
Leveraging digital technologies to support inclusive accessible and innovative Parliamentary Services in Cross River State, Nigeria

Oluwaseun O. Akin-Fakorede

Department of Library and Information Science, University of Calabar, Nigeria.
Seun.fakorede@yahoo.com, akin-fakorede@unical.edu.ng.

&

Adetoun A. Oyelude

Kenneth Dike Library, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
sefoye@gmail.com



Copyright © 2023 by **Oluwaseun O. Akin-Fakorede & Adetoun A. Oyelude**. This work is made available under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>

ABSTRACT

Parliamentarians in Nigeria are saddled with parliamentary activities such as making laws, sponsoring bills, performing oversight functions and many more to bring democratic dividends to their respective constituencies. The advancement of digital tools has brought implementation of democratic engagement and innovation to parliamentary services in Nigeria. This study investigates digital tools to support inclusive, accessible, and innovative parliamentary services in Cross River State, Nigeria. The purpose of this study is to assess the level of accessibility, usage and influence of digital tools such as: smartphone, IPAD computer, virtual tools, digital network, internet, projector, and digital library towards innovative parliamentary services in Cross River State House of Assembly. Survey research method was used for the study while twenty-five (25) lawmakers in Cross River State House of Assembly were the respondents for the study. Three research questions were proposed to guide the study, questionnaire and interview were instrument used for data collection, SPSS was used for data analysis and finding reveals that, digital tools that are more prevalent among the parliamentarian was smartphone. Majority of parliamentarian were not acquainted with digital tools to communicate to their constituent. Very few numbers made use of social media. It was therefore recommended that they should be more enlightenment and training on effective use of digital tool for parliamentary work.

Keywords: *Digital Technologies, Inclusive Library services, Innovative Library services, Parliament libraries, Special libraries, Nigeria.*

Introduction

Nigeria having celebrated her 24th year of uninterrupted democratic governance, has shown the power of the people. An indication to the fact that, democratic governance has been firmly rooted and there is no better alternative to democracy as a form of government that gives the people the right to choose who to govern and represent them at the National and State levels.

Nigeria operates a Bi-cameral legislature; made up of two Independent Chambers; the Senate and the House of Representatives. The Senate referred to as the Red Chamber, comprises 109 Senators representing three Senatorial Districts of each of the 36 States of the Federation. 2022). The democratic right of choice put up 25 elected representatives in the Cross River State House of Assembly in Nigeria to represent various constituencies as parliamentarians. The mandate given to them is a liability to law-making, sponsoring of bills, and doing an

oversight function in order to bring democratic dividends to their constituency. To do these effectively, parliamentarians leveraging on digital technologies could be either a stitch in time saves nine or time dawdle.

Almost every aspect of human life has been transformed by digital technologies including banking, health, communication, entertainment, parliamentary sessions, travel, and many more. Digital technology refers to a device that helps to create, store and manage data. Hence, the ability to reach out to their constituency because data generated is a necessary tool for the parliamentary process. These help parliaments to create, develop and disseminate political content that facilitates improved representation. Okon et al. (2014) noted that digital tools have brought innovation to parliamentary activities worldwide over the past two decades. With digital tools, parliamentarians are able to disseminate information and reach out to a large coverage of their constituent, as the tools facilitate information flow in society. Rumbul (2016) noted that global increase in internet usage and accessibility have brought corresponding development in the use of digital technologies and ICTs within parliaments in the region have a functioning website with basic information on members, activity and access but few have information published and displayed in formats that are easily navigable to individuals. It is pertinent to examine how parliamentarians in Cross River State, Nigeria are leveraging on digital tools to support inclusive accessible and innovative services.

Objectives

1. To investigate the digital tools that are accessible to parliamentarians.
2. To investigate the extent of usage of digital tools by parliamentarians in the discharge of service.
3. To know the influence of digital tools on service delivery in parliament.

Research Questions

1. What are the digital tools that are accessible to parliamentarians?
2. To what extent is the usage of digital tools by parliamentarians in the discharge of service?
3. What is the influence of digital tools on service delivery in parliament?

Literature Review

Digital library tools focus on ingestion, preservation, and access to online reading content. These tools and resources available to people generally in many libraries and documentation centres are Word processing documents, Slide presentation software, Electronic reference materials, and, Tablet and cell phone apps. These can be provided free, or on payment of a small fee, depending on the institution providing the library service.

