Metanorma GSoD’21 Qualitative Audit

The qualitative content audit looks at the quality and structure of a single document.

To standardize the content more, we will use the [Diataxis approach](https://diataxis.fr/introduction/) to structure new documents.

# Analysis criteria:

The criteria for our analysis are:

* The types of content based on the 4 types of content in diataxis: Tutorials, How-To Guides, Explanations, Reference
* Readability using the Flesch Kincaid Index (0 very hard, highly academic - 100 very easy, elementary school level) using an [online tool by WebFX](https://www.webfx.com/tools/read-able).
* The Hamburg comprehensibility model, which consists of four criteria:
  + Plainness: No jargon (or at least explain jargon), short sentences, no complicated sentence structures
  + Structure: The text follows a logical structure, highlighted by (sub-)headings and formatting. Images and code examples are referenced in the text.
  + Shortness/ conciseness: If something is essential, it can be repeated in different words. Otherwise repetitions should be avoided.
  + Stimulating additions: Small injections that spark joy and interest, such as an example, or an analogy.

Since it isn’t feasible to analyze every page on the website, we are choosing the following representative examples:

1. Quickstart Guide (How-To): Tina <https://www.metanorma.org/software/metanorma-iso/docs/quickstart/>
2. Explanation (Ankita): <https://www.metanorma.org/author/approach/>
3. Reference / how to (Ankita): <https://www.metanorma.org/author/iso/sample/>
4. Reference: Tina <https://www.metanorma.org/author/ref/document-attributes/>

# 

# Analysis Results

## Quickstart Guide

**Analyzed Screenshot**: [Quickstart Analysis](https://drive.google.com/file/d/18m0CHtoW1aEkir-FwSkNNxIwCA24iW74/view?usp=sharing)

**Type of Content**: How-to Guide; mixed with Explanation

**Readability score**: 47 ≈ 10th grade level

**Comprehensibility**:

| Plainness  0 | Structure  - |
| --- | --- |
| Shortness/ Conciseness  - | Stimulating additions  - |

**Further remarks**:

* A lot of broken links (15 in total)
* Plainness:   
  There is jargon our target audience might not be familiar with (yet): “gem”, “dependency”, “cli”, “well-formed”, “semantic”, “flagging”.   
  The sentence structure is mostly okay. Sometimes it deviates by using semicolons ; or brackets (), which is not a good style. Some steps are implicit, that means they want the user to do something, but are hidden in a paragraph.
* Structure:   
  The subheadings should follow a logical structure, i.e. following the different phases: converting, authoring, compiling, etc.   
  The text within a section often requires the reader to know certain concepts before they are explained.
* Shortness/ Conciseness:   
  The text lacks context, that a less tech-savvy user needs to understand what and why they should do something.   
  The Quickstart guide is linked in the ISO documentation. In some sentences it says it was written for ISO, in others it says it is general -> Contradicting message for the user.
* Stimulating additions:   
  The text introduces topics that aren’t needed to get started. Example: The TIP on Ruby explains background information, but does not contribute to the goal to get the user started.   
  If the standard user is not very tech-savvy, code samples that are not explained are confusing.

**Summary**: The Quickstart guide could be understood by people with a high level of technical expertise, but still lacks structure.

**Recommendations**: A quickstart guide should be plain enough to help a non-technical, first-time user to get started

In its current form, the Quickstart guide provides 3 choices: New document, template document, converting from Word to AsciiDoc. A new user might be confused about these choices, so there needs to be more context on when to use what, or reduce the amount of choices. The choices should be covered from most likely scenario (conversion) to least likely scenario.

A general quickstart guide would make sense, based on the Metanorma standoc model and basic steps to convert, edit and compile a document. An ISO-specific quickstart guide contains everything from the general quickstart + flavor-specific additions.

## Metanorma Approach

**Analyzed Screenshot**: [Approach](https://app.diagrams.net/#G1k1NUxvgNgsE1L6QZDvEGtwT8nB-33bZd)

**Type of Content**: Explanation

**Readability score**: 24 ≈ 13th grade level

**Comprehensibility**:

| Plainness  - | Structure |
| --- | --- |
| Shortness/ Conciseness  + | Stimulating additions |

**Further remarks**:

* Plainness:

The text is mostly okay but still needs a much simplified explanation.

