MANAGEMENT RESEARCH AND PRACTICE
VOLUME 10, ISSUE 4, DECEMBER2018

HUMANIZING OR DIVIDING?

THE CHALLENGE OF DIGITAL DEMOCRACY IMPLEMENTATION IN INDONESIA

Bevaola KUSUMASARI
Department of Public Policy and Management
Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta 55281, Indonesia
bevaola@ugm.ac.id

Abstract
The rapid growth of government digitization has complemented public administration reforms the world over. However, the issue of digitization has attracted widespread attention and triggered a debate over how humanities can be democratized through collaboration with digital technologies. The present study offers both an analytical framework of and empirical evidence on the key aspects of digital government engagements in the Indonesian context. This article utilizes a case study approach to examine how digital practices in Jakarta Special Capital Region Province and Surabaya city in Indonesia are attempting to democratize the humanities through efforts to increase access to and participation in the humanities. Both cases will be explored to identify a core set of values such as openness and collaboration of digital democracy practices that unite the digital humanities. This research found that government digitization has changed the way community used to live and interact although the digital divide that is occurred in the research areas has still becoming the major obstacles for government in implementing digital government innovation. Therefore, strong leadership is crucial at the global and local levels to make certain coordinated efforts among governments, local authorities, and other stakeholders on the ground to overcome the digital divide.
Keywords:Digital Democracy; Digital Divide; Digital Humanity; Government Digitization

1. INTRODUCTION

The concepts of digital democracy and global public management revolution have been rearranging the relationship cultivated between government and citizens since the 1980s. This shift relates to how the government can step up its responsiveness to the public in order to encourage citizens to become more involved in public administration (Kettl, 2005). New tactics and strategies are necessary to reconstruct the responsive linkages between governments and citizens. The utilization of information and communication technology (ICT) to strengthen citizens' political participation has been recognized as a key solution to problems found in representative democracy, particularly, the lack of connection between representatives and citizens, and the waning of political concern among the populace (Kang and Dugdale, 2010). Digital democracy is any effort that governments carry out to facilitate more extensive participation in government and to build up effective governance through the use of digital or electronic means (Coleman and Norris, 2005). Many researchers found that digital democracy practices have been applied in various sectors such as governance and public services

(Spirakis et al., 2010; Saez and Cabaliero, 2011; van Dijk, 2013). These practices have led to significant achievements in relation to public administration reforms (Chen and Perry, 2003; Ebrahim and Irani, 2005; Fan, 2011; Macintosh and Whyte, 2008). The innovations supporting digital democracy practices have also improved the political information and exchange between governments, public administrations, representatives, political and community organizations, and individual citizens in various areas of research (Coleman, 2001; Coleman and Gotze, 2001; Clift, 2002a). Digital democracy practices also encourage public debates, deliberations, and community formation as well as enhanced participation in political decision-making by citizens (Tsagarousianou, 1999).

However, despite digital democracy practices' potentiality in offering opportunities, it is clearly understood that reaching citizens is a tough job in a world of differences and diverse challenges (van Dijk, 2000; Katz and Rice, 2002). Therefore, how today's governments reach their citizens through the utilization of ICTs has mostly been focused on promoting public administration responsibility and creating wider citizen participation as well as lowering costs of interactive services (Khircu, 2008). Yet, many argue that the personal touch citizens used to experience has been replaced by open government initiatives and contactless service for the purposes of providing convenient and accessible services. Hence, in recent years, there has been much debate about how digital democracy practices have degraded the humanities (Alvarado, 2012; Cecire, 2011; Fitzpatrick, 2012; Gouglas, Rockwell, Smith, Hoosein & Quamen, 2013; Hayles, 2012; Kirschenbaum, 2012; Rieger, 2010). The challenge of digital democracy practices, which involves attempting to attract citizens to use computing and digital technology, has been expanding and diversifying humanities as well as shifting culture and communication of citizens.

This article aims to add to the debate by arguing that one of the means to articulate what constitutes digital humanities is not through the use of technology but rather through humanists' attempts to democratize the humanities through collaboration with digital technologies. The regions chose for this paper were Jakarta Special Capital Region (SCR) and Surabaya City due to their being the best examples of digital democracy practices in Indonesia. Jakarta SCR has shown an excellent performance in digital democracy with prominent programs such as the Jakarta Smart City and Qlue, which aims to respond to citizen's complaints, while Surabaya city has been successfully implementing e-Health. In this case, Jakarta's Provincial Government has been awarded Best Practice Services Public Complaints in 2016 in the government category for innovations in the management of public complaints. Concurrently, Surabaya was ranked as excellent according to the 2016 Indonesian e-Government Ranking.

ISSN: 2067 – 2462
www.mrp.ase.ro

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

What Is Digital Democracy and Why Is It Used?

