

CASE OF E-GOVERNMENT INNOVATIONS AND PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION: A REVIEW

Prof. Dr. Abdul Quayum

Professor-Cum-Director, CSE Coaching Academy,
Maulana Azad National Urdu University, Hyderabad, India.

ABSTRACT: This paper analyzes the institutional incentives that drive innovation. While motivation was included in early theories of innovation, there is a lack of actual research on this phenomenon. Gaining a more precise comprehension of the varying institutional incentives may shed light on the reasons why public organizations, when implementing new strategies and initiatives, sometimes struggle to reproduce the advantages of previous implementations. We use organizational and political theory to uncover several processes that might potentially result in the acceptance of innovative practices. More precisely, we propose that organizational motives might be linked to concerns about efficiency, the management of internal bureaucratic politics and external pressures, or the pursuit of legitimacy in relation to peer organizations. We examine ideas by using data on the timing and extent of e-government advancements from 1999 to 2009. Our research indicates that motives focused on external issues have a greater

impact compared to internal causes like bureaucratic politics. This implies that in the long term, the development of e-governance might potentially enhance the responsiveness of local governments to external stakeholders, provided that obstacles to change can be successfully addressed.

INTRODUCTION

The paper aims to clarify the observed trend of widespread but superficial replication of breakthroughs by examining the underlying institutional motives. Motivations, referring to the objectives that an institution seeks to achieve and the intensity with which it pursues those objectives, have been extensively studied in the field of dissemination of innovations. However, the field of public administration literature has not consistently differentiated between different incentives that institutions may have when studying the spread of policies or technologies. Instead, the literature has mostly concentrated on the institutional, political, and environmental circumstances that facilitate or impede experimentation

[1].

An enhanced emphasis on institutional motives may contribute to the development of theory and provide guidance for policies aimed at fostering innovation. If individuals do not have enough incentive, official efforts to promote innovation by providing resources or knowledge are unlikely to succeed. Furthermore, several tactics are necessary to promote organizational transformation, depending on the specific reasons that drive organizational decision-making. For instance, the theories of New Public Management argue that organizational innovation is primarily driven by efficiency concerns. This implies that implementing policies that address information asymmetries or other impediments to innovation may be sufficient to encourage wider adoption.

Our study sheds light on the institutional incentives for innovation by examining the adoption of websites by municipalities and the subsequent growth of e-government services offered via those websites. The study of e-government is particularly compelling and valuable for examining the spread of innovation due to many factors. E-government refers to a collection of technologies and services that may be used by various public entities. This offers a wide variety of prospective users for research purposes. Implementing e-

government also has inherent risks. Developing it requires substantial resources, involves intricate technical uncertainties, and has the capacity to alter established power structures and work routines in towns. Therefore, the implementation of e-government is a significant choice that municipalities should not make without careful consideration. The adoption of e-government may be influenced by several incentives due to the diverse advantages it offers, including efficient service delivery, enhanced internal administration, and increased political communication. This study enhances the comprehension of the process of spreading new ideas by investigating both the timing and the extent of e-government adoption. We provide careful consideration to the motives of institutions, with a specific focus on the degree of decision-making inside organizations and the influence of both internal and external forces on the choices made by the organization.

It is undeniable that public administration is a domain where values play a significant role and often lead to conflicts and complex situations that do not have clear solutions. Resolving these dilemmas is the primary task of individual bureaucrats, administrative agencies, public administration scholars, and the public sector as a whole. Due to the importance of

resolving conflicts between values, there has been on-going intellectual discussion over the role of values in public administration. This includes determining which specific value or group of values should serve as the fundamental basis and guiding principle for the subject. There has been a recent resurgence in the literature about this topic, namely in the development of what might be referred to as public values research[2][3].

AN INNOVATION DIFFUSION FRAMEWORK

The exploration of the uptake of cutting-edge technologies and behaviors has been examined via several theoretical frameworks. The technology acceptance model originates from the domain of information systems and adopts a mostly psychological viewpoint on the adoption of technology by humans. A substantial and diverse collection of research has used this overarching paradigm to examine the spread of e-government. Data analyses have scrutinized data from many levels of governance, ranging from local towns to whole nation states. The majority of attention has been directed on the implementation of a solitary innovation, such as a website or a geographic information system (GIS) [4].

