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ABSTRACT

As a result of societal transformations, political governance shifts, and advances in ICT, online information has become crucial in efforts by public authorities to make citizens better stewards of the environment. Yet, their environmental information provision may not always be attuned to end users’ rationales, behaviours and appreciations. This study revolves around dynamic river level information provided by an environmental regulator – updated once a day or more, and collected by a sensor network of 333 gauging stations along 232 Scottish rivers. Employing an elaborate mixed methods approach with qualitative and quantitative elements, we examined if profiling of web page user groups and the subsequent employment of a specially designed Natural Language Generation (NLG) system could foster more effective online information provision. We identified profiles for the three main user groups: fishing, flood risk related, and paddling. The existence of well-distinguishable rationales and characteristics was in itself an argument for profiling; the same river level information was used in entirely different ways by the three groups. We subsequently constructed an advanced online experiment that implemented NLG based on live river level data. We found that textual information can be of much value in translating dynamic technical information into straightforward messages for the specific purposes of the user groups. We conclude that tailored NLG could be widely used in more effective online
environmental information provision, and we provide five practical recommendations for public authorities and other information providers.

© 2019 The Authors. Published by Elsevier B.V. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

1. Introduction

Public authorities collecting data on the environment have an increased obligation to offer online information access to relevant audiences. This is in line with a global promotion to open public data (Mathur, 2009; Shadbolt et al., 2012) and with broader ‘political modernisation’ aspirations to replace ‘command and control’ regulation with ‘command and covenant’ stewardship (Arts and Leroy, 2006). The latter implies new societal roles for public authorities, with environmental information becoming a vehicle to generate citizen engagement with, and co-governance of, the natural environment (Bäckstrand, 2003; Fleischhauer et al., 2012).

Informational governance (Mol, 2008) examines new forms of governing through information, and transformative changes in governance institutions due to new information flows (Soma et al., 2016b). Scholars interested in informational governance have called for research into the relationships between environmental information and its use by government bodies and wider society (Soma et al., 2016a). Environmental information is increasingly playing a key role in the governance of natural resources, e.g. Arctic marine governance (Lamers et al., 2016), and government portals designed to provide environmental information and associated services can be seen as tools to exchange information between government bodies and other social actors (Sandoval-Almazan and Gil-Garcia, 2012). The importance of tailoring environmental information on such portals to meet the needs of users, is likewise increasingly recognised (see e.g. Christel et al., 2018 for the importance of differential provision of climate information to different sectors).

Opportunities for improved information provision are strongly influenced by rapid developments in Information and Communications Technology (ICT), which have been shaping many domains of contemporary societies (Castells, 2010) including that of natural resource management (Arts et al., 2015b; Conde-Clemente et al., 2017a; Mol, 2008). The rapid increase in accessible digital technologies and data science tools is transforming understanding and management of key natural resources. For example, cloud-based tools for geospatial analysis and earth observation data are now freely available (Gorelick et al., 2017). Social media platforms are increasingly the default source of information during natural catastrophes, including flood events, thus improving two-way communication (Kryvasheyu et al., 2016).

Content determination is an important step in deciding what information is to be communicated in a generated text or visual message. Indeed, content determination is one of the first stages in a Natural Language Generation (NLG) system, i.e. software developed to produce texts in human language from computer-based input data (Reiter and Dale, 2000). NLG texts are nowadays used for all manner of communication purposes ranging from textual weather forecasts to deforestation reports (Ramos-Soto et al., 2013). Increasingly, automatic linguistic descriptions are linked to big data, allowing for the communication of dynamic phenomena (Conde-Clemente et al., 2017c; Siddharthan et al., 2019).

Data science requires harnessing statistical, computational and human components (Blei and Smyth, 2017). In addition to covering specific events, social media can be combined with river level information for national-scale assessment (Barker and Macleod, 2019). The management of water bodies provides a rich setting to study more effective information provision. Water managers seem relatively quick in piloting and implementing Information and Communication Technologies (ICT) (Hannah et al., 2011; Mackay et al., 2015; Montanari et al., 2013). This may be because water management relates to various vital societal concerns including drinking water supply, climate change mitigation, and flood risk control. Developments in sensor networks and other geospatial cyberinfrastructures have been transforming data collection, and thus feed into novel possibilities for information provision and communication (Campbell et al., 2013; De Longueville Bertrand, 2010). The use of web applications, such as digital observatories (Mackay et al., 2015; Vitolo et al., 2015), has been proposed to aid land and water management. More recently, the potential of information sharing platforms for connective action in rural Africa has been demonstrated (Cieslik et al., 2018).

Despite the opportunities and improvements provided by novel ICT and the open data movement (Janssen et al., 2012), there remain many factors that result in ineffective or even absent communication or information provision by public authorities (Kamal, 2006; Loroño-Leturiondo et al., 2019). These factors include liability issues regarding consistency and quality of the provided information (Arts et al., 2015a), and conceptual barriers related to diverging understandings of how ICTs should be used (Arts et al., 2016). Moreover, a review of the spread of ICT to enable public participation in urban water governance found that although these tools enable many people to be better informed, they provided few opportunities for discussion and deliberation (Mukhtarov et al., 2018).

