

# 'What works'

Key lessons from recent e-Democracy literature





The Local e-Democracy National Project has been set up with £4m of funding from the ODPM to help Local Authorities exploit the potential of new technologies for democratic renewal. The project is one of 22 National Projects, funded with £80m from the ODPM, which aim to bring together councils, central government, the private sector and others to define and deliver projects and national Local e-Government solutions.

**[www.e-democracy.gov.uk](http://www.e-democracy.gov.uk)**

# Foreword

Policy and research on e-Democracy are still in the early stages of their development. The focus of the review, and of the project of which this review forms a part, is on local government. Many local authorities have adopted the use of new information technologies, particularly the internet and mobile phones, to supplement their traditional activities. These projects involve local government councillors and officials, but most importantly they involve citizens.



The e-Democracy Evaluation Expert Group: Professor Stephen Coleman, Professor Ann Macintosh and Dr Mansur Lalljee. Pictured with Nick Gurney, Chief Executive, Bristol City Council.

Does this e-activity make any difference? We have been appointed as an Expert Evaluation Group to think through this question, to identify gaps in the literature and to develop systematic ways of thinking about the evaluation of e-Democracy projects. The question “Does it make a difference?” is beguiling in its simplicity. A difference to whom? How sustainable a difference? How costly a difference? Could the effects have been produced in other ways? In short, e-Democracy can be expected to have multi-dimensional effects which need to be evaluated in a variety of ways.

The starting point for all thinking about e-Democracy should be the empowerment of the citizen. Democracy is not merely an institutional activity, concerned with making it easier to govern people in more modern ways. An evaluation of e-Democracy must centrally be concerned with its impact on the experiences and opportunities of citizens. Nor should these be restricted to citizens who are generally politically engaged, but should encompass those whose voices tend not be heard in the usual processes of policy formation and decision-making.

Our aim as an Expert Evaluation Group is to add substantially to the findings of the literature reviewed in this report. Indeed, a key outcome of the national e-Democracy project will be an authoritative and accessible volume of research findings that will address some of the key questions that are either not raised or not adequately answered in the literature to date.

Professor Stephen Coleman, Oxford Internet Institute, University of Oxford

Professor Ann Macintosh, International Teledemocracy Centre, Napier University

Dr Mansur Lalljee, Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Oxford

# Contents

<b>1 Introduction</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1 Purpose of the report	3
1.2 Structure of the report	3
1.3 Contact details	3
<b>2 Executive Summary</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>3 e-Democracy in context</b>	<b>9</b>
3.1 What is e-Democracy?	9
3.2 Political disengagement	9
3.3 Access to new technology	11
<b>4 e-Democracy initiatives</b>	<b>13</b>
4.1 Information	13
4.2 Consultation	14
4.3. Active participation	16
<b>5 'What works'</b>	<b>17</b>
5.1 General observations made in the literature	17
5.2 Objective evidence of what works	17
5.3 Case studies	18
5.4 Best practice guidelines	19
<b>6 Bibliography</b>	<b>21</b>
6.1 Direct references made in the report	21
6.2 Other sources	23

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of the report

Bristol City Council is a lead member of the Local e-Democracy National Project, which aims to encourage and support democratic developments through new technologies. In this role, Bristol City Council is leading a research and evaluation programme aiming to understand; the current use of e-Democracy around the UK, perceptions of its use, and how e-channels can be used most effectively in the democratic process.

This literature review is the first part of a two stage research programme being conducted by MORI Market Dynamics and MORI Social Research Institute.

The aim of the literature review stage is to report on 'what works' in e-Democracy, based on the available literature.

## 1.2 Structure of the report

The report is split into four sections;

- the first section is an executive summary
- the second section outlines the context of e-Democracy in terms of what it is and the key reasons for its importance, namely, the issues around political disengagement and emergence of and access to new forms of technology
- the third section provides an overview of e-Democracy initiatives, categorising them with the help of an OECD framework into the areas of: information, consultation and active participation
- the fourth section summarises the evidence in the literature of 'what works' by looking at: key observations, an overview of specific studies, case study examples, and concludes with best practice principles as defined by the IPPR and other bodies.

## 1.3 Contact details

Stephen Hilton  
Kevin O'Malley  
Bristol City Council  
Corporate Consultation Team  
Chief Executives Department  
Council House  
College Green  
Bristol BS1 5TR  
Tel: 0117 922 4644  
email: [stephen\\_hilton@bristol-city.gov.uk](mailto:stephen_hilton@bristol-city.gov.uk)  
Internet: [www.bristol-city.gov.uk/consultation](http://www.bristol-city.gov.uk/consultation)



## 2 Executive Summary

This literature review aimed to cover research and thinking around a number of areas of e-Democracy: the meaning of e-Democracy; the social and technological reasons behind its potential importance; the contribution e-initiatives could make to a democracy; example of initiatives taken to date; and evidence of the success of these initiatives. As well as examining the rapidly increasing body of literature in this area, MORI Market Dynamics drew on a specially commissioned analysis of MORI behavioural and attitudinal data, and examined a number of case studies.

### Notes to the reader

- 1 It should be noted that while many will associate 'e-Democracy' with 'e-voting', this is not an area that has been covered within this review (although many see this as one of the key areas of e-Democracy).
- 2 This area is witnessing rapid change in attitudes, behaviour and technological capability. Thus, what the literature 3 years ago may have described as a "challenge", the latest literature may show to have been "solved". We thus place more emphasis on recent reports, although we make reference to some of the debates that took place when e-Democracy was embryonic.
- 3 While PC based internet/e-mail is the prime channel considered in much of the literature, it should be understood that digital TV, mobile phones and public access kiosks are also discussed within some of the literature.

### What makes e-Democracy such a hot topic?

While there is no absolute definition of what e-Democracy is, the one which most closely matches that outlined in the project brief is the one from the e-Democracy National Project website, which defines e-Democracy as... "Harnessing the power of new technology to encourage citizen participation in local decision making between election times". The body of literature reviewed discusses a number of reasons as to why e-Democracy has grown in importance, however, the two key dimensions discussed are political disengagement and the development and uptake of new technology.

There are many reports that show that the level of political interest and engagement in UK society has decreased dramatically over the last decade. Although explanations for this democratic disengagement are various, there is a belief that if the trend continues unabated then not only could it have an impact on short-term electoral results, but that it could in the long-term undermine the authority of government. Much of the literature propounds the view that developing e-Democracy has the potential to help reverse this decline. The IPPR report e-Participation in Local Government states that "e-Democracy techniques are relevant to attempt to reverse this decline both through e-voting and through wider attempts to stimulate e-participation between elections".

New technological developments, such as the internet, mobile phones and digital TV have transformed the way we live and work in developed economies. The development, and more importantly the uptake, of these e-channels make viable the concept of e-Democracy. The research data highlights the gap between the e-haves and the e-have



notes – closely related to age and socio-economic group. The literature examines the issue of exclusion and the importance of addressing it within the context of an effective and fair democracy. Much of the literature concludes that e-channels should not be used as a substitute but as a complement to traditional and established democratic processes.

There is, however, a debate as to whether people being able to more easily access democracy through e-channels will in reality lead them to be more democratically involved, or whether e-initiatives will merely give already politically active groups a new means of expression. The evidence is inconclusive, although there are suggestions that some initiatives have reached some traditionally passive corners of the electorate.

A strong theme coming out of the literature is that developing e-Democracy could be effective at engaging young people, as in a broader context they are the most e-enabled and e-educated groups. The report by DEMOS, *Logged off? How ICT Can Connect Young People and Politics* asks “how information and communication technologies (ICTs) can strengthen the link between young people and the democratic process. Our research has found that there are characteristics of new and emerging technologies that make them particularly valuable to this agenda”.

---

## What practically can be done?

In 2001 the OECD established three headings under which e-Democracy initiatives could be categorised: information, consultation and active participation. These definitions are referred to through much of the literature:

**Information** – a one-way relationship in which councils produce and deliver information for use by citizens, equipping them with the knowledge to participate further in the democratic process

**Consultation** – a two-way relationship in which citizens take part in consultations instigated by the council, with the aim of enhancing the community's involvement in democratic processes

**Active participation** – a relationship based on partnership with councils, in which citizens actively engage in the policy-making process. It acknowledges a role for citizens in shaping policy.

It is clear that these definitions also represent a hierarchy of e-Democracy development: many councils now provide some form of e-information; there have been many serious experiments and a number of successes in e-consultation; but e-participation remains the ultimate goal for the many councils who are taking the issue of e-Democracy seriously.

Many examples are given in the literature of the types of initiatives that councils in the UK and the rest of the world have been undertaking. The literature shows that PC based internet/e-mail initiatives are more advanced than those involving other e-channels:

**Websites/e-mail** – the majority of councils have websites and run some form of on-line democracy initiatives such as e-mail news bulletins or on-line discussion forums

**SMS messaging** – there is only limited evidence of this channel being used in democracy initiatives. Where it has been used these initiatives largely, but not solely, centre on engaging young people

**Digital TV** – has seen relatively few applications in e-Democracy. The INtouch Kirklees Digital Television Project report highlights some of the issues surrounding this channel.

