



AUTHOR(S):

TITLE:

YEAR:

Publisher citation:

OpenAIR citation:

Publisher copyright statement:

This report was commissioned by _____
and was published in the first instance by _____.
(ISBN _____; eISBN _____; ISSN _____)

OpenAIR takedown statement:

Section 6 of the "Repository policy for OpenAIR @ RGU" (available from <http://www.rgu.ac.uk/staff-and-current-students/library/library-policies/repository-policies>) provides guidance on the criteria under which RGU will consider withdrawing material from OpenAIR. If you believe that this item is subject to any of these criteria, or for any other reason should not be held on OpenAIR, then please contact openair-help@rgu.ac.uk with the details of the item and the nature of your complaint.

This publication is distributed under a CC _____ license.

**The impact of new technologies on the communication of
parliamentary information:
a pilot study**

RITA MARCELLA, GRAEME BAXTER AND NICK MOORE

A project funded by the Economic and Social Research Council and
carried out at Northumbria University and the Robert Gordon University

March 2002

CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
1.0 BACKGROUND	5
2.0 OBJECTIVES	7
3.0. METHODS	8
3.1. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACH	8
3.2. THE ROADSHOW APPROACH	9
3.3. THE INTERACTIVE, ELECTRONICALLY-ASSISTED INTERVIEW	12
4.0. RESULTS	15
4.1. PARLIAMENTARY AND DEVOLVED ASSEMBLY PUBLIC INFORMATION SERVICES	15
4.1.1. UK PARLIAMENT	15
4.1.2. THE SCOTTISH PARLIAMENT	16
4.1.3. NATIONAL ASSEMBLY FOR WALES	18
4.1.4. NORTHERN IRELAND ASSEMBLY	19
4.2. USER INFORMATION BEHAVIOUR	21
4.2.1. RESPONDENT DEMOGRAPHICS	21
4.2.2. PARLIAMENTARY INFORMATION NEED, PARTICIPATION AND USE OF ICTs	21
4.2.3. FREE-FORM INFORMATION SEEKING	23
4.2.4. EVALUATIVE FEEDBACK ON PARLIAMENTARY WEBSITES	27
5.0 CONCLUSION	29
6.0 ACTIVITIES	30
7.0 OUTPUTS	30
8.0 IMPACTS	31
9.0. FUTURE RESEARCH PRIORITIES	32
REFERENCES	33

ANNEXES	37
APPENDIX I: Host organisations participating in roadshow events	38
APPENDIX II: Interview schedule for Aberdeen roadshows	41
APPENDIX III: Protocol analysis codes	46
APPENDIX IV: List of topics chosen by respondents during the period of free-form searching	48
APPENDIX V: Sample transaction log for a period of free-form searching	50
APPENDIX VI: UK Parliament website pages visited (minutes of search time)	51
APPENDIX VII: UK Parliament website pages visited (percentage of search time)	53
APPENDIX VIII: National Assembly for Wales website pages visited (minutes of search time)	55
APPENDIX IX: National Assembly for Wales website pages visited (percentage of search time)	57
APPENDIX X: Scottish Parliament website pages visited (minutes of search time)	59
APPENDIX XI: Scottish Parliament website pages visited (percentage of search time)	61
APPENDIX XII: UK Parliament website protocol analysis (minutes of search time)	63
APPENDIX XIII: UK Parliament website protocol analysis (percentage of search time)	64
APPENDIX XIV: National Assembly for Wales website protocol analysis (minutes of search time)	65
APPENDIX XV: National Assembly for Wales website protocol analysis (percentage of search time)	66
APPENDIX XVI: Scottish Parliament website protocol analysis (minutes of search time)	67
APPENDIX XVII: Scottish Parliament website protocol analysis (percentage of search time)	68

TABLES

Table 1: Roadshow events: numbers approached, participants and reasons for non-participation	11
Table 2: Type of search undertaken	23
Table 3: Protocol analysis: minutes and percentage of search time	25

1.0 BACKGROUND

This report details the results of a pilot study, funded by the ESRC, to test the application of a new data collection tool - an interactive, electronically-assisted interview delivered in a roadshow environment - in the context of the public's need for parliamentary and devolved legislature information. This data collection approach was deemed suited to the exploration of a complex area of information need, in particular the relationship between information and democratic participation, combining, as it does, the capacity for observation of online activity with the opportunity to ask probing questions about both the quality and usefulness of information located and respondents' perceptions of the relationship between information and the 'active citizen'. The tool has potential for application in a variety of information behaviour contexts. Given that the interview is conducted in an electronic environment, it is particularly suited to gauging the potential impact of information and communication technologies (ICTs) on patterns of behaviour.

The roadshow sampling mechanism seeks to gather data from all groups in the community and not only those with an expressed need for parliamentary information, getting close to the everyday lives of those studied. Particularly targeted groups included those deemed in danger of social exclusion and, therefore, hypothetically less aware of the value of such information.

The project examines critically the ways in which government realises communication with the citizen, through new strategies emerging from notions of the 'Information Society' and of the role that ICTs play in encouraging public interaction with and participation in government. Transparency and openness are desired characteristics of communication which enable positive involvement and encourage consensus (Sutherland, 1992), where individuals require access to information 'for successful ... critical, participation in the accepted rights and responsibilities of government' (Policy Studies Institute, 1995). The value of such access is two-fold, to the individual in exploiting rights and entitlements and to government in encouraging active citizenship.

Constitutional change, in the form of devolution, has provided the impetus for government to restructure the processes of communication with the general public. The devolved legislatures hypothetically enable a more open and transparent style of government and the present project tests the ways in which the various legislatures' information strategies support this vision and the extent to which these strategies are succeeding in reaching and responding to the needs of users.

The present study also coincides with major developments on public access to government information, such as the *Freedom of Information Act* (2000), the non-statutory *Code of Practice on Access to Scottish Executive Information* (1999), a draft Scottish bill on *Freedom of Information* (2001) and the Welsh Assembly's *Code of Practice on Public Access to Information* (2001).

The UK Government has re-emphasised its commitment to 'information age government', setting a target of 2005 for all dealings with government to be deliverable electronically (Blair, 2000). Its strategic framework for e-government was published in 2000 (Cabinet Office). The UK Online initiative, providing a citizen portal to 'more than 1,000 central government websites', records that 37% of U.K. homes have access to the Internet - primarily A, B or C1 socio-economic groups (Office of the e-Envoy, 2002). A related media campaign encourages exploitation of ICTs, although spontaneous awareness stands at only 3%. While it is predicted that, by the end of 2002, 99% of households in England will be within 5 miles of an Internet access point, the benefit of such access is still in debate.

Recently produced guidelines for government website design emphasise: 'providing the information and services that users want'; a seamless mode of access organised around users' needs; users' 'right to expect' quality, accuracy and relevance; interactivity; and evaluating if users' needs are being met (Office of the e-Envoy, 2001). Given the present Project Team's focus on gathering data about users' needs and expectations, it is particularly satisfying to note this emphasis on the user reinforcing the conviction that such research is vital to the development of a governmental information strategy that not only meets stated needs but also anticipates unexpressed requirements.

2.0 OBJECTIVES

The aim of the project is to investigate the impact of new technology on the communication of parliamentary information from the perspectives of those in government and the users of the information.

The objectives of the project are:

- ***to develop a model of parliamentary information provision to the public in the United Kingdom in the context of a wider understanding of approaches globally***
– The development of a model has been partially achieved through the interviews with parliamentary information providers and roadshows gathering information about user information behaviour; although it is felt that, as a pilot, findings should be treated with caution and that a full-scale project would provide richer data underpinning understanding. A paper will be produced that draws comparison with parliamentary information and communications strategies in other countries, such as Sweden and the United States, which are regarded as particularly dynamic and effective.
- ***to explore, in particular, the actual benefits/drawbacks of technologically supported approaches for certain groups deemed to be in danger of exclusion***
– in the context of a pilot, it is felt that the roadshow approach has proven successful in gathering data about benefits/drawbacks for certain groups targeted, although there are a number of other groups for whom such investigation would be useful.
- ***to develop and evaluate an interactive, electronic interview as a data collection tool employed as part of a pilot roadshow and to make recommendations for future application***
– the pilot roadshows have been fully evaluated and the success of the approach has been critically examined in additional detail in a paper to be presented at an international conference.

3.0 METHODS

3.1. Methodological Approach

Methodologically, information behaviour research has moved from a reliance on positivist surveys to the use of diverse methodologies combining quantitative and qualitative approaches, enabling a holistic view of information need to emerge from the researcher getting ‘close to the data’ (Weingand, 1993). Wilson (1998), for example, has developed a methodology blending a qualitative approach with the collection of quantitative data on information behaviour.

Research has also developed into human-computer interaction in information seeking, utilising instruments such as transaction log analysis (Jansen, Spink and Saracevic, 2000) and verbal protocol analysis (Blackshaw and Fischhoff (1988), Ericsson and Simon (1993) and Nahl and Tenopir (1996)). The present researchers seek to combine these two approaches by developing a data collection tool which simultaneously gathers qualitative and transactional data and which can be delivered on a scale capable of quantitative analysis. Drawing upon previous experience of conducting large-scale surveys by doorstep interview (Marcella and Baxter, 1999a, 1999b, 2002, 2001), they build a holistic and informed view of information behaviour in a range of communities, echoing the move in research from a subject and cognitive approach to a person-centred one. While their theoretical stance is primarily phenomenological, they believe there has been much sterile debate as to the respective merits of quantitative and qualitative tools, which merely exist to serve a positivist or interpretive theoretical stance. The roadshow is a large-scale data collection tool, designed to utilise both quantitative and qualitative techniques in support of an interpretive research perspective.

The present project consists of two stages, the first of which took the form of interviews with representatives of parliamentary and devolved assembly public information services. However, the methodological discussion will focus on the piloting of a novel element, the interactive, electronically-assisted interviews executed during roadshow events.

3.2. The Roadshow Approach

The objective of the interactive, electronically-assisted interviews was to explore the actual benefits or drawbacks of technologically supported approaches to parliamentary communication, particularly for those groups deemed to be in danger of exclusion.

Roadshows, taken out across the UK, involved a researcher, aboard a minibus equipped with laptop and mobile data transmission equipment for Internet searching, interviewing members of the public while they explored parliamentary and devolved assembly websites. For a full-scale project, the vehicle should allow two simultaneous interviews to take place. Despite concerns about reliability, although noticeably slower than with land-lines, mobile download times were acceptable and stable, with only three (4%) of all interviews being affected by access problems. Back-up materials remain useful, however. A transaction log package was used to record online searches.

The roadshows targeted a sample of groups in danger of social exclusion, in three locations (Newcastle, Cardiff and Aberdeen):

- older people
- rural communities
- single mothers
- ethnic minorities
- academics (for comparative purposes)

Roadshows were to be associated with a host organisation and arranging these events proved complex yet crucial to project success. Some difficulties arose because of the timing of the project, while the structure and nature of the organisation proved a barrier to participation in others, where organisations could not guarantee participants or where staff were sceptical about likely response, given the ‘political’ research focus. Such bias was not uncommon and limited the pool of organisations available. Others were dubious about response because of: the gender of the researcher; potential breaches of confidentiality; and/or respondents’ perception of ‘stigma’ associated with membership of a target group. Gender issues suggest that the

concurrent presence of male and female interviewers, to assure respondents' safety and comfort, is desirable.

Fifteen roadshows took place, 5 in each geographic area. Nine exclusively involved targeted groups (3 with the academic community, 3 with older people, 1 with ethnic minorities, 1 with a rural community and 1 with single mothers). The remaining 6 involved a cross-section of the population, although with a realistic hope of including individuals from targeted groups.

As only 3 roadshow hosts were able to provide suitable minibus parking facilities, the remainder were conducted in a range of locations, from a café in Age Concern Newcastle to a mosque in Aberdeen (see Appendix I for further details). However, the 'roadshow' concept was as effective when held 'virtually' within an organisation's premises as when it took place literally in the mobile minibus. In both instances events were taking place close to respondents' everyday lives and with minimal disruption to participants.

Although the majority of the roadshows were held during Parliamentary and Assembly recess periods, this did not impact on public response. However, events should be timetabled to avoid unconventional periods of organisational activity. Prior display of promotional posters did not increase participation: no individual directly approached the interviewer asking to participate, all were 'recruited' by the interviewer approaching individuals and groups.

Although participants were informed about the purpose of the research and assured of their anonymity, they were not asked to sign any form of agreement or disclaimer: however, in the light of data protection concerns, it is recommended that this form part of future procedure.

Table 1 illustrates patterns of response.

Table 1: Roadshow events: numbers approached, participants and reasons for non-participation							
Host Organisation	Approached	No. %		Reasons for non-participation			
				Too Busy	Not Interest.	Afraid of IT	Other
Gateshead Library	33	5	15	14	11	-	3
Age Concern, Newcastle	35	7	20	6	8	10	4
Sure Start, Newcastle ^Ø	12	5	42	-	7	-	-
Park Rd CC, Newcastle ^Ø	29	1	3	17	11	-	-
Univ. of Northumbria	18	6	33	12	-	-	-
Rumney Lib., Cardiff ^Ø	21	5	24	9	7	-	-
Grangetown Lib., Cardiff	22	3	14	8	11	-	-
Rhiwbina Lib., Cardiff	41	6	15	16	19	-	-
Age Concern, Barry	25	4	16	-	16	5	-
Cardiff Univ.	55	9	16	30	16	-	-
Bressay Brae, Abdn.	20	3	15	-	17	-	-
Inverurie Library	41	11	27	12	18	-	-
Univ. of Aberdeen *	89	9	10	21	7	-	2
Aberdeen Mosque	12	2	17	-	8	-	2
Kincorth Lib., Aberdeen	13	3	23	4	6	-	-
	466	79	17	149	162	15	11

Notes¹

The Welsh and (to a lesser extent) Scottish roadshows were affected by some public hostility towards devolution while pages on the Welsh and Scottish websites took longer to download than those of the UK Parliament.

