

# E-Government and E-Democracy in the Making

**Birgit Jaeger**

*Roskilde University, Denmark*

## INTRODUCTION

The development of electronic or digital government (e-government) has varied throughout the world. Although we give it the same name, we know from different studies that, for example, the concept of Information Society can be interpreted in different ways in different cultural settings (Jaeger, Slack, & Williams, 2000; Sancho, 2002). This article provides a general outline of the development of e-government in the West and is primarily based on European and Scandinavian experiences.

It is only possible to give an introduction to e-government if we can define what we are talking about. E-government is still a rather new concept, but most people agree that e-government includes the following features:

- E-government is based on information and communication technologies (ICTs).
- E-government is taking place in public administration.
- E-government concerns electronic ways to perform all kinds of internal administrative tasks.
- E-government also concerns the communication between the public administration and the citizens and other actors in the surrounding society (Jaeger, 2003: 50).

## BACKGROUND

Based on the first part of this definition the history of e-government starts in the beginning of the 1960s when the magnetic tape replaced the punched card. During the 1960s and 1970s big central databases were built and were run on big mainframe computers. The databases mostly contained administrative data from fields where the law and regulations were clear and there was a large amount of data to process. In this period, large registers were formed, and software systems for the government of the economy including salaries, taxes and pensions were developed. These activities were often run centrally and the results were delivered to the relevant authority on paper.

When we turn to the second feature in the definition, we have to include the development of the public administration as well. During the 1980s and 1990s most Western countries

had experienced a profound modernization of their public administration. At first, this modernisation was marked by reforms that have since been collectively labelled New Public Management. According to Rhodes (1997), New Public Management involves two different types of initiatives, the first of which relates to the management itself. These initiatives include a focus on management by objectives, clear standards, and evaluations of the quality of service, while at the same time granting greater attentiveness towards the users of the public service in question. The other type of initiative deals with the introduction of economic incentive structures. This involves the dissection of the public administration in demarcated services, contracting out some services, and other services are sought arranged in competitive-like situations by establishing quasi-markets in which the consumers of the services are provided with an opportunity to choose between different services.

These alterations have had a more or less unintended consequence—the emergence of new policy networks around the provision of public services (Heffen, Kickert & Thomassen, 2000; Rhodes, 1997; Stoker, 1998). These policy networks draw new agents into the management of the tasks in question, including agents from the business community as well as from civil society. Now we see private companies carrying out publicly-commissioned services. We also see civic groups in the local community; NGOs, sports clubs or interest organizations take over different tasks of more social and carrying kind, which were earlier defined as public. (Again we have to be aware of different traditions in different countries but especially in the Scandinavian countries; many of these tasks have been defined as public whereas in other Western countries the family and local community have played a much bigger part in taking care of these activities.) These agents are now engaged in relations with the public administration in collective, binding policy networks. This general development is often described in terms of the transformation of public sector regulation from government to governance.

These reforms differ from country to country (Rhodes, 1999), but the general picture is that these reforms have had great impacts on the way the public administrative tasks are preformed. Here the development of e-government plays a significant role. Many of these reforms would have been very difficult to realize without ICTs. An example of this is the decentralization of administrative tasks from town halls

to public institutions in Denmark. This reform was based on the use of PCs and the development of an internal electronic network between the town hall and all the public institutions. Today we describe it as the start of the development of the intranet in the authority in question (Jaeger, 2003).

This development has continued and today we have a wide range of different software systems for all kinds of administrative tasks. These include electronic archives, systems for handling electronic documents, systems for consideration of different cases and so forth. Garson (2000) provides an overview of this field as well as a review of the literature.

Rather early on, it became clear that the development of e-government was not just a question of the design of an information system and its implementation in an organization. Thus, over the years, a lot of effort has been put into developing methods for the process of design and implementation (Bødker, Kensing, & Simonsen, 2000). Based on analyses of different failures, it was acknowledged that it is very important to draw on the experience of the potential users in the design process. Otherwise, it is easy to produce systems that do not fit their needs. The experience also showed that the implementation of the system is very important if the organization is going to harvest the benefits of the system. A lot of parameters have to be taken into consideration in this process. The staff has to be informed and drawn into the process; it is likely that some training is needed; the way to organize the consideration of cases has to be carefully examined; and it is perhaps necessary to draw in other competences than those that already exist in the organization. The role of the users is not simply a question of starting to use the technology. Studies have shown that users have to domesticate a new technology before they are able to utilize it (Lie & Sørensen, 1996; Silverstone, Hirsch, & Morley, 1992). In this process they can also shape the technology and make it fit to the conditions under which it is utilized (Jaeger, 2005b; Oudshoorn & Pinch, 2003). The inclusion of all these factors is important if one wishes to ensure that the design and implementation of a new information system is to be a success for the public administration.

