



DELIVERABLE

Project Acronym: Europeana Cloud
Grant Agreement number: 325091
Project Title: Europeana Cloud: Unlocking Europe's Research via The Cloud

D3.3 Evaluation report Evaluation report on integration of tools with Europeana

Revision: v1

Authors:

Agiatis Benardou (Athena RC)
Erik Duval (KU Leuven)
Gonzalo Parra (KU Leuven)
Anja Jentsch (Open Knowledge Foundation Deutschland)
Hein van den Berg (VU Amsterdam)
Giannis Stoitsis (ARIADNE Foundation)

Project co-funded by the European Commission within the ICT Policy Support Programme		
Dissemination Level		
P	Public	x
C	Confidential, only for members of the consortium and the Commission Services	

Revision History

Revision	Date	Author	Organisation	Description
V1	9 Feb 2014	Erik Duval	KU Leuven	First consolidation of existing material
V2	11 Feb 2014	Erik Duval	KU Leuven	Integrated input from Agiatis on evaluation with WP1
V3	11 Feb 2014	Giannis Stoitsis	ARIADNE foundation	Input for the ARIADNE Finder
V4	13 Feb 2014	Gonzalo Parra	KU Leuven	Integrated input on the Activity Stream
V5	14 Feb 2014	Anja Jentsch	OKFDE	Integrated input on the TimeMapper
V6	14 Feb 2014	Hein van den Berg	VU Amsterdam	Further integration of input on TimeMapper, rewriting of document, edits.
V7	14 Feb 2014	Giannis Stoitsis	ARIADNE foundation	Small updates and corrections
V8	14 Feb 2014	Erik Duval	KU Leuven	Finalisation

Statement of originality:

This deliverable contains original unpublished work except where clearly indicated otherwise. Acknowledgement of previously published material and of the work of others has been made through appropriate citation, quotation or both.



D3.3 Evaluation report

Evaluation report on integration of tools with Europeana

Executive summary

This deliverable reports on the evaluation of the tools developed and interlinked in WP3. That first set of prototype demonstrator tools was been created, integrated and evaluated. In this document, we present an evaluation of these tools.

This document is a companion document to D3.2, the actual set of tools itself, with an accompanying document that briefly describes the tools and refers to where the software can be accessed on the Web.

The final version of this deliverable is due in M30. The current version is the M12 intermediate version.

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Methodology	5
Evaluation with WP1	6
Evaluation with Axiom Group	8

(List of figures)

Introduction

Work Package 3 aims to develop services and tools that leverage Europeana content in the Europeana Cloud for researchers. During the first months, the work of WP3 focused on the development of personas, scenarios and use cases, in order to understand and analyse the user needs. This initial work on personas, scenarios and use cases was reported in D3.1.

For our target community of humanities researchers who work with Europeana content, more concretely the Axiom Group of Philosophy, three core problems have been identified through the personas and scenarios:

- problems with navigating and identifying relevant (digital) content and problems with building corpora;
- a lack of user-friendly tools for conducting fine-grained textual research;
- a lack of appropriate tools and infrastructure that allow members of research groups to work collaboratively.

Having the scenarios and personas at hand, we evaluated tools to support the workflow of our specific target audience. Thus, we were able to compile a catalogue of tools that should be adjusted to and integrated in the Europeana Research Platform.

Based on this work, a first set of prototype demonstrator tools has been created, integrated and evaluated. These tools are:

- an ARIADNE finder personalized for the Axiom philosophy group to help researchers search and find content coming from Europeana and other sources;
- the TimeMapper, an integrated visualization tool to visualize the search results on a timeline and an interactive map to further filter the content and get a better overview of the different resources found on Europeana;
- an Activity Stream, integrated in the above tools to capture and present the different actions carried out in this process (search, visualize, explore, annotate, download).

In this document, we present an evaluation of the tools. This document is a companion document to D3.2, the actual set of tools itself, with an accompanying document that briefly describes the tools and refers to where the software can be accessed on the Web.

Both D3.2 and D3.3 relate to task 3.2. From the description of work:

Task 3.2 Iterative design, development and evaluation of tools [M1-36]

Four of the WP partners will build upon 3.1 in order to adapt existing or develop new service/tool demonstrators that can illustrate how Europeana content will be put in use. It will assist WP1, offering the necessary materials, guidelines and facilitation support in order to help them organize iterative design workshops/sessions on envisaged services and tools. It will also feed into WP4 giving, guidance on the related metadata requirements.