The literature cites various guidelines for councils to follow when implementing e-Democracy initiatives. These include the need for marketing/awareness building and the need for responsiveness to consultations, as mentioned in an influential IPPR report.

While there are still gaps in the objective evaluation of initiatives to date, many of the reports covered in this review see a positive future for e-Democracy led by the many pioneering and creative councils around the UK.

QZ  
1

ABC  
2

DEF  
3

CANCEL  
ANNUL

HI  
4

JKL  
5

MNO  
6

TC

OK

DECIMAL  
POINT .  
DECIMAL

## 3 e-Democracy in context

### 3.1 What is e-Democracy?

From the balance of reports reviewed in the literature there appears to be no absolute definition of e-Democracy and it is a term used to describe many types of e-governmental activity around the world. However, e-Democracy debates are principally a discussion of the interaction between new technologies and democracy. Timisi<sup>1</sup> states the main argument as involving “the idea that technology has a potential which paves the way for a powerful and direct democracy on the basis of citizen participation”.

The box below gives a selection of some definitions of e-Democracy cited in the body of literature reviewed.

“...use of the internet by government, political parties and advocacy groups to provide information, communicate, deliver services or boost participation to generate a more robust debate among citizens”

e-Democracy is... “IT use in democratic processes”<sup>3</sup>

“...the use of information and communication technologies in support of citizen-centred democratic processes”<sup>4</sup>

“The concept... is associated with efforts to broaden political participation by enabling citizens to connect with one another and with their representatives via new information and communication technologies”<sup>5</sup>

“Webster’s defines democracy as ‘a government in which the supreme power is vested in the people and exercised by them directly or indirectly through a system of representation.’ Putting an ‘e’ in front of democracy means nothing more than information technology tools to facilitate, improve and ultimately extend the exercise of democracy”<sup>6</sup>

For the purpose of this report the definition which most closely matches that outlined in the project brief is the following, (which has been taken from the e-Democracy National Project website):

**e-Democracy is... “Harnessing the power of new technology to encourage citizen participation in local decision making between election times”**

Whatever the definition used, e-Democracy is a subject that many of those reviewed as part of this study believe is rising in importance. This ascendancy is ascribed to many causes, but the two key dimensions discussed are political disengagement and the emergence and access to new technology. Discussions of the various ideas developed around these two themes are covered in the next sections.

### 3.2 Political disengagement

There is widespread coverage in the literature of the increasing political disengagement of the British public. The IPPR<sup>7</sup> outlines the case stating that “there can be little doubt that we currently face a serious crisis of democratic disengagement”.

By political disengagement, Axford<sup>8</sup> made reference to decreasing voter turnouts, a decline in party loyalty and a growing contempt for the political class. Examples of this political disengagement are various:

<sup>1</sup> Timisi, N, Digitalization, Democracy and the Parliamentary Libraries, accessed 2004, <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/aplap/turkey2002/APLAP-Timisi.doc>

<sup>2</sup> PN&A, E-Democracy Around The World, 2001

<sup>3</sup> Gronlund, A, Introduction to the Special Issue on e-Democracy in Practice, E-Service Journal, 2002

<sup>4</sup> Kearns, I et al, E-Participation in Local Government, 2002

<sup>5</sup> Hansard Society, E-Democracy Programme, 2003

<sup>6</sup> Caldwell, J, E-Democracy: Putting Down Global Roots, 2004

<sup>7</sup> Kearns, I et al, E-Participation in Local Government, 2002

<sup>8</sup> Axford, B et al, New Media and Politics, 2000

- turnout in the 2001 General Election was 59%, a fall of 12% from the 1997 figure<sup>9</sup>
- approximately 60% of 18-24 year olds did not vote in the 2001 General Election<sup>10</sup>
- an Electoral Commission report showed that the level of stated interest in politics was at its lowest level since research was first undertaken in 1973

Among other reasons cited in the body of literature Dahl<sup>11</sup> and Street<sup>12</sup> both state, that in the longer term, if the issue of political disengagement is not addressed it could fundamentally undermine the authority of government as an elected body.

The need to address the issues of political disengagement reflects the thoughts of political commentators as far back as Aristotle who is reported to have said “If liberty and equality... are chiefly to be found in democracy, they will be best attained when all persons alike share in the government to the utmost”, while more recently Socitm et al<sup>14</sup> reached the same conclusion; “Local government gains when the community it serves is active and engaged in the democratic process”.

Many see e-Democracy as a way of reversing the decline in participation and interest in political activities. The IPPR<sup>15</sup> stated “e-Democracy techniques are relevant to attempt to reverse this decline both through e-voting and through wider attempts to stimulate e-participation between elections”. However, Bimber<sup>16</sup> states that “Americans in the aggregate are not growing any more engaged in their political system as a result of new technology”.

Never the less, the common hypothesis is that new technology can make it easier for a wider cross section of individuals to be more

democratically involved. The report *New Media and Social Inclusion*<sup>17</sup> documented an example among female survivors of domestic violence, where the online format provided a non-intimidating way for them to express their experiences, while Witschge<sup>18</sup> stated; “The internet is often praised for its possibility to liberate us from the social hierarchies and power relations that exist offline”.

It is also predicted that e-channels may increase participation among the least politically engaged groups, for example; the young, BME (black, minority and ethnic) groups and lower socio-economic groups (see reports *e-Participation in Local Government*<sup>19</sup> and *Understanding Youth Participation in Local Government*<sup>20</sup>). It is thought e-Democracy initiatives could be particularly effective at engaging young people. The 2004 DEMOS report<sup>21</sup> “...asks how information and communication technologies (ICTs) can strengthen the link between young people and the democratic process. Our research has found that there are characteristics of new and emerging technologies that make them particularly valuable to this agenda...”

<sup>9</sup> HM Government, *In the Service of Democracy*, 2002

<sup>10</sup> HM Government, *In the Service of Democracy*, 2002

<sup>11</sup> Hansard Society, *An Audit of Political Engagement*, 2004

<sup>12</sup> Dahl, R, *Democracy and its Critics*, 1989

<sup>13</sup> Street, J, *Mass Media, Politics and Democracy*, 2001

<sup>14</sup> Socitm et al, *Casting The Net Wider: Local E-Democracy 2003*

<sup>15</sup> IPPR, *Public Value and E-Government*, 2004

<sup>16</sup> Binber, B, *Information and American Democracy*, 2003

<sup>17</sup> Hansard Society, *New Media and Social Inclusion*, 2000

<sup>18</sup> Witschge, T, *Online Deliberation: Possibilities of the Internet for Deliberative Democracy*, 2002

<sup>19</sup> Kearns, I et al, *E-Participation in Local Government*, 2002

<sup>20</sup> Molloy, D et al, *Understanding Youth Participation in Local Government*, 2002

<sup>21</sup> Howland, L et al, *Logged off? How ICT can Connect Young People and Politics*, 2002

### 3.3 Access to new technology

In a recent paper Coleman<sup>22</sup> reports that British Parliamentarians have expressed a good deal of enthusiasm about the potential of the internet as a democratic tool. It provides a quote from Robin Cook MP, the leader of the House of Commons, in which he states that “there is a connection waiting to be made between the decline in democratic participation and the explosion in new ways of communicating”. Additionally, Bryant<sup>23</sup> states “the recent developments in ICTs are seen as central transformations in the way in which we make sense of our social and political worlds... and, as a result the way we perceive democracy”.

While use of these technologies has increased, access is not universal and Street<sup>24</sup> among many others reports on the need to be aware of, and address the gap between, those with e-access and those without e-access.

The IPPR<sup>25</sup> raises questions about the validity of the internet in the provision of government services if it is used as a solus communication channel: “The fairness of service provision is unlikely to have been enhanced as e-government activity has not been focused on the most excluded or service reliant citizens. Uneven levels of access to the internet may actually make access to services less equal as the use of e-government becomes more widespread.”

MORI<sup>26</sup> data on access to new technologies: This section draws on a special analysis of data collected by MORI Financial Services, based on interviews with 48,000 people each year.

Use of the internet has seen rapid growth over recent years, although this growth is slowing and MORI Market Dynamics<sup>27</sup>

predicts a further slowing of growth in the near future. Currently 42% of GB adults personally use the internet, although this is biased towards younger people and those in higher socio-economic groups; over 70% of ABC1s who are under 45 years old use the internet compared to 12% of C2DEs over 45 years old.

While penetration of digital TV is at a similar level to the internet, it has a different user profile. Penetration is virtually as high among low socio-economic groups and older people as it is among high socio-economic groups and younger people. Half of those people with digital TV do not have access to the internet. Thus a democratic initiative involving both channels would provide access to around 6 in 10 of the adult GB population. However, research makes clear that very few people currently use digital TV for much more than watching TV channels. 60% of those with access to digital TV in GB use it to watch TV channels only. The majority of the other 40% just access Teletext/Ceefax type information in a relatively passive way.