Digital or electronic democracy is defined by Clift (2004b) as "the use of information and communications technologies and strategies by 'democratic sectors' within the political processes of citizen, states/regions, nations and on the global stage." Cliff (2004a) considered it as the utilization of information and communication technologies and strategies carried out by democratic actors (governments, the media, political organizations, citizen/voters) within the political and governance processes at the level of local communities, nations, and even on the international stage. Hye, Jong, and Hae (2008) defined digital democracy as the use of cyberspace and mobile technologies to create effective governance. Digital democracy is one of the ways in which governments use new ICTs to enhance the way they conduct business and to improve community outcomes.

Digital democracy, as of current, has yet to replace prevailing physical democratic institutions; rather, it accompanies them through various means. There are numerous reasons for using digital democracy's strategies and technologies. First, social media, in particular, enables government officials and politicians to get closer to the constituents they speak for. Such technological innovations also provide citizens with easier access to these politicians and officials. Second, like-minded citizens become capable of sharing ideas and organizing themselves for political action. Third, digital media presents a cost-efficient means of disseminating messages, and of replicating them. A study by Timonen (2013) asserts that the same message has to repeatedly be heard between three and five times for it to eventually be believed, and as more and more time is spent on social networks, the citizenry is more easily reachable. Fourth, digital networks can be function as the crowdsourcing of ideas and a means of empowering citizens. They also make it easier for politicians to draw on these ideas and turn them into concrete policies. And last, these networks enable citizens themselves to become true decision-makers.

Digital Democracy Development Process

Acquiring a digital democracy system that will meet the needs of citizens to participate in the democratic process and the needs of the government to provide citizens with adequate participation channels is paramount in e-democracy implementation (Funikul and Chutimaskul, 2009). A successful digital democracy implementation should, therefore, aim to develop a system that requires adequate channels for enhancing citizens' participation in the democratic process. There are several key characteristics of digital democracy which, namely, include: better provision of service with appropriate access time; inexpensive cost of ICT utilization; government's responsiveness in listening (to feedback, input, or complaints); and promotion of wider citizen participation (Funilkul and Chutimaskul, 2009; Blumler and Coleman, 2000). A number of scholars have worked on

methodologies for digital democracy implementation, including Black and Noble (2001), Clift (2004a), Local E-Democracy National Project (2006), and Funilkul and Chutimaskul (2009).

Black and Noble (2001) pointed out the importance of considering critical keys and potential barriers that may inhibit the success of digital democracy development in achieving a positive implementation results. They proposed six key points of consideration in the development of digital democracy, namely: investment; leadership; training; technological flexibility; access and digital divide; and privacy and security. Investment involves determining the amount of money the government will spend in implementing e-democracy. Leadership involves the leaders at all administrative levels to possess the vision and commitment to spur their government and political operations into digital democracy. In order to rapidly advance e-government and digital democracy principles, both political and bureaucratic leaderships must be committed to providing the investments necessary for transforming the administration (Black and Noble, 2001). Access and digital divide require governments to strive to provide universal access for digital democracy to fully deliver on its mission. By improving communication and exchange, ICT is capable of instigating amazing social and economic networks that will, accordingly, establish the basis for significant development. Technological flexibility demands that e-government/ digital democracy's technological groundwork be sufficiently flexible of supporting a variety of software components and a high level of interoperability between a diverse range of software, hardware, and vendors. Security and privacy issues require governments to establish adequate security statements; otherwise, citizens will remain skeptical of using the system. According to Black and Noble (2001), training entails investing resources in human capital to ascertain that people have the capacity to make use of digital tools so they can consequently participate in democratic debates and processes. Training encompasses three quintessential areas: training of public officials, which ensures they have proper understanding of e-participatory tools and are capable of using them to drive e-democratic principles; training of government workers, which equips them with the capability of using current software, hardware, and tools; and lastly, training of citizens, which will enable them to make appropriate use of the e-democracy tools available.

Clift (2004a) proposed a top ten e-democracy to-do list to guide governments in using ICT to improve their democratic process: i) announce all public meetings online in a systematic and reliable way, for instance, meeting time, place, agenda, and information on citizen testimony, participation, opinion/observations; ii) put a "democracy button" on the top of the website page that will link out to actual information that will assist citizens in gaining a proper understanding concerning the legitimacy of government agency and powers, as well as how to best influence the policy course taken by the agency; iii) implement service democracy like comment forms, online surveys, citizen focus groups to obtain the input necessary to be an e-government with a good level of responsiveness, which also involves employing the Internet to learn about what could be done better from the constituents; iv) end the online deficit of representative democracy by investing in the technology and

