

# E-Readiness and The Effectiveness of E-Participation in Indonesia

<sup>1</sup>ELISA SUSANTI, <sup>2</sup>RIDHO HARTA, <sup>3</sup>BAMBANG AGUS DIANA,  
<sup>4</sup>SAWITRI BUDI UTAMI

<sup>1,4</sup>Universitas Padjadjaran, Jalan Raya Bandung-Sumedang Km. 21 Jatinangor, Indonesia, <sup>2,3</sup>Universitas Terbuka, Jalan Cabe Raya, Tangerang Selatan, Indonesia

email: <sup>1</sup>elisa.susanti@unpad.ac.id; <sup>2</sup>ridho@ecampus.ut.ac.id; <sup>3</sup>bambangad@ecampus.ut.ac.id;

<sup>4</sup>sawitri.budi@unpad.ac.id

**Abstract.** E-participation is a strategic factor in the era of digital governance and open government. The aim of this study is to describe e-readiness and the effectiveness of e-participation in Indonesia. This study focuses on social and economic aspects, specifically on groups of formal workers who are accustomed to using ICT (Information and Communication Technology). The method used is qualitative with informants from fifty-six districts/cities in Indonesia. Qualitative data analysis steps are carried out to obtain findings. The results of the study show that e-participation has not been effective in two-way forms and community involvement. The e-readiness of this community group is constrained by income, network infrastructure, and motivation in e-participation. This study finds that the development of e-participation stages is in line with the development of e-government and digital government stages, as well as rules in conventional participation. Fulfilling basic needs can be a motivation for e-participation and increase the perception of openness.

*Keywords:* e-participation effectiveness, e-readiness, digital governance

## Introduction

Participation is believed to be the core value of open government. Open government is a new perspective in the information age, an innovation that aims to solve complex public policy problems by changing the traditional form of public service provision to a new form that is more innovative, technology-based, open, and prioritizing participation and collaboration (Meijer, Lips, & Chen, 2019) contributing to public knowledge, or replacing traditional forms of public service provision. These innovative open and collaborative organizational forms in cities seem to point toward not only a wide variety of digitally connected actors but also to a fundamentally different and more invisible role of government in these arrangements. We argue that the recently emerging paradigm of New Public Governance (NPG). The essence of open government is transparency and participation (Meijer, Curtin, & Hillebrandt, 2012). Transparency

revolves around freedom of information, active dissemination of information, access to documents and usability of the website. Meanwhile, participation is about interactive policy-making, consultation, dialogue, and stakeholder engagement. Transparency is also an essential element of 21st-century democracy (Gavelin, Burall, & Wilson, 2009).

E-participation is a strategic factor to increase citizen participation in the era of digital governance and open government (Sanford & Rose, 2007). E-participation is defined as the use of communication information technology to support democratic decision-making (Macintosh, 2004; Medaglia, 2012). This is related to opportunities that enable consultation and dialogue between government and citizens using various ICT tools (Medaglia, 2012).

The implementation of public participation and also e-participation in realizing Open Government in Indonesia has

**Received:** November 17, 2020, **Revision:** March 19, 2021, **Accepted:** June 08, 2021

Print ISSN: 0215-8175; Online ISSN: 2303-2499. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.29313/mimbar.v37i1.6931>

Accredited Sinta 2 based on the decree No.10/E/KPT/2019 until 2024. Indexed by DOAJ, Sinta, Garuda, Crossreff, Dimensions

been supported by various regulations, such as the Regional Government Law, Government Regulation on Public Participation in the Implementation of Regional Government, the Public Information Disclosure Law, Presidential Regulation on Electronic-Based Government Systems, and Presidential Decree concerning Electronic Based Government System (SPBE). Indonesia also commits through the Indonesia Open Government Partnership National Action Plan. In the 2018-2020 Action Plan, the Indonesian government emphasizes action on data transparency, data update, data publication, data integration, public participation, and quality improvement of complaint handling of public services.

However, the implementation of public participation in Indonesia still does not meet the ideal goal of participation. The United Nation (2020) stated that Indonesia's e-participation is still at the lowest level. At the national level, the type of e-participation is at the level of e-information, while at the local level, the level of e-participation is at citizen feedback and complaint systems (second level). Indonesia's e-participation index based on The United Nation is 0.7500 (ranking 57) in 2020, had a value of 0.6180 (ranking 92) in 2018, and 0.3729 (ranking 114) in 2016. The World Bank also provides e-participation index of Indonesia, namely 0.29 in 2015, and still 0.29 in 2016. This value is low when it is compared to other countries in Asia, such as Singapore (index of 0.90), Philippines (index of 0.57), Malaysia (index of 0.53), Vietnam (index 0. of 49), and India (index of 0.63).