Mobile phones have the highest penetration of the three e-channels, with 74% of GB adults owning one. Older people are the only group who are significantly under-represented within this channel. Mobile phones add an incremental 22% of the population over those with either internet connection or digital TV. Thus a democratic initiative using all three e-channels could in theory reach 83% of the GB population. However, only 9% of mobile phone users have the WAP phones necessary

<sup>22</sup> Coleman, S, Connecting Parliament to the Public via the Internet: Two Case Studies of Online Consultations, 2004

<sup>23</sup> Bryant, C et al, Electronic Democracy and the Civic Networking Movement in Context, 1998

<sup>24</sup> Street, J, Mass Media, Politics and Democracy, 2001

<sup>25</sup> IPPR, Public Value and E-Government, 2004

<sup>26</sup> MORI Financial Services, 2003

<sup>27</sup> MORI Market Dynamics forecast, 2004

for more complex interactions. Information from the Mobile Data Association<sup>28</sup> confirms the increased use of text messaging, with growth of 28% between June 2003 and June 2004.

This MORI data highlight the potential problem of systematic exclusion of social groups in e-Democracy initiatives, as covered in reports by Stoker<sup>29</sup> and Ferdinand<sup>30</sup> among others. Reports by Compaine<sup>31</sup> and Warschauer<sup>32</sup> extend this analysis with a look more generally at the digital divide and new technology.

This leads onto a separate but related issue of how, if at all, the politically disengaged can be accessed through new technological channels and how interested they would be in any initiatives. Alexander<sup>33</sup> notes that “It will take more than digital systems to spark the political interest of an increasingly cynical citizenry. Fostering an ‘attentive’ public will involve much more than the nationwide installation of hard drives and modems”.

This leads to two related conclusions (reached by many in the literature);

- that the people most likely to take advantage of e-Democracy initiatives are those who are already involved in the democratic processes (Hacker<sup>34</sup>)
- that e-Democracy should not be seen as a substitute for other channels of democratic access but that a successful strategy for democratic engagement should include traditional methods as well as e-channels (OECD<sup>35</sup>).

An alternative or complement to this multi-channel democratic strategy, considered by Rowley<sup>36</sup> and Ashford<sup>37</sup> among others, is the provision of kiosks/public access points which provide internet access through a terminal located in a public place and are

believed by some to be a way of addressing the digital divide. Phythian and Taylor<sup>38</sup> state “20% of local authorities in the UK have experimented with the use of kiosks... kiosks are viewed as being valuable both in introducing IT and also for the delivery of IT-based services to communities in which penetration of PC and telecommunications technologies is relatively limited.”

However, most of the available literature points to the objective of most of these kiosks being to improve citizen access to local government services rather than local democracy and there is little research looking at how kiosks can encourage democratic involvement.

Post Office<sup>39</sup> research within Leicestershire found that interest in using kiosks was relatively weak even among those without internet access. The research showed that while a proportion of citizens without internet access are likely to use kiosks, the majority prefer more established channels to access information on local government.

<sup>28</sup> Mobile Data Association, 2004, [www.mda-mobiledata.org](http://www.mda-mobiledata.org)

<sup>29</sup> Stoker, G, Bottom, K, Community Capacity Building: Notes for a Talk given to MAV, 2003

<sup>30</sup> Ferdinand, P, The Internet, Democracy and Democratization, 2000

<sup>31</sup> Compaine, B, Re-Examining the Digital Divide, 2001

<sup>32</sup> Warschauer, M, Technology and Social Inclusion: Rethinking the Digital Divide, 2003

<sup>33</sup> Alexander, C, Digital Democracy: Politics and Policy in the Wired World, 1998

<sup>34</sup> Hacker, K, Digital Democracy: Issues of Theory and Practice, 2000

<sup>35</sup> OECD, Policies and Problems of E-Democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement, 2004

<sup>36</sup> Rowley, J, Challenges in the Delivery of E-Government Through Kiosks, 2004

<sup>37</sup> Ashford, R, Electronic Public Service Delivery Through Online Kiosks: the user's perspective, 2002

<sup>38</sup> Phythian, M, Taylor, W, Progress in Electronic Service Delivery by English District Councils, 2001

<sup>39</sup> MORI Social Research, Consumer Usage Survey, Your Guide Research Programme, 2002

## 4 e-Democracy initiatives

When discussing the level of interaction or engagement of citizens in public decision making, much of the literature makes reference to a classification established in a paper by the OECD<sup>40</sup>. In reference to this paper Macintosh<sup>41</sup> argues that democratic political participation must involve the means to be informed, the mechanisms to take part in the decision-making process and the ability to contribute and influence the policy agenda. The OECD paper defines the three levels of participation as follows:

**Information** – a one-way relation in which government produces and delivers information for use by citizens. It covers ‘passive’ access to information on demand by citizens as well as ‘active’ measures by government to disseminate information

**Consultation** – a two-way relationship in which citizens provide feedback to government, based on the prior definition by government of the issue on which citizens’ views are being sought. This requires the provision of information as well as feedback mechanisms

**Active participation** – a relation based on partnership with government, in which citizens actively engage in the policy-making process. It acknowledges a role for citizens in proposing policy options and shaping the policy dialogue, although the responsibility for the final decision or policy formulation rests with government.

The literature makes reference to other ‘e-Democracy models’ such as the four scenario model developed by Coleman and Götze<sup>42</sup> and a four-stage model of ‘e-development’ established by Gartner Dataquest, both of which (among others) are summarised in the report *e-Democracy: Putting Down Global Roots*<sup>43</sup>. However, none of these have been as widely referred to as a means of classification of e-Democracy initiatives as the OECD model.

The literature reviewed makes reference to a variety of different e-Democracy initiatives from the provision of council meeting minutes, to on-line consultations, to e-petitions, and we have used the OECD definitions to categorise these initiatives.

### 4.1 Information

The use of new technology to provide information for the purpose of aiding democratic engagement is discussed widely throughout the literature. This has been dubbed by PN&A<sup>44</sup> as “the building block of e-Democracy” and by the OECD<sup>45</sup> as an “essential precondition for engagement”, as it is seen as difficult to participate in democratic processes if citizens know little about the issues concerned. Clift<sup>46</sup> backs this up by stating that what is needed is “systematic full access to legally public information”. From the review of the literature the balance of reports indicate that the on-line sphere is by far the most utilised channel of public information provision out of the new e-channels. This is illustrated in the report *Policies and Problems of e-Democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement*<sup>47</sup>, which states that the internet offers a powerful tool for searching, selecting and integrating the vast amounts of information available on policy issues and presents the results in a form easily usable by citizens.

<sup>40</sup> OECD, *Engaging Citizens in Policy-making: Information, Consultation and Public Participation*, 2001

<sup>41</sup> Macintosh, A, *E-Forum E-Democracy Work Group 4 Initial Results*, 2003

<sup>42</sup> Coleman, S & Götze, J, *Bowling Together: Online Public Engagement in Policy Deliberation*, 2001

<sup>43</sup> Caldwell, J, *E-Democracy: Putting Down Global Roots*, 2004

<sup>44</sup> PN&A, *E-Democracy Around the World*, 2001

<sup>45</sup> OECD, *Policies and Problems of E-Democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement*, 2004

<sup>46</sup> Clift, S, *E-Democracy E-Book: Democracy is Online 2.0*, 2000

<sup>47</sup> OECD, *Policies and Problems of E-Democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement*, 2004

Nowhere in the literature are there arguments against either the need for information provision or the ability of new technology to be used for this purpose. There are, however, several issues highlighted for consideration. The Hewson Group<sup>48</sup> comment that the “sheer quantity of information which councils must place in the public domain and the need for excellent navigation and signposting is a significant challenge”. Additionally, the issue of the digital divide is also brought into focus and the OECD<sup>49</sup> asks how citizens’ rights of access to information are to be ensured in the on-line environment.

## Examples

Poland<sup>50</sup> among others give examples of what information can or should be provided in a democratic context, these include; council meeting minutes and schedules, policy documents, council news and activities, and council/government speeches.

There are many references in the literature to council websites being the primary vehicle for the provision of information on-line. The vast majority of councils across the country now have a website, although they vary in their degree of complexity and sophistication. The report Better Connected 2004<sup>51</sup> presents the results of a survey of all local authority websites and would provide useful reading for councils on examples of website content and usability.

E-mail can also be used for on-line information delivery. A case study of Poole Council by Socitm et al<sup>52</sup> ([www.poole.gov.uk](http://www.poole.gov.uk)) discusses their ‘News Direct’ service, an e-mailed news service for council residents.

There was little in the body of literature reviewed about the application of mobile phones, or more precisely SMS messaging,

in any e-Democracy initiatives, not just the provision of information. However, one example of this can be seen from Kirklees Council ([www.kirkleesmc.gov.uk](http://www.kirkleesmc.gov.uk)) who offers a service called ‘Chatback’ which provides young people in the borough with up to date news and information on a variety of issues and activities by text message.

The literature indicates digital TV has seen few applications in e-Democracy. However, the Office of the e-Envoy<sup>53</sup> gives examples of councils who have chosen to provide a selection of their on-line website content through this medium. These include: Knowsley Council, Newcastle City Council and Kirklees Council.