Rivers can be understood as common pool resources, and their users are usually highly heterogeneous and express a plurality of values and interests. This plurality results in different levels of demand with respect to data, specific data format, and level of detail (Paul et al., 2018). In addition, interpretation issues related to discrepancies between science-based expert and layperson understandings may be present, and prior to that, lack of knowledge or vision on who would use the data and for what purposes (Arts et al., 2013; Hertzum, 1999).

In this paper we ask if profiling of web page user groups (phase 1) and the subsequent employment of a specially designed NLG system (phase 2), could be steps towards more effective online information provision. We ask these research questions in the context of a regulator’s web pages of a national network of river level sensors, and employed an elaborate mixed methods approach. We thus present an interdisciplinary study – in between environmental, social and computing science – that brings together several spheres of the total environment, including the hydrosphere (rivers) and anthroposphere (different user groups).

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Materials

We describe a study of the profiling of user groups as input for a NLG knowledge base (Reiter and Dale, 2000). Our focus is on the users of river level webpages developed and hosted by an environmental regulator in the United Kingdom. The Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA) is an executive non-departmental public body of the Scottish Government, and the main public authority on environmental regulation in Scotland (Ioris, 2008). The river level web pages (http://apps.sepa.org.uk/waterlevels/ – hereafter ‘the webpages’, see Fig. 1) are one of the most visited parts of SEPA’s entire website (ascertained through Google Analytics, see Section 2.2.1) and represent a flagship of the organisation’s digital information supply (Arts et al., 2015a; Macleod et al., 2012). The webpages provide dynamic river level
information (updated once a day or more often) collected by a sensor network of (in 2019) 359 online gauging stations, along 232 rivers in 107 catchments across Scotland (cf. Black and Cranston, 1995) (Fig. 1).

While SEPA is not legally required to communicate river level information to the general public, SEPA has an open data plan since 2016, and is statutorily obliged to provide flood warning service to citizens. Moreover, as Arts et al. (2016) show, in the context of new water regulation and attempts to foster public engagement, effective communication of river level information is all the more important. Similar platforms by environmental authorities can be found elsewhere, such as in Australia, http://www.bom.gov.au/australia/flood/?ref=ftr, England (www.environment-agency.gov.uk), the Netherlands (https://waterinfo.rws.nl/#1/kaart/waterhoogte-t-o-v-nap/), Norway (https://www.nve.no/hydrology/), Spain (www.saihebro.com) and the USA (https://water.weather.gov/ahps/index.php). In the Spanish context, hydrological data has been used to create NLG news stories for general users (Molina, 2012; Molina and Flores, 2012). Contrary to our approach, this was based on data journalism, focusing on ‘newsworthy’ changes in time series (see also Novák, 2016).

2.2. Methodas of Phase 1

A mixed-methods approach was employed, using qualitative and quantitative elements. The research comprised two stages with the following aims:

- Phase 1: User group profiling – To identify the webpage user groups, to find out how the key user groups engage with and value the webpages, how the webpages are used in relation to other information sources, and how they feed into decision-making in relation to river activities or interests;
- Phase 2: NLG experiment – To ascertain if supporting textual information (through NLG) for specific user groups aids towards more effective information provision. We selected the ‘fishing’ user group as our focus for the experiment given the high number of users and therefore a potential high number of experiment participants.

Five methods fed into the profiling (phase 1) part of our longitudinal study that commenced in 2012.

2.2.1. Google Analytics

This functionality was enabled by SEPA for its webpages in 2007. Traffic to river level pages was initially reported from 2008; however it was not until 2009 that a substantial number of stations (104) became digitally available. In 2012, Google modified how it calculated page visits; thus, to be able to compare traffic volume across multiple years we constrained our analyses and comparisons to traffic data from the three-year period 2009–2011. The web analytics data were collected using R package googleanalytics v0.1 for R v3.0, which uses the Google Analytics Application Programming Interface (API) protocols. In total, the webpages received 3,449,954 visits, generating 13,538,626 ‘page views’ between 2009 and 2011. In 2011, more than 25% of all visits to SEPA’s entire website concerned the river level webpages.

2.2.2. Online survey

In 2012 and 2013 we ran an online survey targeting the main users of the SEPA webpages. The survey was conducted with SurveyMonkey; it was tested with SEPA staff and independent users, and we advertised the survey by means of a pop-up banner posted by SEPA on its webpages. The banner popped up once per opening period for a returning visitor, unless web browser cookies had been deleted. The survey included 14 main questions, predominantly multiple-choice but with an optional text box for each question. To counter potential seasonal bias (and to include main holidays in the United Kingdom), the survey was opened twice for a prolonged period: December 2012 to April 2013 and June 2013 to October 2013, totalling 125 and 97 days respectively. The survey was also promoted by means of emails sent to various UK organisations with an interest in Scottish rivers. These organisations were primarily identified through Google Analytics of the webpages (Section 3.1.1). A total of 1923 respondents opened the survey, resulting in 1264 unique responses that followed through from the first to the last question (questions could be skipped).

