E-government harm: An assessment of the Danish coercive Digital Post strategy

PhD defense

Jesper B. Berger Roskilde University 22. June 2015



About the author...

- Jesper B. Berger (52), has been a PhD-student from 2012-2015, now PostDoc at University of Siegen, Germany
- M.Sc. in Engineering, holds a 25+ years industrial carrier in IT supported work processes within public sector, different types of government, different types of positions and different domains
- Was elected member of local government in Nuuk, Greenland due to ethnic unfairness, has been trade union representative in various positions

My stance...

- Researchers should fight for a better world, especially emancipation of the suppressed
- Research should be grounded in practice and collaboration with practitioners
- Researchers should engage with the public to promote interventions and change
- Technology can lead to both improved efficiency and satisfied citizens/staff (I'm NOT against technology!)

What is the problem?

- Expected positive effects from e-government has not been realized
- This may tempt governments to enforce digital services onto citizen (coercive egovernment)
- (e-government = public services to the citizen through the Internet)

Why is it a problem?

- When e-government is voluntary, citizens can avoid consequences from e-government
- We don't know the consequences of coercive e-government
 - to citizens
 - to civil servants
 - to the public organization
 - to the society

The Danish e-government strategy,

two paths



Digital Post (by law)

- Every company has a digital postbox, no exemption
- Every citizen (age 15+) will have a digital postbox, citizens can apply for exemption
- Public institutions can send digital mail
- By law, the recipient has the responsibility to 'empty' the digital mailbox
- The citizen cannot demand digital mail

The 'Wave plan' (by law)

Social security card, EU health cart, enrolment in primary school, enrolment in daycare, passport, driver's likens, new address, new GP, enrolment in high school and higher education, student loan, application for travel, name, handicap aid, rats, marriage, aid for daycare, art aid, tax, father declaration, environmental complaints, use of public buildings, arms permit, building permit, trash, divorce, adoption, children's aid, spouse aid, housing aid, parking, criminal record, retirement pension, social pension, house tax aid, heating aid, maternity aid - more to come, 70+





What is new in my approach?

- E-government is normally perceived as
 - voluntary for citizens
 - only entailing positive effects
 - technology can be planned, designed and implemented to achieve the anticipated effects
- What is new in my approach
 - technology might not operate as planned
 - outcomes from technology cannot be anticipated, might be negative and might harm people
 - critical approach, employees, operations

Case and Research question

- Case
 - Coercive e-government is explored in the case of the Danish Digital Post strategy
- Research question
 - Why is Digital Post perceived as harmful? How could this have been avoided and how is it mitigated in the future?

What theories are my foundation?

- Institutional theory (Scott, 2008)
 - how rules, norms and beliefs shape the behavior of organizations, provides the significance of the "field" including the process of isomorphism
- Technology enactment framework (Fountain, 2001)
 - model that aims to explain how objective technology is shaped by organizational and institutional forces to become enacted technology, which may lead to different outcome than the anticipated

Technology Enactment Framework (Fountain, 2001)



Research approach

- Critical IS Research (CR)
 - criticizes tradition, technology determinism and pure performance intent, emancipation, reflexivity, transformational redefinition
- Participatory Design (PD)
 - genuine collaboration with practitioners, voice to the weak, practice knowledge, opposition to power, workers have a right to influence
- Engaged Scholarship (ES)
 - research should solve problems in the real world, engagement with practitioners, dissemination of research may affect change

13

How did I gather data?

- Delphi study, focus groups in two local governments
- Action Research in two Citizen Service Centers
- Interpretive study in one Job Center
- Adoption study of 98 local governments
- Responsiveness study of 243 public institutions
- Survey of clerical staff (468) (collaboration with trade union)
- Different research purposes/perspectives (ES)



Imposing E-government Harm model



Implications

Practice

- Digital Post harms
 - vulnerable citizens in some situations
 - staff (workload + work life)
 - organizations (economy)
 - public sector ethos (alienation, mistrust)
 - Imbalance
- Harm follows from enacted technology (flawed instantiation)

Research

- Clear case of enacted technology
- More research depth is needed into e-government constructs
- E-government research needs to be extended
 - harm
 - coercive e-government
 - responsible e-government ethics

17

Why does harm occur?

