14: ECS 17 Consulting Time in Minutes*

*495 people answered question ECS 23 and 306 people skipped ECS 23. Out of the 495 people that answered question ECS 23, 7.3% (36) encountered difficulties with the content of cataloging instructions and 6.1% (30) encountered difficulties selecting from options in the cataloging instructions (see Table 15: ECS23).*

*Table 15: ECS23 (As you created/updated authority records associated with this item, which of the following did you encounter difficulties with? Please check all that apply)*

| ***Category\**** | ***Response Count*** | ***Percentage*** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Did not encounter any difficulties* | *394* | *79.6%* |
| *Online tool (RDA Toolkit)* | *42* | *8.5%* |
| *Content of cataloging instructions* | *36* | *7.3%* |
| *Selecting from options in the cataloging instructions* | *30* | *6.1%* |
| *Coding/tagging or communication formats* | *7* | *1.4%* |
| *Other* | *50* | *10.1%* |

*\*Respondents could choose multiple categories.*

*ECS 4 contained 24 general comments from people who answered one of these options. They focused on the difficulty of finding what they need within RDA. There were several comments about the language being unclear and difficult to understand.*

## *Appendix D: Readability Analysis*

*RDA Content: Readability Analysis*

*The purpose of this readability analysis was to determine an approximate readability score representative of the Resource Description and Access (RDA) instructions. This readability score was determined using the instructional text from the RDA manual and did not include headings, examples, appendices, or indexes. In addition, analyses were done on samples of the Anglo‐American Cataloguing Rules, 2nd ed., 2002 revision (AACR2), the CONSER Cataloging Manual (CCM), and the International Standard Bibliographic Description (ISBD) in order to compare the RDA readability scores with three commonly used cataloging manuals and another international cataloging standard.*

*The readability tests used for this analysis were the Flesch Reading Ease Test and the Flesch‐Kincaid Grade Level Test. Readability scores only provide general guidance on a text’s readability and in general they are “accurate only within about one grade level on either side of the analyzed level and only for the typical reader[[9]](#footnote-9).”*

*The Plain Writing Act of 2010*

*In addition, this section provides information on the Plain Writing Act of 2010 (Public Law 111‐274). Although RDA is not a government publication, the Federal Plain Language Guidelines provide valuable information that could be used if RDA is revised or edited. The Plain Writing Act of 2010 defines plain writing as “writing that is clear, concise, well‐organized, and follows other best practices appropriate to the subject or field and intended audience.”*

*Federal Plain Language Guidelines are available for government agencies at http://www.plainlanguage.gov/howto/guidelines/bigdoc/TOC.cfm. The guidelines recommend testing documents for plain language throughout the document’s creation and mention the following testing techniques: paraphrase testing, usability testing, and controlled‐comparative studies. These guidelines instruct agencies, among many things, to write for an identified audience and to organize documents according to readers’ needs. Active voice, the use of short words and short sentences,*

*Report and Recommendations of the U.S. RDA Test Coordinating Committee public release 20June 2011 80*

*6 Andrasik, F., & Murphy, W. D. (1977). Assessing the readability of thirty‐nine behavior‐modification training manuals and primers. Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 103 (2), 341‐344. doi: 10.1901/jaba.1977.10-341.*

*7 Microsoft Office. Test your document’s readability ‐ Microsoft Office Word Support. Retrieved from http://office.microsoft.com/en‐us/word‐help/test‐your‐document‐s‐readability‐HP010148506.aspx*

*and the avoidance of legal or technical terminology are among the recommended guidelines. Additional guidelines relevant to cataloging manuals include the use of examples to “clarify complex concepts,” guidance on minimizing cross‐references, and designing documents for easy reading.*

*Readability Tests*

*Microsoft Word provides readability analysis using two common readability tools: Flesch Reading Ease and Flesch‐Kincaid Grade Level. Both of these readability tests rate texts according to the average number of syllables per word and the average sentence length. In addition, Microsoft Word provides scores on the percentage of passive sentences found in a text and the number of words per sentence.*

