Fostering Citizen Participation Though Innovative Mechanisms

In Governance, Policy, And Decision Making:

Comparing Washington, DC And Seoul

by

So Yoon Chung

A Dissertation Presented in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Doctor of Philosophy

Approved April 2011 by the
Graduate Supervisory Committee:

N. Joseph Cayer, Chair
James H. Svara
Gerald Z. Lan

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

May 2011

ABSTRACT

This research examines the use of innovative mechanisms for
encouragement of citizen participation in the governance, policy, and decision
making processes using case studies of Washington, DC, the United States and
Seoul, South Korea for comparison. The research illustrates ways of encouraging
development of citizen participation using innovative mechanisms through
comparative study.

This research used a comparative case study of the two cities which
focuses on how the two governments apply ICTs and foster citizen participation,
what similarities and differences there are between the two city governments'
performance and practices, and what may cause these similarities and differences.
For the research, websites and citizen participation practices of Washington, DC
and Seoul using innovative technologies – Citizen Summit and Seoul Oasis – are
reviewed and compared using the categories of general capacity, actor, legal
aspect, management, and evaluation. As capitals of the United States and South
Korea, Washington, DC and Seoul lead the encouragement of citizen
participation, and the two cities' specific practices are recognized as exemplary.

The findings describe encouragement of citizen participation using
innovative technologies in governance, policy, and decision making processes of
Washington, DC and Seoul as well as similarities and differences. Both cities
commonly use Government 2.0. Through Government 2.0, citizens can
participate and influence the results and effects of policy. Also, governments
secure transparency, legitimacy, and efficiency through direct communication

with citizens. The study illustrates how citizen participation using innovative

technologies can support civic engagement in local government. Strong

leadership of the mayor is a common driving force of the two cities in initiating

and implementing the Citizen Summit and Seoul Oasis. Different contexts of the

two cities influence ways to initiate and utilize innovative technologies.

Washington, DC implemented a practice combining public meeting and small

group discussion using innovative technologies. On the other hand, Seoul

initiated a new citizen participation practice based on the Internet. The results of

the research show that innovative mechanisms allow adopting new government-

citizen relationships in both cities.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank God who always guides me and gives me strength to successfully complete this long journey. His love and grace was the power to overcome difficulties in my doctoral study and I can do everything through Him. I would also like to give many thanks and respect to my chair and advisor, Dr. N. Joseph Cayer, and other committee members, Dr. James H. Svara, and Dr. Gerald Z. Lan. I always think that I have been extremely fortunate to meet Dr. Cayer and to complete my Ph. D with him. I am always inspired with his dedication and commitment to teaching students and enthusiasm for public administration. Meeting once every week with his extraordinary generous support, advice, and care not only led to my dissertation being successfully completed but also show the way to go as a scholar in public administration. There are not enough ways to express my appreciation to him, and I will truly miss the meetings I had with him. Dr. Cayer is my professor forever. I also thank Dr. Svara and Dr. Lan for their interest and support. In spite of my unexpected visits, Dr. Svara always showed his deep generosity and great care, and advised me about my dissertation. Dr. Lan also gave me encouragement, and advice on my dissertation from China. I offer many thanks to Dr. Ronald Perry, Dr. Khalid Al-Yahya, and Dr. Larry Terry, who had served as members of my committee before leaving the university and Dr. Martin Vanacour who served as a substitute member for the defense.

I want to express my special appreciation to professors, seniors, and juniors in the Department of Public Administration, Yonsei University. I started studying public administration and decided to go on the same path with them at

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

This dissertation examines the use of innovative mechanisms in enhancing

citizen participation as one way of improving governance. The study employs

comparative analysis of Washington D.C.'s Citizen Summit and other activities

and Seoul, South Korea's Seoul City's Oasis as well as official websites of both

cities to examine the use of innovative mechanisms for encouraging citizen

participation. Through examining the similarities and differences of the two cities'

use of innovative mechanisms, a better understanding of the innovative

mechanisms' role in improving participation and governance will emerge.

RESEARCH PROBLEM

The role of governance in modern society is being emphasized in the

effort to enhance representative democracy and in the development of technology

that can support the functions of direct democracy. In direct democracy as

practiced in ancient Greece, people gathered together in an open place, Agora,

and shared information and opinions and made decisions for governing

themselves. Direct democracy evolved into representative democracy due to the

restrictions of time and space. Direct democracy could not cope with the increase

of population and development of the society so that people's direct participation

is rarely performed in modern society. People developed representative

democracy as an alternative and it was useful in the 19th and 20th centuries.

However, the 21st century has highlighted several limitations and problems of

representative democracy including the problem of representation, costs and malfunctions of elections, lack of transparency and accountability, conflict of interest, and so on, and various means to overcome these limitations and problems have been proposed. In addition, citizen's expectations to participate in governing have increased greatly. Governance, a concept associated with the new public management reform, has important roles that could facilitate participation in governing as well as overcome limitations and problems of representative democracy. Current development of information and communication technology (ICT) and its adoption boost the opportunity of citizens to participate.

Governance is not easy to define, but it is certain that governance is a broad concept including currently existing concepts of public service, public administration, and public sector management. Under the concept of governance, government, which traditionally has the main authority in the governance, policy, and decision making process, is merely one of various actors. The governance, policy, and decision making process is led by networking and participation of the various actors in society. Examination of the emergence of the concept of governance is followed by a discussion of what good governance is.

In the Sixth Global Forum on Reinventing Government held in 2005, several key concepts of good governance were discussed. One of the important concepts was participatory governance. Participatory governance includes participation in all parts of society as well as improving participatory methods and environment (Kim, Halligan, Cho, Oh, & Eikenberry, 2005). In this situation emphasizing participatory governance, development of innovative mechanisms

2

including information and communication technology is making a great

contribution. Using technology such as the Internet, opportunities are provided

for the citizen to participate actively in various governance, policy, and decision

making processes that previously were regarded as passive for citizens.

Emphasizing participation in governance and improving circumstances of

participatory governance is now one of the main trends in public administration.

Countries are accelerating innovations for participatory governance using

innovative technology. It is important to find the theoretical and methodological

implications of innovations because participatory governance has positive

influence not only on encouragement of citizens' participation but also on other

factors of good governance including improvement of transparency and

accountability in the governance, policy, and decision making process, local

governance, citizen engagement and so on.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The primary purpose of this research is to examine how citizen

participation is realized differently in different places using innovative

mechanisms and its adoption for the governance, policy, and decision making

process. Based on the overall research purpose, specific research questions in this

research are:

1. What are the features of citizen participation encouragement in the governance, policy, and decision making process using innovative technologies in Washington D.C. and Seoul?

2. What are the similarities or differences in citizen participation encouragement aspects of Washington D.C. and Seoul?

3. What factors may cause these similarities and differences in their encouragement of citizen participation?

To find the answers to these research questions, the study examines current and past practices in the two cities – Washington D.C. and Seoul – to encourage citizen participation in various governance, policy, and decision making processes. The study compares ways of encouraging development of citizen participation using innovative mechanisms. Also, the background of innovative practices is reviewed for better understanding because innovation is deeply related to the context and culture of the situation and environment where the innovation happens, and understanding context and culture behind the innovation is crucial for transferring and sustaining innovations.

IMPORTANCE OF THE STUDY

This work will contribute theoretically and practically to the research on citizen participation and the application of innovative mechanisms to public administration. In public administration, theoretical research on citizen participation has been distinguished from political participation or the concept of

participation in planning. However, after development of innovative technologies

and their application to foster citizen participation, theoretical research on citizen

participation does not seem to be well connected to the research on the application

of innovative technologies to citizen participation. This research is expected to

narrow this gap.

Also, this research is on citizen participation through innovative

technologies in the decision making process, and therefore, it has a different focus

from research on broad e-government topics. Introduction of innovative

mechanisms to public administration has brought enormous changes, and it

promotes realization of democratic values. Through the assistance of technology,

governments' provision of public services becomes more efficient, and

governments become more transparent and accountable. Acceptance and

utilization of new concepts of innovative technology contribute to extending the

range of research on public administration. Much research on e-government,

changes in public service provision and administrative procedure through

technology and following changes in sub-levels of government and sub-branches

in public administration has been done.   Encouraging citizen participation and

decision making in which citizens' opinions are reflected through innovative

mechanisms like the Internet is an advance from current e-government and related

research topics. Existing research is mainly focused on efficient public service

provision and securing government's transparency and accountability using

information and communication technology, and they are usually based on one-

way or limited interaction using technology between government and citizen. E-

participation is possible when government and citizens can fully interact, requiring advanced technology. Research on e-participation, based on the literature of the introduction and utilization of information and communication technologies in public administration, can extend the field of study and produce important results.

Through comparative study of two cities – Washington D.C. and Seoul – efforts of two city governments and their best practices for encouraging citizen participation using innovative technologies are examined. The comparative study on how the two governments apply and use innovative technologies in their public administration and policy making process, how they provide opportunities for citizens to participate in the governance, policy, and decision making process, what similarities and differences there are between the two city governments' performances and practices, and what may cause these similarities and differences will provide understanding of how to foster citizen participation using innovative technologies in different contexts and backgrounds.

CONTENT OF THE STUDY

This dissertation consists of five chapters. The first chapter introduces the dissertation and research questions. Chapter 2 provides a review of citizen participation in the governance, policy, and decision making process, and changes in citizen participation brought by development of innovative mechanisms and its introduction and utilization in public affairs. Chapter 3 describes the research

method of comparative case study including the research setting, case selection, and data collection process. Also, the analytical framework with comparison criteria drawn from the literature review is introduced. In chapter 4, practical programs of two cities – Washington D.C. and Seoul – selected as cases for this research and findings are described. Chapter 5 provides comparative analysis of cases and discusses findings based on the analytical framework. Also, conclusions, implications, study limitations, and suggestions for further study are presented in the chapter.

CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the impact of innovative mechanisms on citizen participation in the governance, policy, and decision making process is reviewed. Historically, development of scientific technology and/or innovative invention and discovery has brought significant changes to human society. The most recent technological development in human society is development of computer technology followed by development of information and communication technology. Computer and information and communication technology have changed almost all aspects of people's lives as well as the society. Public administration is not an exception. Along with the innovative waves toward various values like efficiency and transparency in public administration and the policy process, introduction of information and communication technologies have brought countless changes inside as well as outside government and its affairs.

Development of computer and information and communication technology and its adoption in the governance, policy, and decision making process supports the effort to overcome deficits of representative democracy and the functions of direct democracy together with the emphasis on the concept of governance. Direct democracy changed to representative democracy due to the restriction of time and space. Direct democracy could not cope with the increase of population and development of the society so that people's direct participation is rarely performed in modern society. People developed representative democracy as an alternative and it was useful in the 19th and 20th centuries. However, limitations and problems of representative democracy including the

problem of the costs and malfunctions of elections, lack of transparency and accountability, conflict of interest, and so on have been raised, and various means to overcome these limitations and problems have been proposed. In addition, citizens' expectations to participate in governing and the policy process have greatly increased. Development of computer and information and communication technology and its adoption boost the opportunity of citizens to participate.

Currently, it is not difficult to see citizens' desire toward participation in the governance, policy, and decision making process, and it is increasing. Also, innovative technologies provide opportunities for them to join in. Citizen participation before and after introduction and development of innovative technology in the governance, policy, and decision making process as well as factors that bring changes are reviewed in this chapter.

CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Citizen participation is a core concept of democracy. In the era of direct democracy, citizen participation was a part of citizens' lives. However, development of representative democracy brought about by time and space limitations reduced citizen participation. Citizens' interest in participation in governance, policy, and decision making processes in society seems to be rising again.

Reinforcement of government-citizen relationships result from the changing demands that public policies should deal with and the environment of

9

governance, policy, and decision making. Public policies are more and more

complex and government interacts with numerous actors inside and outside

government to obtain the best available information (OECD, 2009).

Globalization makes these changes more complex and gives government more

pressure to make good public policies. Under the complex governance, policy,

and decision making process, citizen participation is able to support the

government policy-making process. Citizens' increased interest in policy issues

and process encourages inputs of their views as resources, and citizens' inputs

work to better public policy. Through citizen participation, citizens can

understand the governance, policy, and decision making process, and citizens'

opinions can be reflected in it. Also, government improves its openness,

transparency, and accountability, and therefore government can build trust and

obtain legitimacy for its policies. A reinforced government-citizen relationship

encourages more active citizenship in society, and it results in stronger

democracy. Strengthening government-citizen relations requires resources

including time, expertise, and funding (OECD 2001b; OECD 2009).

Creighton (2005) defined public participation as "a process by which

public concerns, needs, and values are incorporated into governmental and

corporate decision making" (p. 7). After surveying definitions of public

participation, Creighton (2005) discovered four common elements of public

participation definitions. Public participation happens in agencies' administrative

decision making. Public participation is interactive, rather than one-sided

providing information between organizations and people, and there is a process

that organizes people's involvement. Finally, people who participate in the process have some level of impact and influence on the decision.

Citizen participation is a simple concept, but the realization of citizen participation in the society involves diverse approaches. Scholars conceptualize citizen participation in various ways. Arnstein (1969) argues that citizen participation is power distribution that makes possible underprevileged citizen involvement in the political and economic process and to enjoy the benefits of society. She categorizes eight levels of participation comparing them to the steps of a ladder – manipulation at the lowest, therapy, informing, consultation, placation, partnership, delegated power, and citizen control at the highest. Manipulation and therapy are not real participating but devising substitutes for real participation. People actively participate, but powerholders either distort their participation or try to disregard them instead of dealing with factors that cause their participation. In informing, consultation, and placation stages, people are given the total extent of participation and they can speak and listen. However, people's participation becomes tokenistic. People are usually informed in one-way flow and their opinions are not significantly considered. In the partnership stages, power redistribution has started through negotiation between citizens and public officials, and it is more effective when citizen groups have leadership and human and financial resources. In the delegated power and citizen control stages, citizens have more dominant power in the decision making process and management. In the delegated power stage, citizens take important roles with accountability in certain programs or citizen groups become equivalent to the

11

powerholder groups and may execute the veto. In citizen control, citizens have power that enables participants to control the programs, to be responsible to the policy and management, and to negotiate with others in the conflict.

Fung (2006) suggested another classification of public participation. He proposed a framework for understanding various institutional mechanisms of public participation in law and policy making with three dimensions: "who participates, how participants communicate with one another and make decisions together, and how discussions are linked with policy or public action" (p. 66). First, encouraging citizen participation is based on the premise that authorized decision makers are not perfect, and therefore, who participates in the decision making matters. Fung (2006) suggested eight methods of participant selection: diffuse public sphere, self-selection, selective recruiting, random selection, lay stakeholders, professional stakeholders, professional politicians, and expert administrators. The second dimension is how participants interact with each other, and there are six methods of participants' communication and decision making: listen as spectator, express preferences, develop preferences, aggregate and bargain, deliberate and negotiate, and deploy technical expertise. The third dimension is related to the impact of public participation - how participants' voices are reflected in public policies. There are five categories along the spectrum of influence and authority: personal benefits, communicative influence, advice and consultation, cogoverning partnership, and direct authority. These three dimensions form a three-dimensional space where various institutional mechanisms of public participation can be located.

12

Creighton (2005) understands participation as a continuum of four stages – inform the public, listen to the public, engage in problem solving, and develop agreements. One-sided information provision does not actually contribute to the participation process, but informing the public is an important factor because participants can participate and make decisions based on impartial and complete information. In listening to the public, agencies initiate either public hearings or increase access to information. These two mechanisms ensure some degree of openness and make legal records for the basis of decision making. Also, government agencies try to seek consensus and solve problems collaboratively with as many people as possible. Whether agreed or not, the public has influence on problem definition, the range of alternatives, the evaluation criteria, and making final decisions in the decision making process. Finally, getting agreement of participants and gaining consensus are beneficial to agencies implementing decisions. Agreement provides agencies confidence and authority to execute consensus decisions as well as provides participants chances to represent and support their constituencies.

OECD (2001b) defined government-citizen relations as "interactions between government and citizens in a democracy" (p. 15), and introduced three kinds of government-citizen relations – information, consultation, and active participation. Information means government's provision of information on policy making, and therefore citizens can access information they want. It is essentially one-way from government to citizens. Consultation is government's asking and receiving citizens' feedback on policy making. Because government

provides information on policy making beforehand and receives citizens'

feedback, it is a limited two-way relation between government and citizens.

Active participation means citizens are actively engaged in decision-making and

policy-making. Citizens actively play their roles of exchanging their views on

policy making, and government is responsible for final decision making. It is an

advanced two-way relationship between government and citizens and it is built on

the principle of partnership.

Active citizen participation in current society is closely related to the

values that modern democracy pursues. Creighton (2005) sees the fundamental of

public participation as a process of value choice. Traditionally, people have had

the right to elect leaders of the government and let them make important decisions

for the public. This right is one of the characteristics of democracy. As time went

by, the size and scope of the government and government affairs grew larger and

more complex, and a great portion of decision making power that the elected

officials executed has been delegated to technical experts, those are bureaucrats.

The delegation of decision-making power to the bureaucrats raised the issue of

bureaucratic responsibility in the decision making process. With their expertise,

bureaucrats can make technical decisions that the public may not always

understand. However, the problem is that most of the decisions that bureaucrats

have to decide for the public are value choices. In the decision-making process,

bureaucrats do not always face technical decisions but value related decisions, and

they have to find a reasonable balancing point or priority between conflicting

values in the society. In case that expertise which bureaucrats have cannot help

14

finding a reasonable balancing point or priority between conflicting values, public participation can give the power to choose back to the public. Creighton (2005) sees public participation as "a way of ensuring that those who make decisions that affect people's lives have a dialogue with that public before making those decisions" (p. 17). Through public participation, people can have more influence on decisions that affect their lives. Also, government can achieve the settlement of issues difficult to resolve.

Fung (2006) mentioned three important democratic values – legitimacy, justice, and administrative effectiveness that participation can improve. Different locations of participation mechanisms can address important problems of democratic governance. Fung (2006) argued that if citizens have good reasons to support or obey a certain public policy, that public policy is legitimate. To make public policies legitimate, policy makers make efforts to design participatory forums or public hearings. Also, political equality produces justice, and justice is increased by replacing authorized decision makers who make unjust decisions or creating significant pressure that can force decision makers to make just decisions. Public decisions should be effective as well as just and legitimate, and Fung (2006) argues that public participation can make decisions more suitable to their situations with insights embedded in their organizations and procedures. However, participatory mechanisms are designed to be suitable to specific objectives, and no single participatory mechanism can satisfy all three values at the same time.

Development of citizen participation brings various results in the society. Creighton (2005) found eight benefits of public participation through his experience. First of all, public participation brings improved quality of decisions through consulting with the public. Second, public participation minimizes cost and delay even though time and costs are not absolute barometers for the efficiency of making decisions. Third, public participation builds consensus and the consensus endows legitimacy on the government. Fourth, public participation makes implementation of decisions easier with people's support. Fifth, people's participation and thorough exchange of opinions can reduce the possibility of confrontation. Sixth, public participation gives decision makers legitimacy and credibility for their decisions. Seventh, public participation provides public officials opportunities to know the public's interests and views on the issues and governments' operation. Finally, public participation makes people more learned and trained, and civil society more improved.

Active citizen participation can produce several positive results in society. Buss, Redburn, and Guo (2006) offered goals for citizen participation: "making democracy more democratic, redefining power structures, enhancing credibility and legitimacy, managing conflict and building consensus, eliciting feedback and consultation, and promoting accountability and transparency" (p. 9). Currently, people cannot fully rely on independent self-governance, and are dependent on representatives. Citizen participation makes democracy more direct, deliberative, and participatory, and finally more democratic. Citizen participation, especially participation of the under-represented, brings redistribution of power. It is

16

believed that governments that have good relationship to citizens with openness,

transparency, and responsiveness obtain credibility and legitimacy in their

political process. Implementation of a well-designed citizen participation process

is essential not only for consensus building but also for conflict resolution,

because citizen participation can reduce the number of disgruntled stakeholders

who cause more conflict. Citizen participation allows citizens to express their

opinions about programs and policies that are proposed and implemented.

Obtaining citizens' feedback and consultation is one of the important and popular

results from citizen participation. Citizen participation also makes public officials

more accountable for their decisions and services. Expressing citizens' opinions

and evaluation with performance measures developed by citizens influences

public officials to make better decisions.

HISTORIC CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

In the relationship between people and governments, citizen participation

is not a new concept. Citizen participation has been directly and indirectly

performed in every part of public affairs, and various methods of citizen

participation have been used. This section, reviews a brief overview of citizen

participation in the United States and South Korea.

U. S citizen participation

The Unites States is one of the leading countries in citizen participation with a rich history since its founding as well as in several recent social movements. King (2007) summarized the history of the U. S. citizen participation with four historical periods: founding, populist, progressive movement, and awakening from the American dream. In the founding (birth-1830's), founders supported representative government, but the roles of ordinary citizens were restricted and citizens were even regarded as unqualified and uninterested in direct participation. The founders thought that representative government could manage the extended geographic scope and social complexity. The federal government dealt with various public affairs, and the bureaucratic administrative system and local governance had not been established yet. In the populist period (1830's-1890's), direct citizen participation and active public activity started with the presidency of Jackson, and the New England town hall style of local governance became popular. The progressive movement (1890's-1950's) was a period of significant changes in citizen participation and administration. Citizens informed themselves about public issues and requested more efficient and professional government methods. Most of the governments, federal, state, and local, have grown to satisfy citizens' extended needs, and various government systems, processes, and structures as well as scientific studies and professional expertise were developed and are still used. In the awakening from the American dream period (1960's-today), factors such as citizen distrust of government institutions and federal requirements of more public participation involved

citizens more involved in administrative processes. Citizen participation in the early 1980's was regarded negatively because citizen participation was considered as a cost of government business. However, in the 1990's, citizens started directly participating in solving environmental, crime, and other urban problems, political organizations arose around ideological and social issues, and a changing relationship developed between citizens and administrators. Core factors that led to these significant changes are accessibility to information and diffusion of expertise.

South Korean citizen participation

The history of civil society in South Korea is short and the process of formation and development of civil society is different from those of Western countries that built their civil societies in their nation-citizen relations or by the bourgeoisie. In addition, the start of Korean citizen participation took the form of activism and demonstrations rather than the more peaceful patterns such as attending public meetings common to the West. Before the Republic of Korea was established in 1948, South Korea experienced dynasty reigns, Japanese colonization, and American military rule. Early citizen movements developed during the Japanese control seeking independence from Japanese rule. Even after the founding of the Republic of Korea, the citizen movement was weak due to strong national authority. However, citizens expressed their demands on the government in three events: the 4·19 revolution on April 19, 1960; the Spring of

Seoul in 1980; and the great struggle for democratization in 1987. The 4·19

revolution was the first civil resistance movement against fraudulent elections and

corrupt dictatorship. The Spring of Seoul in 1980 was named after the Spring of

Prague, which was a pro-democracy movement. The great struggle for

democratization in 1987 was a movement for democracy with a huge number of

citizens which achieved a direct presidential election system and formal

democracy. Democratization in 1987 produced great momentum for the

development of overall Korean society. It also brought diversity in citizen

participation from political participation to participation in economic justice, the

environment, gender equity, and interest in social groups (Lee, 2001; Lee, 2007).

Currently, citizen participation in various areas of Korean society is accelerating

with the development of information and communication technology.