ISSN: 2067 – 2462
www.mrp.ase.ro

communication infrastructure of institutions that are designed to represent the public at all levels of government; v) provide existing representative and advisory processes with internet-enabled tools, such as: video conferencing, online broadcasting of representatives, virtual committee chat rooms, and in-person online consultation; vi) embrace the Internet's two-way nature: this concerns providing the public with the tools to help hold government officials accountable, delivering appropriate feedback such as by responding to constituent e-mails in a timely and effective manner; vii) conduct government sponsored online consultations: offering well structured online consultation events that are designed to influence the policy process, educate citizens on issues relating to public policy, and create a platform that can be used to interact with decision-makers and agency staff; viii) develop e-democracy legislation, with the purpose of enacting laws and seeking the budgetary investments necessary to support governance in the current age of information; ix) provide internet education for elected officials: give elected officials education about internet use that relates to their representative works, encourage peer-to-peer policy exchanges, at both national and international levels, among representatives and staff; and x) create open source democracy online applications leveraging the e-democracy infrastructure and services on open source technology to cut cost.

Digital Humanities Defined

Digital humanities aim to promote a core set of values such as openness and collaboration between government and community. The narrative found in the writing about the digital humanities focus on change, transformation, and strengthening the humanities (Svennson, 2012). Digital humanities attempt to use computing and digital technology to develop and diversify the humanities, changing what we know about human culture and how we communicate that knowledge. So, what is the relevance of digital democracy and digital humanities? Many researchers see digitization as a way of changing human culture (Burdick et al., 2012, Coleman, 2001). Digitization has brought values of openness, inclusiveness, and collaboration. Therefore, digital humanities are often pointed at as an umbrella term for a wide array of digital democracy practices for creating, applying, and interpreting new digital and information technologies (Presner and Johanson, 2009). Since digital humanities are engaged with the rapidly changing world of today, it is imperative that timely and relevant information be its inherent features. Relevant and timely information may help people discover patterns or come up with ways to optimize the practice of digital democracy. Additionally, digital humanities open and extend the reach of digital democracy practices by bridging diverse communities.

Digital Divide

One of the most important arguments prompting the insistent presentation of digital technology was the advent of the digital divide issue. The discovery of this issue, known as the digital divide by the National Telecommunication and Information Agency (NTIA) and reported on under the Clinton administration, has been

debated since the early 1990s (Epstein, Nisbet, & Gillespie, 2011, p. 94). The digital divide is defined by Cullen (2003: 247) as the metaphor used to describe the perceived hindrance of those who either are incapable or do not choose to make use of ICT in their daily life. United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (2005) defines the concept of digital divide as the prevailing gap between those with the capacity of accessing communication tools, such as the Internet, and those without. Dragulanescu (2002), defines the digital divide as disparities that are based on economic capacity, gender, status, physical abilities, race, and geographic location between those who have or do not have access to information, the Internet, and other information technologies and services. Mariscal (2005:410) considers the concept as the gap between individuals, businesses, and geographic areas at different levels of socio-economic conditions that relate to their opportunities to access ICTs and to the utilization of such technologies for a wide range of activities.

The idea of e-governance has disrupted the way in which governments communicate with citizens (Kroukamp, 2005). The disparity in access to ICTs that may be a result of perceptible differences in socio-economic class, culture, age, race, geography or other factors can effectively rob certain citizens of their access to ICTs, hence leading to a digital divide (Kroukamp, 2005). The digital divide's surrounding initiatives seem to have driven much of the technocratic rhetoric regarding the current state of insistence on integration, access, and prioritized usage. Many perspectives on the digital divide have evolved along with political framing as policymakers work to not only increase access to the newest and most economical versions of the tools such as the Internet, personal computers, and mobile phones, but also attempt to transfer democratic approaches to larger social contexts, including design, allowances, and social capital. These are deemed obtainable through user satisfaction, limitations of literacy, and different languages (Madianou, 2014; Wijetunga, 2014). Paul Gorski (2009) challenges other definitions of the digital divide and limits it to physical access to technology (p. 351). While improving users' abilities and increasing customization does not promote digital democracy, framing individualization and democracy as characterized by capitalistic possession and monetary privileges needs to be reconsidered (Burgess, J., and Green, J., 2009). Gandy presents the digital divide as "…a social shaping of new media toward the interests of already powerful social groups, marked by class-specific characteristics" (as cited in Burgess, J., and Green, J., 2009, p.78).

Since standardized tools and approaches to communication are so powerful in defining the approved means of participating in the construction of social reality, it follows that the hidden nature of a greater democratic issue of individual choice is a critical problem for the current digital presentation of reality. Recognizing the reinforcement of these popular ideological presentations and definitions, while reconsidering the available means for participation and the role society plays in choosing these means will further enlighten the nature of digital hegemony.

