This item was submitted to Loughborough's Research Repository by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

Community, diversity and division: the cross organisational networks of practice in web production in UK Higher Education

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

PUBLISHER

© Andrew Cox

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Cox, Andrew. 2019. “Community, Diversity and Division: The Cross Organisational Networks of Practice in Web Production in UK Higher Education”. figshare. https://hdl.handle.net/2134/8111.

Loughborough University

This item is held in Loughborough University's Institutional Repository (https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/) and was harvested from the British Library's EThOS service (http://www.ethos.bl.uk/). It is made available under the following Creative Commons Licence conditions.

creative commons

COMMONS DEED

Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs 2.5

You are free:

- to copy, distribute, display, and perform the work

Under the following conditions:

Attribution. You must attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.

Noncommercial. You may not use this work for commercial purposes.

No Derivative Works. You may not alter, transform, or build upon this work.

- For any reuse or distribution, you must make clear to others the license terms of this work.
- Any of these conditions can be waived if you get permission from the copyright holder.

Your fair use and other rights are in no way affected by the above.

This is a human-readable summary of the Legal Code (the full license).

Disclaimer

For the full text of this licence, please go to:
http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/2.5/

Community, diversity and division: The cross organisational networks of practice in web production in UK Higher Education

by

Andrew Cox

Volume II

Appendices

February 2006

© Andrew Cox (2005)

Best Copy Available

Print bound close to the spine

Appendix 1: Tables associated with literature review and methodology chapters

Table A1.1. The new model of learning proposed in Lave and Wenger (1991) 310
Table A1.2. The contrasting nature of canonical and non canonical knowledge in Brown and Duguid (1991) 310
Table A1.3. Wenger's (1998) usage of the term "community" 311
Table A1.4. Comparison of four seminal concepts of community of practice 312
Table A1.5. Formality and informality 314
Table A1.6. Model of community of practice 315
Table A1.7. Comparison of the concepts of community of practice and networked individualism 317
Table A1.8. Wenger's (1998) model of community of practice compared to Wellman et al.'s (2003) model of networked individualism 319
Table A1.9. Model of factors in cross organisational knowledge sharing 320
Table A1.10. Comparison of email to written and spoken language 325
Table A1.11. Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research, derived from discussion in Sudweeks and Simoff (1999) 326

Table A1.1. The new model of learning proposed in Lave and Wenger (1991)

Old model (cognitive)	New model (constructivism, situativism)
Teaching	Learning
Classroom	In Situ
By Teaching	By observation (therefore social)
	By peripheral participation
(Individualised) pupil learns from teacher	Learning from other learners (therefore social)
Planned in a curriculum	Informal, driven by the task (though elements of the apprenticeship are formal)
Learning is a mechanistic, cerebral process of transmission and absorption of ideas	Learning is as much about understanding how to behave, and is an identity change

Table A1.2. The contrasting nature of canonical and non canonical knowledge in Brown and Duguid (1991)

Canonical knowledge	Non canonical knowledge
Abstract	Situated
Written, logical	Oral, narrative, loosely structured
Fixed	Improvised
Imposed, deskilling	Collaborative, enabling
Individualising	Collective
Alienating	A place in which identity is made and accepted
Merely a useful resource	Efficacious (works to fix photocopier)

Table A1.3. Wenger's (1998) usage of the term "community"

Expected usage	Wenger's usage
Tight knit network	Tight knit
Large scale	Uncertain scale, probably smaller
Neighbourhood based (Geographically situated)	Co-located in the workplace
Self conscious/externally recognised	Not recognised, not clearly bounded
All encompassing	Specific to the enterprise
Friendly, supportive	As likely to be conflictual as harmonious
Unpurposive	Purposive
Static	Ephemeral, creative
Born into	Voluntary

Table A1.4. Comparison of four seminal concepts of community of practice

	Lave and Wenger 1991	**Brown and Duguid 1991**	**Wenger 1998**	**Wenger, McDermott and Snyder 2002**
Concept of community	A group of people involved in a coherent craft or practice, eg butchers	An informal group of workers doing the same or similar jobs	A set of social relations and meanings that grow up around a work process when it is appropriated by participants	An informal club or Special Interest Group inside an organisation, set up explicitly to allow collective learning
View of learning	Central, and seen as occurring through becoming a member – mostly the socialisation of new members by peripheral participation	Collective learning / collaborative problem solving of the group through storytelling	An individual learning history is identification with different communities of practice and trajectories through communities	Learning/ problem solving by deliberately bringing together multiple experts in learning focussed communities
Power and conflict	Between generations, between master, journeymen and novice	Within the community everyone is on the same level, but there is a struggle between the community and the organisation	Conflict is mostly internal conflict within identity, caused by multi-membership	It is assumed that the good of the organisation is the good: Managerialist. Attempts to level relationships within the community.
Change	Gradual change through generations, but rather static	Static, improvisation of solutions to immediate problems is probably within known bounds	Individual change through trajectories and multi-membership	Follows a simple group formation pattern familiar from small group "forming, storming, norming, performing, dissolving"

	Lave and Wenger 1991	Brown and Duguid 1991	Wenger 1998	Wenger, McDermott and Snyder 2002
Formality/ informality	Could be in the setting of a formal system of apprenticeship, but sees most learning as informal, i.e. unstructured, unplanned, not taught	Informal in the sense of existing outside the formal organisation (though premised on its structures), counter cultural Paradoxically this counter culture actually works to get the job done	Authentic engagement around an enterprise, therefore beyond formality. May have a shape and purposes unexpected by the designer of the formal system	• Pre-exists management interest • May pursue its own path of evolution, has no formally constituted objective • Its membership cuts across formal organisational boundaries • Relations are based on expertise not formal position • Has no formal organisational leader
Diversity	Masters / Journeymen / novices – but the practice itself does not have a high division of labour	Egalitarian group of technicians on the same grade	Includes everyone working on the collective enterprise, mutually defining identities – so could be very diverse	Diversity is designed into the group, eg to enhance creativity

Table A1.5. Formality and informality

Formal/good	**Informal/good**
Rules Protection Repeatability Predictability Prestigious (formalised) knowledge	Emergence Spontaneity Creativity Novelty Evolution
Formal/bad	**Informal/bad**
Rigidity Control	Lack of protection of the weak Unpredictable outcomes Lack of rigour

Table A1.6. Model of community of practice

		Community of Practice model	Source
1.	**Core definition**	a) Sustained mutual engagement b) On a valued indigenous, joint enterprise, c) Creating a valued, largely locally created collective repertoire. d) With mutual accountability between participants.	Wenger 1998, Chapter 2
	Dimension 1	**Participation: Who participates given different levels of participation, and how this changes over time**	
2.	**Place/ space**	Local, intimate.	Wenger 1998, Chapter 5
3.	**Mediation**	Face to face, largely unmediated.	Wenger 1998
4.	**Scale**	Scale is small, implied because it is local and based on direct relations.	
5.	**Membership: "Diversity"**	Everybody involved in the practice regardless of profession, proscribed role, pre-existing boundaries of knowledge.	Wenger 1998, pp.75-6
6.	**Participation**	High level, immediate for some but also a value is recognised in peripheral participation, trajectories of participation, multi-membership.	Wenger 1998, Chapter 7
7.	**Boundary work**	Importance of various forms of work on boundary.	Wenger 1998, Chapter 4
8.	**Time: Rhythm**	Communities have rhythms of activity.	Wenger, McDermott and Snyder 2002
	Dimension 2	**Enterprise and repertoire: What is done, accomplished over time**	
9.	**Information and knowledge**	Has a domain of interest. Rapid information sharing, creates knowledge and is a focus of learning.	Wenger 1998, indicators 3, 11, 12
10.	**Narrative and improvisation**	Narrative and improvisation may be important types of activity. Orientation towards getting things done.	Brown and Duguid 1991

		Community of Practice model	Source
11.	**Repertoire**	Over time the enterprise creates a collectively owned, valued set of knowledge, values and discursive resources, such as in-jokes. A significant part of this is locally created, or adapted from pre-existing resources.	Wenger 1998, pp.82-3
12.	**Time**	Transient.	Wenger 1998
13.	**Time: Evolution**	Evolving, adapting to its environment.	Wenger, McDermott and Snyder 2002
	Dimension 3	**Identity and community: How do the group see themselves**	
14.	**Identity**	Mutually defining identities.	Wenger 1998, indicator 8, p.125
15.	**Sense of community Group identity**	Not clear that there is a sense of community, there is an awareness of who is who in relation to the enterprise, but not necessarily a sense of groupness or recognition of the group as an entity.	Wenger 1998, indicator 7, p.125
	Dimension 4	**Climate and governance: What is the climate of interactions, how are they governed?**	
16.	**Climate**	Not predicted: potentially conflictual.	Wenger 1998, pp. 76-7 indicator 1, p. 125
17.	**"Informal" - Governance**	Completely emergent, inventing its own forms of mutual accountability, but presumably these are quite strong norms.	Wenger 1998 pp.81-2
18.	**Co-ordination roles**	Such groups can be facilitated and encouraged to fit with the purposes of other groups (such as an organisation).	Wenger, McDermott and Snyder 2002
19.	**Power**	Fox suggests a weakness is in conceptualising power in communities of practice. There must be power aspects both within the community and between the community and the outside world. He proposes using Callon's (1986) theory of translation to examine the process through which a community is formed for a particular purpose.	Fox 2000

Table A1.7. Comparison of the concepts of community of practice and networked individualism

	Communities of practice	**Networked individualism**
Core idea	Sustained mutual engagement around a shared enterprise building a repertoire of meaning	An individual's contacts exploit the value of weak heterogeneous ties to increase available resources
In SNA terms fundamentally	Strong ties	Weak ties
Network density (proportion of possible ties that actually exist) *	High (everyone knows everyone else)	Low
Graph theoretic distance (number of steps between individuals) *	Low (everyone can contact everyone else without going through another person)	High
Isolates (persons not knowing anybody)*	Few (? but consider the broker role)	Many
Core-periphery structure (no significant sub groups except core) *	Yes	No, does have clusters
Boundedness (whether most of a member's links are in the group or across boundaries) **	Bounded (? But note multi-membership, boundary work)	Unbounded ego centred
Range (heterogeneity of those in the group; and size of group) **	Homogenous (? Part of the concept is to maintain the appropriate level of heterogeneity. The unifying force is the joint enterprise, not similarity) Small (? Scale of a community of practice is unclear.)	Heterogeneous Large
Exclusivity (whether interactions are exclusive to individuals, or open and viewed by others) **	Public	? Exclusive
Social control (how external	Legitimation within the community	? (Rarely discussed)

sources create and control interactions) **		
Strength of relationships (social closeness, voluntariness, multiplexity, frequency of contact) **	Strong	Weak
Place	Collocation, F2F	Distribution, CMC
Channels	Multiple, rich	Few, lean
Time	"Sustained", shared history	Transitory
Purpose	"Shared enterprise"	Specialist
Formality	Informal	Informal
Methods of study	Qualitative (Ethnographic case studies, often exploring narrative)	Quantitative (SNA)

Notes:

* Parameters suggested by Schenkel, Teigland and Borgatti (2001) to define a community of practice in SNA terms and followed by Allatta (2003).

** Wellman (1997) identifies these additional parameters for describing social networks

Table A1.8. Wenger's (1998) model of community of practice compared to Wellman et al.'s (2003) model of networked individualism

Wenger's model of community of practice	**Wellman's model of networked individualism**
Tight knit	Loose knit
Sustained engagement (but a temporary, emergent phenomena)	Transient membership (but community may last)
Mutual accountability	Freedom, lack of security
Bounded	Diversity, rich resources
Mutual knowledge	Weak links
Collective, social construction of meaning	Individuals' motives
Own language and stories	? Borrowed stories, fragmented stories
Small scale	Large scale
Qualitative, focus on meaning (ethnography)	Quantification, focus on behaviour (SNA)
Ethical	Factual

Table A1.9. Model of factors in cross organisational knowledge sharing

Factors operating in favour of sharing	Factors potentially operating to prevent sharing
I Wider Cultural norms, values	
Wider cultural beliefs. At the most general level, society sees sharing knowledge as good (because it is altruistic). Notion of expert has ambivalent impact on sharing. Encourages people to develop expertise, and implies demonstrations of it, but part of expertise is creation of ignorance.	Western society has core values beliefs in individualism and competition (which, for example, are promoted in the very structure of the educational system) neither of which greatly favour selfless sharing. A positivist scientific epistemology governs much evaluation of information. The rigour and objectiveness of this limits people giving their opinion, and favours sharing "hard facts".
Specific cultural values and paradigms. For example of particular relevance to this study is that "Net culture" tends to be a sharing culture, for example (Uimonen 2003b). Again the Open Source movement is an influential paradigm encouraging sharing, openness.	A relevant contradictory force, is that security culture in computing is against sharing anything except on a need to know basis. Thus in any general context there are general norms about the efficacy and appropriateness of sharing knowledge.
Industry wide paradigms. For example, academic culture favours openness and debate (though there are very clear structures of tenure, acknowledgement and citation to motivate and organise sharing in academic communities. Professional communities do not have these).	Institutions in a particular sector are in competition with each other. In academia this is not the fierce, cut-throat rivalry of parts of industry, ultimately it is more important that there is some sort of institutional loyalty which cuts against simply sharing everything with everybody. Because everything is funded by public money there is a potential sense of obligation to share knowledge.
Cross profession sharing. Knowledge sharing is seen as a professional obligation. This is clearly a socially constructed notion.	Different professional epistemologies create barriers between professions, or rather there does not exist common ground of knowledge or notions of validity required to share knowledge. Yet cross professional, cross disciplinary knowledge sharing is often seen as the

Factors operating in favour of sharing	Factors potentially operating to prevent sharing
	most creative form.
II Organisational culture	
Inside organisations, if knowledge is seen as a public good owned by the organisation, this will favour it being shared. Implies a level of trust in and loyalty to the organisation. However this will tend to inhibit sharing with outsiders.	Institutions support internal competition, especially in industry. This could be between individuals or groups. This could be a factor in people seeking answers beyond organisational boundaries.
III Group influence and norms	
Group norms support knowledge sharing, and deprecate free riding. Von Krogh (1998) gives a developed description of a "caring culture" that would support knowledge sharing, but this is faintly absurd.	Members of groups tend to wish to share with fellow members, but not with outsiders.
The individual likes the group or is grateful for past help "generalised exchange": Often seen as a key dynamic in online communities (Hall 2003).	Low quality activity is a barrier to participation, because it diminishes liking of the group.
Broader feeling of sense of community (perhaps, merely, observed or from other direct contacts) implying common values and shared goals, mutual trust.	Feeling of competition with others, including other teams. Ironically this may arise from own team memberships. Fear others might take advantage of information or use it to pursue personal agenda.
IV Individual motivation	
Pro-social motivations	
Genuine altruism	
Empathy with the questioner, who has a tricky, annoying problem, and limited local support. Implies that how the questioner presents themselves, and views on when it is appropriate to help, impact on how much to help is given.	Sense of difference from the other, eg demographic differences. What is seen as sympathetic is socially constructed.

Factors operating in favour of sharing	Factors potentially operating to prevent sharing
Belongingness needs	
Knowledge sharing can be part of sociability, which is enjoyed for itself.	Social interactions often can look like time wasting, and are generally deprecated.
Identity, esteem needs	
The desire to be known by others.	
The desire to be respected by specific individuals.	Fear of criticism or ridicule. What is likely to be respected is socially constructed.
Desire to be seen as expert, very commonly cited as a reason for knowledge sharing. Presumably what this means and the value of it, is a social construct. We want to be approved of by others, but the form that it takes of expertise is specific to our society (perhaps linked to the division of labour?).	Other esteem needs may be more powerful. Being expert implies limiting others to being non-expert, indeed to create ignorance, and desiring to control how knowledge is used.
The desire to define oneself to oneself by one's knowledge, so sharing is a sort of reflexive test.	
Asserting an answer is a form of assertion of personal autonomy.	
Cognitive needs	
If one knows the answer to a question it is a natural instinct simply to offer it, all things being equal.	One does not know what one knows. Requires communication before one recognises what one thinks.
Confidence about the nature of one's knowledge.	Fear information may not be accurate.
The desire to maintain cognitive consistency: its annoying to see something wrong going uncorrected.	Failure to perceive information is relevant.
The challenge of the question, the sense that one needs professionally to keep on one's toes.	
Inherent interest of the question, fascination with the topic.	
Reassurance as have no formal training.	

Factors operating in favour of sharing	Factors potentially operating to prevent sharing
Shared cognitive context.	Lack of common ground of language, skills and language. In highly specialised societies there is little that can be taken for granted as common ground. There is also a cognitive gap between expert and novice. Fear that information is context specific. Fear that information may not be relevant. These factors reflect the difficulty or cost of the potential sharer understanding the context the other is working in.
	Need for skill to interpret information.
Instrumental considerations	
Expect better replies to their own questions, general reciprocation.	
If tasks are not interdependent motivation and understanding required to share knowledge is reduced.	Tasks are actually interdependent – so it is more obviously rational to share knowledge between people working on related tasks.
See value of investing in community.	
Hope for work through establishing their expertise in a particular area (say ASP).	Fear of loss of confidentiality.
Diversion, pleasant interruption	
V Low cost (to user) knowledge sharing infrastructure	
Can / want to use the technology (eg knows how to touch type, likes computers).	
Usability of system.	
Sharing system is integrated with other work processes.	Effort of sharing the information.
A natural process of appropriation of technology by users has been encouraged.	

Factors operating in favour of sharing	Factors potentially operating to prevent sharing
Artefacts can be shared (both ease of sharing, lack of work to share).	
Because people in same environment (eg using windows and OS) without effort ideas are of general applicability. Similar OS, resources levels, time constraints, purposes.	Difficulty of translating information I know to a form that can be shared.
VI Nature of knowledge	
Some forms of knowledge might be easily shared, if it is for example: Codified Factual Abstract Well tested	Other forms of knowledge would be harder to share: Tacit Linked to values Embedded in routines, situated Provisional

Table A1.10. Comparison of email to written and spoken language

Like written language	Like speech	Unique characteristics
Structured like a letter	Casual address	
Lacks context, must build its own		
Cannot employ prosodic features (such as tone of voice) or non verbal communication		Rapid replies compared to text, but not immediate as in conversation
Complex grammatical constructions	Relaxation of strict grammar	Unique features such as emoticons
Saved for reflection / reuse	Invites response	Reuse is very easy
Available across time and space		
		Particular features, eg Petrie (1999) found the single most distinctive feature of email writing to be the use of trailing dots (cited Shortis 2001, p.89)

Table A1.11. Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research, derived from discussion in Sudweeks and Simoff (1999)

	Quantitative	**Qualitative**
Purpose	To explain observed phenomena	To understand observed phenomena
Epistemology	Tends to assume there is a real world, for which truth can be known (positivism)	Tends to assume there are meanings which can be understood
Typical approach	An experiment	A case
Role of theory	Hypothesis to test	Theory with a loose collection of hypotheses
	Can be replicated / accuracy	Loosely structured data, but systematic approach
Role of investigator	Objective observer	Researcher is participatory
Data	Often experiment	Collected in context
Method of working	Analysis after data has been collected	Interpretation throughout
	Constructs knowledge; generalisation and predictive model	Discovers knowledge
Presentation	Graphs attempt to show main points by choosing level of detail shown	Includes lots of quotes from data

Appendix 2: WS Charts

Chart A2.1 WS messages March 1998 to February 2005 328
Chart A2.2 Annual cycle of postings 329
Chart A2.3 Annual cycle in JISCMAIL global postings 330
Chart A2.4 Average length of threads 331
Chart A2.5 Average postings per author 332
Chart A2.6 Number of posters 333
Chart A2.7 Comparison of postings between WS and WIM 334
Chart A2.8 Time of day of postings (March 2002) 335
Chart A2.9 Monthly pattern of posting (March 2002) 336

Chart A2.1 WS messages March 1998 to February 2005



Chart A2.2 Annual cycle of postings



Chart A2.3 Annual cycle in JISCMAIL global postings



Chart A2.4 Average length of threads



Chart A2.5 Average postings per author



Chart A2.6 Number of posters



Chart A2.7 Comparison of postings between WS and WIM



Chart A2.8 Time of day of postings (March 2002)



Chart A2.9 Monthly pattern of posting (March 2002)



Appendix 3: WS tables

Table A3.1. Total postings WS (1st March 1998 to February 28th 2005) 338
Table A3.2. Sample months: summary data 339
Table A3.3. Membership of WS over time 341
Table A3.4. Churn of membership 341
Table A3.5. Numbers of unique posters in each year 342
Table A3.6. Domain and gender of members, posters and posts 342
Table A3.7. Findings of googling subscribers email addresses 343
Table A3.8. List settings data: year of joining 345
Table A3.9. List settings data: settings 345
Table A3.10. Signature file analysis 346
Table A3.11. Roles of questionnaire respondents 346
Table A3.12. Dual membership 347
Table A3.13. Posters and posting 348
Table A3.14. Continuity of participation: posters from first six months of archive 349
Table A3.15. Posting behaviour in the six month period, October 2002 to February 2003 349
Table A3.16. Frequency of topics in WS threads and messages May 1998, October 2003 351
Table A3.17. Question and answer genre and uncommon variants 353
Table A3.18. Other genres A 356
Table A3.19. Other genres B 357
Table A3.20. Frequency of genre in sample months 360
Table A3.21. Long threads 361
Table A3.22. Analysis of long threads March 2000-February 2001 362
Table A3.23. Analysis of long threads March 2002-February 2003 364
Table A3.24. Genre distribution of contributions from persons posting a single message 369
Table A3.25. Comparison with other lists A 371
Table A3.26. Comparison with other lists B 377
Table A3.27. Uwebd analysis 380
Table A3.28. Artefact exchange 381
Table A3.29. Subliminal images thread 382
Table A3.30. Email archive usage, 2001 and 2002 385
Table A3.31. Comparison of May 1998 and October 2003 climate 386

Table A3.1. Total postings WS (1st March 1998 to February 28th 2005)

	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	
1998/9	149	123	203	103	95	133	56	87	133	62	178	101	1423
1999/2000	88	65	94	135	106	83	77	136	107	150	85	236	1362
2000/01	277	60	132	181	99	140	67	124	117	120	146	261	1724
2001/02	171	111	247	144	198	122	78	220	49	73	70	63	1546
2002/3	177	95	171	52	233	188	155	111	123	105	67	38	1515
2003/04	106	70	131	116	165	19	122	199	117	71	163	89	1368
2004/05	190	126	70	95	82	86	74	27	61	79	82	59	1031
Total	1158	650	1048	826	978	771	629	904	707	660	709	788	9969
Ave.	165	93	150	118	140	110	90	129	101	94	101	113	
											Av. per year		1424.143
											Av. per month		118.68

Notes:
Months used as samples are highlighted.
For discussion see especially Chapter 4.3.1

Table A3.2. Sample months: summary data

	May 1998	October 1999	January 2001	July 2001	March 2002	October 2003	August 2004
Total posts (weekdays in month)	203 (21)	136 (21)	146 (23)	198 (22)	177 (21)	199 (23)	86 (22)
Total threads (corrected note 1)	42	37	49	44	42	37	25
Longest thread (in number of messages)	22	17	26	31	24	34	18
Total posters	85	69	62	69	62	49	35
Ac.uk posters	76	54	51	58	57	32	32
Proportion messages by ac.uk posters	95%	80%	60%	70%	70%	74%	92%
Proportion messages by ac.uk, if exclude one high posting individual (FM)	95%	85%	60%	85%	90%	82%	98%
Number of messages posted by highest poster	19	11	21	28	36	39	13
Maximum in one day	23	17	36	27	26	26	25
Maximum in one week	62	43	76	73	99	88	40
No. threads complete in one day	28	26	35	27	26	24	22
As %age of all threads	67%	68%	71%	64%	62%	65%	88%
Mean length of thread in days	1.41	1.39	1.24	1.52	1.40	1.46	1.12
No. threads more than 2 days	4	2	2	5	1	3	3
No. times restarted after w/e	2	1	1	5	1	4	1

	May 1998	October 1999	January 2001	July 2001	March 2002	October 2003	August 2004
Threads running over non-consecutive days	2	1	1	7	1	4	1
Single message threads (%age of all messages) (note 2)	11 (5%)	11 (8%)	19 (13%)	17 (9%)	11 (6%)	10 (5%)	13 (15%)
Weekend posts	0	4	12	3	0	14	0
Posts outside 9 to 5	45	19	43	48	42	29	21
Posts outside 8.30 to 6	17	10	32	19	19	13	16
Proportion of messages falling outside weekday 8.30 to 6	17 (8.37%)	14 (10.29%)	44 (29.93%)	22 (11.11%)	19 (10.73%)	21 (13.57%)	16 (18.6%)

Notes:

1. Counting the number of messages in a thread was not based solely on common subject lines (the method used in the archive to automatically generate thread listings), rather it included all related messages, even if they occurred under different headings, for example, due to slight rewording of the subject line, or attempts to change the subject line. This was somewhat subjective since many threads could be related, but it was necessary in the early years to reduce the number of stray mails.
2. In comparing this figure to Butler's figure of 32% for a sample from 204 lists (1999, p.26) it should be taken into consideration that the thread correction exercise would reduce the number of threads, also the months were sampled specifically for their level of activity. It seems likely that as in the last sample month as total posting falls the proportion of single message threads would rise.

Table A3.3. Membership of WS over time

	2003	2004	%age annual change	2005	%age annual change
Total	759	724	-5%	651	-11%
Ac.uk	600 (79%)	577 (80%)	-4%	525 (81%)	-9%
Non ac.uk	147	135	-8%	114	-15%
Unknown	12	12		12	
Male	511 (67%)	485 (67%)	-5%	443 (68%)	-9%
Female	186 (25%)	178 (25%)	-4%	145 (22%)	-19%
Unknown	62 (8%)	61 (8%)	-2%	63 (10%)	

For discussion see Chapter 4.3.2
Note: data isfor March 1st for each year.

Table A3.4. Churn of membership

	2004	2005
Up on previous year	86 (11% of 2003 total)	85 (12%)
Down on previous year	121 (16%)	158 (22% of 2004 total)
Net change	Down 35 (5%)	Down 73 (10%)
	12% members in 2004 are new	13% members in 2005 are new

For discussion see Chapter 4.3.2

Table A3.5. Numbers of unique posters in each year

Year commencing March	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004
No. posters	288	304	306	261	228	192	168

For discussion see Chapter 4.5.1, see also Chart A2.6.

Table A3.6. Domain and gender of members, posters and posts

	%age of members	%age of posters	%age of posts
Non ac.uk	19-21%	22%	23% (or 13% if exclude one individual)
Female	22-25%	18%	9%

For discussion see Chapter 4.5.2

Table A3.7. Findings of googling subscribers email addresses

Total membership at time of search	724			Notes
Total whose email is unknown	12			Hidden accounts
Duplicates	9			
Not ac.uk email accounts	131 (19% of 703)	Consisting of: 53 from UK (8 gov.uk, 8 other research bodies such as British Library, 10 web consultancies); 82 non UK (including 25 from education outside UK)		
FE	27			
Ac.uk bodies	34	Central services and bodies like JISC itself		
HEI based	511 (73% of 703)			
	Consisting of:			
	Ac.uk for whom no data found	123 (24% of 511)		40 suspicious, suggesting the subscription might be an anomaly. Eg references found to the retirement of people who were still on the list.
	Data found	388		
		In central department	252 (65% of 388)	Of which 40 (16%) were not in computing/library
		In a department	136 (35% of 388)	

Notes:
"Ac.uk bodies" were mostly bodies such as JISC that are national services. In fact, some are based in universities, and a few accounts categorised as within an HE, could have been treated as national bodies (eg the archaeological data service based at University of York). A few other ac.uk bodies such as Wellcome institute were treated as central bodies, even though their precise status is unclear to the author. There was no real need to investigate their precise position.

For discussion see especially Chapter 4.3.3.3, 4.7.1

Table A3.8. List settings data: year of joining

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	(Total)
421 (411 at November 26 2000 and 10 during the remainder of 2000)	82	119	66	36	724
58%					

Notes:
Data is for 10th May 2004.
Jiscmail took over the service at 26 November 2000, at which date existing subscriber lists was transferred, so pre-existing members are recorded as joining at that date.