3.2.1 Initial brainstorming and scenario building [M1-3, M12-15, M24-27]

3.2.2 Paper prototypes to gather initial feedback on early ideas [M3-6, M15-18, M27-30]

3.2.3 Gradual development of more functional digital prototypes in rapid iteration cycles [M6-9, M18-M21, M30-M33]

3.2.4 *Deployment of final implementations in realistic testbeds [M9-12, M21-24, M33-36].*

Deliverable 3.2 available at M12, 24 and 36

3.2.5 *Evaluation of technical integration of tools with Europeana Content [M9-12, M21-24, M33-36] Deliverable 3.3 available at M12, 24 and 36*

The work reported on here is thus a logical follow-up to the work of D3.1, which mentioned:

The main aim of WP3 is to develop tools and services that allow researchers to make optimal use of Europeana content. For this initial phase of work, we focus on developing tools that benefit researchers in the humanities. To this purpose, we have worked more closely with two concrete communities of researchers interested in using Europeana content:

- *The DM2E project (<http://dm2e.eu>) is also looking at “new tools and services for the re-use of Europeana data in the Digital Humanities”. Of particular interest for us is the Pundit (<http://www.thepund.it>), a ‘semantic annotation tool’ that enables the sharing of annotations between researchers. We have discussed (online and face-to-face) collaboration with this project and will focus in a first phase on a small community of researchers that focus on the Wittgenstein Archives at the University of Bergen – see http://wab.uib.no/wab_nachlass.page/.*
- *The Axiom group of history and philosophy of logic, semantics and axiomatics (<http://axiom.vu.nl/>) at the VU University of Amsterdam studies the ‘Semantics and Axiomatics from Bolzano to Tarski against the Background of the Classical Model of Science’. Also with this group, represented directly in eCloud through the participation of Stichting VU-VUMC, we have interacted both online and face-to-face.*

On the basis of this early interaction with the DM2E and Axiom Group, we have identified three core problems that many of these researchers face:

- (i) *problems with navigating and identifying relevant (digital) content and with building corpora;*
- (ii) *a lack of user-friendly computational tools for conducting fine-grained textual research;*
- (iii) *a lack of appropriate tools and infrastructure that allow members of research groups to work collaboratively rather than individually.*

In our work so far, we have identified

- (i) *search tools to find relevant content, and*
- (ii) *visualization tools (geographical maps, timelines) that assist in overcoming problems (i).*
- (iii) *annotation tools (see below), incorporating information extraction methods and Linked Data techniques, that help solve given problems (ii),*
- (iv) *and social awareness and discovery tools (see below) that help tackle (iii).*

These tools will be further developed, linked to each other, and linked to Europeana content in the next phase of our work. As such, WP3 will provide researchers in the Humanities with tools that assist them with various aspects of their work, ranging from the identification of textual resources to the analysis of these resources, and that allow them to fruitfully exploit content provided through Europeana.

Methodology

The basic methodology is that of User Centered Design [Abrams, Maloney-Krichmar & Preece, 2004]. As mentioned on the Wikipedia article about User Centered Design:

The chief difference from other product design philosophies is that user-centered design tries to optimize the product around how users can, want, or need to use the product, rather than forcing the users to change their behavior to accommodate the product.

In this context, we have had regular formative evaluation sessions over Skype or Google Hangout sessions throughout 2013.

More concretely, this work has been undertaken in collaboration with the DM2E project (and more specifically the Wittgenstein archives at the University of Bergen) and, in a more intensive way, with the Axiom philosophy group at the VU University Amsterdam. Especially with the last group, we had regular virtual meetings and a face-to-face meeting for feedback on on-going development and integration work.

In addition, WP1 also organised an evaluation session on 26 November, and we organised an additional evaluation session with the Axiom group on 31 January. Both these sessions took place on-line.

It is important to note that the evaluation sessions focused on usefulness and usability-in-the-large, i.e. on whether or not the WP3 toolset would actually be of any substantial added value to the researchers involved. We wanted, more specifically, to find out whether our approach could help them to actually *change* the way they work, whether such an approach would address problems that they may or may not be aware of in their current way of working, etc. We were *not* interested in whether the users can carry out their current way of working in a more efficient way.

Evaluation with WP1

Note This section reports on joint work with WP1. Some of this section may also become part of deliverable 1.7 (Research Community Evaluation Report), which reports on that work from the WP1 perspective, due in Month 36.

This section reports on an evaluation workshop, via Skype on November 26th, 2013. The workshop focused on the usefulness of the tools listed in D3.1, which were considered for inclusion in the mash-up then under development in WP3. (See D3.1 for more details on the tools.)