The outcomes of diffusion studies are often very responsive to the method by which the

dependent variable is defined and measured. However, the outcomes in this collection of research are consistently in agreement. Research indicates that the availability of surplus resources and institutional assistance, such as having more professional legislatures and council-manager forms of government, have a crucial role in facilitating the adoption of e-government.

This paper has insufficiently addressed other types of institutional motives that drive innovation. There has been a propensity to examine certain motivational elements individually, rather than assessing the comparative significance of a variety of reasons. For instance, several studies have specifically examined the impact of public officials' political objectives on the implementation of new ideas or practices[5].

VALUE AND VALUES IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION

The word "value" often denotes the inherent worth of anything. In the context of government, "public value" refers to the evaluation of what is produced and maintained by the government for the benefit of the public. The concept of generating public value is often associated with[6], who posits that the objective of management efforts in the public sector is to produce public value, similar to how

managerial work in the private sector aims to generate private profit. Public value is generated when policy and management initiatives possess political legitimacy, feasibility, and sustainability, as well as operational possibility and practicality, while also providing substantive value to the citizens [7]. Public value is diminished when incorrect judgments are made on the demands that must be fulfilled, the tactics used to fulfill those needs, and the procedures used to generate and provide services. Currently, the concept of generating public value has been integrated into a comprehensive management ideology, in which public services are focused on achieving results that fulfill the specific requirements of the local population and are approved by the service users and their communities. In order to effectively deal with the diversity of public values, public administrators require tools to observe and comprehend the pertinent public values involved in a specific policy matter or dispute. These tools, or frameworks, enable them to take into account a wide range of significant human values and prevent the neglect of certain values while excessively prioritizing others. Indeed, researchers have produced a substantial amount of literature in which they have categorized public ideals. This categorization often involves fundamental values, chronological

ordering, or some kind of division or difference based on dimensions. Additional categorizations are generated from an examination of the literature on public administration and political science, or are established on the distinctions between the values of public and private organizations. Additional categories are established according to the distinction between "hard" and "soft" values. These values may be categorized as individual, professional, organizational, legal, and public-interest values, as well as ethical, democratic, professional, and people values. Another categorization is based on values associated with administrative rationality, democratic morality, and political survival[8][9].

INSTITUTIONAL MOTIVATIONS AND DIFFUSION THEORY

Unravelling the reasons why institutions are motivated to innovate presents many philosophical and empirical difficulties. Interpreting organizational purpose statements may be challenging since they could serve as explanations for activities that have already been performed or as a means to achieve credibility by emphasizing broad societal roles. One common approach is to use surveys at the individual level to assess and distinguish various aspects of motives. One significant drawback of this method, however, is that an organization's objectives are not only a

combination of individual interests. Objectives are not determined unilaterally, but rather emerge via a process of negotiation across different departments and people. These objectives are a result of reaching a compromise among members of a dominating coalition, whose makeup may not be clearly determined[10]. This approach considers public agencies as cohesive decision-making units that operate in accordance with a shared preference function influenced by both internal and external influences[11]. Quantifying organizational motives is not done by direct measurement. Researchers analyze organizational acts and then inquire if there is an underlying decision criteria that the bureaucracy seems to be seeking to adhere to.

Using the principles of revealed preferences, we use many branches of organizational, administrative, and political theory to establish a link between observable acts and their underlying reasons. Prior research has attributed a diverse array of goals to public institutions, either directly or implicitly. The images encompass a spectrum of bureaucratic roles, ranging from the competent bureaucrat who prioritizes efficiency, to the budget-maximizing bureaucrat who seeks personal benefits, to the institutional leader who adds value to the organization and ensures its stability within its external

context, and finally to the politically motivated organization that prioritizes the re-election of officials[12].

BUREAUCRATIC COMPETITION.