Electoral Participation / Voting

    Voting is the most well-known mechanism by which citizens formally

express their preferences. Voters elect their representatives, and elected

representatives work for what the voters want to have. Through voting, the value

of procedural fairness can be reflected because voting is based on equal rules of

campaigns, contributions, and voter eligibility. However, several reasons

including poverty, lack of education, gender, or class may inhibit equal access to

voting (Banyan, 2006).

Referendum / Initiative

Referendum and initiative are direct forms of participation through which citizens take responsibility for personal involvement in the policy making process. Through initiative and referendum, citizens can propose legislation and vote on state constitutional amendments or specific policy proposals. Direct initiative works powerfully especially in the policy formulation process because it skips state legislatures in the policy formulation process. Direct initiative and referendum endow the state with legitimacy by opening policy making processes to citizens and therefore allowing citizens to control (Banyan, 2006). Referendum and initiative are more active participation forms than voting when they are performed. Voting is usually for the performance or the candidates with expected performances, but citizens can directly make policy through referenda and direct initiatives with their own policy issues. However, referendum and direct initiative depend on the policy of jurisdictions regarding whether referendum and initiative are available as citizen participation methods (Buss, Redburn & Guo, 2006).

Public meeting/hearing

Public hearing is one of the participation mechanisms based on citizen-government interaction. Through public hearing, citizens can be involved in the decision making process, and public officials can get citizens' advice. Public hearing, a form of citizen-government interaction, is regarded as a key element of participation because a public hearing considers citizen's input as well as

official's input important, and therefore both legitimacy and competency are involved. For desirable public hearings, citizens fully engaged in government are necessary (Banyan, 2006).

In public hearings, decision makers listen to various stakeholders and citizens speaking their views on legislation. Ideally for participation in a public hearing, stakeholders perform research for reinforcement of their arguments. Stakeholders obtain data from reliable sources which make their arguments accurate and credible. They collect personal narratives of people whose lives will be affected by decision making because personal narratives emphasize humane aspects of the legislation. Also, stakeholders research each committee members' position on the issues.

Speaking out on policy issues is the right of citizens, and listening to citizens' speaking on issues is important for decision makers to make legislative decisions. Both citizens and decision makers have opportunities to speak and listen to voices on policy issues through public hearings (Taylor, 2004). Although participants cannot directly participate in decision making because decision making happens after the meeting by meeting organizers, participants in the public meeting provide information and feedback. Because all of the public who want to attend can attend, decision makers can have various knowledge and viewpoints on policy issues from citizens who attend. However, decision makers should be careful about biased representation (McComas & Derville, 2004). It is true that it is difficult to expect people's attendance and representative comments even though the issues are about important budget proposals influential economic

or community development on other issues. Sometimes public officials have difficulty controlling attendees because anyone can speak about anything and all the speeches are performed in front of the media. On development issues, public hearings may become just a formality because negotiations and the decision-making process are occur prior to the hearing and a high cost of any changes is a burden for public officials (Buss, Redburn & Guo, 2006).

Town hall meeting

A town hall meeting, as distinguished from a New England Town Meeting, is an informal public meeting. All community members are invited to attend. They also can voice their opinions, and hear the responses from public officers and elected officials. It originated from the colonists' debate for the establishment of the nation (McComas & Derville, 2004).

Citizen survey / Polling

In spite of some critiques and biases, citizen surveys have been one of the popular and important mechanisms through which citizens participate in the governance, policy, and the decision-making process. Typically citizen surveys have been conducted through telephone or in person among various methods. Through surveys, policy makers can obtain a large amount of information from selected people with relatively low cost, but the information collected is highly

structured according to the questions, and the quality of the information is not always good (Buss, Redburn & Guo, 2006).

Citizen advisory committees/panels

Citizen advisory committees/panels provide advice and recommendations on issues of various aspects of public affairs and policies. Citizen advisory committees/panels are organized with selected individuals who have connections between the public and various organizations working in the community. Selected individuals work like consultants with their expertise and ability to represent particular viewpoints, but their recommendations are not binding (McComas & Derville, 2004). Citizen advisory boards do not have decision making authority (Buss, Redburn & Guo, 2006). Increasingly used since the first presidency, citizen advisory committees/panels have sometimes been required by national legislation to increase community input on policy issues as well as citizen participation in the governance, policy, and decision-making process. The Federal Advisory Committee Act in 1972 defines an advisory committee at the federal level as "any committee, board, commission, council, panel, task force, or similar group established in the interest of obtaining advice or recommendations for the president or one or more agencies of offices of the federal government" (Palenchar, 2004, p. 1). A citizen advisory committee/panel's role is to encourage the relationship between the public and influential organizations in the community to improve the quality of services and decision-making capabilities. Citizen

advisory committees/panels pursue "the cooperation of key stakeholders, information and perception exchange, and the development of trust, sense of control, credibility, and consensus making" (Palenchar, 2004, p. 1). Through citizen advisory committees/panels' work, organizations have greater accountability, citizen advisory committees/panels also open up decision making and policy formation processes to citizens. However, representativeness of the board can be problematic because citizen advisory boards may only represent some of the general demography of the affected community. Also, members of the board may have different views depending on how they are selected (Buss, Redburn & Guo, 2006). There are two kinds of committees: short-term committees organized for specific issues and time periods, and long-term committees providing continuous feedback on issues (Palenchar, 2004).

Activism / Protest

Activism is an extreme form of participation. There are various forms of activism from sending inoffensive letters to radical protest. Radical protest, usually accompanied by other forms of participation, is a strong expression of the will of citizens to attempt to change the direction of policy making. Freedom of speech and a free media are vital for activism. Free media and open-minded activism greatly improve government's transparency, and therefore, openness of government (Banyan, 2006).

Petition

Petition is, simply, submission of requests for taking actions or considering views to change something. Petition has a long history from the pre-modern era and made contributions to the U. S and British history of democracy. Petitions are usually made to a governing institution through citizens' contacting their representatives. Recently, petitions via email or web posting make it possible for citizens to make petitions at any time (Malina, 2003).

DEVELOPMENT OF INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY AND E-GOVERNMENT

Introduction of technology, especially information and communication technology (ICT) to the performance of government functions has brought diverse changes. The role of communication, connecting citizens and governments, national government and sub-national governments, and three branches of the state, is essential to maintain state functions. Development of ICT, started by telegraph and telephone, has extended to computer technology and the Internet. These ICTs support all kinds of government functions and operation.

From the early 1800's in the United States, the effort to facilitate communication started with setting up Federal records management and publication policies. Various policies include "statutes providing for the printing and distribution of laws and treaties, the preservation of state papers, and the maintenance of official files" (Relyea & Hogue, 2004, p. 17). The invention and

adoption of telegraph and telephone helped government performance by

increasing speed of communication.

Development of the computer starting from simple calculation to

management of information has brought great changes to overall society as well

as to government. After World War II, a commercial and business oriented

market developed, computer technology developed, and the Federal government's

computer purchases became a major driver of its development. In the 1960s, the

Internet was created with the development of computer networking based on a

federally funded project. Creation of technology related to the Internet including

File Transfer Protocol (FTP), e-mail, and Transmission Control Protocol (TCP)

with Internet Protocol (IP) have been the basis for development and vitalization of

the Internet. By the 1990s, the Internet was used by people around the world, and

the development of Web browsers and search engines provided more convenience

to people looking for information. ICTs slowly became utilized in the Federal

government. In particular, the Department of Defense, National Aeronautics and

Space Administration, and General Services Administration adopted ICT,

followed by general government agencies.

Following the development of ICTs, policy frameworks changed for

utilization of ICTs as well as for realization of digital government. Starting from

the release of the agenda for realizing a national information infrastructure by the

Clinton Administration, a variety of statutes were passed for improving efficiency

and economy in government operations, securing management of these

27

technologies and the systems, protecting them from physical harm, and the

security and privacy of information[1] (Relyea & Hogue, 2004).

E-government, based on the development and adoption of ICTs, can be

defined as "the use of ICT and its application by the government for the provision

of information and public services to the people" (United Nations, 2006, p. 14).

There are three kinds of interaction in the concept of e-government: government-

to-government (G2G), Government-to-business (G2B), and Government-to-

consumer/citizen (G2C). In 2008, the United Nations suggested another advanced

definition of e-government: "the continuous innovation in the delivery of services,

citizen participation and governance through the transformation of external and

internal relationships by the use of information technology, especially the

Internet" (p. 69). The UN (2006) shows the aims of e-government – "to provide

efficient government management of information to the citizen; better service

delivery to citizens; and empowerment of the people through access to

information and participation in public policy decision-making" (p. 14).

The United Nations (2006) also argues that the development of e-

government follows five stages of evolution. The first stage is emerging

presence. Governments establish their official websites, and may or may not

---

[1] Laws and directives enacted for the vitalization of e-government in the United States are: Privacy Act (1974), Paperwork Reduction Act (1980), Computer Security Act (1987), Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act (1988), Electronic Freedom of Information Amendments (1996), Clinger-Cohen Act (1996), Executive Order No. 13011: Federal Information Technology Management (1996), Presidential Decision Directive 63: Critical Infrastructure Protection (1998), Rehabilitation Act Amendments (1998), Government Paperwork Elimination Act (1998), Children's Online Privacy Protection Act (1999), and OMB Memoranda: Federal Website Privacy (1999).

connect links to other government agencies and other levels of governments in this stage. Information provided may be agency heads' message or articles, and it is basic, static, and limited. Enhanced presence is the second stage where governments provide information about policies and governance sources and databases that citizens can download. Citizens can get information on policies, laws and regulations, reports, and newsletters. Emerging presence and enhanced presence are one-sided provision of information. In interactive presence, the third stage, an interactive mode with services is provided and updated including downloadable forms for various public services and public information with audio and video. Various forms for public service such as tax payment and license renewal are provided. Citizens can communicate with public officials through mail, fax, telephone, and e-mail. From transactional presence, the fourth stage, two-way interactions between governments and citizens including filing tax forms and applying for various kinds of certificates are provided in public service delivery with 24/7 online service. Monetary transactions relevant to public service provision including paying taxes and fines are also possible using credit cards. Online bidding for public procurement is possible through secure links.

In the last and the most advanced stage, networked presence, citizen participation in the decision-making process is possible with two-way open discussions through the web comment form and online consultation mechanisms. Also, this stage is fully integrated, so all of the public services of all the government agencies are provided in one portal website. In the United Nations' later work (2008), a simplified version of e-government stages is introduced,

29

which is the three phases of e-government - infrastructure, integration, and transformation. In the infrastructure phase, including emerging and enhanced stages, information infrastructure is established for all of the actors in society based on reliable and affordable Internet connectivity. In the phase of integration, covering interactive and transactional stages, infrastructure as well as a more efficient and citizen-centric governance model is utilized for better sharing information and public service delivery. In transformation, closely related to networked presence, service innovation and e-government as well as democratic development are pursued through networked governance patterns not only in all parts and levels of governments but also in all sectors of society. Most leading e-government countries currently concentrate on achieving the transformation phase.

Buss and Redburn (2006) quoted the Center for Technology in Government's definition of e-government as "the use of information technology to support government operation, engage citizens, and provide government services" (p. 171), and introduced the concept of 'E-Democracy' using ICTs to facilitate citizen participation among e-government functions. In e-democracy, various ways are used for the connection of citizens and government. Public agencies can obtain citizen feedback, complaints, recommendation of changes, or participation in opinion surveys through the Internet. Citizens can access individual policy makers' personal websites. Governments provide citizens large amounts of information online. The provision of information through the Internet can be specifically targeted using detailed and technical information.

Governments use the Internet for providing specific information and data with a fee for citizens, businesses, and scholars. Citizens can follow the processes of government activities, especially regulatory activities, with monitoring and evaluation. Through the Internet, collective deliberation and electronic voting may also be realized.

CURRENT CHANGES AND TRENDS IN CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

In reinforcing government-citizen relationships and raising citizen participation, the importance of information and communication technology (ICT) has been emphasized. OECD (2001b) sees ICT as "computers or other screen based terminals, databases, software applications, and the networks connecting them" (p. 67). ICT has its own special features as a powerful tool to encourage government-citizen relationship; first, ICT brings many new opportunities through more information using electronic databases, transferred to large numbers of people in larger areas with faster speed. ICT also makes it possible to organize information and provide it simultaneously in new, user-friendly ways. Finally, through ICT, information can be combined with various forms in various ways, thus providing more interactivity for information users to access and react to the information.

Governments have already experienced the positive effect of ICT reinforcing government-citizen relationships and organizing their legal, institutional, and policy frameworks to maximize ICT's effect. To adopt and

activate the ICT, governments introduce and/or modify related laws and institutions. Policy frameworks, directly related to the government-citizen relationship, also focus on activating ICT use. Policies promote ICT use of government for citizens' information, consultation, and active participation. The employment of ICT makes it possible for government to provide government information as well as consultation online. Handbooks and guidelines for the use of ICT are also provided.

Current trends in governments' using ICTs show various tools for encouraging government-citizen relationships. OECD (2001b) introduced a variety of tools using ICTs in three kinds of government-citizen relationships – information, consultation, and active participation. Governments have most frequently used ICTs in the information area. Through ICTs, government can create and exchange information in innovative ways, and increase accessibility to the information. ICTs can improve speed and efficiency in accessibility and distribution of information related to policy making. Most governments run their own websites and provide policy-related information. Often, governments open portal sites and provide single access points for various parts and levels of government. Governments establish search engines for fast search of information, and develop their website with simple and clear structures and links. To increase accessibility, governments establish electronic kiosks and computer terminals in public places for citizens to use for free. Governments sometimes distribute information contained in various data storage devices including CD-ROMs and computer diskettes. Governments provide information products including policy

proposal documents, draft legislation and reports, official documents, current

legislation, budgetary information, and catalogue documents. Governments

present information relevant to overall policy-making processes and procedures

on their websites, and create depositories and archives of publications for citizens'

convenient use of electronic information products. Also, innovative use of ICTs

allow citizens to access new or previously unpublished information including

official details of government structures, personnel, personal information, and

texts responding to online users, such as Frequently Asked Questions. For

citizens' convenience in finding and accessing information, governments re-

package existing catalogues, registrars, and document collections, and provide

internet-adapted guides and dynamic details of administrative procedures and

user-oriented navigation tools. Governments use traditional tools including

telephone services, entertaining elements such as films, music, and animated

graphics, games, or quizzes, or texts in paper format as well as innovative ways of

using ICTs.

In consultation and active participation areas, ICT tools are used in diverse

innovative ways. In consultation, citizens can give feedback to governments

through electronic tools like email or electronic letterboxes. Email distribution

lists make citizens subscribe to governments' circulating documents and send

their responses. In the web forums and newsgroups online on policy issues,

citizens can see the responses of participants, respond, and therefore interact.

Governments can either let citizens freely exchange their views or intervene with

facilitators or moderators. Governments can offer real time online chat events for

a few hours and let participants exchange their views promptly. Online surveys

on government services or policy issues can be conducted by governments on

their website as well as through emails.

ICT also contributes to citizens' active participation in policy making

processes even though this area is the least activated. Government can use the

same tools for consultation such as web forums and online chats provided by

governments or citizens. Governments provide independent links run by a third

party, usually civil society organizations, from their websites, and obtain open

approaches to policy making regardless of their stances. Through this tool,

governments encourage citizens' active exchange of their views and set policy

agendas together with citizens. Using ICTs makes it possible to develop policy

proposals through online games and scenario planning, and ICTs create virtual

work spaces with information for citizens to join in the policy making process

with governments.

Based on these relationships between government and citizen, Macintosh

(2004) developed three levels of participation using technology -- e-enabling, e-

engaging, and e-empowering – as one of the key dimensions of her framework,

and characterized three practices with her framework. In her work, e-enabling is

the first level that enables participation using technology. Accessibility and

understandability of information are the focus. The second level is e-engaging

concerned with top-down consulting using technology for citizens' deeper

contribution and deliberative debate on policy issues. The third and highest level

is e-empowering. In the e-empowering level, technology supports active

participation with the bottom-up perspective influencing the policy agendas.

FACTORS THAT CAUSE CHANGES

The reappearance of and emphasis on citizen participation and its

development, especially in the policy making process are caused by several

factors. Forlano (2004) mentioned pressures for e-government, and these factors

can also be factors bringing about changes in citizen participation in the policy

making process because current citizen participation is closely related to e-

government. Factors that Forlano (2004) mentioned are following: citizens' uses

of information and communication technology and their influence on policy

makers, the migration of government information on-line, availability of technical

infrastructure, and the effect of e-government strategies on public sector reform.

OECD (2001a) addressed five needs that are driving forces of strengthening

government-citizen relations. Those are the need to improve the quality of policy,

to meet the challenges of the emerging information society, to integrate public

input into the policy-making process, to respond to calls for greater government

transparency and accountability, and to strengthen public trust in government.

Broadly, development of the information and communication technology, growth

of citizens' awareness and demand for participation, and changing contexts for

policy making can be considered.

The most direct cause of change is absolutely the development of

information and communication technology. As mentioned before, the

development of ICT has brought numerous changes in the public sector as well as

every aspect of society. In addition, the application of the ICT is making great

contributions to active citizen participation. Many other factors bringing current

changes in citizen participation are also based on the ICT or using the ICT.

Growth of citizens' awareness and demand for participation in the policy

making process is an important factor. Citizen participation has a great number of

advantages including "increased problem-solving ability, better channels for

communication, improved program implementation, protection from criticism,

and clout in the budget process" (O'Looney, 2006, p. 237), and the most

important advantage in the public sector is acquisition of legitimacy in public

affairs. Legitimacy in the public sector is reinforced by enhancing citizens' roles

with citizens' demand on more reflection of their opinions in decision making as

well as required citizen participation in the legislative process, identification of

the value of social capital, and changes of professional norms (O'Looney, 2006).

Citizens just want to take part in and express their opinions when they want. The

things for government to do are recognizing that citizen participation is a

"disciplined and structured way to respond to the pressure exerted by citizens

demanding to have a say in the decisions that affect them most" (OECD, 2009, p.

203), and "managing a process of engagement that balances various interests and

responsibilities" (OECD, 2009, p. 203). Also, educated and well-informed

citizens, especially in OECD member countries, want their governments to

consider their opinions and knowledge on policy issues in the policy making

process (OECD, 2003).

Changes in various parts of society such as an increasingly interconnected

governmental environment and growing complexity in government itself,

increasing demands for detailed care from society and markets, and several

challenges that governments face like tax evasion, crime, and environmental

destruction make policy making more complicated. Citizens find it difficult to

understand the policy making process, to influence through voting, and to watch

government to keep it accountable. Also, governments have difficulty making

and implementing policies effectively and legitimately with their limited

resources and public support. Through changes in citizen participation in the

policy making process, citizens can increase their understanding and trust of

government and support it. Governments can also increase transparency and

accountability and obtain public support through satisfying citizens' expectations

(OECD, 2001b).

RESEARCH ON CITIZEN PARTICIPATION AND E-PARTICIPATIN IN

PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

In public administration, important research on citizen participation exists.

Arnstein's (1969) work is regarded as the origin of scholarly research in citizen

participation. Requirements of citizen participation in the by-laws of state and

federal governments produced various citizen participation programs, and

Freedom of Information Acts (FOIA) are the most representative laws that allow

citizens and anyone else to access government information. In addition, the

Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) can be regarded as an originator of citizen

participation in generic public administration in that it provided public

information to the public for selling public projects and gaining local support.

Subsequently, research on citizen participation in public administration is led by

two groups of scholars. One group saw public participation as "involving the

public decision making process of the bureaucracy and the deliberation of

democracy" (Cho & Hwang, 2010, p. 10). Thomas (1993; 1995; Thomas &

Streib, 2003), one of the leading scholars, examined appropriate levels of public

participation with a theory of decision-making. The other group of scholars saw

citizen participation as civic engagement. This group of scholars, led by Terry

Cooper (2005), argued the importance of collaboration between neighborhood

groups and city agencies to build more democratic governance, and therefore,

establish a stronger civil society (Cho & Hwang, 2010).

However, research on citizen participation using ICTs (e-participation) is

still at a beginning stage, in spite of its importance in research and government

practice in public administration. ICTs can advance citizen participation, and

therefore, satisfy the aspect of normative theory which states that every

stakeholder is given right to participate in the decision making. Some European

scholars focus on e-participation and e-consultation. Macintosh and Whyte

(2006) focused on the role of ICTs in the engagement of local authorities and

citizens in U.K. local government, and Coleman (2001) examined the relationship

between ICTs and citizen participation and democratic deliberation in the U.K.

Also, research on ICTs and citizen participation in the rule-making process is

performed in the U.S. (Cho & Hwang, 2010). Moynihan (2003) suggested

Washington D.C.'s Citizen Summit as a good example of fostering citizens' input

and overcoming citizens' weak understanding of public problems caused by

absence of adequate data using ICTs (Hwang & Hoffman, 2010).

HISTORICAL INSTITUTIONALISM

This research is a comparative study of citizen participation practices

using ICTs in Washington D.C. and Seoul. In the comparative analysis, concept

of historical institutionalism provides an analytical approach because it helps

explain why these two cities have different practices and perform as they do.

Historical institutionalism, a faction of new institutionalism, is a

perspective explaining social phenomena emphasizing institution as an important

variance and historical context. Historical institutionalism effectively explains the

differences between policies in different countries and the maintenance of policy

patterns in countries with an integrated view of historical context and macro-

structural analysis (Ha, 1999). Historical institutionalism argues that "the policy

choices made when an institution is being formed, or when a policy is initiated,

will have a continuing and largely determinate influence over the policy far into

the future (Skocpol, 1992; King, 1995)" (Peters, 1999, p. 63). Hall (1986), one of

the earliest researchers of historical institutionalism, emphasized the importance

of institutions in shaping policies in his work. Hall (1986) argued that "to understand the economic policy choices being made in these two countries (or any others) it was necessary to understand their political and policy histories" (Peters, 1999, p. 64). "The idea that institutions provide the context in which political actors define their strategies and pursue their interests" (Thelen & Steinmo, 1992, p. 7) is the main premise of historical institutionalism. One of the important features of historical institutionalism is path dependency. It means that "when a government program or organization embarks upon a path there is an inertial tendency for those initial policy choices to persist" (Peters, 1999, p. 63), and considerable political pressure is necessary to change this path (Peters, 1999). According to Hall (1986), the factor that differentiates historical institutionalism from normal incremental patterns of policy-making is path dependency. Historical institutionalism is looking at the influence of various institutional factors over governments' policy choices and performance. Once created, patterns of governments' selecting their initial policies and making institutional choices in a policy area will continue until enough force to overcome the current pattern appears, and it is called path dependence. Historical institutionalism does not always stick to the initial patterns - it adapts or evolves - but the formative period of the institution will restrict the possible changes (Peters, 1999).

SUMMARY

40

In democracy and democratic government, one of the most important elements is citizens' consent. Public consent and the reflection of citizens' views for governance, policy, and decision making and implementation invest governments with legitimacy and authority. However, ancient direct democracy and citizens' direct participation in governance, policy, and decision making process had transformed to representative democracy due to time and space limitations. Citizens can express their opinions and take part in the governance, policy, and decision making process through voting and other participatory mechanisms such as attending public hearings, joining in citizen advisory meetings, or answering surveys. In spite of various participatory mechanisms, citizens' demands for overcoming deficiencies of representative democracy and higher transparency and accountability from governments are growing. Also, citizens' demand for more active participation in the governance, policy, and decision making process is rising. With developed citizens' demands, the environment of governance, policy, and decision making becomes increasingly complex. These factors are driving forces of change in citizen participation in the governance, policy, and decision making process.

