ABSTRACT
The first official order of business carried out by US President Obama in 2008 was presenting a memorandum entitled the Open Government Initiative. The three pillars of transparency, participation and collaboration form the foundation for the initiative. Our study analyzed the use of social media as one of the means being employed to achieve these goals by conducting a case-study of one government agency, the US Department of Agriculture (USDA). While most of the agencies who are officially participating in the Initiative provide links to some sort of social media on their homepages, we question whether this actually results in increased transparency, participation and collaboration. We used a mixed-methods approach based in grounded theory, content analysis and discourse analysis. Early findings suggest that although the USDA is explicitly mentioned in the tweets there is no clear evidence of discourse, in the sense of exchange of tweets between the USDA and other Twitterers. This is assuming that anyone who may post from the USDA would do so overtly via the auspices of the organization and not as an individual with a unique user name. Our research indicates that traditional definitions of these terms may need to be expanded to account for the types of interactions occurring via social media. In this paper, we report on our research plan and initial observations.

Categories and Subject Descriptors
K.5.2 [Government Issues]: Censorship, Regulation, Taxation. H.4.3 [Communications Applications]: Bulletin boards, Computer conferencing, teleconferencing, and videoconferencing, Electronic mail, Information browsers, Videotex. H.4.m [Miscellaneous]

General Terms
Management, Measurement, Documentation, Performance.
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1. INTRODUCTION
The Center for Democracy and Technology (CDT) [1] indicates that; “E-Government can be defined as the use of information and communications technologies by governments to enhance the range and quality of information and services...in an efficient, cost-effective and convenient manner, making government processes more transparent and accountable and strengthening democracy.” In a similar vein, Andersen, Medaglia, Vatrapu, Henriksen and Gauld [2] define digital government as encompassing “...the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) to enable citizens, politicians, government agencies, and other organizations to work among themselves and with each other and to carry out activities that support civic life.” Another similar definition comes from the Commission of the European Communities which defines e-government [3] “...as the use of information and communication technologies in public administrations...to improve public services and democratic processes and strengthen support to public policies.” The definitions all appear to agree that e-government or digital government is intended to strengthen democratic processes and interaction between government and its citizenry, yet it should be acknowledged that the definition is still in flux as is the naming convention itself.

Prior to the 1990’s, much of the information technology used by the U.S. government was employed to automate internal operations and did not heavily feature service provision and information dissemination to the public [4]. In the late 1990’s, emphasis shifted from simple automation toward projects that would offer services to citizens [4]. In 1997, Access America: Reengineering through Information Technology was published as a report based on the National Performance Review [4]. The Access America report signified one of the first occasions in which the federal government seriously began addressing use of information technology in the context of public service and information dissemination [4]. Access America can be viewed as a conceptual precursor to the current Open Government Initiative in
that its implementation was slated as a way to empower not only government but businesses and citizens alike. The two have strong similarities in that each has focused on reforming the Executive branch of the federal government. Indeed, Access America was billed as a way to strengthen leadership in information technology, implement electronic government and establish the accompanying support mechanisms necessary for e-government [4]. E-government implementation in essence is meant to reform or transform government to make it more agile and accessible, but also more responsive and interactive with citizens [1].

Open government holds the promise of transparent, responsive, accessible and interactive government operations [5, 6, 7]. During the 2008 presidential election campaign, current U.S. president, Barack Obama promised to create a more transparent federal government. His first official act as President was to sign the Memorandum on Transparency and Open Government [3]. This document was addressed to the heads of the executive departments and agencies of the federal government. In it, President Obama stated; “My Administration is committed to creating an unprecedented level of openness in Government. We will work together to ensure the public trust and establish a system of transparency, public participation, and collaboration. Openness will strengthen our democracy and promote efficiency and effectiveness in Government” [5]. To meet these goals Obama asserted that government should be: transparent, participatory, and collaborative. In a subsequent memorandum dated, December 8, 2009, and addressed to the heads of executive departments and agencies, Peter Orzag, Director of the Office of Management and Budget, laid out the guidelines for the open government initiative, through the Open Government Directive [6]. The Open Government Initiative represents an unprecedented opportunity for citizens to interact with and understand how their government functions. The current administration’s Open Government Initiative is primarily focused on provision of digital or e-government information and services. President Obama has stated that; “Executive departments and agencies should harness new technologies to put information about their operations and decisions online and readily available to the public” [5].