Table A3.9. List settings data: settings

Nomail	Digest	Digest and nomail	Index	"Active" ie receiving messages
183	53	3	5	486
Of whom 80% had joined in November 2000. 35% of all (411) transferred accounts are set to nomail				67% of total members

Table A3.10. Signature file analysis

	May 1998	October 1999	Jan 2001	July 2001	March 2002	October 2003	August 2004
Total individual posters in month	85	69	62	69	62	49	35
Not ac.uk	10	15	11	11	6	7	3
Ac.uk but no signature file / job title not stated in signature	28	10	12	9	17	10	9
Number for which data exists	47	44	39	49	39	32	23
Institutional web master or team	7 (15%)	8 (18%)	8 (21%)	9 (18%)	10 (26%)	7 (22%)	7 (30%)
Central computing services, but not apparently web dedicated	20 (43%)	14 (32%)	14 (36%)	12 (24%)	13 (33%)	5 (16%)	4 (17%)
In a central service other than IT or Departmentally based	14 (30%)	17 (39%)	9 (23%)	22 (45%)	12 (31%)	12 (37%)	9 (39%)
HE national service / project	6 (13%)	5 (11%)	8 (21%)	6 (12%)	4 (10%)	8 (25%)	3 (13%)
(Learning technology or similar in title	3	2	0	3	2	1	2)

For discussion see Chapter 4.3.3.3

Table A3.11. Roles of questionnaire respondents

Institutional web master	16
Departmental web master	8
Web application developer	7
Learning technology role	5

Table A3.12. Dual membership

	2003	2004	2005
WS also on WIM	37% (277 out of 759)	36% (258 out of 724)	36% (233 out of 651)
WIM also on WS	47% (277 out of 588)	44% (258 out of 583)	45% (233 out of 510)

Table A3.13. Posters and posting

Total posting, over seven years	9881	
Total number of unique posters	876	
Top poster, number of messages	929	9.4%
2nd poster	486	4.9%
3rd	446	4.5%
4th	374	3.8%
5th	297	3%
Top 13 posters (1.5% of members) collectively (all those posting 100+ messages)	3528	36%
18 people (2.1% of members) posting 50-99 messages	1344	13.6%
Individuals posting one message only, 292 (33.3% of all posters)	292	3%

Notes:
The method of calculation involved some manual methods which introduced an underestimate of 1% of all messages sent and the numbers of posters is probably an overestimate due to difficulties of de-duplication.
For discussion see Chapter 4.3.1

Table A3.14. Continuity of participation: posters from first six months of archive

Measure	Statistic
Total messages sent to list >Feb 28 2003	7570
Total posters in period March-May 1998	144
Total of these still members of list in 2003	53 (equivalent to 6.98% of total membership as at February 2003)
Of this group proportion in ac.uk in 1998	94.34% (50)
Proportion in ac.uk in 2003	81.1% (43)
Total postings by this group, as proportion of total messages >Mar 2003	34.99% (2649)
Total postings by three core individuals, as %age of all messages >Mar 2003	16.84% (1275)
Total postings by eleven others from the 53 with 50+ lifetime postings	12.02% (910)

For discussion see Chapter 4.5.1

Table A3.15. Posting behaviour in the six month period, October 2002 to February 2003

Measure	
Total members (as at 2 March 2003)	759
Total postings in period	599
Total no. posters in the period	135
Total lurkers, defined as non posters in the period (as %age of total membership)	82.21%
Regular posters (sent a message in three or more of the six months, as %age of membership)	4.48% (34) posting 70.28% of all messages (421)
Low posters (send a message in only one or two months)	13.31% (101) posting 29.72% of all messages (178)
Heavy posters (sent more than 20 messages in the six	0.66% (5) posting 36.73% of all messages (220)

months, as %age of membership)	
Single posters (sent one message, as %age of membership)	7.64% (58)
Posters from non.ac.uk domain	14.07% of posters (19), sending 19.53% messages (117)
The heaviest poster	12.02% of all messages

Table A3.16. Frequency of topics in WS threads and messages May 1998, October 2003

Clusters	Activities	Threads		Messages	
		1998	2003	1998	2003
Strategy and Management	Supervision				
	Strategy				
	Policy	1		1	
	Politics and liaison, encompasses relations with web authors				
	Project management				
IT (coding)	Web mark up (HTML, CSS, Javascript) - includes standardisation aspects of these	12	15	66	119
IT (development)	Programming / database connectivity (including writing cgi scripts)	5	4	23	8
IT (networking)	Networking, server maintenance and reporting (including logs)	8	8	54	57
	Search engine	2		6	
	System choice, implementation (browsers)	17 (7)	15 (8)	109 (32)	98 (68)
IT (MIS)	Core business processes/ portals/e-commerce				
IT (helpdesk)	Trouble shooting	2		3	
	Documentation				
	R&D	2	2	4	3
Usability/accessibility	Interface design, navigation, usability, accessibility	3	4	49	22
Staff development/ HRM	Training				
E-learning	E-learning		1		2
Information management/ librarianship	Information management, taxonomies, metadata		2		18
	Legal issues				

Clusters	Activities	Threads		Messages	
Marketing	Writing for web, content creation				
	Graphic design (and multimedia)	2	1	7	1
	Marketing				
Reflexive	The job itself		1		7
	Off topic	1	1	1	1

Keywords: May 1998

Accessibility, browsers (8), caching, cgi, collaboration tools, content negotiation (3), cookies, course, file conversion (2), forms, frames, graphic formats, HTML (6), html editor, java, javascript, monitors, multimedia, pdf, reuse, scheduling, search engines (2) security, site blocking, SSI (2), usability, user support, validation, web mirroring, web server (3), windows, Word, XML (2).

Keywords: October 2003

Accessibility (3), applications, best practice, browsers (7), case studies, cgi (2), character encoding (2), CSS (4), e-learning, email, file conversion (2), file upload, hardware, HTML, humour, image, java, javascript, mark up, MS (2), multimedia, OS (3), Pdf, personal, security, web server, web server testing, software, usability, validation, XHTML, XML (4) , XSLT, (off topic)

Notes:
Each thread was coded, then the score multiplied by number of messages in thread.
Multiple keywords were given to threads.
For discussion see Chapter 4.4.1

Table A3.17. Question and answer genre and uncommon variants

	Question and answer genre			Uncommon variants	
	Q/A (how do I fix this problem?) "Fixes"	Q/A (how do I do x?) "How tos"	Q/A (what tools are there to do x?) "Recommend -ations"	Generalisation to good practice	Improvisation
Example (fictional)	I have a problem with this code – I cant see where the problem is, can anyone help? I am using this tool – but it seems to be doing *?	How do I do * in ASP? Has anyone unified authentication in this environment?	I need software to mirror my site – any one out there experience of using anything to do that? Is $ any good?	You should be using CSS not using that tag, because ... This would be better achieved by content negotiation.	Has anybody done X? Why not try? (For a detailed example see Chapter 4.4.2.6.2)
Apparent purpose	Get an answer to a specific problem	Get answer	Input to choice of tool	To define / propagate good practice	To find and explore multiple solutions
Typical length of messages	Medium (Question requires context, problem could be quite involved)	Medium (Question requires context, problem could be quite involved)	Short (Answers can simply give name/reference/ URL and summary evaluation)	Long (It is a matter of evaluation)	Short
Whole or part of thread?	Whole	Whole	Whole	Part (usually at end – after Q/A opening) Very much more rarely direct request for	Whole

				good practice guidance or request for what is current practice.	
Typical length of thread	> 5 messages	> 5 messages	5 messages + (there could be lots of alternatives)	5 messages +	10 >
Style of writing	Impersonal, but with face saving	Personal	Impersonal	Impersonal (=generalised), closely argued	Personal, immediate
Style of opening message	Face saving	Face saving	Direct request	Challenge pre-existing thread	How to question
Framing	Once, of the question in answers	Once, of the question	No	Multiple (because challenges point by point)	Possibly
Use of emoticons etc	Possibly	Possibly (as face saving)	No	No	No
Participants	Dual	Multiple	Multiple	Dualistic	Multiple
Response options	Answers, face saving, sympathy	Offer answer, question value of doing X	Give answer, URL of resource	Flame	Bounces ideas off other people
Who participates?	All	All	All	BK likely to be central	All
Artefacts (code, URLs, quotes)	Yes (code)	Possibly	URLs	URLs	Yes
Most characteristic and unique feature	Heavy opening face saving	Possibly rather vaguely distinguished	URLs in answers	Highly reasoned, referenced argument	Large number of participants all adding a small element to the solution
Narrative	Possibly	Possibly	No	No	No
Could be construed	Restricted to		Orientation towards	Neutral,	No

as "masculine" because … [all could be so construed, as they are public utterances.]	technical aspects of problem. Focus is on solution not moral support / empathy.		using tools to control world	unemotional	
(Frequency)	Common	Common	Common	Medium	Rare

For discussion see Chapter 4.4.2

Table A3.18. Other genres A

Genre:	Simple Announcement	Resource announcement	Warning	Site evaluation
Example (all fictional)	Job opportunity ... Conference announcement ... Survey ...	* is a really useful resource.	Beware a variant on the * virus is around.	This is a really terrible site ...
Apparent purpose	Make information known to audience (event, job, resource)	To share useful resource (sometimes out of self interest if own resource)	To warn others of possible risk & find solutions	To generate fellow feeling, explore boundaries with commercial web site creation; defines bad practice
Typical length of messages	Long (gives full details of event etc)	Medium (gives full details)	Long	Long
Whole or part of thread?	Whole	Whole, but could be part of response. Offered as thanks for help.	Whole	Whole
Typical length of thread	1 message	1 message	1 message	10>
Style of writing	Impersonal administrative	Description and URL	Detailed and specific	Rant / complaints about bad site
Framing	No	No	No	Possibly
Use of emoticons etc	No	Possibly	No	Possibly
Participants	Single	Single	Multiple	Multiple
Addressing	Impersonal	Friendly	Impersonal	Impersonal

Response	None	Gratitude, agreement that this is good resource	Confirm that risk exists To offer solutions	Evaluations
Who participates?	Low posters	All	All	All
Artefacts (code, URLs, quotes)	URL of web site for more information, text drawn from other source	Single URL of resource	URL	No
Other features	Cross posted "apologies for cross posting"		Flagged as urgent because of danger	
Most characteristic and unique feature	Single message threads Cross posting			
Could be construed as "masculine" because ... [all could be as public utterances.]	Formal, public discourse could be construed as more male.			Enjoyment of anger and scorn
(Frequency)	Medium (a few per month)	Rare	Rare	Rare

For discussion see Chapter 4.4.2

Table A3.19. Other genres B

Genre:	**Banter**	**Netiquette**	**Rant**	**Flaming**
Example (all fictional)	Hi, Johnny, haven't heard from you for a while :-(– how are you ?	This list should be about *. Stop sending messages like that.	I have just wasted two hours trying to configure*. This software is really useless.	You really should read the manual you idiot

Genre:	Banter	Netiquette	Rant	Flaming
			I cant use this web site because they have designed it ignoring X.	
Apparent purpose	Express and reinforce friendly feelings	To discuss what the list should be about, what behaviour is best (includes complaints about netiquette failures)	Relieve frustration with sympathetic audience / show off	To express anger or contempt
Typical length of messages	Short	Short	Long	Long
Whole or part of thread?	Part (occurring at end)	Part (at end)	Part (often opening)	Part (usually middle of thread)
Typical length of thread	2/3 messages	1 message, occasionally longer	1 message	5 messages +
Style of writing	Highly personal (eg poor spelling, little structure, in jokes) Techie showing off.	One line complaint or request for information.	Personal (colourful)	Violent language
Framing	No	Yes (eg of message breaking netiquette)	No	Yes
Use of emoticons etc	Yes	No	More likely exclamation marks, substitution of letters in swear words	Yes
Participants	Dual	Single	Single	Dualistic
Addressing	Direct and personal	Impersonal	None	One other
Response	Annoyance or None	Debate	Sympathy /	Flames in response,

Genre:	Banter	Netiquette	Rant	Flaming
				attempts to face save
Who participates?	SF, FM	All	JM	FM
Artefacts (code, URLs, quotes)	No	No	No	No
Most characteristic and unique features	Personal addressing		Acknowledgement that it is a rant	Ad hominem attack
Stories?	No	No	No	No
Could be construed as "masculine" because ... [all could be as public utterances.]	Part of jokey culture		Expresses anger, which is commonly seen as easier for men than women to express.	Expresses anger
(Frequency)	Very rare	Fairly common	Rare	Very rare

For discussion see Chapter 4.4.2

Table A3.20. Frequency of genre in sample months

		May 1998		October 1999		January 2001		July 2001		March 2002		October 2003		Aug 2004	
		Threads	Messages												
Q/A	How to	11	37	10	33	8	18	7	25	4	13	5	16	2	13
	Fix	7	48	6	20	7	18	7	27	3	14	4	17	6	26
	Recomm-endation	10	68	4	15	4	8	7	34	9	26	5	28	4	14
	Others	2	4	7	23	12	38	0	0	5	27	4	16	3	5
Simple announcements		2	2	3	3	8	8	7	7	4	4	3	3	1	2
Resource announcements		2	2	0	0	4	4	4	13	0	0	3	6	7	7
Warnings		1	2	0	0	1	4	4	21	0	0	0	0	0	0
Complex Threads		2	40	2	32	2	43	3	67	5	46	5	91	1	18
Netiquette		0	0	6	10	2	3	2	3	8	14	0	0	1	1
Banter		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	3	10	0	0
Rant		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0
Sympathetic		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0
Prof. Issues		0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	2	24	1	7	0	0
Off topic		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
Total		37	203	38	136	49	146	41	197	42	177	37	199	25	86

For discussion see Chapter 4.4.2

Table A3.21. Long threads

Pattern	Frequency of occurrence
Q/A > related or follow up question (rarely more than two – usually by original poster, not another individual, sometimes as follow up, sometimes in original posting)	Common
Q/A > unrelated question gets into thread.	Relatively rare
Q/A > relatively open question = lots of answers (applies most to evaluation of tools which are inherently rather open ended)	Medium
Q/A > improvised answer to novel problem (variation on lots of answers to open question)	Rare
Q/A > more general principles of best practice (usually several people ganging up on someone who steps out of line, so can seem a bit flamey. Its longer because its more involved and adds to just answering question)	Medium (what is good practice)
Q/A > unexpected issues with what the questioner trying to do	Surprisingly rare (perhaps people are wary about embarrassing someone)
Q/A mixed with other genres such as metadiscussion or banter.	Relatively common
Some issues such as some professional or metadiscussion issues excite considerable heat, sometimes negative, other times positive	Rare

For discussion see Chapter 4.4.2.2

Table A3.22. Analysis of long threads March 2000-February 2001

Date	Subject line	Length in messages	Free text description	Genre	Cause of length
Mar 2000	Domain name checking	21	Warning of nefarious practice associated with domain name registration, discussion of possible solutions (avoidance, wrecking, go to press, action by nominet)	Warning > Evaluation of services	Confirmations of the problem / drift onto second topic about recommending ISPs
Mar 2000	IP addresses, locator?	11	How to check who owns a domain name / IP address > request service to deliver mappings to country on fly > becomes content negotiation	Really two Q/as conflated (what service is there? What tool is there > best approach might be)	2 questions
Mar 2000	Job:Web assistant	26	Announcement > Objection to requirement to have a degree for web editor post, response is guarded. Not really linked back specifically to web work.	Professional status in response to job announcement ?	Stirs up some emotion?
Mar 2000	Job opportunity	12	Job announcement > pay discussion	Professional status thread	Second thread started
Mar 2000	re: users with old machines/old browsers	23	How to fix strange effect of page width > becomes why should we use standards > how to monitor page width of browser	Q/a (fix) / best practice/ request for explanation of how something works	Expansion to standards
Mar 2000	Quark conversion	11	Search for tool to convert quark files for web	Q/a (recommendation)	Only just beats 10 – range of options?
Mar 2000	List of experts	10	Request for help putting expert database on web > various problems such as legal, different purposes of such a system	How to > problems with doing this	Finding problems with original concept
May 2000	RDF Resources?	11	Request for resources on RDF > explanation of how to use	Resources request (/ close to tools request)	Novelty of subject perhaps

Jun 2000	Front page	24	Request for pros and cons of this software	Evaluation of software	Evaluation is always open ended
Jun 2000	Stopping people print	23	Various workrounds to achieve non printable web page	Q/a (how do I do X?) Collaborative improvisation	Improvisation
Jun 2000	Typefaces for the web	16	Request resources on fonts for web > evaluation of particular web page > good practice	Q/a (for resources) and page evaluation	Two questions
Jun 2000	.eml extension	10	Strange email attachment	Q/a (what is this?)	Uncertainty over answer (tinged with fear it might be virus)
Aug 2000	Dreamweaver manuals	17	Is it worth buying manual? > using two screens when developing & what is CHEST?	Evaluation (of manual) + banter	Multiple questions
Aug 2000	Features/drawbacks of search engines	13	How should newbies be treated?	Metadiscussion	Strength of feeling?
Aug 2000	the ultimate nail	35	Discussion of poor non-HE sites > Mac v Win > legal requirements (really about cultural divide /boundary with commercial?)	Site evaluation	Genuine two sided discussion, but with flamey undertow
Oct 2000	SMS messaging	13	What web to SMS services are there? > what software is there?	Q/a (recommendation /services?)	Two questions
Oct 2000	WebTV	13	Will WebTv be relevant to HE ?	? evaluation of potentially relevant technology	Speculative, inherently difficult to argue there is a correct answer
Nov 2000	Specification for webserver machine	16	Request for detailed spec for a web server	Q/a (what hardware)	Techie enthusiasm
Dec 2000	ASP and search engines	11	Question about ASP delivered site's being spidered by search engine > best practice about dynamic delivered sites	Q/a (fix) turns to good practice	Expansion to best practice

Dec 2000	Jiscmail not impressed	16	Slow speed of new hosting service's server (merits of running critical services on NT)	Metadiscussion	Exploration of issue
Jan 2001	Multiple MSIE	17	Can one install multiple versions of MS IE?	Q/a (how to)	Multiple answers (emulating sites, install multiple)
Jan 2001	Subliminal images	26	How to produce a subliminal image in a form	Q/a (how to) Improvisation	Improvisation, probably because not done before
Feb 2001	Browser detection	16	Question about using javascript to detect browser / support for layers (/metadiscussion about working of listserv)	Multiple Q/a, banter	Multiple questions, + metadiscussion as third topic
Feb 2001	Critique request	17	Requests for comment on site	Site evaluation / metadiscussion	Multiple type of response, ie metadiscussion as well as answer
Feb 2001	Designing for maximum accessibilit y	11	Direct request for accessibility best practice	Q/a (what is best practice + specific question)	Two questions
Feb 2001	Forwarding addresses	25	How to warn user that link goes to another site > is opening a new window justified?	Q/a (how to) > best practice	Debate over proposed solution
Feb 2001	Frames	15	Looking at bad or good examples of use of frames > specific problem	Q/a (site evaluation) > q/a (fix)	Open question gets multiple answers Two questions
27 threads		459 messages			

For discussion see Chapter 4.4.2.2

Table A3.23. Analysis of long threads March 2002-February 2003

Date	Subject line	Length in messages	Free text description	Genre	Cause of length
Mar 2002	Who uses IE as	18	Debate about what is standard browser > how should standards be implemented > NS role in	? Unusual in being initiated by question	Moves on to good practice of design at a more general level

Date	Subject line	Length in messages	Free text description	Genre	Cause of length
	standard?		web development	about what is general practice	
Mar 2002	MS bashing	13	Flame war about MS	Pure flame/rants	Heightened emotion arising from "religious" controvesy
Mar 2002	Where were you in 1994?	24	Nostalgic look back at where people were at the beginning of the web	Metadiscussion	Bonding exercise?
April 2002	Disability Act 2002	16	Request for information on several specific aspects of how to be WAI compliant > drifts to specifics of Betsie (a tool to generate a text version of a site)	Q/a (How to) > q/a (recommendation/tool evaluation)	Original post has two questions. Drift onto specific problem with tool
April 2002	Security	17	Request for basic information on password protecting web pages > deeper discussion of vulnerabilities of LDAP type method	Q/a (how to) > reveals problems (warning)	Second question
May 2002	Flash advice please	11	Is Flash accessible?	Q/a (Tool evaluation in relation to accessibility)	Ranting (against macromedia, and commercial sites)
May 2002	Stupid NT question	17	Very specific problem with NT/samba connection	Q/a (how to fix)	Very detailed examination of specific problem.
Jun 2002	Spamming of web sites	20	How to stop emails being harvested from web sites by spammers	Q/a (how to)	Lots of possible approaches are available
Jul 2002	Multiple domain names	10	Issues raised by having multiple domain names, particularly redirects from defunct domains	Q/a (what issues are raised by...)	Drift onto specific issue (how to redirect)
Jul 2002	Urgent Euro symbol	12	What is Euro symbol > best way of representing this among alternatives	Q/a (how to) > best practice	Drift onto specific issue
Jul 2002	Search Engine on IIS4	20	What is best search engine > discussion of basis of OS beliefs	Q/a (recommendation) > OS principles	Drift to wider issues

Date	Subject line	Length in messages	Free text description	Genre	Cause of length
July 2002	Derek law broadcast	50	Shifts from complaints that video file does not work to attempt to reach agreement about definition of open source (builds on previous debate)	Site evaluation ? > best practice	Flames
Aug 2002	Content Manageme nt Systems	11	Request for a recommendation of a CMS > information sources > banter	Q/a (recommendation)	Rather self congratulatory banter
Aug 2002	Disappearin g image tag	13	Fiddly problem with coding > learn about doc types	Q/a (how do I fix?)	Complex problem? (very like Stupid NT question)
Aug 2002	I repeat	11	Complaint about "I agree" type messages suggests answers should be off list and summarised > defence of the way the list is used (replies on list)	Metadiscussion	Flood of support for the list
Aug 2002	Recommen d ISP	10	Request for recommendation of cheap ISP, suggestions, plus some issues with proposed providers	Q/a (what service – rather than tool)	Open ended question
Aug 2002	Use of SSIs and PHP	11	Server side processing using both SSI and PHP > second question about defining technology independent URIs	Q/a (how to – issues)	Second question
Aug 2002	Web server software	10	Request recommendation server software for small intranet	Q/a (recommendation)	Simply quite a few options. A lot about suitability of apache.
Sep 2002	Betsie and .htaccess	14	Workround to use Betsie on password protected areas	Q/a (how to fix) Improvisation (not that convincing)	Two threads
Sep 2002	Linux	11	What html editors and email clients are available for linux	What tools available (but not to do x, but to work on this OS)	Rather open ended
Sep 2002	MS patches	18	MS patch rant, plus second strand on linux security list	Q/a what resources?	Two threads

Date	Subject line	Length in messages	Free text description	Genre	Cause of length
Sep 2002	Netscape	20	Has NS/NS4 use declined & is NS7 ok> value of CSS	? partly request for evaluations of tool	Various points of dispute: the stat.s, are there NS users
Oct 2002	Font sizes in CSS	23	Specific problem with defining font sizes in a way that works across browsers leads to very detailed discussion of limited validity of WAI guidelines. Genuinely seems to be discovering (revealing) the limits of the standards.	Q/a (fix) > best practice discussion	Multiple perspectives on complex issue
Oct 2002	Label element	15	Problem complying with standard requiring text label and visual sense > validity of WAI And drifts into question of whether there are free tools for accessibility testing	Q/a > best practice discussion	Both attempts to fix problem and discuss best practice, moves on to free tools that are available
Oct 2002	Linux box	10	Request for ideas about how to fix a networking problem	Q/a (How to fix)	Variety of possible approaches explored, lack data to really know answer.
Nov 2002	Ampersands in URLs	13	Problem with encoding of characters and failure in validators	Q/a (How to fix) & tangential question	Two questions
Nov 2002	Case tools	14	Looking for a tool to design web sites visually	Q/a (recommendation) Sub theme of favourite games / OSS	Multiple questions
Nov 2002	Branding Intranets	10	Can Intranet use be increased by branding?	Q/a About site promotion	Some iterations between those offering answers and the questioner (which is unusual)
Dec 2002	W3C/WAI	21	Request for contradictions in W3C guidelines! Drifts at end into discussion of graphics files.	Best practice	Complexity of issues.
Dec 2002	CMS on front line	15	Request for CMS > follow up to get more responses > mostly comments to Macromedia contribute	Tool evaluation	Drifts onto evaluation of specific tool. Too open question gets narrowed down to one product.

Date	Subject line	Length in messages	Free text description	Genre	Cause of length
Jan 2003	Webcam recording	10	Request for description of set up to record lectures for web broadcast.	Tool evaluation (hardware)	Quite complex answer?
31 threads		488 messages			

For discussion see Chapter 4.4.2.2

Table A3.24. Genre distribution of contributions from persons posting a single message

	October 1999		July 2001		March 2002	
	Total in month	Total by singleton posters	Total in month	Total by singleton posters	Total in month	Total by singleton posters
Q/A	91 (in 27 threads)	28, 11 of which initiated thread	86 (in 21 threads)	15, 8 of which initiated thread	80 (in 21 threads)	15, 7 of which initiated the thread.
Simple announcements	3	3	7	4	4	4
Resource announcements	0	0	13	4	0	0
Warnings	0	0	21	1	0	0
Complex Threads	32	5	67	11	46	1 (The post was actually by a heavy poster, see note below.)
Netiquette	10	6 (4 of which enquiries how to leave/change sub)	3	0	14	3
Banter	0	0	0	0	9	0
Prof. Issues	0	0	0	0	24	11
Total messages	136		197		177	
Total by singleton (%age of months posts)		42 (30.88%)		35 (17.77%)		34 (19.21%)

Notes:
In July 2001 and March 2002 among the persons only sending one message three were actually regular or heavy posters, but happened only to send one message in that month, but broadly single posters are genuinely infrequent posters. In October 1999 seven single posters were regular or frequent posters. For discussion see Chapter 4.5.3

Table A3.25. Comparison with other lists A

	Uwebd (University web developers)	webmasterworld	Css-discuss	e-mint	Lis-link
Self description (of purpose)	"This list is dedicated to assisting people responsible for implementing and maintaining web sites in a University environment." "The mandate of the University Web Developers' Mailing List is to provide a discussion forum for people responsible for designing, implementing, and maintaining a web site for a higher education institution such as a University. Any topic related to this audience is allowed, including technical web development and site design questions,	"News and Discussion for the Independent Web Professional" Four sub sections: Browser side world The webmaster world The marketing world The Search engine world Local "We are here for members to discuss the process of doing business. There are enough B2B and B2C sites out there. Running a website these days takes a great deal of knowledge. The design, coding, maintenance, promotion, marketing, and management of a	"... is primarily intended to be a place for authors to discuss real-world uses of CSS. This doesn't preclude discussions of theory, or nifty cutting-edge tricks that show off the power of CSS, or even talking about (X)HTML, DOM, and so forth. However, it's greatly appreciated if such discussions have some practical payoff, even if it's just teaching other list members a little bit more about how CSS works. While we don't forbid discussions of the future direction of CSS, the W3C runs a listserv explicitly for	"e-mint is the informal name for The Association of Online Community Professionals." "It is a body, a community, of people interested in all aspects of online community, and has members from all over the world, though presently is very Eurocentric." Membership identified as: - Community Managers and Moderators - Academics and Educators - Technologists (esp community software suppliers / designers)	"A general Library and Information Science list for news and discussion."

	Uwebd (University web developers)	webmasterworld	Css-discuss	e-mint	Lis-link
	inquiries about administrative policies at various institutions, training and conference information, useful support tools, etc." (FAQ)	website is almost an impossible task for one person alone without extensive training. We are here as a forum for the members to share and gain knowledge in operating and promoting a website. Think of us as part of your extended site development and process team. We are not here to actually do business with one another."	that purpose called www-style. It's probably a better place for those kinds of discussions."	- Media people with community interests - People interested in how online community will affect society, politics etc - Students	
My description	Professional community in N. American HE web context	Amateur/pro site	Amateur/pro; perhaps a classic techie list.	Pseudo professional, mostly built round discussing F2F events	Library profession announcement list
Technology	Mailing list	Web BBS	Mailing list	Yahoo groups	Mailing list
URL	http://www.usask.ca/web_project/uwebd/index.html	http://www.webmasterworld.com	http://css-discuss.incutio.com/	http://www.emint.org/ http://groups.yahoo.com/group/e-mint/	http://www.jiscmail.ac.uk/cgi-bin/webadmin?A0=lis-link
Owner	Terry Calhoun, Society for College and University Planning (http://www.scup.org/)	Brett Tabke	Eric A. Meyer and John Allsopp [http://www.meyerweb.com/eric/,	Jen Leibhart and Lizzie Jackson (BBC) [http://www.e-mint-	Cheryl Coveney (and others)

	Uwebd (University web developers)	webmasterworld	Css-discuss	e-mint	Lis-link
			http://www.alistapart.com/authors/johnallsopp/]	usa.com/jen/jen2.html]	
Business model	Entirely voluntary	"Donationware", subscriptions towards "some of costs"	Donated server resources, so probably entirely voluntary, for consulting profile.	Voluntary, but moving towards being membership organisation	Voluntary
Membership (Jan 2005)	1678 (May 2004)	Unknown	Unknown	480	3077 (March 2005)
Nationality	US	US/world	Worldwide	UK	UK
Rate of activity p. month (est.)	500	Very high. 1 million messages as of Dec 2003. A single section http://traffic.alexa.com/graph?w=1000&h=620&r=3y&u=webmasterworld.com	900	50-100	150-250
Governance	No (explicit) rules	Long list of draconian rules, cf webdesign-l tight netiquette, chiefly directed against flaming and advertising and to avoid liability Specifically excludes identifiable domains, as seen as potential way of advertising.	Rather long list of rules and counsel to observe local custom. Emphasis on danger of irritating others and "Offensensitivity" (but also standard things such as keep it short, don't post in html mail or send attachments etc) Also a privacy profile,	No rules	No rules

	Uwebd (University web developers)	webmasterworld	Css-discuss	e-mint	Lis-link
			probably versus spamming.		
Collective action	None apparent	Unknown	Unknown	Organising meetings, feeding into home office report	No
F2F	No (though there are several national conferences advertised on the list)	"Pubconf"	Unknown	London meetings central to whole enterprise	No
Web site	Quite developed FAQ and collection of links	Entirely web based	Wiki to support community	Scrappy and disorganised. Talking about upgrade to technology. Little use of the other features of yahoo groups apart from mail.	None apparent from jiscmail archive.
Genre (rough indication) / subject	Broader range of topics: probably more policy/ choice of systems type issues, definitely more marketing type topics.	Unknown	High proportion of help fixing individual problems; occasionally generalised to tips and tricks.	Frothy friendly stuff Sites Meetings / associated stuff In the news	Announcements Surveys Jobs New resources Courses PR Offers of books Debates: professional image & list rules Content probably influenced by origin in

	Uwebd (University web developers)	**webmasterworld**	**Css-discuss**	**e-mint**	**Lis-link**
					BUBL announcements list
Climate	Impersonal, but friendly	Unknown	Impersonal	Gushing friendliness, positive	Impersonal
Community claims		Gushing stuff after conference. Thank yous on exit.	No attempt to present it as a community in associated web	Tone is friendly, gushing	Discussion of librarian image
Time	Before mid 2000	"Sep 1999- - 84-88 single line commodore based bbs's. - 88-89 2 line commercial bbs. - 90-91 single line bbs again. - 92-96 sysop of 64 line support bbs for major computer manufacturer. - 96 first "web bbs" went up on old isp site. - 97 first bbs went up on searchengineworld.com - late 98 lost domain after registrar failed to auto renew domain. - 99 started registered	24 Jan 2002 -	July 2000 -	Mar 1998 (archive)

	Uwebd (University web developers)	webmasterworld	Css-discuss	e-mint	Lis-link
		webmasterworld. - 99 got searchengineworld back and started with this software base. - 2000 moved the rebuilt forums (called WebmasterWorld, over to this domain)."			
Observations	Developed web site, eg with history Only just developed national conferences.	Conference is fascinating deviation from professional model - simply a huge networking event in a pub, over several days called "pubconf"	Use of wiki to maintain list of links and debates seems to be effective	Online discussions very thin, seems to be more focus on face to face meetings.	Implicitly embodies library view of knowledge: announcements without evaluation, little discussion.
Gender split	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	45% female on published membership list (only 48 total)	50% plus
Why a relevant reference point	US equivalent of WS	Same domain, but different technology, worldwide	Closer to group bounded in a way to exploit occupational socialisation effect	Professionalising group, in not unrelated domain - web communities	Jiscmail, a list for people in a particular profession

