

Results from JISC DepositMO project user test of new deposit tools

Procedure This is the simple chronology of the deposit test process:

Deposit a Word document (using Word tool) Doc 1
 Deposit an image (using file manager tool) Image 1
 Deposit a pdf using the standard EPrints repository interface (PDF)
 Deposit a second Word document (tool chosen by user) Doc 2
 Deposit a second image (tool chosen by user) Image 2
 Update the second Word document (Update doc)
 Add an image to a collection including the second image (Add image)
 Deposit own content (Own content)

Results

Based on the tests we have a number of ways to analyse the results:

1. Times taken to perform the tasks
2. What users did, based on the repository record and observer notes
3. What users said, based on feedback from the test form

1 Time taken to perform set tasks

Can timings and task completion tell us about the usability of the deposit tools?
 Table 1 shows times grouped by process and tool rather than chronologically.

Table 1. Time taken by users to perform set tasks in deposit test process

	User 1	User 2	User 3	User 4	User 5	User 6	User 7
Total test time	73 mins	75 mins	?	84 mins	80 mins	71 mins	64 mins
Deposit time	61	67	44-54	63	56	46-51	47
1 st doc	4	3	10	5	7	2-7	3
2 nd doc	5	5	2	5	6	3	2
Update doc	7	3	1-10	6	2	3	4
Total doc time	16	11	10-19	16	15	8-13	9
1 st image	20	6	12	14	4	5	6
2 nd image	5	5	6	3	6	10	3
Add image	-	4	-	4	5	7	11
Total image time	25	15	18	21	15	22	20
PDF	8	10	14	13	17	5	8
Own content	10 two videos	30 doc ppt xlsx pdf	-	10 doc, pdf	8 zip, web site	8 video	8 images

Notes on Table 1

User tests were performed over a series of dates during June and July 2011. Some tests were simultaneous and co-located. In total 13 users performed the test in 6 pairs and one singly.

Users 1, 2: June 3

Users 3, 4: June 17

User 5: June 20

Users 6, 7: July 5

All users completed the same tasks, guided by the same instruction document. Minor amendments were made to the document between tests to improve and clarify procedure, as pointed out by users, where problems were deemed to be due to the documentation rather than the tasks and tools under test.

Times were recorded by observers for selected stages in the overall process. The repository timestamps, including the EPrints history for each record, were used to calculate times of individual tasks.

Where a time duration is unknown, or where a time range is given, the observer notes are incomplete.

Where no time is given, the procedure was not completed.

Where the process appears to be continuous, it is assumed that the last recorded deposit time for an item is the start time of the next deposit process, even if the first recorded deposit time for the subsequent item is some minutes later. This assumption is based on the need for users to assess the instruction and decide which actions to take, and that the time taken to do this is an implicit part of each item deposit process.

Not all user processes were continuous or followed the order of the instructions. Where this happens timings are likely to be less reliable, based on an assessment of the record and a judgement of how users proceeded. Such instances will be specified.

e.g. User 1: the deposit of images and the PDF appear to be interleaved, so apportionment of the times between images and pdf are approximate.

Deposit time \neq Total doc + Total image + PDF + Own. Allow \pm 1 min for each action.

Deposit time \neq Total test time. Additional time is taken to read the documentation for the procedure, and to complete questions before and after the deposit process.

Repository clock set 1h slow. (This is only relevant when comparing observer timings with repository record.)

General observations on times

The total time taken to complete image deposits was in all cases longer than the time taken to deposit and update Word docs. There was more variability in times of image 1 deposit, but less so for subsequent image deposits when the procedure was more familiar. Some image deposit cases were not completed, but all doc deposits were completed.

User Workarea or Under Review?

In the user's list of records in the repository, the status of some items is shown as Under Review while others are in the User Workarea. Typically when depositing to a repository such as EPrints the work is complete and ready to be made accessible by clicking the Deposit button. Some repositories have an editorial review buffer stage before access to a new item becomes public, and this is shown to the depositor as Under Review. An alternative presented to the depositor, or the default for an incomplete deposit, is 'Save for later', which effectively places the work in the User Workarea rather than in the editorial buffer.

In the case of DepositMO and preliminary deposit of in-progress work not yet ready to be made openly accessible to all, the work is not formally 'deposited' or ready for review, but only available to the user, in this case in the User Workarea. An In-Progress header can be used to indicate this status and in principle the new deposit tools can and should place in-progress work in the User Workarea, but that is not currently the case. All works deposited using the drag and drop file manager tool have this header and so will be in the User Workarea; those deposited using the Word tool will be Under Review.