- No joint responsibility for the overall solution. Public institutions have individual responsibility
- DP too flexible, a multitude of variations to support the entire communication chain
- Lack of control of the implementation process due to software market reliance
- No coordinating entity with power to ensure public sector compliance
- Poor design choices on crucial elements (EasyID, forwarding) together with harsh rethoric
- Failure of adjusting due to lack of responsiveness and agility
- Complexity does not match time frame

How could e-government harm have been avoided? Design choices

- Enabling forwarding of DPs
- Easier EaseID login (e.g. by single-level login)
- EasyID should not have been based on sensitive CPR, alternatively means should have been provided for staff to assist citizens directly
- Applying for exemption should have been more "worthy"
- · Certain vulnerable citizens should never have been forced
- PDF forms should only have been allowed when they could have been signed digitally
- · Standardization of digital postboxes and hierarchies
- External receipts to citizens when DP received by staff

How could e-government harm have been avoided? Implementation choices

- Reduced project scope by only including digital post to citizens
- Incremental evolution from G2G, then G2B and then G2C
- Only <u>one</u> end-to-end solution from the 3 most important (volume) feeding systems should be provided to start with
- Project controls of public organizations concerning commitment, resource allocation and implementation to ensure synchronicity
- Involvement of and responsiveness towards operational staff and citizens to be able to redirect and adjust

Ethical e-government questions...

Is it right for public institutions to mandate e-services, to force citizens to be users of the electronic media? And if it is right, should an exit analogue strategy for a particular e-service, likewise, be mandatory? May e-government create feelings of anxiety amongst citizens? Is it right to lay-off staff in the department that is struggling with new e-government services? May e-government impose economic loss on

public institutions? May e-government create unequal access to welfare benefits? Is it

right to send digital forms to citizens to print, fill out, scan or mail with the implied dependency of computer, Internet connection, printer etc.? Is it right for government to impose e-government initiatives to lower levels of government and reduce the funding according to estimated costs reductions? Is it right to do it without a transparent publicly accessible business case or without recurrent evaluation and regulation? Is it right to impose e-government on beneficiaries that may be considered weak in electronic communication capabilities? Is it right to impose e-government on

citizens aged 70+? Is it right that citizen must spend money on

COMPUTERS and Internet access because public sector has decided to cut postal costs? Is it right that the citizen cannot get help operating the computer at the Citizen Service Centre?

21

How can e-government harm be mitigated? Ethics

Concern for public ethos

- A balance must be obtained between citizens' and public institutions' rights and obligations
- 2. E-government initiatives must always be assessed within the wider long-term impact on public sector ethos

Rights for individual citizens and staff

- 3. No one older than 70 must be forced to use e-government
- 4. No beneficiaries must be forced to use e-government
- 5. E-government must not harm citizens or staff
- 6. E-government must not entail increased taxation
- 7. Necessary receipts and a non-electronic emergency solution

How can e-government harm be mitigated? Ethics

Power to staff

- 8. Public institutions that are subject to coercive e-government must receive a 10% increased funding for at least two years from operation
- 9. Staff have a veto towards coercive e-government
- Assurance for control of economic consequences
- 10. The economy in every coercive e-government initiative must be transparent and accessible, and due to automatic regulation when deviating from business case

How can e-government harm be mitigated? Institutional framework

The Council of E-government Ethics

 Interprets compliance of the principles for ethical coercive egovernment in particular incidences from an expert and a public view

The Citizens' E-government Complaints Board

 Awards compensation for citizens, where public institutions have violated the principles for ethical coercive e-government

The State E-government Audit Department

 Performs control and consultancy towards public institutions of compliance of the principles for ethical coercive e-government

