



Delft University of Technology

## Editorial 14(2)

Virkar, Shefali; Edelmann, Noella; Zuiderwijk-Van Eijk, Anneke

### DOI

[10.29379/jedem.v14i2.785](https://doi.org/10.29379/jedem.v14i2.785)

### Publication date

2022

### Document Version

Final published version

### Published in

eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government

### Citation (APA)

Virkar, S., Edelmann, N., & Zuiderwijk-Van Eijk, A. (2022). Editorial 14(2). *eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government*, 14(2), i-iii. <https://doi.org/10.29379/jedem.v14i2.785>

### Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable). Please check the document version above.

### Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

### Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights. We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



## Editorial 14(2)

# Shefali Virkar<sup>1</sup>, Noella Edelmann<sup>2</sup>, Anneke Zuiderwijk-van Eijk<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> ORCID Nr: 0003-0701-7684

*Department for E-Governance and Administration, University for Continuing Education Krems, Austria, [shefali.virkar@donau-uni.ac.at](mailto:shefali.virkar@donau-uni.ac.at)*

<sup>2</sup> ORCID Nr: 0000-0001-8386-9585

*Department for E-Governance and Administration, University for Continuing Education Krems, Austria, [noella.edelmann@donau-uni.ac.at](mailto:noella.edelmann@donau-uni.ac.at)*

<sup>3</sup> ORCID Nr: 0000-0002-3552-7289

*Faculty of Technology, Policy and Management, Delft University of Technology, The Netherlands, [A.M.G.Zuiderwijk-vanEijk@tudelft.nl](mailto:A.M.G.Zuiderwijk-vanEijk@tudelft.nl)*

Welcome to Issue 14(2) of the eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government!

This issue includes several different types of papers – conference papers, ongoing submissions, and reflections – that critically consider the issues and challenges that societies face today as a result of the proliferation of digital technologies and rapid digitalisation from a variety of disciplinary and methodological perspectives.

Every year, JeDEM publishes some of the best papers from the IFIP EGOV-CeDEM-ePart conference. Held in its current form since 2018, this conference represents the merge of the IFIP WG 8.5 Electronic Government (EGOV), the IFIP WG 8.5 IFIP Electronic Participation (ePart) and the Conference for E-Democracy and Open Government Conference (CeDEM). From the 2021 edition of the conference we publish three articles in this issue. In the paper “Beyond Substantive Goals: A Framework for Understanding Citizens’ Needs and Goals in Bureaucratic Encounters”, Søren Skaarup develops, and subsequently applies to empirical data, a conceptual framework that may be used to analyse citizens’ strategies for bureaucratic encounters and their use of self-service systems. Skaarup identifies four needs and three goals that guide citizens’ approach to bureaucratic encounters. The degree to which they are met, it is argued, may impact the efficiency of service delivery, as well as citizens’ satisfaction with the authorities involved.

Stakeholder interactions with government are also at the heart of our second conference paper, “Stakeholder Views of Process Automation as an Enabler of Prioritized Value Ideals in a Swedish Municipality”, written by Daniel Toll, Ida Lindgren, and Ulf Melin. In taking a closer look at the case of a Swedish municipality, the authors use a combination of stakeholder theory and a model of public value ideals to critically explore how different stakeholder groups perceive process automation in relation to value ideals they prioritize in their respective areas of work. Results show that different

stakeholder groups prioritize different values and that their views on process automation as an enabler of these value ideals are either optimistic, undecided, or pessimistic. The benefits associated with the use of stakeholder theory and public value as an analytical lens are also highlighted.

Accessibility and ease-of-use are important prerequisites for citizen acceptance of technology. To build an inclusive data infrastructure, metadata describing datasets published on open data portals should be available in as many languages as possible. The third conference paper, by Sebastian Urbanek and Sonja Schimmler, “A Translation Service for Open Data Portals”, presents an approach for the automatic translation of metadata within Open Data portals, based on Semantic Web technologies and using the metadata standard DCAT-AP. Based on this approach, the authors argue that new functionalities are possible, such as enabling users to search for datasets in their native language. The approach was implemented for and tested within a practical application in a production environment.

