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1. REPORT PURPOSE

SPHERE (Stormont Parliamentary Hansards: Embedded in Research and Education) is a JISC-funded project based at King’s College, London and Queen’s University, Belfast, working in Partnership with the Northern Ireland Assembly Library, and the NIA Official Report (Hansard). Its purpose is to assess the use, value and impact of the Stormont Papers digital resource, and to use the results of this assessment to make recommendations for a series of practical approaches to embed the resource within teaching, learning and research among the wider user community.

This report describes the web survey performed by the SPHERE project to examine current use of the Stormont Papers and determine functionality that would improve utilisation in the future. The survey uses a mix of qualitative and quantitative methods. In our survey, we deal with quantitative data but actually do not look at them from the point of view of statistically significant research, but as hints that support or contradict other data gathered by the project team, in the qualitative study, workshop, and the web analytics: for example, the interview protocols were designed to be comparable to the web questionnaire.

The online survey gathered information on four key topics:

1. Communication methods that have proven most effective for raising awareness of the resource;
2. Purpose for which the resource is currently used;
3. Effectiveness of provided functionality to perform the intended purpose;
4. Future enhancements that could be made to better support users to perform their work.

Both the survey and the interviews revealed that users whom provided feedback primarily use it for research purposes and are, for the most part, satisfied by the functionality offered. However, it found that respondents would like to see modifications to the visual appearance of the site to make it more visually appealing, and enhanced functionality for browse, search, and general navigation. In terms of the addition of new content, the inclusion of Committee Papers and Bills & Acts were considered to have particular value.

2. SITE OVERVIEW

The Stormont Papers web site (http://stormontpapers.ahds.ac.uk/) provides free access to an electronic library of the full text Official Record, or Hansard, of the House of Commons for the Northern Ireland Parliament during the period from June 7, 1921 - March 28, 1972 – from Partition with the Irish Free State, and Direct Rule from Westminster. It includes over 92,000 printed pages from 84 volumes of debates of the Stormont devolved parliament. These provide a rich source of information on the government of the Province. The debates reflect the holistic nature of powers devolved to Stormont including both social and economic policy in Northern Ireland and relations with the British and Irish governments. It includes coverage of issues relating to Home Rule, security and the Northern Ireland troubles and has largely been used as a source reflecting these issues. The historiography of Northern Ireland over this 50-year period...
has largely ignored the day-to-day process of governing a state with devolved powers in all areas save that of Foreign Policy. The project was organised by the Centre for Data Digitisation and Analysis (CDDA) at Queen's University Belfast and made available by the Arts and Humanities Data Service Executive using funding provided by the Arts & Humanities Research Council (AHRC). It is currently hosted by the Centre for e-Research (CeRch) at King’s College London.

3. WEB SURVEY METHODOLOGY
The project utilised an online questionnaire as a research instrument on users’ current and potential future usage of the Stormont Papers resource. A questionnaire, particularly in its online form, offers the potential to collect a combination of quantitative and qualitative information from a large number of respondents with focused effort by an investigator. This was supplemented by semi-structured interviews, and the web log analysis (described in detail in part 2).

The questionnaire was comprised of ten questions, consisting of a series of closed Boolean (yes/no), multiple choice and scaled responses, to gather quantitative information that may be easily compared. These were supplemented by open-ended unstructured comment fields, in which the user could provide a response as considered appropriate.

1 Awareness of site
   a. How the respondent had became aware of the existence of the site
   b. Whom, if anyone, the respondent had recommended the site to

2 Purpose for which the respondent currently uses the site
   a. Frequency of site visits
   b. Purpose that they use it for
   c. Subject domain in which the site is used

3 Effectiveness of current functionality
   a. Search interface
   b. Browse interface
   c. Navigation
   d. Visual layout
   e. User documentation

4 Future enhancements
   a. Improvement functionality that would better support users
   b. New content that users would find beneficial

The survey was hosted on the SurveyMonkey (http://www.surveymonkey.com/) service, enabling quick access to the resource for both users and for interpretation of the results.
The project team utilised a number of methods to make the user community aware of the existence of the questionnaire and its purposes.