As far back as 2006, the UNDP considered that “e-Parliament was an emerging area of work in developing countries, and in its infancy when compared to national ICT for Development strategies, e-government or e-commerce. e-Parliament was not yet considered a strategic area of work when it came to e-government programmes or national ICTD priorities. However, many things have changed, and advances have been made in developing countries, hence this assessment of parliamentarians’ use of digital tools (UNDP, 2006).

Bwalya et al (2012) noted that the majority of African parliaments lacked the quality and volume of expertise necessary to implement good ICTs, which manifested as a resistance to the adoption of digital tools. Holt (2008) made suggestions on what legislators could do using technology in carrying out their duties. The tips bordered on them keeping in touch with their constituency and organizing their time through Smartphones and other hand-held computing devices. They were also to stay on top of constituents, using helpdesk software packages adapted to a legislator’s needs. They need to track legislation and their workload as well, using spreadsheets for tracking. These digital tools are what parliamentarians use.

International Republican Institute (2021) makes recommendations that legislatures should consider in adjusting their rules and procedures. Software and internal structures that will make digital operations possible are desirable. All parliament staff will need to have secure, fast access to key software, central file storage, and collaboration tools, to be able to move their operations online. Three key components to achieve this were identified:

“Software (e.g. word processors and spreadsheets); hardware (e.g. computers, modems and Wi-Fi routers); and, infrastructure (e.g. an internet connection). In order to effectively facilitate virtual operations, parliaments need to consider all three.” (International Republican Institute, 2021: 9).

Further recommendations by International Republican Institute (2021) for parliamentarians are:

1. To use a cloud-based office suite because they are more secure, facilitate easier remote collaboration and don't require in-person maintenance.
2. Microsoft Office and Google's G-Suite could be used because they both offer special support and features for democratic actors and governments.
3. Internet connectivity for staff and parliamentarians should be considered.
4. Parliaments need to select their communication platforms accordingly, and consider diverting funds for internet service upgrades, if possible. (International Republican Institute, 2021:11)

In a study of young Moldova people's outlook on digital transformation, Jones, Davies, Margarint, Vasilescu and Botezatu (2022) sought to understand the digital needs and challenges which they encounter, as well as their grassroots vision for a better digital future. It was found that "majority agreed that incorporating digital tools (interactive whiteboard, videos, podcasts, PDFs etc.) into learning, be it in-person or online, enriches the learning process by adding a multimedia dimension".

In the meantime Citino (2023) observed that while many parliaments are exploring digital strategies and increasing their investments in digital technologies, currently only 10 per cent of them have adopted AI-based applications. The 2020 pandemic has created a situation whereby parliamentary procedures have been revolutionized with a fearless approach, capitalizing on swift transformations in institutional culture. Virtual sittings and remote voting have enthusiastically or inevitably become the new normal.

Abideen (2023) described some other democracy technology tools that employ AI, as including Adhocracy for input categorization and moderation assistance, and ZenCity for trend and theme identification. These tools are AI propelled. Abideen noted that adopting and deploying AI technologies to advance democracies is the seamless nature that allows citizens to participate effectively, mostly from the comfort of their own homes, and expressed the challenges involved in doing so. Data security, funding, digital dependency, potential exclusion, and other ethical implications must be deliberately addressed if AI is to play a crucial role in advancing democracies and promoting political education and participation (Abideen, 2023).

Methodology

To examine how parliamentarians in Cross River State, Nigeria are leveraging on digital tools to support inclusive accessible and innovative services, attempt was made to interview the twenty five lawmakers in Cross River State. Only sixteen made time for the interview. The interviews were recorded where permitted, and where not, notes were taken by a research assistant. The interviews were transcribed and thematically analysed.

Findings of the Study

The socio demographic and socio economic characteristics of the respondents were recorded. Table 1 shows the frequency and the percentage distribution of the parliamentarian by their socio-demographic and socio economic characteristics.

Of the sixteen, (10, 62.5%) parliamentarians are male and (6, 37.5%) are females. 37.5% of the parliamentarians are of the age group 35 – 44, half of them are in the age group 55 – 64 and the other 12.5% of the respondents are of the age group 55 – 64. All of the respondents who participated in this research are married.