Table A3.26. Comparison with other lists B

	AIR-L	Cp.square	WebDesign-L	Slash dot	lulu
Self description (subject)	"The Association of Internet Researchers is an academic association dedicated to the advancement of the cross-disciplinary field of Internet studies. It is a resource and support network promoting critical and scholarly Internet research independent from traditional disciplines and existing cross academic borders. The association is international in scope."	"...the community of practice on communities of practice. And like a town square, a place where people gather to connect and learn together. Where many of us are joining in this enterprise from a variety of organizations in the private and public sectors."	"The list is intended as a forum for those involved in creating the Web — whether for business, for self-expression, or for exploring the possibilities of a new medium. The list community continues in order that we might share our sundry experiences and perspectives with others. In and out of that shared knowledge we hope to build a new sense of ourselves as practitioners of Web design and development. Originally chartered to address both "page design" and "site architecture", the list has grown organically	"News for Nerds. Stuff that Matters."	"An informal Linux users list, and is unsupported by CC"

	AIR-L	Cp.square	WebDesign-L	Slash dot	lulu
			to cover most any topic related to the Web as a profession or as a labor of love."		
My description	Academic, putative new academic area	Practitioner group	Very general web list, explicitly encompassing amateur and professional	News site with lots of reader comments & recommendation	Local to Loughborough Linux users list
Technology	Mailing list	webcrossing	Listserv (no web archive)	Web site	Web archive
URL	http://aoir.org/ http://listserv.aoir.org/listinfo.cgi/air-l-aoir.org	http://www.cpsquare.org/	http://www.webdesign-l.com/	http://slashdot.org	https://internal.lboro.ac.uk/mail/public/lulu/ http://www.loughborough.lug.org.uk/
Owner	Jeremy Hunsinger	J. D. Smith, Etienne Wenger	Steve Champeon	OSTG	Ron McKeating Martin Hamilton
Business model	Voluntary	Subscription based	Voluntary	Commercial, takes advertising	University computing service
Membership (Jan 2005)	Unknown	300	2200+ (claimed March 2005)	Unknown	Unknown
Nationality	US/world	World	US/world	US/ world	Loughborough university
Rate of activity p. month (est.)	100-200	Unknown	Unknown	DNA	Unknown
Governance	No rules	No rules	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
Collective action	Conference?	Workshops and meetings	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown
F2F	Conference central	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Meetings in pub
Web site	Web site for	Web, phone	Unknown	Is web based	Unknown

	AIR-L	Cp.square	WebDesign-L	Slash dot	lulu
	association, much behind firewall	conferences			
Genre (rough indication) / subject	Conferences CFP Research openings Requests for references Debates: academic issues	Large discussions	Unknown	News Reactions from readers to news Features Book reviews	Q/As, discussions
Time	May 2001 (extant archive, but did exist prior to this)	January 2003		September 1997 onward	Archived January 2001 onward
Observations		http://www.weknow.ch/marco/A2004/CPsquare/Slides041216/index.htm		Massively busy tech news community	
Gender split	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Unknown	Apparently 100% male (from posters)
Why a relevant reference point	Academic group	Highly creative practitioner group, using relatively sophisticated technology	Universal web design community	Very busy general techie community	Very local, highly technical list

Table A3.27. Uwebd analysis

uwebd activity October 2003: Summary	
Postings	496
Threads	126
Corrected threads	109
Average thread length	4.55
Longest thread	23
Posters	166
Average post per person	3.01
Highest poster	17
Female posters	48
Proportion all posters female	29%

Table A3.28. Artefact exchange

Sample month	URLs	Code (HTML, CSS)	Script, cgi, ASP	Other (full text, log files)	Total messages in month
May 1998	48 (3 own url)	16	0	12	203
October 1999	22 (10 own url)	2	8 (6 in one thread)	9	136
January 2001	55 (20 own url)	4	2	5	146
July 2001	50 (15 own url)	11 (6 in one thread)	6	12	198
March 2002	41 (9 own url)	1	11 (8 in two threads)	6	178
October 2003	49 (7)	7	6	10	199
August 2004	47 (11)	3	0	2	86

For discussion see Chapter 4.4.2.1

Table A3.29. Subliminal images thread

Time	Message	Contribution	Helpfulness	Sender
15.19 (Thurs.)	Wants to find out how to make a subliminal image appear on a form. States her own (low) level of expertise. Implies javascript is solution.	Request		1
15.34	Key obstacle stated: Caching and loading makes it difficult to control how long image will appear for. Asks for clarification - but questioner does not respond. Maybe Flash?	Define obstacle: Suggests method 1.		2
15.49	Argues javascript will not work. Problems reemphasised.	Rules out method 2.	Explicitly states he has not checked javascript documentation	3
15.51	Use flash, flash can also do forms But requires skilled person	Recommends method 1, but suggests problem	No detail	4
15.53	Flash is not difficult to learn, should be resources to find someone in the institution	Counters obstacle to method 1		2
16.06	Yes, Flash is not difficult.	Agrees obstacle can be overcome		4
15.56	Why not use Director? Asks if there is anyone with knowledge of that tool.	Method 3		5
16.05	Why not use an animated gif?	Alternative method 4		6
16.10	Use Flash	Again counters obstacles to method 1		7
16.14	How animated gif might solve the problem	Proposes method	More specific, eg	8

		4 (has not read 16.05 message)	suggesting tools	
16.27	Problem with animated gif (runs as soon as page is downloaded)	Obstacle to method 4		9
16.23	Use lingo, and where to learn more	Returns to Method 3	Offers information source	10
16.38	How animated gif might do it, combined with Javascript	Solves obstacle to method 4		4
16.32	Maybe subliminal images shouldn't be used	Raises ethical issue with whole idea		11
16.29	Demo of animated gif	Demo of method 4	Has created demo Suggests tool	12
16.49	Agreed it is not that ethical a concept, in general		Offsets ethical aspects with humour (against microsoft)	4
17.05	Thank you – any more ideas?			1
17.32	Standards based approach using SMIL	Method 5	URL explaining offered – but this is not followed up by anyone	13
17.59	Assurance that application is ethical			1
18.08	Could this be researched through porn sites – is this ethical?			13
18.36	Subliminal images are unethical			3
23.36	Javascript sample	Demo of Method 2	Suggests javascript	14
23.44	This would not work on all browsers	Obstacles to Method 2		4
Friday	Don't worry about ethical issues no one reads		Banter	15

08.07	web pages anyway, let alone subliminal ones			
10.28	Is anyone working on blocking of subliminal images?			16
Saturday 20.59	Demo using javascript	Implements Method 2 – suggests Method 6	Demonstration page and code written	17
21.06	Expresses satisfaction with the demo		Phatic – perhaps response to level of effort exhibited by the previous message.	3

Notes:
The speed of the interactions is such that slight differences in speed of local mail servers distorts ordering. Whereas the times in column one are those on the clock time when the message left the local machine, the order is that determined by when the message was received at the jiscmail host, hence the time anomalies. Note sender 4's messages arrive quicker than those of others (or perhaps his local clock times are wrong).

For discussion see Chapter 4.4.2.6.2

Table A3.30. Email archive usage, 2001 and 2002

Archive hits												
	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
2001	439	983	576	782	1421	887	840	948	382	793	507	321
2002	555	494	606	929	1030	672	1002	810	620	847	649	565
Searches												
2001	71	50	87	62	102	83	69	80	37	53	82	33
2002	100	62	78	77	113	99	39	87	84	89	106	49

For discussion see Chapter 4.4.3

Table A3.31. Comparison of May 1998 and October 2003 climate

	May-98	Mar-02	Oct-03	(Change 98/03)
Average message length in words (note 1)	85		106	0.24706
Longest message in month	950		1249	
Shortest	1		1	
Interaction				
Average thread length	4.83	4.21	5.38	
No. of threads <5 messages	22		25	
Framing (note 2)	16/203		16/199	
Poster replies to own thread	15		11	
Other posters post more than once	7		9	
Mentions archive	0		0	
Total number of authors	85	62	49	0.42353
Average posts per author	2.4	2.9	4	
Contribution of single posters	37	34	26	
As %age of all messages	18%	19%	13%	
Solo messages	24% (11/42)		24% (9/37)	
Contribution of main posters (note 3)	53	92	132	
As %age of all messages	26%	52%	66%	

Notes

1 This was the text supplied by poster as counted by MS Word, excluding text quoted from previous messages and signing/signature text; including any quoted text or code not from a previous message.

2 This was whether a message responded to a previous posts section by section, with the response framed by pieces of quotation.

3 Main posters were individuals sending more than 5 messages

Appendix 4: Second coding

Coding instructions

1. You have been given: a) descriptions of a number of generic types of thread of emails. b) a word document containing a month's emails (October 2003) from WWW-list, organised by thread. It is suggested you navigate using the table of contents. Note that messages often quote previous messages, different messages are separated by a string of "=" c) a word document with a list of the threads to be categorised in a table, with empty columns in which to place the codes.

2. The task is to say into which category each thread falls. Simply type the category into the table in the appropriate column in c). If you consider that none of the categories applies state this and why, eg which it seemed like, but why it did not fit. If a thread contains more than ten messages (they are highlighted) it is considered complex, in these cases please suggest of which types of thread it is composed.

3. It would also be useful to have any comments on the clarity of the thread genre description, eg did you have difficulty applying some of them because they did not seem well defined or because the messages did not really fit the protocol; would you define any other types of genre?

	Thread type	Description	Examples
1.	Simple announcement	Announcement of event or opportunity.	Job posting Conference announcement Survey Call for papers
2.	Resource announcement	More personalised announcement of a "useful resource" that someone has come across (or created themselves)	* is a really useful resource
3.	Warning	Alert of threat	Beware a variant on the * virus is around.
4.	Self introduction	Brief biography by new or delurking member	Hi all, I'm new to the list, I thought I'd just introduce myself...
5.	Fix	Question and answer sequence, where initiator has specific problem they need help with	I have a problem with this code - I can't see where the problem is, can anyone help?
6.	How to	Question and answer sequence, where initiator asks how to achieve a particular outcome	How do I do * in ASP?
7.	Recommendation	Question and answer sequence, where initiator asks for recommendations / evaluations of software tools to accomplish a particular task	I need software to mirror my site - any one out there experience of using anything to do that?
8.	Other q/a	Question and answer sequence of other type	
9.	Banter	Jokey exchange	You're making me feel old...
10.	Metadiscussion	Discussion about the purpose of the list and its rules (netiquette)	Don't forget to suspend your list account before setting an out of the office message
11.	Narrative	Extended story about incident	You wouldn't believe what just happened...
12.	Rant	Venting of anger or frustration with an external thing or person	I have just wasted two hours trying to configure *. Its useless.
13.	Flame	Direct ad hominem attack	You really should read the manual you idiot
14.	Complex thread: concatenation	Thread of more than 10 messages resulting from the concatenation of only loosely related questions	... can I just throw in this other question?
15.	Complex thread: best practice	Thread of more than 10 messages resulting from expansion of question to a general issue of best practice	...Its not so much how do you do that as whether you should be doing that at all
16.	Professional issue	Raises issues relating to professional image,	I've just seen this job advert: ridiculous what they're paying isn't it?
17.	Off topic	Message is off topic	Does anyone know of a good hotel in Malta?
18.	Supportive	Expression of personal concern for another	Hi, Johnny, haven't heard from you for a while :-(how on earth are you?

1.	Thread	Type	Comments
2.	A Design Question (13 messages)		
3.	Accessible Web Publishing Wizard Version 1.0		
4.	Acronyms and Abbreviations		
5.	another must read		
6.	Anyone fancying writing a case study on examples of use of standards & best practices?		
7.	Apache and Perl CGI Question (2 messages)		
8.	browser statistics (9 messages)		
9.	cayenne		
10	Character sets (again) (5 messages)		
11	Charset/character encoding/character references (2 messages)		
12	Click and Go Video; Access for All		
13	Distributed browser "visited" links (2 messages)		
14	DRC investigation - progress report		
15	Friday discussion: XML vs. seXML (was RE: How big is my website?) (8 messages)		
16	go forth, read, vomit...		
17	How big is my website? (17 messages)		
18	WEB-SUPPORT Digest - 29 Sep 2003 to 30 Sep 2003 (#2003-144) (2 messages)		
19	Use of XHTML (34 messages)		
20	more uses for XML (3 messages)		
21	LRN Toolkit 3.0 (2 messages)		
22	OpenOffice 1.1 (15 messages)		
23	OSS watch (4 messages)		
24	this is too funny to miss		
25	Help wanted re: item positioning using css (8 messages)		
26	Web designers are like magicians? (7 messages)		
27	[Web-Pub] PDFs and accessability		
28	sendmail invalid email address bounce problems (4 messages)		
29	I love SPAM		
30	Web testing software		

31	Experiences of Web testing software (11 messages)		
32	OT about Fred was Re: A Design Question (2 messages)		
33	IE and CSS support (3 messages)		
34	Dyslexia and MCQs (12 messages)		
35	Target window size (6 messages)		
36	in my ongoing quest... (11 messages)		
37	off on one...		

Comments:

Appendix 5: Questionnaire design: Changes made in response to pilot reactions

	Suggestion	Action
Local respondents (7 persons, 1 did not respond)	Indent all questions, to avoid question text wrapping round question number.	None. On screen existing version read adequately.
	Various proofing mistakes	Corrected
	1. Suggested add colour 2. "Add a colour! :)"	Gave blue heading It was thought appropriate to the list to make the questionnaire feel professional, and not over designed graphically.
	1. "Form is rather long though might be difficult to split into sections if relying on emailing answers?" 2. "Its a bit long but if you're sure you need to ask all the questions then that's life."	None. The form is quite long but respondents consistently reported taking 10—15 minutes to complete it. Clearly the chances of getting a high response rate, and perhaps more input from the open questions would potentially have been increased by shortening the questionnaire. In particular it would have increased the chances of input from low posters and lurkers.
	Q.2 "Odd combination of when, how and what makes them read them"	Changed this to choose any that apply.
	1. "Q.13 wording of question, from "tick the best three descriptions of web support"" 2. "Only one thing stood out which made me think about what was being asked and that was Q13. Perhaps something like 'Tick the best 3 phrases that describe the community of people who post to web support'."	Changed wording to "Do you see Web-support as" Made all references to Web-support consistent
	Q.23 Make recording email optional	An objective was to get respondents email so could match to actual behaviour on list. Added note at the beginning of the personal details section: "(Note: as with all the data collected in the form, information from this section will be used for research purposes only, and

	Suggestion	Action
		will not be passed to a third party)"
	Q23 "asks for email address, yet the form's header: from control is set to your name. This is probably a good thing to do as it means you can easily identify questionnaire responses in your email from the from field rather than the subject field, but you may want to indicate that people don't have to supply their email address if they don't want to. "	See action immediately above.
	"I didn't understand question 17 because I don't know what website-info-mgmt is, but why would you say 'less' instead of 'more' there? "	See comments below on Question 17.
	"Q.No. 6 , if a respondent never posts to the list, what should he go next? Can he still go on Q.No.7 and so on? "	None. Query didn't arise in other responses.
	"Try to decrease the open questions as much as you can."	The form included quite a few open questions, to increase free input, though granted it was unlikely that people would supply much data at these points and it was acknowledged that there would be an impact on drop out rates.
	Need to motivate people to fill in the survey	Added more details about the project to motivate people to participate.
Core members **(4/5 completed the questionnaire)**		
	"I would have liked to know towards what degree your work contributes "	Changed planned introductory text for list, to reference the fact that the researcher was PhD student.
	"(and since there wll be many students coming back with similar) I would like a reassurance that the findings are made available in a simple summary format ... kind of if you see what I mean." [Reflects dislike of student survey in working lists in UK	Undertook to make anonymised data available in SPSS/excel format.

	Suggestion	Action
	HE]	
	"Question 1 needs a "don't remember" option." "Q1. Who remembers year let alone month. Maybe how long someone has been a member along the lines of less than 6 months, 6-12 months, 1-2 years, more than 2 years ..." Respondents struggled with this	Changed options.
	"Q2. If it was tick boxes I could select 3 options all equally valid All the messages as they come When I have time When the topic looks interesting "	Changed it to choice of any appropriate options
	"Q6. Given web support is a busy(ish) list your figures appear to be too low to make much difference .... too easily you might get too many respondents saying more than 10 times. "	Participation is mostly at the level of 50+ pa (5 people), 15-20 (50 people) or very few postings (everyone else). So the question does distinguish the regular/heavy posters, occasional and rare posters and lurkers.
	"Q18. Is it my Mozilla or the form ??? Put cursor in Q18 window, and my text appears window of Q16. Probably a feature at my end. "	Could not replicate this problem. Respondent said he could not replicate problem either.
	"1. Not that happy with wording of Q17" "2. Q17. More !!! Not happy with the options. Not answering it. Suggestion: More Less About the same Don't know "	Followed second suggestion
	"Suggest Q19 has link to archive in case people don't know what it is."	None. If they don't know what archive is presumably they will answer "Never".
	"Q20. You may have your reasons for asking it as is. If I knew someone is very likely to know the answer, not just "might" I could have contacted them direct. Eg. Someone who uses the same software as me. However, in this instance I am a "community" person hence having seen a message in the archive I might have raised the issue on the list again (probably done it anyway). "	None.
	"Q24. I take _professional_ too literaly. I could answer you what is my job (or similar) ... what I do is not a professions	None. Agree the word professional has a lot of associations, but in this case the respondents seemed to have no difficulty

	Suggestion	Action
	(and unfortunatelly in my view, the same applies to most others on the list). "	reading this as a questions about what they were trained as.
	Failure of respondents to record anything for Q21	Changed the wording from "a good experience" to "one good experience"

Appendix 6: Survey of Web-support @ Jiscmail

Survey of Web-support @ Jiscmail

This is a survey about the jiscmail list web-support. It should take only 10-15 minutes to fill in.

It is gathering data for one of a number of case studies about virtual communities. My interest is in why people join and contribute to "virtual communities", and particularly about information and knowledge sharing. There is more information about the research available, via this link, or just email me with any questions.

Even if you do not consider yourself very active on the list your input is valued.

Data collected will be used purely for research purposes. All replies will be treated confidentially. Data will be anonymised in any publication.

Please complete all the fields

Q.1 When did you join Web-support?
(be as precise as you can)

Q.2 How do you read Web-support messages? (tick any that apply)

- ○ All the messages as they come
- ○ Longer threads
- ○ When the topic looks interesting
- ○ When you have time
- ○ At a set time of day or week
- ○ As a digest
- ○ Rarely
- ○ Never
- ○ Dont know

Q.3 What proportion of messages do you read?

- ○ All
- ○ More than 50%
- ○ 26% to 50%
- ○ 1 to 25%
- ○ None

Content

Q.4 Have you found Web-support a good source for

	Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly

	strongly				disagree
Answers to specific questions	O	O	O	O	O
Evaluations of tools	O	O	O	O	O
Announcements of events, jobs, new resources	O	O	O	O	O
Learning about web development when you were new to it	O	O	O	O	O
Light relief	O	O	O	O	O
Discussion about best practice	O	O	O	O	O
A feel for what is going on in institutions other than your own	O	O	O	O	O
Access to experts	O	O	O	O	O

Continued	Agree strongly	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly disagree
Picking up jargon	O	O	O	O	O
Making friends	O	O	O	O	O
Letting off steam about badly designed software	O	O	O	O	O
Finding people to collaborate with	O	O	O	O	O
First hearing about new developments in the field	O	O	O	O	O

Realising others are struggling with the same issues	O	O	O	O	O
Finding out implications of new legislation	O	O	O	O	O
Making up for lack of formal training	O	O	O	O	O
Acquiring knowledge to perform new tasks	O	O	O	O	O

Q.5 The overall quality of the messages is

- O Very good
- O Good
- O Moderate
- O Poor
- O Very poor

Sending messages

Q.6 How often do you post to the list?

- O 10 or more times per annum
- O 6 to 10 times pa
- O 1 to 5 times pa
- O Never

Q.7 What factors have made you answer a question posted to the list?
(tick any that apply)

- ☐ You've been helped in the past by web-support
- ☐ Professional obligation to help others
- ☐ To be part of the group
- ☐ To test out your knowledge
- ☐ If it's an area where you have some expertise
- ☐ You like the challenge
- ☐ Its more interesting than work
- ☐ To get better replies if you have a question
- ☐ To impress certain members of the list

Q.8 Have you ever decided not to post a question for one of the reasons below ?

	Agree	Agree	No opinion	Disagree	Strongly

	strongly				disagree
You feel you should have known the answer	O	O	O	O	O
You are not part of the *in-group*	O	O	O	O	O
You would get too many answers that take time to check	O	O	O	O	O
Fear of public criticism	O	O	O	O	O
You haven't earned the right	O	O	O	O	O
Questions are just too complicated to put over on email	O	O	O	O	O

Q.9 When you post to the list do you feel ...? (tick the one that best describes your feeling)

- O Completely anonymous
- O Fairly anonymous
- O People will recognise my name from previous messages
- O People know you from previous messages
- O People know you from past jobs, conferences etc and "real world" contacts

Q.10 Thinking about responding to other people's messages on the list, do you send ...?

- O Four or more times as many replies OFF list
- O Two or three times as many replies OFF list
- O About the same ON and OFF list
- O A few less OFF list
- O Far fewer OFF list than ON the list

Q.11 What is the main reason you reply OFF list?

Q.12 Has your degree or quality of participation in Web-support changed over time? If so, describe the change.

The Group

Q.13 Do you see Web-Support as:
(tick the best three descriptions)

- ☐ Experts in web development
- ☐ The competition
- ☐ A clique
- ☐ Other learners
- ☐ A good information source
- ☐ Potential customers
- ☐ Potential employers
- ☐ People from the annual webmasters' workshop
- ☐ Chiefly techies
- ☐ A diverse range of experts
- ☐ No clear image

Q.14 How many people from the list have you met face to face?

- ○ None
- ○ 1 to 5
- ○ 6 to 10
- ○ More than 10

Q.15 How many useful professional relationships have you established through the list?

- ○ None
- ○ 1 to 5
- ○ 6 to 10
- ○ More than 10

Q.16 Does Web-support feel like a community? If so, can you put your finger on why?

Q.17 Is Web-support more of a community than website-info-mgt?

- ○ More
- ○ Less
- ○ About the same
- ○ Don't know

Q.18 Do you think Web-support has changed or developed over time? If so how?

The Archive

Q.19 How often do you use the Web-support archive?

- ○ Every week
- ○ Every month
- ○ A few times a year
- ○ Never

Q.20 Have you ever used the archive to see who might know the answer to a question and contact them direct?

- ○ Yes
- ○ No

Your views

Q.21 Describe one good experience you have had from the list

Q.22 Is there anything that could be improved about Web-support?

About you

(Note: as with all the data collected in the form, information from this section will be used for research purposes only, and will not be passed to a third party)

Q.23 What is your email?

Q.24 What is your professional background?

Q.25 When did you join your current institution?
(month / year)

Q.26 What proportion of your time do you spend on web development?

- ○ 100 %
- ○ More than 50%
- ○ 26% to 50%
- ○ 1 to 25%
- ○ None

Q.27 Briefly describe your work

Q.28 Do you work in a team?

- ○ No
- ○ Yes

Q.29 How many emails do you get a day?

- ○ Less than 20
- ○ 21 to 50
- ○ 51 to 100
- ○ More than 100

Q.30 Are you...?

- ○ Female
- ○ Male

Q.31 Any other comments

Submit or reset the form

Thank you for completing the form!

Page Last Updated 12 May 2003 by Andrew Cox

Appendix 7: Questionnaire results

The following is the summary of the results of the questionnaire as posted to the WS list in March 2004 (note that this was before the main interviews reported in Chapter 5 were conducted). Anonymised summary data was also made available as a comma separated variable file.

Summary of results of questionnaire 408
1. When did you join {the list}? 408
2. Which best describes your way of reading {the list} messages? 408
3. What proportion of messages do you read? 408
Content 409
4. Have you found {the list} a good source for: (various options) 409
5. Rate the overall quality of posts 410
Sending messages 410
6. How often do you post to the list per anum? 410
7. What factors have made you answer a question posted to the list? (tick any that apply) 410
8. Have you ever decided not to post a question for one of the reasons below ? 411
9. When you post to the list, do you feel (tick the one that best describes your feeling) 411
10. Thinking about responding to other people's messages on the list, do you send ...? 412
11. What is the main reason you reply off list? (text box for open reply) 412
12. Has your degree or quality of participation in {the list} changed over time? If so describe the change. (text box for open reply) 412
The group 413
13. Do you see {the list} as (tick the best three descriptions) 413
14. How many people from the list have you met face to face? 413
15. How many useful professional relationships have you established through the list? 414
16. Does {the list} feel like a "community", if so can you put your finger on why? (open text box) 414
17. Is {the list} is more of a community than {another related list}? 415
18. Do you think {the list} has changed or developed over time? If so how? (open text box) 415
The archive 416
19. How often do you use {the list} archive? 416
20. Have you ever used the archive to see who might know the answer to a question and contact them direct? 416
Your views 416
21. Describe one good experience you have had from the list 416
22. Is there anything that could be improved about {the list}? 417
23. What is your email? 418
24. What is your professional background 418
25. When did you join your current institution? (month/year) 418

26. What proportion of time do you spend on web development? 419
27. Briefly describe your work 419
28. Do you work in a team? 419
29. How many emails do you get a day 419
30. Are you? 419
31. Any other comments 419
Questionnaire response 420
Table A7.2 Membership history of respondents
Table A7.3 Lifetime postings by respondents
Table A7.4 Claimed posting frequency

Summary of results of questionnaire

Thank you to all those who took the time to fill out the questionnaire I posed to the list a while back (a total of 43 people) – here are the results with some analysis.
Feel free to comment ... to Andrew, a.m.cox@lboro.ac.uk

Question	Answers	Options [identifying coding in square brackets]
1. When did you join {the list}?	Mean 3.42 years. Although 13 respondents had been on the list for only one full year or less, the mean length of membership was quite high. 7 had been on the list from 1994 or 1995. Total investment in membership by the 43 respondents was 147 years. Some respondents knew to the exact date the time of joining, others were unclear.	Method of calculation: The list started in 1994, and length of membership was calculated in terms of full years to February 2003 (the terminal date for analysis of the archive). Those stating that they had joined in a particular year were assumed to have joined mid year, meaning the calculation may underestimate the length of time of participation. Thus someone joining in mid 2002 is considered not to have completed a full year, so scores 0.
2. Which best describes your way of reading {the list} messages?	The only common responses were "all the messages as they come" and "when the topic looks interesting". It does suggest a high level of immediate involvement with messages when they come. Not surprisingly, given that news of the questionnaire was only distributed through the list, none of the respondents said they rarely or never read their messages. None said they didn't know the answer to the question. None used the digest option to receive messages. None read the messages at a set time of day or week.	Options All the messages as they come [21] Longer threads [22] When the topic looks interesting [23] When you have time [24] At a set time in the day or week [25] As a digest [26] Rarely [27] Never [28] Don't know [29] There was a technical issue with the question which prevented an option being unchecked once it had been checked. However the data has been used, since few people checked more than one box anyway, though results are to be treated with some caution.
3. What proportion of messages do	Respondents read a high proportion of all messages.	All [4]

you read?	Mean 2.88 Mode 3 Most respondents either read over 50% of messages (21 or 48% of respondents) or 26-50% Only 1 person said they read less than 25% of messages. 9 persons claimed to read all messages.	More than 50% [3] 26% to 50% [2] 1 to 25% [1] None [0]
Content		
4. Have you found {the list} a good source for: (various options)	Overall nearly all the propositions seemed to get quite a high proportion of consent. But the list is seen as primarily as source of information. A score above 3 implies quite strong agreement from all respondents. Both "answers to specific questions" and "best practice discussion" were high scorers. Only one person disagreed that it was a good place for answers to specific questions, 95% agreed or strongly agreed. Any score above 2.5 implies agreement. It is interesting that the list scores relatively badly for "first hearing about new developments in the field". But it is only relatively badly, 67% agreed with the first proposition., only four individuals disagreed. "Finding people to collaborate with" scores surprisingly low too. "Learning about web development as a newbie" scored relatively low. It is less surprising that "light relief" scores quite low, though there is an interesting spread of view: 30% (N=13) disagreed or strongly disagreed with the proposition; 48% (N=21) agreed or strongly agreed with it. The other propositions that got weak support were "letting off steam", "light relief" etc. People may have disagreed with the proposition about "lack of formal training", because they did consider themselves to	Options were scored on a scale of Agree strongly [4] to strongly disagree [0]. Answers in rank order were: Answers to specific questions [41] 3.35 Discussion about best practice [46] 3.21 A feel for what is going on in institutions other than your own [47] 3.19 Realising others are struggling with the same issues [495] 3.19 Access to experts [48] 3.16 Finding out implications of new legislation [496] 3.02 Evaluations of tools [42] 3 Announcements of events, jobs, new resources [43] 2.84 Learning about web development when you are new to it [44] 2.83 Acquiring knowledge to perform new tasks [498] 2.79 First hearing about new developments in the field [494] 2.77 Picking up jargon [49] 2.70 Making up for lack of formal training [497] 2.49 Light relief [45] 2.26 Finding people to collaborate with [493] 2.12 Letting off steam about badly designed software [492] 2.09 Making friends [491] 1.74

	have had good training (10 or 23.3% disagreed, 60% agreed or strongly agreed). A score of between 2.5 and 1.5 implies neutrality to mild agreement. The lowest score applied to the idea of making friends, 40% of people disagreed with this proposition (17 people) and a similar percent were neutral (19 respondents). A score of less than 1.5 implies that on the whole most people disagreed with the proposition. None of the propositions scored at this level.	
5. Rate the overall quality of posts	The quality of the list is seen as good, but not very good. Mean 3.16 Mode 3 So the quality of messages was seen as good, but not very good. Nine persons rated postings as very good. Only five rated posts as moderate, none as poor or very poor. Of the people who rated it as moderate, in answers to other questions they complained about unnecessary "ranting".	Very good [4] Good [3] Moderate [2] Poor [1] Very poor [0]
Sending messages		
6. How often do you post to the list per anum?	Twelve people said they were posting above 10 per anum, Most of the other respondents said they were posting 1 to 5 times (23 persons).	10 or more times per annum [3] 6 to 10 times pa [2] 1 to 5 times pa [1] Never [0] Mean 1.65 Mode 1
7. What factors have made you answer a question posted to the list? (tick	Thus expertise and a sense of retrospective obligation seem to be the predominant motives. There was some sense of	Answers in rank order, were: If it's an area where you have some expertise [option 5] 0.81

any that apply)	professional obligation. Wishing to be part of the group is acknowledged, but not strongly supported. Participants denied the motive of wishing to impress specific others on the list (though this does not exclude the possibility of trying to impress everyone). Only one person accepted that this was a motive. Intellectual challenge was not a strong motive, in this case there is less reason to suppose people might deny such a motive if it existed.	You've been helped in the past by web-support [1] 0.72 Professional obligation to help others [2] 0.40 To be part of the group [3] 0.28 To get better replies if you have a question [8] 0.28 To test out your knowledge [4] 0.19 You like the challenge [6] 0.16 Its more interesting than work [7] 0.12 To impress certain members of the list [9] 0.02
8. Have you ever decided not to post a question for one of the reasons below ?	Overall the impression is that people were not inhibited from asking questions: if they didn't ask they didn't have a question. There was some support for the proposition that the questioner felt they should know the answer or feared public criticism (in both cases 30% agreed with the proposition; equally over 50% disagreed or strongly disagreed that this had ever influenced them). Although there was not much feeling that not being part of an in-group was a inhibitor, a significant number, N=11 did agree with this. Of course such an answer implies a belief that there is an in-group, which is not self evident. There was no feeling that not having earned the right to post was an inhibitor, only three people agreed with the proposition.	(Scale of Agree strongly [4] to strongly disagree [0]) Responses in rank order: You feel you should have known the answer [81] 1.73 Fear of public criticism [84] 1.57 You are not part of the in-group [82] 1.54 Questions are just too complicated to put over on email [86] 1.34 You would get too many answers that take time to check [83] 0.95 You haven't earned the right [85] 0.95 A score below 0.5 would imply strong disagreement. A score below 1.5 implies most people disagreed with the proposition. A score between 2.5 and 1.5 implies neutrality, disagreement.
9. When you post to the list, do you feel (tick the one that best describes your feeling)	The average score implies that authors feel they will be recognised from previous postings, but not really known. Looking more closely at the frequencies, there were two clusters, those who felt fairly anonymous, and those who felt they were known to others, mostly through other real world links.	Completely Anonymous [0] score of 1 (2.3%) Fairly anonymous [1] 15 (34.9%) People recognise my name from previous messages [2] 7 (16.3%) People know me from previous postings [3] 5 (11.6%) People know me from past jobs, conferences etc and real world contacts [4] 14 (32.6%)

10. Thinking about responding to other people's messages on the list, do you send ...?	This result implies that most people roughly sent the same number of messages off list as on list, or a lot less. Six people said they posted two or three times as many off list. Only one person posted a lot off list. About a third were posting far fewer off list.	Four or more times as many replies OFF list [4] 1 (2.5%) Two or three times as many replies OFF list [3] 6 (15%) About the same ON and OFF list [2] 15 (37.5%) A few less OFF list [1] 4 (10%) Far fewer OFF list than ON the list [0] 14 (35%) Missing 3 Mean 1.4
11. What is the main reason you reply off list? (text box for open reply)	A wide range of reasons for posting off list were suggested. The commonest type of explanation was that the comment was only relevant to the poster. Confidentiality was also frequently cited. Complexity or a sense of their answer lacking authority, or fear of embarrassing the questioner seemed quite low on the list. Fear of flames was only felt by five persons. Five respondents, though, gave No Return. There didn't seem to be a correlation with the answer to the previous question, however, that is to say, only in one case could it be because they had never done it.	50 suggestions were made, by the 38 who did respond (presented here in my categorisations) Never do it (3) It was only of personal or specific relevance to the poster (10) By request (7) The information contained confidential or private information (6) It was on an off list topic theme (6) Fear of flames (5) Fear of creating noise (3) Doubted authority of own answer (3) It was tangential to the topic (1) It would be dull if everybody gave same answer (1) It was too long (1) To rant (1) Wanted further information to answer question (1) To send a joke (1) To avoid embarrassing the sender (1) It is the list default (1)
12. Has your degree or quality of participation in {the list} changed over time? If so describe the change. (text box for open reply)	Eight people responded that their activity had not changed. Eight said they were participating more, as their confidence had increased; three said that it had declined. Overall the response rate was low on this question.	