2.2.3. Interviews

Following on from analysis of the survey results we targeted representatives of the identified user groups. The interviewees were randomly sampled, stratified by user group from the pool of survey participants who declared willing to take part in further research and provided contact details. A total of 32 phone interviews (paddling n = 9, fishing n = 10, flood-risk-related n = 6) were conducted. Randomly selected users (i.e. members of the public) that did not fall in either of the focal groups were also interviewed to collect additional perceptions (n = 7). All interviews were conducted in 2013, recorded (mean duration 14 min) and verbatim transcribed.

2.2.4. Workshops

To explore the potential role and form of supporting textual information, two workshops with 15 participants in total were organised in 2014, with representatives of the user groups (cf. user-centred design – Bevan and Curson, 1999). Participants were invited on the basis of preparedness to participate in further research as indicated in the online survey, but stratified by the AB postcode (Aberdeen and Shire) to minimise travel for participants. Participants were divided
into two groups according to their primary interests in the river level pages (evening 1: paddling and fishing; evening 2: flood-risk related, and fishing and other). Four group exercises followed, moderated by a facilitator for each group. First, as an introduction exercise, groups were given printed examples of the current webpages (Fig. 2), and were asked to discuss: what the most important pieces of information on the webpage were; why this was the case; and how long they spent on the webpages. Second, to explore textual forms of how river level information could be presented, participants were asked to describe river level trends (verbally and written), using three printed examples of the river level webpages. Each example was chosen to show distinct hydrographs (e.g. a rapid rising limb). Third, to explore where textual information might be presented, participants were asked to consider the design of the webpage itself. Using printed examples of the river level webpages, groups discussed and annotated the pages to indicate how they felt information could be differently presented. Fourth, groups explained the outcomes to each other, followed by plenary discussion (which was recorded).

2.2.5. Exploration of other online environmental information providers

To gain insight into the information that user groups used in conjunction with the river level information (but which was not to be found on the river level webpages), we studied commercial and non-commercial websites, and other digital sources such as newsletters provided by organisations with a stake in Scottish rivers. These were selected following references from text box suggestions in the online survey and the interviews. Two informal interviews were also conducted with other river level service providers. This interview material was analysed on key features (content, interface) that were not, or differently, provided by SEPA’s river level webpages.

2.3. Method for Phase 2

For Phase 2, an online NLG experiment was conducted over 49 days in 2014 with 33 participants from the fishing user group. The aim of this experiment was to understand if the employment of a NLG system based on a user group profile, could help towards more effective online information provision. A copy of the SEPA webpages was built (including parts A, B and C in Fig. 2) by the research team and linked to SEPA’s river level databases to provide identical information for all 333 monitoring stations in 2014. The copy of the website was hosted on a separate internet domain. Additional textual information was provided on the same screen (Fig. 3D, Table 1). All text categories (see Table 1) randomly changed order upon each new opening of the webpage by a user to pre-empt bias related to position. Except for the ‘regional weather forecast’ (provided through an API from the Met Office – www.metoffice.gov.uk), text was created through NLG on the basis of the dynamic SEPA river level data. The steps carried out, i.e. the NLG ‘pipeline’, are summarized in Table 1.
Participants were invited through their email addresses optionally entered in the online survey. Experiment participants had to create usernames and passwords and were encouraged not to use the SEPA webpages during the time of the experiment. Four forms of data collection were conducted.

I. *Pre-experiment surveys* for research permission and baseline information, and *post-experiment surveys* with four evaluative questions related to: a) whether the additional texts had affected personal decision-making about the user group activity; b) how the participant valued the different elements of the new information (text categories in Table 1); c) how the additional texts could be improved upon; and d) if river level information provision tailored to user groups was deemed desirable.

II. *'Like' buttons*, to make possible rapid evaluation of new information sections by users; each text category (Table 1) was accompanied by three buttons: ‘thumbs up’, ‘thumbs horizontal’ and ‘thumbs down’ (Fig. 3F). One option could be chosen per section per visit.

III. *Feedback box*, allowing participants to provide feedback at any time, on a topic of their choice.

IV. *Website visit behaviour* (tacit user feedback), assessed through mouse clicks or finger tabs required to activate a blurred information section. This blurring technique was used to verify which parts of the webpages were actually viewed (and for how long). Clicking on a new section resulted in a blurring of the previous section. To ensure that participants would not have to guess what information was available where, the headers of each textual information section were readable throughout.

For all methods, free, prior, and informed consent was obtained from all participants regarding the research purpose, methods used, use and storage of data, their rights as participants, implications of their participation, and access to research materials and outputs. Anonymity and confidentiality were ensured in all stages.

3. Results

3.1. Users group profiles

3.1.1. Google Analytics

From Google Analytics it emerged that the number of ‘page views’ throughout each calendar year was seasonal, with peaks during summer months (July, August) and early autumn (September). Through analyses of traffic sources we identified five major streams of traffic: direct (39%); free search generated (34%); fishing related (14%); boat related (6%); and weather/flood risk related traffic (1%); the remaining 6% comprised miscellaneous traffic sources.