Development of technology, especially development of information and communication technology make it possible to satisfy citizens' growing demands. Development of ICTs renovates traditional forms of participation as well as creates new mechanisms and trends to extend the opportunities for citizen participation in the governance, policy, and decision making process. Adoption of ICTs in the governance, policy, and decision making process fosters citizen

41

direct participation and helping citizens and governments pursue democratic

values.

Chapter 3 explains the methodology used in the dissertation including

comparative case study analysis and its selection of cases. The analytical

framework and comparison criteria are introduced.

CHAPTER 3. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

COMPARATIVE CASE ANALYSIS

Among three purposes of research – exploration, description, and explanation (Babbie, 2004) - this research about citizen participation through innovative mechanisms is exploratory. Exploratory research is performed for the satisfaction of the researcher's curiosity and desire for better comprehension, test of the feasibility of more extensive research, and development of methods for further study (Babbie, 2004). E-participation is a relatively new research area, and adoption and application of information and communication technology in governance, policy, and decision making processes and changes in citizen participation need to be understood.

The methodology of this research is comparative study of two cities – Washington D.C. and Seoul. Comparative research is for finding patterns of similarities and differences across the cases. The goals of comparative research are exploring diversity within a particular set of cases, interpreting cultural or historical significance, and advancing theory as well as knowledge of cases themselves. The unique feature that comparative research has is focusing on diversity, therefore comparative researchers try to find the patterns of differences as well as patterns of similarities among cases, and assess patterns of diversity (Ragin, 1994). Through comparative study of two cities, these two cities' encouragement of citizen participation with innovative technologies as well as the

similarity and differences of their practices derived from the context of these two cities are reviewed.

Case studies help to consider variables and context at the same time, and provide comprehensiveness of the research (Jraisat, 2002). Babbie (2004) noted that the essential characteristic of case study is "limitation of attention to a particular instance of something" (p. 293). Yin (2009) pointed out that case study makes researchers keep "the holistic and meaningful characteristics of real-life events" (p. 4). Also, case study is suitable for research on critical, extreme, unique, representative, typical, revelatory, or longitudinal cases (Yin, 2009). The case study is suitable because research on citizen participation using innovative mechanisms is still relatively rare, and it will support this research to review and compare two cities' various practices encouraging citizen participation using ICTs.

As the first step for data collection, a literature review is performed based on international organization publications and government documents. Through the literature review, theoretical background and criteria for comparison will be set up for analysis. After the literature review, relevant data on the cities' efforts as well as specific programs of the two cities for encouraging citizen participation is collected for analysis. The source of data is mainly government reports and documents. The cities' main websites and their programs' websites are examined because basically the two cities' programs are based on use of information and communication technology, especially the Internet. Qualitative analysis will be used. General information on the programs, history and background of

implementation, key benefits, implementation strategies, and obstacles to implementation is reviewed.

After collecting data and description of the programs, some of the two cities' citizen participation programs will be selected and analyzed for the comparative study. The facts of Washington D.C. and Seoul encouraging citizen participation shown in their specific programs are reviewed and compared in each category of an analytical framework. Factors included in each category of the analytical framework are compared in specific programs of the two cities.

SELECTION OF CASES

For this comparative research, Washington D.C., the United States and Seoul, South Korea are selected as units of analysis. Jraisat (2002) argued that the purpose of a comparative research strategy is "to define general patterns from experiences across several cases" (p.51). In comparative research, determining the unit of analysis is an important step to start research. The unit of analysis can be individual, group, organization, or national bureaucracy (government). Also, organizations within or across political boundaries can be compared. Within the same society or the same political setting, various activities of organizations and agencies can be compared. First, the United States and South Korea are famous for their use of innovative technologies in public administration and citizen participation.

In e-government surveys, the UN has performed assessment of the quality and usefulness of countries' information and services for the engagement of their citizens in governance and the public policy making process through information and communication technologies with an e-participation index. The UN categorizes e-participation under three categories: e-information, e-consultation, and e-decision-making. In the e-information category, governments' websites and various information of public interest that governments' websites provide through a number of online tools are reviewed. The e-consultation category reviews tools provided in the government website for e-consultation allowing citizens to set agendas, direct communication with elected officials, and feedback. In the e-decision-making, governments focus on citizens' direct input through technologies in decision making processes, and government's provision of information on decision making are reviewed (UN, 2008).

The OECD (2001a) also emphasizes information, consultation, and active participation for strengthening relations between citizens and governments, and these are similar to the three categories that the UN suggests. Information means government's provision of information on policy making, and therefore citizens can access information they want. It is essentially one-way communication from government to citizens. Consultation is government's asking and receiving citizens' feedback on policy making. Because government provides information on policy making beforehand and receives citizens' feedback, it is a limited two-way relation between government and citizens. Active participation means citizens are actively engaged in decision-making and policy-making. Citizens

46

actively play their roles of exchanging their views on policy making, and government is responsible for final decision making. It is an advanced two-way relationship between government and citizens and it is built on the principle of partnership. In the United Nations e-government survey, the United States and South Korea have been recognized as top-ranked countries.

The fact that Washington D.C. and Seoul as capitals of the two countries – the United States and South Korea – fostering of their citizens' participation in their governance, policy, and decision making process has been recognized is a major reason that these two cities are selected for this research. Usually, cities that have much similarity including population, stage of development, and various demographic and other situations are chosen when cities are selected for comparison. Washington D.C. and Seoul do not fit typical standards of case selection. However, it is symbolic and meaningful that the two cities are selected and compared because Washington D.C. and Seoul both are the capitals of the United States and South Korea respectively. Even though the cities have differences in various aspects, programs and practices of these two cities can be models for other local governments' programs and practices in their countries. Practices of the two cities using innovative mechanisms in citizen participation become exemplary to other cities. Both cities have made great effort to build and utilize their websites and provide every kind of information and services about city affairs. They also encourage citizens to participate in administration and policy making processes by answering citizens' questions, receiving citizens' petitions, and opening places to participate in discussions on their policy issues.

47

Washington D.C. has been recognized several times in various research and surveys on e-government and e-participation. Know-how used in Washington D.C. Citizen Summit was disseminated to other cities and states in the United States including New York, New Orleans, Ohio, and California. Seoul also has been highly ranked as one of the most ICT-utilizing cities in the world and its practices have been recognized as best practices. Several international conferences about information and communication technology and e-government were held in Seoul such as the World e-Government Mayors Forum and the World Cities CIO Forum, and Seoul e-Government Declaration was approved. Comparative study on these two cities' efforts to foster citizen participation can suggest meaningful implications for citizen participation using innovative mechanisms.

ANALYTICAL FRAMEWORK

For the comparison of electronic citizen participation practices in Washington D.C. and Seoul, it is necessary to build a framework which contains what to compare. Because the subject of electronic citizen participation is a relatively new research area, preceding research is rare. However, several scholars have studied key factors of e-participation and developed frameworks.

Macintosh (2004) provided a characterization framework for comparison of e-participation initiatives. She identified ten key dimensions of e-participation and characterized three initiatives in Scotland. She argued that the main focus of

this framework is "how ICT could be applied to enhance citizen participation in the policy process" (p. 2). Key dimensions of e-participation are level of participation, stage in decision-making, actors, technologies used, rules of engagement, duration and sustainability, accessibility, resources and promotion, evaluation and outcome, and critical factors for success. Level of participation is about "what level, or how far, citizens are engaged" (p. 2), and focuses on the use of technology to enable, engage, and empower citizens in each level. Stage in policy-making process views "when to engage citizens" (p. 3) in the policy-making life cycle of agenda setting, analysis, creating the policy, implementing the policy, and monitoring the policy.

Actors are about "who should be engaged and by whom" (p. 4), identifying stakeholders' responsibility in e-participation. Technologies used "considers how and with what to engage citizens and support participation" (p. 4). The application of technologies in each level of participation is reviewed. Rules of engagement "considers what personal information will be needed/collected, how it will be used by the system, and also what citizens can and cannot do during the e-participation" (p. 5). Duration and sustainability is about "what period of time the initiatives lasted" (p. 5), which sees whether the initiative is one-time or not, and then how long it lasted.

Accessibility concerns "how many citizens participated and from where" (p. 5), and considers the channel and the locality of participation. Resources and promotion consider "the financial implications of using ICTs to support participation" (p. 5). Evaluation and outcomes considers "how the initiative was

49

evaluated, the results of the evaluation and also the overall results from the initiative" (p. 5) in political, technical, and social perspectives. Finally, critical factors for success focus on any "political, legal, cultural, economic, or technological factors" (p. 6) that researchers need to consider. As mentioned above, Macintosh (2004) clarified the purpose of the framework is comparing and contrasting e-participation practices.

Chen and Hsieh (2009) developed a framework for electronic governance (e-governance) performance based on Fountain's (2001) technology enactment framework, and compared e-governance performance of Taiwan and the United States. They argued two defining features of e-governance. One is seamlessness and integration of government and the other is online citizen participation in governance. For comparing e-governance performance, three drivers – institutional, organizational, and technological drivers – are essential. Institutional factors including laws and policies and democratic institutions which support citizen participation become a foundation of development and implementation of e-governance. Also, laws and policies build trust by protecting privacy and security of citizens, and provide governments' transparency. These features encourage citizen participation. Organizational drivers in e-governance are e-government as a part of administrative reform and "government effort to engage citizens in the policy-making process" (Chen & Hsieh, 2009, p. S153). Technological development is another driver of e-governance. Development of information technologies and telecommunication infrastructure allows citizens to access the Internet at anytime in any place (Chen & Hsieh, 2009). Even though

these three drivers are not directly for e-participation, they can be considered as criteria for the comparison of citizen participation through innovative mechanisms because online citizen participation is one of the defining features of e-governance.

Macintosh and Smith (2007) developed an analytical framework for a forum on identifying important characteristics of e-participation within the Western Balkan context. They performed case studies of the best e-participation initiatives to find initiatives of e-participation that are relevant to the context of the WebDep forum. For the case studies, they developed its framework, DEMO-net, "Dimensions to describe and compare eParticipation tool categories", and other resources. The framework consists of 17 key dimensions – title, general description, basis of initiative, democracy context, participation area, direction of communication/level of participation, stage in policy cycle, stakeholders, rules of engagement, moderation/facilitation/content-rating, accessibility of the tool, language support, channel availability, technologies, evaluation mechanisms, further examples, and further information. Among 17 dimensions, several dimensions, for example, title, general description and so on, can be omitted for the comparison criteria. Even though this framework was developed for the purpose of finding initiatives that are good for the WebDep forum and Western Balkans context, this framework contains necessary dimensions to be used as comparison criteria for this research.

The OECD has two works about citizen engagement with government. First, the OECD (2001b) suggested necessary elements of building a framework

for strengthening government-citizen relations. The framework has five categories of strengthening elements – legal, policy, institutional, evaluation, and general capacities – and specifically provides legal, policy, and institutional elements in each level of citizen engagement - information, consultation, and active participation.

Another OECD work (2003) presents case studies on countries' e-engagement. For the case studies on countries' experiences of online citizen engagement in the policy-making process, OECD provided an analytical framework for e-engagement and analyses of ten cases. Items of the framework are the relevant stage in the policy-making cycle, the government units and the target groups involved, feedback received from participants, the specific technologies used (described specifically in information, consultation, and participation), the main obstacles encountered, and the key elements of success.

Coleman and Kaposi (2006) proposed five key themes for their research on the relationship between using the Internet and forms of participation – national context, objectives, governance and accountability, publicity, and evaluation. To answer the question of "whether the Internet facilitated forms of participation that strengthen citizens' capacity for collective action and political influence" (6), they collected information about e-democracy projects and performed in-depth descriptive case studies of six selected cases. Five themes were used in the case studies. National context means the specific historical and socio-political context, which focuses on the media and telecommunications environments. Objectives mean not only explicitly stated but also implicit

objectives. Coleman and Kaposi (2006) argued that almost all initiatives have one of three common objectives – "to make power more transparent and less corrupt" (p. 14), "to facilitate the free flow of shared knowledge between hitherto under-resourced or dispersed networks" (p. 15), and making "opportunities for citizens to initiate policy ideas" (p. 17). Governance and accountability is about how projects are started and shaped, and to "whom they are accountable" (p. 18). Publicity concerns project marketing and attempting "to overcome popular disdain for political and governmental initiatives" (p. 19). Evaluation concerns the evaluation of outcomes and sustainability of projects as a key factor of evaluation.

Holzer and Kim (2007) performed the Digital Governance in Municipalities Worldwide Survey. In the research, they evaluated 100 cities' websites worldwide, and one of the Survey areas is citizen participation. The measurements of the evaluation in citizen participation are: comments or feedback, newsletter, online bulletin board or chat capacities, online discussion forum on policy issues, scheduled e-meetings for discussion, online survey/polls, synchronous video, citizen satisfaction survey, online decision-making, and performance measures, standards, or benchmarks. The UN (2010) assesses e-participation of countries as one part of the United Nations E-government Survey. Questions on E-participation assessment focus on "the use of the Internet to facilitate provision of information by government to citizens, interaction with stakeholders, and engagement in decision-making process" (p. 113). Specifically, laws and regulations accessible, strategies and policies are explained and options

under consideration presented are measured in the use of the Internet to facilitate provision of information by government to citizens. Feedback from citizens acknowledged with an appropriate response is measured in interaction with stakeholders. In engagement in the decision-making process, direct input into public policy by citizen's groups is measured. Then, an e-participation index value is calculated with these measurements.

The analytical framework in this research for comparison of two cities' e-participation practices is built by synthesizing frameworks and combining key factors of e-participation described above. Comparison items are general capacity and description, actors, policy, management, and evaluation. These five comparative items are reviewed with various specific sub-comparison items. Comparison items are organized in Table 3.1. With these comparison items, practices that are being performed and have been performed in Washington D.C. and Seoul are described in the next chapter.

Table 3.1

Comparison Items

Comparison item	Possible specific sub-comparison item
General capacity	- Title - General description - Basis of initiative - Participation area - Moderation - Objective - Stage in decision-making process (when to engage) - Technologies used (how to engage, with what to engage)
Actors	- Who engaged / by whom engaged - Organization leader

	- Government unit - Target group involved - Stakeholder - Initiator
Legal aspect	- Rules of engagement - What personal information needed/ collected - What information is accessible to citizens - How the information can be accessed and/or received
Management	- Resource and promotion (cost, advertisement, external funder/internal constituencies) - Publicity - Accessibility to the tool - Language support - Channel availability
Evaluation	- Evaluation methodology - Outcome - Critical factor for success (political, legal, cultural, economic, technological) - Main obstacles - Innovation and key elements of success - Duration and sustainability

CHAPTER 4. FINDINGS

This chapter explains citizen participation using innovative mechanisms in

Washington D.C. and Seoul. As explained in Chapter 3, e-participation can be

divided into three categories of information, consultation, and participation.

These categories are evident in the governance, policy, and decision making

process and are realized through specific tools. The examples of e-participation

in information are access to public records, official gazettes, and government

websites. In consultation, public opinion surveys and comments on draft

legislation are examples. Consensus conferences and citizens' juries are

examples of participation (OECD, 2001a). OECD (2003) summarized specific

tools used in each category in practice as indicated in Table 4.1. Some tools are

used in different stages in the policy-making cycle.

Table 4.1

Tools for Online Engagement at Each Stage of Policy-making

Stage in policy-making cycle	Information	Consultation	Participation
Agenda-setting	- Site-specific search engines - E-mail alerts for new policy issues - Translation support for several languages - Style checkers to remove jargon	- Online surveys and opinion polls - Discussion forums - Monitoring emails - Frequently asked questions (FAQs)	- E-communities - E-petition - E-referenda
Analysis	- Translation support for ethnic	- Evidence-managed facilities	- Electronic citizen juries

	languages - Style checkers to remove jargon	- Expert profiling	- E-communities
Formulation	- Advanced style checking to help interpret technical and legal terms	- Discussion forums - Online citizen juries - E-community tools	- E-petitions - E-referenda amending legislation
Implementation	- Natural language style checkers - E-mail newsletters	- Discussion forums - Online citizen juries - E-community tools	- E-mail distribution lists for target groups
Monitoring	- Online feedback - Online publication of annual reports	- Online surveys and opinion polls - Discussion forums - Monitoring emails - Bulletin boards - Frequently asked questions (FAQs)	- E-petitions - E-referenda

Source: *Promise and Problems of E-democracy* (p.14), by OECD, 2003, Paris: OECD Publications.

Various tools of e-participation in information, consultation, and participation mentioned above can be found in governments' integrated websites. Governments have opened representative websites for the purpose of facilitating citizens' easy access to government affairs. For citizens to access and gain what they want in a spot conveniently, governments combined separate websites and put almost all necessary functions in one website. As necessary, separate websites are linked to the representative website. Washington D.C. (www.dc.gov) and Seoul (www.seoul.go.kr) also have their integrated representative websites encompassing various tools of e-participation. Therefore, in this research, the main objects for the review and analysis are the websites of Washington D.C. and Seoul because the websites are important tools of

information and contain tools of consultation and participation. In this chapter, the two websites of Washington D.C. and Seoul are described in detail following criteria suggested in Chapter 3. In addition, websites of Washington D.C.'s Citizen Summit and Seoul's Oasis[2] as examples of active participation are reviewed.

DEMOGRAPHIC CONTEXT OF THE CITIES

Seoul has been the capital of South Korea from the Joseon Dynasty since the end of the 1300's. After World War II and independence from Japan, the Republic of Korea was established in 1948 and Seoul continued to be the capital of the Republic of Korea. Going through the Korean War, modernization and democratization, Seoul has grown as one of the biggest and the most dynamic cities in the world. Seoul is located in the center of the Korean Peninsula, and it is 605.25 square kilometers in area. Seoul's population was 10,464,000 and population density was 17,289/km^2 in 2009, one of the cities in the world that have the highest population density. Seoul is divided by 25 Gu – sub-level local district of city, wards ("Seoul City", n. d.). Seoul is the biggest city in South Korea, and it is the core of all aspects of Korean society including politics, economy, and culture. Seoul is governed by the mayor and the city council has 114 members ("Members of Council", n. d.).

The percent of households in Seoul holding personal computers was 86.8% in

---

[2] Seoul Metropolitan Government is operating a separate website for Seoul Oasis (http://oasis.seoul.go.kr).

2008, and the percent of households in Seoul with high-speed broadband Internet access was 96.6% in 2008 ("Seoul Statistics", n. d.).

Washington D.C. has been the capital of the United States since 1790. Different from other cities in the United States, Washington D.C. was established by the Constitution of the United States for serving as the capitol of the nation. After the Civil War, Washington D.C. absorbed surrounding areas and expanded. Wars and national events brought the growth of the Federal government as well as population. Population of Washington D.C. was 601,723 in 2010, and the daytime workweek population increases due to commuters from the suburbs. Population density of Washington D.C. is 9,856.5 per sq. mile. According to the 2010 U. S. Census, 50.7% is African –American, 38.5% is Caucasian, 3.5% is Asian, and 0.3% is American Indian. 9.1% is Hispanic, and 90.9% is non-Hispanic ("Census 2010 Data", 2011). There has been a large African-American population in Washington D.C. since the city was built[3]. The total area of Washington D.C. is 68.3 sq. miles (177 km^2). Washington D.C. is a planned city, and it has eight wards. The U. S. Congress is granted ultimate authority over D.C. by the United States Constitution Article One, Section Eight. Washington D.C. had an elected municipal government and an elected mayor for the first time after the 1973 Home Rule Act passed. The Council of the District of Columbia has thirteen members, but Congress reserves the right to oversee city affairs and the

---

[3] After it was released, the result of the U.S. Census in 2010 showed the possibility that the largest racial group in Washington D.C. could change. In the result of 2010 Census, the Hispanic and non-Hispanic Caucasian population grew. On the other hand, the population of African-American is reduced more than Caucasian's increase. African-American is still the largest group in Washington D.C. but it is gradually changed (Dorell, 2011).

local budget adopted by the mayor and council are approved by Congress ("Market facts and statistics", n.d.).

In 2003, about 59.5% of the households in Washington D.C. had a computer and the percent of households in Washington D.C. with Internet access is about 53% (US Census Bureau, 2003). The percent of households in Washington D.C. using broadband in the home was 71.7% in 2010 (NTIA, 2011).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA WEBSITE

Washington D.C. government opened its web portal, DC.Gov (http://www.dc.gov), in 1999 for providing government information and services in the District of Columbia. The website includes over 100 websites for District government and covers topics of overall city affairs. The website also provides numbers of online services, forms, and databases, and encourages citizens to request city services online instead of waiting in line. Launched in 1999, the District's website developed the appearance of a user-oriented portal site in a short time. The website design was developed with its strong user-oriented features of integration of information and services and convenient and efficient access to information and services across boundaries of organizations that provide information and services (Ho, 2002). In the website, links of the most popular online services are in the center of the front page, and pull-down menus of other online services, online forms, and online searchable databases are in the left and right side of the portal page. The D.C. website is clearly laid out, and it has

privacy and security statements and plenty of information with various forms including audio and video materials (West, 2004a).

The Washington D.C. website has been redesigned with new features in response to requests from the public and District agencies since 2007. The changes are to improve the level of service and transparency to those who access the website and use services and information. Website redesigning pursues improved accessibility for residents with disabilities, intuitive navigation with dynamic menus, and graphs for fast and natural movement through sites, offering contents for mobile access and incorporating Government 2.0 functionalities, and sustainability by reducing the number of steps so agencies keep the contents current. New design of the website allowed citizens to personalize functions such as tracking news, online transactions, and favorites. The District accepts changes to the website quickly and easily, organizes content to avoid duplication of effort, and automates content publication from the website. Redesigning is continuous and current redesign efforts will be completed by the first quarter of 2011.

In 2009, web content management system replacement has been accompanied by implementing a new design interface for the website. The new platform of the website is more customer-centric. Replacement of the system, completed in 2010, brought an increase of access to mobile devices and improvement of online service workflow. The new system speeded up agencies' content posting and made integration of social networking technologies possible. Integration of agencies' individual sites into the overall website architecture and workflow has been performed in coordination with other agencies. Coordination

includes update of content, provision of consultation, and training on information architecture, and overall project consultation. In 2010, 35 websites of 31 agencies launched with the new content management system of the District. Transformation of the remaining websites will be completed by 2011 (OCTO, 2008; 2009a; 2010a; 2010b; 2011)

DC.Gov, first launched with 20 pages of content in 1999, is now providing more than 200,000 pages of content, more than 120 websites, over 300 online forms and surveys, and more than 200 online applications. Because the template with the same design is provided, connected websites of agencies have the same look and feel. Applications developed over the last 10 years allow government to automate transactions, and these applications permit citizens to have online services. The most used services are Online Service Request Center, DMB online application, Applying for Government Jobs, and Public School Information.

The Office of Chief Technology Officer has the mission to maximize integration as well as to improve cost efficiency of government operations through improving service delivery, leading innovation, and bridging the digital divide using technology. The website of the District has three purposes: to provide website users clear routes to the information and services necessary so they can reach what they want to find quickly and easily, to satisfy citizens requests, and to make citizens' experience with the government affairs positive. DC.Gov is an innovative web portal of the District of Columbia improving transparency and accountability in government agencies of the city.