	Of those who had been on the list < two years (13persons), 8 gave no return, which is not surprising. Another 2 said their participation had not changed.	
The group		
13. Do you see {the list} as (tick the best three descriptions)	There is wide agreement in seeing the list as a good information source (though there were still nine people who did not choose that for one of the three propositions they agreed with), and also seeing it as a diverse collection of experts. Eight people did see it as a clique. Only one person saw it as "the competition." Few acknowledged that they had no clear image of it.	The figure for each item is the number of people who ticked that proposition, divided by the total number of respondents, scores could potentially be between 0 (if no one ticked the item) and 1 (if everyone ticked the item). The responses in rank order, were: A good information source [5] 0.79 A diverse range of experts [10] 0.67 Experts in web development [1] 0.42 People from the annual webmasters' workshop [8] 0.28 Chiefly techies [9] 0.28 Other learners [4] 0.19 A clique [3] 0.19 No clear image [0] 0.16 Potential customers [6] 0.07 The competition [2] 0.02 Potential employers [7] 0 Five people ticked more than three boxes, two less than five (one one only, one two). But it was decided to simply count all the responses in the results.
14. How many people from the list have you met face to face?	There was quite a range of variation in answers to this question. 12 people knew more than 10 people on the list. Most of the rest knew less than 5 (16 respondents) or none (11)	Mean 1.38 0 N=11 26.2% 1 N=16 38.1% 2 N=3 7.1% 3 N=12 28.6%

		1 missing
15. How many useful professional relationships have you established through the list?	The score for this was bound to be less than for 14. The figure suggests that people had made some useful connections through the list, ie the mean score, 0.63, was not very close to 0. However, around 50% said they had made no collaborations. A third more only said they had had 1-5 links (though establishing five useful professional collaborations would be significant). One individual who said they had established over ten connections, did not agree with the proposition in question 4 about the list being about finding people to collaborate with. Equally another individual who strongly agreed that the list was a means of finding people to collaborate with (493) said they had not made any collaborations. Two individuals said they had made more than 10.	The options were None [scored 0] 1 to 5 [1] 6 to 10 [2] More than 10 [3]
16. Does {the list} feel like a "community", if so can you put your finger on why? (open text box)	Nine respondents did not answer the question. Of those that did respond, five thought it was not a community. 28 thought it was a community at some level. Of these 20 asserted that it was a community without qualification. Of the other eight, four said it was a bit of a community, four thought it was a community for some, either for core members (in one case a bit of a clique) or one respondent thought it was a male only community. Reasons given for it being a community tended to stress shared context, issues, problems (10). Six mentioned seeing core posters messages as making it feel like a community (but did not seem to say it was a clique). Four people mentioned helpfulness and support as the source of community. One person mentioned in jokes. "A bit - everyone seems to be in the same boat and that helps give a sense of a community - especially when web	

	work can be quite isolating." "Yes. There are "in jokes" (eg it's Friday) and everyone has roughly the same concerns / problems and so a shared understanding." "There is a community, but it is a fairly closed group" "Not as it used to, no." "Yes, but predominantly single sex community - I guess that's because the industry is" "because of recurring cast of characters (ie. same names tend to crop up)"	
17. Is {the list} is more of a community than {another related list}?	Most respondents fell into one of two groups: those who thought web-support was more of a community, and those who didn't know. Don't know here probably either implies that they are not familiar with the other list, or they feel the question is meaningless.	Less [option 0] 0 agreed with this More [1] 16 agreed 37.2% About the same [2] 7 agreed 17.1% Don't know [3] 16 agreed 39% Missing 4
18. Do you think {the list} has changed or developed over time? If so how? (open text box)	The response rate was very low here: 23 people made no return. Two simply said they did not feel qualified to comment. Only a couple of replies extended beyond a sentence. Such answers as were given did not seem to be very clear, three respondents thought it had not really changed. Some felt that it was not as good as before (3 complaints about ranting and showing off) – some that it was better (5 seeing it as more informal). Topics had broadened (4).	

The archive		
19. How often do you use {the list} archive?	Mean 0.79 This score suggests that the archive is relatively little used. 12 persons answered that they never used the archive (27.9% of respondents). 65% (28) said they used it a few times a year.	The options were Every week [scored 3] Every Month [2] A few times a year [1] Never [0]
20. Have you ever used the archive to see who might know the answer to a question and contact them direct?	Mean 0.14 This score suggests that the archive is rarely used to find people, only 6 people said they had ever done this.	Yes [1] No [0]
Your views		
21. Describe one good experience you have had from the list	The response rate was moderate. There were 14 no responses (32%). Two did not specify an event as such. Of those who did respond, with a specific experience, 12 referred primarily to something to do with getting answers to their own specific question. Two referred to being helped to identify software quickly. Two referred to receiving encouragement and support, not simply factual help. Most other answers were only suggested by one individual (my summary): having learned having their own expertise recognised finding experts receiving thanks for help amusing incidents (2) making friends found work Two referred to non ICT mediated connections, follow up phone calls and the annual conference associated with the list.	

	"Generally finding out what other people are up to. This helps put your own work into perspective and to show those higher up in the food chain what isbeing done inother institutions - good evidence!" "Used it a lot for support when I was working entirely on my own. Not so needed in that respect now I have colleagues, but still useful. ""Confidence that I know the resource is there for future problems" "Advice on [text deleted] software helped us pick the right product and saved us weeks of research" "Not so much one experience as just lots of really useful and timesavingadvice - often directly relevant the sector which is equally important." The response to this question supports the idea that the main benefit is direct help on specific problems. However a range of other types of benefit were perceived (which can be cross referenced to the results of question 4).	
22. Is there anything that could be improved about {the list}?	Again the response rate to this open ended question was quite low. 17 persons offered no sort of answer (39% of respondents), somewhat more than failed to answer the previous question. 8 more said that they couldnt think of any improvement to the list. No one drew on experience of other communities or technologies, to suggest changes. Of those who did identify an area for improvement, the following broad themes emerged:	Open

	• list culture: either referring to unwanted ranting and flames, chatty postings or an intimidatory feel for new comers (5) • facilitation (2). Some members thought it would be better if the list owner or moderator behaved differently: either to summarise content or stamp down on irrelevant messages. • different or enhanced technology (6) Two unspecified issues with the list technology, one with specific criticisms. Thus it was negative aspects of existing technology, rather than positive suggestions for enhanced technology. • more members (1) • some face to face meetings (1) • better understanding of issues (1)	
ABOUT YOU		
23. What is your email?	80% of respondents were from the ac.uk domain. Only 6 were from non-ac.uk domain	open
24. What is your professional background	Of the 43 respondents, 6 did not answer the question (of these 4 were persons who did not leave an email, so presumably they did not answer this question, again out of a desire for anonymity). Of those who did answer, many (20) saw their professional background as in IT, with 11 seeing it as specifically web related IT and 9 implying an other than web IT background. Others mentioned backgrounds in publishing (2), marketing/PR (4), librarian/information management (2) and teaching (2).	Open
25. When did you join your current institution? (month/year)	Mean 6.19 years	

26. What proportion of time do you spend on web development?	The average score being close to 3 suggests that the group spend a lot of their time on web development. 60% of respondents spent over half or all of their time on web development. But most have other activities, and over a third spent less than half their time on developing for the web.	Mean 2.81 4 N=13 31% 3 N=13 31% 2 N=11 26.2% 1 N=5 11.9% 0 N=0 Missing 1
27. Briefly describe your work	The answers to this question revealed a range of different roles, but the majority could be classified as institutional web master (or institutional web team member) or departmental web master. Several described roles that fell into a number of the categories below. 16 IWM or team 8 Departmental web master 7 Web application developer 5 Learning technology role	
28. Do you work in a team?	Score 0.68 There were 13 individuals who worked on their own in the group of respondents.	Options were: No [0] Yes [1]
29. How many emails do you get a day	The mean score was 2.95: this suggests that typically the group get more than 50 but less than 100 emails per day. This is quite high, but not very high. However the commonest response was actually over 100 (N=15). Only three people said they got less than 20 a day.	Options Less than 20 [score = 1] 21 to 50 [2] 51 to 100 [3] More than 100 [4]
30. Are you?	Mean 0.52 This means that women responded at the same level as men.	Female [0] Male [1]
31. Any other comments		Open

Questionnaire response

Table A7.2 Membership history of respondents

	Length of membership in years	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	9	20.9	20.9
	1	4	9.3	30.2
	2	7	16.3	46.5
	3	2	4.7	51.2
	4	4	9.3	60.5
	5	7	16.3	76.7
	6	3	7.0	83.7
	7	2	4.7	88.4
	8	5	11.6	100.0
	Total	43	100.0	

Table A7.3 Lifetime postings by respondents

	Postings	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
	0	11	25.6	30.6	30.6
	1-10	9	20.9	25.0	55.6
	10-20	3	7.0	8.3	63.9
	20-100	8	18.6	22.2	86.1
	100+	5	11.6	13.9	100.0
	Total	36	83.7	100.0	
Missing	Unknown	7	16.3		
Total		43	100.0		

Table A7.4 Claimed posting frequency

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	2	4.7	4.7	4.7
	1-5 p.a.	23	53.5	53.5	58.1
	6-10 p.a.	6	14.0	14.0	72.1
	10+ p.a.	12	27.9	27.9	100.0
	Total	43	100.0	100.0	

Appendix 8: IWMW tables

Table A8.1. IWMW conference series 423
Table A8.2. "Genres" of activity at IWMW 424
Table A8.3. IWMW subject analysis 425
Table A8.4. IWMW1997 427
Table A8.5. IWMW1998 428
Table A8.6. IWMW2003 430
Table A8.7. IWMW2004 432
Table A8.8. Words in job titles of delegates 434
Table A8.9. Relationship between delegates and list membership 435
Table A8.10. IWMW speakers' affiliations 435
Table A8.11. Roles of people putatively included in the community 436
Table A8.12. Key challenges for web teams 437

Table A8.1. IWMW conference series

Kings College London, 1997	Running and institutional web service
University of Newcastle, 1998	(no subtitle)
Goldsmiths College, 1999	The Next Steps
University of Bath, 2000	The Joined-Up Web
Queens University Belfast, 2001	Organising Chaos
University of Strathclyde, 2002	The Pervasive Web
University of Kent, 2003	Supporting Our Users
University of Birmingham, 2004	Transforming The Organisation

Table A8.2. "Genres" of activity at IWMW

Genre of activity	Features
Plenary talks	Paper presented to entire conference (hour long). These are given precedence, eg by being reported in greater depth in reports. Their purpose may be to define the next big thing or comment on technology fashion.
Parallel sessions	In depth, participatory sessions on a particular topic to develop skills. These were not reported.
Discussion groups	Topical discussions continued over a number of sessions and intended to produce recommendations to be presented to a plenary session at the end of the conference. Has a sense of trying to set an agenda (for JISC), certainly a practical focus that would not occur in an academic conference.
Debates	Set piece two sided debate on a controversial topic.
Birds of a Feather meetings	More informal meetings for emergent interest groups.
Exhibition	Stands by various commercial and academic services.
Informal encounters at between-session tea breaks and at meal times	
Social events: Dinner, Trip, Disco etc.	

Table A8.3. IWMW subject analysis

	IWMW 1997	IWMW 1998	IWMW 2003	IWMW 2004
Supervision	0	0	2	0
Strategy	1	2	6	6
Policy	1	1	0	4
Politics and liaison, encompasses relations with web authors	3	1	4	7
Project management	0	0	0	1
(Total "management")	(5)	(4)	(12)	(18)
Web mark up (HTML, CSS, Javascript) - includes standardisation aspects of these	2	3	3	1
Programming (eg cgi scripts) / database connectivity	3	7	2	1
Networking, server maintenance and reporting (including logs)	6	1	2	0
Search engine	0	0	2	1
System choice, implementation	2	3	12	9
Core business processes/ portals/e-commerce	0	2	2	6
Trouble shooting	0	0	0	0
Documentation	0	0	0	0
R&D	1	1	2	0
(Total "IT")	(14)	(17)	(25)	(18)
Interface design, navigation, usability, accessibility	2	4	7	4
Training	0	0	0	1
E-learning	0	0	5	0
Information management, taxonomies, metadata	3	6	3	3
Legal issues	0	1	1	1
Writing for web, content creation	0	0	0	0
Graphic design (and multimedia)	0	1	0	1
Marketing	0	0	0	0
The job itself	2	3	3	2
Off topic/ not classifiable	0	0	5	1
TOTAL	26	36	61	49

Notes:

1. Method: each plenary paper or workshop was categorised on the basis of extant material (in some cases this was only a short abstract). If the session encompassed multiple topics it was recorded under each main topic. Because the taxonomy included more technical headings this would tend to mean that technical papers were scored more times. Nevertheless the broad point of the analysis is not obscured by this bias, as the topical focus emphasis is clear.
2. Excludes discussion groups

Table A8.4. IWMW1997

Title	Researcher's description	Topics
Introduction	Introduction to web focus role, summary of who is present	The job itself
Charisma or camel: A socio-technical approach to web redesign	Description of how university involved stakeholders in a major redesign	Strategy, politics and liaison, interface design
Information flow	Implications for management / governance of a model of information flow	Information management, politics and liaison, policy
Security and performance issues	Overview of security and performance issues	Networking / server maintenance
Networking for webmasters	Introduction to computer networks	Networking / server maintenance
WWW/database integration	overview of connecting databases to web	Programming
WebTools	UCISA group which will be evaluating all sorts of web tools	Web mark up, networking/server, programming, system choice
WWW caching	Role of caching in conserving bandwidth	Networking/ server maintenance
Next year's web	Future developments in web	R&D
Workshops		
Trials and tribulations		The job itself
Metadata		Information management
Design		Interface design
Information flow		Information management, politics and liaison
Web tools		Web mark up, networking/server, programming, system choice
Caching		Networking/server maintenance

Table A8.5. IWMW1998

Title	Researcher's description	Topics
Commercial database and collaborative web development tools	Database integration and collaboration	Programming, systems choice
Commercial XML and HTML authoring tools	Authoring tools	Web mark up, systems choice
Introduction		The job itself
Dumbing down - making the UCE web site more accessible	Redesign of site, including working with commercial web design company	Strategy, interface design, graphics
Does web content grow on trees?	Redesign of site, into three core structures	Strategy, interface design, information management
Publishing and devolving the maintenance of a prospectus	Online/print management of prospectus	Information management, programming
DataWeb: three worlds collide	How web site is managed using back end database	Programming
Information management and the institutional website	Implications of different style of information publication on the web	Information management, the job itself
Web front ends to student databases	Web enabling student information databases	Programming, core business systems
Events online	Events database using XML	Programming, markup
The use of online databases to manage student support and learning	web interfaces to student databases	Programming, core business systems
The DISinHE Centre - accessibility and the web	Work of DISinHE centre	User interface
Publish and be damned?	AUPs and legal liability for what is hosted on institutional web site	Policy, legal issues
The British council on the web	Running of very large, distributed site	Information management, politics and liaison
Deploying new web technologies	Future development of web	R&D
Workshops		
Web design		Interface design
Metadata		Information management
Web server management		Networking/server maintenance

Title	Researcher's description	Topics
Web tools		Programming, web mark up, system choice, information management
Management issues		Job itself

Table A8.6. IWMW2003

Title	Researcher's description	Topics
The Web Of Higher & Further Education: How To Deal With The Spiders	Broad trends in education and impact on web	Strategy
Semantic Web Technologies for UK HE and FE Institutions	Explanation of semantic web	Web mark up, R&D
JISCinfoNet: Helping Web Managers Support Our Users	Introduction to new JISC service to support choice of systems, but in fact talk focussed on Freedom of Information act	Systems choice, legal issues
Web Strategies: Bridging a Continent	Case study of web implementation at this university	Strategy, politics and liaison, system choice
Focussing On Users: Gathering Users' Requirements	A method for gathering user requirements for usability of portal	Interface design
Content Management - Buy or Build?	Explores alternative strategies for developing and implementing CMS	System choice
Community Portals - A False Dawn Over The Field of Dreams?	Discussion of readiness of local government for community portals	Off topic
E-learning: The Strategy Continuum	E-learning strategies	E-learning
Beyond Your VLE: Strategic Challenges	E-learning and MLEs	E-learning
Parallel sessions		
Online Research and Technology Transfer Expertise Systems		Strategy, off topic
Integration, Integration, Integration: Issues Involved in Providing Web Access Across Institutional Systems	Integration of different forms of content (portalisation)	Strategy, systems choice, core business processes, interface design
Practical approaches for gathering users' requirements		Interface design
Implementation of a Commercial Content Management System		Politics and liaison, systems choice
The WWW Web - Widgeted, WebDAVed and Write-enabled Web	Within browser editing technologies	Web mark up, systems choice
Learning Technology Interoperability Standards Update		e-learning, information management
Promoting Online Collaboration and Virtual Community: Benefits For	Different forms of collaborative tools	Systems choice

Title	Researcher's description	Topics
The Web Team		
Bandwidth Management Techniques: Technical And Policy Issues		Networking
Supporting The Research User		Off topic
Ubiquitous Computing And The Institutional Web	Paper on possibility of every student being given a laptop by the university & implications for policy	Off topic
Beyond Accessibility - Thinking Holistically About Your Web Site		Interface design, the job itself
Catching Mistakes: Using QA to Address Problems on your Web Site	Quality assurance on web site	Information management
E-learning And Accessibility		Interface design, e-learning
Institutional E-print Repositories	Local databases of academic content	Off topic
'One Query To Rule Them All' - Cross-database Searching and Finding	Many aspects of local and distributed searching	Search engines, web mark up
Web Services and The Institutional Web		Programming, systems choice, R&D
Professional Development for Webmasters	Training and accreditation for web managers	The job itself
Managing People in an Educational Environment		supervision
Search Facilities For Web Sites		Search engine, system choice
Can Librarians Transform The Institutional Web?	Various skills librarians might bring to institutional web	Information management, job itself
Managing People And projects		Supervision
Whose Web Is It Anyway?	Overall web strategy - balancing stakeholder needs	Strategy, politics and liaison, interface design
From Vision to Reality : Implementing a University Web Strategy	Issues around developing an institutional web strategy, under the headings infrastructure, environment and support	Strategy, politics and liaison, networking, system choice, interface design
Open Source Software - The Developers View / The User's View		Programming, systems choice
Vertical Learning Environment to Community Portal	Virtual learning/ portals	Systems choice, core business processes, e-learning

Table A8.7. IWMW2004

Title	Researcher's description	Topics
Introduction to the community I	What is JISC	Not classifiable
Introduction to the community II	Who is the web community	The job itself
Introduction to the event	Introduction to the event	The job itself
Life After E-mail: Strategies For Collaboration in the 21st Century	Supporting different communication technologies: policy, support issues	Policy
Trials, Trips and Tribulations of an Integrated Web Strategy	One institutions overall strategy, argued against CMS, pro portal	Strategy, system procurement, core business processes
E-business: Why Join In?:	E-commerce, but strong on politics, liaison role	Strategy, politics and liaison, core business processes
Socrates: Building an Intranet for the UK Research Councils	Building and selling an intranet	Strategy, politics and liaison, systems choice
LSE for You: From Innovation to Realism and Beyond	Political decisions made to build a portal	Strategy, core business processes, system procurement
Beyond Free Beer: Is Using Open Source A Matter Of Choosing Software or Joining A Political Movement?	Open source, but attempting to justify it in terms of typical management values, rather than ethical claims	Strategy, system procurement
Strategic Staff Development for the Web-enabled Organisation	The need for large number of people in institutions to get training in web: how to address this	Training
Beyond Web Accessibility: Providing A Holistic User Experience	An attack on the idea that accessibility can be a standard, rather than guideline	Usability/accessibility
Parallel sessions		
Blogs & Wikis: Herding Cats?	New forms of communication for collaboration	System procurement, policy
QA For Web sites - What Goes Wrong And How Can We Prevent It?,	Management controls, quality management	Information management, policy
Cheesy And Sad Images	Looked at inappropriate imagery used in many HE web sites, ways of identifying images which users like	Graphics

Title	Researcher's description	Topics
Give The Dog A Plone	One open source technology used for CMS	Politics and liaison, system procurement
Implementing Web Standards Across The Institution - Trials And Tribulations Of A Redesign	Standards, accessibility	Politics and liaison, web mark up, interface, policy
Measuring the Impact of a CMS Implementation	CMS, measuring impact	Systems implementation
Using your Ayes and Noes: Creating a Business Case for an Institutional Portal,	Portal, business case	Core business systems, politics and liaison, usability, strategy
Taxonomy: The Science Of Classification	Taxonomy for portal, stressed collaboration between librarian and IT specialist	Information management, core business processes
Paper Prototyping in Practice	Design method - links to usability	Usability/accessibility
Developing an E-content Strategy for your Web Site	Information management strategy to deal with scale of content on web site	Information management
Defining the Role of the Web Editor	Supporting departmental web authors	Politics and liaison
It Always Takes Longer Than You Think (Even If You Think It Will Take Longer Than You Think),	Project management	Project management
From Swipe Card Machine to the Computer Screen	E-commerce	Core business processes, politics and liaison
Being Open Source	How to organise an open source project (note implication of identity)	System procurement, programming
Integrating legal compliance into web management	Legal issues	Legal issues
Choosing a search engine for your website	Technology choice	Search engine, choice of engine

Table A8.8. Words in job titles of delegates

2004		Frequency		2003		Frequency		Changes	
[1]	web	80		[1]	web	74		web	6
[2]	manager	37		[2]	manager	48		manager	-11
[3]	officer	27		[3]	officer	31		officer	-4
[4]	developer	19		[4]	and	18		development	0
[5]	development	17		[5]	development	17		developer	4
[6]	and	12		[6]	information	18		systems	3
[7]	systems	12		[7]	developer	15		editor	2
[8]	editor	11		[8]	editor	9		services	0
[9]	services	9		[9]	of	9		learning	-6
[10]	of	8		[10]	services	9		director	-4
[11]	senior	8		[11]	systems	9		head	0
[12]	webmaster	7		[12]	learning	8			
[13]	assistant	6		[13]	director	7			
[14]	head	6		[14]	support	7			
[15]	media	6		[15]	technical	7			
[16]	[no title]	6		[16]	webmaster	7			
[17]	support	6		[17]	head	6			
[18]	analyst	5		[18]	library	5			
[19]	information	5		[19]	project	5			

Table A8.9. Relationship between delegates and list membership

	IWMW 2003	IWMW 2004
Total delegates	159	147
Delegates also members of WS	65 (41% of all delegates; 9% of WS membership)	41 (28% of all delegates; 6% of WS membership)
Delegates also member of WIM	75 (47% of all delegates; 13% of WIM membership)	48 (33% of all delegates; 8% of WIM membership)
Delegates on both lists	53 (33% of all delegates)	30 (20% of all delegates)
Number on neither	72 (45% of delegates)	93 (63% of delegates)

Note: The IWMW2003 comparison was to the list membership list of March 2003 (i.e. some months before the conference); IWMW2004 comparison was to a list retrieved two days after the conference closed.

Table A8.10. IWMW speakers' affiliations

		1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	Total	%age
1	Total	8	16	17	19	27	34	38	31	190	
2	UK not educ	1	3	1	1	4	1	0	0	11	0.0591
3	Not UK	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	4	0.0215
4	FE	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	0.0108
5	Post 92	0	2	0	2	1	2	2	2	11	0.0591
6	Wales	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0.0054
7	Small HEI	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0.0054
8	Not core total	1	6	1	3	7	4	3	5	30	0.1613
9	%age Not core	13%	38%	6%	16%	26%	12%	8%	16%	16%	
10	Core	7	10	16	16	20	30	35	26	160	0.8602
11	Female	1	2	1	1	7	8	16	7	43	0.2312
12		13%	13%	6%	5%	26%	24%	42%	23%	23%	

Table A8.11. Roles of people putatively included in the community

Role as listed in "optional introduction to the web community" (in original order)	Roles listed in workshop introduction (equivalent?) (in brackets position in slide)	Number of delegates acknowledging this description by show of hands
Web developers, web system administrators ... etc	Techie (1)	Many
Web authors and content providers	[no equivalent]	Does not apply
Web designers, user interface specialists	Designer (5)	Some
Information architects	[no equivalent]	Does not apply
Trainers and support staff	Support staff (3)	Many
Learning technologists	Learning technologist (4)	Few
Team leaders	Manager (8)	Many
Senior managers	[no equivalent]	Does not apply
	Information specialists (2) glossed as librarians	Few
	User (6)	None
	Other (7)	Few
	All of these (9)	Few

Table A8.12. Key challenges for web teams

Audience suggestions (in order of mention)	BK categorisation
Politics	Resources
Procedures	Technologies
Resources	Strategies
Faculty buy in	Users
Executive buy in	Skills
Keeping up to date with technology	
Strategies, or the lack of	
Accessibility and usability	
User education	

Appendix 9: Interview questions

Note: The precise set of questions used varied between respondents, partly because of their different roles, see Chapter 5.2.3 for discussion.

Preliminaries in or prior to interview [if applicable]

Check out working space: What sort of environment? Eg open plan etc

[Opening script]

My research is just about the jobs of web managers and developers and the relation between them.

[Nature of web work]

1. I think your job title is * how long have you been in that job?

2. What is your background?

3. Could you say a few words about what you do day to day ...

4. Is it a nine to five job?

5. Are you part of a web team? Who else is in it?

6. What name [word] would you use to describe your occupation? [If someone said what do you do for a living?]

7. Could you clarify where you fit into the organisational structure?

8. Where do you fit into how the institution uses the web?

9. At what level is web strategy determined and by who?

10. How has doing web stuff in HE changed over the last few years, would you say?

11. How do you support web authors here?

12. Do you think you are pretty typical of people in HE doing the web?

13. What do you see as your most likely forward career path?

[Networks and reputation]

14. How would you go about developing a new part of the web site?

15. What web sites do you look at when developing site? Do you look at other university sites?

16. Do you see yourself as creative at some level?

17. Do you know many other people in similar jobs?

18. How did you meet them?

19. Would you contact them for help for problems?

20. What sort of help would you exchange?

21. Do you see Institutional Web Managers as a distinct group?

22. What other groups in the web domain would you identify?

23. Do you think there is gender aspects in this area?

[HEIST awards]

24. Have you ever been involved in an entry for a HEIST award for web site for marketing use?

[Conference]

25. Have you been to the Institution Web Managers Workshop?

26. What are the main benefits of going?

27. Has it been an influence on how you have decided to do the web?

[Attitudes]

28. Do you see yourself as a computer scientist?

29. Is keeping up to date a burden or?

30. What does the notion of professionalism mean to you?

31. Are you a member of any professional bodies?

32. What is your attitude to being a member of a professional body?

33. Are you a member of a union?

[E mail use] Just to finish I have a few questions about email...