*The Flesch Reading Ease Test rates text on a 100‐point scale. A higher rating indicates an easier to understand document while a lower score indicates a more difficult to understand document. The Flesch Reading Ease Formula is: 206.835 – (1.015 x average sentence length) – (84.6 x average number of syllables per word)[[10]](#footnote-10)[[11]](#footnote-11). The following scale indicates the grade level that can easily understand a document with the following scores[[12]](#footnote-12):*

1. *90 – 100: 5th grade*
2. *80‐90: 6th grade*
3. *70‐80: 7th grade*
4. *60‐70: 8th to 9th grade*
5. *50‐60: 10th to 12th grade*
6. *30‐50: 13th to 16th grade*
7. *0‐30: college graduates.*

*The Flesch‐Kincaid Grade Level Test rates text by U.S. grade level. For example, a score of 7.0 means that a seventh grader can understand the document. The Flesch‐Kincaid Grade Level Formula is: (.39 x average sentence length) + (11.8 x average number of syllables per word) – 15.59[[13]](#footnote-13).*

*RDA Content: Readability analysis methodology*

*Four training manuals were selected for readability comparisons by the national libraries involved in the Coordinating Committee: RDA, AACR2, CCM and ISBD. The sample size was based on the number of instructional pages in each text, excluding prefaces, appendices and indexes. The sample size for each text was determined such that they would allow analysis of results with a 95 percent confidence level and a 10 percent margin of error. The RDA sample size was 86 pages. The AACR2 sample size was 82 pages. The CCM sample size was 87 pages. The ISBD sample size was 71 pages. A random order generator was used to determine the pages for analysis across each text, excluding prefaces, appendices, and indexes. The first 10 lines from each randomly selected page of text, beginning with the first complete sentence, were analyzed. In order to use complete sentences for the reading tests, some samples contain slightly more than 10 lines in order to include the entire last sentence. If a page did not have any text or it did not have the full 10 lines necessary for the sample, text was taken from the page before or after the randomly selected page. These 10 lines were inserted into Microsoft Word and analyzed to determine the Flesch Reading Ease score and the Flesch‐Kincaid Grade Level. The scores were averaged to create an overall score for the text.*

*RDA Content Readability Analysis: Results*

*The averages of the readability scores from the randomly sampled text, as determined by Microsoft Word’s readability analyzer, are shown in Figure 26: Readability Scores. For the Flesch Reading Ease, a higher score indicates better readability. For the Flesch‐Kincaid Grade Level, a lower score indicates better readability.*

*Readability Scores*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| ***Readability Test*** | ***RDA*** | ***AACR2*** | ***CCM*** | ***ISBD*** |
| *Flesch Reading Ease* | *28.7* | *41.4* | *41.8* | *36.6* |
| *Flesch‐Kincaid Grade Level* | *14.8* | *12.5* | *12.25* | *13.7* |
| *Passive Sentences* | *17.3%* | *10.4%* | *34.9%* | *56.3%* |
| *Words per sentence* | *22.7* | *21.6* | *20.1* | *23.2* |

*Figure 26. Readability of different cataloging manuals*

*As noted above, readability scores only provide general guidance on a text’s readability. Since they focus on the average sentence length and the average number of syllables per word, many factors that help a user read and understand a document, including organization and formatting, are not considered.*

*The Flesch‐Kincaid Grade Level scores of each manual tested ranked at the 12th grade level or above, most having scores that are considered readable by college students. The Flesch Reading Ease Test scores ranked RDA as the lowest, with a score of 28.7 (college graduate level). AACR2, CCM, and ISBD ranked within the 30‐50 range (college student/13th to 16th grade level). The scores of each of these documents should be considered as approximate scores and not as a true indicator of their overall readability. In addition, readability scores are generally, “most meaningful up to about high school or beginning college level. Beyond that point, the reader’s special background knowledge is often more important than the difficulty of the text.”[[14]](#footnote-14) All four of the manuals were created and written for a specific audience with a background in cataloging. This will also influence the level of difficulty since they will include language and styles of writing not necessarily standard for a general audience.*