Over 460 people were approached and 79 were interviewed. While interviewee numbers were lower, and perhaps more realistic, than that originally proposed, the response rate of 17% is in line with similar surveys by, for example, doorstep interview (Marcella and Baxter, 2001). The results should also be viewed in terms of gathering data from a varied sample of the population and in particular from excluded groups. In this respect, the survey gathered data from a representative body of individuals by characteristics such as age, ethnicity and gender, and was particularly successful in reaching older people and economically inactive women.

¹ ^Ø Minibus used during roadshow

* 50 potential interviewees addressed as part of large assembled groups, so reasons for non-participation not known

Refusals consist of those individuals who were not interested in the topic (48%) and those too busy to participate (44%). A further 5% (all older people) expressed unwillingness to use the computer; although the interviewer felt that a higher proportion of non-participants had an unexpressed fear of the technology. Geographic and other demographic factors were not significant to non-participation.

When soliciting interviews, positive response is increased by the researcher being accompanied by an organisational representative or a previous participant who can reassure those nervous of the technology or uncertain of the purpose of the researcher. The potential of group interviews might be considered further, as there is some evidence from the pilot to suggest that reluctant individuals are prepared to take part in a collective event. A rolling approach in attracting older participants might also be utilised successfully, as those who had formerly refused were drawn to observe when interviews were underway.

Mouse technology was a major disincentive for older participants.

3.3. The Interactive, Electronically-assisted Interview

Three versions of the interview schedule were produced, one for each of the three websites being studied (see Appendix II).

The schedule comprised four parts:

- 1) Respondent demographics.
- 2) Past need for parliamentary and devolved assembly information, voting patterns, levels of political participation, previous experience of computers.
- 3) Free-form undirected information seeking, on a suggested or chosen topic.
- 4) User evaluation of the website.

The interviews constituted a successful tool, gathering data illuminating respondents' search for and evaluation of parliamentary information in an electronic environment.

To allow for open elicitation of respondents' thoughts, the free-form sessions utilised verbal protocol analysis, where respondents were asked to 'think aloud' as they searched. As respondents found it difficult to maintain a constant verbal report of their thoughts and actions, a greater incidence of prompts than anticipated was required to elicit evaluative commentary. A common prompt was to ask for reaction to the language and terminology used in the websites. Given the need to develop conversational rapport and to put the respondent at ease, these prompts were essential. However, in order to ensure a systematic approach, they should be pre-planned as part of the interview schedule.

Privacy was also significant, as respondents felt uncomfortable about thinking aloud in the presence of others. Interviews held in a private, or, contrarily, noisier location, elicited less self-conscious comment. Respondents frequently took the opportunity to voice opinions on unrelated topical issues, as in the Cardiff roadshows which took place a week after the terrorist attacks on 11 September 2001. This is not a problem that can be excluded, in that at any given point in time there will be unpredictable incidents dominating public awareness.

Crucial to successful recruitment and interview is the establishment of conversational rapport between the researcher and interviewee. It is important that an open discussion, rather than interrogation, develop. The researcher must be approachable, flexible and able to adjust his/her communications style to the individual respondent. Their gender, nationality and 'maturity' may also be influential.

The interviews were recorded on audio tape which proved problematic as a result of inaudible respondents, noisy locations and interference from mobile phone signals. Transcriptions were coded manually in a protocol analysis approach. Nineteen codes were constructed as the transcription progressed, reflecting the nature of comments made and behaviour exhibited during the search sessions, by the interviewee and the interviewer (see Appendix III: Protocol analysis codes).

Transcription and analysis was carried out on the basis of the time spent on particular protocols, and, while coding was comprehensive, transcription was selective, focusing on meaningful statements.

The roadshow, as a means of executing interactive, electronically-assisted interviews has proven its effectiveness as an instrument in gathering a variety of interlinked forms of illuminating data about people's information seeking behaviour. It enabled free exploration of technologically delivered information by individuals who may or may not have demonstrated a conscious need for such information, allowed them to respond to and evaluate that information and elicited a rich stream of data about the relevance of such information to their lives.

4.0 RESULTS

4.1 PARLIAMENTARY AND DEVOLVED ASSEMBLY PUBLIC INFORMATION SERVICES

Nineteen interviews were carried out with staff of information offices of the UK Parliament and devolved legislatures.

4.1.1 UK Parliament

The House of Commons Information Office's objective is 'to promote knowledge of the House of Commons amongst outside individuals and institutions' (House of Commons Library, 2001). Its 19 staff answered almost 93,000 enquiries in 2001, with an increase of 53% in e-mail enquiries and a drop of 22% in telephone enquiries. However, e-mail enquiries require more staff input and this is regarded as a major management problem.

The largest user group comprises members of the public (44%), followed by the business community (24%) and the media (10%). The most frequent topics of enquiry are MPs (33%), House of Commons business (10%) and legislation (10%). Enquiries tend to increase when the House is debating high profile topics.

There is some public confusion as to the respective roles of the Commons, the Lords and Government, demonstrated by the frequency with which inappropriate enquiries are received.

The Service's publications are made available in hardcopy and electronic form. These range from the *Weekly Information Bulletin* to over 60 Factsheets on significant themes. Staff promote the House of Commons by receiving visitors and giving talks. They also work closely with the information services of the devolved legislatures via an Interparliamentary Forum and staff exchanges, although there is a lack of consensus on best practice in relation to aspects of service. An inter-departmental

Group on Information for the Public (GIP) has recently been established, charged with developing an overarching information strategy for the House of Commons. The House of Lords Information Office aims to 'promote a better understanding and knowledge of the role and work of the House' (House of Lords, 2001). Its four staff dealt with almost 20,000 telephone and 5,300 e-mail enquiries in 2000-01. Enquiries are concerned with membership of the House (25%) and its business (25%). Again, high profile topics of debate cause dramatic increases. Major user groups include the general public, schools, lobbyists and journalists. Enquiries tend to demonstrate confusion as to the business of the House and the nature of its membership. The Service publishes a guide to the House and a set of briefing papers on its role and work. Promotional efforts consist of the production of information packs and slide materials.

The Parliamentary Education Unit is aimed at teachers and young people, producing worksheets, videotapes and slides, and organising visits for young people and teacher training days. It hosts an educational website, *Explore Parliament*, explaining the activities of Parliament, with interactive features.

The overarching U.K. Parliament website was introduced in 1996, to enable free access to parliamentary papers and legislation and to 'encourage wider public interest in, and, knowledge of, the business of the House' (House of Commons Information Committee, 1996). The site's development has been erratic, with disaggregated responsibility for e-content resulting in an unapproachable site for the inexperienced. The site presents navigational difficulties for those with little knowledge of parliamentary procedure and terminology. A redesigned site is to be launched in Summer 2002. A live webcasting service began in January 2002.

4.1.2 The Scottish Parliament

The Scottish Parliament's Public Information Service aims to ensure that 'the Parliament is as open, accessible and participative as possible. Only well-informed citizens can maximise the opportunities ... to contribute to the democratic process' (Consultative Steering Group on the Scottish Parliament, 1998). The Service,

influenced by that of the Swedish Parliament, consists of an Enquiry Unit, an Education Service and a Visitor Centre. It has a clearly stated set of aims - to ensure access to **all** members of the public, to increase interest in and contribution to the work of the Parliament and to provide high quality information that meets users' needs.

Over 7,400 extended enquiries were dealt with in 2000-01, of which 67% were made by telephone and 26% by e-mail (Scottish Parliament, 2001; Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body, 2001). The latter tend to require an individualised response and greater staff effort, although same-day response is the norm. Around 43% of enquiries concern parliamentary business or procedure, 18% relate to MSPs and 10% visits to the Parliament. A significant number are wrongly addressed (19%) and indicate confusion about the role of Parliament and Executive. No record is kept of category of user, despite the emphasis on users' needs in the Service's aims. The major published output consists of eight Factfiles on significant themes such as *You and Your MSP*.

The Visitor Centre attracted over 35,000 visitors in 2000-01 and has an information desk staffed by the Public Information Service. The Education Service caters for the wider educational community, offering visits to the Parliament (223 schools in 2000-01), events such as pupil conferences and parliaments, and an enquiry service for pupils undertaking projects.

Promotional work is limited by the decision not to offer talks to groups, as it was felt that this would disadvantage remoter communities. However, Information Service staff are present at Committee meetings throughout Scotland, using these as an opportunity for outreach.

Reciprocal staff exchanges have taken place with the House of Commons and Welsh Assembly services, and staff are also represented at the Interparliamentary Forum: however, the Scottish service regards interaction as an opportunity to share good practice rather than to identify alternative approaches.

A network of 80 public library 'Partner Libraries' has been established across the 73 parliamentary constituencies, acting as a focal point for information about the Scottish Parliament, providing free access to the Parliament site (37% of libraries at present) and hosting MSPs' surgeries (18%) (Scottish Parliament Information Centre, 2001). In return, Partners receive free publications, support in answering enquiries and training in the use of parliamentary documentation.

The Scottish Parliament website aims to provide 'a popular information service for the public, media and special interest groups' (Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body, 2000). A webcasting facility broadcasts coverage of all proceedings and, in 2000-01, 6.5 million visits to website pages were made.

4.1.3 National Assembly for Wales

The Welsh National Assembly's Public Information and Education Service provides information to the public and encourages growth in awareness and interest in its activities. Twenty-two staff operate in three teams and the Information Line and Correspondence Team comprises two staff who handle approximately 120 telephone and 85 e-mail enquiries each week. Although standardised e-mail replies are used, the majority require individualised responses and the target is a three-day turn-around. Although no analysis takes place, requests for information about Members are frequent, as are those on policy. No data are held on category of user, but the business and educational communities are thought to predominate. There is public confusion over the distinction between devolved and reserved powers, while some enquirers believe their Assembly Member has replaced their MP.

The Assembly's Marketing and Communications Team attends major public events, with plans to increase outreach activities associated with Regional Committee meetings across Wales. Publications include a basic introduction to the work of the Assembly and a series of five information leaflets on Assembly business. All are available in Welsh and English.

The Education Team organises visits, with over 80 taking place in 2000-01. Other special events include lectures by Assembly Members, 'Question Time' sessions in the Chamber and videoconferencing with schools.

Staff have visited the House of Commons and Scottish Parliament information services and attended the Interparliamentary Forum.

As in Scotland, the Welsh service works with public libraries through their Information Link network, based (unlike Scotland) on a formal partnership agreement, where partners are given 'free and open access' to Assembly information in printed and electronic form. The Welsh service also has a publicly accessible Publications Centre, which receives significant numbers of telephone and e-mail enquiries, a model that Scotland will adopt in the move to its new Holyrood building.

The Welsh Assembly website represents one of the Assembly's key approaches to openness, with the site forming an important part of the commitment to inclusion and access. A variety of textual materials is available but no webcasting facilities.

4.1.4 Northern Ireland Assembly

Although power was devolved to the new Northern Ireland Assembly in 1999, delays in the peace process have resulted in its public information service being less advanced than those in Wales and Scotland. With three staff, it does not currently have a mission statement, but reflects the desire for 'a high standard of information and communications systems' in support of the Assembly's aim to be 'as open, transparent, accessible and accountable as possible' (Fee, 1999).

Although enquiries are not systematically recorded, they appear to be growing with approximately 20-25 telephone enquiries a day from the public and 10-12 from the press. Approximately 20 e-mail enquiries are received a week. Again, 'popular' issues impact on numbers. Most enquiries are answered on the day of receipt and there is, as with the other services, public confusion between devolved and reserved matters. A *Weekly Information Bulletin* is produced, while an education programme

for schools is planned. Although no visitor centre is proposed, tours of the Assembly building can be arranged.

The Assembly's website seeks to provide the kinds of information 'essential if the Assembly is to be an open and accountable body' (Fee, 1999). It hosts Assembly documentation, information on the history and Members of the Assembly, as well as live video broadcasts from the Chamber.

4.2. USER INFORMATION BEHAVIOUR

4.2.1. Respondent demographics

During 15 roadshows, 79 interviews were conducted, 24 in Newcastle, 27 in Cardiff and 28 in Aberdeen. Forty interviewees were male, 39 female. There was an even spread by age across respondents, with only those under 20 (3 cases) poorly represented. Ethnic minorities comprised just under 8%, a figure fairly representative of the UK population as a whole (estimated at 7% (Office for National Statistics, 2001a)).

Just under a quarter (i.e. 19 of 79) of the respondents were economically active, considerably lower than the national figure of 50% (Office for National Statistics, 2001b), while almost 40% (30 of 79) were retired. Given that the roadshows targeted less active members of the public, these figures are acceptable. Those respondents in employment tended to be in Socio-economic Classifications 1 and 2.

Almost half (37) had completed school education only, a third (25) had completed an undergraduate or higher degree, and one-fifth had completed a further education course. Over a quarter were currently studying for a university award.

Six respondents (8%) described themselves as disabled. This response is lower than national estimates which range from 15% (Ability, 2002) to 17% (Whitfield, 1997). Greater efforts are required to target this particular group via roadshows.

4.2.2. Parliamentary information need, participation and use of ICTs

Only 20 respondents had previously tried to find parliamentary information. Sixteen had sought information on the UK Parliament; 3 on the National Assembly for Wales; and 6 on the Scottish Parliament.

Those who had sought parliamentary information had required information about: legislation (14 cases); constituencies and elected members (3); general interest (2); policy (1); parliamentary job vacancies (1); and student loans (1). Much of the material sought was required for educational reasons.

Of the 69 respondents eligible to vote, 60 (87%) claimed to have voted at the 2001 General Election. This is a far higher figure than the actual national turnout at 58%, the lowest since the First World War (Gould, 2001). Similarly 59% indicated that they had voted in the 1999 European Parliament Elections: actual turnout in the UK was 23%, the lowest in the Union (BBC, 1999). Either the respondents are atypically active politically or they are over-reporting, a not uncommon feature of surveys.