34. How many emails do you get per day?

35. How important is email to you in day to day work?

36. Or would you use the phone?

37. How important are meetings?

38. Are you a member of many lists? [what sort of numbers?]

39. What role (if any) do they play in your work?

40. Do you have any particular ways of dealing with email from lists? [eg filtering]

41. Do you have filters set-up for incoming emails?

42. Would you ever save emails from lists?

43. Are you are a subscriber to web-support?

44. What is web support about would you say?

45. How would you characterise who is on there?

46. What is the scope of WS against WIM

47. How would you characterise the messages that go out on WS?

48. Is it a typical techie list?

[Closing script]

- Well I think that's all my questions. Do you have any points you want to make, that you feel I should have covered?
- Who else would you recommend talking to?
- What I plan to do is write up a summary of my findings – difficult to say in what form that will appear.
- Can I contact you if I have extra questions?

Appendix 10: Transcription conventions used

Right	Emphasis
RIGHT	Loudness
( )	Inaudible words or where there are doubts of accuracy
[ ]	Deliberate omissions or pseudonymisations
(( ))	Transcriber's comments

References: Potter and Wetherell (1987, pp. 188-9), Silverman (2001, p. 303).

Appendix 11: Tables summarising interview data

Table A11.1 Administrative summary 445
Table A11.2 Sample summary: Gender, region, type of institution 446
Table A11.3 Choice of informants 447
Table A11.4 Cross organisational activism: WS space 448
Table A11.5 Cross organisational activism: IWM space 449
Table A11.6 Connectedness of informants 451
Table A11.7 Use of the word "we" 453
Table A11.8 Summary of interviewees' participation in WS and IWMW 454
Table A11.9 Summary of informants methods of control and influence over web authors 455
Table A11.10 Summary of informants orientation to influence or control 457
Table A11.11 Informants positioning in relation to technology 459
Table A11.12 Background of informants: degree, IT training, age, background, time in post 460
Table A11.13 Job titles and department 462
Table A11.14 Roles 463
Table A11.15 Anticipated career path 465
Table A11.16 Self descriptions and encapsulated occupational identity 466
Table A11.17 Informants' ways of speaking (idiolect) 468
Table A11.18 Informants and the Slater (1999) profile 470
Table A11.19 Professional memberships 471
Table A11.20 Information and Content as discursive resources 472
Table A11.21 Participation in cross organisational spaces and institutional characteristics 473
Table A11.22 Implications of non-professionalisation 474

Note: Informants are listed in the order in which interviews took place.

Table A11.1 Administrative summary

Interviewee	Date	Transcript length (in words)	Comments
AM (pilot)	15-Mar	6740	
BM (pilot)	18-Mar	9418	
CM	06-May	12071	
DM	10-May	6967	
EM	13-May	10608	
FM	19-May	5274	By phone
GM	21-May	8843	
HF	24-May	8991	
IM	25-May	11006	
JM	28-May	5968	
KM/LM	03-Jun	11244	Interviewee brought colleague
MF	07-Jun	5834	
NF	11-Jun	7341	
OF	14-Jun	4898	
PM	16-Jun	5971	
QM	07-Jul	10188	
RM	08-Jul	10633	
SF	21-Jul	10138	
TM	21-Jul	7789	
UM	22-Jul	7420	
VM	22-Jul	6671	

Notes:
Interviews were pseudonymised using a first initial based on order of interviewing and a second based on gender.
For discussion see Chapter 6.2

Table A11.2 Sample summary: Gender, region, type of institution

Interviewee	Gender	Region	Institution
AM	Male	NE	Old, Russell group
BM	Male	SE	Old, Russell group
CM	Male	NW	Old
DM	Male	SE	Old
EM	Male	Mid	Old, Russell group
FM	Male	not UK	DNA
GM	Male	Mid	FE
HF	Female	NW	Old
IM	Male	not UK (SE) note 1	DNA
JM	Male	Mid	Old, Russell group
KM/LM	Male	SE	Old
MF	Female	SE	Old, Russell group
NF	Female	SW	New University
OF	Female	Yorkshire	Old
PM	Male	NW	New University
QM	Male	Yorkshire	New University
RM	Male	N Ireland	Old
SF	Female	Scotland	Old
TM	Male	Scotland	Old
UM	Male	Scotland	Old
VM	Male	Scotland	Small HEI
	16/21 male		

For discussion see Chapter 6.2
Note 1 this interviewee had now lef the field, but as an IWM had worked in the SE.

Table A11.3 Choice of informants

Interviewee	Activism	IWM type role	Sector	Gender	Technology	Secondary data
AM (pilot)	**WIM list owner**	Y				Personal web site
BM (pilot)	**Activist in gamut** (London regional group), IWMW2003	Y			Portal	Several published articles
CM	**Active WS poster**	Y				Personal web sites
DM	**WS list owner**					**Autobiography on web**
EM	**Keynote speaker** IWMW2003	Y			Portal	Speeches
FM	**Most active poster on WS**					
GM	IWMW2003	Y	**FE**			Web site about team
HF	IWMW2003	Y		**Female**		**"Week in life" article**
IM	**Former activist in IWMW and gamut,** mentioned by BK	(up to 2001)				
JM	**Active WS poster**					Blogs
KM/LM		Y			**CMS**	
MF	Active in IWMW and WS poster	Y		**Female**		
NF	**Raised professional issues on WS, faculty web master**			Female		
OF		Y		**Female**		**Web site describing career**
PM	**HEIST award winner**	Y	**New uni**			Previous interview (Campbell 2002)
QM	**HEIST award winner also WS poster**	Y	**New uni**			
RM	Ran IWMW2001	Y			**CMS, Portal**	
SF		Y		**Female**		**Paper on IWM as librarian**
TM	**Active WS poster**					
UM	**Formed regional group during 2004**	Y				
VM	**HEIST award winner**	Y	**Small HEI**		CMS	

For discussion see Chapter 6.2

Table A11.4 Cross organisational activism: WS space

Interviewee	WS member	WS postings (1998-2005)	Summary of orientation to WS
AM	Y	3	Did not seem very concerned with WIM (of which he was list owner) let alone WS
BM	N	DNA	Left because it dealt with issues he understood (BM88) compared it unfavourably with other virtual communities he had been part of (BM93)
CM	Y	237	Strong identification: "its like my days" (CM106)
DM	Y (List owner)	145	List owner, but "just an observer" (DM19)
EM	Y	14	Surprisingly positive, perhaps because of his sense of centrality to whole domain (EM96)
FM	Y	917	For friendship, diversion (see Chapter 6.16)
GM	Y	15	Symbolises HE's different, esoteric approach to web (see Chapter 6.8)
HF	Y	11	Has occasional useful discussions, but also silly ones (irritating), purely technical ones (uninteresting) and techno-ideological ones (irritating) (HF106)
IM	N	18	Critical, wished it had been kept separate from WIM (IM116), but acknowledges it is common for lists to be populated by just a few people with seemingly nothing better to do (IM110)
JM	Y	383	Sees it as unusually supportive, friendly especially for those who are isolated (JM119)
KM/LM	?	DNA	Scornful, "I don't think Oh that's interesting! EVER" (KM201)
MF	Y	116	Valuable source of expertise (MF74)
NF	Y	31	Posts rarely but saw it as core to keeping up to date, aspirational (see Chapter 6.16)
OF	Y	2	Finds it a useful list to study privately and gains comfort in seeing others with similar problems (OF132)
PM	N	DNA	Not a member
QM	Y	44	Relic of former collaborative values (see Chapter 6.16)
RM	Y	31	Useful to save time fixing problems (RM125-7), but is member of many lists (RM62).
SF	Y	2	"I'm just a kind of silent interloper" (SF126)
TM	Y	484	Thoughtful list that sees wider issues, sees problems with approaches, not nerdy (TM130); but also a diversion (TM120)
UM	N	DNA	Not a member: Has other sources of information
VM	N	DNA	Not a member

For discussion see Chapter 6.3, 6.16

Table A11.5 Cross organisational activism: IWM space

Interviewee	IWMW2003	IWMW2004	Other IWMW	Other	Summary of orientation to IWMW
AM		Y	(1997-200?)	WIM List owner	More active in the past, now sends his staff (AM33)
BM	Y	Y	(1997-)	Regional group organiser, Professional web management conference	Continues to see it as key reference point for best practice (BM53)
CM	Y	Y (workshop leader)	?		Values the sense of not being alone (CM58)
DM			Attended a few sessions in 1997		Sees it as irrelevant to him (DM88)
EM	Y (key note speaker)	Y (first keynote speaker)	? (Host 2004)		Sees himself as central to this, yet also reinventing the role so that he goes beyond it (EM66)
FM			Never		Slightly cynical (FM145-7)
GM	Y		?		Sees the gap with HE as too wide to cross (GM37)
HF	Y (rapporteur)		(1997-; Hosts 2005)		Very positive about it (HF53) and clearly a reference point (HF29), but not specific about benefits
IM			(1997-2002; Host 1998)	Regional group organiser, Professional web management conference	Very positive, but critical of over technical focus (IM58)
JM			Never		Aspirational (JM47-55)
KM/LM			Never		Dismissive (KM174)
MF	Y (workshop leader)	Y (rapporteur, workshop leader)	(1997-)		Saw it as having a role in a collective understanding of what the web is about (MF68) consistently misnamed in webmasters meeting.
NF			Never		Aspirational (NF91)

Interviewee	IWMW2003	IWMW2004	Other IWMW	Other	Summary of orientation to IWMW
OF			Never		Relies on colleague from marketing going (OF86)
PM			Y (2003)		Suggests that it is too techie (PM103)
QM			Never		Suggests that it is too techie (QM89)
RM	Y (speaker)		Y (2001 (Host) + ?)		Useful to identify up coming trends (RM77)
SF			Y (1997-2000, 2002)		Found it inspiring at first (SF83), but increasingly less so (SF75)
TM			Y (2002)		It is too specialised for him (TM71)
UM	Y	Y		Regional group organiser	Very positive, both about "networking" and specific knowledge in talks (UM73)
VM			Never		Vaguely aware that it might exist (VM83)

For discussion see Chapter 6.3

Table A11.6 Connectedness of informants

Interviewee	Internal to organisation		External	
	Team	*Wider*	*Collective*	*Personal*
AM	Large specialist, cross departmental team	Key relation with IT, and with departments as clients	Weak, activist in past	Few
BM	Large specialist team	Strong collegial across departments, informal and formal	IWMW activist	Knows many IWMs personally
CM	Isolated in marketing team, one assistant	Wide range of contacts	Via WS, IWMW	Knows a few
DM	Small specialist team	Isolated	Mac world	?
EM	Large specialist team	Strong collegial across departments	IWMW activist	Knows many IWMs personally
FM	Works alone	Not in an organisation	WS	Clients
GM	Small specialist team	Strong collegial across departments	None	None
HF	Small specialist team, undermined by frequent reorganisation	Major reorganisation in progress	IWMW	Unknown
IM (historically)	Large specialist team	Strong collegial across departments	IWMW activist	Knows many IWMs personally
JM	Works alone	Isolated	WS	A few
KM	Large specialist team	Key relation with rest of IT department	None	A few
MF	Works alone	Informal relationships around organisation	IWMW, WS	A few (only sees them at the conference)
NF	Works alone	On standards committee	WS as passive information source	None
OF	Non technical in	Strongly influenced by	WS as passive	None

Interviewee	Internal to organisation		External	
	technical department	Marketing department	information source	
PM	One p/t assistant	Strong collegial across departments	None	Dyadic tie
QM	Large specialist team	Clear division of labour between departments	WS	Dyadic tie
RM	Member of multiple ad-hoc project teams	Many connections across IT department and beyond	IWMW	Strong Dyad, Knows many IWMs personally
SF	Small specialist team, rather informally organised	Collegial ties across departments, undermined by reorganisation	No	No
TM	Works alone	Informal connections	WS	No
UM	One colleague, isolated in Marketing	Building collegial ties	Regional support group	Knows many IWMs personally
VM	Specialist team	Strong	Knows many fellow professionals eg via CASE	Ditto

For discussion see Chapter 6.3

Table A11.7 Use of the word "we"

Interviewee	we count	total words in transcript	Proportion of all words	
AM	102	6740	0.015134	0.02
BM	70	9418	0.007433	0.01
CM	89	12071	0.007373	0.01
DM	26	6967	0.003732	0.00
EM	174	10608	0.016403	0.02
FM	21	5274	0.003982	0.00
GM	162	8843	0.01832	0.02
HF	100	8991	0.011122	0.01
IM	67	11006	0.006088	0.01
JM	10	5813	0.00172	0.00
KM/LM	247	11244	0.021967	0.02
MF	52	5834	0.008913	0.01
NF	56	7341	0.007628	0.01
OF	81	4898	0.016537	0.02
PM	57	5971	0.009546	0.01
QM	256	10188	0.025128	0.03
RM	247	10633	0.02323	0.02
SF	151	10138	0.014894	0.01
TM	66	7789	0.008473	0.01
UM	76	7420	0.010243	0.01
VM	105	6671	0.01574	0.02

Discussed Chapter 6.7.2, 6.10.6.2, 6.16

Table A11.8 Summary of interviewees' participation in WS and IWMW

Interviewee	WS	IWMW	
AM	Inactive member	Much more active in past	
BM	Non member	**Regular delegate, past speaker**	
CM	**High poster**	**Regular delegate, speaker**	
DM	List owner	Never attended	
EM	Rare poster	**Speaker/organiser**	
FM	**Highest poster**	Never attended	
GM	Occasional poster	Has attended but alienated	
HF	Rare poster	**Regular delegate**	
IM	*Formerly* inactive member	*Was* **speaker/organiser**	
JM	**High poster**	Never attended	
KM/LM	Inactive member	Dismissive	
MF	**Active poster**	**Regular delegate, speaker/organiser**	
NF	Occasional poster	Never attended	
OF	Inactive member	Never attended	
PM	Non member	Attended once, saw it as too technical	Heist award winner
QM	**Active poster**	Never attended	Heist award winner
RM	Occasional poster	**Regular delegate, speaker/organiser**	
SF	Inactive member	Ceased to attend	
TM	**High poster**	Attended once, sees it as too specialist	
UM	Non member	**Started regional self help group after attending**	
VM	Non member	Dimly aware it exists	Heist award winner

For discussion see Chapter 6.3

Table A11.9 Summary of informants methods of control and influence over web authors

< More control | More by influence >

	Pull plug or block rogue servers	Do content	Separation: Intranet, VLE	CMS	SSI	By strategy, influence senior staff	Influence choice of staff	Design service	Templates	Guidelines	Train-ing	Commun -ity	Influence & advice	Laissez faire
AM								KEY						
BM								1	1			Collegial		
CM			1	wants			1			1		KEY	1	
DM														
EM	1					KEY			1		1	1	1	
FM														
GM		KEY												
HF				planned		1 (?)		1	1					
IM						1								
JM														
KM/LM				KEY										
MF					1	?			1	1	1	1	1	
NF					1					1				
OF			1	planned						1	1	KEY		
PM		1								1		1	1	
QM	1	1	1						1	1	1	1		
RM				1		1					1			
SF					1			KEY		1	1	1		
TM													1	KEY
UM				1		KEY		0.5	1	1			1	
VM		1	1	KEY										

Notes: DM, FM and JM were not heavily involved in institutional site maintenance so are greyed out.

This is not a comprehensive analysis of strategies used by individuals to influence or control web authors, rather it only summarises what is mentioned in the interviews. What it does show is the range of activities and apparent centrality of different approaches to different individuals.

The distinction between control and influence is not absolute. Although a CMS could be an extreme control mechanism in some senses, often a gradual and permissive approach is taken to implementation and it does, in fact, enable wider participation in publication of content.
For discussion see 6.7

Table A11.10 Summary of informants orientation to influence or control

Interviewee	Most salient orientation toward web authors	Link to IWMW activism	Connection
AM	Design service to departments as clients		Unclear
BM	Complex mix of control and influence	IWMW activist	Unclear
CM	A local community of web authors with a shared moral purpose overcoming stick in the mud attitudes	WS, IWMW activist	Decentralists/activist
DM	Not in web management role		
EM	Consensual community, but recruited to his own strategy	IWMW activist	Decentralists/activist
FM	Not in web management role		
GM	Directly controls all content by his own team being only people to be able to write to web	Non-activist	Centraliser/ non-activist
HF	Sells departments idea of a common template, but defeated by institutional reorganisation		Unclear
IM	Need to control content and ask why each thing is published and for who		Centraliser but activist
JM	Not in web management role		
KM/LM	Use CMS to eliminate the "hobby farm" and reenfranchise those with formal authority to also control web directly.	Non-activist	Centraliser/ non-activist
MF	Influence by building up relationships, training, helping organising common events	activist	Decentralists/activist
NF	Not in web management role		
OF	Community activities but increasingly thinking of CMS	Non-activist	
PM	Cajole web authors through committee agreeing on institutional policies	Non-activist	Decentralist but non-activist
QM	Use maximum means to control content: complex guidelines, training, commission content, ultimate ability to delete unsatisfactory content	Non-activist	Centraliser/ non-activist
RM	Persuade people gradually to come to use CMS		Decentralists/activist
SF	Design service to departments as clients		Unclear
TM	Believed in allowing free for all publishing, with search engine to discover content		Decentralists/activist on WS

Interviewee	Most salient orientation toward web authors	Link to IWMW activism	Connection
UM	Gradually persuade departments to agree to guidelines, introduce CMS	Activist	Decentralists/activist
VM	Control via CMS, academics to be encouraged to update their own content which will be approved by marketing department	Non-activist	Centraliser/ non-activist

For discussion see Chapter 6.7

Table A11.11 Informants positioning in relation to technology

Interviewee	IT orientation (with references to further discussion or transcript references)
AM	PhD in computer science (AM7), but feels less and less of a techie (AM11), doesn't like webmaster name (AM41), operates at a level somehow intermediate between content/infrastructural technology (AM13). But the freedom he values is to choose technology (Chapter 6.13).
BM	Despite solid history in technology (Chapter 6.10.1), his tendency to define people by their technology (eg BM23) and guru way of talking, expressing the magic of technology - the power of "our XSLT" backgrounds technology, as a political liability (Chapter 6.10.3), behind a business discourse and stress on user needs (BM21)
CM	Primarily a techie, but with also credentialised design skills, hence his self description as a "Renaissance man" (Chapter 6.10.3)
DM	Mac enthusiast, not involved in his own institution's web presence (DM5-7)
EM	Differentiates himself from the practitioners of IT (Chapter 6.10.4), but being in the IT department allows the team to flourish
FM	By training a graphic designer, has inadvertently become a techie through practice (FM154-5)
GM	Keen to be seen as a key support point for IT, but presents it as just another communication technology - valuing his broader communication vision (Chapter 6.8)
HF	In-between technologists and content people, translates between them (Chapter 6.10.6.2)
IM	The technology is simple, a diversion from the real issues (Chapter 6.13)
JM	A technology/standards enthusiast, low status "code jockey" (JM141), but worried he is too old to be this
KM/LM	Constructs a powerful business rationale for IT (Chapter 6.7.2.1)
MF	Ambassador of IT department, proud of web master role (Chapter 6.7.1)
NF	Computer lover, enthusiast, amateur (Chapter 6.16)
OF	Dislikes technology, even though her career progress is closely linked to long term computerisation (Chapter 6.10.3)
PM	Enjoys the challenge of fixing code, but doesn't identify his career with it, sees the underlying technology as stable (Chapter 6.11.2)
QM	Enjoys playing with computers but relatively low level expertise, eg talks about HTML as programming (QM21), only limited involvement in systems choice (QM41)
RM	Has computer science PhD & 20 years experience yet now a manager (RM22,10)
SF	Prefers to see the web as an "information thing", resists a techie label (Chapter 6.10.3)
TM	Reluctant, ironic involvement with technology (TM31)
UM	Techie person in a non-techie organisation (Chapter 6.10.3), but backgrounds it as a personal interest as he sees it as important to talk to people in a simple way
VM	Just a tool, as a marketing manager his primary focus is on content

Table A11.12 Background of informants: degree, IT training, age, background, time in post

Interviewee	Field of degree	Formal IT training	Est. age	Background	Time in post (in years)
AM	Computing, Maths (PhD)	Y	>35	Straight from university	8
BM	Psychology (Masters)	Y	>35	Academia then pioneering Internet companies, then another university	3
CM	Design, creative technology	Y	>35	Straight from university	3
DM	Biosciences		50+	Teaching, R&D on computing in schools	12
EM	Computing and marketing	Y	>35	PR, computer sales	4
FM	Not a graduate (dropped out of graphic design)	(computer sales course)	35-50	Graphic design	DNA (web since 1994)
GM	English?		50+	Teaching & other roles in FE	6 (30 years at institution)
HF	Unknown, possibly not a graduate	(computer courses)	35-50	Various: shops, charity sector	1.5 plus overall since 1998, 6 years
IM	Music		>35	Music publishing/ technology	DNA (c1997-2001)
JM	Peace studies, computing	Y	35-50	Learning tech in a university	under a year
KM	Unknown, probably a graduate	?	50+	Health service, then local government and academic web	2
MF	Zoology		35-50	Academic and schools publishing	10
NF	Not a graduate	(HTML writers guild courses)	50+	Secretarial, retailing	5 (but year gap)
OF	Not a graduate		35-50	Secretarial, clerical	5
PM	Politics		>35	PR	2.5
QM	Town planning	Courses at local college	>35	Straight from university	6 (11 years at institution)
RM	Maths and physics (PhD)	Y	50+	Computing services and computer science	6-9 years (30 years at institution)
SF	English, librarianship		>35	Straight from university	7
TM	Political economy		50+	Economics teaching	15

Interviewee	Field of degree	Formal IT training	Est. age	Background	Time in post (in years)
UM	Aeronautics		>35	IT work in commercial sector	1.5
VM	Marketing		>35	Development (fund raising) in university sector	4

For discussion see Chapter 6.10.1

Table A11.13 Job titles and department

Interviewee	Job title	Department	Category
AM	Web development officer	Registry	Registry
BM	Web services manager	Business systems and services (MIS)	Information Services
CM	Web editor	External relations	Marketing
DM	Senior micro computer officer	Mac support	Information Services
EM	Web strategy manager	Information services	Information Services
FM	DNA (independent business)	DNA	
GM	Web manager (Recently redesignated web master)	IT and Professional development	{Further Education}
HF	Head of the web and e-learning	IT services	Information Services
IM	Consultant (formerly Director of web services)	(formerly Information services)	Information Services
JM	Learning technologist/media developer	School of Nursing	Academic department
KM/LM	Web services manager	Computing services	Information Services
MF	Information Provision & Webmaster	Computing service	Information Services
NF	Departmental webmaster	Faculty of applied science	Academic department
OF	Web administrator and information officer	Learning Information Services	Information Services
PM	Internet manager	External relations division	Marketing
QM	New media marketing manager	Marketing department	Marketing
RM	Principal analyst	Information services	Information Services
SF	Web administrator	Planning and information	Information Services
TM	Management information officer	Planning and information	Information Services
UM	Internet officer	Office of Marketing and communications	Marketing
VM	Head of marketing and development	Marketing	Marketing

For discussion see Chapter 6.10.2, 6.10.5

Table A11.14 Roles

Clusters	Activities	AM	BM	CM	DM	EM	FM	GM	HF	IM	JM	KM/LM	MF	NF	OF	PM	QM	RM	SF	TM	UM	VM	
Strategy and management	Supervision	1	1			1		1	1			1					1		1			1	9
	Strategy		1			1				1		1					1					1	6
	Policy			1		1						1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	13
	Politics and liaison		1	1		1		1	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	1	16
	Project management		1			1			1			1						1			1		6
Technical	Web mark up (HTML, CSS, Javascript)			1	1		1	1			1		1	1	1	1	1		1	1	1		13
	Programming / database connectivity (including writing cgi scripts)	1					1	1			1					1	1			1	1		8
	Networking, server maintenance and reporting (including logs)												1							1			2
	Search engine												1							1			2
	System procurement, implementation					1													1		1		3
	Core business processes/ portals/e-commerce		1			1																	2
	Trouble shooting			1		1		1	1						1		1		1	1	1		9
	Documentation											1	1				1		1				4
	R&D	1										1						1					3
Usability/accessibility	Interface design, navigation, usability, accessibility			1			1	1	1			1		1		1	1		1		1		10
SD	Training												1		1		1		1				4
E-learning	E-learning								1		1				{1}								2

Clusters	Activities	AM	BM	CM	DM	EM	FM	GM	HF	IM	JM	KM/LM	MF	NF	OF	PM	QM	RM	SF	TM	UM	VM	
Information management	Information management, taxonomies, metadata																		1	1			2
	Legal issues					1																	1
Marketing	Writing for web, content creation													1			1						2
	Graphic design (and multimedia)			1			1										1						3
	Marketing			1										1		1	1					1	5
Non web roles			1		1	1									1		1	1		1		1	

For discussion see Chapter 6.10

Table A11.15 Anticipated career path

Interviewee	Trajectory	Same institution
AM	At same institution extending application of web to further areas	Y
BM	(Not asked)	
CM	At same institution in management role or consultant	Y
DM	(Not asked)	
EM	Head of IT	
FM	DNA (consultant)	
GM	Same, outside organisation	
HF	Web related managerial position, same organisation	Y
IM	DNA (now consultant, web business man)	
JM	E-learning project	
KM	Chief Information Officer, Retirement	Y
MF	Stay same	Y
NF	Stay same, more technical role	Y
OF	Mentor, Retirement	Y
PM	Marketing/PR	
QM	Integrated marketing, same organisation	Y
RM	Retirement, Stay same	Y
SF	Change of career	
TM	Stay same	Y
UM	At same institution extending application of web	Y
VM	Head of marketing at bigger university	

For discussion see Chapter 6.10.3

Table A11.16 Self descriptions and encapsulated occupational identity

Interviewee	Self descriptions by quotation	Core occupational location (by researcher)
AM	Not a webmaster (AM41), Something between marketing and IT that could not be put into words (AM13-16)	IT/web manager though based in Registry
BM	Guru (BM7), business analyst/editor/information specialist/ project manager (BM25)	Complex role somewhere between specialism and management; and with multiple specialisms in the web, editing, project management, information specialism, business analyst. (See 6.10.6.1)
CM	The web master in general (CM4), Guardian of the web (CM16), gatekeeper (CM12), jack of all trades (CM16), Renaissance man (CM64)	Has training both in technical skill and graphics/multimedia, but backgrounds graphical skills: A techie in a marketing department, fragmented roles
DM	An observer (DM19)	Specialist on Macintosh computers
EM	Professional manager (EM24)	IT manager perhaps general middle manager
FM	High end professional hobbyist, amateur computer scientist, nerd (FM155)	Independent consultant on technology (but with graphics background)
GM	A communications person (GM39)	Communicator with many media, FE careerist
HF	In-betweeny (between content and IT) (HF9), translator (HF13), computing manager (HF19), driver or enabler (HF23)	Web manager - generalist
IM	Web manager (uses the term a dozen times, IM5)	Web entrepreneur (was web manager)
JM	Computer techie (JM60), a technician with knobs on (JM80), code jockey (JM141)	Learning technologist, focussing on technology
KM/LM	Information manager, knowledge manager (KM17), facilitaor or initiatior (KM31)	Web manager
MF	Ambassador for the IT department (MF26), webmaster (MF20)	Also training and documentation roles
NF	Web maker (NF95), computer driver (NF27), computer user (NF97)	Admin level web author, Web page designer, hobbyist
OF	Natural staff developer (OF183), a user person (OF82), web developer and trainer (OF25)	Trainer/ mentor, worked way up from clerical levels

Interviewee	Self descriptions by quotation	Core occupational location (by researcher)
PM	PR, IT or Marketing? (PM19)	PR/marketer
QM	Hybrid marketer (QM117), Odd people in the corner (QM119)	Marketer, specialising in web
RM	Content manager cop (RM24)	IT project manager, with special involvement in CMS
SF	A separate little thing (SF23)	Information specialist, orientated towards librarianship
TM	University administrator (TM31)	General university administrator, reluctant techie
UM	Adviser, would be regulator (UM37), techie person in a non-techie organisation (UM61)	Techie in a marketing department, categorically an IT person
VM	Head of marketing and development (VM28-9)	Marketing manager, member of CIM

For discussion see Chapter 6.10.4

Table A11.17 Informants' ways of speaking (idiolect)

Interviewee		Keywords	Effect	Discussion (Chapter ref.)
AM				
BM	Involuted, complex, glittering phrases - quiet, rapid delivery	Guru, transforming power of our XSLT	Mystification, the expert	6.10.5.1
CM	Meandering ("rambling", "circling" (CM 25)) discourse that elided concepts, reworking ideas - thinking aloud.		Inclusive, moral community builder	6.7.1
DM				
EM	Aggressive, domineering, eloquent	Engagement, taking responsibility, Yer? (challenging the listener to agree)	Recruiting people to a vision	6.10.6
FM				
GM	Argument from history			
HF	Reflective	Uhm. (reflecting on the strangeness of how things have turned out)	Position of failure, uncertain outcomes, lack of control	6.10.5.2
IM				
JM				
KM/LM	Definite, compulsion, rationalised discourses	Should	Moralistic, confrontational	6.7.2.1
MF				
NF		Marvellous, making web pages	Love of web, fear of job being turned into something else	
OF	Answers questions directly, does not expand		Defensive, role distancing	6.10.3
PM				
QM	Ironic, self critical			

Interviewee		Keywords	Effect	Discussion (Chapter ref.)
RM	People as reference points		Networking	6.10.6
SF	Puzzled, self questioning, frustration	Blue in the face	Vulnerability and uncertainty	6.10.3
TM				
UM	Deflationary, everything is straightforward	Nothing complex, folk	Recruiting people to a policy which is unproblematic, to talk to people at their level	6.10.3
VM				

Table A11.18 Informants and the Slater (1999) profile

Interviewee	Techie, sometimes with suit	Misfit	Crawled out of computing, ed. Tech, a dept	Academic qualifications - sniff	Young [<30]	Low management span	Professional	
AM	1	1	0	0	1	1	1	5
BM	1	0	0	0	1	0	1	3
CM	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	6
DM	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	6
EM	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	3
FM	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	5
GM	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	2
HF	1	0	0	1	0	0	1	3
IM	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
JM	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	6
KM/LM	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
MF	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	3
NF	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	3
OF	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	3
PM	1	0	0	1	1	1	1	5
QM	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5
RM	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	3
SF	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	4
TM	1	1	1	0	0	1	1	5
UM	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	5
VM	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2

For discussion see Chapter 6.9

Table A11.19 Professional memberships

Interviewee	Professional membership
AM	None
BM	CILIP
CM	Guild of Accessible Web Design
DM	None
EM	(Not asked)
FM	DNA
GM	British web marketing design association, ILT
HF	None
IM	DNA
JM	None
KM/LM	None
MF	None
NF	HTML writers guild
OF	ILT
PM	None
QM	None
RM	None
SF	CILIP
TM	None
UM	None
VM	Chartered Institute of Marketers, CASE

For discussion see Chapter 6.13

Table A11.20 Information and Content as discursive resources

Information view	**Content view**
Textual, focus on reproducing documents	Exciting content, visual, focus on communication
Informational quality (eg up to date)	Interest is in appropriately written content
Infrastructure within which to publish / policies to prevent illegality	Control of content to fit institutional messages
Technical innovation	Out source technical work and design
Computing services (library)	Marketing, external relations, PR, journalism, graphic design
Male	Female

Table A11.21 Participation in cross organisational spaces and institutional characteristics

High participation in IWMW	**Low participation in IWMW, orientation to Heist awards and WS**
Old university	New university/FE
Good resourcing	Low resourcing, liminality
Decentralised power	Centralisation
IT infrastructural approach	Marketing focus
Portal and high innovation	CMS or low innovation
Network influence on community of web authors	Control of content
Eg EM, BM	Eg QM (though his team is quite well resourced)

Table A11.22 Implications of non-professionalisation

Advantages for organisation Innovative, change, flexible Salaries less Loyalty is to organisational values, there is little conflict of loyalty There is less leakage of knowledge into cross organisational community	*Drawback for organisation* Lack of definition of roles, ability to apply measures of value Lack of professionalism Disconnection from wider best practice Lack of a job market
For individual Freedom, influence, variety, creativity from lack of pre-definition of role	*Drawback for individual* No career path within or across organisations Vulnerability, uncertainty - the costs of flexibility No counter weight to organisational culture

Appendix 12: Transcript samples

12.1. AM (12-17; 46-49) 476
12.2. BM (6-15; 24-27; 33-37; 75-81) 478
12.3. CM (3-16; 21-22; 29-34) 482
12.4. EM (41-42; 55-58) 486
12.5. FM (122-140; 154-5) 488
12.6. GM (30-31; 38-39; 42-3) 490
12.7. HF(4-11) 493
12.8. KM/LM (34-45;70-76) 495
12.9. MF (29-32; 41-49; 115-116) 497
12.10. NF (6-16) 499
12.11. PM (72-80) 500
12.12. QM (108-115) 501
12.13. RM (59-64) 502
12.14. SF (16-29) 503
12.15. TM (30-45) 505
12.16. UM (16-17; 44-47) 507
12.17. VM (61-62; 67-72) 508
12.18. BKI 510
12.19. BKII 510

Note: the purpose of this selection from the transcripts is to give the reader immediate access to some key illustrative material. It enables the reader to gain an impression, within a small sample of text, of the:

- Wider context of key passages which are subject to analysis in Chapter 5
- Typical ways of talking of particular interviewees
- Character of interactions that took place in the interviews

As such it both makes the voice of the interviewees themselves more accessible to the reader, and increases the reader's ability to evaluate the validity of how the data has been used in the thesis.