Organizations that prioritize internal management are driven by worries over rivalry between different departments. The use of information technology (IT), like other advances, has significant ramifications for the allocation of resources and authority inside businesses. E-government technologies, such as those mentioned, restructure the way information is accessed and work processes are managed, which in turn affects departments' control over their work processes. Furthermore, the implementation of e-government leads to the emergence of interdependencies, as IT department administrators assume influential roles in the operations of other departments. Multiple studies provide evidence for the significance of interdepartmental dynamics, showing that power dynamics within organizations greatly influence the design and implementation of new technologies[13]. Furthermore, technologies are frequently adopted in a manner that reinforces existing power relationships. Organizations driven by the need to handle internal politics and competition for limited resources must address the equilibrium

between resistance and support from different departments. Organizations that encounter significant resistance from several departments are more inclined to postpone the implementation of new ideas. On the other hand, organizations that get backing from influential departments for a potentially revolutionary invention may more readily deploy it. The likelihood of departmental resistance is expected to rise in correlation with the intricacy of the internal structure of the organization[14]. This is due to the anticipated growth in the number of central administrators and potential sources of opposition.

WHAT ARE PUBLIC VALUES IN PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION?

The subsequent parts of the study analyze the whole of public values within the field of public administration. The text begins by identifying and discussing four frames of public values. It then on to examine several itinerant public values, which are values that form the basis of public administration but may be interpreted differently depending on the frame of reference. The four frameworks that include the values in public administration are political, legal, organizational, and market. The first two frames, political and legal, may be seen as

components of democratic principles, whereas the latter two frames, organizational and market, can be seen as components of bureaucratic principles[15]. Nevertheless, as mentioned in the conclusion, the inclusion of additional public values frames has the potential to make this fragmented perspective insignificant.

Each of these four frames is defined by fundamental content values and influenced by a certain technique and form of reasoning. Content values are the fundamental principles that provide the framework and set the criteria to be met in activities. Rationality is the use of reason to arrive at conclusions on a matter being examined. It is influenced by the ideas that form and direct systematic decision-making processes. Methodology refers to the precise techniques and strategies used to implement the core principles and beliefs[16].

MEETING ENVIRONMENTAL REQUIREMENTS

Organizations that operate at the management level and have a focus on external factors are driven by the needs of their environment. For instance, politicians seeking support or government officials focused on serving the public may aim to provide widely favored initiatives. The supply of municipal Web applications is

associated with majoritarian politics, depending on broad constituent support, due to the widely spread expenses and benefits. Support is more probable to come from stakeholders with higher socioeconomic level, since they tend to utilize the Internet more often and expect better quality public services[17]. Municipal governments that prioritize economic growth are inclined to embrace innovations when they see their regional rivals successfully implementing them. Multiple research on policy dissemination have shown regional impacts that indicate organizations are responsive to the decisions made by neighboring jurisdictions.

DETAILS AND PROCEDURE

In order to examine these hypotheses, we use several data sources to determine the timing of when municipalities implemented websites, create metrics to assess the extent of e-government services, and define the explanatory factors in a practical manner. ICMA's biennial study of municipal e-government is our primary source for determining the timing of Web site adoption. Conducted in the years 2000, 2002, and 2004, these surveys gathered information on several subjects pertaining

to the implementation and acceptance of e-government strategies[18]. In the 2000 survey, municipalities were questioned about the duration of their Web site, allowing us to ascertain the year of its introduction before 2000. The timeframe for adoptions that occurred after 2000 is determined by the first survey in which the organization had a website. In order to validate and improve upon this information, we used the 2004 Census of Governments and the 2000 ICMA wage survey, both of which included inquiries about municipal websites.

Regrettably, the ICMA data does not provide sufficient information to conduct a comprehensive analysis of the wide range of e-government services that have been implemented. Instead, we create an index that measures the range of e-government services available in 2009. We next use ordinary least squares (OLS) regression to investigate the reasons behind the decision to provide a wider range of e-government services. The 2009 ICMA survey examines whether municipalities provide 17 specific e-government services. Based on previous studies, we create a measure of the extent of e-government by adding up the total number of services given[19]. The reliability of this indicator is quite strong, as shown by a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 801.

In order to analyze the organizational and

environmental traits of municipalities mentioned in our hypotheses, we gathered data on their economic, governmental, and demographic traits from various sources including the three ICMA e-government surveys, the 2002 Economic Census, the 2004 Census of Governments, and the 2000 presents detailed definitions of the variables and offers descriptive statistics. In order to put Environmental Complexity and Internal Complexity into practice, we use measures of dispersion. This is based on the idea that when there are more diverse groups of internal or external stakeholders, there is a wider range of demands placed on municipal governments[20]. This also increases the need for information processing and creates competition for limited resources.