We examined the temporal nature of the traffic from each stream and found distinct patterns (Fig. 4).

Fishing-related sources generated traffic with a rather strong seasonality effect, concerning a gradual build-up of visitation rates from...
very low in winter to much higher and sustained rates during summer and autumn (Fig. 4A). Traffic coming from boat-related sources was relatively evenly spread across each year, with somewhat raised website use in autumn (Fig. 4B). The number of visitors from weather/flood risk related sources was low and constant, with the exception of August and December 2011 (Fig. 4D). Focusing on the two major traffic sources, search (Fig. 4C) and direct traffic (Fig. 4E), we observed strong seasonality with monthly page views more than double those during spring and autumn (Fig. 4A). Traffic use in autumn (Fig. 4B). The number of visitors from weather/flood risk related sources was low and constant, with the exception of August and December 2011 (Fig. 4D). Focusing on the two major traffic sources, search (Fig. 4C) and direct traffic (Fig. 4E), we observed strong seasonality with monthly page views more than double those during spring and winter. The different patterns presented by each cluster indicate a diversity with monthly page views more than double those during spring and autumn (Fig. 4A). Trafﬁc very low in winter to much higher and sustained rates during summer and autumn. The different patterns presented by each cluster indicate a diversity with monthly page views more than double those during spring and autumn.

3.1.2. Survey

Subsequent proﬁling based on the online survey helped towards the further delineation of actual user groups. Yet, it emerged, from the online survey, that the various river related activities or interests were not necessarily mutually exclusive. Analysis of answers to the online survey question ‘For which of the following activities do you mainly use the web pages?’ showed that 56% of respondents chose one activity (or interest in the case of ‘flood risk’), and thus just under half of respondents highlighting one or more main activities or interests (Fig. 5).

Two activities were indicated by 28%, three by 125% and four or more by 4% of survey respondents. These ﬁgures underpinned the rationale for SEPA webpage user group proﬁling. For our purposes, we focused on proﬁling users related to the three largest well-delineated groups: ‘fishing’, ‘flood risk’ and ‘paddling’. ‘Monitoring’ was excluded because it emerged to be a ‘secondary’ activity underpinning ‘primary’ activities such as ﬁshing and paddling. Paddling was here deﬁned as a combination of ‘canoeing’ and ‘kayaking’, partly because many information provision websites address both groups combined or in the same interface. However, special attention was given to key differences in webpage usage and decision making around these two activities.

The ‘scientiﬁc research’ respondents appeared to use the webpages generally in a more technical way – for instance by downloading river level data in CSV ﬁles for their own analyses (occasionally provided by SEPA through use of hyperlink in section Fig. 2B) – and were therefore less interesting as a user group for potentially relatively basic additional textual communication.

The ‘other’ category made up 6% of all respondents, and included activities such as swimming, river crossing for a hill race, historical research, mink raft volunteering, diving, teaching, community council activities, mineral panning, freshwater pearl mussel surveying, photographing, path access walking, and simply “being interested”. This diversity of users acted as a reminder that tailored information provision should not be presented at the cost of general information provision, but instead be an addition.

3.1.3. User group proﬁles for ‘fishing’, ‘flood risk related’ and ‘paddling’

This section provides descriptions of user group proﬁles of ‘fishing’, ‘flood risk’ and ‘paddling’. Each proﬁle development was based on the data generated by the five methods in phase 1 of this research (Google analytics, online survey, interviews, workshops, and exploration of other online environmental information providers). Proﬁles are structured around three themes: webpage use; decision making about the activity; and use of other information sources.

3.1.3.1. User group proﬁle ‘fishing’

3.1.3.1.1. Webpage use. A large proportion of all respondents to the online survey indicated that their main use of the webpages was related to fishing (Fig. 5). Almost three quarters of these respondents visited the pages every time in a personal capacity. That this concerned recreational fishing was conﬁrmed through the interviews and the
exploration of other online information providers. Almost half deemed
the information on the webpages ‘very important’, and about a third ‘ex-
tremely important’. The graph (Fig. 2a) was indicated as the most rele-
vant part of the webpage information items. In terms of potential
improvements of the current information on the webpages, 110 respon-
dents mentioned the expansion of the graph’s timescale and 86
respondents desired more frequent river level updates: “more regular
updates of river height levels would save me a lot of petrol money on
wasted journeys. I know that all travelling salmon anglers, especially
those travelling up from England to Scotland, would greatly appreciate
more frequent updates.” A conversion option from metric to imperial
units (river level in feet and inches) was also suggested (n = 28). The
top five most visited river webpages were respectively the Tay, Clyde,
Spey, Tweed and Dee. From the interviews it emerged that the Spey,
Tay, Dee and Tweed are known as the ‘big four’ Scottish game
fish rivers. Indicated seasonal visits dropped steeply in winter, but remained high
(more than 1 visit a day) compared to other user groups.

### Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct vs. fishing related</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Direct vs. boat related</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search vs. fishing related</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search vs. boat related</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.1.3.2. Decision making about activity. Recreational fishers along
Scottish rivers fell roughly in two groups: freshwater game fish (salmon
and trout) and coarse fish (all other species), and may use different
techniques (e.g. fly fishing, spin fishing, legering, float fishing, of
which the former two seem most popular). Most commonly fished for
species were Atlantic salmon (±January–November), trout (prime

---

Fig. 4. Monthly distribution of pageviews generated from fishing related sources (A), boat related sources (B), search related sources (C), weather/flood risk related sources (D), and direct traffic (E) to the river level webpages. The traffic volume related to the different clusters varied in one order of magnitude.
months July and August, also by night fishing), and grayling (may be caught year round). Generally, in order to fish for game fish, advanced booking is required for access to a certain river ‘beat’. Such fishers may include those who travelled from afar, arranged accommodation and are thus generally less flexible. This contrasted with local fishers who may go out when the conditions are right. Still, most fishers tended to construct a decision-making frame with many variables about where along the beat, and when, to fish. For salmon (seemingly the most fished and paid for species), interviewees described the ideal circumstances as a ‘nice’ river flow, with river levels neither ‘too high’ (prevents salmon ‘running’, i.e. swimming, because of high energy cost), nor ‘too low’ (prevents salmon running too), the level not rising too quickly (coloured water makes lure invisible to salmon), not too cold or too warm (leads to inactive behaviour – “about 57 and 58 °F [~14 °C] is ideal”). It was noted that ideal circumstances also depended on the specifics of the river and the beat, e.g. a certain river level may create favourable conditions along some beats. Other important factors included recent catches, beat availability, weather (affecting fish behaviour, but also influencing the practice of fishing, with wind direction being important for casting) time of the year, etc. Overall though, circumstances were deemed best during a gradual fall of the river level after a high: “salmon will take a fly more readily on a falling river”. The most important information that fed into decision making was related to the river levels and the weather.

3.1.3.3. Use of other information sources. According to the online survey, more than half of the fishers used the webpages in combination with weather information. Other, less commonly used, sources were webcams, tidal information, Facebook updates from ghillies, angling club newsletters, and catch reports. If SEPA could provide additional information, a vast majority of the fishing-related respondents would request water temperature, more than half rainfall information, and about a third water flow and historical river level info. From the other materials it emerged that webcams were used widely by fishers, although the coverage in Scotland is not deemed very good (yet increasing). Summer low river level indications (as opposed to all-time lows) would make a better benchmark for fishers to indicate river level (i.e. ‘above normal summer low’). In contrast to the webpages, a very popular commercial website (www.fishpal.co.uk) provided: river levels in imperial units, and ‘above normal summer lows’; trend (steady, falling, rising); and river level graphs also for the last 28 days and year so far. From other fishing-related information providers, it emerged that alert services for desirable river conditions seemed to grow bigger. Mobile texts alerts (through commercial providers) indicated when a river level hit the desired height, or the general trend of the river level.

3.1.3.2. User group profile ‘flood risk related’

3.1.3.2.1. Webpage use. 18.5% (n = 265) of survey respondents indicated a flood risk related interest in the webpages (Fig. 5). Of these, half mentioned using them every time in a personal capacity (which was considerably lower than the other two user groups). Information for flood risk interest was deemed mostly ‘very’ and ‘extremely’ important. To most respondents, the graph (Fig. 2A) was the most important part of the webpages (almost three quarters considered it extremely relevant), but the bar indicator (Fig. 2C) was also highly valued. 35 respondents would make a better benchmark for desirable river conditions seemed to grow bigger. Mobile texts alerts (through commercial providers) indicated when a river level hit the desired height, or the general trend of the river level.

Fig. 5. Number of indications against each of the main activities (or interests), as generated by respondents to the online survey (n = 1264 in total, n = 1076 for this question with 1435 indications). The legend shows the number of different activities as indicated by respondents. For example, the red part in the ‘fishing’ category denotes that 113 respondents indicated two main activities, one of which was fishing. (For interpretation of the references to colour in this figure legend, the reader is referred to the web version of this article.)
warning system, I prefer to be able to make my own judgements on the like-
lihood of high water, but I can only do that when SEPA keeps its river level
data current”. Webpages for the larger Scottish rivers were the most vis-
ited ones. They were visited throughout the year (with less of a drop in
the winter as compared to the other user groups) and with generally
frequent checks (more than one a day).

3.1.3.2.2. Decision making about interest. SEPA has a designated flood
warning system which means that the residents living in areas in dan-
ger of flooding can request being contacted by SEPA, usually by phone
or text, when conditions of actual flood risk appear. Many of the ‘flood
risk related’ user group seemed to have registered for this system. How-
ever, it emerged that the system was unsatisfactory to many webpage
users; it was deemed to be too general for local geographies, and some-
times too slow. Members of this user group used the river level informa-
tion on different rivers within the same river system or catchment
either from upstream stations or nearby stations. They did so (in combi-
nation with weather information, particularly rainfall) to anticipate po-
tential floods in their local area. “We get quite a lot of flood warnings, (…) and really the only way for us to tell how much it is likely to affect us par-
cularly is from the rate of rise at the nearest monitoring station”. The bar
indicator received regular criticism (since flooding events often fell into
the ‘normal’ range). An integration of the bar and graph (cf. the English
Environment Agency) would make the information to some users more
useful as it would allow for quicker interpretation.