Previous studies on e-participation in Indonesia have examined a lot about websites, complaint systems, LAPOR (Public Complaint and Aspiration Service), social media, and *musrenbang* (Development Plan Discussion). Some research in big cities shows that the use of technology and social media has changed the shape of the relationship between society and government (Purnomo, Nurmandi, Prianto, Solahudin, & Jaenuri, 2015; Sutrisno & Akbar, 2018). However, not many people use e-participation (Atnan, 2018), and not all local governments get benefit from social media (Purnomo et al., 2015). The website also still ignores the existence of the community; there is no room for participation, so that the website has not been able to promote e-democracy (Rinaldi & Yuardani, 2015). Likewise, there are still many problems in *musrenbang*

and transparency (Purnomo et al., 2015). The implementation of e-participation in Indonesia faces many challenges, namely from the digital divide, the lack of skills and education of the poor to be factors inhibiting e-participation. (Sari, Hidayanto, Purwandari, Budi, & Kosandi, 2018)

On the other hand, e-participation studies have focused a lot on technology development, e-participation platforms, the use of internet and social media. Most of the e-participation research uses quantitative methods. The weakness of previous research is the lack of descriptions of the moderating variables, such as cultural and social dimensions (Rodríguez-Bolívar, Alcaide-Muñoz, & Cobo, 2018; Zolotov, Oliveira, & Casteleyn, 2018). Therefore, Zolotov et al. (2018) suggested to include cultural and social factors in e-participation studies.

The difference between this research and previous research is that it will evaluate e-participation with the framework of the theory of evaluating e-participation from a social and economic perspective. As stated by Zolotov et al. (2018), there has not been much research on e-participation from a social perspective. This research will also focus more on groups of formal workers who are accustomed to using ICT. This specialization was conducted because previous research (as conducted by Sari et.al (2018)) revealed the lack of skills and education of citizens in e-participation. Thus, this study of e-participation, apart from emphasizing social and economic perspectives, also focuses on groups of formal workers who are already accustomed to using ICT. This specialization in formal workers is to find out other aspects that can determine the effectiveness of e-participation, other than education and skills.

Comprehensively, evaluation of e-participation is carried out from e-readiness to the effectiveness of e-participation. This research is in line with research from The United Nations (2013) which has developed the Measurement and Evaluation Tool for Citizen Engagement and e-Participation (METEP). However, there are differences in indicators between METEP and research conducted by the author, especially in the e-readiness indicator.

E-readiness refers to the degree to which organizational and social networks are prepared to accept the innovation process made possible by ICT. The e-Readiness

assessment aims to provide benchmarks and measure the progress (Viscusi, Batini, & Mecella, 2010). There are various models of e-readiness assessment. Many e-readiness assessments have been conducted from the technical aspects of ICT. Of all 94 e-readiness articles, there are several factors measuring e-readiness, namely infrastructure and connectivity, human resources, networked world enablers, IT applications, ICT use, barriers to ICT use and external environment readiness (Hanafizadeh, Hanafizadeh, & Bohlin, 2013). Several study focused on e-readiness in measuring organizational e-readiness (Abdulwahid, Salman, & Ouda, 2019; Alghamdi, Goodwin, & Rampersad, 2011; Molla & Licker, 2005; Ogunyemi & Johnston, 2012). Another study proposed a measurement of e-readiness from the factors that influence user acceptance of technology and environmental factors (Dada, 2006). From the social and economic aspects, that e-readiness in the Social and Economic Context Indicators (SECI) is a different step compared to other e-readiness measurements (Viscusi et al., 2010).

E-participation effectiveness is about engaging citizens using ICT (United Nations, 2013). E-participation is about empowering citizens to participate more deeply and broadly in policy making. United Nations (2020) suggests e-participation as the process of engaging citizens through ICT, decision making and service design in order to make it participatory, inclusive and deliberative. This interaction involves citizens, public administration, and politicians. The effectiveness of participation is based on a two-way interaction. Citizens are involved at all stages of defining problems, identifying solutions, and developing priorities (Bassler, Brasier, Fogle, & Taverno, 2008; Sheedy, Mackinnon, Pitre, & Watling, 2008) the hope is that this tool will provide a good overview of the breadth of the field – both the concepts and the methods – and supply ample resources (particularly online resources).

There are various forms of participation, as stated by Arnstein (1969), OECD (2001), and IAP2 (2007). Likewise, there are various forms and levels of e-participation, such as e-informing, e-consulting, e-involving, e-collaborating, and e-empowering (Abu-Shanab & Al-Dalou, 2016), also e-information, e-consultation, and e-decision-making (United Nations, 2014). Another study suggests e-enabling, e-engaging, and e-empowering (Macintosh,

2004). Of these various forms, some are one-way and two-way.

The problem statement from this research is that e-participation in Indonesia has not been going well. Apart from that, there has not been much research done to explore the theory of e-participation from a social perspective. Based on this, the aim of this paper is to describe e-participation in Indonesia from a social and economic perspective. Evaluation of e-participation is conducted from e-readiness to the effectiveness of e-participation. To achieve this goal, the guidance theory used is the Social and Economic Context Indicators (SECI) based on Viscusi et al. (2010), as well as the effectiveness of e-participation based on The United Nations (2013), Sheedy et al. (2008), and Bassler et al. (2008).