*While these scores provide a beginning benchmark to illustrate the approximate readability of each text according to these two readability tests, the results should be treated as complementary to comments from RDA test participants. Comments from the RDA test regarding its readability and usability reflect the actual use and experience of catalogers. The user comments and their reflection on RDA’s readability should thus be given greater weight, while also taking into account these approximate indicators.*

## *Appendix E: Preliminary Analysis of Evaluative Factors C1 and C1a*

*The RDA test sought to evaluate the impact of different types of training on efficiency of record creation and level of difficulty experienced during record creation. Participants were asked to specify what type of training they received. To illustrate the effectiveness of various types of training, participants were asked about amount of consultation time required during record creation.*

*For bibliographic records in the Common Original Set (COS), participants in the professional category who received more than one day of classroom training, hands on training, taught via train the tester method, were self-taught from the RDA toolkit, or completed Library of Congress (LC) webcasts all required about 16 minutes of consultation. Participants who were self-taught from LC documentation required about 12 minutes of consultation and participants who received distance training required about 4 minutes of consultation. Support staff in all training categories except for “train the tester”and “more than one day of classroom training” required 12-17 minutes of consultation. Across all categories of training, students required between 43 and 66 minutes of training. For students, the least amount of consultation (43 minutes) time was required from those who were self-taught from LC documents. The most amount of consultation time (66 minutes) was required from students who received distance training. There does not appear to be a particular pattern relating to number of different types of training received and minutes of consultation required.*

*The test also examined by how many records were completed without any consultation in each training category. 546 records were created without consultation by participants who were self taught from the RDA toolkit, and 500 by participants who had more than 1 day of classroom training. In contrast, 220 were completed without consultation by participants who were self taught by LC documents, and 185 by participants who were taught via train the tester method.*

## *Appendix F: Non-MARC Analysis Results*

***Non‐MARC Record Evaluation***

*Unfortunately, data relating to non‐MARC RDA records are very sparse and therefore conclusions about how successful RDA is with non‐MARC metadata schemes are difficult to make at this point. More data should be collected in order to evaluate the effectiveness of RDA for non‐MARC metadata standards.*

*From the Common Original Set (COS), there were five non‐MARC records created, all in Dublin Core. These records all described different items, and therefore could not be compared for consistency. Additionally, since there were no non‐MARC benchmark records, there was no point of comparison to gauge how well testers were able to apply RDA to non‐MARC metadata standards. No surveys were received for non‐MARC records from the COS, so commentary analysis could not be conducted. The five Dublin Core records from the COS were examined to see if they contained all of the core elements from the corresponding RDA Core records. With few exceptions, they did contain all of the core elements. One record did not include edition information, one was missing the ISBN. Two of the records whose dates were labeled as questioned in the RDA Core record were not labeled as such in the DC records.*

*From the Extra Original Set (EOS), there were 55 non‐MARC records: 25 in Dublin Core (DC), 22 in MODS and 2 in EAD. These records all describe different items, so again there was no way to compare them for consistency. Twenty surveys were completed correlating to non‐MARC records in the EOS. Fourteen respondents answered the question “Please provide any comments you wish to make concerning your experience in creating/completing this bibliographic record and/or any associated authority records.” Eleven of these comments were related to MODS records, and three to DC. Among these comments, nine were considered negative, two were considered positive, and four were suggestions for improvement (some respondents providing both positive/negative comments along with suggestions for improvement).*

*A few themes were echoed in more than one comment:*

* *The QDC (Qualified Dublin Core) element set is not granular enough to express RDA*
* *Instructions for creating conference names are vague and insufficient*
* *Several testers had trouble interpreting and applying the rules for related resources*

*A sample of the EOS non‐MARC records, including seven Dublin Core records, 15 MODS records, and two EAD records, was analyzed for presence/absence of RDA core elements. These records were largely describing unpublished resources. Not having access to the resources being described posed some level of difficulty in evaluating the records. It was possible, however, to get some idea of how RDA was used in non‐MARC environments.*

*Only two elements, “title proper” and “content type” were included in all sampled records. A statement of responsibility was included in all but four records, which were all MODS records for individual photographs.*