- **Web sites:**
  - Stormont Papers front page (http://stormontpapers.ahds.ac.uk/stormontpapers/index.html)
  - SPHERE Project Blog (http://sphere.cerch.kcl.ac.uk/?page_id=19)
  - University of Ulster blog (http://blogs.ulster.ac.uk/library-research/2010/12/17/stormont-papers-web-survey/)
  - Arts-humanities.net (http://www.arts-humanities.net/blog/garethknight/influence_future_development_stormont-parliamentary_papers_digital_resource)
  - Council for British Archaeology (via ah.net news aggregator) http://www.britarch.ac.uk/archaeologylatest/daah
  - Digital Humanist Mailing list (http://www.digitalhumanities.org/cgi-bin/humanist/archive/archive_msg.cgi?file=/Humanist.vol24.txt&msgnum=585&start=70699)

- **Mailing lists**
  - JISC Repositories
  - United Kingdom Council of Research Repositories (UKCorr) mailing list
  - Various Digital Curation Centre mailing lists (via Joy Davidson)
  - Various JISC digitisation related mailing lists (via Alastair Dunning)
  - Specialised mailing list of archivists in Scotland (via Milena Dobreva)
  - Various Irish history and politics mailing lists (via Paul Ell)

- **Twitter messages**

- **Personal correspondence to interested parties**

Although circulated widely, the online questionnaire attracted a lower than expected number of responses. Although inherently difficult to determine, a number of factors may be considered for the low turnout: the survey was circulated in early December, a time when many academics are preparing to go on leave, potentially resulting in the email message being overlooked; and the Stormont Papers web site was affected by unexpected downtime, which prevented the primary audience who visit the web site, but do not use the aforementioned web sites, blogs, or mailing lists, from seeing the message. To address the first issue, the message was re-circulated in January and February, which prompted a limited response. However, the site issues that were affecting the Stormont Papers resource could not be resolved during the survey period. For this reason, we have kept the survey online, and will review the results again nearer the end of the project to see if increased responses from users affect the findings. Nonetheless, it is not surprising that we do not have vast amount of responses for a relatively specialised resource.
4. WEB SURVEY RESULTS

1.1 PROMOTION OF RESOURCE

The first topic for analysis was to determine how awareness of the Stormont Papers resource had been spread through the academic community. The project sought to determine two issues:

1. The success of any strategies employed by the project partners to promote the site within the targeted academic community, and
2. The extent to which the user community contributed to the promotion of the site, through peer recommendation

Respondents were asked to reflect on how they initially became aware of the online resource, and to indicate if they had recommended the resource to others. If the respondent had recommended the resource, they were asked to indicate the type of user.

4.1.1 AWARENESS OF RESOURCE

First, respondents were asked to indicate how they had initially become aware of the existence of the resource. The multiple choice question provided six options: (1) email received via a mailing list; (2) personal email sent direct to the respondent; (3) reference on a third party web site/forum/other resource; (4) search engine; (5) word of mouth, or (6) through involvement in the original project. A text box was provided, allowing respondents to state alternative information sources or provide specific examples using free text. The question was answered by all respondents, whom identified a number of information sources (Figure 1).

![Figure 1: Responses to question on how respondents became aware of the site](image)

The distribution of responses is interesting, implying that a combination of different methods have been effective in communicating the existence of the resource, rather than the success of one specific communication method. The announcement of the launch and continued development of the resource through relevant mailing lists (31%) appears to have been the most effective method of informing a large number of...
interested parties that the resource exists, while targeted emails to selected people has had some success (8%). The indication that the largest percentage of respondents (38%) heard of the resource through ‘word of mouth’ is also reassuring, suggesting that a degree of community-driven promotion has begun to emerge. However, the lack of references to 3rd party web sites, forums, or other online resources, as well as the low response rate to the questionnaire, is a concern, possibly indicating that the resource has, so far, had only limited impact upon the wider research and teaching community. This may reflect the lack definitive sources of information for the large and disparate Irish Studies community with interests crossing a host of disciplinary areas. It seems that there is not a ‘one-stop-shop’ for Irish Studies and reflecting its diverse nature this is significant for for few other subject areas could more effective interactions between users be needed.