## Research Methodology

Based on the research objective, which is to evaluate e-participation from a social and economic perspective, this research uses a qualitative method. A qualitative method is used to systematically describe the phenomenon of e-participation based on experiences, points of view, or individual behavior. With this method, there is an exploration of meaning, trying to explain why a phenomenon can occur. Another purpose of using this method is to generate a new concept at the end of the study.

The technique of determining informants/sampling used a purposive sampling method (namely formal workers who are accustomed to using ICT) and convenience sampling. Convenience sampling is a form of qualitative sampling that occurs when people are invited to participate in research because they are willing in terms of access, time, and willingness (Whitehead & Harding, 2013). The primary data collection technique was carried out by means of interviews and by using open-ended questions (via email and Google Form) and depending on the responses of informants who were interested in participating. Informants are from 56 districts/cities covering 22 provinces in Indonesia. The provinces are Nanggroe Aceh Darussalam, North Sumatra, South Sumatra, West Sumatra, Lampung, Bengkulu, Riau, Riau Islands, Bangka Belitung Islands, DKI Jakarta, West Java, Central Java, East Java,

Bali, West Nusa Tenggara, South Kalimantan, North Kalimantan, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan, East Kalimantan, Central Sulawesi, and West Papua. There were 66 informants from the community, and 53 informants from the local government.

Data analysis was performed after reaching the point of data saturation. The steps in data analysis include: making transcripts, reading the entire data, coding the transcripts that have been made, and making interpretations. In the coding process, every data that has been obtained was coded and then put into the theme category. There are three theme categories in this research data analysis: the data reduction theme group, the theme based on the guidance theory, and the theme outside the guidance theory which serves as a finding. The next step is to make interpretations or meanings of the data by comparing the data with the theory.

## **Results And Discussion**

### **E-Readiness of E-Participation in Indonesia**

There are four themes generated in e-readiness of e-participation, namely organizational units, socio-economic context, ICT access and diffusion, and analysis of the services (Viscusi et al., 2010).

The organizational unit concerns the e-readiness of the conditions of public administration staff, which will also be related to policy support. Most of the informants stated that there was policy support at the central and local governments. An informant from the local government stated that "Central and regional policies are very supportive of the work system, every employee is required to use technology in completing work and providing services. Especially during the work from home period, every job, result and feedback is sent online."

On the other hand, the use of technology in local governments is faced with several uneven conditions in the regions. In terms of hardware, most of the informants stated that the condition of the hardware was supportive, functioning properly, meeting standards, according to needs, and being well cared for. Unlike the case with network conditions, there are still areas that experience problems with the network. The informant stated that "the policy is not implemented properly because it is not

supported by facilities and infrastructure, especially networks."

Likewise, in terms of human resources, more informants said that not all employees have good skills in operating computer hardware and software. There are differences in main duties and functions, and generational differences between employees. On the data integration side, conditions vary between local governments. Some examples of integration cases that have worked well are in public service malls, financial reports, regional asset reports, and education data. The informant stated that "Data integration between the center and the regions has not been going well; there are still many improvements with many regulations issued that often overlap with the regions, there are still many agencies that use the old bureaucratic pattern." Another informant stated that "Changes in organizational structure, the formation of new OPDs (regional apparatus organizations) also affect the difficulty of data integration in the regions."

On the innovation side, local governments encourage regional apparatus organizations to always innovate. However, the obstacles faced are to follow policies, main tasks, and adjust to the budget and priority scale. The informant stated that "There is no application built from its own innovation because it only follows the rules of the center and leadership." Another informant stated that "the freedom to innovate is not supported by the budget and will also return to the main tasks and functions, with the highest authority remaining with the Regional Head." Meanwhile, for regions that consider the budget to be inadequate due to insufficient PAD, the government has various work programs on a priority scale so that technology development is still not a priority scale.

### **Socio-Economic Context**

The second theme of e-readiness is the socio-economic context, which is an analysis of the socio-economic composition of users. The social context varies among different social groups, thus several aspects should be described such as age, socio-economic class characteristics, urban or rural context, as well as education level (Viscusi et al., 2010). In this study, the social groups discussed were groups of workers in the formal sector,

currently studying and accustomed to using technology.

In terms of the age of the informants, the ages varied from 18 to 46 years, but mostly at the ages of 21 to 23 years. Most of the informants are millennials and generation Z who are already accustomed to using ICT in work, education and daily life. In line with the discussion on the aspects of ICT access and diffusion, they have no difficulty in operating the newly built hardware or applications. These skills are also obtained because of demands in work and to complete education.