Table 1. Demographic details of respondents

		Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	10	62.5
	Female	6	37.5
	Total	16	100.0
Age of the respondents	35 - 44	6	37.5
	45 - 54	8	50.0
	55 - 64	2	12.5
	Total	16	100.0
	Marital status	Married	16

Objective 1: To investigate the digital tools that are accessible to parliamentarians

The result of the research shows that of the 16 parliamentarians interviewed, as regards their access to digital tools, all the parliamentarians had access to smart phone, 9 (56.3%) of them have access to IPad, but the other 7

(43.8%) do not. 5 (31.3%) of the parliamentarians have access to a laptop and the other 11 (68.8%) said they do not have access to a laptop. Only one of the parliamentarians have access to a desktop computer, but the higher percentage 15 (93.8%) said they do not have access to a desktop computer.

Regarding the parliamentarians access to a digital library, only one of the parliamentarians claims to have access to a digital library and the other 15 parliamentarians said they do not have access. None of the parliamentarians have access to a projector. 10 (62.5%) of them have an access to the internet and the other 6 (37.5%) have no access to the internet. Lastly, only one of the parliamentarians claims to have an access to virtual video conference while the larger percentage of the parliamentarians do not have access to a virtual video conference.

Table 2. Digital tools that are accessible to the parliamentarian

		Frequency	Percent
Smart phone	Yes	16	100.0
	No	0	0.0
IPad	Yes	9	56.3
	No	7	43.8
Laptop	Yes	5	31.3
	No	11	68.8
Desktop Computer	Yes	1	6.3
	No	15	93.8
Digital library	Yes	1	6.3
	No	15	93.8
Projector	No	16	100.0
Internet	Yes	10	62.5
	No	6	37.5
Virtual video conference	Yes	1	6.3
	No	15	93.8
Total		16	100.0

Furthermore, the result shows in Table 3, that each of the parliamentarians interviewed, are from different constituencies in Cross River. And for the tenure of the parliamentarians in office, 69.2% of the respondents are in their first tenure, 23.1% of them are in their second tenure and the other 7.7% of the respondents are in their third tenure in office. Only 3 of the parliamentarians choose not to disclose their number of tenure in office.

Table 3. Constituency and Tenure in Office

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	
Name of constituency	Abi	1	6.3	6.3	
	Akamkpa 1	1	6.3	6.3	
	Akamkpa 2	1	6.3	6.3	
	Akpabuyo	1	6.3	6.3	
	Bakassi	1	6.3	6.3	
	Bekwarra	1	6.3	6.3	
	Biase	1	6.3	6.3	
	Boki 1	1	6.3	6.3	
	Calabar municipal	1	6.3	6.3	
	Calabar South 2	1	6.3	6.3	
	Etung	1	6.3	6.3	
	Ikom 1	1	6.3	6.3	
	Obubra 1	1	6.3	6.3	
	Odukpani	1	6.3	6.3	
	Ogoja	1	6.3	6.3	
	Yakurr 2	1	6.3	6.3	
	Total	16	100.0	100.0	
	Tenure in Office	1st Tenure	9	56.3	69.2
		2nd Tenure	3	18.8	23.1
3rd Tenure		1	6.3	7.7	
Total		13	81.3	100.0	
Missing	System	3	18.8		
Total		16	100.0		

Objective 2: To investigate the extent of usage of digital tools by parliamentarians in the discharge of service.

Table 4 presents the extent of the usage of the digital tools by the parliamentarians in the discharge of their duties. Half of the parliamentarians have shown that they use digital tools for communicating with constituents daily, 12.5% said they do so weekly, 12.5% also said they do so monthly, and the other 25.0% attested that they rarely use digital tools for communicating. With reference to the digital communication methods preferred by the parliamentarians, none of the parliamentarians prefer using emails, 43.8% of them prefer the use of social media, only one of the parliamentarians makes use of video conferencing and a good number of the parliamentarians (62.5%) prefer mobile apps.

It was noted that 25.0% of the parliamentarians often use digital tools for research and gathering information related to parliamentary matters daily, 12.5% do so weekly, only one of them does so monthly and the other 56.3% of the parliamentarians rarely use digital tools for research and gathering information related to parliamentary matters. Lastly, one of the parliamentarians is familiar and using digital platforms for participating in virtual parliamentary sessions, 25.0% of them are actually familiar with the platforms but have not used them yet, while the other 68.8% of the parliamentarians are not familiar with the digital platforms.

