Summary Table 1: Digital Divide

Research Papers

Citation	Topic	Research design	Results	Conclusion	Link
Jaeger, P. T., Bertot, J. C., Thompson, K. M., Katz, S. M., & DeCoster, E. J. (2012). The intersection of public policy and public access: Digital divides, digital literacy, digital inclusion, and public libraries. *Public library quarterly, 31*(1), 1-20.	Examines what has happened in the gap between concepts and policies, as public libraries organize to provide Internet education, access, and assistance. It also examines the roles of public libraries related to the concepts and the ways in which these roles have been shaped by policies that impact access to information that is increasingly embedded within a range of technologies and the ways in which policy could better support public libraries in these roles and the ways that these roles	Literature review and analysis.	• The United States, for all its technological achievements, has lagged behind many other industrialized nations in the establishment of comprehensive and competitive information-access programs. • Public libraries are relied on more than any other cultural institution to overcome the digital divide, teach digital literacy, and foster digital inclusion. Yet, are predominantly excluded from the funding made available for digital literacy and digital inclusion, and are excluded from the decision-making processes related to policy in this area • While governments at all levels are relying on public libraries to	Three core changes to harmonize the policy and practice of digital literacy and digital inclusion: • Do not reduce library funding. • Bring public libraries into the discussions, designs, and decisions • Libraries need to take more initiative in terms of advocacy.	http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/01616846.2012.654728#.VtlF2H197cs

	can contribute to public library advocacy and a voice in policy making		ensure digital inclusion, the same governments are reducing the funding of the very libraries that are being relied on.		
Citation	**Topic**	**Research design**	**Results**	**Conclusion**	**Link**
Kim, T., & Doh, S. (2006). Analysis of the Digital Divide between Disabled and Non-disabled People in South Korea. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration, 28*(2), 231-261.	Analysis of the digital divide between disabled and non-disabled people by comparing their personal information capacity which consists of four sub-categories: the "access index", "capacity index", "quantitative usage index", and "qualitativeusage index".	Quantitative : Using the Oaxaca model, the digital divide was separated into two parts: the digital divide caused by "disability" and that caused by "other individual characteristics" such as education and household income.	• All four indices are lower for disabled people, and the "usage indices" of disabled people areparticularly low compared to that of non-disabled people. • As regards young people,"disability" is a much more important factor than "other individual characteristics" incausing a digital divide in their personal capacity index. • Regarding middle-aged people, thedigital divide between the two groups is mostly caused by "other individual characteristics",	In order to design an effective government policy to improve the information capacity of the disabled, that policy must consider both the direct and indirect paths.	http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/23276665.2006.10779323

			among which education is the most important.		
Macdonald, S. J., & Clayton, J. (2013). Back to the future, disability and the digital divide. *Disability & Society, 28*(5), 702-718.	The research investigates what impact digital technologies have had in improving the life-chances for disabled people from deprived neighbourhoods in the northeast of England and explores how disabled people engage with digital and assistive technologies in order to overcome disabling barriers and social exclusion	Quantitative: The data in this study were obtained through a quantitative survey completed by local residents in socially excluded areas in the city of Sunderland. A questionnaire gathered basic demographic data, information concerning usage of various technologies, involvement with digital inclusion activities and the discernible impact and benefits upon living circumstances, quality of life and life-chances.	• Disabled people in this study were far less likely to use digital technologies than people in the control group. • knowledge and cost that are barriers to engagement. • Disabled people in this study did not engage with assistive technologies to any great extent. • 57% (n = 145) of disabled people did not consider that technology had improved the quality of their lives. • In five domains of social exclusion (education, employment, social networking, independent living and healthcare), the research discovered no statistical evidence to suggest that digital technologies had improved in any of	Investment by both local and national government in terms of reducing social exclusion in areas of healthcare, education and employability has not yet been successful for disabled people in Sunderland. This paper has presented (some) statistical evidence that it is poverty, a lack of ownership, restricted knowledge and inaccessible ICT that construct new forms of barriers for disabled people in this study. Furthermore, it could be suggested that barriers to digital inclusion also relate to the under use of already existing public facilities in the city due to issues of disabling technologies/public environments (Oliver 2009).	http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/09687599.2012.732538