Most of the informants came from the regency area, and a small part came from the city area. Judging from the activities of the informants, it seems that a small proportion of informants who live in the district conduct activities in the city. There were also informants who lived in districts and villages and conducted activities in their places of residence. And there were also informants who moved and settled in the city. Understanding these characteristics can connect social phenomena with the services they expect. Informants who carry out more activities in district and rural areas have more limited access to services. They expect more complete, closer-to-life basic services, as well as network and electricity improvements. The informant stated that "It is necessary to improve education and health services because we are far from the city." Another informant noted: "all services must be improved, including repair of networks and electricity." Meanwhile, informants who urbanize and live in urban areas expect more speed and simplification of services, such as tax, transportation, and employment services. The informant stated that "all displays of online services make it easier for the public to access them"

In terms of income, although these informants work in the formal sector, many have an income of less than Rp 2,000,000 per month. Income from other informants ranges from Rp 2,000,000 to Rp 10,000,000 per month. These income characteristics can also show informants' behavior in the use of ICT, as discussed in the aspects of ICT access and diffusion.

### **ICT access and diffusion**

All informants are workers who are also students accustomed to using ICT.

They have basic skills (editing documents, accessing, and surfing the web) in using ICT due to the demands of learning and of work. All informants have positive responses. The informant stated that "I'm happy to update every program that needs updating and update my skills in using technology." Most of them learn independently and dare to try to practice using new applications of ICT.

In terms of ICT access sources and infrastructure, mobile phones are the more widely used devices. The informant stated that "cellphones are more practical, easier to carry and use anywhere." Another informant stated that "There are several applications that are easier to download using a cellphone than using a laptop." There was also another informant who stated that "My laptop is broken, and I can't afford to buy it anymore."

From the aspect of access sources, most informants used the network from their cellphones by buying a quota package. Only a small proportion of informants have good access sources from cellphone networks, Wi-Fi at work, and having Wi-Fi devices at home. In terms of adequate quota, informants who have an income of less than Rp 2,000,000 per month generally do not have a sufficient quota each month. The informant stated that "The quota is not enough because my money is limited, set aside from salary and daily necessities." There is also another statement that "the quota is expensive because the data is from Telkomsel which is the only provider with a good network in my place."

There were other obstacles faced by the informants, namely the network and electricity which were often unstable. Informants living in districts and villages experienced more network constraints. The informant stated that "Internet is difficult, Telkomsel is difficult, don't ask about Indosat." Another informant stated that "There is no fiber optic cable here, so everything is still (done) via V-SAT with high ping times and small bandwidth." There are also informants who do not experience problems in accessing online services, namely informants who live in big cities and have a fairly good income level (more than Rp 5,000,000 per month).

Considering such conditions, online service initiatives should allow supplying services through multichannel, especially through social media. On the other hand,

efforts are needed to expand internet, network, and electricity services, due to the high need for ICT use.

### **Analysis of the Service**

There are various media that have been built by the Regional Government, such as (1) Online media (websites, email and social media); (2) Offline media (telephone, fax, post, suggestion box, or by visiting OPDs in person); (3) From the public face to face in various activities such as during dialogue. Even so, there are still many agencies in the regions that do not yet provide media for submitting complaints/suggestions online. An informant from the local government stated that "Many complaints are submitted offline because there are still areas that have not been reached by the internet." In other conditions, there are obstacles from the community, in which e-participation has not been well responded to by the community, lack of community involvement, especially those who live in villages, people do not understand online services, and limited facilities and networks.

From the community side, not all of them have used online services, and only a few know about the e-participation application. Some of the reasons put forward by the informants were they did not know online services, online services that were not yet effective, and did not need these services. The informant stated that "I didn't know there was a LAPOR application, nor was it necessary because it had nothing to do with work." Another informant stated that "I don't know about the application about complaints, I don't know it and don't need to." However, informants who have never used online services are active in using social media and online services from sectors outside the government.

Of the informants who have used online services, most of them use online services that are one-way information. Only a small proportion of informants use services transactions and fewer informants have used the application to submit complaints online as well as by e-Musrenbang. From informants who have used websites, social media or online applications related to information services, informants considered that the application was good enough but not optimal. The informant stated that "there is still little information with quite a

long update." From submitting complaints, there are actually various applications that can be used, such as call centers or panic buttons. However, most informants are more familiar with social media, and some local governments also do not have services such as call centers or panic buttons.

In terms of basic online services, it has not fully met the expectations of the community where people still complain about basic services. Public expectations regarding meeting basic needs are found in public information services, hospital registration, payment of local taxes, population registration, employment information, network repair and free internet, online trade, transportation services, complaint handling, and also ease of service, especially for people who live far from cities and government centers. Some of the basic services put forward by the informant are in line with Viscusi et.al (2010) which classify services based on functional characteristics including services of income, certification, license, qualification, return, information provision, and supporting knowledge. The government can maximize or prioritize these types of basic services to increase public satisfaction.

### **Effectiveness of E-Participation**

Effective citizen engagement involves deliberative dialogue (Epstein, Coates, Wray, & Swain, 2006). Citizens are said to be involved when playing an effective role in decision making, namely at all stages in defining problems, identifying solutions, and developing priorities (Bassler et al., 2008; Sheedy et al., 2008) the hope is that this tool will provide a good overview of the breadth of the field – both the concepts and the methods – and supply ample resources (particularly online resources. This e-participation evaluation is seen from its practice in real life (United Nations, 2013). Regarding this concept, three themes are resulting from this research, namely follow-up from the government regarding public complaints, community involvement in decision making and decision follow-up, and openness from the government.