Conversely, when asked if they otherwise participated in the political process, only 19 (just under a quarter) believed themselves to be politically active: 12 of 24 Newcastle, 5 of 27 Cardiff, and only 2 of 28 Aberdeen respondents. Types of participation involved: informal discussion (9 cases), membership of a political party (3), membership of a pressure group (2), distributing political material(1), contact with local councillors (1), directorship of a political club (1), administration of the Campaign for a Welsh Parliament (1), and mock elections at School (1).

While there was correlation between political activity and voting, there was no correlation between activity and past need for parliamentary information.

Forty-eight of the 79 respondents were regular computer users and overall three-quarters (60 of 79) used a computer on at least an occasional basis. Just under a quarter of the sample were first-time computer users, although it should be noted that fear of the technology may have deterred a number of potential interviewees. Eighty-five per cent of those who had used a computer found them very or quite easy to use. Forty-seven respondents had previously used the Internet, and 11 of those had previously sought parliamentary information on the Internet.

4.2.3. Free-form information seeking

Table 2 illustrates the type of search undertaken.

<i>Table 2: Type of search undertaken</i>				
Type of search	Website			
	UK Parliament	Nat. Assembly for Wales	Scottish Parliament	Totals
Search for info on specific topic(s)	10	19	10	39
General browse	12	7	14	33
General browse leading to specific search	2	1	4	7
Total	24	27	28	79

Just under half (39 of 79) looked for information on a specific topic, while 33 browsed generally. Some browsed initially then focused upon a specific search. The proportions were similar whether experienced or first time users.

Of the 46 who undertook a specific search, 18 selected topics from the researchers' list of suggested topics. The other 28 sought a topic of their choice (see Appendix IV for full list). The interviewer did not direct subject choice, despite the fact that a parliamentary website might not have been the most obvious source. Information was found on the majority of topics selected.

Participants expressed an interest in a range of both general and very specific topics. They frequently looked for topics with local significance or for information about their parliamentary or Assembly Member, despite the initial topic selected.

Thirteen participants refused to use the mouse, preferring to delegate navigation to the interviewer. Of these, 11 were first-time computer users and 2 were occasional users: all were aged 45 or over.

The 76 (6 individuals worked in pairs) online search sessions varied considerably in length, ranging from 3 to 45 minutes, with an average of 17 minutes. Factors affecting duration included: the time that the respondent had to spare; level of interest in the information found; and data download times.²

Although the greatest proportion of online time (almost 20%) was devoted to using search engines, only 35 of the 76 searches involved any use of the search engine and those interviewees with highly specific searches spent disproportionately long on this activity. Respondents also spent significant periods (13%) on Home Pages exploring site content. Other popular areas included education, Members' information and news sections.

² Full transaction logs of all searches provide data as to the pages visited (see Appendix V for a sample search log), while a full breakdown of the website pages/sections visited can be found in Appendices VI – XI.

Table 3 provides a summary of the results of the protocol analysis for each of the three websites (see Appendix III for the full explanation of codes).

Table 3: Protocol analysis: minutes and percentage of search time								
Coding Categories	Website							
	UK Parliament		Nat. Assembly for Wales		Scottish Parliament		Total	
	Mins	%	Mins	%	Mins	%	Mins	%
Interviewee Categories								
IE Search	86.8	20.1	36.7	9.6	34.3	7.5	157.8	12.4
IE Browse	51.5	11.9	24.6	6.5	47.5	10.4	123.6	9.7
IE Navigate	6.0	1.4	4.7	1.2	4.2	0.9	14.9	1.2
IE Read aloud	22.0	5.1	18.1	4.8	16.1	3.5	56.2	4.4
IE Read internal	30.4	7.0	33.4	8.8	46.5	10.1	110.3	8.7
IE Positive	17.8	4.1	7.5	2.0	10.9	2.4	36.2	2.8
IE Negative	33.0	7.6	20.5	5.4	17.2	3.8	70.7	5.6
IE Parliament	7.4	1.7	1.5	0.4	8.3	1.8	17.2	1.3
IE IT	5.0	1.2	5.3	1.4	1.8	0.4	12.1	0.9
IE Project	-	-	1.7	0.4	3.3	0.7	5.0	0.4
IE Political	8.3	1.9	53.7	14.1	25.3	5.5	87.3	6.9
IE Personal	16.7	3.9	23.8	6.2	31.6	6.9	72.1	5.7
Interviewee Total	284.9	65.9	231.5	60.8	247.0	53.9	763.4	60.0
Interviewer Categories								
IR Search	32.3	7.5	24.4	6.4	30.2	6.6	86.9	6.8
IR Navigate	87.7	20.3	89.5	23.5	113.9	24.8	291.1	22.9
IR Question	7.5	1.7	7.1	1.8	5.4	1.2	20.0	1.6
IR Parliament	2.4	0.5	4.8	1.3	19.1	4.2	26.3	2.1
IR IT	5.0	1.2	13.1	3.4	17.5	3.8	35.6	2.8
IR Project	0.5	0.1	7.9	2.1	13.6	3.0	22.0	1.7
Interviewer Total	135.4	31.3	146.8	38.5	199.7	43.6	481.9	37.9
Interruptions	12.2	2.8	2.6	0.7	11.5	2.5	26.3	2.1
Grand total	432.5	100	380.9	100	458.2	100	1271.6	100

Supporting the emphasis on the need for support in navigation, 22.9% of search time consisted of the interviewer providing navigational instructions and advice, compared with only 12.4% of unassisted search formulation on the part of the interviewee. These were the two protocols that occupied most of the think-aloud narrative.

Experienced computer users tended to be less reliant on advice and guidance from the interviewer. Of the 37 respondents whose protocols occupied 60% or more of the time online, 31 were regular computer users; while of the 42 interviewees whose protocols occupied less than 60% of the time, only 17 were experienced.

A number of interesting findings emerge from the protocol analysis which are summarised below:

- ❑ Users frequently combined a specific search with browsing activity.
- ❑ Time spent in formulating searches ranged from just under one minute for a basic search to over 31 minutes for a highly specific search.
- ❑ Respondents experienced in using ICTs required less interviewer input in formulation and execution of searches.
- ❑ Search engine queries were less successful than those conducted via website menu structures.
- ❑ Users did not consult online search help facilities.
- ❑ Searches were conducted largely via keywords, with some use of limiters, such as date or type of document, often with no understanding of the significance of the latter.
- ❑ Searches tended to result in unmanageable numbers of hits, through which users began to browse but quickly became dissatisfied and discontinued the search.
- ❑ Searchers tended not to use full search functionality – only one used Boolean operators – and were unfamiliar with phrase matching.
- ❑ Inexperienced computer users required interviewer guidance on a variety of features, such as use of the scroll-bar or the nature of hypertext links.
- ❑ Much of the users' online time was spent reading internally and digesting the information presented.

- The frequency of excessively large documents, with long download times, discouraged users.
- The Scottish Parliament website search engine was particularly frustrating for users, in its seeking exact phrase matches for any two keywords entered together, resulting in very low numbers of hits.
- Respondents frequently made qualitative comments about the nature and content of websites visited:
 - a) Positive comments were made about the quantity and usefulness of the information available, the ease of use of the sections aimed at children (for adult users), the detailed material available on some topics and the ability to e-mail a Minister.
 - b) Negative comments were made about website design features, the legibility of text, the poor structure of sites, broken and interrupted hypertext links.
- Users took advantage of the roadshow interviews to discuss broader political issues and current issues of concern, such as the Government, the Parliament and Assembly buildings, political participation. Welsh (15 of 27) and Scottish (16 of 28) respondents were more likely to do so than English (only 3 of 24). This would suggest that the roadshow approach has additional potential in eliciting such data.
- Many respondents also freely contributed personal information about their past use of computers, their newspaper reading habits, education, career choices and so on.

4.2.4. Evaluative feedback on parliamentary websites

Overall 68 of the 79 participants believed that the website they examined was a useful information source and served a useful purpose. Various themes underpinned this sense of value: depth of information coverage (15 cases); reliability of information (13); ease of access (12); that this represented ‘the way ahead’ (8); supporting education (3); and encouraging political interaction (2). Eight participants were concerned, however, about the means and costs of access; 4 felt the approach more suited to younger people; and 1 person preferred the media as a source. Two

participants felt that the information was boring; 2 that it was of little interest to 'ordinary people'; and 6 expressed dissatisfaction with search functionality. In terms of ease of use, all 3 sites were rated favourably (the Scottish Parliament site was particularly highly rated). Of the 19 first-time computer users, 17 felt the website had been easy to use. Equally, of the 32 participants aged 55 and over, only 4 recorded difficulties. However, it should be noted that the interviewer had played a more active role with many first-time users and older participants.

Sixty-one of the 79 participants felt that the retrieved information had been very or quite interesting (fewer for the UK Parliament site). Sixty-nine of the 79 found the retrieved information very or quite easy to understand, with the best ratings recorded for the Scottish Parliament website. However, only 43 of the 79 respondents believed that the retrieved information was relevant to their lives, while 36 indicated that it was irrelevant (the UK Parliament site ranked least relevant).

When asked how they would go about finding more information on their chosen topics, respondents would:

- Go back to the parliamentary website (19 cases);
- Use a general search engine (10);
- Consult the media (including websites) (6);
- Approach local council or councillors (5)
- Use libraries (5);
- Approach other governmental websites (4);
- Telephone experts (2);
- Approach political party websites (1);
- Approach interest group websites (1);
- Approach Assembly Members or the Assembly direct (10 all Wales).

Web sources were cited by 29 of the 46 participants who might search for further information, with 18 citing **only** online sources. Sixty-one of the 79 participants said they would use the parliamentary website again, suggesting that roadshow exposure might change behaviour: however, only 10 of the 19 first-time computer users would

do so. Various reasons for possible future visits were given, including: to support studies (16); to expand on media reports (6); work-related reasons (5); in relation to a personal problem or issue (5); jobseeking (1); pursuing environmental interests (1); and for local interest (1). Only 3 participants cited political reasons: to support an interest in politics (1); to aid voting decisions (1); and to 'harass Welsh Assembly members' (1).

Participants saw the advantages of electronic access as: overcoming mobility problems; keeping up with other family members; as materials became less available in print; and improved access for rural communities. For those who would be unwilling to visit the parliamentary sites again the following factors were influential: lack of interest in politics (7); lack of interest in ICTs (2); lack of access to a computer (3, all retired); and an existing surfeit of information about politics (1).

5.0 CONCLUSION

Although the present project was only a pilot and its findings should, therefore, be regarded with caution, the results would appear to indicate that the availability of information in readily accessible electronic form is not enough alone to encourage citizen participation. Other motivators and forms of support are required in order to encourage and enable people to access, use and apply that information and to encourage them to use ICTs to interact with democracy.

The model of parliamentary information communication to the public is one where two-way interaction is desirable, yet where the public may be unaware of or disinterested in such interaction. The issue of relevance is the single most significant factor in impacting upon user behaviour. In order to encourage participation, communications via ICTs must visibly enable meaningful and useful interaction that is relevant to citizens' everyday lives. However, results also suggest that supported exposure to parliamentary websites may cause individuals to change behaviour and develop new perspectives on the value of such information and that the roadshow concept is a valuable vehicle via which to enable such exposure while simultaneously gathering further data about user attitudes and needs.

6.0 ACTIVITIES

The Project Team were represented by Rita Marcella at the Gender Research Forum organised by the Cabinet Office in London, at which a paper was presented on gender aspects of information need, in the context of European information and communications strategies. This provided an opportunity to touch on the present project in particular in terms of gender issues associated with the roadshow approach and gender variations emerging from analysis.

7.0 OUTPUTS

Two papers are in the process of publication on the project. The first constitutes an in-depth review of the theoretical and methodological debate that led to the development of the roadshow approach. It is scheduled for publication in March 2002. Given that this is a twelve month project, and in the light of publication schedules for highly ranked refereed journals, earlier publication was impossible.

Marcella, R., Baxter, G. and Moore, N. (2002). Theoretical and methodological approaches to the study of information need in the context of citizenship and new information and communication technologies. *Journal of Documentation*, 58 (2), pp. 167 – 190.

The second paper evaluates critically, and in great detail, the methodology in terms of the effectiveness and validity of the execution of the interactive, electronically-assisted interview in a roadshow environment.

Marcella, R., Baxter, G. and Moore, N. (2002) . *The interactive electronically assisted interview, delivered via mobile roadshows, as a means of gathering information about the impact of technology on information-seeking behaviour in the context of parliamentary and devolved*

legislative information: a pilot study. Fourth Information Seeking in Context Conference, Lisbon, September 2002.

Three further papers are in preparation:

1. On the results of the interviews with service providers for *Government Information Quarterly*, which will review the strategies adopted by the UK Parliaments and legislatures.
2. On the results of the interviews with users on their patterns of information seeking behaviour, for *Information Processing and Management*.
3. On the policy implications of the findings and comparison of strategies globally for *Policy Studies*.

8.0 IMPACTS

All of the parliamentary and devolved legislature information services participating in the project will be provided with a copy of the end of award research report. It is hoped that the findings will provide useful data on user needs and response in particular to their websites.

Aberdeen City, Aberdeenshire and Gateshead Borough local authorities have all expressed an interest in the results of the project. They are particularly interested in the application of the roadshow approach in developing their own information and communication strategies. News articles about the project may also encourage interest in the project and the piloted methodology in other governmental bodies.