The website of the District performs important roles of information provision, community building, consultation, discourse, and mediation by providing information, applications, and services. These website's various functions and information help citizens of the District participate in the governance, policy, and decision making process, especially in the agenda setting stage. Citizens can express their opinions about city affairs based on information they obtain in the website.

Actor

The government unit that manages the website of D.C. is the Office of Chief Technology Officer. The Office of Chief Technology Officer was established by the D.C. Council in 1998, and the Chief of Technology Officer has full authority and power over the Office. The Office of Chief Technology was established to "centralize responsibility for the District government's investments in information technology and telecommunications systems to help District departments and agencies provide services more efficiently and effectively" (DC ST §1-1402, 2001). The Office develops and implements policy directives and standards of information technology and telecommunication systems of the District government. Also, the Office provides expertise for the District government and agencies to improve public service using information technology and telecommunication systems. The Office of Chief Technology Officer has three primary organizational functions – the Office of the Chief Technology

Officer, Agency Support Services, and Technical Services (DC ST §1-1401, 2001; DC ST §1-1402, 2001; DC ST §1-1405, 2001).

To make DC.Gov useful, over 80 District agencies provide content in their website and are responsible for their posted content. Users of the website can find agencies' phone numbers and contact information at the end of content. Various groups work together to make online applications, maps, and data available so that website users can easily find what they want.

D.C.'s website mainly targets residents in the District, but also provides various information about the District of Columbia so everyone who is interested and wants to get information about D.C. can use the website. The website has separate sections for the District residents, businesses, and visitors. The website also provides services with a differently designed website for children. The website provides games from which children can get to know about the U.S. Presidents, the Capitol, political words, and the Smithsonian. Using video clips and animation, children can get information about D.C. including D.C.'s history, historic people and places, facts, and D.C.'s sports. Through these services, children can get information about D.C. in a fun way.

Legal Aspect

The Legal basis for Washington D.C.'s website opening and operation is various policies in federal acts, executive orders, and the city's official codes. Federal laws supercede executive orders and the city official codes in Washington

D.C. The Privacy Act of 1974 established policy to find a balance between government's management of individual information and individuals' rights concerning protection of their privacy and personal information and public agencies' unwarranted dealing with personal information. The main focuses of the Act are to restrict public agencies' disclosure of personal information, to grant individuals increased rights to access public agencies' records and to request amendment if they find records flawed, and to establish strong standards for public agencies to collect, maintain, and disseminate personal information. This Act also concerns possible abuse of personal data stored in the public agencies' computers resulting from the increase in computer use. In 1988, The Privacy Act was amended by the Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act. The Computer Matching and Privacy Protection Act prescribes procedural requirements for public agencies' computer matching activities. When public agencies use computer matching with personal information, public agencies must notify the subjects before matching and individuals must have the chance to refute adverse information. Public agencies that engage in matching activities must establish a Data Integrity Board to oversee and coordinate matching activities (Department of Justice, 2010; Relyea & Hugue, 2004).

The Freedom of Information Act, enacted in 1966, is another important legal framework for maintaining e-government in the United States. The Freedom of Information Act of 1946, revision of the public disclosure of the Administrative Procedure Act, prescribes citizens' rights to request access to public agencies' records. As long as records do not fall under one of the nine

exemptions or three special law enforcement records exclusions prescribed in the

Act, the records of public agencies, especially information of the Federal

executive branch must be provided upon request. The basic purposes of the Act

are to insure that citizens are informed, to prevent corruption, to raise

accountability of public officers, and therefore to make democratic society

function well. The Freedom of Information Act has been amended several times.

The amendment in 1996, the Electronic Freedom of Information Act Amendment,

addressed electronic forms of records as one of the objects to which the Freedom

of Information Act is applied. People can electronically request information, and

be provided an electronic form of public agencies' information. Also, public

agencies must provide so-called electronic reading rooms for citizens to access

information online (Department of Justice, 2009; Relyea & Hugue, 2004).

The Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 was passed to reduce excessive

information collection by public agencies and reporting requirements of citizens.

The purposes of the Act are to minimize the paperwork in administrative

procedures, to maximize public benefit and minimize the cost, and to improve

quality and use of public information. Also, the Act focuses on the management

of federal information resources by the Office of Management and Budget. For

information collection, it is mandatory for public agencies to have clearance by

the Office of Information and Regulation Affairs established in the Office of

Management and Budget (Relyea & Hugue, 2004).

The amendment of the Paperwork Reduction Act in 1995 revised the

authority and functions of the Office of Information and Regulation Affairs (S.

244). In 1996, the Paperwork Reduction Act was modified by the Clinger-Cohen

Act. The main ideas of this Act are to establish chief information officer

positions and to provide for the duties and qualifications of chief information

officers. Also, each agency has responsibility to develop the best cost-effective

information technologies. After the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 and the

Clinger-Cohen Act of 1996, Executive Order No.13011: Federal Information

Technology Management was issued by President William Clinton in 1996. The

main focuses of the Executive Order are "to improve Federal IT management and

promote a coordinated approach to its application and use across the executive

branch" (Relyea & Hugue, 2004, pp.27-28). The Government Paperwork

Elimination Act of 1998 is another amendment to the Paperwork Reduction Act.

This act establishes duties of the Director of the Office of Management and

Budget related to directing and overseeing procurement and use of information

technology substitutable for paper and use of electronic signature.

  The E-Government Act in 2002 was enacted for the improvement of

electronic government service. To keep up with changes in society with

information and communication technologies, and to provide better and more

convenient government services using the Internet, the Act prescribes the

establishment of effective leadership in the Office of Management and Budget to

develop and promote electronic government services. Also, the Act provides

promotion of the use of information and communication technologies and the

Internet to achieve benefits including more citizen participation, improvement of

effectiveness, transparency and accountability of government affairs, and provision of higher quality information.

The District of Columbia Official Code §1-1403 is statutory authority for D.C.'s Internet related policies including Internet access and e-mail use. The District of Columbia Official Code §1-1403 (2001) includes of the Office of the Chief Technology Officer which is responsible for the management of the website of Washington D.C. Major functions of the Office of the Chief Technology Officer mentioned in the District of Columbia Official Code §1-1403 are review, approval, and issue of information technology and telecommunication systems resources, and services, coordination, promotion, and provision of advice for online activities of D.C. government agencies, and maintenance and oversight of data and equipment.

Management

In 2010, the budget of the Office of the Chief Technology Officer, responsible for maintaining the website of the District was about 59,000,000 dollars. It was more than 30% less than the budget in 2009. However in 2011, a 16.5% budget increase was proposed, to about 69,000,000 dollars. With this budget, the Office of Chief Technology Office operates seven divisions: application solutions, program management office, shared infrastructure services, information security, technology support services, agency management, and agency financial operations. Among activities of seven divisions, activities of

application solutions, shared infrastructure services, and information security are directly connected to the operation and maintenance of the website (OCTO, 2010c).

To draw attention of citizens to the information and services in DC.Gov, various means are used both on- and off-line. Agencies individually publicize their services in the website with various forms of media. Traditional methods including television, newspaper, radio, flyers, and brochures are used, and agencies also use social networks to provide information to citizens as well as to receive feedback from citizens ("Washington D.C. – Top city government website award", n. d.).

Launched in 1999, DC.Gov rapidly grew as a portal website with plenty of online content and applications relevant to citizens' lives in the District, and became a popular website. The number of visitors to the website increased with rapid development of the website. In five years after opening, over 100 million visitors accessed the website. In 2004, more than 11 million people visited the website ("About the District Government Website", n. d.). DC.Gov also follows federal government standards that allow people with disability to use Web content and applications. Using graphic elements and assistive technology, the District website gives opportunities to citizens with disability.

The District supplies the website users with translation services, machine translation and human translation, to provide government documents. The D.C. website provides online machine translation of text and the webpage for the website users' convenience, but machine translation is sometimes incorrect or

imprecise and some resources in the website cannot be translated. Also, the

District government does not guarantee the quality of information translated by

machine service. Therefore the District government strongly encourages citizens

to make phone calls directly to District agencies for additional information

translated in their languages. District agencies use staff who can speak other

languages or telephonic interpreters for more assistance. Also, District agencies

keep the information of their agencies up-to-date and post translated information

into the languages that are used by the large population of the District.

Internet technology allows citizens to obtain information about District

affairs and to use public services and applications online. E-mails and text

messages are other tools that connect the District government and citizens.

Citizens can subscribe to information about city services, news, and events that

the District government provides by email and text alerts. Government agencies

provide information through various social networks, and citizens can follow

services and topics that they are interested in. Through social networking sites,

citizens can see and make news, submit requests, and start conversations about

issues of their city and communities. In 2010, the District government launched a

beta mobile site of DC.Gov and mobile application (OCTO, 2009b).

Evaluation

When the website of the District, DC.Gov, was first established in 1999,

the appearance of the website was simple with 20 web pages. For 12 years, the

website has greatly improved with various content, information, forms, applications, and services for citizens in the District. To continue the improvement of the website to be more convenient and efficient, the District government operates the system getting feedback and evaluation by citizens about the overall issues of the website. The Office of Chief Technology Officer arranges regular meetings with other agencies and quarterly meetings with the Chief Technology Officer. Surveys for other agencies are performed by the Office of Chief Technology Officer. Through these efforts, agencies can receive meaningful and immediate feedback on the interaction with the Office of Chief Technology Officer. An automatic system sends voluntary customer satisfaction surveys to customers by email. Citizens can provide feedback on the experience with D.C. government as well as using the District website, and because the website is currently under the redesign, opinions and feedback on redesigning and improvement of the website also can be expressed ("About the District Government Website", n. d.). Citizens can give their feedback through the District's main 311 call center, social networking site, and direct suggestions at physical service centers located throughout the District. Agency directors and program managers collect and review citizens' feedback and opinions, and prioritize what kinds of online services are beneficial to citizens (OCTO, 2009a; "Washington D.C. – Top city government website award", n. d.).

The effort of the District government to provide high quality information and services through its website has been recognized with many awards. In 2003 and 2005, DC.Gov was selected as the best government website in America by

the Center for Digital Government[4]. The website was selected through evaluation

on innovation, web-based public service delivery, efficiency, economy, and

functionality for improved citizen access. In 2010, the District website was

recognized as one of the top city government websites by Juggle[5]. In the Digital

Cities Survey, Washington D.C. has been in the top ten cities among American

cities with 250,000 or more population several times from 2004 to 2009. DC.Gov

received the 2009 Municipal Web Portal Excellence Award in the U.S.

Municipalities E-Governance Survey. In the research performed from 2001 to

2004 by West (2001; 2002; 2003; 2004b), Washington D.C. had been highly

ranked in e-government among 70 American cities.

Time, money, and resources are major obstacles to overcome in launching

and maintaining the website, similar to other projects. Building most portal

components and moving them into a large maintenance system and operation

through 2005 was finally done after the Office of Chief Technology Officer got

executive buy-in for a large scale of overhaul start redesign. These obstacles still

exist in some ways, and it causes operational teams to spend their energy on

overcoming those obstacles.

In spite of these difficulties, the District website has been a successful

program thanks to the efforts to provide convenient and efficient services to the

---

[4] Center for Digital Government is a national research and advisory institute on information technology policies and best practices in state and local government (www.centerdigitalgov.com).

[5] Juggle is a website that provides various information, articles, facts, and discussions in various areas of interest. It has a Website Awards Program that recognizes outstanding websites across a variety of categories (www.juggle.com).

citizens. Redesigning the website, system and information architecture

replacement, and content strategy improve user experience with the website as

well as reduce maintenance costs and time. In addition, these efforts utilize the

latest web technologies to supply news, information, and services to the citizens

in the District. The innovative website of the District of Columbia encourages

transparency and accountability of the government agencies in D.C. with various

useful resources.

SEOUL WEBSITE

The City of Seoul's website (http://www.seoul.go.kr) was launched in

1996. At that time, building websites was booming in Korean governments,

central as well as municipal, prompted by development of Internet technology and

popular vote in municipal elections. Since 1995, the era of citizen's popular vote

in municipal elections developed, and many municipal governments in South

Korea started paying attention to promoting municipal administration through

websites because opening and maintaining websites made governments' domestic

and overseas visibility possible with effectiveness and efficiency. Municipal

governments opened their websites with the purpose being to publicize municipal

administration. Because launching its website was later than other municipal

governments, Seoul Metropolitan Government made an effort to develop the most

representative website in Korea. In first Seoul's website, various information

about Seoul was provided with photos including Seoul's history, nature,

geography, culture, administration, and industry. Citizens as well as others could

find information relevant to sightseeing – cultural facilities and tourist places,

lodging, transportation, sports and event schedules, and information for living in

Seoul and for making civil complaints.

After 2002, the Seoul website was reborn as a portal site. The website

changed its Internet address, and individually operated websites of Seoul

Metropolitan Government were combined into one. Before the combination of

websites, 126 websites were opened and operated by Seoul Metropolitan

Government, and they were criticized for inefficient management. For

improvement of website management and maximization of user convenience

through a one-stop visit, integration of websites was started in 2002, and phased

integration was done in 2004. Final integration was completed in 2005. The

integration was not a simple combination of the websites but functional re-

organization of the websites. Contents and services were completely modified.

Standardization of technology and management was also completed. Therefore,

convenience in information use and complaints settlement were improved and

efficiency in management following extension into the future was secured. Seoul

Metropolitan Government's successful effort for the Seoul website was rewarded

with being selected as the most excellent e-government in 100 cities in the world

by the United Nations in two years, 2003 and 2004 (SMG, 2007).

In 2007, the Seoul website was renovated with the movement from

concentration on information providers to information users based on

Government 2.0 technology. The most used sub-menus were combined into six

items, and necessary convenient functions were added. Introduction of the

Government 2.0 technology extended sharing of information on the city

administration, citizen participation, and openness. A mileage system[6] was added

for encouraging citizen participation (Kim, 2007). Website renovation was

performed in 2009 again. Access to the website was improved for those who

were marginalized from getting information, and administrative information

provided by individual agencies, bureaus and centers were collected and re-

organized with five administrative issues. Also, improved composition of the

website allowed citizens to use it conveniently according to their purposes (Jeon,

2009).

As a portal website, Seoul website provides information about Seoul and

its administration, one-click public services combining about 680 e-government

services from 15 government agencies, reservation for use of facilities and for

educational programs, policy discussion arenas, and a window for direct appeal to

the mayor. These functions of the website cover mainly information provision

and consultation, and community building, discourse, and mediation for agenda

setting.

Functions that achieved objectives of the website were changed whenever

the website was renovated. At the early stage, the Seoul website was for

publicizing Seoul and its administration like other municipal websites. As the

website was renovated, the focus moved from publicity to provision of

---

[6] Mileage system is an award system which presents points useful for purchasing
services to citizens who actively participate in the website. With the points,
citizens can pay for sending text messages, make a donation, exchange for culture
gift certificates, and pay for public transportation.

information about Seoul customized to various website users. Also, provision of

public services including forms and documents, responses to various requests, and

actual transactions (direct or indirect ways to connect links) became another

objective of the website.

Actor

The Seoul website is open to everyone who is interested in Seoul.

Website services focus mainly on Seoul residents and their lives, but anyone can

access the website and obtain information about Seoul because information about

various areas is provided on the website. Besides general information and public

services of Seoul, the website provides customized information relevant to

specific citizen groups. For business people, information about running business

in Seoul including taxes, job finding, training, and consulting is provided. For

visitors, places to go, various events, maps, and tour routes are posted on the

website. For older people and disabled people, separate sub-websites are

prepared with customized information. For children, a separate website is open

with explanation about Seoul and its affairs, educational information, and events

and other opportunities that children can participate in, and therefore children can

be familiar with city affairs. Also, detailed information for women, people with

lower income, and people who are looking for jobs is found. The Seoul website is

open so that the public and citizens as well as non-citizens of Seoul can access

and participate in Seoul's public affairs

Operation and management of the Seoul website is the responsibility of

the Information System Planning Bureau, Seoul Metropolitan Government. The

Information System Planning Bureau is in charge of overall affairs of Seoul e-

government and informatization projects, and provides administrative, statistical,

and geographic information for Seoul. For substantial works, the Internet Service

Team and Content Planning Team under the Information Planning Division in the

Information System Planning Bureau take charge of the works. The Internet

Service Team and Content Planning Team are responsible for establishment and

effective management of the website and relevant policy making. Individual

offices, agencies, and bureaus in the Seoul Metropolitan Government and

individual Gu[7]-Offices (sub-level district offices of Seoul) provide information

necessary for posting on the Seoul website, and information is posted with the

content providers' name, post, and contact information.

Legal aspect

Like other public agencies' websites, the legal framework of Seoul

Metropolitan Government's website opening and operation rests on laws,

ordinances, and enforcement regulations to enhance justice, transparency, and

confidence in government, and therefore, to maintain citizens' rights to know and

to foster citizens' participation in government affairs. There are five major laws

that constitute the framework: Act on the Protection of Personal Information

---

[7] Gu is an administrative district of Seoul, which is similar to Ward in
Washington D.C.

maintained by Public Agencies, Basic Act on National Informatization, Act on Disclosure of Information by Public Agencies, Administrative Procedure Act, and Act on Electronic Government (OECD, 2001a). These laws have been amended to accommodate the changes in society and the development of technology.

The Act on the Protection of Personal Information maintained by Public Agencies, established in 1994, stipulates how public agencies deal with and protect personal information and privacy through public agencies' information processing devices including computers. Basic principles of this law are to clarify the purpose of personal information collection, to collect personal information legally and reasonably in a minimum level satisfying the purpose of collection, to secure accuracy, newness, and safety, to clarify responsibility of dealing with personal information, to open the process of personal information collection, and to secure rights of the person whose information is collected. Public agencies must provide notification of the legal basis, purpose, range of use, and rights of subjects. Public agencies' collection of personal information which could violate human rights and use against the purpose are prohibited. The person whose information is collected can request review, change, and elimination of his/her personal information. This law also provides penalties when the law is violated.

The Basic Act on National Informatization, established in 1995, provides basic principles of national informatization and guidelines of national informatization policy making and execution. When established, it was the Basic Act on Promoting Computerization supporting computerization and building the basis for the information communication industry. The law's name has changed

78

and the range of application has been extended. The Basic Act on National Informatization prescribes basic principles of central and local governments' roles necessary in the process of national informatization: to make an effort to gather various opinions from all of society, to prepare steps preventing malfunctions of informatization including information protection and ensuring privacy of personal information, to prepare means for citizens to enjoy the outcome of national informatization, and to make an effort to secure finances necessary for policy execution. Specific articles on how to establish policies related to national informatization and which sub-agencies and departments drive which policies are provided in the law. Processing informatization in each area of society and management and utilization of knowledge and information resources resulting from the informationzation, and guarantee of soundness, universality, security, and trust in the use of information are also stated in the law.

The Act on Disclosure of Information by Public Agencies, enacted in 1996, aims to secure citizens' right-to-know and transparency of government administration, and therefore to encourage citizens' participation in the administration by clarifying citizens' rights to access to information and governments' duties to make information public. Every citizen has the right to request information disclosure and public agencies must disclose information that they maintain in accordance with this law. The Act also provides for the process of agencies' information disclosure and dispute procedures.

The Administrative Procedure Act, legislated in 1996, states administrative procedure to encourage citizens' participation in administrative

affairs, and therefore, aims to secure fairness, transparency, and trust in administration and protect citizens' rights and interests. The Act specifies all the procedures related to governments' actions and citizens' (re)actions in administrative measures, audience requests and suggestions, public hearing, registration, lawmaking notice, administrative rule and regulation notice, and administrative guidance. Through the Act, governments gather citizens' opinions before administrative decision making and respond appropriately to their demands (OECD, 2001a).

The Act on Electronic Government, legislated in 2001, provides basic principles, procedure, and implementation of administrative affairs using information and communication technology for effective realization of electronic government and improvement of productivity, transparency, and democracy in public administration. This Act focuses on adoption of electronic means for conducting government affairs for administrative services and functions. Citizens can electronically make petitions, request various kinds of administrative information, and make various payments to public agencies under this Act. Various government affairs and procedures using information and communication technologies are prescribed including public agencies' provision of electronic government services, operation of portal websites, use and management of electronic documents and reduction of paper documents, use and management of electronic signature and authentication, and effective use and management of administrative information among public agencies. Also, it provides for adoption and utilization of information technology architecture and redesign in public

80

agencies, effective management of information resources, and enhancement of information system security and credibility. Public agencies' efforts for electronic government realization are also specified. Public agencies in this Act include not only executive agencies but also legislative and judicial agencies. Under this law, the existing document management system, such as approval, distribution, and maintenance of government documents as well as administrative tasks has changed to further efficient internal administration and paperless administration (OECD, 2001a).

The laws reviewed above build the basic legal framework of Seoul Metropolitan Government's website development and operation. Practical guidelines of website operation of Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG) are provided by SMG's Municipal Ordinance on Management and Utilization of Internet Website. The purpose of the Ordinance is to provide website use for high quality services and to encourage citizens to participate in city affairs by stipulating required affairs for management of SMG's website. Specifically, the ordinance provides guidelines on management of the website, management of specific information and postings provided in the website, management of citizen participation and publicity events, management of mileage system (points towards purchasing services), encouraging citizens' active participation, and operation of the e-mail service system.

Management

Resources for maintaining the website of Seoul are based on the budget of Seoul Metropolitan Government. When Seoul Metropolitan Government launched its website in 1996, approximately 135,000 dollars (152,000,000 Won) were appropriated (Kim, 1996). Website integration from 2003 to 2005 reduced the budget of the website maintenance (SMG, 2007). Before the integration, the budget for website maintenance was about 1,750,000 dollars (1,974,000,000 Won) in 2003. In 2004 the budget was 1,160,000 dollars (1,308,000,000 Won), a 33.7% reduction. Also, the budget was reduced 30.4% in 2005 to about 810 thousand dollars (910,000,000 Won). The budget of the Information System Planning Bureau, a unit of Seoul Metropolitan Government responsible for the Seoul website and e-government programs was more than 86 million dollars (97,207,000,000 Won) in 2010. In addition, Seoul Metropolitan Government established the Municipal Ordinance on the Internet Launching and Maintenance (later revised to the Municipal Ordinance on Management and Utilization of Internet Website) not only to maintain the website but to support continuous budgeting for and management of the website.

When the website of Seoul opened, publicity for it was done by the Seoul Metropolitan Government's Search Competition for Information about Korea. A Search Competition for Information about Korea was held for 20 days in 1996 and for 10 days in 1997 to celebrate launching the website of Seoul and its first anniversary. Search Competition for Information about Korea was to find erroneous content and information about Korea in Internet websites, CD-Roms,

encyclopedias, and textbooks around the world. In these competitions, about 350 people participated and found more than 1,000 errors in information about Korea. Geographical errors were the most common. These events provided opportunities to find errors about Korea in websites and correct them as well as raise citizens' interest in searching information through using websites (Choi, 1996; Byun, 12-27-1997).

Development of information and communication technology and Seoul Metropolitan Government's effort to update content as well as interface and accessibility of the website have increased the number of website users. Since the website of Seoul was launched, the number of users exceeded 100 thousand a day in 2003, 80 thousand local citizens and 20 thousand foreigners. In 2005, the total number of annual users was 68 million, and it meant an average 185 thousand users accessed the website each day (Yi, 2003; SMG, 2007). When the website for users who were blind was opened, the number accessing it exceeded 10 thousand for just one week and reached 11.2 thousand after 10 days.