From the first theme, namely the follow-up from the government regarding community complaints, all informants from the local government stated that in principle, all opinions, suggestions and complaints from

the community would be accommodated and then discussed whether they could be followed up or not. This follow-up process still follows the rules, adjusting to the priority scale, OPD authority, and budget ceiling. This is in line with the view of the community; only a small proportion of community informants said that their complaints were followed up. The informants also realized that not all complaints would be followed up because they were selected according to the priority and urgency of the problem. The informant stated that "complaints are followed up, but it takes quite a long time because there are many processes to go through."

In the second theme, namely community involvement in decision making and decision follow-up, the informant from the local government stated that there had been efforts to involve the community in making development planning decisions. Community involvement and transparency have been implemented starting from proposing development planning through Musrenbang activities and proposing activity plans which are carried out online. However, in line with the results of the analysis of the service, there is very little use of e-participation in the form of e-Musrenbang. Musrenbang is mostly done offline. Only a few people take part in the Musrenbang. The informant stated that "I am a member of the PKK so I was involved." Another informant stated that "He had participated in the village development planning meeting because he was a member of the LPMD." Meanwhile, most informants were not involved in the Musrenbang. The informant stated that "I am not involved because I am only a small community, and the Musrenbang is only for the board." Another informant said, "never, because never invited." Informants who have used e-participation and are also involved in Musrenbang stated that not all ideas, suggestions or complaints can be followed up. The informant explained that "some are accommodated or not, depending on deliberation to reach consensus and the priority scale of the *renbang* and budget".

On the third theme, namely openness from the government, most local government informants said that there had been efforts to make transparency to the public. It is easy for the public to obtain information through websites, social media or directly to OPD. Several examples of transparency were put forward by the informants, such as: "It is transparent; all forms of financial reports are

openly posted." Another form of transparency is in online services. The informant stated that "transparency in the form of types of services, terms, time periods and services has been conveyed to the public, as well as payments via ATM." There is also a form of transparency in Musrenbang activities. However, another informant stated that "It cannot be fully transparent since there are some data that cannot be widely disclosed because there must be legal interests".

From the perspective of the public regarding transparency, most of the community informants stated that the government was not yet transparent enough, but there were already efforts towards transparency. Some efforts that have been appreciated include the publication of budget data and information related to regional development and programs. However, this effort is considered to be inadequate, such as in terms of the amount of data and information and infrequent updating. Informants stated that "Not all data is published by the government, and I do not know the truth of the data." Another informant stated that "There are many regional developments that spend the budget, but they are deemed not useful and there are no details on the costs involved in the development."

There are still many hopes from the community. Some hopes from the public regarding e-participation, namely: (1) Increasing the use of online media, improving online service features; (2) The desire to be involved in government programs; (3) Aspirations, complaints and suggestions are more realized by the regional government because the community is considered to have a better understanding of what programs are most needed; (4) Increasing accountability and information disclosure; (5) Improvement of community welfare and ICT infrastructure. If the ICT infrastructure can be fulfilled, the informant believes that his area can develop as the regions in Java Island.

The condition that shows e-participation is considered ineffective because there is still a service quality gap. This refers to the concept of e-government effectiveness that online services are considered effective if they can achieve the mission and goals of the organization, as well as services that meet the expectations or needs of citizens (DeLone & McLean, 2003; Yang & Rho, 2007).

**The Development of the E-Participation Stage is in Line With the E-Government and Digital Government Development Stages**

E-participation will develop to a higher stage if it is supported by e-readiness from the government in the form of increasing the effectiveness of the e-government/digital government stage. In general, the phenomenon shows that e-participation is still at an early stage, namely providing information (one way). There is already e-participation at a higher level, but the two-way form of handling complaints and community involvement is considered ineffective. Along with the application of technology in government, where e-government has not been remarkably effective in the form of two-way communication and transactions,

there are still various problems at the integration stage. This phenomenon of ineffective e-participation can also be seen from the digital government stage. There are several stages of digital government, where expectations of effective e-participation are at the engagement stage (stage 3) and the contextualization stage (stage 4). However, the condition of the Regional Government is still constrained by the digitization stage (stage 1), namely the fulfillment of network infrastructure. Infrastructure problems are crucial because they are the foundation for digital transformation.

The following table describes the levels of digital government, e-government, e-participation, and conventional participation.