As part of the Open Government Directive, agencies and departments are required to submit self-assessments of their progress in regard to quality of data and published information, but also to provide a report concerning the state of their implementation of the open government plan and an enumeration of their continuing progress in meeting specific deadlines outlined in the Directive [6]. The assessment criteria used in the self-assessments were drawn from the body of the Open Government Directive and are posted on the White House’s website (http://www.whitehouse.gov/open/documents/evaluation). Each agency is also required to prepare a number of deliverables, which included: high-value data, data integrity, an open government web page, evidence of public consultation and an open government plan. The aforementioned evaluative methods are designed to assess whether participating agencies are meeting the goals and requirements of the Open Government Directive.

The original memorandum released in 2008, named three pillars of open government: transparency, participation, and collaboration. These goals are in line with the driving forces in e-government initiatives, as mentioned above. These three points are also the primary guidelines for meeting the goals and requirements of the Open Government Directive. The first pillar, “government should be transparent,” is meant to promote accountability and information to citizens about the government’s actions. The second pillar, “government should be participatory,” is meant to enhance effectiveness and quality of decisions by offering citizens the chance to participate in the process of policy making and to provide the benefit of contributing to a body of dispersed knowledge by harnessing the collective expertise of the population. The third, “government should be collaborative,” is meant to actively engage citizens in the governmental process, by way of cooperation across all government departments, non-profit organizations, businesses and private sector individuals. In the Open Government Directive, Orzag [6] further elucidates upon the definitions of transparency, participation, and collaboration. He explains that, “Transparency promotes accountability by providing the public with information about what the Government is doing” (p. 1). Orzag goes on to clarify that, “Participation allows members of the public to contribute ideas and expertise so that their government can make policies with the benefit of information that is widely dispersed in society” [6]. He further asserts that, “collaboration improves the effectiveness of Government by encouraging partnerships and cooperation within the Federal Government, across levels of government, and between the Government and private institutions” [6]. With e-government initiatives and programs already being implemented for increasing government responsiveness, accessibility and enhancing transparency as well as efficiency it is worthwhile to establish how the Open Government Initiative and Directive will fit into the larger concept of e-government and by extension government at large.

2. LITERATURE

On the surface, measuring interaction between citizens and government entities would appear relatively easy. From a simplistic perspective the degree of transparency a government agency is able and willing to afford the citizenry would seem to be the easiest to judge. On a fundamental policy level, there are either policies which enable openness and allow the public the greatest access to government activity or there are policies that hinder this type of interaction. When identifying open government as a facet of e-government, the three parts appear to act as enabling characteristics. Participation seems to be a feature, that when present allows the public to essentially have a voice in government or when absent hinders citizen involvement in government matters. Collaboration reflects actual engagement and interaction between the government and the governed. To differentiate participation and collaboration a bit more, participation can be understood in light of the public providing feedback, comments and suggestions to participating departments, whereas collaboration is more concerned with interaction, engagement, partnerships and by extension actual dialogue rather than one way issuance of information either to or from the government. The concept of dialogue is important since information provision and access may occur without actual interaction between two partners in the exchange of information. Yet in the context of the Open Government Initiative, implementation of each of the three pillars of open government demands dialogue. The necessity of dialogue is implicit in the language of both the Open Government Initiative and the Directive. It is a fundamental part of participation, collaboration and e-government services as well as being linked to both government transparency and responsiveness.

This research begins to critically examine the three pillars articulated in the Open Government Initiative and Directive;
namely, transparency, participation, and collaboration. We report on results of an exploratory analysis based on one case study, which will be used as a model for future work. There is a robust literature on implementation practices for e-government. Analyses of the different means used to achieve e-government and their efficacy are rarer. Chun, et al discuss four stages of e-government that define the type of interaction with the public that was present: 1) government websites presented little beyond rudimentary “about us” pages and contact information, 2) basic interaction through email contact and interactive forms, 3) the use of forms which actually allowed the public to conduct business online, and 4) which offers an interactive form of government – public collaboration and participation [8]. As different types of interaction have become common online the ways that citizens can access information about government departments and agencies as well as the opportunities the public has to play a more active role in the democratic process have increased. Not only do we expect to have an email address listed where we can contact different offices, but blogs, Twitter feeds, Facebook pages and YouTube channels have become common place. Of the 29 agencies listed on the Open Government Directive Scorecard, 27 link to Facebook and Twitter. Other social media tools which are widely used by most of the executive departments include, Facebook, Twitter, Youtube, Flickr, Myspace, Linkedin and Vimeo. In addition to social networking sites, a number of the open government pages incorporate RSS feeds, blogs, Wiki’s, links to mobile versions, bookmarking and sharing tools, as well email and podcasts.