EU-convention

Commits the government to comply to the principles for ethical coercive e-government and allocate appropriate funding

Included papers

Paper 1
Madsen, Christian Østergaard, Berger, Jesper B., & Phythian, MIck. (2014). <i>The Development in Leading e-Government Articles 2001-2010: Definitions, Perspectives, Scope, Research Philosophies, Methods and Recommendations: An Update of Heeks and Bailur</i> . Paper presented at the 13th IFIP WG 8.5 International Conference, EGOV 2014, Dublin, Ireland, September 1-3, 2014. Proceedings.
Paper 2
Berger, Jesper B., & Hertzum, Morten. (2014). Adoption patterns for the digital post system by Danish municipalities and citizens. Paper presented at the ECIS2014: Proceedings of the 22nd European Conference on Information Systems, Atlanta, GA.
Paper 3
Berger, Jesper B. (2014). Ethical dilemmas and PD as important steps towards critical e-government design. Paper presented at the PDC '14 Proceedings of the 13th Participatory Design Conference, Windhoek, Namibia.
Paper 4
Berger, Jesper B. (2014). Formative evaluation: A model to ensure value from e-government. Paper presented at the The 11th Scandinavian Workshop on E-government (SWEG 2014), Linköping, Sweden.
Paper 5
Berger, Jesper B. (2014). Mandatory e-government has arrived: The silent protest from staff calls for the committed scholar – resistance must never be futile! Paper presented at the The 25th Australasian Conference on Information Systems, Auckland, New Zealand.
Paper 6
Berger, Jesper B., Hertzum, Morten, & Schreiber, Trine. (2014). Does local government staff perceive digital communication with citizens as improved service? <i>Submitted for publication</i> .
Paper 7
Berger, Jesper B. (2015). <i>E-government harm? Never heard of it!</i> Paper presented at the 12th Scandinavian Workshop on E-government (SWEG 2015), Copenhagen, Denmark.

Limitations and future research

Limitations

- It may not be possible to generalize from Digital Post to e-government
- It may not be possible to generalize from a coercive setting, thus the study is of limited use to other countries
- Impacts on citizens are only weakly founded

Future research

- E-government harm, ontology and epistemology
- Coercive e-government, ontology and epistemology
- The balance between citizens and government
- Ethical responsible e-government
- Critical e-government research principles

What have I been doing since hand-in?

• EGOV 2015 (August 2015)

Formative evaluation, paper 4, further elaboration, accepted as research in progress

- IJEGR (July 2015)
 - Nine challenges for e-government action researchers
- HICSS 2016 (submitted)
 - Coercive E-government Policy Imposing Harm: The Need for a Responsible E-government Ethics, paper 7 split into 2
- H2020, EURO-6-2015
 - Meeting new societal needs by using emerging technologies in the public sector: Responsible
 E-government, U of Siegen, Skövde, Agder, CBS, 8 local governments in Germany, Norway, Sweden, Denmark

27

Acknowledgements...

- My mature-male-e-government PhD-student network
- My PhD-roomie at RUC and other RUC PhDs
- All the practitioners in CCS, ASC, AJC, KMD, DIGST... and other institutions
- Senior scholars that have assisted me into this world of academia at PhD-courses and collaboration
- My two daughters and my mother...

Summing up...

- Exploratory, critical study of a Danish coercive egovernment initiative, Digital Post from 8 empirical settings on individual, organizational and national level
- Digital Post might harm public institutions, citizens, staff and public sector ethos due to enacted technology and the e-government field
- The study suggests a responsible e-government ethics and an institutional framework
- Responsible e-government must be grounded in the public
- Research is needed into critical e-government, egovernment harm and coercive e-government

29

Questions for the committee...

- How do we convince the public and politicians to engage in the process of establishing responsible e-government?
- How do we convince scholars of the necessity of conducting research in harm and ethics?
- What further contribution might emerge from the study?

Thanks for listening...

Jesper B. Berger Roskilde University jbberger@ruc.dk