Editorial JeDEM Vol. 14, No. 1 (2022)

Welcome to this new issue of JeDEM!

Before you start reading the papers in this issue, let us inform you about the changes that took place in our Editorial Board. We would like to welcome our three new board members: Prof. Dr. Joep Crompvoets (KU Leuven, Belgium), Prof. Dr. Edimara Mezzomo Luciano (Pontifical Catholic University of Rio Grande do Sul, Brazil) and Dr. Anastasija Nikiforova (University of Tartu, Estonia). We are grateful that they accepted our invitation to help us steer the direction of JeDEM and broaden the reach of this journal.

This issue includes seven articles from diverse backgrounds. It includes research on mobile government adoption, open data, voting security measures, liquid democracy, social media and artificial intelligence. All these papers are connected to the key topics covered by JeDEM, such as e-democracy, e-participation, digital government and open data.

The paper "*Towards Identifying Factors Influencing Mobile Government Adoption: An Exploratory Literature Review*"by Gregor Eibl, Thomas Lampoltshammer and Lucy Temple analyses factors that drive mobile government adoption. Their systematic literature review identifies twelve key factors, including quality, trust, awareness, security and user experience. Each key factor consists of various components. For example, the factor 'trust' encompasses the components of 'trust in technology', 'trust in government', 'transparency', 'perceived risk', 'perceived reliability' and 'procedural fairness'. While some factors are consistent with factors previously identified in technology and e-government adoption models, the authors also define new specifics in mobile and government, such as the benefits that mobility brings and the influence of trust on mobile government adoption.

In the article "*Publishers Working with Open Government Data: A Work Framework*", Jonathan Crusoe and Karin Ahlin develop a framework for openly publishing government data (OGD). An initial version of their framework was derived from previous research, policy documents and seventeen interviews with Swedish open data publishers. This preliminary framework was reviewed by OGD experts and tested in two international contexts. The evaluated framework addresses factors in three environments: the internal, interstice and external environments. Within each environment, different factors play a role, including those related to social units and those related to fields of work.

Moreover, this issue contains another open data article entitled "*Considering the Reluctance to Adopt Open Data in German Public Administration: An Exploration of Individual Innovation-Decisions*". In this article, Yanik Elixmann and Juliane Jarke examine the divergence between the opportunities, advantages and potentials of open data as pointed out in the academic literature and policy documents on the one hand, and the reluctance of administrative staff in Germany to implement open data in practice on the other hand. Based on ten interviews with experts who work at all three levels

of the German public administration, or in their direct environment, the authors provide explanations for the reluctance to publish open data, such as perceived high risks associated with open data implementation. At the same time, the authors conclude that experiences regarding barriers, like an insufficient technical framework, hinder open data implementation in Germany.

In the conceptual paper *"Towards Identifying Social Factors behind (In)Efficiency of Voting Security Measures"*, Jan Willemson discusses the societal parameters that determine whether a given security measure is efficient in achieving a given target requirement of voting. The article identifies various societal parameters that some voting security mechanisms rely on, such as the tendency for coercion, the level to which extent deliberately proving one's preferences are spread in the society, and the readiness of the citizens to accept decreased usability in order to counter a problem that they did not cause. The list of societal parameters is then analyzed to create more general categories of parameters that need an assessment before deciding on the elections' protection mechanisms, including coercive behavior, voter identification, voter awareness and trust issues.

Aguirre Sala reports on so-called "Liquid Democracy". His conceptual article entitled "*The Liquid Proposal Facing Democratic Challenges*" shows how Liquid Democracy intends to assume the *sine qua non* conditions of a true democracy and undertake the democratic challenges to achieve democratic principles. In a Liquid Democracy, citizens do not transfer their sovereignty over political representatives for determined periods of time but, instead, exercise or delegate it in different ways (Blum and Zuber, 2016). The authors conclude that Liquid Democracy can meet the conditions of a quality democratic model and address various challenges. However, it has difficulties in some particular moments of the operation and also in avoiding communicative vices during the deliberation process.

The paper "*The Social Media in Politics: Interrogating Electorate-Driven Hate Speech in Nigeria's 2019 Presidential Campaigns*" by Agaptus Nwozor, Olanrewaju Ajakaiye, Onjefu Okidu, Alex Olanrewaju and Oladiran Afolabi focuses on the use of Facebook by political supporters and electorates. This study aims to critically evaluate how political supporters and electorates used the instrumentality of Facebook to share hate messages during the 2019 presidential election and its impact on Nigeria's political space. The findings suggest that political supporters and electorates widely disseminated hate comments to support their preferred presidential candidates. The authors argue for the responsible use of Facebook in elections and the regulation to prevent the circulation of electoral hate comments that could trigger electoral violence.

The article "*Responsible Artificial Intelligence in Government: Development of a Legal Framework for South Africa*" by Dirk Brand looks into the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in government. Currently, specific legislation on artificial intelligence is lacking in South Africa and many other countries. The author argues that while some governments are using AI in the delivery of public services, there is a lack of appropriate policy and legal frameworks to ensure responsible AI use in government. The study reviews recent international developments and concludes that developing an appropriate policy or legal framework for responsible AI in government requires a solid foundation consisting of key principles such as transparency, accountability, fairness and privacy. The study emphasizes the need for a human-centered approach, which recognizes human rights, and the author proposes several recommendations for a legal framework for responsible AI in South African government.

This issue concludes with the reflection *"Social Media Adoption and Labor Migrants Protection: The Case of Philippines' Department of Foreign Affairs"* by Jovito Jose Katigbak. He considers the 'culture of migration', that is, the phenomenon of labor migration in a developing country such the Philippines. In particular, he looks at how public sector organizations use social media and mobile applications to reach out to the citizens that have migrated. He argues that in the Philippines' case, the adoption and use of social media platforms by government agencies offers tremendous benefits to ensure migrant workers' protection.

We hope you enjoy reading this issue!

Anneke Zuiderwijk (Editor-in-Chief), Noella Edelmann (Managing Editor), Margarita Fourer (Managing Editor) and Shefali Virkar (Managing Editor)