Research into the efficacy of these types of media, in regard to e-government, is less common. Some recent work in this area includes Bertot, Jaeger and Hanson’s analysis of the impact of social media in government [14] and Anderson, et al’s critique of promises left unfulfilled through digital government [11]. While we can ask what tools are being used to achieve e-government, it is also critical to ask if these techniques are actually creating new venues for transparency, participation, and collaboration. Or are these primarily broadcast technologies used to distribute information in a traditional top-down model? With this question in mind we have begun research into the way government agencies are using social media to promote transparency, participation and collaboration by asking:

2.1 Specific research questions

(R1) How has the open government initiative been operationalized?

(R2) What evidence is there for transparency, participation, and collaboration?

(R3) How does the type of information being presented affect participation and collaboration?

(R4) What kind of variation is evident across agencies?

(R5) How does the use of social media appear to influence concepts of authority and legitimacy?

For this preliminary study we have begun by asking more specific questions. Namely:

(r1) Is the use of social media, such as Twitter, providing a venue for interaction between government and citizens?

(r2) What form does this interaction take? (For example, in our case study, does the USDA reply to posts from the public?

(r3) Is there evidence of implementation of the three pillars of open government in the social media environment?

3. METHODOLOGY

Some research has been conducted regarding the level of government responsiveness to citizens’ concerns via e-government. Gauld, Gray and McComb [9] conducted research that looked at the way e-government was being realized in Australia and New Zealand. In a similar study, Andersen, Medaglia, Vatrapu, Henriksen and Gauld [2] focused on Denmark. While both of these projects looked at national level government practices, we drew on techniques used in the aforementioned studies by conducting an initial case study focusing on a single federal agency, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). We used a mixed-methods analysis combining a case study approach, content analysis and critical discourse analysis. Our goal with this early study and in future work is to gather evidence as to how the three pillars are being met. While channels for achieving each may be present, without some element of information exchange or dialogue the websites and social media outlets appear to simply broadcast information rather than embody interaction. In fact, according to a 2010 Pew Internet and American life report, “individuals who follow government officials or agencies on social media platforms are … mostly engaged in information-seeking as opposed to interaction with the agencies they follow. At the time of the report the number of Twitter users who were following a government agency or official was too small to report the findings” [10].

As previously stated, the Open Government Directive charges all executive departments and agencies of the federal government with taking the necessary steps to increase transparency, participation and collaboration across departments and with the public. This encompasses a large number of government entities and the actual number participating in the Open Government Initiative is much larger and includes state as well as a city governments. The first stage of this research was to analyze the primary mission statements of all 29 agencies listed in the Open Government Directive Scorecard. This was done in order to identify the intended audiences and stakeholders of the officially charged agencies. We then compared this information with the audiences actually addressed on their websites through social media. Were messages sent out to specific groups or constituencies? Did individuals or agencies self-identify as either constituents or government participants?

At this stage we decided to limit our focus to one executive agency; the United States Department of Agriculture, rather than begin our research by looking at multiple agencies. We did this because of the wide-range of services and sub-agencies incorporated into any one executive agency. Since we intend on building on this work in the future, we decided it best to address as many aspects of one case before moving on to the next. The USDA alone, for example lists 28 different Twitter accounts that are all related to the larger agency1. Additionally, we chose the USDA because of their long established relationship with the public through outreach programs such as Future Farmers of America, involvement with land-grant university programs,

1 For a complete list refer to: http://www.usda.gov/wps/portal/usda/usdahome?navid=USDA_STR
disaster assistance, and farm loans, but also because of the evidence of citizen participation and to some degree, interaction with stakeholders on their website. The USDA is involved with topics ranging from animal health, biotechnology, energy, food safety, forestry, laws and regulations, to homeland. Given the range of issues with which the Department of Agriculture is involved and most importantly the Department’s intimate involvement with food regulation, processing and basic food stocks in the United States, this agency also seemed to have the potential to reach a large constituency.