Participants in the workshop were: Lorna M. Hughes (NLW), Erik Duval (KU LEUVEN/WP3 Leader), Vicky Garnett (TCD), Owain Roberts (NLW), Stefan Ekman (SND), Thomas Baldwin (CERL), Eliza Papaki (ATHENA R.C.), Björn Sjögren (SND), Pavel Kats (EF), Gonzalo Parra (KU LEUVEN), Hein van den Berg (Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam), Dimitris Gavrilis (ATHENA R.C.), Andreas Drakos (ARIADNE Foundation), Alastair Dunning (EF/Project Co-Ordinator), Agiatis Benardou (ATHENA R.C./WP1 Leader)

The discussion considered the different tools listed in turn:

- **ARIADNE finder:** Unlike for instance Google, the ARIADNE finder restricts searches to specific collections relevant to the community of researchers involved. One specific example was discussed during the workshop: a search for the philosopher and mathematician Bolzano within the collections aggregated by Europeana. The participants agreed that this tool serves a major stage in the research cycle ‘search and discovery’. They suggested that it would be useful if the ARIADNE finder included thematic descriptions of content and metadata held both within Europeana and elsewhere, regardless of the possibility to access the material itself. It was further suggested to have a demo of not just text, but also of other types of Europeana content, such as image, audiovisual and 3D. The ability to preview audiovisual and 3D records would further nicely complement the view possibility offered by the ARIADNE Finder. Finally, when searching with the ARIADNE finder, it would be useful for a user to have the possibility to search by chronological area as well, and for the results to be sorted by specific thematic tags.
- **Visualisation tools:**
 - **TimeMapper:** There was basic agreement that this kind of tool would be of particular use to historians, art historians, and archaeologists. The main concern was whether this approach would scale up to larger collections.
 - **RelFinder:** The main concern related to this tool is that it draws the data from dbpedia, rather than from Europeana. Moreover, RelFinder does not necessarily guide the user to relevant content, as it is focused more on the relations between the terms considered.
 - **Muse:** There was quite a bit of discussion around whether this visualization tool would be interesting for researchers in Humanities and Social Sciences. In any case, this tool requires a multitouch table for interaction and is thus currently less relevant for experimentation in eCloud.
 - **MappingPhilosophy/GlamMap:** Again, discussion focused on whether this approach would transfer beyond the original scope of supporting philosophers.

- **Awareness tools:**
 - **TiNYARM:** There was consensus that this tool represents a good first step toward the promotion of collaboration and awareness, which could, at a later stage, be extended to material other than reading documents and publications. Similar to reading trends promoted and encouraged through TiNYARM, creating trends inside Europeana based on the most popular content reached or retrieved would be useful to the communities of both the Humanities and the Social Sciences.
 - **More!:** As this tool focuses more on real-time collaboration and awareness in a co-located setting, the link with Europeana content and the eCloud project is less clear.

- **Annotation tools:**
 - **AnnotateIt, Textus, Pundit, OpenAnnotation, DocumentCloud, Researchr:** There was agreement that annotation is a key activity in Humanities and Social Sciences and that tools of this nature would be most relevant. However, specific tools often have usability issues for Humanities and Social Sciences researchers. Moreover, they do not transfer well to non-textual material.

Evaluation with Axiom Group

After the first round of development (which included regular formative evaluation sessions, following the User-Centered Design approach), new members of the Axiom philosophy group (who did not participate in the formative evaluation studies) were asked to participate in an online session to discuss, evaluate and provide their feedback for the above tools. The meeting took place on the 31st of January 2014 and below, we present the gathered feedback.

General discussion

ARIADNE Finder

The members of the Axiom philosophy group had the chance to look and reflect on the Ariadne Finder. The general idea behind the Finder seems very attractive to them. They also believe that the Finder will help them in their work. The problem they face when searching for (new) resources is that they often end up browsing a lot of unrelated results or have to use numerous different sites in order to be able to search different collections. As a result, they often face a duplication of search results. Having a personalized tool such as the ARIADNE Finder, embedded in their site to search different collections from one point of entrance, would provide them with the ability to reduce the time spent on searching and browsing. They also find it useful to have a uniform way of viewing the metadata of the results, regardless of the initial provider, and value having the metadata in a cleaned format.

The users provided feedback on a number of things that could be adjusted in the Finder to better cover their needs. The need to filter search results per year is very important for them, as well as a facet to filter results based on the author of the resource. These needs are related to the way that philosophers search for resources. They usually start from the work of an initial researcher (philosopher, mathematician, etc.) and then move to work or (secondary) sources related to this person. For this reason, they also asked if a way of prioritizing results could be implemented. As was discussed during the meeting, a facet for authors could provide a suitable way to prioritize results, but other ways to cover this need can also be explored.

Another comment received from the group is related to the type of resources they usually work with. As philosophers, they usually work with books, as opposed to images or audiovisual material, and would like to access books more easily. Hence, they asked whether the respective facet could be pre-enabled when making a search.