*Items in this sample were primarily all unpublished. There were variable interpretations of field definitions for date and publisher fields. Date fields sometimes included dates when the record was created and at other times included dates when the item itself was created. Some records included both. Many records were using “publication statement” fields to record information about the library or institution that was describing the item or who currently owned the item. A “date of production” was included in all but two records. One of these was a photograph and the other was an EAD record for a scrapbook collection.*

*Statements relating to the elements “carrier type” and “extent” were both included in a majority of the records, but were missing in a large number of them. A statement of extent was included in all Dublin Core and EAD records, but was missing from five MODS records, all records for photographs.*

*MODS seemed to provide a particularly good environment for describing related resources and naming additional constituents associated with a work. While many MODS records included this information, it was absent from all Dublin Core and EAD records.*

*While the majority of the EOS non‐MARC records provided a very detailed level of description, the RDA core elements were not generally well‐represented in these records.*

*Recommendation from Coordinating Committee*

*The Coordinating Committee believes that further instruction could help creators of non‐MARC RDA records more uniformly include RDA core elements, particularly in relation to specifying publisher, copyright, and date information even when the value is null or unknown. Additionally, further instruction and/or mapping between metadata schemes could help ensure that catalogers understand field definitions for publication and date fields so that similar values are entered in them.*

## *Appendix G: Partial analysis of Evaluative Factor D4*

***Evaluative Factor, Section D: use of RDA Online Tool/RDA Content***

***RCP 2: Please supply your overall opinions about RDA, if you wish.***

***D4: Is the text of RDA Online readable?***

*Record Creator Profile Question 2 (RCP2) asked participants to “Please supply your overall opinions about RDA, if you wish.” There were 173 unique responses to RCP 2. These comments were categorized as positive, negative, mixed, and/or suggestions for improvement. 53 responses expressed overall positive opinions about RDA, 65 responses expressed overall negative opinions about RDA, 44 responses expressed overall mixed opinions about RDA, and 93 included suggestions for improvement. While many respondents expressed an opinion (positive/negative/mixed) and provided suggestions for improvement, 11 respondents only noted suggestions for improvement to RDA. 24 respondents with mixed opinions on RDA included suggestions for improvement. 34 respondents with negative opinions included suggestions for improvement, and 24 respondents with positive opinions included suggestions for improvement.*

*55 respondents mentioned the toolkit with 46 respondents expressing negative opinions about the toolkit and 4 respondents specifically mentioning it as something they liked. Other users, while not specifically mentioning the toolkit, did note difficulties searching and the need for an index was mentioned at least 4 times.*

*A number of users also expressed difficulty understanding the RDA text. To answer evaluative question D4 “Is the text of RDA Online readable?” commentary from RDA Test Record Creator Profile Question 2 (RCP2) was reviewed. While specific numbers were difficult to obtain, the sample of quotes below provides a sample of some of the negative comments about the ability to understand the text:*

* *“The style and language of RDA is an obstacle to comprehending the rules.”*
* *“It is written more complicated than it needs to be. It is difficult to understand, and each person may arrive at a different conclusion from the same instruction. There are lots of inconsistencies and very confusing examples. It should be half the length it is. It’s cumbersome and repetitive to use and read.”*
* *“Trying to read through the second part of the rules becomes very frustrating, very quickly. It’s like reading word problems, and definitions are often of little help”*
* *“Many of the instructions are difficult to understand since they are poorly written.”*
* *“The goals of RDA are good but rules are written poorly. Difficult to understand and not enough examples”*
* *“The language reads like a legal document”*
* *“I found RDA rules to be vague and circular. One could not read a rule long without being referred to another location.”*
* *“In my opinion, the weakness of RDA is the “disorganized vagueness” of the RDA rules”*

*That being said, 2 positive comments were also included about the ability to understand RDA and are copied below:*

* *“RDA is extremely well-written and detailed for all formats”.*
* *“RDA is conceptually elegant and necessary for future access to library resources. RDA Toolkit should not be the only access – this cataloger also needs a print manual!”*
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