No test users commented on this distinction, although there was concern over the distinction between 'submit' and 'deposit'. In some cases test users switched to the standard EPrints deposit interface to add metadata and then, inadvertently or not, clicked the Deposit button, which would have changed the status from User Workarea to Under Review. Hence it is not possible, from the respective repository records, to see a pattern in status that is consistent with the setting of the In-Progress header in the different tools as explained above.

User profiles

The test instruction document included two questionnaire sections:

1. Before any deposit actions, to find out the prior experience of testers in using repositories.
2. After deposit tests, to discover their reactions to the tools used in the test

This section summarises the findings from part 1.

1. *Have you deposited content in an institutional repository?* Yes 9 No 4

2. *In which repository do you deposit most?*
EdShare (3 users), EPrints (3), Blackboard (2), MediaBin (1), none (4)
3. *Do you deposit content regularly? Approximately how many items have you deposited in this repository? Over how long a period have you been depositing?*

Regular deposit	Number of deposits	Time period
No	70	2 years
No	30(ish)	2 years
No	Bursts	1-4 years
No	2	Ad hoc
-		
-		
-		
-		
-		
?	100s (images)	3 months
-		
?	4	10 months
?	15	1 year

4. *What type of data have you deposited:*
Presentation slides (4 users), research papers (PDF) (3), images (3), video (3), docs (2), theses (2), audio (1), research data (1), spreadsheets (1), handouts (1), reports (1), essays (2), computer project (1), database (1).

This presents a picture of a mix of experienced and new repository users, a reasonable profile for this test since the tools are aimed at both types of users. Among the experienced users, none claim to deposit on a regular basis, but some show many deposits of a wide range of data types over an extended period. In these results we will not be seeking to stratify the results between users and non-users, at this stage.

2 Results by users: what users did

In this section we get some insights into the times taken to perform the tasks by using the records of what users did, taken from the observer notes and an assessment of the repository records they created.

User 1 Pair. Experienced repository users, many deposits of a variety of content types over years.

From repository record

Hard to match record with observer notes and intended test chronology. Ended with 5 deposits of doc 1. Took a long time to deposit image 1. Appears to make some false starts with image deposit, did PDF, then returned to image 1 and ended with a collection of 4 images, including all 3 images provided in the sample data for the test and an additional image not provided. Deposited doc 2 (no metadata) and updated by adding a new item (with metadata).

Extracts from observer record

Deposit item 1 (doc 1) Clicked submit x2 so resulted in 2 deposits. "Would have expected an update" – both agreed. It's like a 'save' button – expect new copy of the doc. Item type – should be doc not unspecified

Deposit item 2 (image 1) Didn't work first time. Then did work when refreshed screen for manage items = Revision 11 though! But there doesn't seem to be anything actually there? Ghost image and also actual file. Went back 3rd time for item 2 -> added another image as the revision of the first Separate folder for each item? How would it tell which version? Well that worked = Rev 14 did what was expected

PDF Subjects -> LC/Dewey - choice? Tried to search for several subjects.

Image 2 Seems odd that would need to create a separate folder for each item. If I have to create a new folder for each item I am never going to use this!! Cut item from original folder. Waited for metadata file. Revised metadata - abbey by night. Resulted in a deposit with 4 files

Doc 2 MS Word error message about the file because it seemed to take the title and corrupt the file. Going back and try again - create new folder. Doc not corrupt at moment. Used short cuts to copy and paste -> my doc which I've spent months working on may have been corrupted ... Titles seem to be switching around ... and the doc seems to be fine when opened up in the repository Updating doc Error message – forgotten details which had been provided – username and password but no location -> went to item which was locked. *Hopelessly lost.* No confidence about which document we are working on Click on 'Submit' – then this created another copy Characterising and preserving How does it know which doc I want to update rather than creating a new version?

User 2 Single. Experienced repository user, many deposits of a variety of content types over years in different repositories.

From repository record

Appears to have completed all stages in correct order, and deposited a substantial number of own items including a variety of document and format types, although the collections appear to have become mixed within records, some duplication of items. All repository records can be identified by title, with supplementary metadata added to describe items within records. Looks like an exemplary result.

Extracts from observer record

Opening Word user panel. Missed (the Word deposit tab) at first; looked at repository. Needed prompt to 'show' the panel.

Image 1 Had closed depositMO folder after first use. Eventually realized it had to be reopened.