ISSN: 2067 – 2462
www.mrp.ase.ro

3. METHODOLOGY

We employed a qualitative methodology for this study. The data collection process took place from March to September 2017 through several activities. First, we conducted a media analysis. Generally, the media analysis was designed to provide a situation of the digital democracy implementation in selected areas. Also, it aimed to give some key information, including identifying whether digital democracy practices were planned and implemented in these areas; to what extent and through which channel digital democracy was implemented; and identifying regional strategy and its problem in designing, budgeting, and implementing e-government policy. To answer these questions, we have chosen newspaper and online media as the media for analysis. Using classical content analysis, the article was not only to provide insight into a specific problem in each area but also to identify the stakeholders included in the case studies. Two national newspapers were selected as the corpus of the study, specifically Kompas and Jawa Pos. The study also included two local newspapers and online media. The first two corpuses were chosen due to their availability online and their coverage. The media analysis was used as baseline information for both FGD and in-depth interview.

The second data collection process involved Focus Group Discussion (FGD). The FGDs were held in the study areas. The information gathered from this activity was aimed at answering the questions on the opportunities and challenges of digital democratic practices and the strategy of the community and government to solve the issue of the digital divide. One of the significant processes in the qualitative approach is selecting key informants. The research team identified all stakeholders or actors that were mentioned in the media analysis. These actors were further treated as eligible participants both for FGD and in-depth interview. The participants of the FGD included the Management from Jakarta Smart City, a local development planning agency (Bappeda), and local institution forums. The third method of data collection was through an in-depth interview. In-depth interviews were carried out to gather information about existing and planned e-government program, opportunities and challenges of implementing digital democracy, and the strategies employed to solve the problems as well. Information was collected from various informants such as health agencies, community health centers, public hospitals, patients in both community health centers (Puskesmas) and public hospitals, NGOs, health community leaders and community leaders in Surabaya. In Jakarta, the informants for this phase of data collection were the Management of Jakarta Smart City, Qlue Operators, NGOs, local community leaders, CSOs. We interviewed 20 local community leaders as the representatives in DKI Jakarta. The last step was secondary data analysis. Secondary data analysis was conducted based on several documents reviewed in this study, including the current regional medium-term development plan (RPJMD), regional regulation, provincial reports, and institution reports from different offices.

4. RESULTS

Case Studies 1. Jakarta SCR Province Public Service Innovation

Jakarta Smart City is an innovation prompted by the Jakarta SCR Province in provision of public service that has been established since 2014. The public is able to access the www.smartcity.jakarta.go.id website, Qlue application on Android, and @JktSmartCity on Twitter. The objective is to provide the public with information on Jakarta's conditions and to assist the public in getting to know public facilities as a reference and information according to their daily needs. Through the Jakarta Smart City website, the public can gain information on crowded Transjakarta bus stops and track the buses; observe congested areas in the city, damaged street lights, garbage, damaged roads, floods, even potential terrorism activities through community reports published via the Qlue application on Android of which locations are displayed on the website; and also see the locations of Regional Work Units (SKPD) in Jakarta. Several factors led to the success of this program, these include a leader with strong political will, systems and regulations supportive of transparent collaborations between the government, the private sector, and the community in development activities. We can also find Jakarta Map in the Jakarta Smart City website, which is a flood map that can be observed in real time from Twitter, pasangmata, and others based on reports from the community. Aside from Jakarta Map, an application for community reporting is accommodated via Qlue, which derives its name from the word keluhan (complaint). The complaints received and processed are quality complaints that are subsequently reported as feedback to the government. Qlue aims to enhance public participation and transparency. Qlue also has a rating for government performance, such as whether sub-district officials conduct their businesses in a timely matter based on reports from the community, and these results can be seen by the public, and there is also a publication shared with the media every three months. These reports are filtered manually and automatically by a staff member to ensure all of the reports are accurate.

Case Studies 2. Health Service Innovation (e-Health) in the City of Surabaya

E-Health is one of a set of digitally based programs available in Surabaya Municipality. It is a service provided in the health sector to simplify the public registration system at public hospitals or community health centers (Puskesmas). The e-Health service innovation was established through an initiative of the Surabaya Municipality Health Services and the Mayor of Surabaya with the aim of shortening the registration time for patients to improve accuracy and efficiency. The process of establishing such a digital system in the provision of health services was accomplished through the assistance of the Bappeko (Municipal Development Planning Agency) as part of city planning, the Diskominfo (Communication and Information Technology Services) as network provider and system creator, and it is also aligned with the Disdukcapil (Civil Registry Services) as the organization tasked with registering Surabaya citizens who are the direct users of e-Health. The Surabaya Municipal

ISSN: 2067 – 2462
www.mrp.ase.ro

administration initiated the e-Health service, which had been operational since 2014, in order to minimize the long queue of people at the Puskesmas or hospital windows just for getting their queueing ticket number, to put an end to the complex referral system, and to have an organized health database of Surabaya's citizens that is integrated throughout the 61 kiosks spread out in 61 Puskesmas in North Surabaya, West Surabaya, East Surabaya, Central Surabaya, and South Surabaya. The e-Health application has 3 language options: Indonesian, Javanese, and Madurese.