3.1.3.2.3. Use of other information sources. From the survey respond-
ants, almost three quarters used the webpages in combination with in-
formation about the weather, about a third with flooding-specific
information, and a fifth with a web cam. If SEPA could provide addi-
tional information, rainfall information would have priority, followed
by water flow and historical river level information. Weather informa-
tion in relation to snow melt was also deemed important, and over-
views of previous years to compare for each month would help to
better contextualise the values in the bar indicator which were seen as
not very useful.

3.1.3.3. User group profile ‘paddling’

3.1.3.3.1. Webpage use. An outcome of the online survey was that
paddlers accessed the webpages also from their smartphone and some-
times near a river. The graph (Fig. 2A) was deemed the most relevant in-
formation on the webpages. Amongst the most given suggestions for
improvement of the current webpages were the expansion of the graph’s timescale (towards weeks, months or even years as opposed to
days); improvement of the bar indicator (Fig. 2C) – the ‘normal’
category was found to be too crude and thus unhelpful. More frequent
river level updates and a better map that included catchments were
also returning suggestions. In contrast to kayakers, canoeists visited
mostly the webpages for the larger, ‘flatter’ rivers such as the Tay and
the Spey. The webpages were used throughout the year (with most fre-
quent visits either in or just before the weekend), but with slightly more
use for kayakers in autumn (i.e. September–November). For canoeists
there was a clear dip in winter (December–February) which was not
present for kayakers.

3.1.3.3.2. Decision making about activity. From the sources it emerged
that the graph was primarily used by paddlers for two insights: 1. How
much water is in the river (too low: scrape ground, too high: danger
from overhanging trees); and 2. Whether river levels are falling or ris-
ing. For kayakers, rising water often meant challenging conditions, and
this was usually best predicted by “big spikes” on the graph. Many expe-
rienced kayakers were ‘white water kayakers’ and they described them-
selves as ‘rain chasers’. ‘When?’ and subsequently ‘where?’ were the
underlying dimensions of white water kayakers’ rationales; they ac-
tively looked for small rivers in spate that offered rough white water
and rapids – and were prepared to travel and adjust plans last minute.
An interviewee said: “Some of these [rivers] are rising and dropping and
in a couple of hours, you have missed it. Especially the rarer ones that you
get every, maybe once a year or once every two years”. The best river
conditions tended to be in winter – more rainfall, although sometimes
low upstream rivers in winter because of frozen hills - and spring (mel-
ting snow). If the summer was dry there would be very little paddling,
despite summer holidays. White water kayakers did not necessarily
paddle entire stretches of rivers or burns, but looked for shorter and in-
tense runs with fast water or steep descent, often in small groups of two
to six paddlers. Compared to white water kayakers, the webpages were
less used by canoeists for finding rivers, and more for finding out about
the conditions of the targeted river. This was mainly because fewer
Scottish rivers were deemed suitable for canoeing; canoeists were gen-
erally looking for relatively flat and wide rivers (downstream) to cover
larger stretches (i.e. ‘touring’), and it was deemed important to know
about potential rapids or shoots in such rivers. Canoeists would take
less risk due to the open boat design (avoidance of strong currents),
and would generally go out less in winter. Indeed, water temperature
had to be ‘bearable’ in case of capsizing. One interviewee said that can-
oeis were “much easier to sink and the consequences of a swamping are
much more difficult to deal with. So canoeists generally tend to be more
conservative than white water kayakers who probably go out more for
thrills”.

3.1.3.3.3. Use of other information sources. Weather information
would be the most helpful additional information to kayakers and
canoers according to the survey. For canoeist, this did not just include
rainfall but also wind, as strong wind makes steering of a canoe more
challenging. Paddlers would also welcome water flow, water tempera-
ture, and historical river level information. Some paddlers also looked
for dam release information and webcams. But rainfall information
stood out as being most important, the reason being that it allowed
users to better predict the river attributes level and flow. Important
here for kayakers was that many of the steep, smaller (upstream) rivers
did not have gauging stations. They overcame this by looking at the
trend in the wider catchment of the particular stream. The assumption
was that if adjacent rivers go up, there was good chance the river of
choice could rise too. This involved taking some risk, explained an inter-
viewee: “I have turned up at rivers hundreds of times and I have lost count
the amount of times I have turned up at a river and there has been nothing in it, when you think, ‘there has got to be water in it!’”. It was said that the
risk may be better estimated on the basis of additional information such as
rainfall and water flow. Dam releases and webcams were also men-
tioned in this respect. Kayaking and canoeing communities often used
their own calibrations for river level and river trend (sometimes on
the same site and interface). Kayaking websites frequently offered tools
to match rivers to personal condition preferences, or easy-to-
view indications of whether rivers volumes are e.g. ‘huge, very high,
high, medium, low, scrapeable, empty’, and their water level trends
(‘going up, going down, steady’).