During the last couple of decades, public authorities on different levels have developed their own information systems for performing their tasks. This has led to a situation where many public agencies are unable to communicate electronically because they use different technological protocols and standards. Thus there is a need today for developing common standards for electronic communication between public agencies at different levels. In recent years, this has become a barrier to the development of e-government and therefore a large amount of resources is now spent on solving this problem.

## **E-DEMOCRACY**

Nevertheless, public authorities do not only communicate internally or with other public agencies, they also communicate with citizens, private companies and other users of public services. This is the last of the above listed features of e-government. With the introduction of the World Wide Web in the 1990s, the public authorities were given a tool for this external communication. During the late 1990s and since, most public agencies have developed their own Web site where they place a lot of information, and electronic forms citizens have to fill out to apply for a public service and so forth.

Also in this area of the e-government, we find different kinds of development. In a study of the development of digital cities in Europe (Bastelaer, Henin, & Lobet-Maris, 2000; Williams, Stewart, & Slack, 2005), it became clear that in some cities [e.g., Copenhagen (Jaeger, 2002)], the web site was developed as a part of the e-government and interpreted as a tool for communication between the public authorities and the citizens, while in other cities [e.g., Amsterdam, (Van Lieshout, 2001)], the web site was developed as a tool for communication between citizens and did not involve the public authorities very much.

In terms of definitions, this is the most debated aspect of e-government. Some people interpret a public web site only as being a tool for administrative tasks for use between the public agency and the citizens, while others see the web site as a place for debate and a tool for democracy as well. The first group defines the objectives of e-government as a way to rationalize public administration and increase its efficiency, thus democratic debate should, in their understanding, not be a part of a public authority's web site but should be developed as something else—as e-democracy. The last group defines the objectives of e-government as a tool for all the tasks a public authority has and, consequently, also a tool for the democratic process. In this understanding, the democratic use of ICTs should be developed side by side with the administrative use.

Whether e-democracy is developed as an integrated part of e-government or as a special service, it is the least developed use of ICTs. To further this development, it is necessary to define what kind of democracy the technology should support. Without going into a theoretical discussion of the concept of democracy, it is possible to state that we have at least two different kinds of democracy: representative democracy and participatory democracy. Representative democracy is what the Western world mostly defines as democracy, and functions through a parliament where all the citizens in a country have the possibility to elect some politicians to represent them. Participatory democracy is defined as the wide range of activities in which citizens participate in the political process. It

3 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage: [www.igi-global.com/chapter/government-democracy-making/13746](http://www.igi-global.com/chapter/government-democracy-making/13746)

## Related Content

---

### The Keys to the White House: A Preliminary Forecast for 2012

Allan J. Lichtman (2010). *International Journal of Information Systems and Social Change* (pp. 31-43).

[www.irma-international.org/article/keys-white-house/38994](http://www.irma-international.org/article/keys-white-house/38994)

### A Survey of Recommendation Systems

Sushma Malik, Anamika Rana and Mamta Bansal (2020). *Information Resources Management Journal* (pp. 53-73).

[www.irma-international.org/article/a-survey-of-recommendation-systems/262970](http://www.irma-international.org/article/a-survey-of-recommendation-systems/262970)

### Integration of Knowledge Resources in R&D Organizations: A Human Resource Management Perspective

Valentina Janev and Sanja Vraneš (2009). *Journal of Information Technology Research* (pp. 35-48).

[www.irma-international.org/article/integration-knowledge-resources-organizations/4141](http://www.irma-international.org/article/integration-knowledge-resources-organizations/4141)

### Change Leadership Styles and Behaviors in Academic Libraries

John Kennedy Lewis (2019). *Advanced Methodologies and Technologies in Library Science, Information Management, and Scholarly Inquiry* (pp. 439-450).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/change-leadership-styles-and-behaviors-in-academic-libraries/215946](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/change-leadership-styles-and-behaviors-in-academic-libraries/215946)

### A Qualitative Study of Small Business Internet Commerce: Critical Success Factors and Challenges

Lei-da Chen, Steve Haney, Alex Pandzik, John Spigarelli and Chris Jesseman (2004). *Advanced Topics in Information Resources Management, Volume 3* (pp. 117-146).

[www.irma-international.org/chapter/qualitative-study-small-business-internet/4615](http://www.irma-international.org/chapter/qualitative-study-small-business-internet/4615)