Table4. Frequency of use of Digital Tools

		Frequency	Percent
Frequent use of digital tools for communication with constituents	Daily	8	50.0
	Weekly	2	12.5
	Monthly	2	12.5
	Rarely	4	25.0
	Total	16	100.0
Which digital communication methods do you prefer for interacting with constituents?		Frequency	Percent
Email	No	16	100.0
	Yes	7	43.8
Social media	No	9	56.3
	Total	16	100.0
Video conferencing	Yes	1	6.3
	No	15	93.8
Mobile apps	Total	16	100.0
	Yes	10	62.5
How often do you use digital tools for research and gathering information related to parliamentary matters?	No	6	37.5
	Total	16	100.0
	Daily	4	25.0
	Weekly	2	12.5
	Monthly	1	6.3
Familiar with using digital platforms for participating in virtual parliamentary sessions?	Rarely	9	56.3
	Total	16	100.0
	Yes, I am familiar and actively use them	1	6.3
	I am familiar but haven't used them yet	4	25.0
	No, I am not familiar with them	11	68.8
	Total	16	100.0

As regards the digital platforms or tools found most effective by the parliamentarians, Zoom was the most preferred digital tool by the parliamentarians who responded, followed by Google Meet. Only 2 (12.5%) parliamentarians use digital tools for collaborating with other parliamentarians or stakeholders on legislative matters but the other 14 (87.5%) do not. With regards to digital tools or platforms found most useful for collaboration on legislative matters, only 3 parliamentarians found google drive most useful, 4 of them found Dropbox as the most useful digital tool and none of the parliamentarians found neither Slack nor Trello useful. More so, out of the 16 parliamentarians interviewed, only 2 of them received basic training or support in effectively utilizing digital tools for parliamentary work, while the other 14 parliamentarians have no training what so ever.

Table 5. Usefulness of Digital Tools to Parliamentarians

Digital platforms or tools found most effective				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Digital platforms or tools you find most effective	Zoom	7	43.8	77.8
	Google Meet	2	12.5	22.2
	Total	9	56.3	100.0
Missing	System	7	43.8	
Total		16	100.0	
Do you use digital tools for communication?	Yes	2	12.5	12.5
	No	14	87.5	87.5
	Total	16	100.0	100.0
Digital tools or platforms found most useful				
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Google Drive	Yes	3	18.8	18.8
	No	13	81.3	81.3
	Total	16	100.0	100.0
Dropbox	Yes	4	25.0	25.0
	No	12	75.0	75.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0
Slack	No	16	100.0	100.0
Trello	No	16	100.0	100.0
Received any training or support in effectively utilizing digital tools for parliamentary work?	Yes, basic training	2	12.5	12.5
	No, I haven't received any training	14	87.5	87.5
	Total	16	100.0	100.0

Out of the 16 parliamentarians interviewed, only one of them has ever used digital platforms to conduct virtual town hall meetings or public consultations, 10 parliamentarians said they have not, while the other 5 parliamentarians gave no response. 18.8% of the parliamentarians consider the use of digital tools for increasing transparency in parliamentary proceedings very important, half of the parliamentarians consider it somewhat important, while the other 31.3% consider the use of digital tools for increasing transparency not important.

When asked if there are any other tools the parliamentarians would like to see being implemented, the only tool that was mentioned by a parliamentarian is the virtual video conference tool, and lastly, a large proportion of the parliamentarians 75.0% when asked if they would be open to further training or workshop on effectively utilizing digital tools for parliamentary work, responded 'they areasq questions interested'.

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Have you used digital platforms to conduct virtual town hall meetings?	Yes	1	6.3	9.1
	No	10	62.5	90.9
	Total	11	68.8	100.0
Missing	System	5	31.3	
Total		16	100.0	
How important do you consider the use of digital tools for increasing transparency	Very important	3	18.8	18.8
	Somewhat important	8	50.0	50.0
	Not important	5	31.3	31.3
	Total	16	100.0	100.0
Are there any digital tools that you would like to see implemented?	Virtual video conference	1	6.3	6.3
	None	15	93.8	93.8
	Total	16	100.0	100.0
	Yes, I am interested	12	75.0	75.0
Would you be open to further training on effectively utilizing digital tools	No, I am not interested	4	25.0	25.0
	Total	16	100.0	100.0

Objective 3: To know the influence of digital tools on service delivery in parliament.