In order to partially address this, the project organised a stakeholder workshop, which took place at PRONI (Public Record Office of Northern Ireland) on April 8th, 2011.

4.1.2 COMMUNITY-DRIVEN PROMOTION

Second, the project sought to determine if respondents had made recommended the web site to their peers for use in their own work. The question had a dual purpose: to determine if respondents considered the Stormont Papers to be a valuable resource for research and teaching purposes (respondents would not recommend a web site if it did not meet the users’ needs), and to establish the extent to which the user community contributed to ongoing promotion of the resource. A statement that the respondent had recommended the resource to others was also seen as evidence that the resource was benefiting from self-sustaining, community-driven promotion, enabling a larger audience to become aware of its existence and value.

The multiple choice question provided respondents with nine user categories, of which they could select one or more: (1) academic researcher (2) undergraduate students (3) postgraduate students, (4) library staff, (5) archives staff, (6) media, (7) politician(s), (8) school or FE college staff, or (9) no one. A free text box was provided at the end of the question to allow respondents to indicate other users who they had recommended the resource to, or provided additional comments. A text box was provided, allowing respondents to state alternative types of user or provide specific examples using free text.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of user types</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 1: No. of different groups of user to whom respondents have recommended the resource

The question was answered by all respondents, of whom only one indicated that they had not recommended the resource to others. The remaining respondents have recommended the resource to 1-9 different types of user (Table 1). Seven respondents indicated that they had recommended it to a number of different users, with four respondents recommending the resource to 4 or more different user groups. Although, to some extent, the figures are an indication of the type of group with whom the respondent comes into contact, it may also be used to demonstrate the value of the resource to different user communities.

As indicated in Table 2, academic researchers were the most common user group to whom the respondents recommended the resource, following by postgraduate students, undergraduate students, library staff, archives staff, media staff, School/FE colleges and politicians.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User type</th>
<th>Percentage of total responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic researchers</td>
<td>69.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate</td>
<td>53.80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>46.20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>38.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archives</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media</td>
<td>23.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School or FE College</td>
<td>15.40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Politician</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: User types most commonly recommended to use the resource

Of the respondents who completed the survey, only one indicated that they recommended the resource other types of user, beyond those that were listed. Respondent 6 stated that, in addition to academic researchers and postgraduate students, they recommended it to a friend whom had a personal interest and maintained a blog on Irish culture.

4.2 CURRENT RESOURCE USAGE

The second topic for analysis was to determine how the Stormont Papers resource is currently used by its user community. The project sought to determine three issues:

1. The frequency of visits that the respondent made to the web site;
2. Purpose that they currently use the resource for;
3. The subject domain in which the resource is used;

1 A full list of user groups recommended by each respondent can be found in Appendix 2.
Respondents were asked to reflect on their current usage of the resource, citing any tangible research, teaching, or other outputs that had been produced as a result. Frequent visits to the web site may be indicative that the web site has a key role in the work activities of the respondent, while reference to the purpose and subject domain how the resource is used.

### 4.2.1 FREQUENCY OF VISITS

First, respondents were asked to state the frequency of visits to the web site. The multiple choice question offered four possible categories, each of which was associated with a specific time period: (1) Frequently, (2) Occasionally, (3) Infrequently, or (4) Have not previously used web site. A frequent visitor was classified as one who visits the site every day or, as a minimum, a number of times per month; occasional visitors visit the site monthly, or at least once every three months; whereas infrequent visitors were determined to be those who visit the site a few times each year on an irregular basis. The final category was provided for respondents that were unaware or had not visited the site prior to receiving the survey request.

![Figure 2: Frequency of visits to the Stormont papers web site](image)

The question was answered by all respondents, all of whom indicated that they had previously visited the site. This outcome is to be expected, given the information gathering method utilised. The time investment required to read and complete an online questionnaire would only have been considered worthwhile by those who are an existing user of the resource. New users may become aware of the resource through the promotion of the questionnaire, but may not consider themselves sufficiently expert in its use to provide a response. The data may also indicate that the site is not attracting significant numbers of new users.