3.1.4. Potential for NLG

It emerged from phase 1 that the graphical presentation of the river
level data was clear and understandable, and that this should remain
the basis for any improved information provision. In line with the out-
comes of the profiling exercises, workshop participants confirmed that
their interest in river level data, and subsequent potential for improve-
ment, was linked with the specific interests of each user group. For ex-
ample, for fishers it was important to establish whether there were
“angling opportunities”, while kayakers were keen to know “whether parts of the river are passable”. For the fishing user group there were
three common elements to the descriptions of river level trends given
by participants, and these were subsequently used for the creation of
NLG:

1) The rate of the river level trend (e.g. rapidly falling);
2) Characteristics of the graphs i.e. steady periods, peaks, and to a lesser
extent troughs, were described relative to the wider trend in the graph:
3) The general water level of the river.
3.2. Results online NLG experiment

‘Fishing’ had emerged as by far the largest user group (Fig. 5), and so it was decided to target this group for the experiment. This generated 33 participants of this user group, resulting in 235 platform visits. Ten participants visited the website once, 23 participants twice or more (Fig. 6a). Of all the experiment elements, the graph was the most looked at element (Fig. 6b). This may be surprising because it had no novelty factor, yet it was found in phase 1 that the graph was a trusted and highly appreciated feature of the SEPA webpages for the fishing user group. Still, participants were generally positive about the ‘general information’ NLG text category (see Table 1, and Fig. 3D). Although offering information also visible in the graph (“should be obvious in the graphics”), it served a function for some, for example “to easily read the precise river level”. Such appreciation of the ‘general [river level] information’ category was also reflected in Fig. 6c.d. The ‘temporal trend’ NLG text category scored highest in the voluntary ‘thumbs’ evaluation (Fig. 6d) and received the highest amount of clicks and time spent on it (Fig. 6c). From the written feedback it emerged that the main disadvantage of this category was the lack of precision in its descriptions. ‘Station context’ was not valued highly by fishers and least time was spent on it (Fig. 6c); it was deemed “too general” and not adding to the graphed information. ‘Regional weather’ scored fairly high on all fronts (Fig. 6c.d); while not as elaborate as weather websites, it was valued by several participants in that it “saves having to access a separate weather site”. ‘Geographical trend’ received a relatively high amount of clicks and time spent on it (Fig. 6c), but a low score from the ‘thumbs’ category. While it was deemed useful for obtaining a bigger picture, the mixed appreciation of the ‘geographical trend’ category may have reflected that the primary focus of fishers was generally on local ‘micro-conditions’ of the river at a particular river beat. To the question if the texts affected decision making or insight in relation to fishing, mixed replies were given. On the one hand it was felt that the information overlapped quite a bit with the information obtainable from the
groups comprising the bulk of users (Fig. 5, Section 3.1.3), and provide level information, it may be feasible to identify and pro-

authorities chatbots, which engage in dialogue with website users. A challenge not addressed in (see e.g.https://twitter.com/riverlevelsukalthough not using NLG). It is media may be opportune here as well, e.g. tweeting river level stations (Lazard and Atkinson, 2015; Siddharthan et al., 2019). The additional role on this front too (Ayturan et al., 2018; Bellinger et al., 2017; Mosavi 2015)

words of another respondent:

to the original, pretty good, SEPA data

graph. On the other hand they were valued as “helpful”, and one particip-

ant said: “I really like the additional data given in the left-hand column. This is great contextual information for fishers and adds significant value to the original, pretty good, SEPA data”. A lot of respondents saw the potential of user group tailored river level information provision. In the words of another respondent: “yes it would be a step forward, as myself as a salmon fisherman has different needs as oppose to farmer etc.” Other positive comments included “set up looked very good” and “from a fisherman’s point of view I found the experiment most helpful”.

4. Discussion

4.1. User group profiling and NLG

Our triangulated results suggest that more basic profiling exercises for managerial purposes by public authorities may suffice as a foundation for improved information provision. The articulation of user groups through profiling and the experiment has importance not only for a river level or information tailoring context, but also for wider river and catchment planning and management. To our knowledge, we present the most elaborate description of main (online) river user groups at a national level (Section 3.1.3). Moreover, traditional stakeholder analyses tend to approach communities in terms of power relations and (conflicting) interests (cf. Reed, 2008); we considered stakeholder positions in the context of online information use, thus providing insight into relationships between offline outdoor spheres related to river use, and online spheres related to information.

When considering the evaluation methods in the experiment, the (NLG generated and thus textual) category of temporal trends came out as the most important one. This was perhaps surprising in the sense that this information was essentially ‘available’ in the graph too (as opposed to geographical trend or weather forecast). While acknowledging the important role of visualisation in information communication (Grainger et al., 2016; Levinton et al., 2017; McNerney et al., 2014), our investigation indicates that there is added value of textual information provision in addition to visual information provision. Indeed, a combination of visual and textual content appears a fruitful route (Lazard and Atkinson, 2015; Siddharthan et al., 2019). The additional layer of explanation offered by text was valued by various experiment participants. From our results we argue that NLG has the potential to play a much bigger role in tailored or dynamic environmental information provision. This aligns with conclusions by others in different domains (Conde-Clemente et al., 2017a,b; Gkatzia et al., 2017). In addition, in contexts where language may have an edge over visual representations – for instance because of limited data transfer speed, poor coverage, or older hardware or software (Banks, 2013; Maffey et al., 2015) – NLG will be of much value too. Connection to particular social media may be opportune here as well, e.g. tweeting river level stations (see e.g. https://twitter.com/riverlevelssuk although not using NLG). It is likely that artificial intelligence and machine learning will play a bigger role on this front too (Ayturan et al., 2018; Bellinger et al., 2017; Mosavi et al., 2018). For instance, advanced datamining can be used to create chatbots, which engage in dialogue with website users.