This section seeks to know the influence of digital tools on service delivery in parliament. On the impact of digital tools in enhancing productivity in service delivery, 43.8% of the parliamentarians thinks its impact is moderate, 31.3% said the impact is slightly, while the others said the impact is either is not felt or not applicable. As for the effectiveness of digital tools in improving the efficiency of service delivery processes, 37.5% of the respondents agreed the effectiveness is moderate, 37.5% also agreed the effect is slight, the others said the effectiveness is not applicable. To the extent to which digital tools have reduced service delivery time, 43.8% said the extent is moderate, 31.3% said the extent is slightly, while the other parliamentarians said the extent is not applicable. For the impact of the digital tools on minimizing errors and inaccuracies in service delivery, 37.5% of the respondents agreed the effectiveness is moderate, 37.5% also agreed the effect is slight, the others said the effectiveness is not applicable.

When asked about the effectiveness of digital tools in facilitating quick and accurate data analysis for delivery, 25.0% of the respondents said the effect is moderate, 50.0% said the effect is slight, while the other 25.0% of the respondents said the effect is not applicable. As for the extent to which digital tools have reduced administrative costs in service delivery, 12.5% of the respondents said the effect is moderate, 62.5% said the effect is slight, and the other respondents said the effect is not applicable. Lastly, on the impact of digital tools on streamlining financial processes in service delivery, 75.0% of the respondents thinks the impact is a slight one, while the other respondents think it is not applicable.

		Frequency	Percent
Impact of digital tools on enhancing productivity in service delivery.	Moderately	7	43.8
	Slightly	5	31.3
	Not at all	1	6.3
	Not applicable	3	18.8
	Total	16	100.0
Effectiveness of digital tools in improving the efficiency of service delivery processes.	Moderately	6	37.5
	Slightly	6	37.5
	Not at all	1	6.3
	Not applicable	3	18.8
	Total	16	100.0
Extent to which digital tools have reduced service delivery time.	Moderately	7	43.8
	Slightly	5	31.3
	Not at all	1	6.3
	Not applicable	3	18.8
	Total	16	100.0
Impact of digital tools on minimizing errors and inaccuracies in service delivery.	Moderately	6	37.5
	Slightly	6	37.5
	Not at all	1	6.3
	Not applicable	3	18.8
	Total	16	100.0
Effectiveness of digital tools in facilitating quick and accurate data analysis for service delivery.	Moderately	4	25.0
	Slightly	8	50.0
	Not applicable	4	25.0
	Total	16	100.0
	Extent to which digital tools have reduced administrative costs in service delivery.	Moderately	2
Slightly		10	62.5
Not at all		1	6.3
Not applicable		3	18.8
Total		16	100.0
Impact of digital tools on streamlining financial processes in service delivery.	Slightly	12	75.0
	Not at all	1	6.3
	Not applicable	3	18.8
	Total	16	100.0

As touching the effectiveness of the digital tools in improving financial transparency in service delivery, 75.0% of the parliamentarians thinks the effectiveness is a slight one, while the others said the effectiveness is either is not felt or not applicable. As for the extent to which digital tools have reduced paperwork and documentation in service delivery, 12.5% of the respondents agreed the extent is moderate, 56.3% also agreed the effect is slight, the others said the extent is not applicable. For the impact of digital tools on cost savings in service delivery, 12.5% said the impact is moderate, 56.3% said the extent is slightly, while the other parliamentarians said the impact is not applicable.

As regards the extent to which digital tools have improved data security and privacy in service delivery, 6.3% of the respondents said the extent is moderate, 56.3% said the effect is slight, while the other parliamentarians said the effect is not applicable. As for the impact of digital tools on reducing operational costs in service delivery, 6.3% of the respondents said the effect is moderate, 56.3% said the effect is slight, and the other respondents said the effect is not applicable. Finally, on the overall impact of digital tools on service delivery in terms of time, productivity, efficiency, and cost, 6.3% of the parliamentary mentioned that the impact is a moderate one, 56.3% of them thinks the impact is a slight one, while the other respondents think the impact is not applicable.