9.0 FUTURE RESEARCH PRIORITIES

The pilot has demonstrated that the roadshow approach to carrying out interactive, electronically-assisted interviews has great potential in eliciting qualitative and quantitative data from representative samples of the population and in particular in accessing participants from groups in danger of exclusion. It is hoped that the roadshow can be replicated, taking on board the lessons learned, in a wider environment across the UK, targeting a number of groups who may face particular barriers in accessing and using ICTs. To this end the Project Team are working on a proposal to the ESRC's e-Society call. Again, the major theme of this proposal will centre around the relationship between information, technology and participation, probing further the kinds of motivators that are necessary to encourage people to access and interact with democracy.

REFERENCES

- Ability (2002). *Home page*. Available at <http://www.ability.org.uk/> (Accessed February 2002).
- BBC (1999). *UK turnout: apathy or ignorance?* Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/1/hi/english/events/euros_99/news/newsid_368000/368908.stm (Accessed December 2001).
- Blackshaw, L. and Fischhoff, B. (1988). Decision making in online searching. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 39(6), pp. 369-389.
- Blair, T. (2000). *Government to speed up introduction of online services*. Press notice, 30 March. Available at <http://www.number-10.gov.uk/news.asp?NewsId=744&SectionId=33> (Accessed September 2000)
- Cabinet Office (2000). *e-government: a strategic framework for public services in the information age*. Available at <http://www.citu.gov.uk/iagc/pdfs/Strategy.pdf> (Accessed September 2000)
- Consultative Steering Group on the Scottish Parliament (1998). *Information strategy for the Scottish Parliament*. CSG Discussion Paper CSG(98)(77) Available at <http://www.scottish-devolution.org.uk/csg/csg77.htm> (Accessed June 1999)
- Ericsson, K. A. and Simon, H. A. (1993). *Protocol analysis: verbal reports as data*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Fee, J. (1999). *Official Report (Hansard) of the Northern Ireland Assembly*, 22 February, Line 300. Available at <http://www.ni-assembly.gov.uk/hansard.htm> (Accessed September 2000)
- Gould, P. (2001). *A strong case of election apathy*. Available at http://news.bbc.co.uk/vote2001/1/hi/english/features/newsid_1371000/1371191.stm (Accessed June 2001).
- Great Britain: House of Commons (2000). *Freedom of Information Act 2000*. Available at <http://www.hmso.gov.uk/acts/acts2000/20000036.htm> (Accessed June 2001)
- House of Commons Information Committee (1996). *First report on electronic publication of House of Commons documents*. HC328. London: HMSO.
- House of Commons Library (2001). *House of Commons Information Office annual report 1 April 2000 - 31 March 2001*. London: House of Commons Library.
- House of Lords (2001). *Annual report and accounts 2000-01*. Available at <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/ld200001/ldbrieff/2301.htm> (Accessed February 2002)

Jansen, B.J., Spink, A. and Saracevic, T. (2000). Real life, real users and real need: a study and analysis of user queries on the web. *Information Processing and Management*, 36(2), pp. 207-227.

Marcella, R. and Baxter, G. (1999a). The information needs and the information seeking behaviour of a national sample of the population in the United Kingdom, with special reference to needs related to citizenship. *Journal of Documentation*, 55(2), 159-183.

Marcella, R. and Baxter, G. (1999b). The citizenship information needs of the UK public: the quest for representativeness in methodological approach. In: Wilson, T.D. and Allen, D.K., eds. *Exploring the contexts of information behaviour: proceedings of the second Information Seeking in Context Conference, 13/15 August 1998, Sheffield*. London: Taylor Graham, 304-320.

Marcella, R. and Baxter, G. (2000). Information need, information seeking behaviour and participation, with special reference to needs related to citizenship: results of a national survey. *Journal of Documentation*, 56(2), 136-160.

Marcella, R. and Baxter, G. (2001). A random walk around Britain: a critical assessment of the random walk sample as a method of collecting data on the public's citizenship information needs. *The New Review of Information Behaviour Research*, 2, 87-103.

Nahl, D. and Tenopir, C. (1996). Affective and cognitive searching behaviour of novice end-users of a full-text database. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science*, 47(4), pp. 276-286.

National Assembly for Wales (2001). *Code of practice on public access to information*. 2nd edition. Available at <http://www.wales.gov.uk/keypubcodespractice/content/codespractice/contents-e.htm> (Accessed June 2001)

National Assembly for Wales (2002). *Home page*. Available at <http://wales.gov.uk/> (Accessed February 2002).

Northern Ireland Assembly (2002). *Home page*. Available at <http://www.ni-assembly.gov.uk/> (Accessed February 2002).

Office of the e-Envoy (2001). *Guidelines for U.K. government websites: framework for senior managers*. Available at <http://www.e-envoy.gov.uk/webguidelines.htm> (Accessed February 2002)

Office of the e-Envoy (2002). *Monthly reports: report from the e-Minister and e-Envoy to the Prime Minister*. Available at <http://www.e-envoy.gov.uk/publications/reports/pmreports/rep4feb.htm> (Accessed February 2002)

Office for National Statistics (2001a). *Regional Trends, 2001 edition*. London: The Stationery Office.

Office for National Statistics (2001b). *Social Trends, 2001 edition*. London: The Stationery Office.

Parliamentlive.tv (2002). *Home page*. Available at <http://www.parliamentlive.tv> (Accessed March 2002)

Policy Studies Institute (1995). *Information and citizenship in the United Kingdom: a draft report prepared as part of the European Commission's Information and citizenship in Europe study*. London: Policy Studies Institute.

Scottish Executive (1999). *Code of practice on access to Scottish Executive information*. Available at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library2/doc01/code.pdf> (Accessed September 2000)

Scottish Executive (2001). *Freedom of information: consultation on draft legislation*. Available at <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/consultations/government/dfib-00.asp> (Accessed June 2001)

Scottish Parliament (2001). *The Scottish Parliament Public Information Service: some statistics*. Unpublished internal document.

Scottish Parliament (2002). *Home page*. Available at <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/> (Accessed February 2002).

Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body (2000). *Annual report of the Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body 2000*. Available at <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/spcb/spar00-01.html> (Accessed February 2002).

Scottish Parliamentary Corporate Body (2001). *Scottish Parliament statistics 2000-2001*. Available at <http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/spcb/stats/statistics01.pdf> (Accessed February 2002).

Scottish Parliament Information Centre (2001). *Partner Libraries telephone survey*. Unpublished internal document.

Sutherland, P. (1992). *The internal market after 1992: meeting the challenge: report to the EEC Commission by the High Level Group on the Operation of the Internal Market*. Luxembourg: OOPEC.

UK Online (2002). *Home page*. Available at <http://www.ukonline.gov.uk/> (Accessed February 2002).

United Kingdom Parliament (2002). *Home page*. Available at <http://www.parliament.uk/> (Accessed February 2002).

Weingand, D. (1993). Grounded theory and qualitative methodology. *IFLA Journal*, 19, pp. 17 – 26.

Whitfield, G. (1997). *Disability Discrimination Act: analysis of data from an Omnibus survey*. Department of Social Security In-House Report No.30. Figures cited by Baroness Blackstone in House of Lords Written Answers for 13 July 2000, Column WA40. Available on UK Parliament website at <http://www.parliament.uk> (Accessed February 2002).

Wilson, T. D. (1998) . Exploring models of information behaviour: the 'Uncertainty' Project. In: T.D. Wilson and D.K. Allen, eds. *Exploring the contexts of information behaviour: proceedings of the second International Conference on Research in Information Needs, Seeking and Use in different contexts, 13 - 15 August 1998, Sheffield*. London: Taylor Graham, pp. 55-66.

ANNEXES

APPENDIX I – Host organisations participating in roadshow events

Newcastle upon Tyne

Gateshead Library. At the time of the roadshow, Gateshead Libraries were coordinating a 'Summer Surfing' scheme, a programme of free Internet sessions. As Gateshead has a large orthodox Jewish community, it was hoped that access to members of ethnic minority groups might be achieved. Library users were approached while they used the computer or reference facilities.

Age Concern Newcastle upon Tyne. The organisation had just appointed an IT trainer and installed two computers with Internet access in their café, where this roadshow took place. A significant proportion of non-participants declared a wariness or fear of the technology, although this was eased when reassurance was provided by the Age Concern IT trainer and/or by individuals who had already taken part in an online session. Four interviewees, all novice computer users, preferred to participate in pairs, for further reassurance and support. Novice users had particular difficulties in operating the mouse.

Sure Start Newcastle East. A social development initiative, aimed at disadvantaged parents and children. This roadshow took place during a family fun day held at the programme's headquarters. The majority of the parents present were single mothers. In the first event to use the minibus, a degree of 'bribery' (in the form of free pens and yo-yos for the children present) was required to attract adult interviewees. Although the overall level of adult participation was not all that was hoped, there was a constant stream of children visiting the minibus, giving the 'feel' of the type of roadshow originally envisaged.

Park Road Community Centre, Newcastle. The Centre is located in Cruddas Park, an area with one of the highest proportions of ethnic minority groups in the city, and regarded locally as somewhat 'rough'. There were no parking facilities immediately outside the centre's entrance, so the minibus was physically detached from the host organisation. A very poor response was obtained, with only one participant. Events resulted in the interviewer becoming selective (and thus biased) when approaching potential interviewees, in particular an episode when a woman, on her own, appeared genuinely alarmed at being invited onboard the minibus.

University of Northumbria. The event was held in the Learning Resources Centre, supporting the Faculty of Health, Social Work and Education. Interviews were conducted with staff and with users in the computer and journals area.

Cardiff

Rumney Library, Cardiff. Hosts an Age Concern 'Good Neighbours Scheme'. The minibus was located immediately outside the library entrance, and this appeared to dispel any wariness or suspicion amongst potential interviewees, as well as any feelings of detachment or insecurity on the part of the interviewer. However, participant numbers were small, suggesting that the minibus approach is more appropriate when it can be tied in with an 'event' of some description.

Grangetown Library, Cardiff. Caters for the large Asian community living in the area and is also a National Assembly for Wales Information Link library.

Rhiwbina Library, Cardiff. The busiest branch library in Cardiff. The roadshow took place in the library's vestibule.

Senior Health Shop, Barry. A project aimed at promoting better health in later life, co-ordinated by Age Concern. The roadshow took place in the snack bar. All 4 participants refused to use the mouse.

Cardiff University. Held within Cardiff University's Arts and Social Studies Resource Centre. The interviewer was located opposite the main entrance, close to the information desk and a computer area.

Aberdeen

Bressay Brae Sheltered Housing Complex. Operated by a non-profit making housing cooperative. Its common room was about to take delivery of a computer with Internet access. Initial interest in the roadshow was low, but, on observing participants using the laptop, other residents began to approach, look on and ask questions about the project and the Scottish Parliament website.

Inverurie Library. One of Aberdeenshire's three Scottish Parliament Partner Libraries and chosen because of its rural location. This event was held in the library's computer area.

University of Aberdeen. Held in the Taylor Library, which houses a law collection, UK and Scottish Official Publications, and a European Documentation Centre. The interviewer was given use of a project room in which to conduct the interviews.

Aberdeen Mosque. This took place between the final two prayer sessions of the day. This was the only roadshow to take place during the evening and connection and download times proved embarrassingly slow, bringing into question the suitability of current mobile technology for evening Internet access.

Kincorth Library. One of Aberdeen's three Partner Libraries, in the week prior to the roadshow it had hosted a Scottish Parliament exhibition.

APPENDIX II: Interview schedule for Aberdeen roadshows

SP/

PARLIAMENTARY INFORMATION INTERNET ROADSHOW INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

LOCATION: _____ GROUP: _____ DATE: _____

Hello, I'm _____ from the Robert Gordon University in Aberdeen, and I'm doing some research into how information about the Scottish Parliament is presented on the Internet.

I was wondering if you could spare around 15-20 minutes to have a look around the Scottish Parliament website on the Internet, just letting me know what you think of it, and also to answer a few questions about yourself. I'd also like to tape-record part of the interview.

All of your answers will be completely anonymous, and you can refuse to answer any particular question if you want to.

Information about the respondent

[1] a) **Gender.** Male Female

Could you start by telling me a little bit about yourself.

b) **Age group.** To which one of the following age groups do you belong?

16-19	<input type="checkbox"/>	55-64	<input type="checkbox"/>
20-29	<input type="checkbox"/>	65-74	<input type="checkbox"/>
30-44	<input type="checkbox"/>	75 or over	<input type="checkbox"/>
45-54	<input type="checkbox"/>		

c) **Ethnic Group.** To which one of the following ethnic groups do you belong?

White	<input type="checkbox"/>	Pakistani	<input type="checkbox"/>
Black Caribbean	<input type="checkbox"/>	Bangladeshi	<input type="checkbox"/>
Black African	<input type="checkbox"/>	Chinese	<input type="checkbox"/>
Black Other	<input type="checkbox"/>	Other (<i>please specify</i>)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Indian	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____	

d) **Status.** Are you:

In paid employment	<input type="checkbox"/>	Retired	<input type="checkbox"/>
Self employed	<input type="checkbox"/>	Running a home	<input type="checkbox"/>
Seeking work	<input type="checkbox"/>	Student	<input type="checkbox"/>

(If in paid employment or self employed) Could you please specify your occupation:-

e) **Educational attainment.** What was the highest level of education you completed?

School	<input type="checkbox"/>	University postgraduate	<input type="checkbox"/>
Further Education College	<input type="checkbox"/>	Doctorate	<input type="checkbox"/>
University undergraduate	<input type="checkbox"/>		

f) **Disability.** Would you describe yourself as a disabled person? YES NO

g) **Place of residence.** Do you live locally? YES NO

If NO, where do you live? _____

Past parliamentary information need, levels of participation and experience of ICTs
--

[2] Have you ever tried to find information about

	YES	NO
the Scottish Parliament	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
the UK Parliament at Westminster	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

If YES, what kind of information did you try to find?

Where did you go to obtain this information?

[3] Did you vote at the last:

	YES	NO
Scottish Parliament election	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
UK General election	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
European Parliament election	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

[4] Apart from voting, would you say that you actively participate in the political process?