The question responses were well distributed, covering all three time categories: more than half of respondents (54%) indicated that they visited the web site at least once every 1-3 months, 23% indicated that they visited the site on a daily or weekly basis, while the remaining 23% indicated that they visited the site infrequently, a few times every year. As noted above, these figures may be indicative that the resource has a key role in the work of a small number of researchers, and a small role in a larger user group.
4.2.2 PURPOSE OF USAGE

Second, the project sought to determine the purpose or function for which the web site was used. The multiple choice question provided respondents with five options, of which they could select one or more: (1) Research, (2) Teaching, (3) Personal interest, (4) Political Reference, and (5) Journalism. A text box was also provided, enabling respondents to refer to public outputs of their investigatory work or further comments.

![What purpose do you use the Stormont Papers resource for?](chart)

As indicated in Figure 3, the majority of respondents (84.62%) use the resource for research purposes, with 46.15% using it for ‘personal interest’, 38.46% using it for teaching purposes, 23.08% using it for political reference, and 23.08% using it for journalism purposes. Only one respondent provided further information – the respondent indicated use of the resource for personal interest, research, and teaching purposes, stating that they were investigating the devolution process.

4.2.3 SUBJECT DOMAIN

Third, the project sought to identify the subject domains in which the Stormont Papers resource is used. Respondents were provided with a text box in which they could enter one or many different subjects. The intent was to allow respondents to provide a detailed explanation of the subject domains and sub-domains in which they used to resource. To assist the respondent in the type of information required for the question, history and social studies were listed as example subject domains. See Error! Reference source not found. Appendix 2 for a full list of responses).
Figure 4: Responses to question on subject domain in which resource is used

As indicated in Figure 4, the majority of respondents (76.92%) stated that the resource was used in the history domain only. In the response listing multiple subjects, the history domain was the first subject to be stated. A small number of respondents cited other subject domains – one respondent indicated the resource was used for scientific study in research, teaching and journalism, but did not provide further explanation of the area of study; a second respondent indicated it was used for political research and teaching; and a third respondent indicated that they used the resource for research into economics, finance and history.

The frequency in which the history subject appears is perhaps unsurprising – the Stormont Papers is a historical resource, documenting political debates that took place 40-90 years prior, and the listing of history as an example subject domain may have influenced respondents to some extent. However, its use in this manner is ambiguous due to the wide-ranging nature of the subject area. Responses would have benefited from further information indicating specific types of history, e.g. local history, political history, constitutional affairs.

4.3 EVALUATION OF CURRENT FUNCTIONALITY

The third topic of analysis was to determine if the current design and structure of the Stormont Papers resource met the current needs of the user community. The project sought to determine the usability and usefulness of five characteristics of the site:

1. Search functionality
2. Browse interface
3. Site navigation
4. Visual appearance and layout
5. User documentation
The information gathered during the survey analysis would be used to determine areas where further development and refinement would be performed.

4.3.1 GENERAL OPINION ON WEB SITE
First, respondents were asked to comment on the ease of use of the web site as a whole. The question was intended to be deliberately simple for two reasons:

1. It would require little thought in comparison to the previous question, while preparing them for the subsequent question which would ask them to evaluate different attributes of the site.
2. Respondents may use it to comment upon features or functionality of the site that were not covered elsewhere in the questionnaire.

The multiple choice question provided three options: (1) Yes (2) To some extent / for some purposes; or (3) No. In addition, a text box was provided, that the respondent could use to validate their response or comment on specific aspects of the site.

---

Figure 5: Respondent evaluation of the ease of use of the Stormont Papers user interface

The question was answered by all but one of the respondents: the largest percentage (69%) of respondents indicated that the web site was easy to use; 8% of respondents indicated that it was relatively easy to use, dependent upon the purpose or objective that they are attempting to achieve. One respondent stated, “[The site] just looks a bit out of date - search results could be more intuitive”. A single respondent (8%) indicated that the site was not easy to use, but they did not state the reasons.