In the Seoul website, five foreign languages are supported – English, Japanese, Chinese, French, and Spanish. When users select foreign language options, a new window opens with a selected language. The content of the website in foreign languages is different from that of the website in Korean. The website with foreign languages focuses more on publicity about Seoul with more visual resources like photos and video clips. The websites of Seoul in foreign languages put emphasis on introducing Seoul to foreigners and providing necessary information for foreigners who are living in Korea, running businesses

or planning to run businesses, and visitors for sightseeing. Also, the website for

those who are blind launched with sound content. People who are blind can

access the Seoul website and get necessary information after they install specific

software for the blind in their computers (Park, 2000).

The Seoul website is open to the public, and various information and

communication technologies make for easy access to the website. Web 2.0

technology is important to operate the website, and e-mail, blogs, and social

network media linked on the website support direct communication between

Seoul Metropolitan Government and citizens as well as citizens with each other.

Video news clips and Internet broadcasting provide citizens information with

dynamic methods. The Seoul website also provides applications for smart phones

to keep pace with rapid changes in personal devices technology. Currently eleven

applications services are provided for smart phones supporting information

services on transportation, sightseeing, locations, restaurants, and so on. The

Seoul website service is provided with a different design that fits mobile devices.

Because the website is designed with various simple icons, it is convenient to see

and to use the website with a small mobile device.

Evaluation

Since it launched in 1996, the website of Seoul Metropolitan Government

has had a key part in providing information regarding Seoul's city affairs and

public services as a portal site for more than 15 years. Four renovations after the

website opened changed Seoul website's appearance, functions, and content matching development of technology and citizens' needs, and this endeavor brought positive evaluation results. Seoul Metropolitan Government has an internal monitoring system for the Seoul website, and uses the result of monitoring to provide better website services to citizens. In the website, Seoul Metropolitan Government opened an exclusive window to collect citizens' opinions about maintenance, content, and use of the website for providing satisfactory website services. Citizens can report errors or inconvenience in the website, and express their opinions on the website operation. A cyber monitoring system composed of citizen volunteers monitors citizens' inconveniences using Seoul website services (Cho, 2009). Research on evaluating Seoul website with various aspects is also actively performed.

For a long time since the website of Seoul opened, Seoul Metropolitan Government had difficulty in operating the website. Even though a large budget was invested to open and to operate the website, increases in the rate of visitors on the website and users of e-government services of the website were slow (Byun, 2005; Jang, 2007; Kim & Yum, 2004). However, through efforts to improve the website, both visitors and users of the website increased, and the usability of the website was positively evaluated by citizens as well as experts (Jang, 2007). Citizens express their satisfaction with using the Seoul website, and experts highly evaluated information and services that are provided in the website and its trust and feedback. Seoul's effort to advance its website was also highly recognized worldwide. Seoul achieved top ranking four times consecutively

85

(2003, 2005, 2007, and 2009) in the Global E-governance Surveys[8], biennially

conducted by the E-Governance Institute, School of Public Affairs and

Administration at Rutgers University-Newark, and the Global e-Policy e-

Government Institute at Sungkyunkwan University, Korea. Also, the Seoul

website received Government Technology Awards in 2007 and the UN Public

Service Awards in 2008. E-government practice in Seoul not only leads the

central government's policies but also is recognized as a benchmark by other

municipal governments worldwide, and the website service of Seoul is at the

center of good e-government practice.

The most important factor that made the website and its services highly

regarded is that Seoul Metropolitan Government continuously tries to encourage

citizens to participate in the governmental process. In the Global E-governance

Survey 2009, Seoul website ranked first in the categories of privacy, content,

service, and citizen participation. Seoul Metropolitan Government makes an

effort to provide information and services, privacy protection, and well-organized

and systematic opportunities for participation. Seoul Metropolitan Government

promotes citizens to participate in the governmental process and express their

opinions and suggestions on city affairs. Active citizen participation through the

website brings fast and direct responses by elected officials as well as public

---

[8] Global E-governance Survey evaluated websites of municipal governments
worldwide in terms of privacy, usability, content, service, and citizen participation
and ranked the cities on a global scale. It is co-sponsored by the UN Division for
Public Administration and Development Management and the American Society
for Public Administration.

servants to citizens' expression on city affairs ("Seoul and Prague Achieve Top Rankings in E-government Web Portal Excellence", 2010).

Even though Seoul website service is highly recognized, it still has room to improve. In the first stage of the website operation, lack of budget, number and quality of personnel in charge, laws and systems, and links between new services and existing systems brought relief (Kim & Yum, 2004). These deficits were addressed with continuous effort, but provider-oriented service has to be progressively enhanced to be user-oriented. Difficulty in finding exactly what users want easily in a short time is the most frequent concern mentioned among website users. It is important that the website of Seoul improve its search functions and ranges, core content and function, and content exploitation and design for the future, and therefore become a website that is more useful and easy to use (Jang, 2007).

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CITIZEN SUMMIT

The Citizen Summit was a large-scale town hall meeting held from 1999 to 2005 in the United States District of Columbia. The Citizen Summit, called a 21st Century Town Meeting, was held four times, one every two years, and the Youth Summit was held in 2000. Working together with AmericaSpeaks, a nonprofit organization, the District government combined a small group conversation with a public hearing to accept more citizen input using innovative technology.

The Citizen Summit was the beginning point of a citizen-driven management cycle of Neighborhood Action. Anthony Williams, the 4th mayor since 1995 when the District was given authority to govern itself by Congress, started his administration with citywide strategic planning. The planning had six strategic priorities – building and sustaining healthy neighborhoods, strengthening families, investing in children and youth, making government work, economic development, and unity of purpose and democracy – and action plans for the achievement of the six strategic priorities were developed by agency directors and staff from the office of the mayor. The Neighborhood Action Initiative and Citizen Summit were started to engage citizens in the development of these strategic priorities.

In Mayor Williams' two consecutive terms, from 1999 to 2005, the Citizen Summit was held four times, and follow-up meetings were held a few months after each. The Citizen Summit was a daylong discussion beginning in the morning and finishing in late afternoon. Different from existing public hearings, 10-12 citizen participants sat together at one table assigned by organizers and shared their visions for the city and opinions about strategic priorities with the assistance of trained discussion facilitators. In about one hour, participants discussed an assigned discussion topic, usually citywide goals in the morning sessions and specific neighborhood issues and plans in the afternoon sessions. In each discussion session, opinions, decisions, and feedback of participants were sent to a central system by networked laptop computers and keypads, and a team of experts reviewed the results and identified common

88

themes. At the end of the Citizen Summit, the mayor wrapped up with his comments and feedback about the discussion summary and output. After the Citizen Summit, output of the tables were thoroughly reviewed and reflected in the citywide strategic planning, and the government changed action items of strategic priorities based on the citizens' input. Citizens were invited again to a half-day follow-up meeting of the Neighborhood Action Forum where the mayor shared how citizens' input influenced his proposals. Participants shared opinions and comments one more time on a revised citywide strategic plan. Agency directors gathered citizens' comments relevant to their agencies, and considered the comments in developing their agency and budget plans.

The first Citizen Summit was held in November, 1999, and a follow-up meeting was held in January, 2000. More than 3,000 participants discussed six citywide strategic planning priorities, and building and sustaining healthy neighborhoods was selected as the first priority followed by investing in children and youth. The second Citizen Summit was in October, 2001, focusing on housing in the District of Columbia. The result of approximately 3,000 participants' discussion in the second Citizen Summit was allocation of an additional 25 million dollars for a housing trust fund and two million dollars for neighborhood-level citizen engagement in governance. Also, the Strategic Neighborhood Action Plan (SNAP) was developed. Citizen Summit III was held in November, 2003 focusing on three specific policy areas – providing quality education, making neighborhoods safer, and expanding opportunities for residents. More than 2,800 residents participated in the Summit, and the results

directly influenced more than 20 concrete policy proposals. Also, 200 million additional dollars for education and nearly 20 million dollars for police and juvenile initiatives became available. Citizen Summit IV, which was the last Summit of the Williams administration, was held in November, 2005. More than 2,000 residents participated in the discussions on "Lifting All Communities" in the District of Columbia. Discussion mainly focused on support for youth growth and development, improvement of job training and employment for all citizens, public library system rebuilding, and housing and economic development policies including all residents of D.C. In 2000, the Youth Summit was held to hear young people's voices. Aged 14-21 residents participated in discussions on young citizens, the most concerning issues of safety and violence, education, and job training, and the mayor reflected the results in his programs and budget. The Youth Summit resulted in the establishment of a Youth Advisory Council with a statutorily-based role in the District's governance which oversaw youth programs, presented recommendations, and reviewed city policies related to young citizens.

The Neighborhood Action Initiative and Citizen Summit were initiated for improving government accountability and public services early in Williams' first term. Starting his first term, Mayor Williams tried to improve management of the government, reduce distrust, and to maintain responsible government providing high quality service. To engage citizens and communities in the governance process and to be responsible to what citizens said, and therefore to rebuild trust, Mayor Williams initiated the Neighborhood Action Initiative and Citizen Summit.

Citizen Summit's unique structure combining public hearing and small group discussion covered various functions of participation including information provision, community building, consultation, deliberation, discourse, mediation, and polling. In the decision making process, Citizen Summit involved agenda setting and policy formulation.

In Washington D.C's Citizen Summit, technology was used for gathering, distilling, and projecting themes and concerns and it facilitated citizens' participation. At each table, networked laptop computers were provided. Facilitators at the table listened to all of the ideas of discussants and made electronic flipcharts using these laptop computers. Also, laptop computers were wirelessly connected, and facilitators instantly transmitted collected data to the central computer set for distillation of themes from discussion tables and the voting process. Members of the Theme Team collected and read reports from every table and identified the 5 to 10 strongest themes among them in real time. It took no more than 30 minutes for the Theme Team to report back after the discussion had ended, and participants responded to and voted on the themes selected. Another technology used in the Citizen Summit was a wireless voting keypad. Wireless voting keypads were given to each participant. Participants identified their preferences among recommendations, made decisions on topics to discuss later, sent their demographic information, and evaluated the meeting using their keypads. Laptop computers and keypads were useful for generating prompt data, quantitative as well as qualitative, and made timely reporting of results for

91

interactive and in-depth discussion possible (Lukensmeyer & Brigham, 2002;

2005).

Actor

Mayor Anthony A. Williams was one of the most important actors

executing the Washington D.C. Citizen Summit. Mayor Williams was mayor for

8 years, serving two consecutive terms. Before he became mayor, Williams

served as the District of Columbia Chief Financial Officer (CFO) for 4 years.

When he started his work as mayor of the District, Williams introduced proven

management practices to the operation of the District government escaping from

the control of the District of Columbia Financial Responsibility and Management

Assistance Authority. Also, he helped D.C. recover from a difficult economic

situation and balanced the District's budget for 10 years. Mayor Williams

recognized the importance of citizen engagement in the governance process and

encouraged residents, the faith community, the academic community, civic

organizations, local businesses, and government representatives to come together

and share ideas and opinions to rebuild the city. This is how Neighborhood

Action and Citizen Summit were initiated by Mayor Williams.

The Executive Office of the Mayor is a government unit responsible for

executing Citizen Summit. Before the Citizen Summit, action plans for strategic

priorities were decided by agency directors and staffs. Citizens' input was

reviewed in the Executive Office of the Mayor after the Citizen Summit, and

specific action items were sometimes changed in response to citizens' input. Revised strategic plans passed through the follow-up meeting, and agency directors gathered relevant comments and related the comments to the plan and budget.

Citizens residing in Washington D.C. are another important actor executing Citizen Summit. There were four Summits and four follow-up meetings, and citizens actively participated in those meetings. More than 13,000 citizens actively participated in day-long Citizen Summit discussions for six years. Participants recognized the importance of attending the Citizen Summits and sharing visions and opinions for their city, and participants strongly believed that the Citizen Summit could make a difference. Composition of participants reflected the overall population of Washington D.C. for the most part.

AmericaSpeaks, a national nonprofit organization interested in encouraging citizen participation using technology, supported Citizen Summit by providing its expertise on designing and leading with a new concept of large scale public meetings as well as technological facilities. Citizen Summits were organized and managed by personnel of AmericaSpeaks. The lead facilitator from AmericaSpeaks framed and defined the overall proceedings of the Citizen Summits, and led the first step of the Summit, grasp of participants' demographics as well as the day-long processes in the main stage (Potapchuk, 2002).

Table facilitators directly supported discussions at each table. Facilitators had strong background in small group facilitation and confidence through training and experience in promoting small group discussions. Table facilitators had the

93

most crucial mission for productive table deliberation. Most facilitators

voluntarily participated and supported table discussion.

Theme Team members, a team of experts, read participants' opinions sent

by networked laptop computers and identified several strong comments in real

time. Selected comments by the Theme Team were submitted to votes. The

Theme Team's activities in the Citizen Summit contributed to immediate response

to participants' views and input in the meeting.

Legal aspect

The Citizen Summit was introduced as a part of the Neighborhood Action,

the initiative that District Mayor Williams launched in 1999. To collect and

reflect citizens' opinions on the city's administrative issues to prioritize policies

and budget in his terms, Mayor Williams initiated the Citizen Summits. Creating

initiatives is one of the mayor's authorities in the District of Columbia. In the

District Official Code §1-204.22, the District Charter, powers and duties of the

mayor in the District of Columbia are broadly described. As a chief executive

officer in the District, the mayor is responsible for the proper execution of all laws

and administration of affairs of the District. The mayor also has authority to

initiate and implement administrative orders to execute the mayor's functions and

duties within the boundary of acts of the Congress and the council.

Management

Cost of the Citizen Summit I was about $500,000 and $80,000 of the cost was from the District budget. The Citizen Summit II cost about $800,000, and taxpayers paid about $700,000 of the cost. It was almost 9 percent of the mayor's office budget of 8 million dollars in fiscal year 2001. Most financial support came from donations from private companies and foundations because the Citizen Summit was not in D.C.'s original budget. Additional resources from foundations and corporate sponsors were necessary, and the mayor signed an order that gave authority for solicitation by his staffs to help pay for the summit in 2001. Several local nonprofit organizations including the American Legacy Foundation and the Annie E. Casey Foundation contributed at least $ 150,000 (Uchimura, 2002; Cottman, 1999; Chan & Woodlee, 2001).

The Citizen Summits were held every two years and follow-up meetings were held in the year after the Citizen Summits were held. Through these two big events, Mayor Williams introduced the citywide strategic plan to citizens at the Citizen Summit, and received citizens' feedback on the revised plan after collecting citizens' ideas at the follow-up meetings. Mayor Williams issued an official announcement of invitation for the District residents and encouraged them to participate in the Summit. The Neighborhood Action website, independent from the D.C. website, was opened for providing more detailed information. Media, especially local newspapers, were used for publicity of the Citizen Summit. Prior to the Summits, a Neighborhood Action Discussion Guide was circulated as inserts in two local major newspapers – *Washington Post* and

Washington Times – as well as posted on the website. In the Neighborhood

Action Discussion Guide, strategic priorities and actions that the District

government proposed were introduced, so citizens could know what issues would

be discussed at the Summit and have interest in the Summit (Uchimura, 2002).

Ways to provide feedback for citizens who watched broadcasting of the Citizen

Summit were available through the Neighborhood Action website, feedback

sheets distributed with the Guide in the local newspapers, and phone lines

(Potapchuk, 2002).

In the four Citizen Summits and the four Neighborhood Action forums,

follow-up meetings, approximately 13,500 residents in the D.C. area participated

– more than 4,500 in the first Citizen Summit and Neighborhood Action forum,

more than 4,250 in Citizen Summit II and the follow-up meeting, more than 2,800

and 2,000 in the third and fourth Citizen Summit. In Youth Summit 2000 and its

follow-up meeting, more than 1,500 citizens aged 14-21 participated. Thanks to

using keypads, participants' demographics could be easily grasped. Participants

reflected the demographic composition of D.C. – gender, age, race and ethnicity,

income, geography (Ward), physical disability, and gender orientation.

Politicians and government officials in the D.C. area attended the Summit and

showed their interested in the Citizen Summit. In Citizen Summit I, several D.C.

Council members and former Mayor Marion Barry attended (Cottman, 1999).

Former Mayor Marion Barry also attended the Youth Summit to support youths

(Fernandez, 2000). Also in Citizen Summit IV, D.C. Council members including

the Chairman and three mayoral candidates attended (Montgomery, 2005). The

Citizen Summit was opened to citizens with disability and necessary services were provided. The Citizen Summit was broadcast live on local cable television, and citizens watching the broadcast could give feedback even though they could not be at the venue (Potapchuk, 2002).

In the Citizen Summit, simultaneous translations were provided for getting every participant on the same stage. Real time translations proceeded in Spanish, Chinese, Vietnamese, and Korean. Foreign language translators sitting in glass cubicles provided translation, and participants could hear in headphones provided by summit organizers, like the United Nations offers simultaneous translation in its Assembly. Sign language also was offered for participants who had hearing impairments (Cottman, Fehr, Montgomery, Williams & Woodlee, 1999). In addition, materials and handouts used in the Summit were translated into several foreign languages (Gerona, 2003).

In the Citizen Summit, technological methods like networked laptop computers and keypads were only used for the Summit proceeding. In-person attendance was the only way to participate in the Citizen Summit. The Citizen Summit was broadcast live with specialists' commentary during discussions to the whole city via local cable channel for citizens who were interested but could not attend. Indirect participation was opened through sending feedback forms after watching live broadcasting.

Evaluation

The Citizen Summits were regarded as successful in engaging citizens of D.C. with prioritizing government policy issues as well as with themselves in discussions of city affairs (Uchimura, 2002). Through the Citizen Summit, citizens directly allocated millions of dollars in the city budget to their priority concerns, and structures and programs of the city were changed according to citizens' priorities. In addition, a new governance process that converted the citizens and budget development connection was established, and therefore the relationship between the city government and its citizens was redefined ("DC Citizen Summit", n. d.).

Evaluation by participants in the Citizen Summit was very positive. After Citizen Summit I, ninety-one percent of participants – almost all – said that Neighborhood Action was a very important program, and the Summit was overall excellent or good. Ninety-four percent of the participants said that they felt that they had the opportunity to fully participate (AmericaSpeaks,1999; Uchimura, 2002). Participants' doubtful view on engaging a great number of citizens and having a meaningful discussion on the city's priorities before the Summit had changed into acceptance of the Summit's usefulness. In addition, citizens felt that the Summit was really meaningful after they were invited to the follow-up meetings and saw the revised citywide strategic plan and budget plan in which opinions of the participants in the Summit were reflected (Uchimura, 2002). Most of the participants had doubts even though they showed up at the venue, but they changed their minds after they experienced the Summit and its follow-up

meetings. Participants were impressed that they could have open discussions on the city issues with a lot of their neighbors, and also expressed their excitement about using technology and appreciation of the mayor's view that the city's performance should be evaluated (Cottman, 1999; Cottman, Fehr, Montgomery, Williams & Woodlee, 1999).

The condition of D.C. was changed in reality, and citizens liked its change. Citizens' input significantly influenced the prioritization of public issues of the Williams' administration. After Citizen Summit I and its follow-up meeting, crime and violence declined, abandoned buildings were cleaned up, and city streets were resurfaced (Barnes, 2001). Even though all problems in the city were not solved, consensus about improved basic services, commercial and residential development, and a safer city was reached among citizens (Montgomery, 2005).

Mayor Williams' endeavor to open decision making processes of the government to the public and accept citizens' input on budget prioritization was the most critical factor that made the Citizen Summit successful. As soon as he was inaugurated as mayor, he initiated the Neighborhood Action and the first Citizen Summit to make D.C. government accountable and to recover citizens' trust. The first Citizens Summit was held in the year after his inauguration, and the Citizen Summit became a biennial event. Through follow-up meetings, Williams' administration showed revised plans and had another chance to accept citizens' input. Based on citizens' input, agencies developed final budgets and policies, and implementation. In these processes, Williams' administration

experienced much doubt and skepticism on whether his initiative would work or not. Even participants in the Citizen Summit had a certain degree of doubt, and there were also participants who opposed or protested. However, Mayor Williams tried to overcome doubt and prejudice by presenting a process of accepting citizens' comments in the budget and strategic plans and the progress of D.C. in the issues that citizens prioritized.

Citizens' interest and strong desire to be in the center of the city development was another important factor in the Citizen Summit's success. In every Citizen Summit, thousands of citizens came and participated in the longest-running large-scale town meeting in the U.S. Citizens wanted to improve their communities and to share their voices on the development of their communities with other residents and the government with positive minds. Citizens' active participation was the basis of the Citizen Summit.

Organization of the Citizen Summit involved several problems including logistical challenges. Because a great number of citizens participated in each day-long town hall meeting, finding venues that could accommodate a large number of participants was not easy. Also, measuring the total number of participants was difficult because participants' registrations were made by various methods including mail, telephone, and the Internet. The number of participants was very important because it determined almost everything related to the organization of the Citizen Summit including the size of venue, necessary numbers of tables, laptop computers, lunches, and volunteer facilitators. Recruiting and training volunteer facilitators for the event where thousands of people participated was

another serious issue. In the Citizen Summit, about 250 volunteer facilitators were necessary. Securing funds was an issue, too.

Satisfying participants' higher expectation through the Citizen Summit and continuing momentum of the Citizen Summit were more significant challenges. Citizens wanted to deal with their own interests and problems faced in their own communities, but it was impossible to address them due to time limits. To maintain and strengthen citizens' input to the Citizen Summit and encourage other opportunities of direct dialogue about city and community issues, it was necessary to show that citizens' input had influence on the city policies (Uchimura, 2002).

Mentioned above, the first Citizen Summit was held in 1999. After the Citizen Summit I, Citizen Summits were held three more times in 2001, 2003, and 2005. Neighborhood Action forums, follow-up meetings, were also held in every other year between the Citizens Summits. In 2000, the Youth Summit was held separately. There were a total of ten meetings associated with the Citizen Summits including the Youth Summit, and they spanned almost the same duration of the two consecutive terms of the Mayor Williams' administration in D.C. (Uchimura, 2002). Since Mayor Williams left the position, the Citizen Summit has not been held.

The next step – District of Columbia Apps for Democracy

Apps for Democracy is a contest for innovative software applications using the District's open government data for cash prizes in Washington D.C. It

was held two times once in 2008 and once in 2009. The purpose of this

competition was to develop innovative, more cost-effective and user-friendly,

software solutions to utilize open government data, for city services requests, and

therefore to enhance the ease of public access and use of the data. Apps for

Democracy improved transparency and cost-saving in the District government,

and broadly, citizen engagement (Smith, 2009b).

In Apps for Democracy 2008, contestants competed during thirty days for

a total of 20,000 dollars in cash prizes, and 47 software applications were

submitted. The applications utilizing open government data covered a wide range

of public services in Washington D.C., and the applications were released to the

public as well as other states and local governments for free[9]. 2009's Apps for

Democracy followed the same basic rules, but changed its features. The title of

the contest changed to Apps for Democracy: Community Edition (APPS09), and

the amount of cash prizes increased to 35,000 dollars. Apps for Democracy:

Community Edition consisted of two parts. The first part was the contest to have

citizens' ideas about how technology can improve government operations and the

community. The second part was a contest for software developers to develop

creative applications to make submission of online requests easier using newly

launched Open 311 API (Application Programming Interface). In the second

---

[9] Featured applications are DC Historic Tours, iLive.at, Park it DC, AreYouSafe
DC, It Happened Here – DC Edition, DC Multimodal Crime Finder, Stumble
Safely, Fix My City DC, Your Mapper – DC Crime Reports, find a metro DC,
and so on. These applications and more applications are provided and can be
downloaded in the Digital Public Square website.