YES NO

If YES, in what way(s) do you actively participate?

[5] How often do you use a computer?

Regularly Occasionally Have never used one
(Go straight to period of searching)

[6] Do you find computers easy to use?

Very easy Quite easy Quite difficult Very difficult Not applicable

[7] Have you ever used the Internet?

YES NO Not applicable

Period of Searching

I'd now like you to look on the Scottish Parliament website for information on a particular topic. If there's a particular subject you're interested in you could look for information on that. Or I've got a list of topics here that you might want to choose from.

I'm interested in what you think about the website and about the type of information that's actually on it. So I'd like you to try to think aloud as you're looking through the website. What I mean by think aloud, is that I want you to try to tell me *everything* that you're thinking about as you go along.

It could be what you think about the design of the website: what it looks like and how easy or difficult it is to find your way around it. Or it could be about the information that you actually find: how easy or difficult it is to understand and whether or not it's the sort of information that you think might be useful to you.

So, if you can, just try to act as if you're alone in a room speaking to yourself. And just try to keep talking all the time. If you *do* stop talking, I'll probably come in with a question for you. And if you could try to speak as loudly and as clearly as possible, because I'll be tape-recording you as you go along.

If you've used the Internet before, I should point out that, because we're using a mobile phone to connect to the Internet, we'll only be operating at about half the speed of a normal computer. So, it *will* be slower than what you're used to.

Do you have any questions about what I'd like you to do?

Time search started: _____

Time search ended: _____

Final questions: evaluative feedback

[8] Do you think the Scottish Parliament website is a useful way of providing information to the public?

YES NO

Could you explain why you've responded like this?

[9] How easy to use would you say the Scottish Parliament website is?

Very easy Quite easy Not easy at all

[10] How interesting did you find the information that you obtained here today?

Very interesting Quite interesting Not interesting at all

[11] How easy to understand was the information you obtained here today?

Very easy Quite easy Not easy at all

[12] How relevant do you think this type of information is to your own day-to-day life?

Very relevant Quite relevant Not relevant at all

[13] If you wanted to find out more about the topic that you were looking at today, how would you go about it?

Not interested

[14] Having used the Scottish Parliament website and seen some of the information that's available on it, do you think you might want to use it again in the future?

YES NO

Could you explain why you've responded like this?

That is the end of the interview. If you feel you can spare another few minutes of your time, I'd like you to browse through some of the Scottish Parliament's publications that I've got with me here today, and then answer a few short questions on how you feel they compare with the Scottish Parliament website.

If you feel that you can't spare the time, I'd like to thank you very much for your cooperation and ask you to accept this pen as a small token of my appreciation.

APPENDIX III: Protocol analysis codes

Twelve interviewee codes with an IE prefix were assigned:-

IE Search. When the interviewee had structured a search, with little or no assistance or guidance from the interviewer.

IE Browse. The interviewee had no specific search outcome in mind, but simply browsed the website.

IE Navigate. The interviewee asked navigational questions or questions about the website's design.

IE Read aloud. The interviewee read aloud the contents of a particular page of the website.

IE Read internal. The interviewee read the contents of a particular page of the website 'internally'.

IE Positive. The interviewee made a positive qualitative comment about the content or particular design features of the website.

IE Negative. The interviewee made a negative qualitative comment about the content or particular design features of the website.

IE Parliament. The interviewee made comments on, or asked questions about, parliamentary procedure or terminology.

IE IT. The interviewee made comments on, or asked questions about, the software and hardware being used, or computers and the Internet in general.

IE Project. The interviewee asked questions about, or commented on, the research project.

IE Political. The interviewee voiced his/her opinions on particular political and current issues.

IE Personal. The interviewee gave personal information, relating to work or study experiences, previous use of computers, or to a specific life incident.

Six interviewer codes with an IR prefix were assigned:-

IR Search. The interviewer provided the interviewee with specific instructions or advice on formulating a search.

IR Navigate. The interviewer provided specific navigational instructions or advice, or answered questions on website design.

IR Question. The interviewer asked questions when the interviewee failed to maintain a constant verbal report of their thoughts and actions, or when a specific matter of interest arose during the search.

IR Parliament. The interviewer provided an explanation of parliamentary procedure or terminology.

IR IT. The interviewer provided an explanation of, or answered questions on, the technology used in the project, or on computers and the Internet in general.

IR Project. The interviewer provided further details of the research project.

The last of the 19 codes is **Interruptions**, indicating that the interview was interrupted. These may have been verbal, by the interviewee's family or friends or other individuals; or they may have been for technical reasons.

APPENDIX IV: List of topics chosen by respondents during the period of free-form searching

Topics chosen from the researchers' list:

Student tuition fees (6 respondents)

Hospital waiting lists (3)

Foot and Mouth (2)

Long-term care for the elderly (2)

Pensions and welfare benefits (2)

Public transport (2)

Equal opportunities (1)

Single European Currency (1)

Topics freely selected by respondent:

Business/industry in Wales (2 respondents)

Costs of new National Assembly for Wales building (2)

Protection of Wild Mammals (Scotland) Bill (2)

Aberdeen road bypass proposals (1)

Aberdeen city centre road tolls proposals (1)

The Arts in Wales (1)

Asylum seekers (1)

Broadcasting Act 1996 (1)

Costs of new Scottish Parliament building at Holyrood (1)

Farming interests of Welsh Assembly Members (1)

Human Rights Act 1998 (1)

Jamie Bulger murder: early release of killers (1)

Job vacancies and employment opportunities in Scottish Parliament (1)

Llanishen Reservoir, Cardiff: plans for redevelopment (1)

Local MP: information on majority, positions held, etc. (1)

Moral corruption in the media (1)

National Assembly (for Wales) Advisory Group: remit and composition (1)

National Cultural Strategy for Scotland (1)
Opportunities for overseas students in Scotland (1)
Powers and responsibilities of Scottish Parliament (1)
Prescription charges for the under-25s in Wales(1)
Privatisation of Scottish water industry (1)
Protection from Abuse (Scotland) Bill (1)
Scottish Parliament reaction to events in Afghanistan (1)
Section 28 of the Local Government Act 1986 (1)
Single Regeneration Budget (1)
Six-term school year proposals (1)
Special Educational Needs and Disability Act 2001 (1)
Special needs education in Scotland(1)
Sustainable development in Wales(1)
Welsh-speaking population statistics (1)

APPENDIX V: Sample transaction log for a period of free-form searching

WA/2

2001/09/17 10:49:06 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/>
2001/09/17 10:51:07 <http://www.cymru.gov.uk/>
2001/09/17 10:51:08 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/home/welshinfo.htm>
2001/09/17 10:51:39 <http://www.footandmouth.wales.gov.uk/scripts/index.asp>
2001/09/17 10:55:03 [http://www.footandmouth.wales.gov.uk/scripts/
viewnews.asp?newsid=480](http://www.footandmouth.wales.gov.uk/scripts/viewnews.asp?newsid=480)
2001/09/17 11:01:17 <http://www.footandmouth.wales.gov.uk/scripts/index.asp>
2001/09/17 11:01:22 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/>
2001/09/17 11:02:08 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/search/advanced-e.htm>
2001/09/17 11:03:03 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/cgi-bin/htsearch>
2001/09/17 11:04:31 [http://www.wales.gov.uk/subilocalgov/content/
partnership/contents_e.html](http://www.wales.gov.uk/subilocalgov/content/partnership/contents_e.html)
2001/09/17 11:05:29 [http://www.wales.gov.uk/subilocalgov/content/
partnership/members.html](http://www.wales.gov.uk/subilocalgov/content/partnership/members.html)
2001/09/17 11:06:58 [http://www.wales.gov.uk/subilocalgov/content/
partnership/contents_e.html](http://www.wales.gov.uk/subilocalgov/content/partnership/contents_e.html)
2001/09/17 11:07:01 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/cgi-bin/htsearch>
2001/09/17 11:07:03 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/search/advanced-e.htm>
2001/09/17 11:07:26 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/cgi-bin/htsearch>
2001/09/17 11:08:44 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/index.htm>
2001/09/17 11:10:12 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/organi/index.htm>
2001/09/17 11:11:40 <http://www.wales.gov.uk/organiadministration/index.htm>

APPENDIX VI: UK Parliament website pages visited (minutes of search time)

Respondents and search time (in minutes) spent on particular areas of the UK Parliament website																								
Pages Visited	Respondents																							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10/11	12	13*	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	Tot. mins
UK Parliament Home Page	0.7	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.3	0.5	3.4	5.1	2.5	7.0	7.3	0.4	1.5	0.3	1.3	0.7	0.5	4.5	1.6	1.9	0.7	1.0	0.9	43.0
House of Commons Home Page	0.3	0.7	0.4	-	1.0	-	-	0.8	0.8	-	0.3	0.6	0.4	-	0.5	1.2	0.9	1.3	-	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.2	10.6
What's New	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	2.6
HoC Publications main page	-	0.3	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.6	-	-	-	1.5	0.5	0.5	-	2.1	0.6	-	-	6.3
Commons Hansard	-	1.1	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.6
Private Bills	-	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.4
Public Bills	-	-	-	-	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0	5.8
Select Committee Pubs.	-	-	-	-	4.0	-	-	-	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.0
Other HoC Papers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	1.5
House Business	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.3	2.3
Weekly Information Bulletin	-	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.1
Sessional Info. Digest	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	0.1
Information about HoC	0.1	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	1.2
Members and Ministers	4.4	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.4	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	3.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	19.3
Factsheets	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5	-	3.5	-	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	6.5
Select Committees of the HoC	-	-	-	-	0.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.4
HoC Library Research Papers	-	-	-	-	4.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.0	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	17.3
Early Day Motions' Database	-	-	-	-	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.0
House of Lords Home Page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	1.0	-	2.3
Register of Lords' Interests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.2	-	-	-	-	6.5
Register of hereditary peers...	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4	-	-	-	-	1.4
Info. about HoL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.0	8.0
Explore Parliament	-	-	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	14.0	5.5	-	-	6.3	4.0	11.5	5.8	-	53.2
Parliamentary Info. & Services	-	-	-	-	-	6.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	1.5	-	-	0.5	9.2

Pages Visited	Respondents																							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10/ 11	12	13*	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	Tot. mins
Enquiries	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	3.0	-	-	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	-	-	-	-	9.1
HoC Reg. of Members' Interests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4	1.4
Search Engine	5.9	10.8	14.3	-	6.0	-	-	6.2	19.3	-	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	29.5	18.8	12.0	4.0	1.4	6.6	141.0
Index	0.7	-	-	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.5	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	14.8
Site Map	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.7	-	-	-	12.4	18.1
Other sites	5.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.0	-	1.8	6.0	-	-	21.5
Total search time (in minutes)	20.8	15.7	24.2	3.7	20.7	7.2	6.4	12.1	29.4	19.9	13.8	4.3	2.7	30.1	19.3	9.9	8.9	45.3	43.4	23.7	23.7	18.6	28.7	432.5

*Cache search only

APPENDIX VII: UK Parliament website pages visited (percentage of search time)

Respondents and % of search time spent on particular areas of the UK Parliament website																								
Pages Visited	Respondents																							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10/ 11	12	13*	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	Tot. (%)
UK Parliament Home Page	3.2	2.1	1.8	3.0	1.6	6.9	53.1	42.1	8.5	35.2	52.9	10.3	55.6	1.0	6.7	7.1	5.6	9.9	3.7	8.0	3.0	5.4	3.1	9.9
House of Commons Home Page	1.6	4.3	1.4	-	4.8	-	-	6.6	2.7	-	2.2	12.8	14.8	-	2.6	12.1	10.1	2.9	-	1.7	1.7	2.2	0.7	2.5
What's New	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.7	-	-	-	29.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.4	-	0.6
HoC Publications main page	-	2.1	-	-	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.8	-	-	-	15.2	5.6	1.1	-	8.9	2.5	-	-	1.5
Commons Hansard	-	7.1	22.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.8
Private Bills	-	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.8
Public Bills	-	-	-	-	8.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.9	1.3
Select Committee Pubs.	-	-	-	-	19.4	-	-	-	6.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4
Other HoC Papers	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.1	-	-	-	-	2.1	-	-	0.3
House Business	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.0	0.5
Weekly Information Bulletin	-	12.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5
Sessional Info. Digest	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.1
Information about HoC	0.5	-	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	5.1	-	-	-	-	3.4	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	0.3
Members and Ministers	21.4	-	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	42.2	-	-	-	5.0	-	-	41.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5
Factsheets	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	35.9	-	11.6	-	-	-	-	-	3.5	-	-	-	1.5
Select Committees of the HoC	-	-	-	-	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0
HoC Library Research Papers	-	-	-	-	23.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	36.5	-	-	-	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	4.0
Early Day Motions' Database	-	-	-	-	8.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4
House of Lords Home Page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	-	-	5.4	-	0.5
Register of Lords' Interests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.0	-	-	-	1.5
Register of hereditary peers...	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.2	-	-	-	-	0.3
Info. about HoL	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	43.0	-	1.8
Explore Parliament	-	-	8.7	-	-	-	-	-	13.6	-	-	-	-	-	72.5	55.5	-	-	14.5	16.9	48.5	31.2	-	12.3
Parliamentary Info. & Services	-	-	-	-	-	93.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.2	6.3	-	-	1.7	2.1

Pages Visited	Respondents																							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10/ 11	12	13*	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	Tot. (%)
Enquiries	14.4	-	-	-	-	-	46.9	-	-	10.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.5	-	-	-	-	2.1
HoC Reg. of Members' Interests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.9	0.3
Search Engine	28.3	68.8	59.1	-	29.0	-	-	51.3	65.6	-	44.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	65.1	43.3	50.6	16.9	7.5	23.0	32.6
Index	3.2	-	-	97.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	31.6	-	-	-	-	2.3	-	-	-	-	3.4
Site Map	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.1	-	-	-	43.2	4.2
Other sites	27.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.7	-	7.6	25.3	-	-	5.0
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total search time (in minutes)	20.8	15.7	24.2	3.7	20.7	7.2	6.4	12.1	29.4	19.9	13.8	4.3	2.7	30.1	19.3	9.9	8.9	45.3	43.4	23.7	23.7	18.6	28.7	432.5