**Table 1**  
**Level of Digital Government, E-Government, E-Participation, and Participation (Conventional)**

| Stages in the Digital Government Evolution |   |  |   |   |                      |                        |                   |
|--|---|--|---|---|----------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| (Janowski, 2015)                           | Digitization (Technology in Government) | Transformation (Electronic Government) | Engagement (Electronic Governance)                  | Contextualization (Policy-Driven Electronic Governance) |                      |                        |                   |
| Stages of E-Government                     |   |  |   |   |                      |                        |                   |
| Figures                                    | One Way                                 | Two Ways                               |   | Integration   |                      |                        |                   |
| (Gil-Garcia, 2012)                         | Initial Presence                        | Extended Presence                      | Interactive Presence                                | Transactional Presence                                  | Vertical Integration | Horizontal Integration | Total Integration |
| (Anttiroiko, 2008)                         | Emerging                                | Enhanced                               | Interactive   | Transactional   | Seamless             |                        |                   |
| Levels of E-Participation                  |   |  |   |   |                      |                        |                   |
| Figures                                    | One Way                                 | Two Ways                               |   | Partnership and Empowerment                             |                      |                        |                   |
| (Abu-Shanab & Al-Dalou', 2016)             | e-informing                             | e-consulting                           |   | e-involving   | e-collaborating      | e-empowering           |                   |
| (United Nations, 2014)                     | e-information                           | e-consultation                         |   | e-decision-making                                       |                      |                        |                   |
| (United Nations, 2020)                     | Provision of information                |  | consultation  | collaboration   | empowerment          |                        |                   |
| (West, 2011)                               | Billboards                              | Partial service delivery               | portal with secure operability and integral service | interactive democracy                                   |                      |                        |                   |



| Level of Participation (Conventional) |  |           |              |                             |             |                 |                 |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------|--------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Figures                               | One Way  |           | Two Ways     | Partnership and Empowerment |             |                 |                 |
| (IAP2, 2007)                          | Inform   |           | Consult      | Involve                     | Collaborate | Empower         |                 |
| (OECD, 2001)                          | information  |           | Consultation | Active participation        |             |                 |                 |
| (Arnstein, 1969)                      | Manipulation and therapy (including non-participation) | Informing | Consultation | Placation                   | Partnership | Delegated power | Citizen control |

Source: the writer, compiled from various sources

The e-government development stage model can assess whether a community is mature enough to move to the next stage in service provision from the supply (government e-readiness) and demand (community needs, motivation, and behavior) side. The service must have a prominent level of maturity before entering a higher level to ensure its effectiveness (Anttiroiko, 2008).

In relation to conventional participation and e-participation, in the early stages of participation in the form of providing information, communication and feedback, it will be more effective with the use of technology (such as in the use of websites and social media). Whereas, at a higher level that involves the involvement of citizens in decision-making, the effectiveness of e-participation will also depend on various rules in conventional participation (such as rules for participation in Musrenbang).

### **Increase Citizen E-Participation Motivation by Fulfilling Basic Needs and Basic Services Online**

In the earlier discussion, it is known that there is still a gap between e-participation services and the expectations of the community. The failure to fulfill various expectations has an impact on participation and trust in the government. Several figures have expressed motivation or user satisfaction in the use of e-government. People will be motivated and assume their hopes are fulfilled if they get the benefits of an online service (DeLone & McLean, 2016; Sigwejo & Pather, 2016; Weerakkody, Irani, Lee, Hindi, & Osman, 2014). The results of this research reinforce the previous theory,

namely that the community will be motivated in e-participation if it is related to meeting their basic needs. In addition to the research results, community needs differ between community groups.

There are differences in behavior between poor and middle-income households in participation. Poor households face many obstacles because of limited resources and must prioritize their needs. Research results show that informants who earn less than Rp 2,000,000 per month have difficulty in meeting internet quota needs so that they cannot access online services. Referring to BPS, that the poverty line per household in March 2020 was Rp2,118,678/month (Badan Pusat Statistik, 2019).

For middle- and upper-class groups of society, people have a different set of basic needs from low socioeconomic class communities. This means that the middle-class community can have a higher level of involvement, but it will also depend on meeting their needs (Schutte, 2018) development consultants and day-to-day talk among those involved in shaping the future in under developed and developing countries. Success stories are few and there is simply little or no guarantee that the outcome of a community development project will be successful. This paper argues that the reason for this intolerable state of affairs is that community development lacks a proper scientific theory. Current development approaches are re-visited and the Basic Needs theory is introduced as the only theory that takes community development beyond just the various "approaches" currently seen. This new theory integrates the complexities of community development into a distinct scientifically based theory and

accommodates the typical convolutions of the interdisciplinary approach by introducing a user-friendly basic needs assessment technique (P-Index). The research results from the middle class show that they have skills in ICT and can find the information they need independently. However, they do not know or do not use e-participation because it is not related to their daily work, or it has nothing to do with their needs.

This study also found that basic needs intersect with participation. The government's attention to meeting basic needs can be done in a participatory way. Community informants argue that they will support and feel happy if they are involved in government programs so that there are positive impacts to be able to improve welfare.