Apps for Democracy, almost 230 creative ideas and solutions were submitted (Corbett, n.d.; Opsahl, 2009; Smith, 2009a; Smith, 2009b; Williams, 2009).

Apps for Democracy was initiated by Vivek Kundra, the Chief Technological Officer in the Washington D.C. Kundra was appointed by Mayor Adrian Fenty in 2007 when Mayor Fenty began his administration. Kundra requested iStrategyLabs, a private company in Washington D.C. developing computer program solutions, for suggestions on how to utilize the Data Catalog, which contains all kinds of data relevant to Washington D.C. The iStrategyLabs held a contest, Apps for Democracy, to obtain creative Web applications using D.C.'s live data feeds for the provision of more accessible and useful government data through Web applications, and Washington D.C. sponsored the contest (Corbett, n.d.). After the first Apps for Democracy, CTO Kundra was named the Chief Information Officer in the Federal government in 2009, and Chris Willey was appointed as the Interim Chief Technology Officer in Washington D.C. Interim CTO Willey kept Apps for Democracy in 2009 with an extended format. He tried to find ways to formalize the process for suggesting software applications like Apps for Democracy as a continual process rather than a once-a-year event, and to provide opportunities for application developers to improve government (Towns, 2009). Mayor Fenty was interested in improvement of public services and quality of lives using technology, and appointed Kundra and CTO Willey. Mayor Fenty expected that Apps for Democracy would help make more accessible and responsive government (Smith, 2009b).

Apps for Democracy was opened to the public but most competitors were residents in the District area (Towns, 2009). A lot of software developers were interested and participated as individuals or as agencies, and awards were also given to individuals and agencies separately.

Featured applications were produced in both competitions. iLive.at which provides information about residential areas in D.C. received the Silver medal in 2008. DC Historic Tours which helps customized tour plans was the Gold winners in 2008. These two applications were representative applications in 2008 Apps for Democracy. The 311 iPhone app in which users can submit 311 service requests by iPhone won the first prize as well as an additional development grant in 2009.

iStrategyLabs was another important actor in Apps for Democracy. After they received the request from CTO Kundra, iStrategyLabs built and launched the Apps for Democracy in six days using social network sites and social technology tools without any specific fees and customization. In addition to developing Apps for Democracy, iStrategyLabs helped commercialization of the applications as an advisor (Corbett, n.d.; Opsahl, 2009).

In Apps for Democracy, iStrategyLabs contributed to the development and management of all the processes. Rules for contests were minimized to maximize creativity of competitors. The only rule was to use at least one data source from the open D.C. data to develop a software application. Judges were selected from the District government, the technology community, the media, academics, and venture capitalists with the criteria of understanding technology, and whether

104

judges can help inform the contest. For easier selection of competing

applications, a simple judging guide was distributed to the judges.

The criteria for selection of winners were "usefulness to the citizens,

visitors, and government of Washington D.C., potential for application to be

useful for other governmental bodies outside of D.C., appeal of the application

from a usability perspective, and inventive and original nature of the application"

(Corbett, n.d.). Prize structures of the Apps for Democracy in 2008 and 2009

were different. In 2008, a total of 60 prizes, two Gold, six Silver, ten Bronze,

forty Honorable Mention, and two People's Choice, were awarded with a total of

20,000 dollars. To encourage participation, prizes were segmented and individual

participants and agency participants were separately awarded. People's Choice

was selected by people's votes. Apps for Democracy Community Edition in 2009

had a different prize structure. The competition consisted of three rounds of

prizes, and contestants were encouraged to participate again after review of

programs with evaluation and feedback from the judges. In the first and second

round, there were the first place and second place in each, and one application

was selected for the final round. Also, a Community Grant Option was awarded

to the developer of the application which the District government considered for

further development. The Social Citizen Award was given to the citizen who

suggested the best idea. Because of the stricter rules and the encouragement to

participate, cash prizes became bigger.

iStrategyLabs opened the website of Apps for Democracy for efficient

marketing and publicity to application developers and for use a focal point for

uploading open data and applications developed in the contest (Corbett, n.d.; Smith, 2009a).

Apps for Democracy was highly regarded in the cost-saving of the District government. The District government spent only 50,000 dollars for the Apps for Democracy 2008, and the value of applications produced in the contest was estimated about 2.3 million dollars. This figure was from a sum of the individual cost for development of the applications and the internal human resources expense for procurement and management of the project. Apps for Democracy considerably reduced the time to develop new technology for the District government (Aden, 2008; Corbett, n.d.; Opsahl, 2009). Also, the former CTO Vivej Kundra was individually recognized and received several awards in appreciation for his contribution to advancing accessibility and transparency of the government using technology.

After the Apps for Democracy was held in 2008 and 2009, it ended functioning. The Apps for Democracy website remains open, but there are no processes for participation or activity on it. A window for suggestions for creative applications was re-launched in the Digital Public Square site (http://dps.dc.gov) launched by the District government for discovery of how the government works, participation in the democratic process, and connection to the government. The process continues.

The latest step

The effort of the District government to become a leader of innovations using information and communication technology among local governments continues in the newest administration. Mayor Vincent C. Gray addressed his plan to make Washington D.C. one of the technologically advanced cities in America as well as in the world and maintain its leadership status in his State of the District Address. In economic development efforts, the District government started the D.C. Community Access Network project. DC Community Access Network (DC-CAN) is a municipal broadband network that the District government provides. DC Community Access Network provides broadband services with lower prices than private companies. It connects community anchor institutions with direct Internet including community colleges, public safety entities, schools, libraries, and health care clinics, and shares relevant information. DC Community Access Network also focuses on reducing the digital divide, and is performed in Wards 5, 7, and 8 which are underserved and economically distressed areas in Washington D.C. For the DC Community Access Network, the District government received a 25 million dollar grant from the National Telecommunication and Information Association (DC-NET Citywide Communications Network, 2010; DC-NET Citywide Communications Network, n.d.). The Gray administration has not announced any new initiatives specifically addressing citizen participation.

SEOUL OASIS

To facilitate citizens' more interactive participation in the city's policies, Seoul Metropolitan Government opened a portal website, "Seoul Oasis" (http://oasis.seoul.go.kr), independent from the city's main website. The name of Seoul Oasis means "a fountain from which citizens' valuable creative ideas spring out endlessly" (SMG, 2009). In Seoul Oasis, citizens can freely express their opinions and suggest policy ideas on Seoul city's overall affairs as well as experience the process of decision making with the ideas they propose together with opinions of other participants including experts, public officers, and non-governmental groups.

Seoul Oasis launched on October 10, 2006 after Mayor Oh, Se-Hoon, the 4th mayor elected by popular vote, finished overall planning of specific programs to be performed in his 4-year term. After it first opened, the Seoul Oasis has renewed its system four times with the addition of new functions and revision of existing functions after monitoring. Before Seoul Oasis officially opened, Seoul Metropolitan Government established a preliminary website and started collecting citizens' creative suggestions for about two months, and this performance became the basis of the Seoul Oasis operation.

Seoul Oasis has five serial procedural components: Ideas and Suggestions, On-line Discussion, Off-line Preliminary Examination, Seoul Oasis Meeting, and Implementation. The Ideas and Suggestion stage is the first step to accept citizens' creative ideas and opinions about Seoul's public affairs. Any citizens who are interested in Seoul's public affairs can post their ideas and suggestions in

the Seoul Oasis website, and citizens can participate through either Internet or

mobile. Citizens' ideas and suggestions are reviewed and filtered by other

citizens as well as public officers and the Citizen Committee. Selected ideas and

suggestions are submitted to On-line Discussion for advanced discussion. For

idea collection, there are two categories where citizens propose ideas: free

suggestion and theme suggestion. Citizens can post their ideas and suggestions

freely in the free suggestion with various interests anytime. Departments in the

city government can open suggestion space with specific themes in a limited

period and collect citizen's opinions and suggestions (OECD/Korea Policy

Center, 2009b).

　　　　Filtered ideas and suggestions based on the number of comments and hits

by 'Netizens[10]' and the Citizen Committee[11]'s recommendation are deeply

discussed in the On-line Discussion. In this stage, citizens have on-line

discussions and live-polls, and advice and opinions of experts, NGOs, and

---

[10] Netizen is a newly-made word combining network and citizen which means people who actively participate in cyber space. In the Seoul Oasis, Netizens are categorized into five levels according to their activity points. Activity points are given according to registration, log-in, posting, recommendation, reply, photo posting, and reply in discussions (SMG, n. d.).

[11] Citizen Committee is a voluntary group composed of citizens. Citizen Committee evaluates ideas and suggestions, participates in the discussions and the Seoul Oasis Meeting, and suggests ideas for utilization and management of the website. Netizens who are in the third to fifth level can be members of the Citizen Committee. Opinions of members in the Citizen Committee are weighted in the selection of discussion topics, and considered prior to other opinions in the selection of the Off-line Preliminary Examination items. Also, 1~3 members of the Citizen Committee attend discussions of the Seoul Oasis Meeting (SMG, n. d.).

relevant public officers on discussion topics are provided for more advanced and realistic discussions.

Final suggestions for the Seoul Oasis Meeting are decided in the Off-line Preliminary Examination which is a working-level meeting led by the Deputy Director. It is an off-line brainstorming meeting consisting of the director general, directors, and external experts to develop citizens' suggestions into policies. In this meeting, suggestions from the On-line Discussion stage are examined for their feasibility, validity, and efficiency for real policies, and the possibility to develop or to modify policies to respond to citizens' needs is reviewed. After the examination and review, final agendas for the Seoul Oasis Meeting are decided.

The Seoul Oasis Meeting is an off-line decision-making debate open to the public. The chair of the Meeting is the Mayor of Seoul Metropolitan Government, and various participants attend the Meeting including idea providers, external experts, NGOs, general citizens who are interested, and Citizen Committee members, as well as the vice mayor and director generals, and relevant public officers. The Seoul Oasis Meeting is a final meeting to determine whether suggestions brought up by the Off-line Preliminary Examination are adopted into real policies. Real-time broadcasting of the Meeting is performed via the Internet, and the Meetings are recorded and uploaded for the citizens who cannot attend the meeting and for future information sharing.

Adopted suggestions in the Seoul Oasis Meeting are implemented in various ways from simple modification of current policies to establishment or

amendment of ordinances, rules, and regulations. The process of implementation is continuously opened and monitored through the Seoul Oasis website. Once suggestions are developed into policies and implemented, idea providers and public officers who contribute to the development are rewarded. Ideas and suggestions that are not selected are separately posted with the opinions of experts and relevant public officers.

The goals of the Seoul Oasis are "improving creativity and imagination in the city's administration" (OECD/Korea Policy Center, 2009, p.1) and realizing participatory governance. Existing citizen participation channels had limits because they focused on responding to specific complaints rather than providing a broad-based system for citizen participation. In this aspect, introduction of Seoul Oasis is innovative as an interactive communication space between the public and government pursuing realization of direct democracy.

The Seoul Oasis covers almost all areas of participation including information provision, community building, consultation, deliberation, discourse, mediation, and polling. Also, in the decision making process, Seoul Oasis is relevant to all stages, directly connected to agenda setting, policy formulation, and policy adoption, and indirectly to policy implementation and evaluation. In the technological aspect, Seoul Oasis adopted Web 2.0 technology which makes interaction in cyber space possible using blogs, wikis, user-generated video sharing, and social networking tools (Cho & Hwang, 2010). Through Web 2.0 technology, Seoul Oasis maintains various functions including discussion boards, real-time broadcasting of the Meeting, establishing space for citizens' uploading

111

their video clips, and other maintenance tools to encourage citizens' participation

with fun. Also, in the main screen, icons connecting to the social networking

websites which are currently popular are established for citizens' convenience to

access the Seoul Oasis website.

Actors

In the execution of the Seoul Oasis, various actors participate. The mayor

of Seoul is one of the significant actors in Seoul Oasis. The Seoul Oasis is one

component of the Creative Management which is the main theme of Mayor Oh's

administration in the Seoul Metropolitan Government since 2006. The launching

of Seoul Oasis was based on the establishment plan of the Mayor's Initiative No.

300. Also, the Mayor chairs the Seoul Oasis meeting in which final decisions are

made.

Substantive administration of Seoul Oasis is operationalized in the Citizen

Proposal Team in the Management and Planning Office of the Seoul Metropolitan

Government. This department is in charge of management of the website,

supporting the meetings and activities, publicity, recording, and developing plans

for the website utilization. In other departments, offices, bureaus, and centers in

the Seoul Metropolitan Government, there are positions that deal with proposed

ideas and suggestions related to their work.

Participation in Seoul Oasis by proposing ideas and suggestions about the

city of Seoul affairs is open to all citizens. When Seoul Oasis was first started,

the Ordinance limited proposers to citizens and groups who were residents or worked in Seoul. However, the Ordinance has been amended and any individual or any group who is interested in the city affairs can propose ideas and suggestions. For the proposal, member registration and log-in are necessary for authentification, and only members who log in can make suggestions, recommendations, and replies in the website. Experts from outside of SMG or the Seoul Development Institute join and review proposed ideas and suggestions for the Seoul Oasis Meeting together with the officials and attend the Seoul Oasis Meeting. Various NGOs, college students, people from industry, and general citizens can attend the Seoul Oasis Meeting, ask questions, and vote if voting takes place in the Meeting.

Legal aspect

Seoul Oasis, as a system through which citizens can originate ideas for better governance of Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG), follows the City of Seoul Municipal Ordinance on Citizen Origination System Maintenance. The Municipal Ordinance on Citizen Origination System Maintenance was first enacted in 1997, for the purpose of providing guidelines for invigorating citizen participation in the city's affairs, reflecting citizens' creative ideas and suggestions for city affairs, and therefore promoting development of city affairs. To keep up with the development of information and communication technology and to satisfy citizens' needs, the Ordinance has been amended a few times.

Citizen origination has two categories: free origination and recommended origination. Free origination does not limit topics of suggestions; citizens can suggest ideas for any issues regarding city affairs. Recommended origination includes proposals and suggestions that are selected and regarded as potentially successful ideas among collected ideas by public officers for developing timely policy agendas. Citizens can suggest ideas on system improvement that enhances citizens' lives, the promotion of efficiency in administration, budget saving through development of technology related to city affairs, increasing city tax revenue, and other innovative measures contributing to the development of city affairs. Qualification of proposers is not strict; anyone or any group of people who are interested in the city of Seoul's affairs can make suggestions regardless of their residence or working places. Suggestions can be made anytime without a particular format in-person, by mail, and on the Internet. Seoul Metropolitan Government established the Citizen Origination Council to review and prioritize proposed ideas and other related works, and the Ordinance provides rules for the Council operation. Also, the Ordinance provides regulations on awards for selected suggestions and application of suggestions for real operation of city affairs.

Management

The Citizen Proposal Team in the Management and Planning Office, Seoul Metropolitan Government operates Seoul Oasis. Before Seoul Oasis

officially started, a preliminary website for it was opened. The main function of the preliminary website was collecting citizens' creative and imaginative ideas and suggestions about city affairs. While the preliminary website was running, the process of planning, calling for bids, selection of the party, and developing a contract for building the website of Seoul Oasis took place (SMG, 2006).

Explanation of the detailed operation of Seoul Oasis follows. In the Ideas and Suggestions stage, postings that are not related to the suggestion are automatically removed. Filtered postings are categorized into the suggestions, complaints, other department affairs, and others, and e-mails about appreciation, guide to the process, and transfer to relevant departments are automatically sent. Once discussion topics are decided by Netizens and the Citizens Committee's grading suggestions, topics and suggestions are categorized with 24 departments, bureaus, and centers. Duration of discussion is flexible with two weeks maximum according to topics. In the discussion, citizens propose specific ways to realize suggestions. The Citizen Committee, selected for the topics in culture, environment, transportation, women/welfare, industry/economy, and urban planning/housing, are slated for active and substantial discussions. City officials provide information, resources, and expert opinions regarding what would be required for suggestions to work and participate with objective and citizen perspectives. The results of discussions and topics for the Off-line Preliminary Examination are summarized and posted on the website, and incomplete discussions continue.

Selected suggestions in the Off-line Preliminary Examination are sent to departments, bureaus, and centers. Departments, bureaus, and centers make specific plans including scheduling and budget planning for feasible suggestions, and for unfeasible suggestions, they develop review reports including specific reasons and alternatives.

Additional live polls and surveys can be performed after the items for the Seoul Oasis Meeting are selected. The Seoul Oasis Meeting is held once a month. About 10 items are brought to the Seoul Oasis Meeting. Suggestions and discussion results are reported, chiefs' review presentation of relevant offices, and discussions are held and conclusions are reached. After the Meeting, confirmed items are implemented, managed, and reported to citizens. The selected items are completed including awarding the proposers, civil officers, and offices. Proposers whose suggestions are confirmed as projects are given gift certificates worth about one hundred dollars and selected suggestions are nominated for the Seoul Creativity Awards. Civil officers and offices who execute the projects are also given tributes (SMG, n. d.).

The financial resources of Seoul Oasis come from the budget of Seoul Metropolitan Government. Because the cost for building the Seoul Oasis website in 2006 was not included in the budget, reserved funds were used for launching Seoul Oasis, and the budget for it was added to the regular annual budget of Seoul Metropolitan Government starting in 2007. The annual budget for Seoul Oasis is approximately 150 thousands dollars, and it is used for management of the

program and its website, purchasing hardware and software, events and promotion.

Before Seoul Oasis started, promotion of the website was done in various ways. When the preliminary website of Seoul Oasis started running, an animated teaser was released for advance publicity. To raise awareness of Seoul Oasis, a puzzle game section and a section for quiz entry on Seoul Oasis was opened in the preliminary website (SMG, 2006). Posters, films, publications, and publicity materials for the promotion of Seoul Oasis were made and released to citizens. Promotions for college students including city affairs briefing, idea contests, and running the banner of Seoul Oasis on the universities' websites were also done (OECD/Korea Policy Center, 2009b). In the website of Seoul Oasis, the SMG added "Wow Seoul", which is an entertainment function, and allowed citizens to upload articles, photos, and video clips and to have information on Seoul's major sightseeing attractions (OECD/Korea Policy Center, 2009a).

Since Seoul Oasis opened in 2006, 4,696,769 citizens, about 3,707 citizens per day, have visited the website through March, 2010. There have been about 67,550 ideas suggested, 1,608 ideas in a month (SMG, 2010). Among suggested ideas per month in the Ideas and Suggestions stage, an average of 120 ideas are sent to the On-line Discussion stage, 40 ideas are sent to the Off-line Preliminary Examination, and about 6 ideas per month were selected for the Seoul Oasis Meeting (SMG, 2009).

The Internet is the most significant technical background for Seoul Oasis. The website provides space for citizens' participation including introduction to

the Seoul Oasis website, how to participate, personal information board for registered citizens, discussion boards for each stage of the process, and announcement and Q & A together with photos, video clips, animations, and illustrations. Web 2.0 technology makes these components possible. Also, on the front page, there are links to the news and information about administration and living in Seoul, so that citizens can refer to the information when they suggest ideas. E-mail is one of the main communication tools, and registered citizens can receive announcement of idea contests, participant recruitment for the meetings, and other notification and information through e-mails. Citizens can also ask questions through e-mails. Citizens have access to the Seoul Oasis website with their personal computers and laptops with wired and wireless connection to the Internet. Rapid dissemination of smart phones makes it possible for citizens to use the Internet and access the website regardless of time and place.

However, support for mixed language use is not available on the website; the website services are provided in Korean. The population of foreign residents in Seoul was about 256,000, about 2.5% of the total population of Seoul in December, 2009, and the population is increasing. The need to use foreign languages on the Seoul Oasis website has not been raised yet. Any comments for qualification of foreign residents to participate in Seoul Oasis are not mentioned, but in the future, it is possible that foreign residents in Seoul speaking other languages than Korean would participate in the Seoul Oasis because it is prescribed that anyone who lives or works in Seoul can participate in it.

Evaluation

Launched in 2006, Seoul Oasis has been operating for more than 4 years. By May, 2009, 33,737 ideas and suggestions were posted on the Seoul Oasis. Among suggested ideas, 2,391 suggestions were selected in the On-line discussion stage, and 314 suggestions were selected in the Off-line preliminary examination. From Off-line preliminary examination, 123 suggestions were sent and discussed in the Seoul Oasis meeting and 87 citizens' suggestions were implemented (SMG, 2009). A specific evaluation device for Seoul Oasis does not exist, but monitoring of the Seoul Oasis operation is performed.

Seoul Oasis is regarded as a successful program of citizen participation through an innovative mechanism. Developed from existing systems focusing on citizens' complaints and grievances, Seoul Oasis allows citizens to suggest their ideas and participate in the policy making process of their local government. Using the Internet in Seoul Oasis permits citizens to suggest their ideas and to provide feedback without regard to time and place (OECD/Korea Policy Center, 2009b). Also, Seoul Oasis is meaningful not only opening to the citizens to freely suggest their creative ideas about city affairs but also providing citizens opportunities to participate in the policy making process together with experts and public officials. Seoul Oasis is an open space with a two-way relation, not a simple exchange of information and feedback but based on partnership between citizens and public officials, and it is innovative and has possibility to enhance governance (Kim, 2010). The innovative feature of the Seoul Oasis was

positively evaluated in the UN Public Service Awards and selected as a finalist in 2009.

The mayor's strong leadership is the most important factor in the success of Seoul Oasis. The mayor of Seoul shows his aggressive and constant leadership with the mind that "all city policies should be considered from the perspective of citizens (SMG, 2009)" in the implementation of Seoul Oasis. The mayor's strong leadership also encourages civil officers to actively participate in the Seoul Oasis process. Psychological encouragement including self-awareness of participation in the discussion with senior public officers in the policy making process and other citizen participants' interest and replies to the suggestions bring voluntary participation of citizens and civil officers (SMG, 2009). The mayor's leadership and determination to accept citizens' need to change their participation and efficiency and transparency of the government become a driving force for success and constant development of Seoul Oasis (OECD/Korea Policy Center, 2009b).

One of the difficulties in the implementation of Seoul Oasis is civil officers' passive attitude and response. To overcome this difficulty, an incentive system for civil officers is used. In every month, civil officers who actively participate in the discussion stage are selected. Their contribution is reflected in their promotion and they are introduced to the competition among offices, bureaus and departments in the Seoul Metropolitan Government (SMG, 2009). In addition, management of responses to the suggestions in the Seoul Oasis was assigned to one department to reduce the burden of other departments.

In Chapter 5, discussion and conclusions are provided. Results of comparative analysis based on findings of practices in Washington D.C. and Seoul are discussed. Then, the study concludes with implications, limitations, and suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

OVERVIEW

This chapter compares the use of innovative mechanisms in the governance, policy, and decision making process in two cities – Washington D.C. and Seoul – and tries to provide answers to the research questions based on the findings described in the chapter 4. First, the websites of Washington D.C. and Seoul are compared using categories of comparative analysis identified in chapter 3 and specific practices of active citizen participation using innovative technologies. The Washington D.C. Citizen Summit and Seoul Oasis are compared, and the next steps after the Citizen Summit are introduced as well. After the comparisons of the websites and the practices, the overall process of Washington D.C. and Seoul in encouraging citizen participation using innovative technologies in governance, policy, and decision making are compared.