## 4.2 Consultation

A discussion of the potential of new technology to develop consultation activities and extend consultation beyond the traditionally politically engaged has been a major theme throughout the literature on e-Democracy.

The focus in the literature on ‘consultations’ is on the potential of e-channels to act as an interactive medium. This point is highlighted in the report Connecting Parliament with the Public<sup>54</sup>. Of all the e-channels, the internet is cited as having a particular interactive strength with Coleman and Götze<sup>55</sup> describing its ability to allow genuine two way communication and make manageable large-

<sup>48</sup> Hewson Group, Towards a Citizen Centric Authority, 2004

<sup>49</sup> OECD, Policies and Problems of E-Democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement, 2004

<sup>50</sup> Poland, P, Online Consultations in GOL Countries, 2001

<sup>51</sup> Socitm, Better Connected 2004, 2004

<sup>52</sup> Socitm et al, Casting the Net Wider: Local E-Democracy 2003, 2003

<sup>53</sup> Office of the e-Envoy, Digital Television: A Policy Framework for Accessing E-Government Services, 2004

<sup>54</sup> House of Commons, Connecting Parliament with the Public, 2004

<sup>55</sup> Coleman, S & Götze, J, Bowling Together: Online Public Engagement in Policy Deliberation, 2001

scale, many-to-many discussions and deliberations. Corroborating this, there is little in the literature reviewed which refers to running e-consultation activities anywhere other than through the on-line environment.

The IPPR<sup>56</sup> goes on to argue about the potential e-channels have to engage community groups in consultations who would otherwise not have participated in the democratic process. Arguments on this issue are divided. Some success has been had by the House of Commons<sup>57</sup> in involving members of the public, who would otherwise have been excluded, in on-line consultations. However, a frequent argument in the literature (mentioned specifically by the OECD<sup>58</sup>) raises a concern that e-consultations have inbuilt biases towards those participants who already have access to the technology. Ward<sup>59</sup> cited that this may result in the possibility of further cementing existing participation inequalities between the rich and the poor ie the technology have's and have not's.

In many places, such as the report Digital Technology: Working for Parliament and the Public<sup>60</sup>, there are recommendations that every effort should be made to bridge the digital divide by enabling wider access to technology, for example through libraries or ICT centres. A case study of Argyll and Bute Council by Socitm et al<sup>61</sup> ([www.argyll-bute.gov.uk](http://www.argyll-bute.gov.uk)) illustrates how they have taken action to include the remote parts of its community through setting up internet 'Service Points'.

The arguments and considerations around the topic of e-consultations are lengthy, with academics dedicating papers and reports to this one topic. Readers interested in further exploring these issues should refer to the bibliography where there is a comprehensive list of literature on e-Democracy.

The general consensus of the body of the literature reviewed is that the use of e-channels for feedback and consultation is at varying stages of development across councils. The report Casting the Net Wider: Local E-Democracy 2003 summarises this, stating that "in some cases this is only an occasional extension of the normal channels but, for others web-enabled consultation is now a regular and well-supported process".

## Examples

In the on-line arena, consultation activities (as stated by Coleman<sup>62</sup> and PN&A<sup>63</sup> among others) include: discussion forums, polls and surveys, comment and complaint facilities and the provision of councillor e-mail addresses. For the most part these initiatives are set up on councils' web sites with the interactive mechanism facilitated through the use of e-mail.

Where e-mail contact points are concerned, Ward<sup>64</sup> found that although they are quite common, they tended to be generic organisational addresses, rather than specific people, such as elected representatives or executive committee members.

As previously mentioned, there is limited coverage in the literature about the application of SMS messaging in e-Democracy initiatives. However, a case

<sup>56</sup> Kearns, I et al, E-Participation in Local Government, 2002

<sup>57</sup> House of Commons, Connecting Parliament with the Public, 2004

<sup>58</sup> OECD, Policies and Problems of E-Democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement, 2004

<sup>59</sup> Ward, S, Participation, Political Organisations and the Impact of the Internet, 2001

<sup>60</sup> House of Commons, Digital Technology: Working for Parliament and the Public, 2002

<sup>61</sup> Socitm et al, Casting the Net Wider: Local E-Democracy 2003

<sup>62</sup> Coleman, S & Götze, J, Bowling Together: Online Public Engagement in Policy Deliberation, 2001

<sup>63</sup> PN&A, E-Democracy Around the World, 2001

<sup>64</sup> Ward, S, Participation, Political Organisations and the Impact of the Internet, 2001

study of Lancashire County Council<sup>65</sup> shows how they have tried to overcome the issues of disengaged young people in the community by establishing an SMS messaging consultation process which invites young people to respond to questions sent via this channel once a month.

According to the Office of the e-Envoy<sup>66</sup>, councils have begun to use digital TV for consultation exercises. Newcastle County Council offers a comment facility for citizens, while Kirklees Council has established an interactive on-line consultation accessible through digital TV called 'Have Your Say'.

### 4.3 Active Participation

The OECD<sup>67</sup> defines active participation as the development of on-line tools and discussion formats which leave citizens latitude to propose opportunities for participation, set new agendas for discussion, submit their own proposals and shape the final outcomes.

There has been less written about councils experiments in active participation. The literature suggests this is because local authorities have done little in this area to date.

This may not be surprising as Millard<sup>68</sup> suggests this step towards on-line public engagement in policy deliberation represents the most advanced level of participation and is the most difficult to generate and sustain. The report Policies and Problems of E-Democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement<sup>69</sup> hypothesises that this is partly due to cultural resistance in forming new partnerships with citizens in policy-making and to change traditional policy development processes within representative democracies.

What limited commentary there is in the literature focused entirely on the internet as a channel for enabling this type of political engagement and there is no mention of the potential of other e-channels in this arena.

### Examples

Initiatives cited in the literature include e-petitions, on-line referenda and more advanced discussion groups. Of these, e-petitions received the most attention. A pilot study<sup>70</sup> has been undertaken in e-petitioning in Queensland, Australia, and the Scottish Parliament<sup>71</sup> also facilitates the creation of on-line petitions.  
[www.scottish.parliament.uk/petitions/](http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/petitions/)

There are also two UK pilots currently underway, being carried out by local authorities, Bristol and Kingston.

- <http://www.bristol-city.gov.uk/epetition>
- <http://epetitions.kingston.gov.uk>

<sup>65</sup> Socitm et al, Casting the Net Wider: Local E-Democracy 2003

<sup>66</sup> Office of the e-Envoy, Digital Television: A Policy Framework for Accessing E-Government Services, 2003

<sup>67</sup> OECD, Policies and Problems of E-Democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement, 2004

<sup>68</sup> Millard, J, The IPTS Report: ICTs and Governance, 2004

<sup>69</sup> OECD, Policies and Problems of E-Democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement, 2004

<sup>70</sup> Audit and Evaluation Services, Evaluation of the E-Petitioning Pilot Project, 2003

<sup>71</sup> Machintosh, A et al, Digital Democracy through Electronic Petitioning, 2002

## 5 ‘What works’

While there is information in the literature on best practice, there are few objective evaluations of ‘what works’. For example the reports on case studies were often PR focused or provided little concrete information on the successes and failures of the schemes.

### 5.1 General observations made in the literature

There were no definitive studies in the literature reviewed that gave a summary of ‘what works’ when providing information to enhance the democratic process through e-channels. However, Poland<sup>72</sup> among others report on the need for accessibility of information. That it the ease with which one can actually make use of information, which incorporates such factors as clarity, reliability and affordability.

Socitm et al<sup>73</sup> argue that it is very difficult to establish real evidence that projects aimed at providing better information to citizens and communities are actually performing a democratic function. The report stated that although councils are making information available through new channels it is difficult to show that the information is, as a result, reaching more people, reaching new people, or offering a greater chance to become actively involved in the democratic process.

In participatory activities, specifically involving the use of e-mail, the need for councils to respond to participants has been cited repeatedly throughout the literature as a key requirement for success – for example in *E-Participation in Local Government*<sup>74</sup> and *In the Service of Democracy*<sup>75</sup>. The e-government unit<sup>76</sup> suggest that if no replies are sent this can be seen by citizens as indifference and can undermine the social contract and the willingness of participants to

engage further. The report goes on to further discuss the issue of the commitment of councils to consultation practices as they require both financial and human resources.

A report, *Digital Technology: Working for Parliament and the Public*<sup>77</sup>, produced by the House of Commons Select Committee sets out a number of recommendations for the conduct of future on-line consultations. These include making the purpose and terms of the consultation clear from the outset and making every effort to ensure on-line consultations are socially inclusive.

### 5.2 Objective evidence of ‘what works’

The following are examples of studies which have been reported in the literature and from which assertions on ‘what works’ can be made.