3.1 Policy Analysis

One requirement of the Open Government Directive is that agencies have a section of their websites dedicated to the Open Government Initiative. Included on this site, for the USDA, is the publication of the department’s Open Government Plan, a Web Improvement Plan, a Plain Writing Plan, an outline of USDA Infrastructure Projects, a self-evaluation and statistics related to citizen involvement with the USDA via the different channels made available.

This data provides a rich set of objects for content analysis, which can be defined as, “a systematic research for analyzing textual information in a standardized way that allows evaluators to make inferences about that information” [11]. At this high level we used social network analysis to determine the directionality of Twitter messages. Directionality shows more than just who is speaking or addressing whom. Therefore, our analysis of this content also takes a critical approach by asking whether changes in assumed characteristics such as authority and legitimacy can be seen in Twitter discourse. These concepts work hand in hand; a particular view or decision may be considered legitimate via, “reference to the authority of tradition, custom, law, and of persons in whom some kind of institutional authority is vested” [12]. Traditionally, the voice of government has been identified as a type of “formal” discourse. At the most extreme this understanding would be a type of bureaucratic speech. In the case of law discourse this would be referred to as “legalese,” while for the USDA we may think of this style as “agencyese.” The goal of bureaucracy is the, “objective discharge of business according to calculable rules and without regard for persons. Bureaucracy develops the more perfectly, the more it is dehumanized, the more completely it succeeds in eliminating from official business, love, hatred, and all purely personal, irrational, and emotional elements which escape calculation” [13]. Regardless of the originating speaker, the result is a distance between the speaker or organization and the public, whereas it would seem that the point of the Open Government Initiative would be to reduce or eliminate the distance between government and the public [5, 14]. Social media would seem to break this separation down. Ideally, when individuals use a type of social media the assumption is that there will be some sort of dialogue between participants. With this, comes an opening up of concepts like authority and legitimacy. Not only the voice of the agency or government official is valued and acted upon, but the voice of the public also carries weight. This is a key element of “public sphere” participation [12, 15-17]. Whether or not this has been the case, through implementation of the Open Government Directive, at least for this one agency, is one of the driving concerns behind this research.

3.2 Broadcast or Dialogue

The terms participation and collaboration both imply interaction. Yet, do social media tools, blogs, or even email, for example, facilitate such interaction? This question lies at the nexus of our research and our more detailed research questions are an attempt to achieve a more fine grained understanding of the issue.

Part of our initial research was to conduct an exploratory content analysis of agency policy in relation to the Open Government Directive. This included identifying the tools being used by all 29 executive agencies to facilitate information sharing and citizen involvement or outreach. Social media tools that were being used to address the three pillars of the Open Government Directive were identified specifically. These were, namely: Facebook, Twitter, YouTube, and Flickr. While all four of these types of social media allow for communication between agencies and the public, we gave particular focus in our case study of the USDA to Twitter data because the data is publically available and can be easily captured. At one point, the USDA did offer an area within their website at http://www.usda.gov/open where individuals could share ideas, post comments and critique the agency. Visitors are now being directed to contribute at the USDA blog, Twitter or Facebook2.

We are collecting Twitter data using the twitteR package, in the open source statistical program R. This package allows researchers to pull the most recent 1500 tweets by a specific user, hashtag or keyword [16]. Due to limits with the Twitter API (application programming interface) only 1500 most recent tweets can be pulled at a time. This limited the initial data collection and subsequent data analysis. While this is a relatively small amount of tweets, considering the amount published per day, we started with this initial corpus as a snapshot in time. We now have over a month of data which includes over 14,000 tweets where USDA is the keyword. In future work we will expand our research beyond this snapshot and will analyze USDA Twitter data over a period of four months. Initially this data will be harvested weekly but this rate will be adjusted so we can be assured we are downloading as many unique Tweets as possible. If our initial schedule of pulling tweets every Monday results in redundancy we may extend the retrieval schedule; or conversely, if we observe that each week there are at least 1500 new tweets or unique uses of retweets we will increase the rate of retrieval. Additionally, we are further analyzing the data using Gephi. This is a platform which provides a visualization of social media networks.