		Frequency	Percent
Effectiveness of digital tools in improving financial transparency in service delivery.	Slightly	12	75.0
	Not at all	1	6.3
	Not applicable	3	18.8
	Total	16	100.0
Extent to which digital tools have reduced paperwork and documentation in service delivery.	Moderately	2	12.5
	Slightly	9	56.3
	Not applicable	5	31.3
	Total	16	100.0
Impact of digital tools on cost savings in service delivery.	Moderately	2	12.5
	Slightly	9	56.3
	Not at all	1	6.3
	Not applicable	4	25.0
Total	16	100.0	
Extent to which digital tools have improved data security and privacy in service delivery.	Moderately	1	6.3
	Slightly	9	56.3
	Not at all	2	12.5
	Not applicable	4	25.0
Total	16	100.0	
Impact of digital tools on reducing operational costs in service delivery.	Moderately	1	6.3
	Slightly	9	56.3
	Not at all	2	12.5
	Not applicable	4	25.0
Total	16	100.0	
Overall impact of digital tools on service delivery in terms of time, productivity, efficiency, and cost.	Moderately	1	6.3
	Slightly	9	56.3
	Not at all	2	12.5
	Not applicable	4	25.0
Total	16	100.0	

Recommendations and conclusion

Development comes with responsibilities, for parliamentarian to discharge their duties effectively that will have a positive effect on their constituent, there must be commitment to the use of digital tools at all times and not during electioneering period. Training and retraining of parliamentarian on the use of digital tools is inevitable. This will ease the gap between them and their constituency. More enlightenment will create access and inclusion which bring better representation. Leveraging digital technologies will greatly enhance parliamentary service in terms of inclusivity, accessibility and innovation. It will enable participation in parliamentary sessions and committees through video conferencing or live streaming platforms. This allows members of parliament who cannot physically attend the sessions to actively participate and contribute to debates and decision-making processes.

Parliamentarian should be encouraged to use digital collaboration and communication tools, such as Microsoft word, projector, social media, mobile apps, drop box, Slack, Trello, to streamline internal processes with the parliamentary administration. This can enhance teamwork, information sharing and coordination hence dividends of democracy.

REFERENCES

- Abideen, O. (2023). *Exploring artificial intelligence technologies for enhanced deliberative democracy*. The Cable, May18, 2023. <https://www.thecable.ng/exploring-artificial-intelligence-technologies-for-enhanced-deliberative-democracy>.
- Bwalya, K., Plessis, T. D., & Reinsleigh, C. (2012). Conceptualization of e-parliament in promoting e-democracy: prospects for the SADC region. In Z. S. Mehmet (Ed). *E-Parliament and ICT-Based legislation* (pp. 295-311): Concept, experiences and Lessons. Hershey: GI Global.

- Citino, Y. M., (2023). *Bot-Legislator and AI-powered legislative processes*. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/371911554_Bot-Legislator_and_AI-powered_legislative_processes [accessed Jul 03, 2023].
- Holt, D. (2008). *Tools for the modern legislator current technology can make the work of the lawmaker much easier*. State Legislatures JANUARY 2008. 30-32. <https://leg.mt.gov/content/For-Legislators/orientation/tools-for-legislators.pdf>.
- International Republican Institute, 2022. *Going Digital: A Playbook for Legislatures*. https://www.iri.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/01/going_digital_playbook_for_legislatures.pdf.
- Jones, E., Davies, R., Margarint, N., Vasilescu, D. & Sergiu B., (2022). *Digital Horizon — Moldova’s Youth on the Digital Future They Want to See, in Their Own Words*. <https://www.undp.org/sites/g/files/zskgke326/files/2022-11/EN%20Digital%20Horizon%20Paper.pdf>
- Okon, E. A., Patrick, N. & Bosire, O. (2014). Accessibility and utilization of electronic information resources for research by academic staff as selected Nigerian Universities between 2005 and 2012. *International Information and Library Review*, 46, 1-2, 51-60, DOI: 10.1080/10572317.2014.922858
- Rumbul, R. (2016). ICT and citizen efficacy: the role of civic technology in facilitating government accountability and citizens confidence. *In IFIP World Information Technology* (pp. 213-222). Springer, Cham.
- UNDP, 2006. *Empowering Parliaments through the Use of ICTs*. <https://www.unapcict.org/sites/default/files/2019-01/Empowering%20Parliaments%20through%20the%20Use%20of%20ICTs.pdf>.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear respondent,

This questionnaire is designed to gather information in digital tools. Please answer the questions below to enable us to complete the research. We thank you very much as you accept our request.