**5.2.1** A recent webcasting survey<sup>78</sup> carried out among local government staff found that they were overwhelmingly positive about the potential of webcasting, stating that it offers many potential benefits to local democracy and service provision. Key benefits of webcasting were cited as saving time and money, reaching a wider audience and being able to replay events, although there was no concrete evidence presented of the success or failure of any webcasting initiatives

<sup>72</sup> Poland, P, *Online Consultations in GOL Countries*, 2001

<sup>73</sup> Socitm et al, *Casting the Net Wider: Local E-Democracy 2003*

<sup>74</sup> Kearns, I et al, *E-Participation in Local Government*, 2002

<sup>75</sup> HM Government, *In the Service of Democracy*, 2002

<sup>76</sup> E-Government Unit, *eDemocracy Seminar Report*, 2004

<sup>77</sup> House of Commons Information Committee, *Digital Technology: Working for Parliament and the Public*, 2002

<sup>78</sup> IDeA, *Local Government Webcasting Report*, 2003

**5.2.2** A study in Queensland, Australia looking at e-petitioning<sup>79</sup> found there to be a high level of support for it in the community and among members of Parliament, although they found that e-petitioning had not reached as great or varied sectors of the community as expected. Despite this there was a belief that it increased accessibility.

**5.2.3** The final report of the INtouch Kirklees Digital Television Project included feedback from citizens stating that the service was not that easy to use. Although digital TV may be an alternative e-channel for those that cannot afford a PC, feedback from users found that a high degree of training and support is required to get people interactive on this channel.

**5.2.4** A report by the Office of the e-Envoy<sup>81</sup> listed some potential weakness of digital TV including: the viewing incompatibility of transferring web pages designed to be seen on a monitor to the television screen; the limited functionality of the television remote control which is used for interacting; the limited availability of the alternative DTV keyboards; and concerns over full internet access via the TV leading to exposure of potentially unsuitable content.

**5.2.5** A recent report by Coleman<sup>82</sup> outlines the results of the online parliamentary consultations conducted on behalf of the UK Parliament between 1998 and 2002. The findings corroborate the idea that on-line consultations provide a space for inclusive public deliberation and that discussions are neither uninformed nor of poor quality.

Other studies readers may want to consult include a survey of citizens' political activity via the internet<sup>83</sup> and a public participation survey of local authorities<sup>84</sup>.

## 5.3 Case studies

The following are examples of case studies which have been cited in the literature as examples of best practice in the arena of e-Democracy initiatives.

- **Brent County Council** [www.brent.gov.uk](http://www.brent.gov.uk)

This council won the IPPR Best use of E-Media award in 2002, while the 2002 National Audit Survey judged Brent as amongst the best local authority websites. The website contains information on reports and minutes of council meetings, information on the calendar of council committee meetings and a guide to democracy and representation. Information on council representatives' e-mail contacts are also provided. Additionally citizens can receive e-mail alerts about consultations, developments or events. The website has a feedback, complaints and enquiries facility for council decisions and the Local Democracy Page includes forums in which people can contribute to decision making in the Borough<sup>85</sup>.

- **Consultation in Kalix, Sweden** [www.kalix.se](http://www.kalix.se)

Kalix won a national award as 'e-Democracy town of the year' in 2001, because of two of their consultation initiatives. The first concerned the remodeling of the town centre and the second dealt with tax levels. Web pages were provided giving information to the public about rules and procedures for the

<sup>79</sup> Audit and Evaluation Services, Evaluation of the E-Petitioning Pilot Project, 2003

<sup>80</sup> Smith, C et al, Final Report on the INtouch Kirklees Digital Television Project, 2003

<sup>81</sup> Office of the e-Envoy, Digital Television: A Policy Framework for Accessing E-Government Services, 2003

<sup>82</sup> Coleman, S, Connecting Parliament to the Public via the Internet: Two Case Studies of Online Consultations, 2004

<sup>83</sup> Gibson, R et al, UK Political Participation Online – The Public Response, 2002

<sup>84</sup> ODPM, Public Participation in Local Government, 2002

<sup>85</sup> Macintosh, A, E-Forum E-Democracy Work Group 4 Initial Results, 2003

consultation as well as specific information about the project/issues to be debated. e-mail addresses were provided for questions, comments and responding to interactive discussions<sup>86</sup>.

- **London Borough of Camden**

Camden Council set up a website specifically designed to engage young people. It received around 1,000 hits per month, with environmental issues one of its hot topics<sup>87</sup>. This initiative aimed to engage traditionally inactive groups in the democratic process. It also followed recommendations made in the literature such as by Ward et al<sup>88</sup> that website pages should be tailored to target specific user groups. There was no evidence in the literature as to whether young people had been involved in setting up and running the site, but this is a strategy which has been cited by Howland<sup>89</sup> as beneficial when engaging young people.

For more case study examples of best practice in e-Democracy readers should refer to the following reports:

- e-Forum e-Democracy Work Group 4, Macintosh, A, 2003
- Casting the Net Wider: Local e-Democracy 2003, Socim et al, 2003
- Case Studies on Good Practice in ICT Projects, Aitken, H, 2002

## 5.4 Best practice guidelines

While little objective evidence exists about 'what works' in e-Democracy there are a number of reports which provide some basic principles and recommendations for best practice.

The IPPR drew up a set of best practice guidelines for e-participation, based on an

examination of case studies and the available literature. The report is in itself a summary of other reports on best practice. Readers should refer to the report e-Participation in Local Government<sup>90</sup> for more detail and information on these guidelines.

### Summary: E-Participation – The IPPR Good Practice Guidelines

- **Marketing:** for e-participation experiments to be a success, people need to take part and they can only do so if they are aware that the opportunity exists. One of the common reasons for failure in running e-participation activities is poor marketing. Consequently, any e-participation efforts must be publicised in an effective and targeted manner.
- **Responsiveness:** obviously, if no one in local government listens or responds to communications received over the internet then there would be very little point in citizens attempting to use this channel. Citizens need to know both that specific complaints and points will be responded to and that, if they take the time to participate in an online discussion or debate, that there is some chance that councillors and officers will take note of the views expressed. Consequently, commitments on responsiveness are a crucial part of good e-participation policy.
- **Published rules and guidelines:** e-participation is a new form of participation and the rules of engagement are therefore not obvious. Both the citizens taking part, and

<sup>86</sup> Macintosh, A, E-Forum E-Democracy Work Group 4 Initial Results, 2003

<sup>87</sup> HM Government, In the Service of Democracy, 2002

<sup>88</sup> Ward, S et al, Online Participation and Mobilisation in Britain: Hype, Hope and Reality, 2003

<sup>89</sup> Howland, L et al, Logged off? How ICT can Connect Young People and Politics, 2002

<sup>90</sup> Kearns, I et al, E-Participation in Local Government, 2002

those running e-participation activities on behalf of the authority, need clarity on what is involved and what is and is not allowed or expected. This is particularly true in relation to participation in e-mail discussion forums or website discussion spaces but, in all cases, the citizen is entitled to know what his or her rights are and what he or she can expect both from the local authority responsible for managing e-participation activity and from other citizens by way of online behaviour.

- **Inclusiveness:** to have any legitimacy in democratic terms, e-participation efforts must be as inclusive as possible and must not be allowed to solely become a channel where those who already engage politically can simply do so more easily and conveniently. Inclusive e-participation therefore requires specific attention to providing information and access to a variety of ‘hard to reach’ minority groups.
- **Use of moderators:** e-participation, particularly as it relates to online group interaction rather than simply e-communications between individual citizens and their local authority, requires moderation. Moderation by an independent official can ensure that e-participation stays focused and useful and that any participation rules and guidelines are observed in practice. This can maximise the value to all involved, provided the role and behaviour of moderators is explained to participating citizens.
- **Privacy:** privacy, and in particular a sense of freedom from surveillance and intimidation is important to democratic politics. In the digital age, privacy can be impacted by the data gathering practices of local authorities. Consequently, it is important that authorities both respect privacy in any e-participation activities and communicate clearly their data gathering practices to the citizen.
- **Working in partnership:** given the levels of current disengagement, local authorities cannot simply expect that building e-participation spaces on the internet will result in major increases in political involvement. Instead, they must work in partnership with NGOs and voluntary groups in their areas to develop e-participation spaces which address the needs and interests of the groups of citizens involved, and also assist those community groups to get online and begin using the internet for enhanced engagement in their own right.
- **Training:** the skills required to engage in e-participation must be recognised and training provided to develop them. E-participation efforts can have their legitimacy damaged in their infancy by inappropriate activity and it is important to recognise this at the outset and to commit to identifying and providing the skills necessary.

Although not as directly applicable for councils as the IPPR guidelines, there are other sets of guidelines and principles which the reader may want to follow up;

- the report *E-Democracy Around the World*<sup>91</sup> includes a ‘**Top Ten e-Democracy “To Do List” for Governments Around the World**’ written by Steven Clift. This list includes among other things a suggestion of putting an e-Democracy button on a website’s homepage
- the report *E-Government: The Next American Revolution*<sup>92</sup> cited a list of guiding principles to answer the question ‘**What e-government should be?**’. The report states that these principles should guide the choices of leaders in pursuit of e-government.