*Cache search only

APPENDIX VIII: National Assembly for Wales website pages visited (minutes of search time)

Respondents and search time (in minutes) spent on particular areas of the National Assembly for Wales website																												
Pages visited	Respondents																											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	Tot mins
Home Page	0.9	4.7	1.2	3.1	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.2	1.4	3.5	1.3	1.6	3.1	1.2	20.	1.5	2.1	2.0	1.3	2.7	4.7	1.9	2.3	3.0	1.9	1.3	0.5	58.5
News	-	-	-	-	2.9	10.3	1.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5	-	1.8	-	2.1	-	-	-	5.0	-	4.2	29.4
Foot and Mouth	-	9.6	-	-	2.8	-	-	-	-	6.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.7	-	-	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	28.6
Latest Additions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5
Assembly New Building	-	-	10.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22.1
Public Information main pg.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5	-	1.1	2.7	-	-	-	-	-	2.0	-	-	7.3
How to Visit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0
Assembly at the Pierhead	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.0
News from Presiding Office	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4
Key Publications main page	-	-	-	-	-	8.6	2.1	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.6
Annual Reports	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.7
Assembly Committees	-	-	-	6.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.5
Legislation & Circulars	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3
Record of Proceedings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	17.6	-	-	-	17.6
Reg. of Members' Interests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.6
Statistics for Wales	4.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.1
Subject Index main page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	0.5	-	-	1.0	0.7	-	4.1
Assembly Business	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	-	-	-	0.7
Children & Young People	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.3-	-	2.1	6.5	-	11.9
Culture, Sport, etc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	0.5
Economic Development etc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	10.0
Education & Training	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4	1.6	2.0	
Health	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.4
Local Government	-	2.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.5

Pages visited	Respondents																												
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	Tot mins	
Themes & Strategies main pg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	1.5	-	3.0	5.5	
Betterwales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.8
Sustainable Development	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.0	-	-	-	3.0	
Voluntary Sector	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.3	3.3	
Organisation Index main pg.	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5	
Cabinet	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	
Assembly Structure/Staff	-	6.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.6	
Your Questions main pg.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	0.4	-	-	-	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.7	
Where?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.7	
Who?/Who's Who?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.5	9.3	-	-	-	-	4.9	-	-	4.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22.3	
Search engine	2.0	1.2	-	2.8	-	-	-	-	2.1	3.1	2.8	12.9	10.9	-	-	13.0	-	-	-	1.1	-	-	7.3	-	1.3	-	-	60.5	
Other sites	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.7	
Total search time (minutes)	7.0	26.1	11.8	12.4	8.0	21.4	6.0	28.0	15.8	12.8	8.4	14.9	14.0	17.7	15.0	16.3	17.0	8.7	5.9	16.2	10.1	12.4	12.9	25.3	14.8	9.4	12.6	380.9	

APPENDIX IX: National Assembly for Wales website pages visited (percentage of search time)

Respondents and % of search time spent on particular areas of the National Assembly for Wales website																												
Pages visited	Respondents																											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	Tot (%)
Home Page	12.8	18.0	10.2	25.0	28.8	11.7	38.3	7.9	8.9	27.3	15.5	10.7	22.1	6.8	13.3	9.2	12.4	23.0	22.0	16.7	46.5	15.3	17.8	11.8	12.8	13.8	4.0	15.4
News	-	-	-	-	36.3	48.1	26.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.8	-	30.5	-	20.8	-	-	-	33.8	-	33.3	7.7
Foot and Mouth	-	36.8	-	-	35.0	-	-	-	-	48.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	77.0	-	-	32.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.5
Latest Additions	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4
Assembly New Building	-	-	89.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	76.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.8
Public Information main pg.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.8	-	18.6	16.7	-	-	-	-	-	13.5	-	1.9
How to Visit	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3
Assembly at the Pierhead	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	29.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3
News from Presiding Office	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1
Key Publications main page	-	-	-	-	-	40.2	35.0	6.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.3
Annual Reports	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	48.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.6
Assembly Committees	-	-	-	52.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.7
Legislation & Circulars	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	22.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3
Record of Proceedings	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	69.6	-	-	-	4.6
Reg. of Members' Interests	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	65.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.0
Statistics for Wales	58.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.3	12.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.7
Subject Index main page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.7	-	4.0	-	-	6.8	7.4	-	1.1
Assembly Business	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.8	-	-	-	0.2
Children & Young People	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	25.6	-	14.2	69.1	-	3.1
Culture, Sport, etc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.3	-	0.1
Economic Development etc	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.6	-	-	-	-	-	2.6
Education & Training	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.3	12.7	0.5
Health	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	51.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	37.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.7
Local Government	-	9.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7

Pages visited	Respondents																											
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	Tot (%)
Themes & Strategies main pg	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.0	10.1	-	23.8	1.4
Betterwales	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5
Sustainable Development	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	11.8	-	-	-	0.8
Voluntary Sector	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	26.2	0.9
Organisation Index main pg.	-	5.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4
Cabinet	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3
Assembly Structure/Staff	-	25.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.7
Your Questions main pg.	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.3	-	-	2.7	-	-	-	-	7.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7
Where?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4
Who?/Who's Who?	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.5	58.9	-	-	-	-	27.7	-	-	27.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.9
Search engine	28.6	4.6	-	22.6	-	-	-	-	13.3	24.2	33.3	86.6	77.9	-	-	79.8	-	-	-	6.8	-	-	56.6	-	8.8	-	-	15.9
Other sites	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	
Total search time (minutes)	7.0	26.1	11.8	12.4	8.0	21.4	6.0	28.0	15.8	12.8	8.4	14.9	14.0	17.7	15.0	16.3	17.0	8.7	5.9	16.2	10.1	12.4	12.9	25.3	14.8	9.4	12.6	380.9

APPENDIX X: Scottish Parliament website pages visited (minutes of search time)

Respondents and search time (in minutes) spent on particular areas of the Scottish Parliament website																											
Pages Visited	Respondents																										
	1/2	3	4	5	6*	7	8/9	10	11	12	13	14*	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	Tot mins
Home Page	7.2	3.2	1.5	1.0	2.3	1.3	4.3	2.7	1.7	1.0	1.0	4.5	4.5	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.0	1.5	2.0	2.1	2.8	4.2	3.7	2.3	3.8	1.5	66.1
What's Happening	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.8	-	3.7	6.2	-	0.9	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.6
News Releases	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.7	3.3	13.5
WHISP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.9
Contracts and Recruitment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	-	-	-	1.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.9
About the Parliament	-	3.5	-	0.8	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	0.5	-	-	0.5	-	-	0.3	1.5	-	-	-	-	1.7	9.5
FAQs	-	-	-	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	2.3	-	-	-	-	-	6.5
Holyrood	6.9	7.6	-	-	0.5	-	-	6.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.1	0.8	-	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	25.8
Visitor Information	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5
MSPs List, Biographies, etc.	6.3	-	4.6	4.0	-	7.5	-	-	-	-	-	2.2	2.4	-	-	-	2.5	-	-	3.0	-	-	-	3.3	2.8	-	38.6
MSPs Register of Interests	-	-	-	-	-	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	3.3	-	-	-	2.0	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	1.4	1.3	-	11.1
Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.5	-	1.5	-	3.1	-	-	3.6	7.5	-	5.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.0	-	35.9
Documents main page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3
Bills	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	5.0	-	-	4.5	-	-	3.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.0
Business Bulletin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	5.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.5	-	1.3	10.3
Official Report Parliament	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.2	-	-	-	-	-	15.8	-	-	-	9.8	22.6	-	-	58.4
Official Report Committees	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.8	5.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.1	-	-	-	-	35.8
Parliamentary Factfiles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21.3	-	-	1.8	2.6	-	-	5.3	-	-	-	-	-	31.0
Research Publications	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	12.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.4	16.6
Written Answers Report	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5	-	-	-	4.5
Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7
Site Map	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	0.6	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.3
Search engine (general)	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.3	-	2.1	6.5	6.4	-	4.6	-	-	-	4.0	-	4.0	-	-	4.3	-	1.7	-	-	47.9
Written Answers database	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.5

Pages Visited	Respondents																											
	1/2	3	4	5	6*	7	8/9	10	11	12	13	14*	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	Tot mins	
Other sites	-	-	-	-	-	2.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.0
Total search time (minutes)	21.1	14.3	6.1	9.1	3.3	12.6	27.1	21.3	19.6	16.7	12.9	15.6	31.2	28.6	22.3	23.0	16.3	11.9	23.7	9.6	12.7	36.9	26.3	12.2	12.6	11.2	458.2	

*Cache search only

APPENDIX XI: Scottish Parliament website pages visited (percentage of search time)

Respondents and % of search time spent on particular areas of the Scottish Parliament website																												
Pages Visited	Respondents																											
	1/2	3	4	5	6*	7	8/9	10	11	12	13	14*	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	Tot %	
Home Page	34.1	22.4	24.6	11.0	69.7	10.3	15.9	12.7	8.7	6.0	7.8	28.8	14.4	6.3	7.6	6.5	6.1	12.6	8.4	21.9	22.0	11.4	14.1	18.9	30.2	13.4	14.4	
What's Happening	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.8	-	23.7	19.9	-	4.0	4.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.0
News Releases	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	33.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	21.4	29.5	2.9	
WHISP	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.6	
Contracts and Recruitment	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.1	-	-	-	5.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4	
About the Parliament	-	24.5	-	8.8	15.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3	-	1.7	-	-	3.1	-	-	3.1	11.8	-	-	-	-	15.2	2.1	
FAQs	-	-	-	36.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5	-	-	0.9	-	-	-	-	-	18.1	-	-	-	-	-	1.4	
Holyrood	32.7	53.1	-	-	15.2	-	-	28.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	13.9	3.5	-	-	-	-	6.3	-	-	-	-	-	5.6	
Visitor Information	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	
MSPs List, Biographies, etc.	29.9	-	75.4	43.9	-	59.5	-	-	-	-	-	14.1	7.7	-	-	-	15.3	-	-	31.3	-	-	-	27.0	22.2	-	8.4	
MSPs Register of Interests	-	-	-	-	-	14.3	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	10.6	-	-	-	12.3	-	-	10.4	-	-	-	11.5	10.3	-	2.4	
Education	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	58.7	-	9.0	-	19.9	-	-	16.1	32.6	-	47.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.9	-	7.8	
Documents main page	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	
Bills	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	17.5	-	-	27.6	-	-	33.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.8	
Business Bulletin	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	42.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	28.7	-	11.6	2.2	
Official Report Parliament	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	32.7	-	-	-	-	-	66.7	-	-	26.6	85.9	-	-	-	12.7	
Official Report Committees	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	80.6	35.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	38.2	-	-	-	-	7.8	
Parliamentary Factfiles	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	74.5	-	-	11.0	21.8	-	-	41.7	-	-	-	-	-	6.8	
Research Publications	3.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	-	-	53.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	30.4	3.6	
Written Answers Report	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.2	-	-	-	1.0	
Contacts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	
Site Map	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5	-	-	5.0	3.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	
Search engine (general)	-	-	-	-	-	-	52.8	-	10.7	38.9	49.6	-	14.7	-	-	-	24.5	-	16.9	-	-	11.7	-	13.9	-	-	10.5	
Written Answers database	-	-	-	-	-	-	31.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	

Pages Visited	Respondents																											
	1/2	3	4	5	6*	7	8/9	10	11	12	13	14*	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	Tot %	
Other sites	-	-	-	-	-	15.9	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100
Total search time (minutes)	21.1	14.3	6.1	9.1	3.3	12.6	27.1	21.3	19.6	16.7	12.9	15.6	31.2	28.6	22.3	23.0	16.3	11.9	23.7	9.6	12.7	36.9	26.3	12.2	12.6	11.2	458.2	

*Cache search only

APPENDIX XII: UK Parliament website protocol analysis (minutes of search time)