4. EARLY FINDINGS

When basic social network analysis principles are applied, we can discern that the USDA’s interaction with the public appears to be one sided or perhaps even parallel. By parallel we mean that information is being posted by the USDA and by the public, but little real interaction appears to be taking place on social media or networking sites. Essentially, the network actors are talking around one another, with the agency not directly addressing anyone and receiving little or no response. In the context of this paper a basic analysis consisted of mapping the nodes and edges in Gephi 0.8 beta. Average degree and average path length were used to conduct a perfunctory determination if a network structure did indeed exist and if the resulting connections were bidirectional or unidirectional. Betweenness centrality was also

2 http://www.usda.gov/open/ideas.nsf?Open
considered, but to a lesser degree, given the context of the data collection.

Figure 1: Network of directionality

A basic network analysis of the data gathered by twitteR indicates that little dialogue is occurring between the USDA and the public. Edgelists for both retweeting activity and replyto messages were compiled. Essentially, the term “USDA” was sought in hashtags, keyword and @mentions during data extraction. The lists were compiled in order to gain a holistic view of the network in relation to the hashtag, keyword and @mention data collected richer dataset for analysis. Analysis of @reply messages indicates that USDA Twitter page has an outdegree of three, but an indegree of 141. Taken as a snapshot of social network activity, it appears that the majority of network directed connections occur on the part of the public and non-governmental organizations. Activity on the USDA’s Twitter page generally takes the form of update postings, news, reposts of forwards of USDA blog postings. The USDA’s retweet activity reflects the @reply activity, with a small outdegree and a high indegree. Identifying a retweet of another user’s post as an outwardly directed edge and the retweeter is considered as the source and the original tweeter as the target. Again from a cursory social network analysis, the data indicates that much of the retweeting activity is on the part of the public, companies, small business, or NGO entities. The single retweet by the USDA in the dataset was from the USDA Rural Development Twitter feed.

In regard to centrality, the USDA features as the node with the highest betweenness centrality. This was expected since data was collected in order to identify network structure and activity in regard to the USDA and its role. The only node with a higher overall degree in the network was McDonalds.

Figure 2: Network directionality of McDonalds via @USDA

As a large fast food producer and distributor, McDonalds has a strong association with the USDA and its appearance as a node in the network is consequently understandable. We can conclude by its position in the network that the information the USDA has posted is being shared among Twitter users and their followers because of the high indegree related to retweets. The data would also suggest that the information posted by the USDA is viewed as authoritative within the network. Further it seems that the USDA’s role as a federal agency places it in an influential role within the network structure.

Despite having a prominent position in the network, the USDA appears to take on a role similar to faceless corporation.

Figure 3: Primary @Tweet references based on Twitter data

It is present in the network by virtue of its name and place in the government, yet shows little in the way of interaction with the public beyond releasing official information and engaging with other agencies. The USDA’s Open Government plan indicates that the agency intends to use social media as a means to “expand
and improve” the participation process and mechanisms [17]. At present this does not appear to be happening. Of the three outgoing edges from the USDA only one was directed a particular person and that person was the host of a news show. If the USDA’s Facebook page is considered as well (which will be done in further research), the same pattern appears to be occurring. Essentially, the activity appears to be limited to information posts by the USDA followed by comments from the public or non-governmental organizations, which then do not appear to receive a response unless the responses are sent privately. This does not seem to adhere with general expectations of what social media sites represent, in essence a bilateral means of communication and interaction between users on the basis of post or update that is made public. If posted for all to see, the posts are generally meant to elicit some response or discussion. This appears to be in line with how the USDA stated it would employ Twitter in its Open Government Plan. The plan explicitly states that, “Effectiveness in public participation would be gauged by the multiple means of accessing the planning rule development and interactive communication through the web site and social media, such as planning rule blog and use of Twitter for announcing updates” (USDA). The social network analysis indicates that this is true; Twitter appears to be used as means for conveying information and announcing updates. The Plan also indicates that the USDA intended to explore ways to use social media to increase collaboration on an intra-governmental or intra-agency level. This also appears to be occurring, on both Twitter and Facebook, the USDA makes connections with its own internal departments such as USDARD or Rural Development and the USDA Forest Service. This can be considered in light of transparency, since the intra-governmental interactions are occurring in a public forum.