Regarding the content itself, the philosophers noted that they would like to be able to search more collections and more providers, such as Google Scholar. They remarked that sometimes searches yielded a limited number of results. As was explained during the meeting, these limited results are due to the limited queries the ARIADNE Finder has used to harvest results from different providers. In the future, members of the Axiom Group will provide new queries to harvest and populate the repository.

Finally, they liked linking the ARAIDNE Finder to Wikipedia for immediate access to a philosopher's biography and asked for a small graphical change to get more search results per page.

TimeMapper

The philosophers took TimeMapper to be a valuable addition to their current set of tools. They study large collections of textual resources published in different historical periods, such as books on logic published from the 17th to the 20th century. They also study multiple editions of books, published at different times, in different languages, and in different places.

Identifying relevant content and learning about the existence of different types and editions of books is time-consuming and requires a high level of expertise. The TimeMapper provides the philosophers with a quick overview of which textual resources were published when and where, and thus allows them to quickly order and interpret these resources. The TimeMapper was taken to:

- (i) support the identification of (novel) relevant content;
- (ii) provide quick and easy access to important metadata (e.g., holding of a work, description of content);
- (iii) assist historical research by allowing the philosophers to identify and compare works published in the same period.

It was also noted that the tool could significantly benefit students in philosophy, who often have little to no knowledge of different (historical) textual resources.

Activity Stream

After discussing the other tools, the Activity Stream functionality was demonstrated to the Axiom Group. Whereas search or visualization tools may be considered familiar to the members of the group, an awareness tool is a new and possibly interesting addition to their current toolset. In its current state, the Activity Stream captures and presents traces of searches conducted with the ARIADNE Finder and of visualized searches using the TimeMapper. The discussion and feedback therefore mainly concerned these activities. Based on the feedback received, the relevant features of this tool are taken to be:

- (i) enhancing group awareness,
- (ii) supporting direct collaboration among colleagues, and
- (iii) supporting individual research.

Group Awareness: Members of the group remarked that the Activity Stream allows one to obtain an overview of each other's work. They thought this was useful, although they did note that having such an overview might be more relevant to the leader of the group than for junior researchers. Currently, the stream shows different daily activities of the researchers. It shows topics and the time taken to explore different ideas. The philosophers remarked that this overview provides information that might be worth to explore further or to discuss in the group. It was also remarked that the tool might help students to find unknown resources and to gain relevant contextual information regarding a topic.

Collaboration: The Axiom philosophers thought it was interesting to observe what other colleagues were searching and what results they obtained. Furthermore, they liked the possibility of building on research done by their colleagues, and to use search results that they did not think of themselves or that would have taken quite some time to compile.

Individual research: Regarding their individual work, the researchers saw the Activity Stream as an opportunity to save searches or visualizations without the need to always actively conduct these activities themselves.

In general, the philosophers liked the fact that the Activity Stream is presented in a separate screen. This ensures that the use of other tools (such as the Ariadne Finder) does not become more complex. They also look forward to connect other tools to the Activity Stream, so that multiple different kinds of information can be presented in the stream. Other functionalities they would like to see are:

- Ability to prioritize (or rank) and save successful search sessions. This will allow them to immediately continue their work at a later stage, without losing time by repeating previous actions.
- Possibility to search for activities based on a date.
- It would be interesting to include more information with the activities, such as the size of the result set or the different information sources used.

Other comments

They would like to see a way to save a search result, bookmark, send through an email (Annotation for search results)

Participants in this session

- Axiom Philosophers
 - Pauline van Wierst
 - Jeroen Smid
 - Dirk Gerrits
 - Hein van den Berg (also member of WP3)
- eCloud WP3 staff
 - Erik Duval
 - Gonzalo Para
 - Andreas Drakos
 - Anja Jentsch

Conclusion

The work of WP3 is structured around yearly cycles. In the first year, we focused on collaboration with the Axiom group of philosophers and, to a much lesser extent, the DM2E project.

D3.1 reported on the development of personas, scenarios and use cases. D3.2 is basically the software that resulted from our development and integration work. D3.3 summarizes the evaluations that took place throughout the project and in two specific evaluation sessions.

Basically, the user-centered development process seems to work as intended: the end result is positively evaluated by the intended users. An important issue for the next cycle is to connect the front-end tools for researchers with the back-end infrastructure of eCloud in specific and Europeana in general, so that we can work with more comprehensive content collections.

We are now at the start of the second cycle of WP3 and will soon start developing personas, scenarios and use cases for other contexts relevant for eCloud. We are currently considering potential communities to work with in this second cycle.

References

[Abrás, Maloney-Krichmar & Preece, 2004] C. Abrás, D. Maloney-Krichmar, and J. Preece. User-centered design. Bainbridge, W. Encyclopedia of Human-Computer Interaction. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 37(4):445–56, 2004.