Interviews of GM and BKII were phone interviews.

12.1. AM (12-17; 46-49)

12	**Interviewer:** Thinking about what *you* do, have you got a name to describe - what occupation would you say
13	((pause - laughs)) A name - to describe. I'm not really although I have a technical role its not really - its not really a sort of technical outfit in the same way there is a team over in our information systems and services which is our computing service at Newcastle. They do an awful lot of the heavy technical back end. So they look after systems. There can be a Unix systems administrator, or something like that. My role is really its sort of it is just to develop the web, but from a - but more from a marketing users point of view, rather than the actual nuts and bolts of the platform we are running on. Yes we do do an awful lot of technical work as well. I think we are probably underselling I'm probably underselling ourselves the work that we do there. But its primarily we are primarily not not a technical not a heavy technical infrastructure outfit - in the same way ISS are. So my job is. Its really just to develop the corporate side of the web site and all that that's meant to do in order to underpin the University's business plan. Putting all that into a word or a term. I would fail miserably. Its just web development. Its corporate web development. I suppose probably that's the nearest you could get to describing it. So not just the content side, but also the technical side. Nothing that's sort of below the, nothing that's below the server level, we do. We don't do anything heavy below the server level. Its all sorts of things that are running on top of the platform that we have been provided with. Which does often involve an awful lot of database building and looking at emerging Internet technologies and stuff like that - but the function is really just to market the institution. I'm not a marketing person, but I suppose I enable the rest of the university, the rest of my sort of more marketing colleagues, my student recruitment colleagues for example, enable them to promote their stuff on the university web site. I don't know how you can pull that into one single word.
14	**Interviewer:** Maybe we can't
15	Give me some example words ((laughing))
16	**Interviewer:** You've mentioned the words. I was wondering whether you would mention the word marketing or IT
17	Yeah, its, sort of using the IT to market. Well we are - well I was based - you're are sitting in the registrar's office, at the minute. When I was first brought into this post. I was placed solely within a section of the registrar's office, because that was where the content was coming out. We had a web team over in what was the computing service, back then. Who looked, who looked over the infrastructural side. But they had no one to look after the content side. So really that's where myself, and my team evolved from. Its the content side. This sort of external. Marketing. I keep using the word marketing but we don't really sort of do marketing in the proper sense of the word. Its just sort of getting information out about the institution and its courses, and its research and its other activities.

45	[...] So I think although it would be nice to belong to a professional body, that had some accreditation, etc etc etc, erm I still think that is going to be some way off because of the way it evolved organically, across every single institution, and every single institution is doing it slightly differently - its not recognised, its not sort of structured and formalised in the same way, that admissions would be - another sort of university function - or - not quite recruitment, but sort of the way examinations are run or the way people graduate, those more traditional functions of institutions. There is no one fixed model that people can immediately sort of use and work with. We've all just sort of developed different styles of working. And I suppose to that extent, means there is no one recognised professional standard body organisation whatever. And I

	don't think there will be for some quite some period of time. I don't know whether there is anyone looking even, at setting something like that up. Brian would know. Brian knows everything.
46	**Interviewer:** But is that a personal issue for you - in the sense..?
47	No no no absolutely not no.
48	**Interviewer:** It doesn't have any career implications in the sense of even if you were to go somewhere else, would they know what you'd done, in the same way as .. or you don't see it like that?
49	It would be, I think it might be harder to explain what you'd done. But its because there's nothing formalised and structured. Its nice to be - I do feel as if. I've always felt as if I've had not quite a free rein, but I've been able to make suggestions and develop things the way that... I've been able to steer things quite well. Because people basically they don't know enough about it, and its it could be quite dangerous I could have been just sitting here for the last eight years doing nothing. But I have felt as if I've been able to have a real an impact and a real input into the way the institution has developed in this particular area, because they are looking to people like me to tell them what they should do and what they need to do. So I've had quite a bit of freedom, that my other administrative colleagues might not have had. Its more along the lines of my ISS colleagues where they've been able to, we wouldn't have had a web site, if back in 92 93 someone hadn't seen on a mailing list this thing about this world wide web thing so and said I know what - lets have a play around with that, and it just developed from there and its a similar sort of thing, we'll play around with technologies because there's all these things coming up, erm only a handful of them will actually be useful in the future and we do play around with stuff and we do try and see whether it has a use. Keep an eye on what's emerging as a leading technology and then just apply that in the institutional setting. So for example now its a database driven, dynamic web site which we didn't have before. We didn't have the technology before. We played around with mysql and a scripting language called php, and basically said right this is what the institution should be going for, and this is what the institution has got. Without actually the institution making any sort of yes this is what we want decisions. We've just said this looks excellent we'll use these, as long as the institution gets its course information up there gets a nice well presented front end, with lots of things happening, lots of good content on. That's all they want to see, how that's actually implemented is really down to us. And what we are comfortable with doing. There is a lot of talk about things like portals and, erm, content management systems as well, which we have stayed away from, we think because of good reasons, but again they've listened to the reasons that we have come up with, and no one has come back on us and sort of argued against the reasons yet, but its been quite nice because its been quite new quite flexible, we've been able to drive forward to a position where we think we should be, erm which I don't know whether that would harm or enhance jobs elsewhere if I did move elsewhere, I'm not sure to be honest, I'm not too sure, at all.

See discussion Chapter 6.13

12.2. BM (6-15; 24-27; 33-37; 75-81)

6	**Interviewer:** [...] I was going to go on and ask that about how have things changed in your job in the last couple of years?
7	Well its interesting, because previously and certainly early on I think Brian Kelly used the right word when he was at the last Institutional Web Management Workshop he talked about gurus. And it was interesting – because although I wouldn't like to say I'm a guru – I've felt like that at times in the context - I felt the people I was working with were like that not - because internally they were trying to promote, evangelise the web within institutions and what happened from my experience is that those people were particularly knowledgeable of the potential and also of the technology and often did it themselves a lot and what has happened is that the message got through - all of a sudden - and those people found themselves in the very difficult position of people's expectations suddenly being a lot higher than when they were preaching and being confronted with a storm of demand and excess of need which couldn't be met through home grown, cheap open source-based solutions - within institutions - and certainly within the context of the small tools people were working with erm and very rapidly we saw some institutions move into content management solutions or purchasing professional services from external companies whilst internal discussions in work mode focussed onto resource acquisition - purchasing content management systems etc and certainly the last few conferences Institutional Institutional Webmanager Workshop the discussions about purchasing CMSs were prevalent across two or three sessions over two or three years. So: the role has changed from one of being an evangelist in a sense and a do-it-your-selfer to a manager in the strictest sense, of somebody who is trying to acquire the resources and control the resources to provide the business benefits to the institution.
8	**Interviewer:** So that is quite a dramatic shift isnt it
9	Absolutely
10	**Interviewer:** of demands Do you feel comfortable with that?
11	Absolutely, yeah I think back in 2000 we did a we organised a conference which was Professional Web Management and the aim of that was to highlight this issue - that really the web is a medium and it requires distinct technology and it requires a specific team be provided by the institution and to a large extent the issues are surrounding the production and the provision of content rather than the development of technical standards. Its getting to grips with those issues within an institutional context that really matters and...
12	**Interviewer:** Can you explain a bit more about that distinction you just made - because Im not quite sure I understand it.
13	Between?
14	**Interviewer:** technical standards and content, was it?
15	Yep. Content yep. I think the key here is that we're providing web services because they meet needs, and those needs are represented in terms of the interests of the business, cos that's the institution, the needs of the customers who are the various representatives within the business in academic departments, students, alumni and so on and so forth and then the suppliers the service providers within the institution and previously – I think - all IT all strands of IT have had this issue - that in the early days one would develop the software, develop the systems, use engineers to produce solutions but more and more its about buying off the shelf products which have built-in the functionality required and offer an 80 20 rule Pareto rule which is you get 80 percent of the needs and 20 percent remaining to be provided through customisation and (inaudible word)

24	**Interviewer:** Maybe a slightly strange question, but can you put a word or a name to your occupation?
25	Its either – I think it has to anchor itself to existing titles. There is a specialism in the context of the web and the three things that spring to mind are business analyst, certainly, which is something that comes up time and time again in different areas as a role, a key role. There is

	the editor, who is acting as an editorial junction point for content and there is also the information scientist, the information professional, information specialist whichever term you prefer. I would see those three terms as really clearly describing, I would hook my role on those, I would probably add a fourth, of project manager, erm, but
26	**Interviewer:** So you see your job as like multi-occupational?
27	Definitely. Definitely, I think that is the nature, partly of academic institutions, because we work in such a complicated environment. That one has to be to some extent a bit of a chameleon to survive, not to be a jack of all trades or all things to all men, but to be able to adapt to the changing circumstances without losing one's anchor and one's focus in terms of profession. I don't go into areas of the school pretending to be a librarian I don't go into areas of the school and pretend to be an information technologist. I'm not those things. I do go into parts of the institution and make clear statements in the context of being an information professional or being an editor or being a project manager and so on. Sorry if my voice sounds a bit weak – I've been got a ten month old baby and I've been awake all night. I might sound a bit lame at the moment.

See discussion Chapter section 6.10.5.1

33	Well I had this debate recently with myself and my problem was I was trying to decide whether I'm going to be an expert, in a professional sense, not the academic sense, professional expert in the context of information specialism, information scientist is the usual term, or whether I've become a manager, and I should just accept that, accept the role of manager, project manager, whatever editor in a sense is a manager role. And I suspect an editor would see the same distinction - am I managing people or am I actually employing my editing skills and experience. The answer is as always to be a combination of the two. My question is 'where's the pendulum swinging?' - where is it going ? And six months ago I'd made the decision very clearly that I had swung towards the manager, and to accept it. Having done that I now appreciate that the big problem is that one cant effectively in this context manage without a knowledge of the actual technology. One has to be able to ask the right questions, so one has to maintain, obviously a level of understanding as an expert in the web so I see myself swinging more towards management but working quite hard to ensure that the swing doesn't carry all the way through, and that I keep that expertise, that level of expertise.
34	**Interviewer:** Because that's quite a classic move isn't it for a technical expert to be pushed into management and not really to like it
35	Yeah
36	**Interviewer:** But I suppose what you are saying is praps to try and find some sort of balance
37	That's right and I think I think a lot of it comes down to working very closely with team members and at least being able to have a reasonable dialogue with them about the technical aspects of what is being done so that one can maintain enough knowledge to be able to ask the right questions and also propose the right pathways for new developments and initiatives and also block pathways which are inappropriate. So: a lot of my information comes from actual team members as well as reading in my own time reading journals, and attending conferences and what have you - but I think ultimately what I'm coming round to at the moment and this isn't - my thinking is in flux at the moment so I cant say I've decided, I suspect the better way to be is an expert with managerial skills, what we are really seeking in this context and also probably in other contexts, one thinks of the health services and other areas, but management skills now are sufficiently generic and accessible to be something that is part of the portfolio of skills that every individual can carry with them, provided that they can actually practise those skills in a reasonable fashion. So I'm starting to think of the pendulum swinging the other way towards expert.

See discussion Chapter 6.10.5.1

75	**Interviewer:** Do you dis- do you distinguish yourself very strongly against sort of the techie image
76	I do actually. The reason I do that is because. Not because I don't have a problem being associated with technical people, I don't care if you call me anorak or a geek - it doesn't interest me - that's their issue - but what does bother me is that those perceptions - I cant remember who said it - but perception is truth - no more so than in an academic institution - If people get the wrong idea that's it. You've got to ensure all the time - and its one of the things I've learned from the people here at [University name] - you've got to make sure that people's perceptions are being influenced to be as close to the truth as possible. If I am providing a new service I've got to sell it. I've got to get out there and show people it exists - I cant allow people to try it and then speak badly of it. Its too - I cant rely in a sense on word of mouth - those sorts of channels. So its (inaudible words)
77	**Interviewer:** Are you actually a member of any professional bodies - or?
78	Yes I'm a member of CILIP, the Chartered Institute of Library and Information Professionals - I've got a problem with that. There's just too much library - I don't see the role of the IIS coming through in CILIP and I don't know whether that is a transitional thing or something that will change in time. I'm deciding whether I should still be in CILIP at the moment. It seems like the right body to belong to. But there's just not enough related to my area. In terms of information. I think partly the issue there is that the library to a large extent the role of the librarian is to take assets which have already been given to them - products which have already been supplied. Its in a sense the role of connecting the user to those products. Having a good solid knowledge of the products available and making the connections between users and the products. And obviously the complexity of managing that given the large number of products available and the complexity of them - I use products not in the consumerist sense - I mean in the sense of the Prince2 project management approach - a product, a deliverable - and they could be external resources and web sites or they could be CD-ROMs or what have you - but its not the same as being in the position where one's working with people to actually create those products as well as provide them and this is key to the web person and I think one of the biggest problems facing web people within institutions they have got to work - to make these products available for users who are asking for them and provide the whole infrastructure that makes that happen - and no building as such and no budget in a sense to build this system often one has to make and design it them oneselves and also work with the institution to identify which products the users are looking for and which the institution wants to make available and help them. I'll give you a concrete example there is something called the [Institution name] academic staff publications catalogue. Previously it was a Quark published glossy, a few pages, which was created on a yearly basis, done as a historical tradition, I think. That was the context I arrived at and it did not contain a full list of the publications produced by academic staff. It was incomplete in terms of the people who were publishing and incomplete in terms of what they published and of course it was out of date by the time it was published. And it didn't have the latest (inaudible word) and so on and so forth (Sure) What we did with the academic publications office - because they recognised these issues - we worked very closely with them - in joint partnership effort - we produced a system whereby we use the library standard of Endnote - a bibliographic data management solution - we worked with the academic publications office so that individual academics could supply the bibliographic data to the office - they would enter it into Endnote rather than into Word as they had done previously - they would manage the database - and constantly be receiving updates and they would then feed that to us, we would then convert it into XML and we would publish it through our XSLT (inaudible words) using the extensible style sheet language transformations - the directory is published on a weekly basis it's a relatively labour intensive process, in some ways. It only takes a couple of hours but its done, it works and we have created a new product for the institution - this product will now be used, the data in it - which didn't exist before will now be used for part of the RAE, the Research Assessment Exercise, so we are feeding two birds with one seed, if you like, I don't like the

	other proverb. Basically we are going to be producing the product for the library would [end of first side of tape - missing words] ((he says that the library wouldn't get into that))
79	[Start of side B] There are very real differences between information scientists and specialists, editors in the general sense and librarians - that isnt to say that librarians don't get involved in publishing resources of course they do, reports on and so forth working with academics to produce resources or providing assistance to academic staff publishing - right across the broad - its never a black and white issue - but still there is this distinction really and CILIP which is very much weighted towards the librarian - not so much towards the IIS- Id like to see (inaudible words).
80	**Interviewer:** I could comment on that. But I better not. I think librarians have gone away from doing bibliographic work which is what you are describing - but its in the library tradition, but not the academic library tradition - its unfortunate
81	They are getting involved in the open archives initiative, obviously there are some things like Steve Harnard's cogprints work down at Southampton, really exciting developments which have been on the horizon for so long. Its just a shame its taken so long to get there. I think one thing that always absurdly surprises me is the bottom line of resourcing: if it isn't resourced it wont work, to a large extent and a lot of web people come from the background of having had no resources when they started. Simply being the resource. So it's a slightly different approach. Yes, we can do this, it doesn't matter we don't have 100,000 pounds we can make it work. And using free software to enable it.

See discussion Chapter 6.10.3

12.3. CM (3-16; 21-22; 29-34)

3	**Interviewer:** Ok so do you want to start it ... actually I'm not sure what your job title is?
4	Its - well, officially its web editor, but everybody kind of refers to me as the webmaster in general, and er I'm based in Marketing External relations but there's over the last few years the job kind of crossed over with a lot of things that traditionally a normal web editor in marketing wouldn't do like managing certain databases, helping out the er information services division with - who manage the servers - helping them out with some technical kind of issues - kind of suggesting - you know - what software to install and how to install it - and if there's any weird problems anything that's related to web usually one way or the other kind of finds its way into my inbox as - so its a bit of everything really but yeah officially I'm just the web editor.
5	**Interviewer:** Right. How long have you been ..
6	Right, er let me just think. I started January 2001 - so that's what? - three years and a bit
7	**Interviewer:** And what er - what's your sort of professional background?
8	Well er none really. I was - I've been doing web design and kind of little web projects and multimedia projects for kind of a few years before starting that. I've done a graphic design course here at the University of [City name], er followed by a masters course in creative technology. And er basically then - I was already doing freelance jobs doing the web and I was just looking for a job at the time and was lucky enough to find something here. Now initially the first six months of the contract it was only maternity leave cover because the then web editor obviously was going on leave. She then decided that she didn't want to come back full time I was offered to possibly do a job share but it was then - I then pretty much said no I'd really like a full-time job, because my predecessor if you like, she wasn't very technical at all. Whereas - through all the new systems that we were doing. When I started I started setting up databases and loads of kind of server side coding - she wouldn't have had any idea really of how to run these things she was coming more from the copy writing and kind of graphicy - make it look nice kind of side of things and I said you know if we do a job share all the technical stuff is just going to be - I'm going to have a weeks worth of the technical stuff in half a week - and get half the pay for it - so er in the end kind of my job was made then kind of full time permanent - er and so yes - from August pretty much August 2001 I've been the proper full time web editor for the university.
9	**Interviewer:** And can you - I know you started to say about that - what you - what's your main role, what do you do day to day?
10	Ouf. Anything. Anything vaguely related to the web. Officially my remit covers, on the one side I manage I directly manage the main three W Salford site and the external relations web site being based in external relations. I also beyond that oversee pretty much everything that's happening in terms of outward facing web at the university, every faculty, school, research institute should have in theory a have a web person a nominated web author. So they manage their own sub-sites, www dot something dot salford so they manage it themselves, but I'm keeping an overall view of what's happening - er disseminate corporate identity guidelines, web publishing guidelines make sure that they comply as closely as possible to accessibility requirements - offer help and advice when they have a problem in terms of if they want to run anything past me - say is this accessible or not - or we're planning to do something along these lines - is that Ok? in terms of corporate identity as it relates to the web. So offering advice to the web authors. In - I'm involved in kind of - in a round about way in any kind of project that might be run by say information services, they're setting up some kind of outward facing web system at some stage within that process I'm involved in looking at you know the - whatever output is sent to the browser - however the system works - what the user sees, is that compliant with - as I say - corporate identity, accessibility, etc. So I don't really do the back end of those systems- but at least the interface itself I make sure that that's alright, in terms of all our guidelines. Er gawd what else what else - yes we've got loads of database driven systems I manage - I do kind of - a little bit of database admin - just for those systems - its nothing major its just a mysql

	database - so I set up a databases for people, again advise them in terms of if they are trying to do something that they don't have enough expertise in or if they want to run ideas past me like we want to do something database driven - how do we go about it - I kind of put them on the right tracks - sometimes when I have the time and I can spare the time, I might kind of help them out with certain key parts of their if they need server side coding. I might do it almost as a favour really, so its just its not really part of my job - they should really sort themselves out with that kind of thing - but I've - when I find the time I can advise them and give them a helping hand. Er as I say accessibility I go to all these conferences etc. Trying to keep abreast of all the the things that are - you know - involved in web accessibility etc. Er so that as I say that's part of my role, just making sure the university as a whole doesn't fall foul of that. I don't touch the intranet as such. So I've I made a - it was already in my job description - but I kind of made it clear to everybody around the university as well that I'm only concerned about the outward facing kind of openly accessible web. So intranet and extranets don't fall under my remit. Intranet is managed here by information services and extranets - they appear sporadically for say certain faculties wanting to do something specific. Or purchasing department wants to do something - again they manage it themselves, and I don't usually concern myself with it. I might advise them on certain areas, but they should have their own sort of kind of policies and guidelines set up, for that. Yet another part is I actually do write the guidelines and the web strategy for the university and kind of all the boring politics bits that are involved with that, er trying not to step on anybody's toes. And trying to kind of disseminate and enforce them. And - what was it - every year about twice a year I try to get all these web authors together and we do a kind of do a one day brainstorming, seminar, type thing where I might tell them about the latest guidelines etc - try to help them, offer them advice, there and then. And yes that should pretty much cover most of it and then...
11	**Interviewer:** yeh it does sound quite a lot actually...
12	And then every time someone wants a new web site there - it usually comes through me when they want a new web address or a new top level URL - and most of the time I can say to them no you cant have it. There's guidelines in place to - you know when you can and cant have something. So I'm sort of the gatekeeper, for pretty much anything that goes on web wise to the outside world really. Yeah and it is a lot. There is not enough hours in the day, for that.
13	**Interviewer:** Have you - this may seem like a slightly strange question
14	Go on
15	**Interviewer:** - have you got a word to describe your occupation?
16	Well er jack of all trades. That's not one word. Er ((pause)) as I usually see myself pretty much as the the even though it sounds grand and kind of pompous the Guardian of the web - but also kind of - well trying to look at whatever we do in terms of what the users want. I'm trying to keep a customer focussed - God I sound like a marketeer there- a customer focus approach. So I'm sort of - defending the interests of the outside world - in terms of what we do on our web site. But yeah but as a word is something like multi-tasking, kind of jack of all trades, really. Which is quite good. Because I am, that is one aspect I do enjoy the job that because its - because of the wide remit and because of the - kind of - varying demands. It is very - you know no one day is like the previous day - every day - I might even be involved every now and again, because of my graphic design education and background, I get input into things like - you know - the marketing campaigns - or I can do - not just the backend coding for a database, but I can also then make informed decisions about how should it look and what can we do we've got all these images how can we present it visually. So its really a very varied varied job that one day is never like the previous one - and there are always new challenges - kind of - every day. It makes it - keeps it fresh and exciting really.

21	**Interviewer:** How do you think doing web type stuff in Higher Education has changed in the last few years?
22	Erm. I would say that because of things like say SENDA, various pieces of legislation, Freedom of Information Act etc coming into play at the moment er I think a lot of universities are seeing - speaking to colleagues of mine at other universities they are starting to take the web more seriously - I mean up to pretty much the end of last year or so it was all pretty much yeah we'll do something very very much a kind of amateur approach in many areas, at least for our own part, and I know some of the colleagues complaining about the same thing in other institutions. No kind of holistic approach to - you know - what are we going to do with the web? The web has always been seen as - you know - yeah'll we'll spend loads of time and effort with the printed publications then the web we can just do something with it, you know - whatever - once you've got the copy just stick it on the web site. I think lately because of the all the legislation and you know people waking up to the fact that you know that this is actually could potentially result in law suits or whatever, they've kind of realised that there must be a bit more - more of a professional approach really to to how we go about publishing on the web - as I say at least for this institution, it was a sort of a wake up call when er when all these legislations came out and people realised oh this could affect us and the - more and more I think key people around the university are realising its not just the - yeah we want to do something with the web - but they are realising it is actually important - kind of marketing tool. Not just for international - which usually it was yeah we can reach an international market quite easily with the web. That's a very cost effective way even for for internal for UK based recruitment for instance. Its a very important tool just because, because of the reality that you know youngsters - even though I hate that term - go go online far more often - I mean I do it myself - wherever, whenever I'm at home anything I need to look up or whatever, you just go online - so I think they are realising slowly that it is actually a medium that deserves as much attention as printed publications or TV advertising etc. So a lot more resources are - hopefully- I'm being promised anyway - are being put towards it after two years of working, I finally manage to get an assistant, in September, that was after me shouting about all these things that you want me to do. I cant do them - if we do them properly - we cant do them. So resources are - are being made available, and I think there is kind of culture shift now in that its recognised now that the web site is more of a - it needs to be managed in a professional way - before it was all very ad hoc - somebody's got an interest in the web - oh yer you can do a little departmental site. But with things like law suits, potential law suits in terms of say accessibility - all these kind of gifted amateurs that were doing their web sites they're not - they cant be experts in every field - I mean I'm trying - I'm not saying I'm an expert, at least I'm trying to - get a feel for all these different things - and most of these other amateurs around that might do it - they might be really excited about - they might be doing very good things - but they cant keep track of everything so I think as I say the university is realising that - there needs to be more of a managed approach towards - you know - the web as a whole, and not just we'll do something on the home page and then - you know - the department can do what they like on the web. So I think its really kind of a more more professionalism. I see more professionalism on these kind of on our site hopefully, and er - competitors' sites as well - its all getting a bit tighter in terms of how its managed, how it looks, how it feels, and its really being taken more seriously.

See discussion Chapter 6.7.1

29	**Interviewer:** You've used that word professionalism a few times - what - what roughly does that sort of mean?
30	Oh.
31	**Interviewer:** In your opinion
32	erm. in my opinion. Er. Its difficult to kind of put into words, just, say for instance a big corporation, out in the real world so to speak, a big corporation you'd have a dedicated team

	you know somebody looking after the web, you'd never dream of say in a big company - that you know we will just do our little part of the web site. So all kind of managed, in a kind of a very structured way, its part of the whole. Its basically seeing the whole thing as a business, and then looking at the web site needs to be managed in a proper structured way - which as I said before - before - probably before I started and even the first few months while I was here it was still very much ad hoc. Kind of we'll just do it. You are relying on a lot of - kind of - as I said - very enthusiastic amateurs, who, they've all got a little bit of knowledge here and there. And they just, whenever they feel like it, whenever they've got a few minutes they might do something that they think is good. They never consult with what are the guidelines, what are the requirements, looking at the university as a whole, saying what are our targets, what do we want to achieve for this web site. And it was a whole collection of little kind of web islands, and in terms of professionalism I think it I probably equate that more to having a kind of managed, structured kind of approach where we look at the thing as a whole, and actually make a decision for the university as a whole, like any other kind of business process of the university - you know you wouldn't dream of having say every department does their own kind of very special way of doing admissions or something, there needs to be either a centralised kind of admissions system or you know at least some kind of guidelines and everybody refers to them. And its really just that kind of structuring it, managing it properly and making everything pretty much consistent, and giving kind of a one single image to the outside world rather than all these kind of myriads of little kind of very eclectic looking little web sites. So that that kind of thing so
33	**Interviewer:** Yeah
34	And getting as I say getting people actually you know are employed to do that and have a background in - if not directly related to web might be conducive to that - getting people with graphic design skills with a design background, people with copy writing skills. Getting the right people for the right job really, so not getting somebody who - just because somebody's say a lecturer in something - saying oh right you are a lecturer of that, you can also design the whole web site for that. So somebody might be brilliant in one area but not in another. The same way I've made a decision: I'm not a copy writer. So I'm not going to write any copy. I'm going to make sure the web site runs, make sure everything looks alright, the same thing - I'm a designer by education but I'm not employed to be a designer. I might have my input, but as I said, I'm only going to be here to make sure the web site runs, whatever content I get is put up, I wont start kind of just because I can start thinking I might design something on my own without consulting anybody. I might just rewrite this copy. So its really kind of getting the right people for the right job, because I know there's people employed here that could do all the copywriting, or you might have the designers here, that have been working on say all the prospectus and everything else. Just to keep it all consistent, I then say, you design it then, and I'll just use whatever designs you come up with. Which then as a whole makes the whole thing a lot more consistent internally and to the outside world. I do sound like a marketeer (laughing) oh dear. Does that sort of answer the question?