4.2. Barriers and opportunities for tailored information provision by public authorities

Online environmental information provided by public authorities is often non-specific. This study shows that, at least with respect to river level information, it may be feasible to identify and profile main user groups comprising the bulk of users (Fig. 5, Section 3.1.3), and provide tailored information. However, two main concerns should accompany such an exercise.

First, while most users indicated one focal activity or interest, almost half indicated multiple activities (Fig. 5). A challenge not addressed in this work is how textual tailoring could support multiple activities of a user (see Webster et al., 2014).

Second, creating categories of inclusion simultaneously creates exclusions, which in turn may have implications for creating or perpetuating digital divides and social inequalities (Arts et al., 2018; Castells, 2010). Public authorities particularly need to operate conscientiously on this front and have clear responsibilities with regard to informational governance in the Information Age (Loroño-Leturiondo et al., 2019; Mol, 2008).

Bearing these two points in mind, several arguments can be made in favour of tailored approaches to information provision. This holds especially true when, as this study shows with regard to river level information, the same information is used in entirely different ways by clearly identifiable user groups.

First, it aligns with society-wide trends towards user-centric approaches of environmental governance (Zulkafi et al., 2017). If public authorities take seriously the normative components related to the late-modern governance shifts in political modernization processes (e.g. Arts and Leroy, 2006), then effective information provision – and perhaps information co-production (Loroño-Leturiondo et al., 2019; Hewitt and Macleod, 2017) – is a key vehicle towards ‘command and covenant’ stewardship and interaction with members of the public. A key question related to our case though, is to what degree mere information provision is desirable, as opposed to two-way communication streams with double or triple feedback loops. Examples of the latter reside in developments related to digital catchment observatories and polycentric environmental resources management (Mackay et al., 2015; Zulkafi et al., 2017) in which stakeholders play a central role in the constitution and operation of the information network (Macleod, 2015).

Second, consistency in non-specific information provision by public authorities may be implicitly sought but not necessarily achieved. For instance, SEPA’s separate flood warning system targets residents vulnerable to flooding. Yet, the ‘flood risk related’ group pursued independent information interpretation because the flood warning system was deemed too general and sometimes too slow. Opportunities provided by access to non-specific information could thus be seen as an argument against tailored information provision. On the other hand, tailoring does not preclude additional provision of raw data or basic information, and in this case the argument by the flood risk group was not against profiling, but followed from discontent with a different service. The general point here is that tailored approaches to information provision may address differentiation in access and use amongst user groups.

5. Conclusion and recommendations

We set out to address if profiling of Scottish river level web page user groups (phase 1), and the subsequent associated employment of a specially designed NLG system (phase 2), could be steps towards more effective (tailored) online information provision. With regard to phase 1, we identified and described very specific profiles for the three main user groups: fishing, flood risk related and paddling. The clear delineation and existence of well-distinguishable rationales is an argument for profiling; the same river level information was used in entirely different ways by the three groups. This insight provides a strong basis for steps towards the tailoring of environmental information. Our triangulated results indicate that basic profiling exercises for managerial (non-academic) purposes by public authorities may suffice as a foundation for improved information provision.

In terms of provided information categories for the fishing user group through NLG based on live and dynamic river level data (phase 2), the category of temporal trend came out as the most important one. It demonstrated that besides visual information, textual information provision can be of value to users. The additional layer of explanation, which is arguably more difficult to provide visually, is valued by
many and plays an important role in translating dynamic technical information to plain messages for the specific purposes of the user groups. Finally, we list five key recommendations for public authorities and other information providers (for instance operating in the realm of climate services – Vaughan and Dessai, 2014):

1. If transformations towards ‘command and covenant’ stewardship are taken seriously by public authorities (Arts et al., 2016), more effective information provision and communication is a key dimension, often in need of improvement.

2. Many public authorities and other information providers do not have full insight into who uses the provided information, for what reasons, and how it is interpreted. Profiling user groups is a fruitful and relatively straightforward way of finding out about a range of uses and demands for information.

3. Effective information provision may take many shapes, but since environmental information is used in entirely different ways by diverse user groups, the tailoring of information is an important step towards more targeted information provision and more effective communication.

4. There is value in textual information provision (for instance provided through NLC) alongside visual information provision.

5. Collaborations between public authorities who provide information and (interdisciplinary) research groups are needed to lead to researched applications of digital, social and natural science knowledge and methodologies, to provide solid insights for all involved and beyond.
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