CONCLUSIONS

This article presents a nuanced portrayal of the institutional incentives for innovation, indicating that municipalities are generally more driven to innovate by external environmental variables rather than internal organizational constraints. At a technological level, firms react to environmental complexity by seeking to exploit opportunities brought about by innovations in order to enhance the efficacy and efficiency of their core services. At the administrative level, towns tend to

prioritize responding to environmental concerns above managing internal bureaucratic politics. Public organizations at the institutional level strive to meet institutional standards by adopting techniques used by similar organizations. While municipalities may seem to be driven more by external pressures rather than internal politics, it is evident that IT leadership plays a significant impact and that vendor relationships may influence the organization's will to innovate. These findings provide a fresh viewpoint in contrast to other studies on e-government innovation that focused on internal variables such as surplus resources, professionalization, bureaucratic politics, and government structures. The primary importance of efficiency and external responsiveness as driving factors should compel businesses to prioritize the effectiveness of their innovations. However, this still does not address the fundamental question: why do we consistently witness widespread but superficial trends in the spread of innovations? The impact of vendors, along with the aspiration to imitate regional rivals, might contribute to understanding why organizations adopt innovations without a long-term motivation for improvement, due to the effect of mimetic pressures and responsiveness to salesmanship. Different organizational

motives may prevail at various phases of the innovation process. Efficiency and responsiveness are crucial at the first phases of the innovation process, as businesses assess potential benefits. However, as the implementation progresses, bureaucratic politics tend to take over due to organizational conflicts and external pressures.

Conversely, it is possible that we are evaluating the effects of e-government prematurely. Considering the importance of efficiency and responsiveness as driving factors, it is plausible that the use of IT in the public sector is undergoing a transformation that is comparable to that of the private sector. From the late 1960s, companies started making substantial investments in information technology (IT). However, there was limited proof that these investments had a positive impact on productivity until the late 1990s. It was only after companies made significant investments in human resources and made changes to work processes to leverage computers that improvements in productivity were observed[21]. We demonstrate that public organizations, like their private sector counterparts, prioritize efficiency and adaptability to external influences. However, the fulfillment of these priorities may be hindered by the challenges associated with modifying public institutions.

Looking at the bigger picture, the outcomes of the e-government example further reinforce the idea of New Public Management, which emphasizes that local governments should prioritize efficiency and customer service. Hypotheses that center on the internal political context get little support. The proven impact of vendors, however, indicates that the motives of municipalities may be susceptible to persuasive selling techniques, which might be a significant weakness in the current age of outsourcing. Our research indicates that local governments that use vendors tend to prioritize efficiency and responsiveness less than other municipalities. This indicates that vendors have the ability to influence local governments to take into account additional criteria when making decisions on innovation. However, the available data does not provide enough information to determine the validity or worthiness of these considerations. Vendors often advocate the wider use of better quality services when there is an independent IT department, suggesting a mutually beneficial connection between vendors and IT departments. IT departments may benefit from external assistance in their efforts to expand the use of IT, while vendors may need the technical competence provided by an IT department to market their products to local

governments.

This paper highlights the significant influence of institutional motives on the innovation process and emphasizes the need to take into account various motivations that operate at different levels of decision-making in public organizations. The statement implies that innovation in this scenario is mostly motivated by external factors, indicating that firms pursue technological improvements to handle external complexities and imitate the inventions of rivals in the area. Subsequent research should examine the potential fluctuations in motivations to innovate within public organizations and how these fluctuations impact the quality and efficacy of creative practices.