See discussion Chapter 6.13

12.4. EM (41-42; 55-58)

41	**Interviewer:** Is it like an initiative of your department or is it?
42	Well I mean the university decided in the beginning of 1999 to to engage - and this is just before I joined - so me joining the university was one of the recommendations of this report and they were commissioned at the top level of the institution, so it was a project sponsored by the pro-vice chancellor at the time - it had that kind of top level engagement. Erm and that's what set up the unit in external relations and it floundered there, because it didn't understand and it couldn't bridge the gap in both politics and characters and understanding of what we were actually trying to do from this - it couldn't do it from where it was sat. And it floundered for a year - the second we moved and we became a - we had more of a technology focus delivering the messages that were pre-defined by marketing we could take - you know - our wings could kind of stretch - and we delivered everything we needed to from that point of view because we were very reliant on an informal technology arrangements - and that was a major political bridge that had to be kind of stepped over - erm - the actual decision to form the team in information services that was - I was sat there - there was a conversation - there were three people - the registrar and secretary at the time - and there was the head of information services who was obviously the librarian at the time and myself and basically sat down and said - you know - can we move this activity over - will it be better will it be worse - will it take off - can you deliver what we are trying to deliver - which is what that report recommended - and the agreement round the table was yes and so that was it - first of January - which was literally two days after external relations officially folded - erm - we were re-sited over here in this building - and formed the team downstairs. From that point forward the politics really was based around developing a relationship with the university - because prior to that external relations had had a very very up-front and unengaging relationship with the university, they were seen as being exceptionally forceful and not understanding the technology erm coming out with real kind of faux pas about you know everything needs to be done in - they all want the font on the screen to be Bedoni, for instance - because that was the official font of the university, at the time, of course, web cant make you force you to use a certain font set, especially if its a non-microsoft font set - I mean nobody had heard of Bedoni apart from here - so you know - coming out with edicts like that - didn't - that really undermined your position because you were trying to espouse a position on a technology that you didn't understand, we joined - we had to defuse all those kind of scenarios. And then we had to go - we were in the position that a lot of universities are still in but thankfully this is four years ago that we had a vast web site that was blue and green and red, and little dogs running across it and it looked abysmal - there was no continuity - there was no central navigation systems - there was no understanding really about the importance of the web, or how and why it worked, it was not a valued exercise. You know, it ranged from one person who was the web master at the time kind of looking after the top end through to somebody in marketing doing a little bit here - through to the gardener somewhere doing a bit, because he knew a bit about it - because somebody had shown him one day. And we basically chucked all that model in the dustbin - and we developed what we called our web co-ordinator community, so every single school has a web coordinator, and the wed editors who publish information work for them. All their templates - were kind of basically we developed a corporate infrastructure new templates, new servers and everything was centralised, and we went out there and visited school after school after school and sold the solution to them, because we had to generally sell them the idea that they were part of the university - that they should actually adopt these templates, that they should get rid of the server they bought two years ago that cost them five thousand pounds. Lots of different issues that we had to run through, to be able to give them the confidence that we were going to support their web site and professionalise it. And we trained all their staff how to use our stuff - and we emphasise a lot of value on - and you have to, I think - we emphasised a lot of value on the contribution that the school and the departments could make to the big picture and er three years into that

	the vast majority of our three hundred thousand page web site, is within the corporate templates, on my servers, you know and everything kind of works together - and we have this informal web coordinators network supporting it.

55	**Interviewer:** I'm quite interested - do you have a sense of you're making the strategy, do you have a sense - is it your strategy?
56	Yes it is. So if. Anything that I show you ((he pulls up a diagram of overlapping circles which say research, learning and administration with a small triangle in the middle saying integrated.))- if I draw that on the board and sho- and talk about how e-learning, e-research and e-administration is integrated within the institution. I've written that. I've made the words and I deliver it. It is absolutely mine. For developing a vision for the institution. This this job has an opportunity to let you do that, I think, which is quite unique - because nobody else is going to do it. And if nobody else does it then universities flounder with it as an issue, which is why they end up with - you know e-learning not talking to the digital library people, not talking to MIS, not talking to the registry not talking to personnel. You get these kind of pockets of development. As opposed to treating the whole place as a business and saying what does this business want to do - it wants to unite its activities in terms of its admin, its learning and its research - there the three things we do here - a combination of them. Every single thing we do on the campus drops onto those boxes. Apart from the students drinking beer I think, and there is a certain element of administration that goes behind that as well
57	**Interviewer:** I thought it was e-learning, but er
58	It could quite be. But developing the institutional vision for what we want to do and how we want to deliver this business virtually is what I've been able to do. But with the backing of what I do as my job - that allows me to do that. Um it's the visibility of that as a kind of role. If its just a little web team with two people and a dog, sat in the corner somewhere in a big university, you are never going to do that in a million years, until you actually give some element of ownership of something. So I can own that I can deliver that, yer?

See discussion Chapter 6.10.6

12.5. FM (122-140; 154-5)

122	**Interviewer:** Right. and specifically, say about web support, what do you feel you get out of it sort of thing, what's the
123	Friendship. Mostly Im on web support nowadays Im getting to be an old geezer so I manage to reply to a few questions - erm recently I've had I've asked a few questions, because I'm not - I don't like perl and I don't use perl and used web-support as a web-support for some perl questions. Being around for so long I've got online friendships with people I've never seen.
124	**Interviewer:** Right. Because its mostly I suppose people from UK universities
125	Yer. Right. there's a few Americans. Not many. They're not very noisy. They're the ones that write when I get into my political - I almost got into my political context ((laugh)) - a few days ago - I bet you can imagine why - but plus when I say stroppy things like get rid of Blair and Bush and lets get back to a normal life and stuff like that - I get about three mails telling me to go off and shut up
126	**Interviewer:** Oh right
127	And that's when lots of people come out of the cupboard and sort of - well said - I wish I could say that but I cant because I would get fired from my job. Stuff like that. So I use it - I work on my own from my own living room, so web-support for me is - is like having - I have the radio on as well as background noise - I work and then I'll come back and read some messages - and if there is a question somebody has asked that I can help I'll help and I sort of chat with people on or off list. I have lots of mail off list as well, from several people.
128	**Interviewer:** Would you, is it like a typical technical list - or?
129	No its not technical - its not technical at all. The support word is very important in it. And they ask a technical question that's more - they're technical people - so its more the opinions of others - what do you think of - I'm trying to do this - and I've got this I've got this solution - what do you think of it - and people say yeah we've done that or don't go there - been there and it doesn't work. And and other other end of the scale you've got people that - we get less and less absolute beginners - I remember a few years back people asking questions you know - which were like read the fucking manual! - erm but its people will ask questions about stuff like I did with perl - how the hell do you strip the characters out of a string of characters out of a text with perl. And what did I reply about the other day ... something I knew about - I replied. We had the question about the DNS, the other day. That stuff you know. So its not - the technical lists I'm on its is like programming - its like programming java - like programming digital tv cards - its - like programming - I've got a mini ITx a via a mini ITX system so I'm on a list about that - about the video driver - they are rewriting the driver for via - which is very nice of them, so its really c-code - and apply this patch to get 3D and apply this patch to get accelerated hardware and video playback
130	**Interviewer:** so are you saying they are more announcements - or
131	The other lists Im on?
132	**Interviewer:** Or they're more purely technical
133	They're more pure, pure programming.
134	**Interviewer:** Sure
135	On web support you've got a sort of mix.
136	**Interviewer:** Right
137	The stylesheet thread will be you know I can't position here how do I do it? - and stuff like that - and its not what I call real programming anymore.
138	**Interviewer:** Sure
139	Maybe a few years ago it was pretty high end, but its more or less. People know - people know what they are doing and sometimes you are sitting there with your head in the screen and get stuck on really stupid things. And so you whip the list out and say can you put my back eyes in straight please and show me where Im going wrong. Whereas the other list its

	like lines of c-code. And stuff like that.
140	**Interviewer:** Right right

See discussion Chapter 6.16

154	**Interviewer:** Sure. Do you - possibly a slightly strange question: do you see yourself as a computer scientist?
155	I don't - I didn't I didn't. Erm I didn't now I think now seeing how people some people react to me and the real life outside maybe I am . Maybe I am. I do some I do some stuff that. Being self taught sticking the word scientist on the end is very pretentious when you are self taught - hobbyist - high end hobbyist ((laughing)) - high end professional hobbyist. Probably I am. I'm probably a nerd. I think its caught up on me. Like I said Like I said I learned I learned how to stick a linux system on a strange hardware. Since I stuck it on strange hardware. I've had easy hardware the server that's easy. Since then I've always tended to choose personal computers that were difficult to get it on and get it working. So I spend a lot of time messing around and I can read through c code and find bugs, which is pretty strange for somebody who has never studied c in his life. So something has happened somewhere along the line - I'm not quite sure when or where. So amateur computer scientist would be a lot better ((laughing)).

12.6. GM (30-31; 38-39; 42-3)

30	**Interviewer:** [...] Do you feel you are like - people in HE doing the web - do you feel you are like the people who are doing the web in HE ?
31	((pause)) No not really. I sometimes think we're a may be that little bit nearer than a lot of FE web folk would be, because I'm not sure - I could be wrong - Maybe your research will find out and tell me - But I never feel what we are doing is totally typical of many FE colleges and I also get that impression when people contact us - because we do - we do get other colleges saying how have you done this - we tend to think we are behind - we feel as I've mentioned with the courses database we feel we are a little bit behind in our use of web technology. But a lot of colleges obviously think we're not - and that does surprise us sometimes erm - from where we sit - HE looks very well resourced, looks better resourced than we are - it appears when I meet web managers at conferences - that they have far more staff and far more resources and far less to do. They tend have to more staff working on smaller projects, which enables then to do more research. Some of them of course are not - our function here is to provide web services - but some of their roles are also teaching web technologies - so there is for many people a dual role - I don't - in fact I've resisted teaching on any of the web courses in college because there is enough work to do in here. So therefore for that reason it may be if you're teaching about web systems then obviously you've got much more of an obligation to research and to learn more about developments in technologies. Whereas we tend to buy in - we will always have the latest versions of the latest web authoring software here - latest dreamweaver, latest photoshop, the latest acrobat - we'll always have them here - because we haven't got time not to. I could be wrong it could be that I've actually got the life of Reilly here and my HE counterparts are horrendously overworked and would be horrified to know that my work ends at five o'clock in the evening, I don't know. But that is not the impression I get. It might be - its a shame there is not a kind of network that will enable people to move about - we did have the opportunity - my chaps did get to spend a week each at the FERL centre in Coventry. I managed to sort that out because of our - because our ILT manager went to work there. And they found that very useful - and that might be something that is quite useful. JISC had set up - as you probably know - these regional support centres - but again - Im sorry - that really does feel like a hand me down. It really does feel like - what did Monty Python called their last album? the contractual obligation album - its feels like it is being done because somebody has noticed that FE has been left out by everything that JISC does. It's not certainly the local RSC is not hugely helpful. It runs a lot of workshops that er - are quite good - I think - for subject teachers, but I know they are not particularly well attended. So I don't think that's quite got it right yet.

See discussion Chapter 6.8

38	**Interviewer:** I think you said also earlier you found the conferences technical or a bit too.
39	They're an interesting mixture. There's an element that's - there's clearly people from librarian backgrounds - there is always quite a few librarians there - a few a few marketing - but predominately I would say the people there are programmers - and I don't see myself as a programmer - I've always thought of myself as a communications person - and this is just the latest tool. I mean, I do stuff for hospital radio - I've done stuff for the BBC - I've written stuff - This is just another communications tool, as far as I can see, albeit one that's quite fun to play with every now and again. But its not - if I can produce another analogy - I think there are two ways that people think about cars. And either you use the car because it gets you from a to b. or you are fascinated about how it works and what goes on underneath the bonnet - and I feel when I go to these conferences - that there are a lot of people there who are mechanics - there are some people there who are drivers - and there are just one or two who do both. But certainly that HE conference has more mechanics there than - their interest is in the beauty of the technology rather than the content. I think, you see this with

	accessibility actually - where you see they've tackled accessibility but they've done it from it a - I don't know - from a very sort of scientific - because it was there - a bit like climbing a mountain - they've done it because it was there - not because there is a good view when you get to the top. Erm I say that because some of them have accessibility features that we were advised were totally unnecessary - things like - key coding - so that a combination of keys takes you to a part of a web site - very quickly - which we were told is unnecessary, because firstly people have got to learn what those keys mean and secondly any - all the students - all the disabled students that we know that use the Internet - have already adapted - they have already learnt how menu systems work and so they don't need short cuts - so. If the shortcuts were that good everybody would use them. I think it was seen in academia in terms of academic study of accessibility - it was one of the many features they wanted to implement - therefore the organisations that implemented accessibility in that kind of clinical way - did do that. We did it by trying it out with blind people - and you know we had blind students and we asked them what they thought - and they told us - as well as the RNIB audit. So we're perhaps a bit more user focussed - if that's not a pompous thing to say - it does sound pompous.

42	**Interviewer:** And could you say - I mean we discussed accessibility quite a lot off the tape - and erm - perhaps about the process of why you wanted the award from RNIB
43	Well you know the coll - this college has had a long tradition of good provision for students with physical and learning disabilities. I mentioned the Warnock report, which I think in the early 80s had highlighted that further education really didn't do anything like enough for students with any kind of disability, and that prompted a lot of action in colleges and this one in particular. We've been using IT with students with special needs ever since 82 83 to the extent that we've been involved in a number of projects researching the use of IT with students with learning difficulties, featured in open university publications, featured on open university broadcasts. So its something that we've been aware of - and I think its kind of underlying - those of us who have worked with colleagues in that area - its part of your fibre that whenever you are planning anything - you try and think of all your users. When I first started doing web sites - once I'd got past learning html and so on - I used the package hotmetal pro - which I think was the first commercial web authoring package. And it had got accessibility features built in - but it didn't particularly highlight them at the time - in that if you loaded an image into the web page - it asked you for the description of the image - which dreamweaver didn't do originally but does now. And I put in the description without particularly thinking about it. Then I learned from somebody that I know through hospital radio that is blind that that was what explained to them what the picture was when you were using a screen reader - and then we - I was at a conference where the RNIB speaker Julie Halles was getting very vehement about how bad web sites are. Well I thought that ours cant be that bad. And she mentioned that standard life were sponsoring a certain number of RNIB audits for free. And so we put in for one of those basically - so we put in for one of those - and thinking we were fully accessible - such was our arrogance - and as I told you the seventy sides of A4 came through. And we were shocked. But found - I think that is one of the best bits of staff development I've done in the last few years, working through that report, and fixing it and then what we've had to do of course then is roll it out to other - like the ILTeam in the college and then so on and so forth. At the same time we've been a bit disappointed that when you go to other conferences or talk about accessibility that its dismissed a bit - I don't think people realise its importance - and I - maybe it seems strongly important to me - because I know people who are blind I know people who are deaf - and we ran here the first teacher training course where all the students were deaf in the UK. So - this is a college that does do a lot for a wide range of students - I think we are particularly aware in that kind of area. So accessibility was important, and when we knew there was a badge to be had we had to have the badge. But we are still the only education establishment that has the RNIB audit - and that's a year after we got it - that may well be a reflection on - I know that some people are now quite critical of the RNIB as having

	sidelined the accessibility issue, and the award is not thought of as highly as it used to be - but at the same time its a bit surprising that - that conference I was at was only for further education colleges - so everybody there was an educational user - and yet we are still the only college that has got that award. the only college, school or university that has got it.

12.7. HF(4-11)

4	**Interviewer:** Erm, how long have you been in that sort of
5	How long have I had that title?
6	**Interviewer:** Yes
7	About a year and a half - do you want a bit of history?
8	**Interviewer:** Yes it would be very interesting to
9	Yer Ok. Well what happened was - in 1998 - I think - it was a fair while ago - I was appointed to a job called web officer at [University name]. ((coughs)) And that was - kind of - a bit unclear what its role was really. It was a job description as long as your arm. It was based in information systems, so it was based in the computing support department, it wasn't an external relations type job. But it was the only job that there was related to the job in the university. So I had this in-betweeny kind of role really, which is part techie and part content (coughs) - when people didn't write content I wrote it - not with any great glee - because I often felt I was not the right person to be writing stuff - but we got on and did stuff. And er I was the only person. And I was managed by the chap who was what was called learning technology officer - who had been here a bit longer and had a few projects as well - so that was - ((coughs)) (inaudible words) ((- an aside about coughing?)) - that was a section within ISD - little section compared to the networking people or the user support people at the time. And erm - as time went on the web seemed to get a little bit more important and the guy from the networked section that used to look after the servers and with a strong interest in programming - he became more and more of a web person and er - he got good at it. And eventually he got moved to the section that sort of split in two. So it became - I was in charge of the web - and I was in charge of [Personal name 1] the developer - and [Personal name 2] was - it was a bit more complicated than this - I'm trying to simplify - [Personal name 2], the learning technology guy the e-learning person - and the situation went on like that for a while. Then external relations got some writers to write to the web site - then we had a big web site redevelopment project - and - I was sort of managing that - there was sort of a bit of argy bargy between me and the publications person in External relations who thought she knew more about it than I did. That was a cooperative effort shall we say. And then I always had an interest in e-learning as well - for various reasons in the past job was an e-learning type job and (inaudible word). And erm to cut a long story short, when [Personal name 2] who was in charge of the e-learning bit left, my head of department said why don't we merge the sections back again and you can be head of it - so that's what we did. It was slightly a money saving exercise because we replaced somebody at quite a high grade with another web developer type person. But it worked out quite well, I think. It got immensely complicated because - I don't know if you know about this merger thing - have I told you about the merger thing?
10	**Interviewer:** You've mentioned it briefly.
11	UMIST and the university of Manchester are coming together and er so lots of things get put on hold and we don't know what's going to happen we don't know what the structures are going to be all that kind of stuff- so its been a difficult time really to be head of anything. And the new university which is going to be called the university of Manchester is deciding on its structures now. And its got a section within the computing support - which is Manchester computing - a section within the computing support - called Internet services - which includes the web and also for the time being includes e-learning, although that's a huge political football - and we don't know really where that's going to go. And so there is a competitive job of applying for jobs within [University name]computing - heads of service jobs - and I didn't get that one - the guy from [University name] got it. So my role as somebody in charge of webby stuff - has sort of gone away a bit. And I've got a new role in the new university. Which is a bit of a poisoned chalice, but its the portal project manager, so I'm going to be responsible for trying to drive forward a portal for the new university, which will then probably become a service in its own right or possibly not. And we're also trying to put in a content management system. And er ((laugh)) as a joint project - life is

	kind of complex - but I've just kind of fallen into things as time has gone on. It hasn't been a developed project plan at all. No career plan to it, it just happened. Mmm there you go - there's the history.

See discussion Chapter 6.10.5.2

12.8. KM/LM (34-45;70-76)

[The interviewee was accompanied by a colleague, LM. The speaker is KM unless otherwise stated.]

34	**Interviewer:** Do you - a lot of - is there anyone in external relations who does a lot of web stuff or?
35	Excellent question. The web services team latterly were located within marketing and communications and just before I came into post they moved it back into computing services. We still maintain a quite close relationship with marketing and communications. But we have had to redefine the roles and help them to become aware of what their real role should be in web service delivery. We also work with them quite closely when it comes to designing the new looks and feels and things like that. But essentially what we've achieved is to say to Marcoms that they legitimately would be responsible for the high level information provision, the marketing sensitive information, student prospectuses, information that is provided to press organisations - that kind of thing - but they are not responsible and shouldn't be responsible for the content of the entire site, the navigation tools and structures and any of that kind of stuff. So there is a clear division between the technicalities of web sites and the information that is provided. And really, although their role is greater than other schools and departments it is really just another information provision role.
36	LM: But they have the web editor post, that was just redefining that one to make sure it was clarifying traditional - you know - what people saw the web editor's responsibilities were - to what they are when you move towards knowledge management.
37	Yes, so when they moved the web services from Marcoms into computing services they retained the web editor. And over the last eighteen months, we've agreed to change that so that now the web editor is within the web team. And they have redefined that role as a communications officer brackets web. And that person really manages as I say all that marketing information.
38	**Interviewer:** (pause) I imagine that is quite a political process or is that
39	((suppressed laughter))
40	I don't think there is a word to describe how sensitive that relationship is.
41	((suppressed laughter))
42	LM: At least not on tape.
43	((open laughter))
44	**Interviewer:** Fair enough
45	And by the fact that you've asked the question indicates that you are completely aware of those issues.

70	So its all in the context of making supplying web content a business process rather than something which people do as an adjunct to their normal jobs. And as Bill says, you know, we've taken away things like policing the visual identity, because that is now controlled within the content management system. So that is not an issue any more, and that frees up Marcoms to look at language and terminology. And because we are using a content management system we can apply workflow. And actually say this person will authorise this information to be published. We can maintain currency of information so you know the amount of stuff on that is out of date on the web site will be dramatically reduced, although never eliminated. And those kind of things. Because we are using the content management system, which is essentially a business tool. We are able to regulate in a much more formal way what we're doing with our web content, rather than it just being a much more disparate, informal and unregulated situation.
71	**Interviewer:** Are there any downsides to it
72	To what?
73	**Interviewer:** To having - a content management system

74	I would probably say no - there are no down sides - from my point of view. There may be down sides - there certainly are downsides from other people's points of view, people who have been in control of their own web pages or web sites - as they prefer to call them here - will lose a lot of that control. Erm people who've done their own thing. We've got three or four situations in the university where schools have sufficient political clout to be able to manage their own web - section of the web site and have their own titular web service. Erm and those are quite difficult to deal with. So they would perceive this centralised control as being a disadvantage. But it's the same with all these kinds of things, it's a case of bringing them all on board and showing them that yes while you are losing control of these services your gaining better control of others. It really is just a selling job. You know - you can do the job you really need to do much better than you've been able to do in the past.
75	LM: And I think another - not a disadvantage - but its just forces - there are posts around the university where there are - they'll have a developer who is just that section or mini school etc. And they are used to being the technical resource for getting stuff done on the web site. But now with the introduction of the CMS and there is less and less need for that position. They've either got to evolve the position and become more of a you know a way of becoming a content editor, and working into that role - which mightn't be as interesting for them - you know - sort of - going from designing your own your doing your own code etc to putting in copy into a content management system. And there is a big down side initially there was a lot of er - a threat - not so much a kind of a fear that was like - they were a bit worried about their - how it was going to affect their day to day positions.
76	Some of them had developed their web inputs into you know quite a substantial part of their job - so obviously they were worried about that kind of thing. And that is all part of the change management processes you know trying to demonstrate that actually we are enhancing their job rather than removing things. But er - its - you know - we've got to the stage now where we have to look at this sensibly, it's a business tool - we rely on it to attract students to the university, so it cant be left to individuals to use pink comic sans to you know title their pages and all this kind of stuff. And we've got to say to people its not about your tastes, and its not about how you think the page should look. We don't - its not about flashing gifs and all that sort of stuff and doing - achieving that is quite difficult because people have been doing it for ten, fifteen years maybe, but its - what we are trying to do is to say - again its just another business system and thats how we must approach it. The days of - as [LM] says - of hobby horse - or hobby farm web development have gone. That's fine if you want to be want to do that - pay your five pounds a year and get your own domain and get your ISP and do it yourself. But what we are not here to do and what no university or any organisation is here to do is to train hundreds of web developers or web designers, that's not what we're here to do. I've made that very clear from the outset. We're not going to do that.

See discussion Chapter 6.7.2.1

12.9. MF (29-32; 41-49; 115-116)

29	**Interviewer:** So where - where would you say in broad terms do you fit into how the institution uses the web?
30	I suppose I've got fairly high profile level. I mean ultimately I have the control over it. Because I'm the person who manages the content, I log onto it and delete it and do whatever. Erm if other people want something doing to it then they have to come to me and say they want something doing to it. But to be honest its usually the other way round, I'm storming around saying ((reported speech)) something has to be done, this page needs to be updated, who's going to update it for me, because we've had this content for the last two years, and its out of date. Erm so I suppose in real terms I've got quite a lot of power. But in organisational terms I'm fairly low down the order. Which is an odd - situation.
31	**Interviewer:** Does that create problems or?
32	It does create problems, yes. It creates problems because as yet the infrastructure doesn't put web information as a very high profile. They are right there - doing stuff - to change that now. They are writing a new information strategy and so on to try and put the web information or provision at the top level, so that when the information is initially created people think and it'll have to go onto the web, and this is what we have to think about now. But in the old more formal structure, that came at the very end, when they finished the whole process of generating the information and making their paper based information or whatever. They'd say ((reported speech)) Oh this booklet better go on the web. Arrgggh ((mock screams of frustration)). Not again please.

See discussion Chapter 6.7.1

41	**Interviewer:** Were you saying there the departments or is the the colleges - are the colleges independent?
42	The colleges are independent entities but the departments.
43	**Interviewer:** So the history department or
44	Yer.
45	Some of the departments are huge. The department of engineering is a very big entity which has - wields a lot of power. In many respects they think of themselves as a separate organisation.
46	**Interviewer:** So how would you see your relationship in - as regards them? I mean is it supporting or? What's a word to describe it?
47	Well with all of - I've gradually built over the years I've built up a relationship between me and the departments and the colleges - I run a group called the web liaison group - which really means one or two times a year we have a meeting where I trend to try and pre-digest things in order to pass them on and give them a forum so that they can meet together. Because all of these are isolated people in departments who don't see other people who do similar jobs by and large and they need help, you know. So my strategy is to give them help and give them support. And to hopefully to be someone - somewhere where they would come when they feel they need to ask a question. And then you can steer them in the right course. I think you get much more out of people by being nice to them rather than trying hitting them with a stick. So that's always the way that I've gone. We provide - we have a system where we provide templates for the university house style and they give guidance for those - if people have problems erm they can come and ask me and email me. But because I run the courses as well, the courses often refer to the templates and the issues that are involved. And now of course accessibility is a big issue as well, which they often come in asking about.
48	**Interviewer:** So you have a couple of meetings a year, do you have any other communication methods or?
49	Yer I've got an email list as well - so that if anything comes up I can email email out to

	them. If there is anything important or that I think they ought to know - I tend to keep it very low level list so that they know that if its not just going to be endless stuff because otherwise its just like more spam then.

See discussion Chapter 6.7.1

115	**Interviewer:** [...] does the notion of professionalism - is that something you see as important or?
116	Uhm. Yes. To some degree. Er. To do the kind of job I do properly. You do have to have a kind of - you have to have a professional attitude to exactly what it is you have to achieve. There is no book - that says this is how to be a webmaster and this is all the things you have to do and have to think about. So you have to be responsible enough to anticipate all of that for yourself. Erm its like we have to have an institutional strategy for accessibility - under the disabilities discrimination act, its something we have to have. But I'm probably - I was probably the only person who knew that we had to have it. And so - two years three years later the disability discrimination people could come along and say ((reported speech)) but you haven't got one. And probably the people over in admin would have no idea what it was you were talking about. So you have to be able to anticipate these things. And go in - and say actually you chaps you have to have one of these. And they'll say: well you better write one then. So its all those kinds of things gets to be quite important. But unless you anticipate them yourself you are not going to achieve it for the institution. So yer you do have to be professional about it. Where there isn't any place you can learn how to do it. Or any qualification that you can go and get that gives you all of the strands that you need to know about. Its just something you have to find out about for yourself. Which is why these kind of groups where you can talk to other people are so important. Because you suddenly think to yourself damn we should have been doing that. ((laughing))

See discussion Chapter 6.16

12.10. NF (6-16)

6	It's full time yes yes. Although there is some marketing things creeping in now much more than there used to be. My job has changed quite a bit since I came back from being off sick.
7	**Interviewer:** Oh right
8	Erm. And I've been brought into the admin team. I was in the technical team for a while. First I was admin, then I was technical then I was admin again. And my current boss is quite keen on me doing a lot more sort of market research via the web. and that kind of thing. So its still web but its different sort of web. Its more finding things out than making things. And still also making quite a lot, I'm producing quite a lot.
9	**Interviewer:** So you - right, we'll go into that. But what's your sort of background, roughly speaking.
10	What academically or?
11	**Interviewer:** Whatever.
12	I'm self taught, I'm completely self taught. Er academically I got as far as college and dropped out. I was in first year at university and dropped out. I've done loads and loads and loads of courses over the years, but never got any pieces of paper. Open University and other stuff. The html I found out about the web about 1992. Er we went - where did we go? We heard about it and actually got hands on at the shopping centre in [city name]. [city name] university had a few computers set out. Showing people: this is the web! Their geology department has always been very very strong on on web things. One of the first in Britain. And of course I like geology anyway, so I was fascinated. So I'm looking at all these wonderful web sites. And thinking I've got to have this.
13	**Interviewer:** Right
14	And then there was an open university course starting the following year, brand new, THD204 - which is about computers and technology and society. Quite an interesting sort of cross-discipline thing. And I did that and the open university as part of the terms of that course - they lent me a computer with an Internet connection - and that was my first real taste of the web. And it was horrible because the computer didn't work right, and the Internet connection didn't work right, we paid huge amounts of money for the telephone bills. And er - but I totally fell in love with the Internet. And at that point, and I wanted to start making web pages, and just moved on really. And I was lucky enough to get a couple of jobs where people wanted me to make pages. Kind of looked up the things I needed to know as I went along.
15	**Interviewer:** Was that like in the university - or was it like
16	That was in the university. I didn't do it straight away. I worked - I wasn't working when I took the course, then I worked in shops for a while. I had a background in admin work, but years and years and years ago - so I worked in a job centre driving a computer for a while. I worked in an admin job er a shop job, as a delicatessen supervisor, and then another shop job as a delicatessen supervisor, then I had major health problems when I had to come right out of retail. I had developed a very bad allergy to nuts. And we were handling nuts obviously. So I came right out of that, changed completely. And a one day a week course came up at [Nickname] campus of this university. Just doing general admin, secretarial stuff. One of the things she wanted me to do was make web pages. And it all started from there, really. So I've been very lucky. Things worked out at just the right times for me really.