Oluwaseun O. Akin-Fakorede and Adetoun A. Oyelude

July, 2023.

SECTION A: SOCIO DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Please answer the following questions appropriately.

1. Gender: Male () Female ()
2. Age bracket: 25 – 34 () 35 – 44 () 45 – 54 () 55 – 64 ()
3. Marital status: Single () Married () Separated ()
4. Name of constituency: Abi () Akamkpa 1 () Akamkpa 2 ()
Akpabuyo () Bakassi () Bekwarra () Biase () Boki 1 ()
Boki 2 () Calabar municipal () Calabar south 1 () Calabar south 2 ()
Etung () Ikom 1 () Ikom 2 () Obanliku () Obubra 1 ()
Obubra 2 () Obudu () Odukpani () Ogoja () Yakurr 1 ()
Yakurr 2 () Yala 1 () Yala 2 ()
5. Tenure in office: 1st Tenure () 2nd Tenure () 3rd Tenure () 4th Tenure () 5th Tenure ()

SECTION B

What are the digital tools that are accessible to you as a parliamentarian?

Smart phone () iPad () Laptop () Desktop computer () Digital library ()
Projector () Internet () Virtual video conference ()

SECTION C

What are the extent of usage of digital tools by parliamentarians in the discharge of service?

1. How frequently do you use digital tools for communication with constituents?
a. Daily () b. Weekly () c. Monthly () d. Rarely ()
2. Which digital communication methods do you prefer for interacting with constituents? (Select all that apply)
a. Email () b. Social media () c. Video conferencing () Mobile apps ()
Other () _____
3. How often do you use digital tools for research and gathering information related to parliamentary matters?
a. Daily () b. Weekly () c. Monthly () d. Rarely ()
4. Are you familiar with using digital platforms for participating in virtual parliamentary sessions or committee meetings?
a. Yes, I am familiar and actively use them () b. I am familiar but haven't used them yet ()
c. No, I am not familiar with them ()
5. Which digital platforms or tools do you find most effective for virtual parliamentary sessions or committee meetings? (Select all that apply)
a. Zoom () b. Microsoft Teams () c. Google Meet ()
d. WebEx () e. Other: _____
6. Do you use digital tools for collaborating with other parliamentarians or stakeholders on legislative matters?
a. Yes () b. No ()
7. Which digital tools or platforms do you find most useful for collaboration on legislative matters? (Select all that apply)
a. Google Drive () b. Dropbox () c. Slack () d. Trello () e. Others: _____
8. Have you received any training or support in effectively utilizing digital tools for parliamentary work?
a. Yes, extensive training () b. Yes, basic training () c. No, I haven't received any training ()
9. 10. Have you used digital platforms to conduct virtual town hall meetings or public consultations?
a. Yes () b. No ()
10. How important do you consider the use of digital tools for increasing transparency in parliamentary proceedings?
a. Very important () b. Somewhat important () c. Not important ()
11. Are there any digital tools or platforms that you would like to see implemented to enhance your parliamentary work? (Please describe)
12. Would you be open to further training or workshops on effectively utilizing digital tools for parliamentary work?
a. Yes, I am interested () b. No, I am not interested ()

SECTION D

S/N		Highly	Moderately	Slightly	Not at all	Not applicable
1	Extent to which digital tools have improved the quality of service delivery.					
2	Impact of digital tools on enhancing productivity in service delivery.					
3	Effectiveness of digital tools in improving the efficiency of service delivery processes.					
4	Extent to which digital tools have reduced service delivery time.					
5	Impact of digital tools on minimizing errors and inaccuracies in service delivery.					
6	Effectiveness of digital tools in facilitating quick and accurate data analysis for service delivery.					
7	Extent to which digital tools have reduced administrative costs in service delivery.					
8	Impact of digital tools on streamlining financial processes in service delivery.					
9	Effectiveness of digital tools in improving financial transparency in service delivery.					
10	Extent to which digital tools have reduced paperwork and documentation in service delivery.					
11	Impact of digital tools on cost savings in service delivery.					
12	Extent to which digital tools have improved data security and privacy in service delivery.					
13	Impact of digital tools on reducing operational costs in service delivery.					
14	Overall impact of digital tools on service delivery in terms of time, productivity, efficiency, and cost.					