Doc 2 Reset user panel correctly. Added more metadata through EPrints deposit interface

Image 2 Named folder ('Bath') this time. Again added more metadata through repo. interface.

Update doc 'lost some of my added metadata' e.g. item type. Went back to add again

Add image User waited to see if more VIEW, METADATA files were generated. Noted they didn't. 'lost metadata again'. Added again through repo. interface

Own content Deposited 2x pdf + ppt via file manager tool. Added metadata via repo. interface. Added Word doc via panel, added metadata. Then copied ALL own content into one folder. Added one extra item to collection which overwrote previous title and added title of new item.

Parting comment: 'Like Word'. Would like other (Office apps). That would encourage. Don't like losing metadata.

User 3 Pair. One is an occasional repository user, the other a non-user.

From repository record

We don't have an end timing for the short break in the process prior to update doc, hence the span of time for this task and for the total deposit time. A lengthy time for first deposits of both doc and image. No image deposits can be found in the repository workspace for this user. On inspection, these deposits can be traced to the workspace of User 1, probably due to an issue with the user configuration file in the 'watch folder', which directs content to the user's login space in the repository. Image 2 was at first added to same folder as image 1, but then deposited separately in own folder. The docs and pdf do not use the config direction and appear correctly in this user's repository workspace, with a duplicate entry for doc 1, all identified with metadata. No own content.

Extracts from observer record

Opening CONGIG file. Doesn't automatically open – users had to open this in Notepad

Opening Word user panel. No label to say it is 'user panel'. Author panel had a label, which caused some confusion.

Resetting repository location in Word user panel. My testers missed out this step, so the process didn't work. They received an error message 'couldn't understand response from server endpoint' and realized their mistake.

Setting login in Word user panel. Password defaults to admin – confusing. No confirmation when new password is entered to say that the username and password works.

Doc 1. Two identical records were added to DepositMO. . Users updated one, so there may be two on the screenshot with different times. Some confusion over 'item type' and what this meant. The testers had a discussion at this point about

metadata, and how the repository found the title, as it wasn't the title of the document.

Image 1. Testers not entirely sure where the depositMO folder was. Users said they didn't understand what the script was meant to do. They misunderstood and thought they had to copy the image into the repository itself. On adding metadata to the image, testers were disappointed with this – they didn't understand exactly what they were doing. They expressed doubts that academics would do this (XML text edit). Image 1 didn't appear in the repository, although clicking on the View_item.html took them through to the appropriate record. It appears that drag and drop was adding the record to the 'user1' account, even though they had updated the Config file correctly.

Doc 2 Deposited using the Word App

Image 2 Deposited using the Drag & Drop method. The testers didn't understand the point of the different folders. Testers didn't set up different content folders at first, but realized their mistake and made a second attempt.

Testers had remembered most steps at this point. Testers commented that there are too many steps, it is not straightforward, and it is not that different to the existing eprints interface in that regard.

Add image. Testers didn't have time for this, but had inadvertently done this already.

Testers queried again how much more metadata you would have to add if using the Word app and the Drag and Drop options.

User 4 Pair. Both are non-users of repositories.

From repository record

As with user 3, which was simultaneous with this user test, image 1 and the added image appear in the repository workspace of the user 2 account, although this was avoided for deposit of image 2 by using the conventional EPrints deposit interface. Image 3 was added to image 1 and so also ended in user 2 account. As with user 3, this may partly account for the time taken to deposit image 1. All repository entries have at least basic metadata description and are identifiable in the list of records, including two items of own content but excepting the drag-and-drop items that ended in the user 2 account.

Extracts from observer record

Doc 1 "Show' panel not obvious – "need explanation" Prompted

Image 1 Just deposited item, not in list of records but can view item

Doc 2 Word user panel – need to update again "find it hard to remember what have done"

Image 2 Used EPrints deposit interface

Update doc Went to repository 'Edit item' button. Prompted – back to Word panel. "Check if it worked"

Own content 1 Word doc – deposited, then added more metadata through EPrints deposit interface

Own content 2 pdf – using EPrints deposit

User 5 Pair. Test users only to date, but expect to be more regular repository users in future.

From repository record

An unspecified item appeared in this user account just prior to deposit of doc 1. Image 2 is described, but image 1 with added image 3 are not.

Unusually for these tests the pdf is fully and correctly described, this taking slightly longer on this task than other users.