In the USDA’s Open Government Plan, the agency appears to recognize the possibilities for enhanced interaction and collaboration with citizens by decreasing the limits on opportunities to interface through the use of social media tools. Indeed if the USDA’s blog and Ideaspace are considered as social media resources, then collaboration is occurring in some limited form. Ideaspace was an online tool which the government was using in tandem with the Open Government Initiative to collect citizen feedback, structure discussion of topics, and gather suggestions, data, feedback and ideas from the public. On both the blog and in Ideaspace there does appear to be limited evidence of dialogue and collaboration in the sense that citizens are posing questions or voicing critiques which have been responded to by a USDA representative. Unfortunately, as mentioned above, individuals are now directed on the Ideaspace webpage to use Facebook or the USDA blog.

This early look at the USDA indicates that there are several considerations that need to be addressed in relation to use of social media web resources. While the researchers have sought to identify the existence and degree of dialogue occurring as result of the Open Government Initiative, we recognize that there may be policy and content considerations that may be underlying some of the actions or inaction on the part of the USDA. Certainly, it must be acknowledged that social media sites such as Facebook and Twitter are private companies with their own policies surrounding control of the data. Thus, there may be some hesitancy on behalf of administrators or moderators to use non-governmental social media resources for anything more than making an initial connection with the public and disseminating information. Additionally, the USDA’s plan indicates that it is reviewing its internal policies and regulations governing dissemination of information to public. The aforementioned issues are valid in regard to government use of social media and the resulting interactions with the public.

The research leads to two possible suggestions in regard to the USDA’s open government efforts. The first is to integrate the USDA Open Government website more into the USDA’s main page. This could be done by adding a link from the homepage or even adding a link in the sites index. Secondly, the agency could make greater efforts to increase public awareness of existing resources such as govdelivery.com. This site is meant to be used as a communication tool for reaching out to large community. Yet, in the whole of the USDA’s open government plan, it is only mentioned once and links to the resource are buried far from the main page.

5. NEXT STEPS
As indicated earlier, this preliminary study is the first part in a larger project which will examine the Open Government Initiative as it relates to interaction between the U.S. government, individuals, and the organizations that are the intended stakeholders of the Initiative. While, this particular study focused on the USDA, it is intended to form part of a larger research study which will examine the Open Government Initiative as it is has been implemented, thus far, across multiple agencies. At present 29 federal agencies, ranging from the Department of Defense to the Department of State, are listed as participating in the initiative. Each agency hosts different issues in respect to the three pillars (transparency, participation and collaboration) of open government. One would expect that Department of Labor or Department of Agriculture would have different considerations in regard to transparency, collaboration and participation than the Department of Homeland Security or the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. In future work we will seek to form a more detailed and expansive conception of how the Open Government Initiative is taking shape across multiple agencies. As we have understood it, the Open Government Initiative is intended to increase or enhance interaction between the government and its people. Is there evidence, through the discursive elements of dialogue that this is occurring?

In regard to methodology, we hope to include a more longitudinal perspective by collecting and analyzing data over time. By doing so, we intend to gain a more comprehensive understanding of agency-citizen interaction. Additionally, we intend to collect data across different social media sites. We are interested, primarily, in identifying the existence and degree of dialogue occurring as a result of implementation of the Open Government Initiative. At a fundamental level we hope to better understand how openness in government is affecting interaction between citizens and the government as a result of the implementation of the Open Government Initiative.

To summarize, the next steps will be:

1.) To continue to gather Twitter data related to the USDA for longitudinal perspective;
2.) Selection of other agencies to expand study;
3.) Policy analysis of each additional agency to identify specific stakeholders and goals;
4.) Expand data gathering to encompass newly identified agencies;
5.) Gather and analyze data from other social media sources and sites;
6.) Followed by the eventual creation of a holistic understanding public and government agency interaction in light of the Open Government Initiative.

6. CONTRIBUTIONS
While earlier research has looked at the different way that citizens are accessing government services and getting information about the government, there has been limited research into the type of interaction that is happening between government agencies or between government agencies and citizens via social media. Since dialogue is a key element of participation, understanding if, or the extent to which, social media is facilitating dialogue will inform a better understanding of citizen participation in the democratic process.
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