The public can utilize e-Health services via the e-kiosk by directly registering at the e-kiosk machine stand. Once a patient has done that, they can select the intended services and follow the instructions on the monitor until their data is saved and a queue number sheet is printed out. The main benefit of the e-Health system is in providing easy access for patient registration to the Puskesmas and Regional Public Hospitals (RSUD). Patients no longer need to stand in a long line to get a ticket at the Puskesmas or hospital windows. Patients who are residents of Surabaya Municipality only need to bring their e-KTP (electronic ID) when going to Puskesmas or RSUD. For residents who did not bring their e-KTP with them, their registry can still be verified via name and address search as well as a fingerprint. E-health has also accelerated the patient referral system from Puskesmas to RSUD and vice versa. Additionally, e-Health has also enhanced the quality of service for patients based on the medical records of patients that have been referred, reduced the data entry load on the officers at the Puskesmas and RSUD, reduced the queueing time at Puskesmas and RSUD, and facilitated doctors in examining the patient's prior medical history as the health database of Surabaya residents has been properly arranged. The e-Health program initiated by the Surabaya municipal administration is one of a set of existing e-Government programs, namely E-Musrenbang, E-Procurement, E-Controlling, E-Performance, E-SDM, E-Education, E-Permit, E-Monitoring, and E-Office. E-Health has been implemented in two RSUD and 64 Puskesmas in the city of Surabaya. Based on interviews with Health Services staff, it was found that the number of patients registering online was still limited to those registering manually. Such condition is due to the public's lack of IT competence, and the users of e-Health were also found to be mostly from the middle-upper social group.

One of the opportunities brought about by the implementation of e-Health is the ability to conduct independent dissemination by street-level bureaucrats. One example of an initiative led by the heads of Puskesmas was a promotion offering rewards to the first 10 patients to sign up on the e-Health application. These efforts of disseminating e-Health have been independently conducted by Puskesmas, another such example was by employing cadres and conducting promotions to attract patients in registering using the e-Health application. The dissemination process was not carried out as a special occasion, but it utilizes the residents' routine activities that generally have a substantial amount of participants. Additionally, WhatsApp groups became one of the effective means of disseminating e-Health. The use of WhatsApp groups became one of the most simple, cheap, and effective means of e-Health dissemination. The government also disseminated information about e-Health

through public media such as through public service advertisements on Suara Surabaya radio, a method which had been proven to reach residents who did not directly attend dissemination activities.

5. DISCUSSIONS

Opportunity of Digital Democracy Practices

The implementation of digital democracy practices in the research areas has revealed several significant issues concerning the opportunities and challenges confronted by both the government and the public. First, the existing opportunities, among others, are the availability of policy support from the government. In the case of Jakarta SCR, the use of Qlue is supported by the availability of the Gubernatorial Regulation on the conduction of the RT (Neighborhood Association) and RW (Community Association) tasks and functions in Jakarta SCR that obligates its use in the region. While in the City of Surabaya, there is a Municipal Regulation No. 5 year 2013 on Guideline to the Use of Technology and Communication in Regional Government Administration. Besides local regulation, there is also the Presidential Instruction on National Policy and Strategy on the Development of e-Government, which serves as the basis for implementing digital democracy practices in Indonesia.

Second, connectivity between assessment of government staff performance and digital democracy practices. In the Jakarta SCR context, all complaints that go into Qlue and are displayed on the Jakarta Smart City website have indicators that can be used to assess staff performance at the district and sub-district level. The basis of this performance assessment is subsequently set as the foundation for determining the ranking of every head of district and sub-district, and it will concurrently affect the amount of incentives they will receive in the following month (monitoring and evaluation are conducted once a month and every two months and are presented in the form of scorecards that influence their performance assessment). The Jakarta SCR government provides incentives (as much as IDR 925,000 per month) to heads of RT/RW who submit reports through Qlue. Yet, on the other hand, the Surabaya Municipality has not considered the success of e-Health as an indicator of government staff performance, particularly the e-Health Services.

Third, improved effectiveness and efficiency of services. The services provided by the government became effective and efficient due to the high level of public participation in both filing complaints through Qlue and utilizing e-Health systems in Puskesmas or hospital registry processes. Various public complaints are immediately detected and resolved. The community has become more active in submitting reports to sub-district offices because they know that their complaint will be addressed or responded to within 2x24 hours. In the same manner, e-Health implementation has shortened the waiting time for patients in hospitals and Puskesmas in the City of Surabaya. Patients who have used e-Health have experienced direct benefits. The use of e-Health has significantly cut the time for queuing making it more time efficient so that residents who have used it continue to utilize the e-Health application. In both research areas, periodic training and information dissemination are

ISSN: 2067 – 2462
www.mrp.ase.ro

provided to all District employees. In the City of Surabaya, dissemination of information on e-Health was also conducted through advertisements on the radio, which was proven to have reached residents who would have been unable to participate in direct dissemination. For certain groups unable to access e-Health, for instance, the elderly, the Puskesmas have served as a facilitator to register them into the program.