A large amount of own content was added using the file manager tool. These were packaged content – a ‘web site’ and zipped archive – and the aim was to see how the tool extracted and presented the contents. No metadata was added.

Extracts from observer record

Doc 1 Two unspecified objects in repo at this point + deposited doc. Picked up metadata from doc inc abstract: “Good”. Does doc need to be “tagged” for this to happen? “Good to have item type.” “Could improve description.” Started to add metadata via EPrints interface – “off piste”.

Image 1 Copied doc by mistake. Deleted – but it returned. Then successfully copied intended image. “Quite fun.” “Could be more user-friendly – populate metadata rather than XML.”

PDF Couldn’t copy-paste abstract. Worked 3rd time. Added metadata carefully

Doc 2 Want Word deposit set to default URL. “Like the way it flags up” missing metadata. Checked what’s there/not there: “still quite a few required fields not populated”

Image 2 Chose to use EPrints interface – “like to be able to add keywords, contextualise, but don’t know creator, etc.

Update doc Users checked this replacement but couldn’t identify which document to open at first

Add image This instruction assumes they would have used the file deposit tool to add image 2 – they hadn’t (see above). Added image to existing folder. Then didn’t know which item it had been added to – at first.

Own content “Quite like to test uploading a Web site.” The file tool grabbed lots of pdf files. Zip file: “Maybe it doesn’t like zip files”

User 6 Pair. Mixed experience pair: one had not previously used a repository; the other has used a media and image repository rather than an open access institutional repository such as EPrints.

From repository record

We do not have definitive observer time checks for start of deposit, hence the span of time for doc 1.

Doc 1 is listed with a title, but there is no other metadata in the record and full-text is not available.

Image 2 was deposited twice, accounting for the extended deposit time for this item. Added to same folder as image 1, then deposited as separate item as required. Title metadata added

PDF added with minimal metadata.

Own content included a large video (700 MB) and further attempts to deposit image 1 (an archaeology picture by a colleague)

Extracts from observer record

File manager deposit tool setup: user A didn't understand the config file set up although user B went straight to it and just did it with no comments

Doc 1 Options did not seem straightforward, there was clicking to find things and then going back. "We can't follow simple instructions" – they are too impatient they think. I think they were looking for a way to upload a new description but couldn't find one. There is confusion around the terminology of "submit" and "deposit". Tried to submit it twice because of confusion but recognised that when they got a warning or error message.

Image 1 Confusion about folders for deposit but reference back to the instructions helped. Some uncertainty about what to put in the title

Doc 2 Error message for address to deposit – some confusion until the right place found. Some confusion from two people working together not knowing what button the other has pressed. Some problems when didn't submit properly. They tried to submit again. Some confusion about how much information you HAD to put in before it would allow you to submit. What does "user work area" mean?

Image 2 Managed to submit things and then made the new folders which was considered to be confusing. Metadata file appears to have been rewritten – it did not contain the information they had submitted. Different file structure for this part of the test. It takes a while for the metadata file to be written. The metadata options generated some uncertainty with data deleted or overwritten and so the required things to enter could not be found. They lost the object that they had put in by putting it in the same folder as something else. They put it in again. Considered to be very fiddly, and creating a new folder for every file at this speed is too time consuming with the delay in the creation of the metadata file. AND then another object appeared in the folder – seemed to be a serious time lag for this to happen i.e. reentering stuff that is there but hasn't appeared yet... "This is evil".

Update doc Success first time.

Add image Worry and concern that this would break the system again! But some uncertainty about how this as a system would work, i.e. illogical? Problem – they think that the program keeps rewriting their metadata. The program is confused about the files and the metadata. Trying to sort it out took some time – Had to use the details to work out what was happening. Altered through the web browser (EPrints interface) which takes a long time to update the metadata file itself.

Own content Using the EPrints interface as it was considered to be the easiest way to do it. Video took a long time to upload but no problems.

User 7 Pair. Both are regular and experienced users of the Blackboard repository, and have deposited a range of content types.

From repository record

An 'unspecified' and unexplained record appears first, as for some other users. The first doc deposit has metadata, but doc 2 unusually has no description,

although it is updated correctly. The PDF is deposited with made-up metadata. All texts are deposited into the repository review area. From the summary timings, only the image addition is notably longer than other tasks. Deposit of image 1 appears to be unsuccessful, but it appears with image 2 (not according to instructions), both attempts listed as 'unspecified'. Then image 2 is joined with image 3 (as instructed) but with the title 'Waterwheel'. Finally, own content is a series of 6 images collected, again, under the name 'Waterwheel'.