4.3.2 USEFULNESS OF SITE FUNCTIONALITY
Second, respondents were asked to rate the usefulness of five elements of the Stormont Papers resource - (1) Search interface, (2) Browse interface, (3) Site navigation, (4) Visual layout, and (5) User documentation – on a scale of 1-5 (1=very unsatisfactory, 2=unsatisfactory, 3=satisfactory, 4=good, 5=excellent), or Not Application (N/A).
4.3.2.1 EVALUATION OF SEARCH INTERFACE

Respondents were asked to evaluate the usefulness of the search interface. Content searching is a useful method of identifying information that meets specific user needs. The question was designed to gauge opinion on the suitability of the search interface for locating relevant information. The interpretation of relevance is a qualitative decision that will vary between different user communities – one of the many challenges to a web site developer is to implement search functionality that meets the specific needs of the target user community.

The evaluation of search interface was completed by all respondents. The majority of respondents (92.4%) considered the search interface to be useful, 46.2% considered it to be excellent, 30.8% stated it was good, while 15.4% indicated it was satisfactory. One respondent, who was involved with the initial work on the resource, found the search interface to be very unsatisfactory. Although they did not provide additional comments in the survey, their response to a follow-on question on enhanced functionality implies that they are dissatisfied with current search functionality associated with mark-up.

4.3.2.2 EVALUATION OF BROWSE FUNCTIONALITY

Respondents were asked to evaluate the usefulness of the browse functionality. The content browsing facility may be useful to a researcher when they are navigating a web site for the first time, have limited understanding of the content that a resource contains, or have chosen to navigate the resource with no fixed objective in mind.
The evaluation of the browse functionality was completed by all respondents. The majority of respondents (92.4%) considered the browse interface to be useful, 38.5% considered it to be excellent, 30.8% considered it good, while 15.4% indicated it was satisfactory. One respondent who chose the satisfactory option indicated their reason in a text box for the ease-of-use question (Q6): “search results could be more intuitive”.

4.3.2.3 EVALUATION OF NAVIGATION FUNCTIONALITY
Third, respondents were asked to evaluate the suitability of the navigation functionality. Navigation is a broad term that may refer to the organisational model developed for storing and accessing content, as well as the overall site structure.

The question was answered by all, but one, of the respondents that completed the survey. The majority of respondents (84.59%) considered navigation functionality to be appropriate, 38.46% considered it to be excellent, 30.77% considered it good, while 15.38% indicated it was satisfactory.
4.3.2.4 EVALUATION OF VISUAL APPEARANCE

Respondents were asked to evaluate the suitability of the site’s visual appearance, including its current design and layout. The question was intended to gauge opinion on the influence of the visual appearance upon the usage of the site. Although researchers are often willing to accept a poor visual design, if they know that the information has intellectual value, some visitors may find the visual appearance unappealing and leave the site before they have found information of use.

![Figure 9: Usefulness of visual layout](image)

The majority of respondents (92.3%) considered the visual layout of the site to be sufficient, 53.85% considered the visual appearance to be excellent, 30.77% considered it to be good, and 7.69% considered it to be sufficient. The respondent who considered the visual appearance to be only sufficient provided further explanation in response to the ease-of-use question (Q6), stating: “[The site] just looks a bit out of date”.

4.3.2.5 EVALUATION OF USER DOCUMENTATION

Finally, respondents were asked to evaluate the suitability of the user documentation. The question was intended to gauge opinion on the quality of information available to assist the user when using the resource to navigate the resource and locate appropriate information.
The majority of respondents provided a positive response regarding the suitability of user documentation, (38.46%) considered it to be excellent, 30.77% considered it to be sufficient, while 7.69% indicated it was good. Two respondents did not evaluate the user documentation.

4.3.2.6 SUMMARY
The majority of respondents were positive about the functionality offered by the Stormont Papers resource. Many considered it to be excellent or good, while a smaller number expressed satisfaction. However, it is evident that the site does not meet the needs of all respondents. It is recommended that further investigative work is performed to trial the use of new functionality that revises and refines the method in which content is accessed and manipulated.