<sup>91</sup> PN&A, *E-Democracy Around the World*, 2001

<sup>92</sup> The Council for Excellence in Government, *E-Government: The Next American Revolution*, 2001

# 6 Bibliography

## 6.1 Direct references made in the report

- Alexander, C and Pal, L (1998) *Digital Democracy: Policy & Politics in the Wired World*, Oxford University Press, 1998, 1-256
- Ashford, R, Rowley, J, and Slack, F (2002) *Electronic Public Service Delivery Through Online Kiosks: the user's perspective*, In: Traunmuller, R and Lenk, K (2002) *Electronic Government: First International Conference, proceedings / EGOVS 2002*, Aix-en Provence, France, September 2002. Springer (Lecture Notes in Computer Science; Vol. 2456), 2002, 167-172
- Audit and Evaluation Services (2003) *Evaluation of the e-Petitioning Pilot Project*, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Queensland Government, 2003, 1-29
- Axford, B and Huggins, R (2000) *The New Media and Politics*, Sage, London, 2001, 1-240
- Bimber, B (2003) *Information and American Democracy: Technology in the Evolution of Political Power*, Cambridge University Press, 2003, 1-284
- Bryan, C et al (1998) *Electronic Democracy and the Civic Networking Movement in Context*, Cyberdemocracy, Routledge, London, 1998, 1-200
- Cabinet Office (2004) *e-Democracy Briefing*, 2004, [www.e-government.cabinteroffice.gov.uk](http://www.e-government.cabinteroffice.gov.uk)
- Caldow, J (2004) *e-Democracy: putting down global roots*, Institute for Electronic Government, IBM, 2004, 1-11
- Clift, S (2002) *E-Democracy E-Book: Democracy is Online 2.0*, [www.publicus.net/ebook/](http://www.publicus.net/ebook/)
- Coleman, S (2004) *Connecting Parliament to the Public via the Internet: Two Case Studies of Online Consultation*, Information, Communication & Society, March 2004, 1-17
- Coleman, S and Götze, J (2002) *Bowling Together: Online Public Engagement in Political Deliberation*, Hansard Society, 2002, 1-48
- Compaine, B (2001) *Re-Examining the Digital Divide*, Research Affiliate, Internet and Telecoms Convergence Consortium, MIT, 2001, 1-31
- Coleman, S and Normann, E (2000) *New Media and Social Inclusion*, Hansard Society, 2000
- Dahl, R (1989) *Democracy and its Critics*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1989, 1-397
- E-Government Unit (2004) *Seminar Report, eDemocracy*, eGovernment Unit, 2004, 1-30  
[http://europa.eu.int/information\\_society/programme\\_s/egov\\_rd/doc/edemocracy\\_report.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/information_society/programme_s/egov_rd/doc/edemocracy_report.pdf)
- Ferdinand, P (2000) *The Internet, Democracy and Democratization*, Frank Cass, London, 2000, 1-193
- Gibson, R, Lusoli, W and Ward, S (2003) *UK Political Participation Online – The Public Response*, European Studies Research Institute, Salford University, [www.ipop.org.uk](http://www.ipop.org.uk) 2003, 1-8
- Gronlund, A (2002) *Introduction to the Special Issue on e-Democracy in Practice*, e-Service Journal, Volume 2, No 1 “e-Democracy in Practice”, Indiana University Press, 2002
- Hacker, K, L and Van Dijk, J (2000) *Digital Democracy: Issues of Theory and Practice*, Sage, London, 2000, 1-240
- Hansard Society (2003) *E-Democracy Programme*, Hansard Society  
<http://www.hansardsociety.org.uk/programmes/e-Democracy>
- Hansard Society (2004) *An Audit of Political Engagement*, The Electoral Commission, 2004, 1- 63
- Hewson Group (2004) *Towards a Citizen Centric Authority*, Hewson Group, [www.hewson.co.uk](http://www.hewson.co.uk), 2004, 1-160, pdf
- HM Government (2002) *In the Service of Democracy*, HM Government, UK Online, 2002, 1- 59

- House of Commons Select Committee on Modernisation of the House of Commons (2004) Connecting Parliament with the Public: first report of session 2003-04, House of Commons, 2004, 1-55
- House of Commons Information Committee (2002) Digital Technology: Working for Parliament and the Public: first report of session 2001-02, House of Commons, 2002, 1- 45
- Howland, L and Bethell, M (2002) Logged Off? How ICT can connect young people and politics, DEMOS, Carnegie Young People Initiative, 2003, 1-61, pdf, [www.demos.co.uk](http://www.demos.co.uk)
- IdEA (2003) Local Government Webcasting Report: Do we, could we, should we? Understanding webcasting in the context of local government service delivery and communication activity, Improvement and Development Agency/ Xpedita Ltd, 2003, 1-86
- Kearns, I, Bend, J and Stern, B (2002) E-participation in local government, Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR), 2002, 1-38
- Kearns, I (2004) Public Value and E-government, Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR), 2004, 1-50, pdf
- Macintosh, A, Malina, A and Farrell, S (Scottish Parliament) (2002) Digital Democracy through Electronic Petitioning; in Mclver, W and Elmagarmid, A,K (2002) Advances in Digital Government: Technology, Human Factors, and Policy, Boston / Dordrecht / London, Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2002, 137-148
- Macintosh, A (editor) (2003) E-Forum E-Democracy Work Group 4 Report Initial Results, available at: [http://itc.napier.ac.uk/ITC\\_Home/ITC/Publications.asp#technicalDocs](http://itc.napier.ac.uk/ITC_Home/ITC/Publications.asp#technicalDocs)
- Millard, J (2004) The IPTS Report: ICTs and Governance, European Commission, 2004, <http://www.jrc.es/home/report/english/articles/vol85/ICT1E856.htm>
- Mobile Data Association (2004) [www.mda-mobiledata.org](http://www.mda-mobiledata.org)
- Molloy, D, White, C and Hosfield, N (2002) Understanding youth participation in local government, DTLR, 2002, 1-106
- MORI (2003) Full Technology Survey Data July-December 2003, MORI Financial Services, 2003, Tel: 020 7347 3000
- MORI Market Dynamics (2004) MORI Market Dynamics forecasts, 2004, Tel: 020 7347 3400
- MORI Social Research (2002) Consumer Usage Survey, Your Guide Research Programme, Post Office/MORI, 2002
- ODPM (2002) Public Participation in Local Government, ODPM, 2002, 1-68
- OECD (2004) Promises and Problems of e-Democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement. Paris, 2004, <http://new.sourceoecd.org/>
- OECD (2001) Engaging Citizens in Policy-making: Information, Consultation and Public Participation, Policy Brief, 2001, 1-6, pdf
- Office of the e-Envoy (2003) Digital Television: A Policy Framework for Accessing e-Government Services, Cabinet Office, 2003, 1-23
- Phil Noble & Associates (PN&A) (2001) e-Democracy Around the World, A Survey for the Bertelsmann Foundation, 2001, 1-88
- Phythian, M and Taylor, W (2001) Progress in Electronic Service Delivery by English District Councils, International Journal of Public Sector Management, 2001, 569-584
- Poland, P (2001) Online consultation in GOL countries: Initiatives to foster e-Democracy, Government Online International Network, 2001 1-53
- Rowley, J and Slack, F (2004) Challenges in the Delivery of E-Government Through Kiosks, Journal of Information Science, 2004, 369-377

- Smith, C, F and Webster, C,W,R (2003) Final Report on the INtouch Kirklees Digital Television Project, Kirklees Metropolitan Council 2003, 1-85
- SOCITM (2004) Better Connected 2004; A snapshot of all local authority websites, SOCITM insight, [www.socitm.gov.uk](http://www.socitm.gov.uk), 2004, 1-208
- SOCITM, IDeA, LGA (2003) Casting the net wider: Local e-Democracy 2003, SOCITM insight, 2003, 1-56
- Stoker, G and Bottom, K (2003) Community Capacity Building: Notes for a Talk given to MAV conference, Lorne, 25-27 July 2003, 1-40, pdf
- Street, I (2001) Mass Media, Politics and Democracy, Palgrave, London, 2001
- The Council for Excellence in Government (2001) e-Government: The Next American Revolution, 2001, 1-39
- Timisi, N (accessed 2004) Digitalization, Democracy and the Parliamentary Libraries, Ankara University, accessed 2004, 1-10, <http://www.tbmm.gov.tr/aplap/turkey2002/APLAP-Timisi.doc>
- Ward, S, Gibson, R and Lusoli, W (2003) Online Participation and Mobilisation in Britain: Hype, Hope and Reality, Parliamentary Affairs, 2003, 652-668
- Ward, S (2001) Participation, Political Organisations and the Impact of the Internet, Research Report L215252036, 2001, 1-9
- Warschauer, M (2003) Technology and Social Inclusion: Rethinking the Digital Divide, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2003, 1-272
- Witschge, T (2002) Online Deliberation: Possibilities of the Internet for Deliberative Democracy, Euricom Colloquium Electronic Networks & Democratic Engagement, 2002, 1-22
- ## 6.2 Other sources
- Abramson, J, B, Arterton, F, C, and Orren, G, R (1988) The Electronic Commonwealth: The Impact of New Media Technologies on Democratic Politics, Basic Books, New York, 1988
- Acceding Countries (2004) Community Support for E-government project in Acceding Countries Seminar 22 March 2004, pdf [http://europa.eu.int/information\\_society/programmes/egov\\_rd/doc/accession\\_country/acceding\\_final\\_report.pdf](http://europa.eu.int/information_society/programmes/egov_rd/doc/accession_country/acceding_final_report.pdf)
- Accenture (2001) eGovernment Leadership: Rhetoric verses Reality – Closing the Gap, Accenture 2001, 1-17 pdf
- Accenture (2003) The New E-Government Equation: ease, engagement, privacy and protection, Hart-Teeter for the Council for Excellence in Government, Accenture, 2003, 1-32
- Accenture (2004) eGovernment Leadership: high performance, maximum value, The Government Executive Series, Accenture, 2004, 1-110 [www.accenture.com](http://www.accenture.com)
- Aikens, Geoffrey S, (1997) American Democracy and Computer-Mediated Communication: A Case Study in Minnesota, PhD Thesis, Cambridge University, 1997
- Avanti (2002a) Elderly people's use of Internet and their expectations on an Avatar electronic assistant, Avanti Internal Report, Information Societies Technologies/ Avanti Project, 2002, 1-17, available from London Borough of Lewisham [www.lewisham.gov.uk](http://www.lewisham.gov.uk)
- Avanti (2002b) The Avatar at your service; a new way of providing information and services on the Web, Avanti Internal Report, Information Societies Technologies/ Avanti Project, 2002, 1-17, available from London Borough of Lewisham [www.lewisham.gov.uk](http://www.lewisham.gov.uk)