### Conclusions

E-participation in Indonesia has not been effective because there is still a gap between e-participation service and community expectations. E-participation has also not been effective because the two-way form, complaint handling, and community involvement that has not been going well. The effectiveness of this e-participation is related to e-readiness. Society of formal workers groups does not experience obstacles in education and skills to use ICT. From this case, it is known that efforts to improve community skills in ICT can be instilled at an early age in school. However, the barriers to e-readiness among this group include income, network infrastructure, and motivation in e-participation.

The community will be motivated in e-participation if it is related to meeting basic needs. Thus, it is necessary to look at the differences in needs between community groups in the social and economic context, such as rural and urban contexts and differences in income. Efforts to develop the e-participation stage will also be in line with the development of the e-government, digital government, and the rules for conventional participation. Thus, it is necessary to align the development of e-participation with the characteristics and needs of people in an area. More effort is needed in technology need assessment as well as mapping of basic services. Digital transformation is also needed with the fulfillment of network infrastructure first as the initial stage of

digital government. On the other hand, complaint handling, community participation and empowerment are also more needed in sectors that are causally related to basic services and improving welfare.

### Acknowledgment

The authors express their highest gratitude to Indonesia Open University for funding this research through the Penelitian Pengembangan dan Inovasi (PPI) UT Scheme 2020-2021.

### References

- Abdulwahid, H. S., Salman, M. K., & Ouda, A. J. (2019). Identify and assessing the e-readiness of public organizations (case study in Iraq). *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 2144(August). <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5123122>
- Abu-Shanab, E., & Al-Dalou', R. (2016). An Empirical Study of E-Participation Levels in Jordan. *International Journal of Information Systems and Social Change*, 7(1), 63–79. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijssc.2016010104>
- Alghamdi, I. A., Goodwin, R., & Rampersad, G. (2011). E-Government Readiness Assessment for Government Organizations in Developing Countries. *Computer and Information Science*, 4(3), 3–17. <https://doi.org/10.5539/cis.v4n3p3>
- Anttiroiko, A.-V. (2008). *Electronic Government: Concepts, Methodologies, Tools, and Applications*. New York: Information Science Reference.
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder Of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35(4), 216–224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- Atnan, N. (2018). Tingkat Partisipasi Publik Melalui Pemanfaatan Media Lapor Di Kota Bandung. *JWP (Jurnal Wacana Politik)*, 3(2), 150. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jwp.v3i2.19883>
- Badan Pusat Statistik. (2019). Profil Kemiskinan di Indonesia. In *Berita Resmi Statistik*. Retrieved from <https://www.bps.go.id/pressrelease/2020/01/15/1743/persentase-penduduk-miskin-september-2019-turun-menjadi-9-22-persen.html>
- Bassler, A., Brasier, K., Fogle, N., & Taverno, R. (2008). Developing Effective Citizen

- Engagement: A How-To Guide for Community Leaders. *Center For Rural Pennsylvania*. Retrieved from [http://www.rural.palegislature.us/effective\\_citizen\\_%5Cengagement.pdf](http://www.rural.palegislature.us/effective_citizen_%5Cengagement.pdf)
- Dada, D. (2006). E-Readiness for Developing Countries: Moving the focus from the environment to the users. *The Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 27(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1681-4835.2006.tb00183.x>
- DeLone, W. H., & McLean, E. (2003). The DeLone and McLean Model of Information Systems Success: A Ten-Year Update. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 19(4), 9–30. Retrieved from <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.2753/MIS0742-1222290401%0Ahttp://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/B6W4G-4B6SK9R-4/2/52c2f579f2408a886c6896e9e9f50391%5Cnhttp://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0740624X03000790%0Ahttp://www.tandfonline>
- DeLone, W. H., & McLean, E. R. (2016). Information Systems Success Measurement. *Foundations and Trends® in Information Systems*, 2(1), 1–116. <https://doi.org/10.1561/29000000005>
- Epstein, P. D., Coates, P. M., Wray, L. D., & Swain, D. (2006). *Results that matter : improving communities by engaging citizens, measuring performance, and getting things done*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Gavelin, K., Burall, S., & Wilson, R. (2009). Open Government: beyond static measures A paper produced by Involve for the OECD. *A Paper Produced by Involve for the OECD.*, (July). Retrieved from <http://www.oecd.org/gov/46560184.pdf>
- Gil-Garcia, J. R. (2012). *Enacting Electronic Government Success: An Integrative Study of Government-wide Websites*. London: Springer.
- Hanafizadeh, M. R., Hanafizadeh, P., & Bohlin, E. (2013). Digital Divide and e-Readiness: Trends and Gaps. *International Journal of E-Adoption*, 5(3), 30–75. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijea.2013070103>
- IAP2. (2007). Spectrum of Public Participation. *Iap2*, 2. Retrieved from [www.iap2.org](http://www.iap2.org)
- Janowski, T. (2015). Digital government evolution: From transformation to contextualization. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(3), 221–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.07.001>
- Macintosh, A. (2004). Characterizing e-participation in policy-making. *Proceedings of the Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, 37(C), 1843–1852. <https://doi.org/10.1109/hicss.2004.1265300>
- Medaglia, R. (2012). EParticipation research: Moving characterization forward (2006–2011). *Government Information Quarterly*, 29(3), 346–360. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2012.02.010>
- Meijer, A. J., Curtin, D., & Hillebrandt, M. (2012). Open government: Connecting vision and voice. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 78(1), 10–29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852311429533>
- Meijer, A. J., Lips, M., & Chen, K. (2019). Open Governance: A New Paradigm for Understanding Urban Governance in an Information Age. *Frontiers in Sustainable Cities*, 1(August), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frsc.2019.00003>
- Molla, A., & Licker, P. S. (2005). Perceived e-readiness factors in e-commerce adoption: An empirical investigation in a developing country. *International Journal of Electronic Commerce*, 10(1), 83–110. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10864415.2005.11043963>
- OECD. (2001). Citizens as Partners. In *Citizens as Partners*. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264195578-en>
- Ogunyemi, A. A., & Johnston, K. A. (2012). Towards an organisational readiness framework for emerging technologies: An investigation of antecedents for south african organisations' readiness for server virtualisation. *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 53(1). <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1681-4835.2012.tb00378.x>
- Purnomo, E. P., Nurmandi, A., Prianto, A. L., Solahudin, & Jaenuri, M. (2015). The Current Practice of Citizen Participation in Indonesia Citizen and Selected Cases of Local Democracy in Indonesia. *Citizen Participation in Selected Local Governance of Asia Pacific Countries*, (Yogyakarta), 21–48.
- Rinaldi, H., & Yuardani, A. M. (2015). Analisis Peluang Transformasi “E-Government” menjadi “E-Democracy” melalui Website Resmi Pemerintah Daerah. *MIMBAR, Jurnal Sosial Dan Pembangunan*, 31(1),