4.4 FUTURE ENHANCEMENTS
The fourth and final area of analysis was to determine the new features and functionality that respondents’ wish to be provided in future updates to the Stormont Papers resource. The project sought to determine two issues:

1. New or enhanced functionality that should be prioritised in future development work;
2. The material that would be of most interest, if new content were added to the site;

As a result of information gathered during the investigation, the project can establish where future developments efforts should be prioritised.

4.4.1 NEW/ENHANCED FUNCTIONALITY
First, respondents were asked to indicate the functionality that should be added or enhanced on the Stormont Papers web site. The multiple choice question provided respondents with four options, of which they could select one or more: (1) Full text
search, (2) semantic links to external sources\(^2\), (3) Timelines, and (4) Enhancements to existing mark-up of text content. The provision of checkboxes was considered a potential risk – it would be a simple task for respondents to select every option, without any thought to prioritisation of development work or practicality of its implementation. However, the risk was considered acceptable, to ensure that respondents were provided with sufficient flexibility to indicate the new/enhanced functionality that they would consider of value to their research\(^3\). Fortunately, respondents did not simply choose every feature, selecting generally only those that they understood and considered useful.

The evaluation of search interface was completed by all respondents. In total six respondents' specified one feature as being of value, three respondents indicated two features, two respondents chose 2 features, and one respondent chose all four features. Surprisingly, one respondent indicated that new functionality was not necessary, since it was “already excellent”.

---

\(^2\) Functionality that would allow data from multiple sources to be combined and analysed

\(^3\) In retrospect, the quality of responses to this question could have been improved by asking respondents to indicate the priority in which new functionality should be added.
As indicated in Table 3, the responses show that full text search would have value to the largest number of respondents (69.23% of total response), followed by enhancements to existing semantic mark-up of text content (53.85% of responses). (Presently, text searching is controlled by volume number). The addition of timeline functionality and semantic links to 3rd party resources were considered useful by an equal number of respondents (23.08% of respondents). In addition to the stated function, Respondent 5 used the free text box to request that a small modification be made to the existing site to allow searched-for terms to be highlighted in the search results.

4.4.2 NEW MATERIAL

Second, respondents were asked to indicate the material that would be of most interest to them, if new content were added to the Stormont Papers web site at a later date. The multiple choice question provided respondents with five options: (1) Committee papers, (2) Bills and Acts, (3) Additional parliamentary papers, (4) e-Learning materials, and ‘Thematic collections on key issues’ – of which only one could be selected. A sixth option of ‘Other’ and a text box was provided, to allow the respondent to specify other content types. A single choice option box was used for the question, rather than a multiple choice checkbox (as used in 0), to encourage respondents to prioritise the content that they would like to see in later versions of the resource. The process of negotiating and digitizing new content is a time-consuming activity that, dependent upon funding and time allocation, may only be feasibly performed one or two of the listed content types.
As illustrated in Figure 11, the addition of committee papers would have value to the largest number of respondents (39% of respondents), followed by bills and acts (31% of respondents). The addition of e-learning materials and thematic collections on key issues (15% of respondents). The addition of further parliamentary papers or other content was not considered to be of primary interest to any of the respondents, although this does not necessarily indicate that the respondents would not find it beneficial if they were provided.

5. SUMMARY OF WEB SURVEY

The online questionnaire performed by the project suggests that the majority of users who responded are, as a minimum, satisfied with the functionality of the online resource. However, the low response rate is a concern, limiting the value of any conclusions made using the gathered data and potentially casting doubt over the widespread impact of the Stormont Papers resource in the broader learning and teaching community.

Irrespective of the broader concerns, on the basis of the limited information gathered using the online questionnaire the following conclusions may be drawn:

- Several methods have proven to be effective in promoting the resource in the wider user community, the most notable being ‘word of mouth’ communication through peer recommendation and announcements/discussion on mailing lists. Targeted emails to specific individuals have proven to be effective in a small number of cases.

- Respondents to the online questionnaire have recommended the resource to a number of people working in different areas, most notably academic researchers, postgraduates, undergraduates and library staff.
The majority of respondents use the resource for research purposes, followed by personal interest, teaching purposes, political reference, and journalism purposes.

Respondents consider the search, browse, navigation, visual appearance and documentation to be appropriate to the site, with a number of people considering it good or excellent. However, there is evidence to suggest that improvements could be made to provide greater flexibility of access.