- Barber, Benjamin R (1998-1999) Three Scenarios for the Future of Technology and Strong Democracy, *Political Science Quarterly*, 573-589
- Barney, D (2000) *Prometheus Wired: The Hope For Democracy in the Age of Network Technology*, University of Chicago Press, 2000
- Bellamy, C and Taylor, J (1998) *Governing in the Information Age*, Open University Press, 1998
- Bellamy, C (2000) Implementing Information Age Government: Principles, Progress and Paradox, *Public Policy and Administration*, 2000, 29-42
- Betten, Lammy (1998) The Democratic Deficit of Participatory Democracy in Community Social Policy, *European Law Review*, 1998, 20-36
- Blumler, J, G (1997) Origins of the Crisis of Communication for Citizenship, *Political Communication*, 1997, 395-404
- Blumler, J, G and Coleman, S (2001) *Realising Democracy Online: A Civic Commons in Cyberspace*, IPPR, 2001
- Booz, Allen, Hamilton (2002) *International e-Economy Benchmarking; The worlds most effective policies for the e-Economy*, Information Age Partnership/INSEAD, London, 2002, 1-179, pdf
- Bradbrook, G and Fisher, J (2004) *Digital Equality; reviewing digital inclusion activity and mapping the way forwards*, DfES, 2004, 1-88, pdf
- Browning, G (1996) *Electronic Democracy: Using the Internet to Influence Politics*, Online Inc, Wilton CT, 1996
- Bucy, E, P (2002) *Living In The Information Age: A New Media Reader*, Wadsworth Thomson Learning, 2002
- CAB (2004) *Electronic Government Services; key priorities for the Citizens Advice service*, Citizens Advice, 2004, 1-32, pdf [www.nacab.org.uk](http://www.nacab.org.uk)
- Calabrese, A and Borchert, M (1996) *Prospects for Electronic Democracy in the United States: Rethinking Communication and Social Policy, Media, Culture and Society*, 1996, 249-268
- Castells, M (2001) *The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business, and Society*, Oxford University Press, 2001
- Castells, M and Himanen, P (2002) *The Information Society and the Welfare State: The Finnish Model*, Oxford University Press, 2002
- Chadwick, A (2003) *Bringing E-Democracy Back In*, *Social Science Computer Review* Vol, 21 No,4, Sage Publications, 2003, 443-455
- Clift, S (2003) *E-Government and Democracy: Representation and citizen engagement in the information age*, United Nations- DESA, 2003, 1-41
- Coleman, S (2001) *2001: A Cyber Space Odyssey - the internet in the UK election*, edited, Hansard Society, 2001
- Coleman, S (2001) *Elections in the age of the Internet*, Hansard Society, 2001
- Coleman, S (2000) *Elections in the Age of the Internet - the internet in the 2000 US election*, Hansard Society, 2000
- Coleman, S (2002) *Hearing Voices: The Experience of Online Public Consultations and Discussions in UK Governance*, Hansard Society, 2002
- Coleman, S and Spiller, 1 (2004) *Exploring New Media Effects on Representative Democracy*, *Journal of Legislative Studies*, 2004
- Coleman, S (2002) *The E-Connected World: Risks and Opportunities*, McGill University Press, 2002
- Coleman, S (1999) *Can New Technology Invigorate Democracy*, *Political Quarterly*, 1999
- Coleman, S (1999) *New Media and Politics*, *New Media and Society*, 1999
- Coleman, S (2004) *New Mediation and Direct Representation: Reconceptualising Representation in the digital age*, *New Media & Society*, 2004

- Coleman, S (2004) *Whose Conversation? Engaging the Public in Authentic Polylogue*, Political Quarterly, 2004
- Coleman, S, Taylor, J, and van de Donk, W (1999) *Parliament in the age of the Internet*, Oxford University Press, 1999
- Compaine, B, M (2001) *The Digital Divide: Facing a Crisis or Creating a Myth?*, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2001
- Council for Museums (2003) *Framework for the future; Turning vision into action for public libraries*, Resource, 2003, 1-5
- Dahlgren, R and Sparks, C (1993) *Communication and Citizenship: Journalism and the Public Sphere*, Routledge, 1993
- Danziger, I, N, Dutton, W, H, Kling, R and Kraemer, K, L (1982) *Computers and Politics*, New York: Columbia University Press, 1982
- Davis, R (1999) *The Web of Politics*, Oxford University Press, 1999
- Day, P and Harris, K (1997) *Down-to-earth vision*, CDF and IBM UK, 1997, 1-103
- Diani, M and McAdam, D (2002) *Social Movements and Networks: Relational Approaches to Collective Action*, Oxford University Press, 2002
- Doheny-Farina, Stephen, (1996) *The Wired Neighbourhood*, Yale University Press: New Haven and London, 1996
- Drezner, D, W and Farrell, H (2004) *The Power and Politics of Bloggs*, Presented at the 2004 American Political Science Association, 2004, 1-27
- DTI (2000) *Closing the Digital Divide: Information and communication technologies in deprived areas*, An Executive Summary of the report by Policy Action Team 15, March 2000, 1-20 pdf
- Dutton, W, H (1992) *Political Science Research on Teledemocracy*, Social, Science Computer Review, 1992, 505-522
- Dutton, W, H (1999) *Society On The Line: Information Politics In The Digital Age*, Oxford University Press, London, 1999
- Dutton, W, H (1990) *The Political Implications of Communications Technology: Challenge to Power? 173-195*, in *The Information Society: Evolving Landscapes*, New York: Captus University Publications and Springer Verlag, 1990
- Dutton, W, H (1982) *Technology and the Federal System*, 109-120 in *The Communications Revolution in Politics*, New York: American Academy of Political Science, 1982
- Etzioni, A, Laudon, K, and Lipson, S (1975) *Participatory Technology: The MINERVA Communications Tree*, Journal of Communication, 1975, 64-74
- Everard, I (2000) *Virtual States: The Internet and the Boundaries of the Nation-State*, London: Routledge, 2000
- Ferejohn, A and Kuklinski, J, H (1990) *Information and Democratic Processes*, University of Illinois Press, 1990
- Ferguson, R and Howell, M (2004) *Political Blogs – CRAZE or Convention?*, Accenture, Hansard Society, 2004, 1-30
- Fountain, J, E (2001) *Building the Virtual State: Information Technology and Institutional Change*, The Brookings Institution, New York, 2001
- Frewer, L, Rowe, F, March, R and Reynolds, C (2001) *Summary Project Report: Public Participation Methods: evolving and Operationalising an Evaluation Framework, Developing and testing a toolkit for evaluating the success of public participation exercises*, IFR – UK Department of Health, 2001, 1-18
- Gibson, R, K and Ward, S (1998) *UK Political Parties and the Internet: “Politics as Usual” in the New Media?*, Press/Politics 3, (1998), 14-38
- Gibson, R, K et al (2003) *Political Parties and the Internet: Net Gain?*, Routledge, 2003