103. <https://doi.org/10.29313/mimbar.v31i1.1201>
- Rodríguez-Bolívar, M. P., Alcaide-Muñoz, L., & Cobo, M. J. (2018). Analyzing the scientific evolution and impact of e-Participation research in JCR journals using science mapping. *International Journal of Information Management*, 40(November 2016), 111–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2017.12.011>
- Sanford, C., & Rose, J. (2007). Characterizing eParticipation. *International Journal of Information Management*, 27(6), 406–421. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2007.08.002>
- Sari, A. M., Hidayanto, A. N., Purwandari, B., Budi, N. F. A., & Kosandi, M. (2018). Challenges and issues of E-participation implementation: A case study of e-complaint Indonesia. *Proceedings of the 3rd International Conference on Informatics and Computing, ICIC 2018*, 1–6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/IAC.2018.8780467>
- Schutte, D. W. (2018). *The Basic Needs Theory For Community Development*. (October). <https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.11882.98243>
- Sheedy, A., Mackinnon, P., Pitre, S., & Watling, J. (2008). Handbook on Citizen Engagement : Beyond Consultation. *Canadian Policy Research Networks*, (March), 59.
- Sigwejo, A., & Pather, S. (2016). A citizen-centric framework for assessing E-government effectiveness. *Electronic Journal of Information Systems in Developing Countries*, 74(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1681-4835.2016.tb00542.x>
- Sutrisno, B., & Akbar, I. (2018). E-Partisipasi Dalam Pembangunan Lokal (Studi Implementasi Smart City Di Kota Bandung). *Jurnal Sosioteknologi*, 17(2), 191. <https://doi.org/10.5614/sostek.itbj.2018.17.2.2>
- United Nations. (2013). *Measuring and Evaluating e-Participation ( METEP ) : Assessment of Readiness at the Country Level*. 1–24.
- United Nations. (2014). *United Nations E-Government Survey 2014: E-Government for the Future We Want*. <https://doi.org/978-92-1-123198-4>
- United Nations. (2020). E-Government Survey 2020. Digital Government in the Decade of action for sustainable development. In *UN E-Government Knowledgebase*.
- Viscusi, G., Batini, C., & Mecella, M. (2010). *Information Systems for eGovernment: A Quality-of-Service Perspective*. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/44/8/085201>
- Weerakkody, V., Irani, Z., Lee, H., Hindi, N., & Osman, I. (2014). A review of the factors affecting user satisfaction in electronic government services. *International Journal of Electronic Government Research*, 10(4), 21–56. <https://doi.org/10.4018/ijegr.2014100102>
- West, D. M. (2011). Digital government: Technology and public sector performance. In *Digital Government: Technology and Public Sector Performance* (Vol. 9781400835768).
- Whitehead, D., & Harding, T. (2013). Analysing Data in Qualitative Research. *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 193(5), 565.
- Yang, K., & Rho, S. Y. (2007). E-government for better performance: Promises, realities, and challenges. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 30(11), 1197–1217. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690701225556>
- Zolotov, M. N., Oliveira, T., & Casteleyn, S. (2018). E-participation adoption models research in the last 17 years: A weight and meta-analytical review. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 81, 350–365. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2017.12.031>