Extracts from observer record

Setup demo repository Clicked 'New Item'. Added an unspecified object?

Setup file deposit tool, open watch_folder Incomplete

Image 1 Needed to advise opening watch_folder. "What are the unspecifieds that keep popping up?"

PDF Performed deposit without reference to the actual document provided

Image 2 Copied to same folder as image1, then set up new folder. Added metadata via XML page (did not display)

Update doc Opened new copy of doc2 in new Word window. Update didn't work.

Not previously submitted version – opened new? Found path in original eprint, updated successfully. "Hasn't identified title" Wiped metadata, "really annoying"

Add image "went in straight away"

Own content 6 images copied in one folder. "Worked well". Opened XML metadata page for folder. Then added metadata via EPrints form.

Found there were two items in repo! Renamed wrong item. Re-copied. Deleted generated metadata.xml. Failed to recreate. Copied again. Added metadata via EPrints form.

What users said after the test

Summary results

1 Would these tools encourage you to deposit more of your own content in a repository?

Yes (8) No (5)

2 Would these tools encourage you to deposit types of content that you have not previously deposited in a repository? Which type?

Yes 5 (inc. images, multiple presentations/teaching resources, computing files)

No (6) ? (2)

3 Which of the two new deposit tools (in Word, and in the file manager) used here are you likely to use if it was generally available?

Word (7), File manager (1), both (3), neither (1), repository (1)

6 Or are you more likely to continue to use the standard repository deposit interface?

Yes (6), No (0), ? (4), N/A (3)

This suggests that on balance use of these tools might encourage more deposit, just, most clearly in the case of the Word tool, but it won't be so easy to wean users off the standard repository deposit interface on the basis of these tools.

Fully transcribed results

The following are the transcribed responses to questions included in the test instructions and following the test procedure. Test users are from groups participating in the DepositMO project, and with an interest in the outcomes, representing different repositories, disciplines and projects, as indicated.

1 Would these tools encourage you to deposit more of your own content in a repository?

User1/1 (EdShare) Sorry-no

User1/2 (EdShare) Not yet

User2 (EdShare) Yes For me the Word tool. The MO deposit was initially exciting but the difficulty of differentiating between many files was frustrating as filenames were not carried over. The updating via Word for single files and also the addition of new items via MO leading to either loss or overwriting of previous metadata is v. frustrating.

User 3/1 (Library) The Word deposit seems very simple, provided it's easy to get the DepositMO add-in. I would like to know if I need to construct my Word docs in a particular way. In past I have only deposited pdf files. Image deposit seemed complicated and a bit confusing – not sure I'd use this.

User 3/2 (Library) I don't have to deposit, and have never done so, so hard to answer your question

User 4/1 (Library) Yes

User 4/2 (Library) Yes, but need beefing up for the less PC skilled

User 5/1 (Kultivate) If uploading Word files would definitely use the DepositMO tool. Not sure about other content.

User 5/2 (Kultivate) Yes – it is v. helpful to have the basic information format uploading automatically

User 6/1 (Archaeology) No – it seems too fiddly to use

User 6/2 (Archaeology) Not really, no.

User 7/1 (Archaeology) Yes

User 7/2 (Archaeology) Yes

2 Would these tools encourage you to deposit types of content that you have not previously deposited in a repository? Which type?

User 1/1 (EdShare) No. Folder deposit confusing

User 1/2 (EdShare) No. Word integration confusing

User 2 (EdShare) MO would be useful for multiple presentations/teaching resources **if** filenames could be brought over.

User 3/1 (Library) I don't have anything else to deposit

User 3/2 (Library) In theory – yes – but possibly only Word as that was easiest!

User 4/1 (Library) Not deposited before so can't comment

User 4/2 (Library) Yes, images

User 5/1 (Kultivate) N/A i.e. not new types of content, but would encourage increased deposit

User 5/2 (Kultivate) I think yes for PDFs (and Word docs) – of course the images still seem to require more work/metadata
User 6/1 (Archaeology) Not really
User 6/2 (Archaeology)
User 7/1 (Archaeology) Yes, images, computing files, not just Word docs
User 7/2 (Archaeology)

3 Which of the two new deposit tools (in Word, and in the file manager) used here are you likely to use if it was generally available?