UK Parliament website search sessions: protocol analysis (minutes of search time)																								
Coding Categories	Respondents																							
	1 ^R	2 ^R	3 ^R	4 ^R	5 ^R	6 ^O	7 ^O	8 ^R	9 ^{FT}	10/ ^{FT} 11	12 ^R	13 ^O	14 ^O	15 ^R	16 ^O	17 ^R	18 ^O	19 ^R	20 ^R	21 ^R	22 ^R	23 ^R	24 ^R	Tot. mins
Interviewee Categories																								
IE Search	3.1	5.5	2.4	-	11.0	-	-	0.1	0.5	-	3.0	-	-	2.2	-	-	1.4	29.5	2.0	10.0	5.6	1.9	8.6	86.8
IE Browse	3.9	0.2	-	-	-	0.9	0.4	-	0.5	-	-	-	-	0.6	2.1	1.7	1.1	1.0	12.3	4.6	5.5	5.6	11.1	51.5
IE Navigate	-	0.8	0.9	-	0.1	-	0.7	-	0.7	0.1	0.1	-	-	0.6	-	0.1	0.2	1.4	0.1	0.1	0.1	-	-	6.0
IE Read aloud	1.7	2.9	-	0.2	1.7	-	0.9	1.4	4.8	-	-	-	0.4	6.1	-	-	0.6	1.1	0.2	-	-	-	-	22.0
IE Read internal	1.3	0.7	-	0.8	6.0	0.6	0.1	-	-	0.5	-	0.8	-	7.4	2.5	0.8	-	-	2.4	2.4	3.7	0.4	-	30.4
IE Positive	0.7	-	5.2	0.3	-	0.1	-	0.8	-	-	0.8	1.0	-	-	2.5	1.9	-	-	2.7	0.5	0.1	1.1	0.1	17.8
IE Negative	3.0	-	4.7	0.8	0.1	0.7	0.1	-	0.1	-	4.2	0.4	0.3	0.3	-	1.8	-	3.4	2.3	1.5	0.8	5.2	3.3	33.0
IE Parliament	0.3	0.3	2.0	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	2.6	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	0.5	0.1	-	-	1.1	-	7.4
IE IT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.4	1.9	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	5.0
IE Project	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
IE Political	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.9	-	-	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.6	-	-	-	-	8.3
IE Personal	-	-	-	0.8	0.2	0.6	1.8	0.4	-	0.1	1.5	-	-	0.7	-	-	-	-	6.8	-	1.0	-	2.8	16.7
Totals for Interviewee	14.0	10.4	15.2	2.9	19.4	2.9	4.0	5.8	7.0	5.2	11.4	2.2	0.7	18.4	7.3	6.3	3.4	36.9	32.5	19.1	16.8	17.2	25.9	284.9
Interviewer Categories																								
IR Search	0.2	0.9	1.4	-	-	-	-	4.9	10.7	2.1	0.8	-	-	0.4	-	-	-	2.0	8.1	-	0.8	-	-	32.3
IR Navigate	5.5	3.9	4.7	0.4	1.1	2.2	2.3	1.3	10.7	11.4	1.6	1.9	1.8	10.1	3.4	2.1	5.2	6.2	2.4	2.6	4.1	-	2.8	87.7
IR Question	1.1	-	1.4	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	-	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.6	0.3	0.1	0.2	0.4	0.1	0.7	0.5	-	7.5
IR Parliament	-	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	0.7	-	2.4
IR IT	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	-	-	0.6	0.3	-	-	-	0.8	0.4	-	0.2	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	5.0
IR Project	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-	0.5
Totals for Interviewer	6.8	5.3	7.5	0.8	1.3	4.3	2.4	6.3	22.4	14.4	2.4	2.1	2.0	11.7	4.4	2.4	5.5	8.4	10.9	3.2	6.9	1.2	2.8	135.4
Interruptions	-	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	7.6	1.2	-	-	-	1.4	-	0.2	-	12.2
Total search time (mins)	20.8	15.7	24.2	3.7	20.7	7.2	6.4	12.1	29.4	19.9	13.8	4.3	2.7	30.1	19.3	9.9	8.9	45.3	43.4	23.7	23.7	18.6	28.7	432.5

Note: ^R indicates a regular computer user; ^O indicates an occasional user; ^{FT} indicates a first-time user

APPENDIX XIII: UK Parliament website protocol analysis (percentage of search time)

UK Parliament website search sessions: protocol analysis (percentage of search time)																									
Coding Categories	Respondents																								Tot. %
	1 ^R	2 ^R	3 ^R	4 ^R	5 ^R	6 ^O	7 ^O	8 ^R	9 ^{FT}	10/ ^{FT} 11	12 ^R	13 ^O	14 ^O	15 ^R	16 ^O	17 ^R	18 ^O	19 ^R	20 ^R	21 ^R	22 ^R	23 ^R	24 ^R		
Interviewee Categories																									
IE Search	15.0	34.8	10.1	-	52.9	-	-	0.9	1.6	-	21.5	-	-	7.2	-	-	15.4	65.1	4.7	42.0	23.8	10.0	29.8	20.1	
IE Browse	18.7	1.4	-	-	-	13.8	6.8	-	1.6	-	-	-	-	1.9	10.6	16.8	12.8	2.3	28.3	19.5	23.3	30.0	38.8	11.9	
IE Navigate	-	5.0	3.8	-	0.5	-	10.2	-	2.5	0.6	0.8	-	-	1.9	-	1.1	2.6	3.0	0.3	0.5	0.5	-	-	1.4	
IE Read aloud	8.0	18.4	-	5.9	8.0	-	13.6	11.9	16.5	-	-	-	16.0	20.1	-	-	6.4	2.5	0.5	-	-	-	-	5.1	
IE Read internal	6.4	4.3	-	20.6	28.9	7.7	1.7	-	-	2.6	-	17.9	-	24.6	13.0	7.9	-	-	5.5	10.2	15.7	2.0	-	7.0	
IE Positive	3.2	-	21.6	8.8	-	1.5	-	6.4	-	-	5.8	23.1	-	-	13.0	19.1	-	-	6.2	2.0	0.5	6.0	0.4	4.1	
IE Negative	14.4	-	19.2	20.6	0.5	9.2	1.7	-	0.4	-	30.6	10.3	12.0	1.1	-	18.0	-	7.6	5.2	6.3	3.3	28.0	11.4	7.6	
IE Parliament	1.6	2.1	8.2	-	1.6	-	-	-	-	12.9	-	-	-	-	1.2	-	-	1.0	0.3	-	-	6.0	-	1.7	
IE IT	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.8	1.2	9.7	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	10.0	-	1.2	
IE Project	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	
IE Political	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	23.9	-	-	13.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.3	-	-	-	-	1.9	
IE Personal	-	-	-	-	1.1	7.7	28.8	2.8	-	0.6	10.7	-	-	2.3	-	-	-	-	15.6	-	4.3	-	9.8	3.9	
Totals for Interviewee	67.4	66.0	62.9	76.5	93.6	39.9	62.7	47.7	24.0	26.4	82.6	51.3	28.0	60.6	37.8	62.9	38.5	81.5	74.8	80.5	71.4	92.0	90.2	65.9	
Interviewer Categories																									
IR Search	1.1	5.7	5.8	-	-	-	-	40.4	36.4	10.3	5.8	-	-	1.5	-	-	-	4.3	18.7	-	3.3	-	-	7.5	
IR Navigate	26.2	24.8	19.2	11.8	5.3	30.8	35.6	11.0	36.4	57.4	11.6	43.6	68.0	33.7	17.8	21.3	57.7	13.7	5.5	11.2	17.1	-	9.8	20.3	
IR Question	5.3	-	5.8	11.8	1.1	3.1	1.7	0.9	1.2	0.6	-	5.1	4.0	0.8	3.0	3.4	1.3	0.5	1.0	0.5	2.9	2.7	-	1.7	
IR Parliament	-	3.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.6	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	4.0	-	0.5	
IR IT	-	-	-	-	-	26.2	-	-	2.1	1.3	-	-	-	2.7	1.8	-	2.6	-	-	-	3.3	-	-	1.2	
IR Project	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.0	-	-	0.1	
Totals for Interviewer	32.6	34.0	30.8	23.5	6.4	60.1	37.3	52.3	76.0	72.2	17.4	48.7	72.0	39.4	22.6	24.7	61.5	18.5	25.2	13.6	28.6	6.7	9.8	31.3	
Interruptions	-	-	6.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	39.6	12.4	-	-	-	5.9	-	1.3	-	2.8	
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Note: ^R indicates a regular computer user; ^O indicates an occasional user; ^{FT} indicates a first-time user

APPENDIX XIV: National Assembly for Wales website protocol analysis (minutes of search time)

National Assembly for Wales website search sessions: protocol analysis (minutes of search time)																												
Coding Categories	Respondents																											
	1 ^O	FT 2	3 ^O	FT 4	FT 5	FT 6	FT 7	8 ^R	9 ^R	10 ^R	FT 11	12 ^R	FT 13	FT 14	FT 15	FT 16	FT 17	FT 18	19 ^R	20 ^R	21 ^R	22 ^R	23 ^R	24 ^R	25 ^R	26 ^O	27 ^R	Tot mins
Interviewee Categories																												
IE Search	-	1.7	0.5	-	-	-	-	5.8	3.2	1.8	0.6	6.2	0.6	0.9	-	-	1.7	-	-	3.0	-	-	3.2	7.1	0.4	-	-	36.7
IE Browse	-	0.2	1.7	-	0.8	-	-	1.3	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	2.2	-	2.6	0.5	1.4	0.2	2.0	1.7	-	-	3.5	2.2	4.1	24.6
IE Navigate	-	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.3	-	-	0.1	0.5	-	-	-	0.6	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	1.7	0.2	0.6	-	-	-	-	0.1	4.7
IE Read aloud	0.4	1.5	1.9	1.1	1.5	-	-	-	-	2.4	0.6	-	1.0	3.2	-	-	1.1	0.6	-	0.2	-	-	-	1.8	0.8	-	-	18.1
IE Read internal	1.6	-	-	-	-	0.8	0.5	4.0	1.6	1.3	-	2.5	0.4	-	2.7	5.0	2.5	-	0.8	1.2	0.8	1.8	-	-	1.5	2.2	2.2	33.4
IE Positive	-	-	-	0.2	-	0.2	0.2	0.4	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.2	-	0.6	1.1	0.1	-	-	-	2.4	0.4	0.7	7.5
IE Negative	-	-	-	0.2	0.3	1.2	0.3	2.1	-	0.9	-	1.4	-	0.2	-	-	-	-	0.1	4.1	0.1	1.7	1.9	3.5	2.5	-	-	20.5
IE Parliament	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4	0.1	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-	0.4	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5
IE IT	-	1.9	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	5.3
IE Project	-	0.1	-	-	0.2	-	0.2	0.1	-	0.1	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.3	0.1	0.1	-	0.2	-	-	-	1.7
IE Political	-	4.3	3.2	4.7	-	14.3	1.5	-	-	0.4	-	-	-	4.2	6.7	2.4	0.6	2.9	-	0.6	-	-	2.7	4.1	-	1.1	-	53.7
IE Personal	1.2	0.8	0.3	1.0	0.5	0.7	-	1.1	0.6	1.3	2.0	-	1.8	0.8	0.5	-	0.9	-	1.5	0.2	0.3	1.2	0.3	4.2	1.0	0.7	0.9	23.8
Totals for Interviewee	3.2	10.6	7.7	7.4	3.6	17.7	2.7	15.3	7.3	8.2	3.2	10.1	5.2	9.3	12.3	8.8	10.0	4.0	4.4	12.6	3.7	8.5	8.1	20.9	12.1	6.6	8.0	231.5
Interviewer Categories																												
IR Search	2.6	3.2	-	1.8	-	-	-	0.1	1.4	0.9	2.0	1.8	3.1	-	-	3.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	3.1	-	0.7	-	-	24.4
IR Navigate	1.0	9.5	3.6	2.8	3.6	2.7	2.7	8.7	4.8	2.3	1.2	2.7	3.9	8.2	2.2	3.3	5.0	4.4	-	0.2	3.7	3.1	0.9	1.1	1.6	2.5	3.8	89.5
IR Question	0.2	0.1	0.1	-	-	1.0	0.1	0.6	0.9	0.4	0.1	0.3	-	-	0.2	0.1	0.2	-	0.7	0.2	0.3	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.5	7.1
IR Parliament	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	0.5	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.8	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.8
IR IT	-	2.1	0.4	0.4	0.8	-	0.3	1.1	0.9	0.7	1.9	-	0.8	0.2	0.3	0.4	-	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.6	-	0.4	0.5	0.2	-	0.3	13.1
IR Project	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	0.2	0.7	-	-	-	-	1.0	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	1.5	0.3	0.7	-	2.7	-	-	-	7.9
Totals for Interviewer	3.8	15.2	4.1	5.0	4.4	3.7	3.3	11.9	8.5	4.6	5.2	4.8	8.8	8.4	2.7	7.5	7.0	4.7	1.5	2.1	6.4	3.9	4.8	4.4	2.7	2.8	4.6	146.8
Interruptions	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	0.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.6
Total search time (mins)	7.0	26.1	11.8	12.4	8.0	21.4	6.0	28.0	15.8	12.8	8.4	14.9	14.0	17.7	15.0	16.3	17.0	8.7	5.9	16.2	10.1	12.4	12.9	25.3	14.8	9.4	12.6	380.9

Note: ^R indicates a regular computer user; ^O indicates an occasional user; ^{FT} indicates a first-time user

APPENDIX XV: National Assembly for Wales website protocol analysis (percentage of search time)