REFERENCES

- [1] Kyu-Nahm Jun, Christopher Weare, "Institutional Motivations in the Adoption of Innovations: The Case of E-Government". Advance Access publication on June 9, 2010, Published by Oxford University Press Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory,
- [2] Abrahamson, Eric, and Lori Rosenkopf. 1993. Institutional and competitive bandwagons: Using mathematical modeling as a tool to explore innovation diffusion. *The Academy of Management Review* 18:487–517.
- [3] Aiken, M., S. B. Bacharach, and J. L. French. 1980. Organizational structure, work process, and proposal making in administrative bureaucracies. *Academy of Management Journal* 23:631–52.
- [4] Altshuler, A. A., and R. D. Behn. 1997. *Innovation in American government: Challenges, opportunities, and dilemmas*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.
- [5] Bagozzi, R. P. 2007. The legacy of the technology acceptance model and a proposal for a paradigm shift. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* 8:12.
- [6] Balla, Steven J. 2001. Interstate professional associations and the diffusion of policy innovations. *American Politics Research* 29:221–45.
- [7] Barzelay, M. 2001. *The new public management: Improving research and policy dialogue*. Berkeley, CA: Univ. of California Press.
- [8] Bingham, Richard D. 1977. The diffusion of innovation among local governments. *Urban Affairs Review* 13:223–32.
- [9] Blau, P. M. 1970. A formal theory of differentiation in organizations. *American Sociological Review* 35:201–18.
- [10] Blossfeld, H. P., K. Golsch, and G. Rohwer. 2007. *Event history analysis with Stata*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- [11] Bradach, J. 2003. Going to scale: The challenge of replicating social programs. *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 1:19–25.
- [12] Brudney, J. L., and S. C. Selden. 1995. The adoption of innovation by smaller local governments: The case of computer technology. *The American Review of Public Administration* 25:71–86.
- [13] Brynjolfsson, Erik, and Lorin M. Hitt. 2003. Computing productivity: Firm-level evidence. MIT Sloan Working Paper No. 4210-01. Cambridge, MA: MIT Sloan.
- [14] Buckley, Jack, and Chad Westerland. 2004. Duration dependence, functional form, and corrected standard errors: Improving EHA models of state

policy diffusion. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 4:94–113.

- [16] Albury, David. 2005. Fostering innovation in public services. *Public Money & Management* 25:51–6. Aldrich, Howard, and Sergio E. Mindlin. 1978. Uncertainty and dependence: Two perspectives on environment. In *Organization and environment: Theory, issues, and reality*, ed. Lucien Karpick, 149–70. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- [17] Allison, Paul David. 1984. Event history analysis: regression for longitudinal event data. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. Danziger, J. N., and W. H. Dutton. 1977. Computers as an innovation in American local governments. *Communications of the ACM* 20:945–56.
- [18] Danziger, J. N., William H. Dutton, Rob Kling, and Kenneth L. Kraemer. 1982. *Computers and politics: High technology in American local governments*. New York: Columbia Univ. Press.
- [19] Dewar, R. D., and J. E. Dutton. 1986. The adoption of radical and incremental innovations: An empirical analysis. *Management Science* 32:1422–33.
- [20] DiMaggio, Paul J., and Walter W. Powell. 1983. The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* 48:147–60.
- [21] Garson, G. David. 2003. Technological teleology and the theory of technology enactment: The case of the international trade data system. *Social Science Computer Review* 21:425–31
- [22] Hage, J., and M. Aiken. 1967. Relationship of centralization to other structural properties. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 12:72–92.
- [23] Jones, Bradford S., and Regina P. Branton. 2005. Beyond logit and probit: Cox duration models of single, repeating, and competing events for state policy adoption. *State Politics and Policy Quarterly* 5:420–43.
- [24] Mintrom, M. 1997. Policy entrepreneurs and the diffusion of innovation. *American Journal of Political*

Science 41:738–70.

- [25] Moon, M. Jae. 2002. The evolution of E-government among municipalities: Rhetoric or reality? *Public Administration Review* 62:424–33.
- [26] Sapat, Alka. 2004. Devolution and innovation: The adoption of state environmental policy innovations by administrative agencies. *Public Administration Review* 64:141–51.
- [27] Valente, Thomas W. 1995. *Network models of the diffusion of innovations*. Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press. van den Putte, Bas, and G. Dhondt. 2005. Developing successful communication strategies: A test of an integrated framework for effective communication. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 35:2399–420.
- [28] Walston, Stephen Lee., John R. Kimberly, and Lawton Robert Burns. 2001. Institutional and economic influences on the adoption and extensiveness of managerial innovation in hospitals: The case of reengineering. *Medical Care Research and Review* 58:194–228.