In this research, how city governments encourage their citizens to participate in the process of governance, policy, and decision making using innovative mechanisms was reviewed. Two leading cities in encouraging citizen participation using innovative technology, Washington D.C. in the United States and Seoul in South Korea, were selected for this research. The websites of both cities and the programs of encouraging citizen participation – the Citizen Summit and others in Washington D.C. and Seoul Oasis in Seoul – were reviewed to see how the development of innovative technology, especially information and communication technology and its introduction to the public sector influenced the

relationship between government and citizens in both cities. Also, the endeavor of Washington D.C. and Seoul for active citizen participation is compared to obtain implications of using innovative technologies for encouraging citizen participation in different contexts. Both city governments in Washington D.C. and Seoul make a great effort to encourage their citizens to participate in the governance, policy, and decision making process with newly emerging technologies suitable to their own context.

Citizens' desire to directly express their opinions on public issues and governments' intention to secure legitimacy and transparency in their execution reawakened direct citizen participation in the governance, policy, and decision making processes on public affairs in the 20th century's representative democracy. Development of technology, especially information and communication technology and its adoption in the execution of public affairs makes direct citizen participation possible and accelerates it. Introduction of innovative mechanisms in government affairs brought changes practically as well as theoretically in public administration. Introduction of innovative technologies and their update continuously provide for more extended citizen participation. Various tools using innovative technology help build government-citizen relationships. Research on public administration and citizen participation with the adoption of innovative technology also progresses.

Selection of Washington D.C. and Seoul for the comparative research on citizen participation mainly focuses on the two cities' use of innovative technologies in encouraging citizen participation in the cities' governance, policy,

and decision making process. The city governments of Washington D.C. and

Seoul are leaders in citizen participation in the governance, policy, and decision

making process using innovative technologies. Through their well-equipped

websites and programs – the Citizen Summit and Seoul Oasis – Washington D.C.

and Seoul provide opportunities for citizens to directly participate in their cities'

governance, policy, and decision making process, and their performances have

been recognized in awards for their programs. Review and comparison of the two

cities' websites and programs using categories of general features, actor, legal

aspect, management and evaluation show similarities and differences derived

from the two cities' different context and environment.

Development of innovative technology changes citizen participation in the

governance, policy, and decision making process. Development of innovative

mechanisms makes it possible for the governments to introduce new technologies

or use existing technologies in new ways and therefore to encourage citizen

participation. Using innovative technologies, the two cities either designed new

programs or improved existing ones. Through the cities' publicity and showing

the results of the programs, new or improved programs in the two cities attracted

citizens' interest and increased their participation. Also, there was a change in the

content dealt with in the programs. Previously, expressing complaints was the

citizens' major form of activity to participate in the process of government affairs.

On the other hand, introduction of developed innovative mechanisms to the

governance, policy, and decision making process led to introduction of new

programs using innovative technologies, and therefore changed the content of

citizen participation from just facilitating citizens' complaints on governments' performances to expressing their opinions, ideas, and suggestions on public issues in their cities.

In spite of several differences in background, Washington D.C. and Seoul have similarities fostering citizen participation using innovative technologies. As local governments, both Washington D.C. and Seoul use the same technology – Government 2.0 – for their websites and programs. Strong leadership of mayors in both cities is a critical driving force for initiating and implementing new types of programs. Also, on the development stages of e-participation that the OECD (2001a) identified – information, consultation, and active participation – Washington D.C. and Seoul are in the active participation stage along with information and consultation.

Washington D.C. and Seoul show differences in initiating programs and innovative technologies used in their programs. Seoul abolished programs of citizen participation which did not work well, and initiated a new program of citizen participation using information and communication technology, the Internet. A new program with an innovative mechanism slowly drew citizens' interest, and the new program became one of the representative citizen participation programs using information and communication technology. Washington D.C. initiated its citizen participation program in a different way from Seoul – adoption of innovative technologies to improve the existing program. A format change in methods of collecting citizens' opinions by innovative technologies, combination of public meeting and small group

125

discussion, and its effective utilization brought participants' positive responses and encouraged citizens' participation. Either initiating a new program or transforming an existing program brought the same result of encouraging citizen participation, and using innovative technologies is a core factor in this result.

The factor that leads to fostering citizen participation in Washington D.C. and Seoul is the introduction of innovative mechanism to the governance, policy, and decision making process of the two cities' government affairs. Adoption of innovative technology makes it possible to adopt a new concept of citizen participation mechanisms in both cities. These innovative citizen participation mechanisms provide an easier way for citizens to express their ideas, opinions, and suggestions on issues in their city affairs. This satisfies citizens' desire to directly participate in the governance, policy, and decision making and to make their voices heard. Governments also secure legitimacy of their performance initiation and implementation based on citizens' opinions and suggestions gathered using innovative mechanisms. Different background and contexts of Washington D.C. and Seoul produce differences in fostering citizen participation. It is obvious that the impact of innovative mechanisms is different even though these two cities use the innovative technology because technology is a value-neutral method and initiating and implementing programs and practices is influenced and valued by the context of these two different cities. Therefore, it is important to consider the context first and find suitable practices and programs when new practices or programs are initiated and implemented, especially benchmarking of good practices and programs in different contexts is considered.

126

Both websites in Washington D.C. and Seoul perform critical roles of providing information and tools necessary to citizen participation. The websites of both cities are in a developed stage fostering citizens' participation. They contain various tools used in stages in the policy making cycle in each category of e-participation – information, consultation, and active participation – as categorized by the OECD (2003) (see Table 4.1). As city governments' portal websites first launched in the late 1990's, websites of Washington D.C. and Seoul began providing various online services, forms, and data about the cities with several updates of the websites – in functions as well as design – adopting relevant developed technologies. In the first launching of websites, the main focus was publicity about cities and city governments, but later, websites of both cities were developed as portal sites to integrate government services and to provide arenas of citizen participation.

Websites of Washington D.C. and Seoul are open not only to residents of the cities but also everyone who is interested in their city affairs and public services. The Office of Chief Technology Officer in the District of Columbia government and the Information System Planning Bureau in Seoul Metropolitan government are headquarters responsible for operation and maintenance of the websites. Individual offices, agencies, and bureaus of the governments provide information and content for posting.

The legal framework for the website services is equipped to focus on ensuring citizens' right to know and protecting citizens' privacy. One of the

127

major laws that Washington D.C. and Seoul each has is relevant to simplification

of administrative procedure using technologies. The legal framework also

includes laws relevant to informatization and operation of electronic government

and amendment of existing laws according to introduction of information and

communication technology and e-government. Both cities adopted ordinances to

prepare the legal basis to manage their websites.

To manage cities' websites, considerable budget resources of the District

of Columbia government and the Seoul Metropolitan Government are allocated to

the agencies in charge of website management – the Office of Chief Technology

Officer and the Information System Planning Bureau, respectively. Various tools

and methods are used for publicity on the websites, and foreign language

translation services are provided for users' convenience. Thanks to publicity and

renovation for users' convenience, the number of people accessing the websites

has increased, and development of information and communication technologies

allows people to access the websites more easily and conveniently anytime and

anywhere with their personal devices.

Websites and their services in the District of Columbia and Seoul are

positively evaluated. Since being established, the District of Columbia

government and Seoul Metropolitan Government adopted evaluation and

feedback systems and made an effort to improve their websites. Continuous

effort to overcome difficulties and provide better quality of information and

website services was recognized by numerous awards. The website of

Washington D.C. – DC.Gov – has been selected several times as one of the best

government websites, and Washington D.C. has been also selected as one of the top digital cities in America. Seoul has been highly recognized for its e-governance consistently with worldwide awards. The websites of both Washington D.C. and Seoul are highly regarded nationally and internationally as good examples of providing information and government services using information and communication technologies.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CITIZEN SUMMIT AND SEOUL OASIS

The Citizen Summit in the District of Columbia and Seoul's Seoul Oasis are examples of fostering citizen participation in cities' governance, policy, and decision making processes using information and communication technology. Even though the District of Columbia Citizen Summit and Seoul Oasis are different, these two programs encourage citizens' direct participation in the cities' decision making process about city affairs, and information and communication technologies play a critical role in the process. Specific technologies used in the process – networked laptop computers, keypads, and Internet – are different but these technologies contribute to citizens' active expression and exchange of ideas, opinions, and suggestions on their cities' policies and programs.

Anthony A. Williams, Mayor of the District of Columbia from 1999 to 2005, and Oh, Se-Hoon, Mayor of Seoul are the most critical actors in executing these two programs. Both Citizen Summit and Seoul Oasis were initiated by the respective mayors. For smooth and responsible management, a separate office in

the governments is/was in charge of the management of the programs. Mainly citizens participated in the programs, and experts and public officers also participated to support citizens' participation and realization of the results. One thing that is unique in the Citizen Summit is the support of AmericaSpeaks, a nonprofit organization. AmeriacSpeaks provided its expertise, trained human resources, and technical equipment for proceedings of the Citizen Summit.

The legal basis of the Citizen Summit is the mayor's authority to create initiatives described in the District Charter. The City of Seoul Municipal Ordinance on Citizen Origination System Maintenance is the legal basis of Seoul Oasis. The Ordinance provides guidelines about Seoul Oasis in detail. Citizen Summit and Seoul Oasis also follow relevant higher level national and/or federal laws.

Cost of the Citizen Summit was provided for partially from the budget of the District of Columbia. Donations from private companies and foundations also provided financial support for the Citizen Summit. When Seoul Oasis was first launched, financial resources were from a reserved fund. The budget for the Seoul Oasis was included in the regular budget of Seoul Metropolitan Government beginning in its second year. Various methods for publicity were used, website postings and preliminary website running as well as traditional methods such as newspaper ads and publicity materials. The Citizen Summit provided simultaneous translation services, but Seoul Oasis does not provide foreign language services. Technologies used in the two programs were different. In the Citizen Summit, networked laptop computers and keypads were used for

rapid delivery of the results. The Internet is used in the Seoul Oasis to provide citizens space to participate in and have discussions with each other.

The Citizen Summit was evaluated by participants' surveys, and the results of evaluations were positive. According to the Preliminary Report of the Citizen Summit I, participants' agreement with the importance of the Citizen Summit and satisfaction with the Citizen Summit were shown in the surveys after the Summit. Seoul Oasis is monitored and is evaluated as an innovative practice. The mayors' strong leadership was a significant success factor in both practices. Also, the District of Columbia government and Seoul Metropolitan Government make an effort to solve difficulties and problems in management of these programs.

ENCOURAGING CITIZEN PARTICIPATION IN WASHINGTON D. C. AND SEOUL

Using Information and Communication Technology

Web 2.0 is a commonly used technology in both Washington D.C. and Seoul to utilize the Internet for the provision of citizen participation opportunities in the governance, policy, and decision making process. Government 2.0, widely used in government and the IT industry, indicates the use of Web 2.0 technology to enhance collaboration and transparency in government agencies and to potentially transform relations between government agencies and citizens and its operation. Definition of Government 2.0 is "the use of information technology to

socialize and commoditize government services, processes and data" (Di Maio, 2009, p. 2).

The important change that the emergence of Web 2.0 technology and social networks brought is that Internet users were changed from content consumers to content brokers and providers through Web 2.0 and social networks. Through socialization of information with Web 2.0, transparency increases and third parties can create public value by collecting data that is opened to the public by governments. Citizens can also produce information relevant to government processes, and government officials can socialize knowledge on the collaboration platforms provided by the Web 2.0 technology. In Government 2.0, socialization of information more easily occurs, and the concern of socialization moves from information to services governments provide. Also, the emergence of cloud computing[12], together with socialization of information, connects government's service delivery and decision making processes with commoditization of applications and business processes.

Government 2.0 has several characteristics. Government 2.0 is citizen-driven. Citizens can transform government information and configure government services they want to use. Government 2.0 makes it possible to empower government employees to collaborate, to challenge existing procedures, and to be innovative as well as responsible. Introduction of social networks encourages employees to find what matters to them and their jobs. Government

---

[12] Cloud computing is "a style of computing where scalable and elastic IT-related capabilities are provided "as a service" to external customers using Internet technologies" (Di Maio, 2009, p. 5).

2.0 also transforms, manages, and executes the public services provision and its

processes, and uses data generated by a two-way relationship between

government and citizens based on transparency. When initiatives are planned and

start, behaviors and possibilities of communities should be understood and

evaluated, and what purposes lead citizens and public officers to engage should be

identified. Finding internal and external patterns influential to organization

strategies or operations is important because much information on government

services delivery and operation is available outside of government organization.

Management style change is required under the transforming circumstance of

using Government 2.0 by measuring employees not with their output but with

their contribution to their policy outcomes that their agencies are responsible for

(Di Maio, 2009).

     The core of Web 2.0 technology is individual participation and social

interaction. Introduction of Web 2.0 reduces and changes the role of government

from information producer to coordinator. Citizens not only contribute to the

policy process but also influence the result and effect of the policy. In addition,

Web 2.0 technology transforms the one-way relation to two-way interaction

between government and citizens. Governments increase transparency,

legitimacy, and efficiency through online publicity, direct collection of citizens'

opinions, and two-way communication with citizens using social networks based

on Web 2.0. Citizens participate in public service development and provision and

actively monitor government activities. Web 2.0, a customized service, already

shows possibility to evolve to the next generation of technology, called Web 3.0,

133

a personalized service. Web 3.0 will lead to personalized government websites where interactions between an individual and all relevant government agencies are synthesized (Cho, 2009).

Local level of Government

Both governments of Washington D.C. and Seoul studied in this research are local level governments. Citizen participation using innovative mechanisms as well as other e-government issues are discussed and developed in central/federal level of governments and local level governments at the same time. Local governments initiate policies and programs necessary and proper in their situations regardless of their size. Policies and programs produced in local governments compare well with those of central/federal governments, and local government cases often serve as benchmarks.

Application of innovative mechanisms improves government-citizen relationships and quality of public services. Local level government became an excellent laboratory for innovations like adopting information and communication technologies because of the desire to overcome deficits of representative democracy and globalization which changes traditional rules in the public sphere (Alonso, 2009). Citizens desire the extension of participation opportunities and want control over the authority and decisions of government, and the local level is less risky and difficult for adopting and executing participatory democracy. Also, globalization processes and internationalization of capital push local communities

134

to connect to the global order. Very advanced civic culture is a good condition for local communities to survive from the pressure of globalization, and new forms of democratic participation using information and communication technology can support enhancement of the civic culture.

Citizen participation at the local level has an important influence on social capital. Also, citizen participation is closely connected to governance of local public administration. Currently hierarchy in local government is replaced with various networks composed of individuals and collective actors with different degrees of institutionalization (Alonso, 2009). Under this circumstance, new dynamics between citizens and the administrative system are required, and in turn, formulation of objectives will be improved and the means to achieve the objectives will be expanded. Making decisions in the public interest is difficult, and therefore, communication processes in which citizens discuss public issues is necessary. Even though citizen participation using innovative mechanism does not completely replace traditional citizen participation instruments, citizen participation using innovative mechanisms including information and communication technology has potential to further encourage civic engagement in local government (Alonso, 2009).

Different Context of Initiating New Programs

When a new policy or program is introduced, one of the factors that influence the introduction can be whether similar programs or policies have

existed; incrementalism in policy making or historical institutionalism can explain this relationship. Prior programs or policies provide the context or ideas for new programs or policies, and new programs and policies are made in the direction of extending existing programs or policies. If prior programs or policies exist, the issue of new programs or policies can be how strongly the existing programs or policies are rooted in the society, the level of influence of the existing programs or policies, or what the meaning of the existing programs or policies is in the society or to the citizens.

The Citizen Summit in Washington D.C. and Seoul Oasis in Seoul have something in common. Both are programs initiated by mayors' strong will, and executed by city governments. Contribution of innovative technologies used in both programs is enormous. However, the Citizen Summit in Washington D.C. and Seoul Oasis in Seoul have differences in ways of initiating programs and utilizing innovative technologies. The Citizen Summit is a developed form of a public meeting. The public meeting is a traditional form of citizen participation in decision making processes, but recently has not functioned well. Rather than a window for citizens' participation in the policy making process, the public meeting became a mere phase to pass through in policy making. The Citizen Summit arose from an effort to improve the public meeting to graft small group discussion onto public meetings, and innovative technologies were used in the process. On the other hand, Seoul Oasis was born on the basis of information and communication technology, the Internet. There existed a citizen participation system in the policy making process of Seoul, but the real state of the existing

136

system was inactive, and it was a formality. Later, information and communication technologies were developed and introduced to the public sector, and encouragement of citizens to participate in the policy making process through information and communication technologies used the Internet, Seoul Oasis. Launching of Seoul Oasis was an emergence of a program in citizen participation with a new concept, and existing programs were absorbed by Seoul Oasis.

Differences between the Citizen Summit and Seoul Oasis mentioned above can be explained with differences from the background and context of Washington D.C. and Seoul. Washington D.C. and the United States have a longer history of democracy and citizen participation than Seoul and South Korea. Therefore, the concept of citizen participation has been formed in citizens' minds, and personally participating and expressing opinions in various ways of citizen participation is more natural to the citizens in Washington D.C. In this context, adoption of innovative technologies supported a well-maintained existing public meeting system and attracted citizens' attention and therefore encouraged citizens' participation. On the other hand, Seoul has a relatively short history of self-governing and citizen participation. Citizens' desire to participate in the public decision making process is strong, but the condition of existing programs of citizen participation was rather weak. In this situation, rather than utilizing existing programs, it was relatively easy to initiate a new program encouraging citizen participation with a new concept using information and communication technology when various new technologies were introduced to public administration in South Korea.

137

Leadership of Mayors

Among research looking at leadership in the city government, Svara (1990) discussed forms of city governments as mayor-council government and council-manager government and examined how mayors' leadership roles and types in the two forms of city governments are different. Mayors in mayor-council governments, who are easily thought of as executive leaders, innovators, or entrepreneurs in city governments, are driving forces in the policy process. With formal and informal resources, the mayors show goals and directions and unite actors to achieve the goals. The authority is concentrated in the mayors, and the mayors lead the council, government, and citizens to perform what the mayors want. The mayors in the mayor-council system have to deal with frequent conflicts. Different from the mayors in the mayor-council government, mayors in council-manager governments carry the role of guidance. As a facilitator, mayors in the council-manager form encourage effective communication and interaction of actors in the policy process. Even though they do not have strong leadership powers, mayors in the council-manager government achieve the goals by helping others coordinate with each other to reach the goals. Personal characteristics and administrative styles influence both types of mayors.

Leadership of mayors of Washington D.C. and Seoul particularly stood out in the process of initiating the Citizen Summit as well as other programs and Seoul Oasis. Both Citizen Summit and Seoul Oasis were initiated by the mayors, and one of the most important factors in successful direct citizen participation practices is the strong leadership in the government of both cities. Another

similarity is that Mayor Williams and Mayor Oh initiated these two citizen

participation practices as soon as they started their terms. Adopting and keeping

innovative mechanisms and therefore bringing innovations are known to be very

difficult no matter whether the organization is public or private. Strong will and

leadership of mayors in both cities was a great driving force to introduce and

maintain new mechanisms. As examples of mayors of mayor-council system; the

mayors of Washington D.C. and Seoul carried their roles as innovators in policy

initiation as well as implementation.

Unfortunately, the Citizen Summit in Washington D.C. was discontinued

after Mayor Williams left his position, even though innovative technologies in the

District government continue to be in other programs with different focuses. On

the other hand, Seoul Oasis is continuing with Mayor Oh's continuous tenure.

The Citizen Summit was abolished and the agency in charge was closed after

Mayor Williams' tenure ended even though the candidates for mayor agreed to

keep Citizen Summit in their appearances at the last Summit in 2005. Mayors

after Mayor Williams used innovative technologies in other programs in different

focuses rather than encouraging citizen participation, such as efficient and better

public services provision, reducing the digital divide, and therefore giving more

opportunities to less advantaged citizens in different ways. As mentioned above,

the mayor's leadership is a driving force in the city's policies, and it is true that

initiation and implementation of policies depend on mayors in the mayor-council

form of government. Change in a mayor in a city means change of the driving

force in policies and programs. How great the change is depends on who the next

mayor is and what kind of leadership and mind the next mayor has. The possibility for existing policies and programs to be changed or, in worst case, abolished always exists even though programs and policies are currently performed well. The ending of the Citizen Summit and changing focuses about utilizing innovative technology in Washington D.C. is an example of how much mayoral leadership in the city is critical and influential in introducing innovative mechanisms and of the mayor's role as a driving force in policies. For programs and policies to continue, it is necessary for city governments to develop strategies for stable implementation even though mayors change in the mayor-council system.

IMPLICATIONS

This research theoretically as well as practically improves understanding of the use of innovative technologies in governance, policy, and decision making. Research on citizen participation in public administration focuses on either the involvement of bureaucratic decision making processes or civic engagement and building social capital. Research on citizen participation using innovative technologies, e-participation, is just starting by some European scholars. This research introduces a new aspect regarding citizen participation in public administration using innovative mechanisms in civic engagement in the governance, policy, and decision making process. Since the public sector adopted innovative technologies the concept of e-government was introduced to academic

research in public administration, research on e-government has been extensive. However, citizen engagement using innovative technologies has not been studied. The OECD (2001a; 2001b; 2003; 2009) recognized the importance of public engagement in the policy making process and the introduction of information and communication technologies in citizen participation since the early 2000's, and produced various guiding publications. This study attempts to begin filling the gap in research on citizen participation and innovative technologies in public administration by reviewing successful practices in Washington D.C. and Seoul.

Also, this research provides a new idea for encouraging citizen participation for cities by introducing good practices for fostering citizen participation using innovative technologies. This research demonstrates endeavors of Washington D.C. and Seoul to encourage direct citizen participation by providing necessary information and arenas, in reality and in cyber space, for citizens to come together and participate in the governance, policy, and decision making processes. The practices are good examples of activating citizen participation in the city using innovative technologies. In using innovative technologies to foster citizen participation, Washington D.C. grafted it onto the existing practice, and Seoul initiated a new practice. This shows that it is possible to introduce innovative mechanisms to facilitate the existing programs as well as to initiate new programs. The use of innovative mechanisms has potential that allows governments to provide more opportunities for citizens to participate in the governance, policy, and decision making process and give ideas, opinions, and suggestions to their governments.

LIMITATIONS AND FURTHER RESEARCH

This research obviously has some shortcomings. This research explains how innovative technologies are combined with citizen participation practices to foster citizen participation, and how the practices are implemented in Washington D.C. and Seoul. It is known that case study design with a small number of samples cannot provide generalization to a large population. Cases of this research are websites and practices of the two cities, and it is difficult to find another relevant case to the research because the subject of the research is relatively new and similar implemented practices are rare. Since the research is based on findings from two cases, the application of the results of this research is limited.

The second limitation is case selection. These two cities differ in several aspects including demographics, economic, social, and other background and situations. Under this circumstance, comparison of practices of the two cities can bring biases in the analysis. Also, technology reviewed in this research is information and communication technology, mainly the Internet, but the Internet technology was not used in the Citizen Summit of Washington D.C. as it is in Seoul Oasis. Instead of the Internet, networked laptop computers and keypads were used in the Citizen Summit. The definition of the information and communication technology should be broadly understood with the understanding that it is not only the Internet and networking but also other technologies supporting communications among human beings.