Challenges Faced in Digital Democracy Practices

The rapid growth of digital technology, often referred to as information and communications technologies (ICTs) in a broader sense, has largely reshaped how government delivers its services. Problems and possibilities often go hand in hand and problems can be turned into challenges. Elements of digital democracy practices bear two faces, one is an opportunity and the other is a challenge. Challenges of digital democracy practices are specified into cultural challenges and technical challenges. Table 1 presents the summary of technical and cultural challenges found in implementing Qlue in Jakarta SCR and e-Health in the City of Surabaya.

Government Digitization: Is It Bridging the Digital Divide?

All forms of innovation in government digitization have led to numerous changes in the way people see the world or something that literally changes the course of humanity. Human nature basically is a baggy, capacious concept, and humans are intensely social, emotional, and intractably embodied creatures. However, digitization has challenged humanity to become stunningly adept at making decisions on the basis of vast amounts of data. In other words, digitization has brought about technological disruption to humanity. This radical change in government business processes through the introduction of a new service that creates a new value in how the government interacts with its people has also denoted a disrupted condition, which means that the old order is no longer the way things will be done. In the case of the e-Health service being carried out by the Surabaya Municipal government, for example, it has altered the behavior of interaction particularly for the elderly who are the main users of Puskesmas services. When the patient has obtained their queue number, they will have a reduced waiting time at the Puskesmas. However, their habit of socializing with other patients during long queues and waits will be reduced. In the context of rural communities, such interaction space is very important as there are numerous bonds of relationships providing the elderly with energy to fill their life. Concerning the matter, Burdick et al. (2012) emphasized that digitization allows people to find new answers about human culture, yet in the practice of e-Health, digitization has indeed degraded the value of social life particularly for the elderly. In this case, new human culture has eradicated the need for human efforts to be less aware and rational. While e-Health implementation has offered unprecedented opportunities for advancement in the area of health service, it has also been pinpointed as a key factor in social and economic disparities. Accessibility has become limited by physical, social, and cultural impediments. These are closely linked to affordability and access to information. Factors such as geographical isolation and limited access to technological infrastructure can also evidently

prevent women from accessing ICTs in public or at home. Existing inequalities are manifested in discrepancies in the access to and use of ICTs, thereby transposing offline divides into the digital space.

On a different note, the presence of Jakarta Smart City as a form of ICT use has become a potential drive to produce an impact on various aspects of society and the conduct of government operations to business and to individuals' day-to-day lives. Humanity disruption comes from the intersection of knowledge and exploration that drives the potential to truly reshape humanity (Zarrehparvar, 2006). The relentless parade of new technologies in Jakarta is unfolding on many fronts, it alters the social landscape and has the potential to disrupt the status quo. For instance, the performance of district and sub-district heads has become very much determined by their performance in responding to public complaints. Such condition has disrupted the status quo of bureaucratic personnel who had always remained in their comfort zone. This is vital because in order to sustain competitive advantage, the resources of the government institution must first of all be valuable in developing opportunities and resolving threats and it should have the ability to develop the institution's resources as an organizational process (Barney & Clarck, 2007). In the digitization of the government, the bureaucracy apparatus must have bundles of skills, consisting not only of simple skills that are relatively easily obtained but combinations of such skills. These bundles of skills also point to the relationship between skills and holders of skills, such as patterns of cooperation and mutual support with citizenry (Salaman and Asch, 2003). It is therefore critical that government and policy leaders understand which technologies will matter to its citizens and develop them accordingly.

Given that so many dimensions of society have been disrupted by digital technology such as global inequality and lack of access to technology rather than technology itself, in light of these developments, one of the most fundamental questions that must be addressed is: How can we ensure technology is used to enhance humanity rather than to facilitate repression or other nefarious objectives? As more sectors of community have become interconnected to digital, the internet has become the pivotal strength of all infrastructures. Therefore, cyber vulnerability and digital insecurity can be the main major peril to humanity.

Apart from the absence of relevant content of global inequality, the next question is: How do we overcome the digital divide in humanistic government digitization in Indonesia? The essential goal of solving the digital divide is by providing an equal chance for every citizen to get benefit from digital development. In the context of digital democracy practices in Indonesia, actions to foster physical access to the Internet remain essential, but they remain insufficient in ensuring a truly inclusive information society. There is a need for governments at all levels to bridge the prevailing gap that we know as the digital divide. The use of the Internet for capturing and providing access to relevant digital information that are produced by governments could also potentially contribute towards bridging the digital divide (Chisenga, 2004). Humanizing digitization means providing technology that can

ISSN: 2067 – 2462
www.mrp.ase.ro

address and engage disparate people matters across media, language, location, and gender and at the same time, it is unified by its emphasis on making, connecting, interpreting, and collaborating human culture.