If enhancements were made in the future, respondents would like text search functionality to be improved and enhancements to semantic mark-up, followed by the addition of timeline functionality and semantic integration with 3rd party resources.

There were different views on the type of content that should be integrated into the site in the future. Many respondents would prefer that committee papers and bills & acts were integrated into the site. A small number of respondents were interested in e-learning material and thematic collections.
APPENDIX 1: WEB SURVEY

1. Stormont Papers online survey

This survey is intended to gather feedback on the Stormont Papers online site (http://stormontpapers.dids.ac.uk). The information will be used to inform future planning and direction of the resource.

1. How often do you use the Stormont Papers site?
   - Frequently (daily, weekly)
   - Occasionally monthly, every 1-3 months
   - Infrequently (a few times each year)
   - Have not previously used the site

2. How did you become aware of the site?
   - Personal email message
   - References from another resource (e.g., web site, forum)
   - Search engine
   - Word of mouth
   - I was involved in the work on the resource
   - Other (please specify)

3. What purpose do you use the Stormont Papers resource for?
   - Research
   - Teaching
   - Personal interest
   - Postgraduate reference
   - Journalism
   - Other (please specify)
   - Please provide further information or links to public outputs produced as part of work

4. Please indicate the subject domain(s) in which you are using the resource (e.g., history, politics, social studies, combination of subjects)
   [Question 4]

5. Have you recommended the resource to others? If so, which type of user?
   - Academic researcher
   - Undergraduate
   - Postgraduate
   - Librarian
   - Archivist
   - Media
   - Politician
   - School or FE College
   - Other (please specify)
   - Other (please specify)

6. Have you recommended the resource to others? If so, which type of user?
   - Academic researcher
   - Undergraduate
   - Postgraduate
   - Librarian
   - Archivist
   - Media
   - Politician
   - School or FE College
   - Other (please specify)
   - Other (please specify)
6. Do you find the website easy to use?
   - Yes
   - No
   - To some extent or on a purpose (please explain)

Comments:

7. Please rate the usefulness of the following aspects of the resource on a scale of 1-5
   (1 = very unsatisfactory, 2 = unsatisfactory, 3 = satisfactory, 4 = good, 5 = excellent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Search interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Browse interface</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navigation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual layout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User documentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. What new or enhanced functionality would you like to see in the resource?
   - Enhanced full-text search
   - Semantic links to external resources
   - Timelines
   - Enhanced mark up of text content
   - Other (please specify)

Other (please specify):

9. If new content were to be added to the resource, what material would be of most interest to you?
   - Committee papers
   - Bills and Acts
   - Additional parliamentary papers (please give examples in the box below)
   - E-Learning materials
   - Thematic collections on key issues (e.g. socio-economic, etc). Please provide examples
   - Other (please provide examples)

Other/Examples:

10. Would you be willing to participate in a focus group or an in-depth interview on the Stormont Papers resource? If so, please enter your email address and we will contact you shortly.

In addition, please indicate any other comments/questions you have about the site.

Done
## APPENDIX 2: SURVEY RESULTS

**Table 4: Responses to question on purpose that the Stormont Papers resource is used for**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Research</th>
<th>Teaching</th>
<th>Personal interest</th>
<th>Political reference</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>No response</th>
<th>Other information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Number of respondents selecting option: 11 5 6 3 3
Total responses (percentage): 84.62% 38.46% 46.15% 23.08% 23.08%

I use it for information on devolution

---

**Table 4: Responses to question on purpose that the Stormont Papers resource is used for**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>History</th>
<th>Politics</th>
<th>Scientific Studies</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>Finance</th>
<th>No response</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No. of respondents selecting option: 10 1 1 1 1 1 1

---

*Internal document Page 24*
Total responses (percentage) 76.92% 7.69% 7.69% 7.69% 7.69% 7.69%

Table 5: Responses to question on subject domain in which the resource was used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent No.</th>
<th>Users to which the resource has been recommended</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academic researcher</td>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: Users to whom the Stormont Papers site has been recommended to