The four ongoing submission showcased within these pages address a range of topics central to the journal: interoperability in e-government, the use and design of anti-disinformation tools, digital democratic innovation, activism, collaboration and the emergence of so-called digital utopianism. The amount of data generated because of advances in information and communication technologies has prompted several studies on the interoperability of applications used in e-government contexts. These studies focus on the development of information and communication technologies to realize the smooth exchange of information between different governmental actors and agencies. Through a systematic literature review, Paisal Akbar and colleagues, in their paper titled “Research Trends in E-Government Interoperability: Mapping Themes and Concepts Based on The Scopus Database”, map the development of research on interoperability in e-government. Research data obtained from the Scopus database show that there has been a recent decline in the number of articles dealing with to e-government interoperability. Six dominant themes related to e-government interoperability are also identified. Advances in digital technologies have also increased the amounts of amounts of mis- and disinformation circulating online. This has prompted calls for tools to combat and contain the phenomenon. In their research paper “Towards a Positioning Model for Evaluating the Use and Design of Anti-Disinformation Tools”, Mattias Svahn and Serena Coppolino Perfumi provide a framework for understanding what tools are available to the users to combat different typologies of mis and disinformation on the basis of three levels of analysis. They then create a model in which they position the different tools across three axes of analysis, and show how the tools distribute across different market positions.

Jenny Lindholm and Janne Berg, in “Why Do Innovations Fail? Lessons Learned from a Digital Democratic Innovation”, critically evaluate the design, process, and outcome of a digital democratic innovation. The evaluation framework subsequently developed is then tested on a case study centred around the development and implementation of a Finnish mobile application that aimed to present information about municipal decision-making, in a user-friendly manner. Data collected from three online surveys with different groups, and a workshop with young citizens show that the app under study did not fully meet the democratic ideal of inclusiveness at the process stage, especially in reaching out to young people. However, results also show that those groups that had used the app reported positive democratic effects. Democratic deficits, and the need to better connect

citizens with political actors and institutions, are also the subject of the last research paper of this journal issue. In the paper, “To Be or Not To Be ‘Rousseauian’. The Rise and Fall of ‘Digital Utopianism’ in the Five Star Movement”, Gabriele Giacomini take as a closer look at growing political dissatisfaction in Italy. Giacomini charts the rise and fall of the technologically-forward Five Star Movement (FSM), and their manifesto of ‘digital utopianism’ based on the political philosophy of Jean-Jacques Rousseau, as a response to the perceived disconnect between citizens and institutions. Through the use of the FSM case study, the paper evaluates the significance, and applicative feasibility, of Rousseau’s political ideas in modern-day technology-driven contexts.

This journal issue presents to the reader three Reflections, inviting us to take a closer, more critical look at e-government and e-democracy from the distinct perspective of the authors. Digital government practices from a citizen’s perspective are once again in the spotlight in Tayyba Rasool, Muhammad Sajid, and Nosheen Fatima Warraich’s piece on “Factors Influencing the Citizens’ Satisfaction towards the Use of Open Government Data: Systematic Literature Review”. Through an initial systematic review of literature in the field, the authors reflect on the factors that impact the level of citizens’ satisfaction with Open Government Data (OGD) portals. They posit that ease-of-use, usefulness, access, extrinsic motivation, individual differences, computer skills, and training affect the quality of citizen interactions with these portals, and consequently come to bear on the use of the Open Government Data provided. Sudesh Sheoran and Sanket Vij also deeply consider citizen engagement, this time in relation to the maturity of e-government portals. In their paper, “A Review of E-Government Assessment Frame-works: E-Readiness, Adoption, Citizen Engagement and Quality”, Sheoran and Vij review the e-government literature with reference to e-readiness, adoption, citizen engagement and performance and quality assessment. Their paper seeks to contribute to the e-government literature by providing clear insight into the different variables and dimensions in association with the evaluation of e-government, and by setting a future research agenda for developing a holistic evaluation framework. The issue closes with a final Reflection, “Data Processing and Maintenance in Different Jurisdictions when Using a SaaS Solution in a Public Sector Organisation”, written by Björn Lundell, Jonas Gamalielsson, Andrew Katz, and Mathias Lindroth. Lundell and colleagues reflect on the challenges correspondent with the use of using a Software-as-a-Service (SaaS) solution in a public sector organisation, and present an analysis of the implementation of one such package in a large Swedish public sector organisation. The authors also provide recommendations to facilitate a public sector organisation’s procurement and implementation of such a SaaS solution to mitigate risks associated with data processing and the processing of digital assets.

We hope that you will find reading this issue to be a thought-provoking and enjoyable experience!