National Assembly for Wales website search sessions: protocol analysis (percentage of search time)																												
Coding Categories	Respondents																											
	1 ^O	FT 2	3 ^O	FT 4	FT 5	FT 6	FT 7	8 ^R	9 ^R	10 ^R	FT 11	12 ^R	FT 13	FT 14	FT 15	FT 16	FT 17	FT 18	19 ^R	20 ^R	21 ^R	22 ^R	23 ^R	24 ^R	25 ^R	26 ^O	27 ^R	Tot %
Interviewee Categories																												
IE Search	-	6.5	3.8	-	-	-	-	20.6	20.1	13.2	7.6	41.6	4.6	5.1	-	-	9.9	-	-	18.2	-	-	25.0	28.1	3.1	-	-	9.6
IE Browse	-	0.9	14.4	-	9.9	-	-	4.8	1.4	-	-	-	-	-	14.4	-	15.1	5.2	23.5	1.4	20.2	13.6	-	-	23.7	22.9	32.4	6.5
IE Navigate	-	0.4	1.0	1.8	4.2	-	-	0.4	2.9	-	-	-	4.6	-	1.5	-	-	-	-	10.5	2.2	4.6	-	-	-	-	0.9	1.2
IE Read aloud	4.8	5.7	16.3	8.9	18.3	-	-	-	-	18.4	7.6	-	7.3	17.8	-	-	6.6	6.5	-	1.4	-	-	-	7.0	5.3	-	-	4.8
IE Read internal	22.6	-	-	-	-	3.7	7.5	14.1	10.1	10.5	-	16.7	2.8	-	18.2	30.8	14.5	-	13.7	7.7	6.7	14.5	-	-	9.9	22.9	17.1	8.8
IE Positive	-	-	-	1.8	-	1.0	3.8	1.6	6.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3	-	9.8	7.0	1.1	-	-	-	16.0	4.8	5.4	2.0
IE Negative	-	-	-	1.8	4.2	5.8	5.7	7.3	-	7.0	-	9.1	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	2.0	24.5	1.1	13.6	14.7	14.0	16.8	-	-	5.4
IE Parliament	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.6	0.7	-	-	-	3.7	-	-	-	2.6	-	-	-	1.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4
IE IT	-	7.4	-	-	-	2.1	-	-	0.7	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.4	-	-	-	-	-	10.9	-	-	-	-	-	1.4
IE Project	-	0.4	-	-	2.8	-	3.8	0.4	-	0.9	-	-	1.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.1	1.1	0.9	-	0.9	-	-	-	0.4
IE Political	-	16.2	26.9	37.5	-	67.0	24.5	-	-	3.5	-	-	-	23.6	44.7	14.7	3.3	33.8	-	3.5	-	-	20.7	16.2	-	12.0	-	14.1
IE Personal	17.7	3.1	2.9	8.0	5.6	3.1	-	4.0	3.6	10.5	24.1	-	12.8	4.4	3.0	-	5.3	-	25.5	1.4	3.4	10.0	2.6	16.7	6.9	7.2	6.2	
Totals for Interviewee	45.2	40.6	65.3	59.8	45.0	82.7	45.3	54.9	46.0	64.0	39.2	67.4	37.6	52.2	81.8	53.8	58.6	45.5	74.5	77.6	37.1	68.2	63.0	82.9	81.7	69.9	63.1	60.8
Interviewer Categories																												
IR Search	37.1	12.2	-	14.3	-	-	-	0.4	8.6	7.0	24.1	12.1	22.0	-	-	22.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	23.3	-	4.6	-	-	6.4
IR Navigate	14.5	36.2	30.8	22.3	45.1	12.6	43.4	31.0	30.9	17.5	13.9	18.2	27.5	46.5	14.4	20.3	29.6	50.6	-	1.4	36.0	25.5	6.9	4.4	10.7	26.5	30.6	23.5
IR Question	3.2	0.4	1.0	-	-	4.7	1.9	2.0	5.8	3.5	1.3	2.3	-	-	1.5	0.7	1.3	-	11.8	1.4	3.4	0.9	3.4	0.4	1.5	3.6	3.6	1.8
IR Parliament	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.4	2.9	2.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	10.5	-	-	-	14.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.3
IR IT	-	7.9	2.9	3.6	9.9	-	5.7	4.0	5.8	5.3	21.5	-	5.5	1.3	2.3	2.8	-	3.9	5.9	1.4	5.6	-	3.4	1.8	1.5	-	2.7	3.4
IR Project	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	3.8	2.4	-	-	-	-	7.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.8	9.1	3.4	5.5	-	10.5	-	-	2.1
Totals for Interviewer	54.8	58.1	34.7	40.2	55.0	17.3	54.7	42.3	54.0	36.0	60.8	32.6	62.4	47.8	18.2	46.2	41.4	54.5	25.5	13.3	62.9	31.8	37.0	17.1	18.3	30.1	36.9	38.5
Interruptions	-	1.3	-	-	-	-	-	2.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100

Note: ^R indicates a regular computer user; ^O indicates an occasional user; ^{FT} indicates a first-time user

APPENDIX XVI: Scottish Parliament website protocol analysis (minutes of search time)

Scottish Parliament website search sessions: protocol analysis (minutes of search time)																											
Coding Categories	Respondents																										
	FT/O 1/2	O 3	R 4	R 5	R 6	FT 7	R 8/9	R 10	O 11	R 12	R 13	R 14	R 15	R 16	R 17	R 18	R 19	R 20	R 21	R 22	R 23	R 24	R 25	FT 26	FT 27	R 28	Tot mins
Interviewee Categories																											
IE Search	2.4	-	2.0	1.1	-	-	13.2	-	0.7	0.2	1.6	-	2.1	1.3	-	0.1	2.7	-	1.4	-	-	5.5	-	-	-	-	34.3
IE Browse	4.0	0.9	0.2	0.3	0.2	-	0.7	5.2	-	1.6	0.2	5.6	1.6	3.8	8.0	3.1	0.3	3.4	-	0.5	1.4	-	2.8	0.3	0.2	3.2	47.5
IE Navigate	-	0.2	-	-	-	0.1	-	0.5	0.1	0.4	0.1	-	0.6	-	0.9	0.2	0.6	0.2	-	-	-	0.2	0.1	-	-	-	4.2
IE Read aloud	1.8	-	-	1.3	-	1.4	1.5	0.6	3.4	0.6	0.6	1.0	0.3	-	-	1.2	0.5	-	-	-	-	0.8	0.3	0.8	-	-	16.1
IE Read internal	-	0.7	0.5	0.5	-	1.7	-	2.1	1.0	2.9	0.9	2.5	5.6	9.0	0.5	3.8	1.9	3.0	0.7	2.0	0.9	0.8	2.7	-	2.6	0.2	46.5
IE Positive	0.2	-	-	-	0.6	-	-	0.3	-	0.6	0.1	0.7	-	0.3	2.3	-	0.6	0.5	-	-	1.1	-	2.6	-	-	1.0	10.9
IE Negative	0.7	-	0.3	0.6	-	0.7	6.2	-	-	0.2	1.1	-	1.8	2.6	0.6	0.4	0.6	0.5	0.4	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	-	17.2
IE Parliament	-	-	0.1	0.2	-	1.3	-	0.7	-	-	0.4	-	-	0.7	-	2.0	0.2	0.6	-	0.6	1.2	0.1	-	-	0.2	-	8.3
IE IT	1.4	-	-	0.1	-	-	0.1	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	1.8
IE Project	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	0.1	-	0.1	-	-	2.7	-	0.2	-	-	3.3
IE Political	-	2.0	-	-	-	0.2	-	1.9	5.1	0.2	0.4	0.7	1.5	-	0.3	0.2	-	-	1.3	0.5	1.7	-	1.6	4.1	3.6	-	25.3
IE Personal	-	0.7	0.5	0.8	0.3	-	1.9	1.6	1.0	0.4	1.7	0.9	-	1.1	5.5	0.5	0.5	1.1	0.5	1.1	0.6	4.2	0.4	2.4	-	3.9	31.6
Totals for Interviewee	10.5	4.5	3.6	4.9	1.1	5.4	23.7	13.0	11.3	7.1	7.1	11.4	13.5	18.8	18.2	11.5	8.0	9.3	4.4	4.7	6.9	14.3	11.0	7.9	6.6	8.3	247.0
Interviewer Categories																											
IR Search	1.0	-	0.2	-	-	0.7	1.9	-	2.8	4.1	2.5	-	1.8	-	-	-	1.7	-	5.5	0.7	-	4.8	-	1.9	0.6	-	30.2
IR Navigate	4.6	9.0	1.3	2.8	1.5	4.9	-	6.3	3.6	3.9	1.3	3.6	9.5	8.1	1.5	8.5	4.0	0.6	10.5	3.7	3.2	7.7	4.8	2.2	5.2	1.6	113.9
IR Question	0.1	-	0.3	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.3	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.5	-	0.3	0.5	0.1	0.2	-	-	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.1	5.4
IR Parliament	0.7	-	0.5	-	0.5	1.3	0.1	0.2	0.2	0.4	1.7	-	1.1	0.9	0.8	2.4	0.8	1.3	-	-	2.0	3.9	-	-	-	0.3	19.1
IR IT	1.8	0.2	0.2	0.6	-	-	0.1	1.5	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	0.5	0.6	0.9	0.2	0.8	-	0.1	1.9	5.7	-	-	0.9	17.5
IR Project	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	1.1	-	-	-	0.2	0.5	-	-	0.8	-	0.6	-	2.4	0.3	0.5	4.3	2.4	-	-	-	13.6
Totals for Interviewer	8.2	9.2	2.5	4.2	2.2	7.2	3.4	8.3	8.3	8.5	5.8	4.2	12.6	9.8	4.1	11.5	8.3	2.6	19.3	4.9	5.8	22.6	13.0	4.3	6.0	2.9	199.7
Interruptions	2.4	0.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.1	-	-	5.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2.3	-	-	-	11.5
Total search time (minutes)	21.1	14.3	6.1	9.1	3.3	12.6	27.1	21.3	19.6	16.7	12.9	15.6	31.2	28.6	22.3	23.0	16.3	11.9	23.7	9.6	12.7	36.9	26.3	12.2	12.6	11.2	458.2

Note: ^R indicates a regular computer user; ^O indicates an occasional user; ^{FT} indicates a first-time user

APPENDIX XVII: Scottish Parliament website protocol analysis (percentage of search time)

Scottish Parliament website search sessions: protocol analysis (percentage of search time)																												
Coding Categories	Respondents																											
	FT/O 1/2	O 3	R 4	R 5	R 6	FT 7	R 8/9	R 10	O 11	R 12	R 13	R 14	R 15	R 16	R 17	R 18	R 19	R 20	R 21	R 22	R 23	R 24	R 25	FT 26	FT 27	R 28	Tot %	
Interviewee Categories																												
IE Search	11.3	-	33.3	12.5	-	-	48.9	-	3.4	1.4	12.4	-	6.8	4.4	-	0.5	16.8	-	5.8	-	-	14.8	-	-	-	-	-	7.5
IE Browse	18.8	6.2	3.7	3.8	6.9	-	2.6	24.3	-	9.7	1.8	36.2	5.0	13.1	36.9	13.6	2.1	28.8	-	4.7	10.7	-	10.6	2.8	1.8	28.3	10.4	
IE Navigate	-	1.6	-	-	-	0.9	-	2.2	0.6	2.1	0.9	-	1.8	-	4.1	1.0	3.5	1.9	-	-	-	0.6	0.5	-	-	-	0.9	
IE Read aloud	8.6	-	-	13.8	-	10.9	5.6	2.7	17.2	3.4	4.4	6.5	1.1	-	-	5.1	2.8	-	-	-	-	2.2	1.0	6.5	-	-	3.5	
IE Read internal	-	4.6	7.4	5.0	-	13.6	-	9.7	5.2	17.2	7.1	15.9	17.9	31.5	2.1	16.7	11.9	25.0	2.9	21.2	7.1	2.2	10.1	-	20.2	2.0	10.1	
IE Positive	1.1	-	-	-	17.2	-	-	1.6	-	3.4	0.9	4.4	-	1.2	10.3	-	3.5	3.9	-	-	8.9	-	10.1	-	-	9.1	2.4	
IE Negative	3.2	-	5.6	6.2	-	5.5	22.7	-	-	1.4	8.8	-	5.7	9.2	2.8	1.5	3.5	3.9	1.5	-	-	-	2.0	-	-	-	3.8	
IE Parliament	-	-	1.8	2.5	-	10.0	-	3.2	-	-	2.6	-	-	2.4	-	8.6	1.4	4.8	-	5.9	9.8	0.3	-	-	1.8	-	1.8	
IE IT	6.5	-	-	1.2	-	-	0.4	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.9	-	-	0.4	
IE Project	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.7	-	0.7	-	0.5	-	-	7.4	-	1.9	-	-	0.7	
IE Political	-	14.0	-	-	-	1.8	-	8.7	25.9	1.4	2.6	4.4	4.7	-	1.4	1.0	-	-	5.4	4.7	13.4	-	6.1	33.3	28.4	-	5.5	
IE Personal	-	4.6	7.4	8.8	10.3	-	6.9	7.6	5.2	2.1	13.2	5.8	-	4.0	24.8	2.0	2.8	9.6	2.0	11.7	4.5	11.4	1.5	19.4	-	34.3	6.9	
Totals for Interviewee	49.5	31.0	59.2	53.8	34.5	42.7	87.5	60.5	57.5	42.1	54.9	73.2	43.0	65.7	82.1	50.0	49.0	77.9	18.1	48.2	54.4	38.8	41.9	64.8	52.3	73.7	53.9	
Interviewer Categories																												
IR Search	4.8	-	3.7	-	-	5.5	6.9	-	14.4	24.8	19.5	-	5.7	-	-	-	10.5	-	23.4	7.1	-	12.9	-	15.7	4.6	-	6.6	
IR Navigate	22.0	62.8	20.4	31.2	44.8	39.1	-	29.7	18.4	23.4	9.7	23.2	30.5	28.3	6.9	36.9	24.5	4.8	44.4	38.8	25.0	20.9	18.2	17.6	41.3	14.1	24.8	
IR Question	0.5	-	5.6	3.8	6.9	2.7	0.9	1.6	1.1	0.7	0.9	0.7	0.7	2.8	2.1	-	2.1	3.9	0.5	2.4	-	-	0.5	1.9	1.8	1.0	1.2	
IR Parliament	3.2	-	7.4	-	13.8	10.0	0.4	1.1	1.1	2.1	13.3	-	3.6	3.2	3.4	10.6	4.9	11.5	-	-	16.1	10.5	-	-	-	3.0	4.2	
IR IT	8.6	1.6	3.7	6.2	-	-	0.4	7.0	7.5	-	-	-	-	-	2.1	2.5	5.6	1.9	3.4	-	0.9	5.2	21.7	-	-	8.1	3.8	
IR Project	-	-	-	5.0	-	-	3.9	-	-	-	1.8	2.9	-	-	3.4	-	3.5	-	10.2	3.5	3.6	11.7	9.1	-	-	-	3.0	
Totals for Interviewer	39.2	64.4	40.8	46.2	65.5	57.3	12.5	39.5	42.5	51.0	45.1	26.8	40.5	34.3	17.9	50.0	51.0	22.1	81.9	51.8	45.6	61.2	49.5	35.2	47.7	26.3	43.6	
Interruptions	11.3	4.6	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	6.9	-	-	16.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.6	-	-	-	2.5
Total (%)	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	100	

Note: ^R indicates a regular computer user; ^O indicates an occasional user; ^{FT} indicates a first-time user