12.11. PM (72-80)

72	**Interviewer:** So when you are developing a site - what sort of models would you be influenced by or?
73	((pause)) Information architecture to start with, that's the sort of - when we were worked through this process when we came we redid the whole site. So the first thing we did was look at the information architecture. And we did it on the - we worked out who was our most important audience for the site. And that was our model from then on, really how the whole - how the whole site panned out. And we worked out all the different audiences that would come to the site. And there would be seventeen different audiences - which we could identify. The seventeenth was like everyone else, apart from the other sixteen. And we tried to create content, or tried to create a structure which held the content that we had for those particular audiences. So that was the model. And it is a model for recruitment because it was a pot - it was - it was - the most important audience was potential students.
74	**Interviewer:** So is sort of stuff for staff, say
75	Its there - but its on the back burner. It hasn't been developed. I am aware that it hasn't been - there's a lot - there is an awful lot of information structure and different ways we could approach things still to be done. You could do intranets you could do portals - you could do all these things - they they are worth while developments but we haven't done em yet. Because the stage of our development was focussed on the potential students to begin with.
76	**Interviewer:** Sure sure.
77	**Interviewer:** But when you were developing the site - were you looking at other web sites?
78	Yer
79	**Interviewer:** Any - any one stick out or?
80	I'm trying to remember. We did look at loads. We did a competitor analysis, competitor analysis on a few different ones. I'm trying to find the ones - I'm trying to remember the ones that influenced us. I remember thinking there weren't many of the Higher education ones that we really wanted to ((starts laughing)) aspire to though. And that was like eighteen months ago. I think some are actually quite good now. But there's still - But not many of them. Erm. ((pause)) I think [University name]'s was quite well developed at that stage. Some of the older ones - there - I suppose there is that divide though still between the old universities and the new universities. Some of the old university's web sites are absolutely - they are just so boring - it just doesn't inspire you at all. You know. Just a lot of white text, tiny pictures and an awful lot of text, white backgrounds. ((Pause)) ((laughing))

12.12. QM (108-115)

108	**Interviewer:** So you are a member of web-support?
109	Yer yer
110	**Interviewer:** What would you say that is about or who's it for?
111	Erm well it could be about practically anything ((laughs)) that is connected with web. I mean its very useful for me in terms of I mean that's how I first got in contact with [Name] up at [City name]. Stuck an email out on there saying we are reviewing our inquiry management. Is there anybody bought a product or been involved with managing that. And she was one of the people that replied. And so it is actually very useful for that kind of - its almost a lazy man's research - that rather than digging around you can actually get that kind of advice from a group of people that have dealt with problems or if you are thinking of buying a piece of software to do x you can say well we've looked at these systems, has anybody used them. And you get emails back from people saying yer we've already used that system, it works fine, or we ran that for six months and it was a nightmare. So it's a quite nice way of - a supplier comes in and says our content management system is great it will do everything and make tea, you send out an email on there saying has anybody used it - and then you get two or three emails coming back saying yes absolute dog. Erm so it's a quite useful quick erm quick way of gathering opinions of a wider community. And its quite nice actually that kind of area of it you know web sites originally in universities used to be very much about networking community and actually sharing information, and as universities have become more competitive the amount of the information we share has been reduced, but at least on that level, people are still happy to share experiences. Because when you could actually - if university of [city name] or [University name] stuck out an email saying we are just about to buy product X and I knew it was the absolute worst product on earth I could think hurrah one of our competitors is going to screw up their email marketing - but you know at that level you don't - you would actually say we've actually had problems with that, you know, and so would other people. So erm. That community spirit is still there albeit in a small area.
112	**Interviewer:** Right so: community spirit survives just for technical stuff
113	Yer yer.
114	**Interviewer:** And what's your impression of who is on that list?
115	Erm its mainly people who are the domain managers erm the domain managers excluding me as a domain manager if you like. The people who deal with the staff and student intranets, work in the IT department, deal with building web sites, kind of have the erm - probably have higher technical expertise in terms of servers and the network and infrastructure of it than we do. I still think most of the institutional web managers erm and the people on that list - are involved in that kind those side of things rather than the content side of things. In a way a lot of universities are set up the IT department - each department would publish stuff on the web site and the IT department would facilitate that, but it would have no control nor wish to have any involvement in is this content good, is it accurate, they are like your ISP they are simply giving you the web space and you put your stuff into it. And the marketing department might issue a few guidelines and a template and as long as you're using that they're happy but we're kind of another step back from that - we are interested in the content, we will check the content and we vet content. And you will follow the template exactly or we will come and drop something heavy on you. So I think we're a kind of odd breed. I think our number on the web-admin mailing list is fairly small.

See discussion Chapter 6.16

12.13. RM (59-64)

59	**Interviewer:** Do you see yourself as creative - at some level or?
60	What I try to do is to spot you know the oncoming trends - you know web services, smartcards, whatever. And I mean to a certain extent [Personal name] and myself were instrumental in getting the adoption of content management. So its sort of looking at where the industry is going and then sort of trying to see where does that fit in into what [University name] are trying to do. I mean with the smart cards and the authentication we have got - one of our colleagues is looking to use PKI and digital certificates and you have to have that - potentially in the fullness of time we might go there but as I see it at the moment it's a sledgehammer to crack a nut you know
61	**Interviewer:** Sure
62	And with the secure student and staff portal that we have, the normal authentication meets most of our needs and so but its keeping your eye on things like PKI and where things are going like that there. Do we need to know it. Looking at some of the things that are coming in from legislation. God the number of email lists that I'm on is frightening. Er but you know - even even being on email lists you know same seeing where the trends are we fired out a message to here - what's happening here. So - just keeping a watching brief probably, coming back and saying we should be looking at this folks. The problem is that with a lot of support centres I mean we've got our head down trying to deliver what we're currently delivering, it needs a couple of us who are sort of slightly slacker, and step back and see what's happening. An equivalent one would be for the current procurement that we are doing for high performance computing, erm we're not going out to the - what we've done in the past is you need a 64 bit machine with as much umph as you can get - what we're doing with this one is trying to set up form of collaboration. So we're going out and sort of saying this is the type of research that the university does, tell us what you would recommend that we buy out of your product ranges and is there some form of strategic alliance we can do. And one of the vendors came on site and was talking to one of the researchers, and he said what do you do, and the researcher said modelling this and my models this size ((drawing small square in air)) and its got so many equations and the guy said well - step back from that and if I was to give you a system that allowed you to model something this size ((drawing in the air)) what could you do? And at that point the guy's chin hit the floor. Oh you mean I could? So
63	**Interviewer:** Sure
64	We have people who by the nature of their job have to be completely focussed on what they're doing - but some of us need to be further away from it and looking to see what's on the horizon and how its going to impact it us. And that's the job for me! ((laughs))

See discussion Chapter 6.10.6

12.14. SF (16-29)

16	**Interviewer:** Can you say a few - a bit about what you sort of do day to day?
17	Everything, I think. I've got two members of staff. One is the web assistant, [name 1] and the other one is er a web designer who has been in post now for a couple of years. A large part of the job is really managing them. I've found that its changed a lot from being hands on stuff, you know, HTML, putting prospectuses on the web, dealing with enquiries to - you know concentrating on - I mean even things - I was reading articles and sort of high level stuff and coordinating projects. We actually do run a design service for departments and also some external clients. So keeping those projects running and making sure that [name 1] is doing her job on the HTML side, and [name 2] is doing her bit on the web design side and they are meshing together properly and everything is coming up. That's a lot of it. Lots of queries, support enquiries, people having problems publishing. Or people who require access to things they don't have access to. Erm evaluating content management systems, I never quite get there, but that is something that is very high on the list. er lots of central web sites to be maintained like campus guides, fresher's web site is a very pertinent one at the moment, we are just doing that clearing web site. Erm all the top level web pages. Co-ordinating courses - that's very much left to [name 1], but again you know I have to oversee and make sure that's running smoothly. We run courses every term. We don't actually teach them but we pay Netskills to come here to give the courses. That's probably about it. Liasing with various people. External relations very much. IT services. They look after the actual server. Although I look after the apache web server er you know the configuration of that and the running of it. They look after the actual operating system. So.
18	**Interviewer:** A lot of things
19	Yer. Crazy.
20	**Interviewer:** And where I'm slightly uncertain where you fit in the organisational structure?
21	Yer its intriguing here. Erm when I first arrived here, I was physically in the press office. But I didn't report to the press officer. We then had something called the secretary's office, which I think is the equivalent of the registrar's down south. But we had a re-organisation I would say about three years ago now, where they sort of split the whole secretary's office into directorates essentially. And I moved into planning and information. Now my boss way way back has always been [Name 3]. ((as an asside)) Looking at his chair. ((laughs)) And erm at the time there was a certain pull for me to move into external relations. But I didn't really want to do that because I don't see my job as being - I mean it definitely is marketing in some things, but its not a marketing position. Erm it bridges many things. Its primarily about the management of information in my opinion. Now the planning and information directorate includes the likes of the library. Erm and IT services. And those to me are two key departments that I need to be equated with. So that's how that happened. I strongly argued not to be moved into external relations. So who's in information and planning now, I've mentioned the library, I've mentioned IT services. We've got something called [Abbreviation 1] which is all to do with kind of project management. Er we've got [Abbreviation 2], which is archives and records management. Erm and the registry. It doesn't really fit. But its students - student data. So that's how that works. But as I say my line manager hasn't changed all the time I've worked - his position has changed - he was deputy secretary, but became director of planning and information.
22	**Interviewer:** But does that put you - in with the IT people or are you separately.
23	No. I'm a separate little thing. I mean considering IT services and the library are big - we are talking probably three hundred people per department - web development has three - where more likely its two and a half or so because [name 1] also is [name 3]'s secretary. Although he doesn't take very much of her time up, its just really organising meetings, and coordinating his diary. But no - its always been - on the organisational structure I do appear as a separate unit - web development is a separate unit along with the library, IT services etc. But [name 3] has been arguing for some time that this really doesn't work. And we are just about to commence on another radical restructuring of IT services particularly, but also

	web development and planning office. Which is also a two people affair. And [name 4] as well - quite how its all going to pan out - but there's going to be a big shake up.
24	**Interviewer:** So your position is slightly anomalous.
25	((pause)) Yer. I guess it is. I mean [name 3] always says I'm a victim of my own success. I've built this big beast up. Its just grown all these - you know - tentacles - and it reaches out in so many different directions. I mean it is difficult to keep a handle on it. It is difficult. I mean really the team needs to be bigger. There are many things that we should be tackling, which I cannot tackle. I just don't have the time for it, erm but I think generally in this institution the web isn't regarded as being a particularly high priority. That's my honest opinion. Erm. Certainly that's played out through promotional stuff over the years. Erm we - because of the restructuring we've had a new university secretary, we've had a new principal. Erm there has been a lot of change. And there are particular parts of the institution that seem to be favoured. And external relations is a big thing at the moment. My career prospects probably would have been a lot better if I had made that move to external relations. But I don't regret that in any way. So.
26	**Interviewer:** So where would you say you fit in how the whole place uses the web?
27	A general kind of dumping ground probably. Or at least they try to. Erm. (pause) I think we have possibly, well the corporate part of the web site has possibly been neglected slightly to the - well you've got the VLE type stuff that's happened. You've got the centre for learning and teaching that look after that - a completely separate - not in our directorate - nothing to do with us at all. Erm now they've received a lot of funding, a lot of resources, a lot of staff, a lot of input. And I think there's been a shift generally, from moving course materials that they used to put on the central web server and departmental web space onto the VLE, the blackboard VLE. So the emphasis of the web service in terms of information for current students has changed significantly over the years. Even over the last couple of years. Erm the web is seen as a marketing tool, very much by external relations, something that we haven't exploited in the past and that we should be exploiting. Which is great - but does present problems because the senior managers just don't understand the web. And there are uphill struggles there. Erm.
28	**Interviewer:** In what way don't they understand the web, just out of interest?
29	Erm. They're just very paper orientated. They don't know what goes into it. I think its a common problem: you know, a member of department comes along and says ooh you secretary you could go on the web course and publish web pages. Because they don't have a clue how its done. They don't understand that time might be involved or that - I mean the sort of issues that need to be raised. I mean you can talk to external relations sometimes till you are blue in the face and you still cant get across a very simple point. They see it as being design - its what the page looks like, its not to do with the information content. Erm and you can try and persuade him that people are coming to look to satisfy an information need essentially. And they just don't see that. They would dispute that. So its things like that. You know just. That jar that make it very awkward to be kind on the same level of communication with them. Er and plus because they are a new department, a new directorate they are trying to make their mark on the institution essentially. So its very much kind of a bulldozer approach to me - lets achieve this in whichever way we can, and if web development aren't quite saying what we like then we shall just go externally and get somebody in Aberdeen to create us a new web site, or such and such without realising that the web site has to be managed by someone, there's some kind of accessibility problem we need to be able to change one file and it reflects all down the web site and they've broken it all - stuff like that - there are so many issues. I could go blue in the face describing them to you but. Yer

See discussion Chapter 6.10.3

12.15. TM (30-45)

30	**Interviewer:** So if someone says what do you do for a living, what do you say?
31	University administrator, and I leave it at that. I try not to explain it. I try not to say I work with computers, because it would be nice to say I work with people, but I work with computers ((laughs)). I try to keep it very general and vague, and part of that is like I said - it is how - the way we have gone over the years is how we have been treated by the university, is not a bad thing is it has formed us to be the way we are. And we spend a long time where are titles are meant to be non-descriptive of what people do. Erm I have one of those, before that everybody was an assistant secretary or an administrative assistant etc. It didn't matter what you did, you had a generic title basically. Things are changing now, but because we haven't yet - either we haven't caught up or it hasn't come to us. We still have this vagueness that at the end of the day you do as you are asked, if you do at all.
32	**Interviewer:** Sure.
33	Maybe less structured than other universities you have been to. It's got its advantages and disadvantages.
34	**Interviewer:** Yes, I can see it has got quite a big advantages for the institution
35	Yep. And for the individual. Of course the problem is then, that if you only do the things you like doing, in my case a very good example, or the things you are good at doing, then all of a sudden you don't fit into anything. You cannot be - if I go to another university, and say that is what I did, they will say well what do we do with you. Do we put you there, do we put you here? You are not particularly good to be neither, because you haven't got enough of either. But there is a lot more knowledge, but not specialised knowledge if you like, whereas Rebecca's role is much more precise than mine. Er and up to her how wide she makes it.
36	**Interviewer:** Sure.
37	**Interviewer:** Do you think you are fairly typical of people - in Higher education - who are doing the web?
38	I would say for, if you are looking to the medium to the smaller sized institutions, and if you move away from the more clear cut posts like [Name]'s you know - like web administrator - a lot of the other people will be more like me, in the sense the web is just one more thing that they do. Erm. (pause). I know that some universities are talking about the model of centralising publishing etc, well I hear that, yes one or two good things about it here. Our boss believes, and I agree with him, that we have to allow the individuals, whether they are in academic departments or the administration to er to publish and the crunch is how for us to maintain that publishing, to maintain the individual enthusiasm, for people to publish and yes there will be some stuff that shouldn't have been published that should have been put somewhere else, but its better to help people publish than to stop them and restrict them and put all the dos and don'ts, I mean. My view is perhaps a bit more radical than others, the least, I'm all for the little bit more free and let loose. And stop the problem, the particular problem when it happens, as opposed to restrict everybody left right and centre, on the basis that everybody will do wrong. The majority of the people will not do it wrong and they will do it good and some of them may do a very good job as well. Why restrict them? If there is a problem, part of the job to go and sort that problem. As opposed to put bans and strict rules and regulations and basically make it difficult for people to publish. One of the reasons - the first thing I did, when I sort of laid my hands on on the web server technology, running on OS/2, that was the only thing, I had suns at the time, I still run sun OS/2 - was to try and get a search engine going. And I got something working on my computer. Then I found another that an undergraduate student was doing - search maestro - and we are still running that. Yes there are better ones now, even the same guy's working on a better one, but all of a sudden other things come along - and you know - what is it the urgent takes precedence over the important. But part of this idea was instead of trying to control the information we publish, let's try and find the information we publish. And let's help the persons find what they want. Rather than control - you know - going for the ultimate control

	of absolutely everything. So, not sure if that answered the question, it waffled a lot.
39	**Interviewer:** No no
40	What was the question?
41	**Interviewer:** I'm not sure I cant remember
42	Oh
43	**Interviewer:** But I can see what you're getting at, I do
44	Well, OK as far as the web, I'll just give it you as a sort of two liner. I read a book from Sun which went back to mid eighties perhaps. But the Sun intranet, and what Sun discovered was that every employee was running a web server. From within the company. What Sun decided to do, was not restrict them, but to help them. And they tried to get it down to one web server within the company per team, and the team was three to four people. Their own personal computers basically, or sun stations, but anyway. Instead of the company putting the resources to control publishing, they decided to put the resources to enable publishing, and to be able to find the information, call it a search engine, call it whatever you need, technology that would allow people to find the information, so they did not discourage people, they just spend their time trying to make that information accessible and findable. To me that's the radical way of doing things, er when I hear colleagues talk about restricting, I think they are anything but radical, I think, they are basically - they are bureaucrats that shouldn't exist.
45	**Interviewer:** Fair enough

See discussion Chapter 6.16

12.16. UM (16-17; 44-47)

16	**Interviewer:** And could you say what, in a few words about what you do day to day here, kind of thing
17	Day to day here is twofold. The web site was in a state, and remains in a bit of a state. Because it was set up for manual maintenance originally, with a horrific 800 ish Dreamweaver templates and a team of two to support the entire university. So day to day stuff can involve doing basic web updates, on the basis of phone calls, emails, scribbled bits of paper. Folk pointing things out to you in the corridor, all that kind of stuff. Erm. So that's one part of it, which is legacy. The other part of it is trying to fix that, so I'm doing a number - I introduced web guidelines to the uni- that was new twelve months ago. Talking to folk that was new. So that folk around the university might know I exist, erm. Education things along the lines of HTML standards, best practice and that, accessibility - so I work with the university special needs service to do that. And kind of bringing that all together in one big web project to actually implement a web content management system. Erm and that's taking up an awful lot of my time at the moment, as you might expect. It's hopefully going to be worthwhile because we are working with IT services who have a lot of the university's data on databases, so we want to steal that data and put it on the web, where appropriate. So begin to do things that are supportable long term. Its business as usual to keep the databases up to date, so if we can take the information and use it on the web then we're reducing the admin burden on folk and that means I can do techie things and make it nice and pretty and compliant. That's the ((laughing)) lite version of what I do day to day, at various (inaudible word), lots of talking to various committees, talking to individuals, talking to - erm - very technical people and you can have quite a detailed in depth discussion with them and the secretaries who **have** to do it and if you mention HTML tend to fall over in shock. Ehm. So its very very varied.

See discussion Chapter 6.10.3

44	**Interviewer:** [...] Sort of stepping back slightly, how would you say doing the web in Higher education has changed over the last few years?
45	Ooh. (difficult question) I don't know. I think. From what I've seen of other institutions and from speaking to folk in similar roles to myself, erm the spread across the sector of what folk are doing probably spans a couple of years. So I'm six months, eighteen months behind the folk at the front and there are folk 24, 36 months behind me. So the sector is not cohesive at all yet, and from what I can see, that's largely down to funding. I'm lucky in that I've got more than one person, and I've got a project budget to do something. There are institutions working with 0.5 of a web person and no budget. I don't have a running budget day to day, so if I want anything I have to request and justify the money every time. Say I needed, I don't know, an expensive interface device for my computer, that would help me test the web, I'd have to go and request that and justify it and get the money. Other folk have got the budget to just go and buy it. So there's - despite the fact I've only been in the sector eighteen months, two years, I don't think - the sector doesn't have a position. It's just this great big line of folk doing **things**.
46	**Interviewer:** So how would you characterise the people who are right at the front then? What are they doing?
47	Right at the front: they've got a senior manager who is either in direct contact with and has influence over, or is actually on the managing body for the university, they have an annual budget, they have a managed web site, they have processes in the university for keeping data up to date. They have a single university design. And most importantly they have the institutional will to say **no** you are not doing another web site use this one. And if our web site is not good enough tell us why and we'll develop one that is. And they're really quite focussed and they're managing it as I feel it should be managed.

See discussion Chapter 6.10

12.17. VM (61-62; 67-72)

61	**Interviewer:** So - sort of thinking more broadly how do you think - you may not have an opinion on that - how has using the web changed over the last few years in higher education generally?
62	Well I think we are probably a prime example of it - where it was something that was very much - it was just full of information, erm and how useful that information was was quite questionable. You could question that. We've taken it to the step further and said well you know, we have to be quite clear about what's going on and why its on there. Erm you know its not erm its not just a database of information, its got to communicate something to people. Erm and if you are going to start to communicate and use it as a communications tool you've got to be quite clear about what it is you want to say. And I think we've made that that choice. Erm you know, but I don't think that is consistent across the whole sector, I think some institutions are using it very much as a - everything goes on it. Some institutions it has been more wrestled into marketing and they are using it much more effectively. But its about having (the ability to have?) two sites, I mean, the intranet that serves that information resource purpose, yer if you look at things that are on our intranet, that used to be on the main site, they've got nothing really to do with - with people. Erm people don't really need to see your erm - our HR policy - erm or staff handbook for example. You only really need to see the staff handbook if you're a member of staff. There's no need to see it if you are a member of the public. If you want to see it as a member of the public that's fine we can give you a copy of it, erm being an open and transparent institution, its not about not letting anyone see things its about choosing what to actually present to the outside world. Erm but er you know each university is different. And a lot of that is to do with --there are various reasons - but one is - we have a devolved structure as well its very hard to actually control what's going in departments. So in the bigger institutions its probably more difficult.

See discussion Chapter 6.11

67	**Interviewer:** So what did you see as the benefits of like winning?
68	The HEIST award? Internal kudos (laughing)
69	**Interviewer:** No that's
70	Well it pleased the principal so that's you know that's one gold star. Also it kind of in a sense put paid to internal criticism, because you know you'll always get people internally who know better, or who you know don't like this or don't like that. And to actually win and have that external validation to say that actually it is a really good site: it is good. Erm I think for everybody who was involved it was kind of like a erm pat on the back - because it was a hard slog - erm it was about a year to eighteen months, you know the scoping exercise. Which was actually quite an interesting process, because it was done by a design agency - it went out to tender, erm and we decided to split the whole - the scoping exercise and the build into two tender processes. The company that got the tender for the scoping erm when we actually got the mapping back, the outcome of the scoping exercise, it wasn't what we'd expected, because all they'd done they'd just listened to what everybody wanted. And put that down - on a map - in a diagrammatic form - with links to say that links to that page that links to that page - as opposed to actually taking what everybody said they wanted and distilling that and actually questioning that - why do you actually want that - and have you actually thought about this? Erm so after the scoping we actually then - there is a significant difference between what actually was scoped and what actually turned out. And when also you got the scope and the actual build then you actually find a role that duplicates are - that was something that came on as an addition to the site. Towards the end of the build was this ability to duplicate pages, so that people erm - if you went into the homepage they went into architecture, undergraduate architecture so you were in the architecture pages, so you'd got the green border, so you know you are in the architecture, erm then you

	went into how to apply, and how to apply would take you back into erm the core site - and you would lose your breadcrumb. So by introducing duplicate pages stay in architecture but the information just draws from the one source. So that in a sense helped us make sure that all the information is up to date. So we only have to change how to apply once and it changes it across the whole site. Erm. So. How did we get on to this - what was the question?
71	**Interviewer:** I think you were talking about the process of tendering
72	Yer. Oh about the fact you know this HEIST award, that it was a long process, and everybody who was involved in it. And it - it was a long process from that scope to the actual build and the way the thing changed and erm and having a committee you know isn't really the best way to do it - because committees are notorious for erm a never agreeing anything or b agreeing something in one meeting and then changing it the next (laugh). But we actually wanted to get academics involved and have ownership, so there was a representative from each department or each school and they would then feed back to their academic school, so there was someone from fine art, who would feedback to fine art heads. So everyone knew where we were with the process and we were very much engaged. So this HEIST award is as much for them as anyone else.

12.18. BKI

14	**Interviewer:** Specifically about web support have you got a sense of what sort of group of people it is or?
15	Ahm, you should - you will probably see them in June at Kent. So many of the people who go along to my annual institutional web management workshop will be members of that list either that list or the parallel one which is website-info-mgt. So that was one again I encouraged people to start, among people who were thinking about an institutional web manager, there are higher level type issues, strategic type issues, as opposed to how do I do tables in HTML (inaudible words) type of things. So there are those two lists that I'm heavily involved with. An you find that, as I say many of the people go to that workshop are on that list. And I think that's quite nice. So my workshop - started in we're coming to the seventh. So we've had six to date. So that started in July 97, so in a way it provides an opportunity for people to put a face and chat with people that they've seen in cyberspace as it were. And a lot of issues that are discussed are the type of things that are discussed on the mailing list. So in a way the mailing list helps me with that event. And also with articles I write, so for example there were questions yesterday on do I need to employ a company to get my university to the top of google. So we have various discussions about strategies to do this and tools and my next Ariadne article will probably be on that topic.
16	**Interviewer:** Do you see web support as being a particular type of person or role or
17	Erm
18	**Interviewer:** Or is not really that clear?
19	Its difficult to say. Of course what you don't see are the members of the list who only lurk. So you will - the people who post to it will tend to be the people who are willing to - you know - put their head above the parapet. Particularly if its controversial. So occasionally I might have people come along and ask a question and then not be seen again. And may say thanks got an answer. And its really good for that, people are very willing on the list to give specific answers. It's a bit more difficult when you want to discuss sort of strategic type issues but in terms of providing that type of support, it is really good. But you know from time to time I've either met people or have had private email from people saying thanks its really great what you do on the list - which is really nice - but I never hear from them on the list.
20	**Interviewer:** Yer. Do you get any sense of that list or both of those lists are a community?
21	Absolutely. Very much so. As I was saying the fact that there are those close links with my web management workshop means that that is a face to face event, for many people on the list. And also at my event, at the final session I always say here are two mail mailing lists for our community, so hopefully new people will join from that. So yes I very much see it like that. Erm and of course there are of course the characters, you know, I have probably have met, most of the people so there's [Name] from [University] was saying something today, [Name], another guy who regularly posts, with a particular point of view. You know - and [Name] - these people you tend to know what their position is, where they are coming from. Erm you know accept that - we know what people are going to say and they help develop it and sometimes you know change peoples perspectives and the like. Yer I would very much see it as a community. I've used that term myself.

12.19. BKII

33	**Interviewer:** Would you make that claim? Because its all addressed all the main issues of what the web is about, hasn't it?
34	Yer if that event had not been there, the web would still have been done. But what I think its really done is to help develop the community in a consistent manner.
35	**Interviewer:** Sure
36	So: I mean there are institutions that er haven't had - haven't attended the event. And they're still doing things but its really had an opportunity for as I say the best practices to be

	shared across the community. And also and I think the most important thing about it is the difficulties to be shared.
37	**Interviewer:** Oh right
38	In a way that was the aim of the initial workshop, back in 97 at Kings college and also why the website-info-mgt jiscmail list was set up, because people were coming up to me and saying I've just been appointed as a new web editor for my institution and I thought it would be really great, but I've discovered there's all this nightmare. And there's political wars going on. I just - you know - do stuff on the web. What can I do? And so that was why I helped set up the mailing list and then set up that first event which was really a erm what you call it a sort of counselling session. Or a therapy session
39	**Interviewer:** Oh right
40	by which people could go along and discover that it wasn't just them or their institution that these were problems that were encountered more widely. And I think that was particularly important because the web editor profession was so very new.
41	**Interviewer:** Sure
42	So you know I used to work in computing services - you used to work in a library environment - and we'd have our own conferences that we'd go to. But that would be in a mature profession.
43	**Interviewer:** Right
44	Whereas for the web editor there was nothing.
45	**Interviewer:** Sure
46	And they didn't really know who their peers were. So in some situations it would be IT services, and others it might be library and otherwise and others you know it might be you know PR and marketing. Etc etc.
47	**Interviewer:** Sure
48	So there was no natural erm grouping by which people could get together and you know listen to the best practices. But then have the discussion groups, and have a few pints and have a moan - get things off your chest and then realise maybe things arent so bad. And maybe I'm doing things right and etc etc
49	**Interviewer:** Right
50	So for me that was a really important part of the workshop and that's one reason why I've been very keen on having you know a very active and participative element so we've actually you know - we keep dropping down the plenary talks
51	**Interviewer:** Right
52	and having more and more of the discussion group sessions of the parallel workshops which are smaller and supposed to allow everybody to engage, contribute actively to the events.

89	**Interviewer:** But I'm quite interested in that because its like - in a way - what is the motive to give a talk - have you opinions on that
90	Yer, well it. That's a very interesting one, there's a minor perk - you know there's a slight subsidy for speakers and workshop facilitators. But that's not a perk for the individual because the individuals don't pay. But we do try and provide a small present for speakers and facilitators and that's been a bottle of whisky, or last year google er provided a you know a book token, book voucher, 20 or 30 book voucher for facilitators and speakers. But that's not the main thing - I think the main thing is it's its this willingness to want to share and work together. Which I think is you know a part of being in the educational sector. So we're not there to make loads of money, we're not there to be - to beat the competition
91	**Interviewer:** Sure
92	we're there working together with our fellow peers
93	**Interviewer:** Sure
94	And you could ask the same thing - why are people so willing to erm to answer queries on the web support mailing list ?
95	**Interviewer:** Indeed

96	They don't have to but they do ((with feeling)). And that's you know a really great thing about the community.
97	**Interviewer:** Sure
98	And its been there all the time Ive been around its been there, its part of initially in the IT services, IT support community we've been sharing and having national events and the national events allow us to meet the people who we see on the mailing lists.
99	**Interviewer:** Sure
100	So I think that culture has always been a part of what we're doing. And I think I was quite - well in a way I was lucky that it continued across the web management community, which embraced sectors that were new to me, so it was embracing people who might be in a PR and marketing community
101	**Interviewer:** Sure
102	So sometimes you know you get people saying Oh no you know we're going to keep our idea secret and not tell anybody else. I have met a small number of people who have that view. But to be honest it is a very small number.
103	**Interviewer:** Do you think it's a particular web thing?
104	Erm no I don't because as I was saying I got that before there was a web and I worked in IT services departments and I was an information officer at Loughborough university. No, not at Loughborough I worked at Loughborough I worked as information officer at Liverpool and Leeds universities.
105	**Interviewer:** Sure
106	and yer the information and training officer community went to conferences and were sharing were talking and actually in a way my approach to the more participative parallel sessions I really got from the information officer conferences that I used to go to
107	**Interviewer:** Oh right
108	Because basically these were information and training people
109	**Interviewer:** Sure
110	we were aware of sort of training issues and approaches and you know learning models etc etc

THESIS CONTAINS CD ROM