			these domains for disabled people in Sunderland. • When examining the relationship between digital technologies, enriched employment opportunities and income improvement, again there were significant differences between disabled people and the control group.	These data might indicate that disabling barriers cause aspects of digital exclusion for disabled people rather than micro issues resulting from an individual's impairment. There is still a long way to go before digital technology successfully impacts on the lives of disabled people in order to reduce social exclusion.	
Sachdeva, N., Tuikka, A. M., Kimppa, K. K., & Suomi, R. (2015). Digital disability divide in information society: A framework based on a structured literature review. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society, 13*(3/4), 283-298.	The purpose of this paper is to create a conceptual framework, based on a structured literature review, to analyze the digital disability divide and help find solutions for it.	Literature review and analysis: 4,778 conference and journal publications were systematically analyzed.	The literature is highly focused on the technological and social aspects of the digital disability divide, with technology and societal attributes being the core sub-attributes for a comprehensive model. The previous literature did not significantly study the consequences of the financial situation of individuals; rather, the predominant focus was on the have-nots and countries with low income potentials. Furthermore, motivation	Technical innovation is not enough; Social situation must also improve for both the individual and the community. Systemic innovation is also necessary, which makes technology affordable and socially accepted. Business innovations can play a key role in bringing affordable ICT to citizens with impairments.	http://www.eme raldinsight.com/d oi/pdfplus/10.11 08/JICES-10-2014-0050

			reveals a compelling case within the digital disability divide subset.		
Seale, J., Draffan, E. A., & Wald, M. (2010). Digital agility and digital decision-making: conceptualising digital inclusion in the context of disabled learners in higher education. *Studies in Higher Education, 35*(4), 445-461.	The study aimed to explore the e-learning experiences of disabled students at one higher education institution. The discussion will focus particularly on concepts of digital agility and digital decision-making, and will consider the potential implications for the empowerment of disabled students.	Building a conceptual framework. Description of the project LEXDIS where participants were 30 students of the University of Southampton, with disabilities which were varied.	- An important personal resource that disabled students in the study drew on when using technologies to support their studies was their 'digital agility'. - High familiarity with technology. 31 different types of strategies that students were adopting and devising when using technology to support their learning. - High levels of confidence in ability to use technology. - factors that influenced decisions about whether or not to use technologies were varied, including: technological factors, personal factors , IT skills and literacy and contextual social	E-learning experiences of disabled students have been identified and described by two useful concepts: digital agility and digital decision-making which illuminate how digital inclusion in higher education is influenced by a complex inter-play of factors and reveal important implications for teaching and learning support services in terms of empowerment.	https://ore.exeter.ac.uk/repository/bitstream/handle/10871/9947/Digital%20Agility.pdf?sequence=2

			factors. • Students loved and hated technologies (both general and specific) in equal measure, and were able to express preferences for using certain technologies over others based on detailed knowledge of their strengths and weaknesses.		
Vicente, M. R., & Lopez, A. J. (2010). A multidimensional analysis of the disability digital divide: Some evidence for Internet use. *The Information Society, 26*(1), 48-64.	Examination of the Internet digital divide between people with and without disabilities from a multidimensional approach. Rather than analyzing the gap in terms of "haves" and "have-nots," a range of Internet-related dimensions—affordability, motivation and attitudes, skills, usage, and others—is taken	Secondary analysis from the publicly available data set of the project eUser (2005), funded by the European Commission's Information Society Technology (IST) program.	• The eUser data show that people with disabilities do lag behind the rest of the population in Internet use. • Technical accessibility barriers are the most probable cause. • Many striking examples of accessibility deficits across the spectrum of ICT products and services. • Problems with the adaptive technology. • Technical barriers might also be the	• Attenuation of the financial barriers to access the Internet with Public Internet Access Points. • Subsidies or credits to buy ICT equipment for adaptive technologies and to connect to the Internet. • Accessibility as a high priority area for policy action. • Crucial for the EU to make	http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/pdf/10.1080/01615440903423245

into account.			reason for the discrepancies in digital skills. • The lesser digital skills of people with disabilities do not appear to influence what they do online. • Overall, affordability and accessibility are the most pressing areas for policy action in order to bridge the digital divide.	appropriate laws since business "will only make Web sites accessible if government forces them to". • Design should also incorporate the participation of users. • Vital to draw attention to the fact that the input from people with disabilities is needed also in the design of ICT surveys.	
Watling, S. (2011). Digital exclusion: coming out from behind closed doors. *Disability & Society, 26*(4), 491-495.	UK Government visions of digital future: potential – obstacles/risks and need of awareness for disabled people needs.	Literature review.	• Research excludes the digital requirements of disabled people. • Economic barriers. • Inadequate technical support. • Exclusive design practices.	Without increased awareness of digital exclusion for disabled people, government expansion into digital-only welfare will isolate even further those who have the most to gain.	http://eprints.lincoln.ac.uk/4512/1/Disability_and_Society_Journal_Current_Issues_SueWatling_final_version_161210.pdf