6. CONCLUSIONS

Government digitization has been successfully applied in a wide range of activities conducted to support reform and create new public administration. The application of digitization has changed the nature of government bureaucracy as the traditional intermediary between citizen and government. Such digitization has not only reshaped bureaucratic work to improve citizen interaction in general, but the implementation of digitization into government practices has also contributed extensively to creating the implementation of online government policies as well as increasing citizen participation. It has moved the focal point from the new public management trend towards democratic governance with the accelerated process of service delivery and direct communication. The ICT changes have allowed the government to implement democratic governance. The findings of this research emphasize that digital democracy practices have improved information retrieval and exchanges between governments and citizens in the research areas. They also support public debates, deliberations, community formation, and enhanced participation in political decision-making by citizens. However, the degree to which citizens are actively shaping the new culture of bureaucracy through the means of information and communication technology must face digital disruption conditions. Digital divide is a new form of digital disruption that was found in the research areas.

From this research, we learned that the larger implications of the digital divide not only involve those who hold the interpretation and creation of social knowledge within these technological contexts, including the rhetorical presentations of equality, fairness, unforced, user-centered, and empowerment, but also the available opportunity to choose, consent, or abstain from these out of many tools for language, communication, and larger social participation. The digital divide commonly found in this research encompasses two main aspects, namely, the conditions of digital infrastructure and the abilities of residents in using ICTs, particularly the elderly and those living in remote areas. Such conditions have caused global inequality among citizens. It can be concluded that digitization in these cases has reduced the level of humanity. However, these challenges relating to the digital divide cannot be resolved without coordinated efforts by governments, industry, civil society organizations, and academics. Closing the digital divide may play a critical role in the development of the emerging economies, as it can improve social and economic equality, favor social mobility of people, and boost innovation and economic growth in order to create a humanistic government digitization.

REFERENCES

Alvarado, R. C. (2012). The digital humanities situation. In M. K. Gold (Ed.), *Debates in the digital humanities*. minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Barney, J. B., & N.Clark, D. (2007). *Resource-based theory: Creating and sustaining competitive advantage*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Black, A. and Noble, P. (2001). *E-Democracy around the world: A survey for the bertelsmann foundation*. Charleston, SC: Phil Noble and Associate.

Blumler, J.G. and Coleman, S. (2000). *Realizing democracy online: A civic commons in cyberspace.* London: Institute for Public Policy Research.

Burdick, A., Drucker, J., Lunenfeld, P., Presner, T. & Schnapp, J. (2012). *Digital humanities*. London: The MIT Press

Burgess, J., & Green, J. (2009). *YouTube: Online video and participatory culture.* Cambridge: Polity Press

Cecire, Natalia. (2011). When digital humanities was in vogue. *Journal of Digital Humanities, 1*(1), 54–59.

Chen, Yu-Che and Perry, J. (2003). Outsourcing for e-government: Managing for success. *Public Performance & Management Review*, *26*(4), 404-421.

Chisenga, *J.* (*2004*). *Africa governments* in *cyberspace*: are *they bridging* the *content divide*?, in *Birungi*, *P.* and *Musoke*, *M.G.* (*Eds*), SCECSAL Conference Proceeding XVI: *Towards* a *Knowledge Society* for *Africa Development.* Kampala: Uganda Library Association & National Library of Uganda

Clift, S. (2004a). *E-democracy, e-governance and public network*. Retrieved February 5, 2017, from http://www.publicus.net/articles/edempublicnetwork.html.

Clift, S. (2004b). *E-government and democracy: Representation and citizen engagement in the information age*. New York: United Nations-UNPAN/DESA

Coleman, S. (2001). *Democracy online: What do we want from MPs' websites?*. London, UK: Hansard Society

Coleman, S. and Gotze, J. (2001). *Bowling together: Online public engagement in policy deliberation*. London, UK: Hansard Society.

Coleman, S. and Norris, D.F. (2005). A new agenda for e-democracy. *International Journal of Electronic Government Research*, *1* (3), 69–82.

Dragulanescu, Nicolae-George. (2002). Social impact of the digital divide in a central-eastern european country. *The International Information & Library Review, 34* (2), 139-151.

Ebrahim, Z. and Irani, Z. (2005). E-government adoption: Architecture and barriers. *Business Process Management Journal, 11*(5), 589-611.