- Grönlund, A (2002) Introduction to the Special Issue on e-Democracy in Practice: Methods, Infrastructures and Discourse, *E-Service Journal*, Vol 2(1), 2002
- Hague, B, N and Loader, B (1999) *Digital Democracy*, Routledge, 1999
- Hajnal, P, I (2002) *Civil Society in the Information Age*, Ashgate, 2002
- Hall Aitken (2002a) Evaluation of Pioneer and Pathfinder UK online Centres; follow-up study, Research Report No, 362, DfES, 2002, 1-48
- Hall Aitken (2002b) Case Studies on Good Practice in ICT projects, Scottish Enterprise Digital Champions, 2002, 1-29 [www.hallaitken.co.uk](http://www.hallaitken.co.uk)
- Heeks, R (1999) *Reinventing Government In The Information Age: International Practice in IT Enabled Public Sector Reform*, Routledge, 1999
- Held, D and McGrew, A (2002) *Governing Globalization: Power, Authority and Global Governance*, Polity, 2002
- Hill, K and Hughes, J (1998) *Cyberpolitics: Citizen Activism in the Age of the Internet*, Rowman & Littlefield, 1998
- Hoff, I, Horrocks, L and Tops, P (2000) *Democratic Governance and New Technology: Technologically Mediated Innovations in Political Practice in Western Europe*, Routledge, London, 2000
- Holmes, D (1997) *Virtual Politics: Identity & Community in Cyberspace*, Sage, 1997
- Horrigan, J, B (2004) How Americans Get in Touch with Government, Pew Internet and American Life Project, 2004, 1-28, [www.pewinternet.org](http://www.pewinternet.org)
- IDA (2001) Benchmarking; benchmarking of electronic service delivery in the public sector, version 3, iDA, 2001, 1-103, [www.europa.eu.int/ispo/ida](http://www.europa.eu.int/ispo/ida)
- IDA (2004) Multi-channel delivery of e-Government services, IDA, 2004, 1-77
- IFIB (2004) Reorganisation of government back offices for better electronic public services European good practices, Final report to the European Commission 2004, vol. 2
- IFIB (2004) Reorganisation of government back offices for better electronic public services- European good practices, Final report to the European Commission 2004, vol.3: Annex 6, European Good practice case studies, IFIB, 2004, 1-52
- IPPR (2000) Public Involvement Awards 2000, *The Guardian*, 2000, 1-33
- IPPR (2001) Public Involvement Awards 2001, *The Guardian*, 2001, 1-37
- IPPR (2002) Public Involvement Awards 2002, *The Guardian*, 2002, 1-42
- IPPR (2002) Time to re-boot e-Democracy to end the 'digital divide' warns ippr, Press Release, institute for public policy research, 2002, 1-3, [www.ippr.org/press/index.php?release=117](http://www.ippr.org/press/index.php?release=117)
- IPPR (2004) Intermediaries and the Electronic Delivery of Public Services; A mixed economy in eGovernment: a public response to the government consultation paper by Dr Ian Keans, institute for public policy research 2004, 1-23, pdf
- Jordan, T (1999) *Cyberpower*, Open University Press, London, 1999
- Jordan, T (2000) Language and Libertarianism: the Politics of Cyberculture and the Culture of Cyberpolitics, *Sociological Review* 49 (1), 2000, 1-17
- Jordan, T and Taylor, P (1998) A Sociology of Hackers, *Sociological Review* 46(4), 1998, 757- 80
- Keeble, L and Loader, B, D (2001) *Community Informatics: Shaping Computer-Mediated Social Relations*, Routledge, London, 2001
- Kernaghan, K, Riehle, N, and Lo, R (2003) Politicians' use of ICTS: a Survey of Federal Parliamentarians, *Crossing Boundaries*, 2003, 1-25
- Kirklees Metropolitan Council (2003) *Kirklees*

- e-Government Strategy; Implementing Electronic Government, IEG 3 Statement, Kirklees Metropolitan Council, 2003, 1-10, <http://www.kirklees.gov.uk/publications/strategies/IEGStatement.pdf>
- Leitner, C (2003) eGovernment in Europe: the State of Affairs, Presented at the eGovernment 2003 Conference Como Italy, 7-8 July 2003, European Institute of Public Administration, 1-63, pdf
- Lenihan, D (2002) Realigning Governance: From e-Government to E-Democracy, Centre for Collaborative Government, 2002 1-40
- Lessig, L (2000) Code and Other Laws Of Cyberspace, Basic Books, New York, 2000
- Lessig, L (2001) The Future Of Ideas: The Fate of the Commons in a Connected World, Random House, 2001
- Lowe, C (2003) Take-up of eGovernment in Europe, e-forum working group on Take-up and benefits, e-Forum Association, 2003, 1-24
- Ludlow, P (2001) CryptoAnarchy, Cyberstates, and Pirate Utopias, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2001
- Margetts, H (1998) Information Technology in Government: Britain and America, Routledge, London, 1998
- Margetts, H (1996) The Implications for Democracy of Computerisation in Government, 70-84 in Reinventing Democracy, Blackwell Publishers, The Political Quarterly Publishing Co: Oxford and Cambridge, 1996
- Margolis, M, Resnick, D and Wolfe, 1 (1999) Party Competition on the Internet in the United States and Britain, Press/Politics 4, 1999, 24-47
- May, C (2002) The Information Society: A Sceptical View, Polity, 2002
- Mayor of London (2003) Londoners on-line: Analysis of levels of home internet access from the London Household Survey 2002, Greater London Authority 2003, 1-15 [www.london.gov.uk](http://www.london.gov.uk) pdf
- Mazarr, M, 1 (2003) Information Technology and World Politics, Palgrave Macmillan, 2003
- McCaughey, M and Ayers, M, D (2003) Cyberactivism: Online Activism Theory and Practice, Routledge, 2003
- McLean, 1 (1989) Democracy and New Technology, Polity, 1989
- Meikle, G (2002) Future Active: Media Activism and the Internet, Routledge, 2002
- Miller, P (2002) Open Policy: Threats and opportunities in a wired world, Forum for the Future, 2002, 1-28
- National Audit Office (UK) (1999) Government on the Web: A Report by the Comptroller and Auditor General, HC 87, HMSO, London, 1999, <http://www.governmentontheweb.org>
- NCC (2002) Norfolk County Council E-Government and Market Towns, Data report, Norfolk County Council 2002, 121-124
- Negroponte, N (1995) Being Digital, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2004
- NLGN (2004) Invisible Villages; techno-localism and the enabling council, Crabtree, J, Davies, W and Randle, A, New Local Government Network, 2004, 1-42
- NOIE (2003a) e-Government Benefits Study, The National Office for the Information Economy, Commonwealth of Australia 2003, 1-62
- Norris, P (2002) Digital Divide? Civic Engagement, Information Poverty and the Internet in Democratic Societies, Cambridge University Press, 2002
- OECD (2003) Engaging Citizens Online for Better Policy-making, <http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/62/23/2501856.pdf> 2003, 1-8, pdf
- OPM (2004) Lewisham Citizens' Panel – Survey 16, For Lewisham council and partners, Report April 2004, London, 1-48

- Palmer, G, North, J, Carr, J, and Kenway, P (2003) Monitoring Poverty and Social Exclusion, New Policy Initiative/Joseph Rowntree Foundation, 2003, 1-109 <http://www.jrf.org.uk/bookshop/eBooks/1859351417.pdf>
- Price, M, E (2002) Media and Sovereignty, MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2002
- Rheingold, H (1995) Virtual Community: Finding Connection in a Computerised World, London, Minerva, 1995
- Rosén, R (2001) E-Democracy in Practice: Swedish experiences of a new political tool, Svenskom, 2001, 1-15
- Rosenau, J, N and Singh, J P (2002) Information Technologies and Global Politics: The Changing Scope of Power and Governance, SUNY, 2002
- Selnow, G (1998) Electronic Whistle-Stops: The Impact of the Internet on American Politics, Praeger, 1998
- Selwyn, N (2002) Literature Review in Citizenship, Technology and Learning, NESTA Futurelab, 2002, 1-36
- Slaton, C (1992) Televote: Expanding Citizen Participation in the Quantum Age, Praeger, 1992
- Smith, Marc, and Peter Kollock (1999) Communities in Cyberspace, London, Routledge, 1999
- SOCITM (2004b) Local e-government now 2004; building on success, SOCITM insight, I&DeA, 2004, 1-20, [www.idea.gov.uk/publications](http://www.idea.gov.uk/publications)
- Street, J (1997) Remote Control? Politics, Technology and Electronic Democracy, European Journal of Communication, 1997, 27-42,
- Timmers, P (2004) Agenda for eDemocracy – an EU perspective, European Commission, 2004, 1-4, pdf
- Tsagarousianou, D, Tambini, D, and Byan, C (1998) Cyberdemocracy: technology, cities and civic networks, Routledge, 1998
- Weare, C, Musso, J, A, and Hale, M, L (1999) Electronic Democracy and the Diffusion of Municipal Web Pages in California, Administration and Society, 1999, 3-27
- Whyte, A and Macintosh, A (2003) Analysis and Evaluation of E-Consultations, IUPress e-service Journal, 2003, 1-26
- Wilhelm, A, G (2002) Democracy in the Digital Age, Routledge, 2000
- WMRC (2001) Global E-Government Survey, World Markets Research Centre, 2001, 1-16, [www.worldmarketsanalysis.com](http://www.worldmarketsanalysis.com)
- WMRC (2003) Global E-Government Survey, World Markets Research Centre, 2003, 1-27, [www.worldmarketsanalysis.com](http://www.worldmarketsanalysis.com)



**£15**

If you would like this information in a different format, for example Braille, audiotape, large print or computer disc, or community languages, please contact Kersha Wheeler on 0117 922 2848, or [kersha\\_wheeler@bristol-city.gov.uk](mailto:kersha_wheeler@bristol-city.gov.uk)