Input: Explain more about what and why Asciidoc. Need some examples and the language needs to be simplified.

* Structure:

Avoid the heading ‘General’, ‘Introduction’, structure is okay. Can also be previewed as a process:

What> Input> Process(Asciidoc vs Metanorma Asciidoc)> Output

Add a link to why Metanorma for further details and

* Shortness/Conciseness: Good to go
* Stimulating Additions: We need examples. Some visuals would work well or a small demo gif.

**Summary:**

We need this to be linked properly. Explanations shouldn’t be buried deep down in the documentation. In fact, this action should be one of the first sections to read in Authoring. Make it a general document. Adding ISO/IEC specific documents makes them NOT general. So, add it to the examples.

From [Document Format](https://www.metanorma.org/author/topics/document-format/) section, this section is supposed to be technical. Then, we need more technical details here.

**Recommendations:**

## ISO Sample

**Analyzed Screenshot**: [ISO Sample](https://app.diagrams.net/#G1e9-an2olsvXfdMcLDOgDc9jQELIQb9qM)

**Type of Content**: Reference; How-to Guide

**Readability score**: 50 ≈ 9th grade level

**Comprehensibility**:

| Plainness  + | Structure  - |
| --- | --- |
| Shortness/ Conciseness  + | Stimulating additions  - |

**Further remarks**:

* Plainness: Extremely blank page. The information is available in the Github repo. We need to add it here in plain terms. Explain the capabilities of ISO using the Rice Model. Avoid jargons like ‘MakeFile’, why need ‘yq’?
* Structure: We need to add a structure which is currently missing:

What is a Rice Model?

Why Rice Model?

How to install/work rice model?

* Fetching the document
* Installing build tools-- Docker, [Source files](https://github.com/metanorma/mn-samples-iso/tree/master/sources), Description,
* Managing an ISO doc

Building the sample: Loosely hanging (Add it in the structure)

* Shortness/Conciseness:Too short
* Stimulating Additions:
* Change the heading of the page: Capabilities of ISO using the Rice Model
* Add info from github repo

**Summary:** Add the content for ‘How to leverage this Rice Model’ as a sample to the page. Add the ‘[ISO Repo’ Github link](https://metanorma.github.io/mn-samples-iso/) as a link. Add the [Rice Model](https://www.iso.org/publication/PUB100407.html) link. When people come to a reference document, they need point blank information.

**Recommendations:**

## Document Attributes

**Analyzed Screenshot**: [Document Attributes Analysis](https://drive.google.com/file/d/1nG6egd_LBw8mHUWy_GaC84BHruWpMDCH/view?usp=sharing)

**Type of Content**: Reference

**Readability score**: 43 ≈ 10th grade level

**Comprehensibility**:

| Plainness  + | Structure  + |
| --- | --- |
| Shortness/ Conciseness  - | Stimulating additions  0 |

**Further remarks**:

* Plainness: The language used to describe the attributes is plain. Sometimes the description of the attribute is missing (“What does the attribute do?”).
* Structure: The sequence of the attributes on a meso and micro-level is unclear.
* Shortness/Conciseness: The descriptions for the attributes are often too short, so that important details are missing, such as if the attribute is optional or needed for a document to be valid. If, how many and what kind of arguments the attributes take. What problems to expect when using a delicate attribute, etc.
* Stimulating additions: More complex attributes would profit from examples.  
  Attributes “Visual appearance”: Since the selling point of metanorma is that layout and content are separated, the reader needs some background on when to use tags to manipulate appearance. Ideally this is discussed in a blog or Explanation doc & linked in the reference.

**Summary:** The reference is incomplete and lacks details that users need to know. Also, the reference is very long and has no structure, so it’s not easy to find information.

**Recommendations:**Structure the reference entries according to the best practices from the [Microsoft Style Guide](https://docs.microsoft.com/en-us/style-guide/developer-content/reference-documentation). To improve overall findability and navigation, add a layer of abstraction, for example like the [JavaScript Reference](https://developer.mozilla.org/en-US/docs/Web/JavaScript/Reference) did.