Epstein, D., Nisbet, E. C.,& Gillespie, T. (2011). Who's responsible for the digital divide? Public Perceptions and Policy Implications. *The Information Society*, *27*(2), 92-104.

Fan, Q. (2011). An evaluation analysis of e-government development by local authorities in australia. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 34, 926-934.

Fitzpatrick, K. (2012). The humanities, done digitally. In M. K. Gold (Ed.). *Debates in thedigital humanities*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Funilkul, S. and Chutimaskul, W. (2009). The framework for Sustainable e-Democracy Development. *Transforming People, Process and Policy, 3 (1), pp 16-31.*

Gorski, P.C. (2009). Insisting on Digital Equity: Reframing the dominant discourse on multicultural education and technology. *Urban Education, 44* (3), 348-364.

Gouglas, S., Rockwell, G., Smith, V., Hoosein, S., & Quamen, H. (2013). Before the beginning: The formation of humanities computing as a discipline in canada. *Digital Studies/Le champ numérique*, *3*(1).

ISSN: 2067 – 2462
www.mrp.ase.ro

Hayles, N. K. (2012). *How we think: Digital media and contemporary technogenesis*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.

Hye, K., Jong, K., and Hae, L. (2008). A study on the public sphere of mobile media. *Journal of Korea Information and Communications Society, 31*(4B).

Kang, H. and Dugdale, A. (2010). *A comparative study of e-civil participation in australia and south korea: The case study of getUp! In australia and the 2008 Candlelight Protest in South Korea*. ICEG2006-Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on e-Government: Academic Conferences Limited

Katz, J. E., and Rice, R. E. (2002). *Social consequences of internet use: Access,involvement and interaction*. Cambridge: MA MIT Press.

Kettl, D.F. (2005). *The global public management revolution*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Khircu, A. (2008). E-government evaluation: Towards a multidimensional framework. *Electronic Government, An International Journal*, *5* (4), 345–363.

Kirschenbaum, M. (2010). What is digital humanities and what's it doing in english departments?. *ADE Bulletin, 150*, 55-61.

Kontic, B. (2000). Why are some experts more credible than others? *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, *20*, 427-434.

Kroukamp, H. (2005). E-governance in south africa: Are we coping. *Acta Academia*, *37*(2): 52-69.

Local E-Democracy National Project. (2006). Deeper and wider community engagement: E-democracy and its benefits for local authorities, councilors, and communities. NorthLincsNet, Improvement and Development Agency: London.

Macintosh, A and Whyte, A. (2008). Towards an evaluation framework for eparticipation. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy, 2* (1), 16-30.

Madianou, M. (2014). Smartphones as polymedia. *Journal of Computer-Mediated, 19* (3), 667–680.

Mariscal, J. (2005). Digital divide in a developing country. *Telecommunications Policy,29* (5-6), 409-428.

Presner, T and Johanson, C. (2009). *The promise of digital humanities*. Digital Humanities and Media Studies, UCLA: United States of America.

Rieger, O. Y. (2010). Framing digital humanities: The role of new media in humanities scholarship. *First Monday, 15*(10).

Saez, V. M and Cabaliero, F.S. (2011). Citizenship and local development for the participation and digital governance of public administration: Innovative experiences in southern EU member states. *Electronic Government, an International Journal*, *4*(1-2), 121-135.

Salaman, G., & Asch, D. (2003). *Strategy and capability: Sustaining organizational change*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing.

Spirakis, G., Spiraki, C., & Nikolopous, K. (2010). The impact of electronic government on democracy: e-Democracy through e-participation. *Electronic Government, an International Journal*, *7* (1), 75-88.

Svensson, P. (2012). Envisioning the digital humanities. *Digital Humanities Quarterly*, *6* (1).

Timonen, A. (2013). Digital democracy in the EU. *European View,12*, 102-112.

Tsagarousianou, R. (1999). Electronic democracy: Rhetoric and reality communications.*The European Journal of Communication Research*, *24* (2), 189-208.

United Nations Conference on Trade and Development. (2005). *Trade and development report 2005*. New York & Geneva: United Nations.

Van Dijk, Jan. (2000). Widening information gaps and policies of prevention. In K. Hacker and J. Van Dijk (Eds.), *Digital democracy: Issues of theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Van Dijk, Jan A.G.M. (2013). Digital democracy: Vision and reality. In I. Snelen& W.van de Donk (Eds.), *Public administration in the information age: Revisited*. Cambridge, MA: Polity.

Wijetunga, D. (2014). The digital divide objectified in the design: Use of the mobile telephone by underprivileged youth in sri lanka. *Journal of Computer-MediatedCommunication*, *19*(3), 712-726.

Zarrehparvar, M. (2006). Women's human rights in the information society. In R. F. Jorgensen (Ed.), *Human rights in the global information society*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

ISSN: 2067 – 2462
www.mrp.ase.ro