User 1 (EdShare) Too unreliable and uncontrollable
User 1 (EdShare) File manager. Word version confusing in version control, settings and location of files
User 2 (EdShare) Word because it brings over more info initially.
User 3/1 ((Library) Word
User 3/2 (Library) Word
User 4/1 (Library) Directly from repository
User 4/2 (Library) Both if an academic. Neither in my library job
User 5/1 (Kultivate) Word, although if the file manager was more developed I would like this as well
User 5/2 (Kultivate) depositMO in Word
User 6/1 (Archaeology) The Word one is nicer and a good idea, but all are confusing
User 6/2 (Archaeology) Word
User 7/1 (Archaeology) Word depositor tool if uploading a text doc in Word, file manager for multiple image files etc. Both!
User 7/2 (Archaeology) Word was very useful for text. The file manager was good for images but possibly required a bit more prior knowledge.

4 How would you improve either of the tools?

User 1/1 (EdShare)
User 1/2 (EdShare) Make actions of file manager clearer (what is being updated and where)
User 2 (EdShare) More metadata extracted from original file e.g. title from name, creator from owner (if available) and also type (Word added-both showed as HTML files)
User 3/1 (Library) Word – I wouldn't require user to add/edit URL; Image – I think this needs to be made more user friendly
User 3/2 (Library) Metadata requirement (i.e. having to add title in HTML) in file manager prob off-putting to some.
User 4/1 (Library) Colour the buttons on Word tool
User 4/2 (Library) Not sure
User 5/1 (Kultivate) Some aspects were still quite technical - e.g. instead of repository control maybe more integrated into Word ribbon - although the guidance here was straightforward
User 5/2 (Kultivate) (On Word user panel) It would be helpful to have the login details save or remain the same (as well as the URL) so you don't have to keep filling that in
User 6/1 (Archaeology) The folder depositing needs to be more user friendly

User 6/2 (Archaeology) Folder + metadata file is too slow to update making updating metadata + creation difficult. The fact that the metadata was automatically altered, overwriting manual changes was confusing.

User 7/1 (Archaeology)

User 7/2 (Archaeology) The Word plugin was quite intuitive but you needed to know the file path.

5 Are there features of the new deposit tools that would deter you from using them for repository deposit?

User 1/1 (EdShare) Text edit of metadata

User 1/2 (EdShare) Word integration

User 2 (EdShare) Overwriting metadata which had been hand-edited when updating or adding additional files is a real turn-off.

User 3/1 (Library) Image deposit is too complicated. I wouldn't remember the URL needed for Word deposit

User 3/2 (Library) I have nothing to compare this with, but I did find too many windows open caused a degree of confusion

User 4/1 (Library) No

User 4/2 (Library) No, but require good training and support dcs

User 5/1 (Kultivate) With uploading images etc ... I think the time taken in standard way is about the same, due to adding metadata. I think the 'watch folders' idea is brilliant but needs to be developed further.

User 5/2 (Kultivate) (Word user panel) I would prefer to have the tabs all located above the doc or pdf but that is just a preference – it wouldn't deter me from using it

User 6/1 (Archaeology) Yes – metadata generation is buggy

User 6/2 (Archaeology) The fact that each file's metadata had to be in its own folder with that file -> hard to deposit large directories of files.

User 7/1 (Archaeology) No

User 7/2 (Archaeology)

6 Or are you more likely to continue to use the standard repository deposit interface?

User 1/1 (EdShare) Yes. Much clearer

User 1/2 (EdShare) Yes. Better/clearer control. Less ambiguous.

User 2 (EdShare) Would like to be able to use the new deposit tools more as the traditional, although v. good for library geeks like me, is long-winded for the normal academic.

User 3/1 (Library) Depends??

User 3/2 (Library) N/A

User 4/1 (Library) N/A

User 4/2 (Library) N/A

User 5/1 (Kultivate) I think a combination would still work

User 5/2 (Kultivate) Use this (standard interface) for extra/more complex metadata

User 6/1 (Archaeology) I think yes because it is proven to be efficient

User 6/2 (Archaeology) Yes, it seemed the most consistent and reliable.

User 7/1 (Archaeology) For adding metadata after uploading files yes.

User 7/2 (Archaeology) Hard to say. Have the alternatives available whilst working in Word or on the desktop means it is much easier to deposit data.

Any other comments?

User 5/2 (Kultivate) Really helpful for documents – I can see that for repository managers and even self-depositors this could be helpful, saving quite a bit of time.

User 6/1 (Archaeology) Good ideas but they are not easy enough to use. They seem slow and frustrating.

Steve Hitchcock
DepositMO Project Manager
11 August 2011