The third limitation of this research is lack of empirical analyses. This research is mainly based on data collection by review of government reports and documents, and the review of the cities' main websites and the programs' websites. Empirical analyses including interview or survey of public personnel who are/were in charge of implementation or users and participants of the practices can reinforce the results of this research.

Future research should focus on overcoming the limitations addressed above. The digital divide and evaluation of e-participation should also be considered for further research. The purpose of utilizing innovative technologies in citizen participation practices is to provide more opportunities for citizens to participate in the governance, policy, and decision making process and express their ideas, opinions, and suggestions on public issues regardless of time and space. The premise for achieving this purpose is that citizens can access these technologies whenever and wherever they want and limitation to access should be minimized. The research on digital divide is also important in other areas of e-government research, and therefore it should be carried out along with the research on citizen participation in the governance, policy, and decision making process using innovative mechanisms.

Another further research area is about evaluation of citizen participation using innovative mechanisms in the governance, policy, and decision making process. Citizen participation in the governance, policy, and decision making process using innovative mechanisms, for example, information and communication technologies itself is a newly emerging issue, and the research on

its introduction and adoption in practices of governments has recently begun. Therefore, it is almost impossible to find research on the evaluation of these practices. The OECD (2005) produced a publication on evaluation of public participation in policy making, but it is just a start. Evaluation of implementation is essential for all practices and programs, and practices of citizen participation using information and communication technologies cannot be excluded. Proper evaluation of citizen participation using innovative mechanism in the governance, policy, and decision making process will improve the practices and the relevant research has potential to support improvement.

REFERENCES

About the District government website. (n.d.). Retrieved Nov. 2, 2010, from
    http://dc.gov/DC/About+DC.Gov

Aden, D. (2008). 47 applications in 30 days for $50K. Retrieved Apr. 22, 2011,
    from http://www.govtech.com/e-government/47-Applications-in-30-Days-
    for.html

Alonso, A. I. (2009). E-participation and local governance: A case study.
    Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management, 3(12), 49-
    62.

American Psychological Association. (2010). *Publication manual of the American
    Psychological Association*. Washington D. C.: American Psychological
    Association.

AmericaSpeaks. (1999). Citizen Summit I Preliminary Report. Retrieved Jan. 17,
    2011, from http://americaspeaks.org/projects/case-studies/dc-citizen-
    summit/

Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American
    Planning Association*. 35 (4). 216-224.

Babbie, E. (2004). *The practice of social research* (10th Ed.). Belmont, CA:
    Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Banyan, M. E. (2006). Participation. *Encyclopedia of Governance*. Retrieved Feb.
    3, 2010, from http://sage-ereference.com/governance/Article_n383.html

Barnes, D. (2001, October 7). Mayor gets mixed review at Citizen Summit. *The
    Washington Times*, p. A11.

Buss, T. F. & Redburn, F. S. (2006). Information technology and governance. In
    T. F. Buss, F. S. Redburn & K. Guo (Ed.), *Modernizing democracy* (pp.
    170-202). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Buss, T. F., Redburn, F. S. & Guo, K. (2006). Modernizing democracy: An overview of the issues. In T. F. Buss, F. S. Redburn & K. Guo (Ed.), *Modernizing Democracy* (pp. 3-28). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Byun, H. (1997, December 27). Inaccurate information on the websites: Found 516 errors. *Hankook Ilbo*, p. 29.

Byun, M. (2005). Citizen utilization and citizen participation in e-government. Presented in the Korea Association in Public Administration Winter Conference.

Chan, S. & Woodlee, Y. (2001, October 6). D.C. residents to brainstorm on city services – Mayor's Summit called a PR ploy. *Washington Post*, p. B5.

Census 2010 data show population and diversity trends. (2011). Retrieved Apr. 7, 2011, from http://www.usatoday.com/news/nation/census/default.htm

Chen, Y. C. & Hsieh, J. Y. (2009). Advancing E-governance: Comparing Taiwan and the United States. Public Administration Review, 69(Special Issue), S151-S158.

Cho, H. & Hwang, S. (2010). Government 2.0 in Korea: Focusing on e-participation services. In C. Reddick (Ed.), *Politics, democracy and e-government: Participation and service delivery*. Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Cho, K. J. (2009). A study on the next generation model for Seoul e-government. Seoul; Seoul Development Institute.

Choi, D. (1996, November 21). A lot of 'Cyber Error' relevant to South Korea. *The Kyunghyang Shinmun*, p. 25.

Coleman, S. & Kaposi, I. (2006). New democracies, new media: what's new? Retrieved Sep. 26, 2010, from http://www.ega.ee/files/ Coleman_handbook.pdf

Coleman, S. (2001). *2001: A cyber space odyssey – the internet in the UK election*. London: Hansard Society.

Corbett, P. (n.d.). How to run your own Apps for Democracy innovation contest. Retrieved Apr. 20, 2011, from http://www.appsfordemocracy.org/guide-to-creating-your-own-apps-for-democracy/

Cooper, T. L. (2005). Civic engagement in the twenty-first century: Toward a scholarly and practical agenda. *Public Administration Review*. 65(5). 534-535.

Cottman, M. H. (1999, November 21). D.C. residents turn out to hash out their city's future. *Washington Post*, p. C1.

Cottman, M. H., Fehr, S. C., Montgomery, D., Williams, V., & Woodlee, Y. (1999, November 25). Mayor takes in the views at District Summit. *Washington Post*, p. J2.

Creighton, J. L. (2005). *The public participation handbook*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

D'Agostino, M. J., Schwester, R. W. & Holzer, M. (2006). Enhancing the prospect for deliberative democracy: The Americaspeaks model. *The Innovation Journal*, 11(1), 1-20.

DC Citizen Summit. (n. d.). Retrieved May 5, 2010, from http://americaspeaks.org/projects/case-studies/dc-citizen-summit/

DC-NET Citywide Communications Network. (2010). *Yes We Can – DC Community Access Network*. Retrieved Apr. 25, 2011, from http://dcnet.dc.gov/DC/DCNET/About+DC-Net/News+Room/Press+Releases/Yes+We+Can+-+DC+Community+Access+Network

DC-NET Citywide Communications Network. (n.d.). *DC Communicy Access Network*. Retrieved Apr. 25, 2011, from http://dcnet.dc.gov/DC/DCNET/About+DC-Net/Projects/DC+Community+Access+Network

Di Maio, A. (2009). Government 2.0: A Gartner definition. Retrieved Jan. 24, 2011from http://dc.gov/DC/OCTO/About+OCTO/Publications/Government+2.0:+Gartner+Definition

Dorell, O. (2011, March 24). In D. C., blacks are no longer the majority. *USA Today*, p. ARC.

147

Executive Office of the Mayor. (1999). *Mayor Williams calls upon citizens to shape city's future*. Retrieved Jan. 17, 2011 from http://www.dcwatch.com /mayor/991020.htm

Executive Office of the Mayor. (2003). *Mayor Highlights 2003 Accomplishments*. Retrieved Mar 04, 2011, from http://www.dcwatch.com/mayor/ 031217.htm

Executive Office of the Mayor. (2011). *Vincent C. Gray delivers State of the District Address*. Retrieved Apr. 25, 2011, from http://dc.gov/DC/Mayor/ About+the+Mayor/News+Room/Press+Releases/Vincent+C.+Gray+Delivers+State+of+the+District+Address

Fernandez, M. (2000, November 21). Youths' views take center stage at Summit hosted by Williams. *Washington Post*, p. B4.

Forlano, L. (2004). The emergence of digital government: International perspectives. In A. Pavlichev & G. D. Garson (Ed.), *Digital government: Principles and best practices* (pp. 34-50). Hershey, PA: Idea Group Publishing.

Fountain, J. (2001). *Building the virtual state: Information technology and institutional change*. Washington D. C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public administration review*. 66(6). 66-75.

Gerona, R. M. (2003, November 26). DC's Asian Pacific American numbers show civic clout at Summit. *Asian Fortune*.

Ha, Y. S. (1999). Historical institutionalism: An overview. In Research Group for Institutions and Governance (Ed.), *The new institutionalism: Historical and sociological perspectives.* Seoul: Daeyoung Moonhwasa.

Hall, P. A. (1986). *Governing the economy: The politics of state intervention in Britain and France*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Ho, A. T. (2002). Reinventing local governments and the e-government initiative. *Public administration Review*, 62(4), 434-444.

148

Holzer, M. & Kim, S. T. (2007). *Digital governance in municipalities worldwide: A longitudinal assessment of municipal websites throughout the world*. Newark, NJ: National Center for Public Performance.

Hwang, S. & Hoffman, M. (2010). Advancing e-governance at the community level: Creating an information chain reaction with neighborhood information system. In C. M. Shea & G. D. Garson (3rd Ed.), *Handbook of public information systems* (pp. 211-232). Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press.

Jang, M. K. (2007). Evaluation and improvement of the usability of Seoul City Homepage. Seoul: Seoul Development Institute.

Jeon, Y. (2009, June 15). Seoul website reform, user-centered website. *Moneytoday*, p. 2.

Jreisat, J. E. (2002). *Comparative public administration and policy*. Boulder: Westview Press

Kim, H. (2010). Internet citizen participation and governance institutionalization. *Journal of the Korea Association of Party Studies*, 9(1), 121-147.

Kim, J. (1996, June 11). Launching the Internet homepage: Diffusion of city marketing. *The Korea Economic Daily*, p. 44.

Kim, K. (2007, June 19). Seoul website renovation focusing on users. *Seoul Shinmun*, p. 12.

Kim, P. S., Halligan, J., Cho, N., Oh, C. H., & Eikenberry, A. M. (2005). Toward Participatory and transparent Governance: Report on the Sixth Global Forum on Reinventing Government. *Public Administration Review*, 65(6), 646-654.

Kim, S. K. & Yum, I. R. (2004). Exploratory study on development stages and constraints of e-government services in Seoul. *Journal of Korean Association for Local Government Studies*, 16(2), 103-120.

King, C. S. (2007). Citizens, Citizenship, and Democratic Governance. In R. C. Box (Ed.), *Democracy and public administration* (pp. 64-83). Armonk, NY: M. E. Sharpe.

Kjaer, A. M. (2004). *Governance*. Canbridge, U. K.: Polity Press.

Lan, Z. & Falcone, S. (1997). Factors influencing internet use – A policy model for electronic government information provision. *Journal of government information*. 24(4). 251-257.

Lee, H. S. (2001). The rise and development of the civil society in Korea. *Discourse 201*, 4(2), 8-35.

Lee, J. J. (2007). The relationship of civil movements and political parties. *Memory & Prospect*, 17, 69-94.

Lukensmeyer, C. & Brigham, S. (2002). Taking democracy to scale: Creating a town hall meeting for the twenty-first century. *National Civic Review*, 91(4), 351-366.

Lukensmeyer, C. & Brigham, S. (2005). Taking democracy to scale: Large scale interventions – for citizens. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 41(1), 47-60.

Macintosh, A. & Smith, E. (2007, June). Existing e-participation practices with relevance to Web.Dep. Retrieved May 04, 2010, from itx.napier.ac.uk/itc/documents/webdep_e-participation_practices.pdf

Macintosh, A. & Whyte, A. (2006). Evaluating how eparticipation changes local democracy. Presented in eGovernment Workshop.

Macintosh, A. (2004). Characterizing e-participation in policy-making. System Sciences. Proceedings of the 37th Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences – Track 5. Vol. 5. 1-10.

Macintosh, A. (2006). eParticipation in policy-making: the research and the challenges. In P. Cunningham & M. Cunningham (Ed.), *Exploiting the knowledge economy: Issues, applications and case studies* (pp.364-369). Amsterdam: IOS Press.

Malina, A. (2003). Electronic democracy. *Encyclopedia of community*. Retrieved Mar. 28, 2010, from http://www.sage-ereference.com/community/Article _n265.html

Market facts and statistics. (n.d.). Retrieved Mar. 30, 2011, from
    http://brc.dc.gov/resources/facts.asp

McComas, K. & Derville, T. (2004). Collaborative decision making.
    Encyclopedia of public relations. Retrieved Feb. 3, 2010, from http://sage-
    ereference.com/publicrelations/Article_n72.html

Members of Council. (n.d.). Retrieved Mar. 30, 2011, from
    http://www.smc.seoul.kr/?SSid=540_03

Montgomery, L. (2005, November 20). D.C. residents discuss city's faults,
    advanced – School, housing are among top concerns. *Washington Post*, p.
    C4.

Moynihan, D. P. (2003). Normative and instrumental perspectives on public
    participation: Citizen Summits in Washington D. C. American Review of
    Public Administration, 33(2), 164-188.

National Telecommunication and Information Administration. (2011). Digital
    nation – Expanding Internet usage. Retrieved Mar. 23, 2011, from
    http://www.ntia.doc.gov/reports/2011/NTIA_Internet_Use_Report_Februa
    ry_2011.pdf

O'Looney, J. (2006). Simulation and decision support technologies for enhancing
    citizen understanding and engagement. In T. F. Buss, F. S. Redburn & K.
    Guo (Ed.), *Modernizing Democracy* (pp. 235-262). Armonk, NY: M. E.
    Sharpe.

OECD/Korea Policy Center. (2009a). Issue brief: Citizen participation in policy-
    making (English). Retreaved Nov. 11, 2010, from
    http://www.oecdkorea.org/Download/Governance/Manager/General/File/2
    00902/Issue%20Brief%20No.05(4).pdf

OECD/Korea Policy Center. (2009b). Issue brief: Citizen participation in policy-
    making (Korean). Retreaved Nov. 11, 2010 from
    http://www.oecdkorea.org/Download/Governance/Manager/General/File/2
    00901/issue%20brief%20No.26%20(09-01).pdf

Office of Chief Technology Officer. (2008). *FY09 Performance Plan*. Retrieved Mar. 3, 2011, from http://capstat.oca.dc.gov/Pdf.aspx?pdf=http://capstat. oca.dc.gov/docs/fy09/OCTO.pdf

Office of Chief Technology Officer. (2009a). *FY08 Performance Accountability Report*. Retrieved Mar. 3, 2011, from http://capstat.oca.dc.gov/Pdf.aspx? pdf=http://capstat.oca.dc.gov/docs/fy08/OCTO-FY08PAR.pdf

Office of Chief Technology Officer. (2009b). *FY10 Performance Plan*. Retrieved March 3, 2011, from http://capstat.oca.dc.gov/Pdf.aspx?pdf=http://capstat. oca.dc.gov/docs/fy10/OCTO.pdf

Office of Chief Technology Officer. (2010a). *FY 2011 Performance Plan*. Retrieved Mar. 3, 2011, from http://capstat.oca.dc.gov/Pdf.aspx?pdf =http://capstat.oca.dc.gov/docs/fy11/OCTO.pdf

Office of Chief Technology Officer. (2010b). *FY09 Performance Accountability Report*. Retrieved Mar. 3, 2011, from http://capstat.oca.dc.gov/Pdf.aspx? pdf=http://capstat.oca.dc.gov/docs/fy09/OCTO_FY09PAR.pdf

Office of Chief Technology Officer. (2010c). *Mayor's proposed fiscal year 2011 budget*. Retrieved Mar. 9, 2011, from http://www.cfo.dc.gov/cfo/ frames.asp?doc=/cfo/lib/cfo/budget/fy2011/operating- gds/16_to0_agovernmental_direction_and_support124qxd.pdf

Office of Chief Technology Officer. (2011). *FY10 Performance Accountability Report*. Retrieved, Mar. 3, 2011, from http://capstat.oca.dc.gov/Pdf.aspx? pdf=http://capstat.oca.dc.gov/docs/fy10/OCTO_FY10PAR.PDF

Opsahl, A. (2009). Washington, D.C., reloads Apps for Democracy. Retrieved April 22, 2011, from http://www.govtech.com/pcio/Washington-DC- Reloads-Apps-for-Democracy.html

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2001a). *Citizens as Partners: Information, consultation and public participation in policy- making*. Paris: OECD Publications.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2001b). *Citizens as Partners: OECD handbook on Information, consultation and public participation in policy-making*. Paris: OECD Publications.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2003). *Promise and problems of e-democracy: Challenges of online citizen engagement*. Paris: OECD Publications.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2005). *Evaluating Public Participation in Policy Making.* Paris: OECD Publications.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2009). *Focus on citizens: Public engagement for better policy and services*. Paris: OECD Publications.

Palenchar, M. J. (2004). Citizens advisory committees/panels. *Encyclopedia of public relations*. Retrieved Feb. 3, 2010, from http://sate-ereference.com/publicrelations/Article_n63.html

Park, K. (2000, March 2). Seoul launches its website for the blind. *The Kyunghyang Shinmun*, p. 21.

Peters, B. G. (1999). *Institutional theory in political science: the 'New Institutionalism'*. London: Pinter.

Potapchuk, W. R. (2002). Neighborhood Action initiative: Engaging citizens in real change. In D. D. Chrislip (Ed.), *Collaborative leadership fieldbook* (pp. 170-186). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Ragin, C. C. (1994). *Constructing Social Research: The Unity and Diversity of Method*. Thousand Oaks: Pine Forge Press.

Relyea, H. C. & Hugue, H. B. (2004). A brief history of the emergence of digital government in the United States. In A. Pavlichev & G. D. Garson (Ed.), *Digital government: Principles and best practices* (pp. 16-33). Hershey, PA: Idea Group Publishing.

Seoul and Prague Achieve Top Rankings in E-government Web Portal Excellence. (2010). Retrieved Feb. 27, 2011, from http://news.rutgers.edu/medrel/news-releases/2010/07/seoul-and-prague-ach-20100713

Seoul City. (n.d.). Retrieved Mar. 30, 2011, from http://www.seoul.go.kr/v2007/seoul/ ?SSid=205_00

Seoul Metropolitan Government. (2006). *Report for the evaluation of the Creative Seoul Driving Headquarters' 100 days*. Seoul: Seoul Metropolitan Government.

Seoul Metropolitan Government. (2007). *Seoul E-government White Paper*. Seoul: Seoul Metropolitan Government.

Seoul Metropolitan Government. (2009). *Seoul City's OASIS: Turn your ideas into reality*. 2009 UNPSA finalist presentation material. Retrieved March 02, 2010, from http://americaspeaks.org/projects/case-studies/dc-citizen-summit/

Seoul Metropolitan Government. (2010). *The 21st Seoul Oasis Meeting Brochure*. Seoul: Seoul Metropolitan Government.

Seoul Metropolitan Government. (n.d.). *Seoul Oasis Operation Manual*. Seoul: Seoul Metropolitan Government.

Seoul Statistics. (n.d.). Retrieved Mar. 30, 2011, from http://stat.seoul.go.kr/jsp/WWS8/WWSDS8111.jsp?cot=017&srl_dtl=10559&mnu_dtl=10570

Smith, A. (2009a). DC announces winners in second Application for Democracy contest. Retrieved Apr. 20, 2011, from http://octo.dc.gov/DC/OCTO/About+OCTO/News+Room/Press+Releases/DC+Announces+Winners+in+Second+Applications+For+Democracy+Contest

Smith, A. (2009b). District of Columbia announces second – Apps for Democracy contest. Retrieved Apr. 20, 2011, from http://octo.dc.gov/DC/OCTO/About+OCTO/News+Room/Press+Releases/District+of+Columbia+Announces+Second+-+Apps+for+Democracy+Contest

Subscribe to District government news and services. (n. d.). Retrieved Nov. 2, 2010, from http://mayor.dc.gov/DC/Subscribe

Svara, J. H. (1990). *Official leadership in the city*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Taylor, M. (2010). Hearing. *Encyclopedia of Public Relations*. Retrieved Feb. 3, 2010, from http://www.sage-ereference.com.ezproxy1.lib.asu.edu/publicrelations/Article_n194.html

154

Thelen, K. & Steinmo, S. (1992). Historical institutionalism in comparative politics. In S. Steinmo, K. Thelen, & F. Longstreth (Ed.), *Structuring politics: Historical institutionalism in comparative analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thomas, J. C. & Streib, G. (2003). The new face of government: Citizen-initiated contacts in the era of e-government. *Journal of public administration research & theory*. 13(1). 83-102

Thomas, J. C. (1993). Public involvement and government effectiveness: A decision-making model for public managers. *Administration and society*. 24(4). 444-469.

Thomas, J. C. (1995). *Public participation in public decisions: New skills and strategies for public managers*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Towns, S. (2009). Washington CTO Chris Willey discusses continuation of Apps for Democracy. Retrieved Apr. 22, 2011, from http://www.digitalcommunities.com/articles/Washington-CTO-Chris-Willey-Discusses-Continuation.html

U. S. Census Bureau. (2003). Current population reports. Retrieved Mar. 30, 2011, from http://www.census.gov/main/www/cprs.html

U. S. Census Bureau. (2007). American Community Servey. Retrieved Mar. 30, 2011, from http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/DatasetMainPageServlet?_program=ACS&_submenuId=&_lang=en&_ds_name=ACS_2007_3YR_G00_&ts=

U. S. Department of Justice. (2009). Guide to the Freedom of Information Act: Introduction. Retreived Nov. 13, 2010 from http://www.justice.gov/oip/foia_guide09.htm

U. S. Department of Justice. (2010). Overview of the Privacy Act of 1974. Retrieved Nov. 13, 2010, from http://www.justice.gov/opcl/privacyact1974.htm

Uchimura, Y. (2002). The Citizen Summit: Integrating technology and democracy in the nation's capital. *The Public Manager*, 31(2), 27-30.

United Nations. (2006). *Global e-government readiness report 2005: From e-government to e-inclusion*. New York, NY: United Nations.

United Nations. (2008). *United Nations e-government survey 2008: From e-government to connected governance*. New York, NY: United Nations.

United Nations. (2010). *E-government survey 2010*. New York, NY: United Nations.

Washington D. C. – Top government website award. (n. d.). Retrieved Mar. 9, 2011, from http://www.juggle.com/washington-dc-top-city-government-website-award

West, D. M. (2001). Urban e-government: An assessment of city government websites. Retrieved Mar. 5, 2011, from http://www.insidepolitics.org/CityWhitePaper.pdf

West, D. M. (2002). Urban e-government, 2002. Retrieved Mar. 5, 2011, from http://www.insidepolitics.org/egovt02city.PDF

West, D. M. (2003). Urban e-government, 2003. Retrieved Mar. 5, 2011, from http://www.insidepolitics.org/egovt03city.pdf

West, D. M. (2004a). E-government and the transformation of service delivery and citizen attitudes. *Public Administration Review*, 64(1), 15-27.

West, D. M. (2004b). Urban government, 2004. Retrieved Mar. 5, 2011, from http://www.insidepolitics.org/egovt04city.pdf

Williams, M. (2009). Washington, D.C., CTO Vivek Kundra wants Apps for Democracy expanded. Retrieved Apr. 22, 2011, from http://www.govtech.com/pcio/Washington-DC-CTO-Vivek-Kundra-Wants.html

Yi, D. (2003, December 2). Interview: Kang, Jongpil, Deputy Director, the Information System Planning Team, Seoul Metropolitan Government. *Seoul Shinmun*, p. 6.

Yin, R. K. (2009). *Case study research: Design and methods* (4th Ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.