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Web 2.0 and Public Sector

- The rapid evolution of ICTs caused that entities look for the most effective ways of communication.

- The increase in technological readiness of the population has caused a higher demand for the Open Government and E-government e-participation.

- Communication via the Internet is cost saving and allows for richer, more interactive displays than does traditional print media; it facilitates timely information disclosure.

- Consequences of the application of new communication technologies in public administration: increased responsiveness and citizen participation, efficiency, accountability, trust, openness and transparency (Bonsón et al. 2012; Bertot et al. 2010).
Web 2.0 and Public Sector

• **Reforms** in communication strategies of Public Administration authorities

• The Obama Administration – OPEN GOVERNMENT DIRECTIVE (2009) leveraged the power of information technology to transform the Federal Government in order to make it more open and transparent

• Consequently, many democratic countries have joined this movement which has led to overall changes in governmental communication and transparency globally

• In 2012, the Open Government Standards were developed in Europe as a part of the digital agenda in a Europe 2020 initiative

• Many local governments have started to use the Internet and social media (SM) to engage with citizens
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• Principles
Web 2.0 and Public Sector

1. Problem and Previous Research
2. Conceptual Framework and RQs
3. Methodology
4. Findings
5. Implications

Municipalities

- Pina and Torres (2001), municipalities play an important role in the society as they directly affect the everyday lives of citizens regarding administration and service delivery.

Social Media

- SM is ranked third among the preferred communication tools by citizens, administration and politicians, after E-mails and municipalities’ websites.

YouTube

- YouTube (communication media vary in their degree of richness)
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Dissemination channels

- Video
- Photos, graphics
- Text
Disclosure via YouTube

- Visual communication is more **effective** (Cho et al. 2007)
- **YouTube** is an interesting platform for disclosure since it deals with social video
- From psychological point of view, video is a **powerful medium** because of its combination of sight, sound, motion, and emotion reaching our senses and psyche
- **Video can be more engaging** than other media types, making it an interesting tool to interact with the citizens
Previous research

- a number of studies have been conducted on the **SM usage by governments** (Abdelsalam et al., 2013; Bonsón et al., 2014; Ellison & Hardey, 2014; Graham & Avery, 2013; Hofmann et al., 2013; Oliveira & Welch, 2013; Panagiotopoulos et al., 2014)

- just a few address the use of **YouTube on the municipality level** (Brainard & Edlins, 2015; Chatfield & Brajavidagda, 2013).

- Chatfield & Brajavidagda (2013) analysed government-generated YouTube videos in local governments in Jakarta claiming that the transformational political leadership and the **strategic use of YouTube** are the key factors in advancing local government transparency and facilitating **citizen engagement**.

- user-generated content of YouTube and other social media was found extremely useful for managing routine but also **crisis situations** such as earthquakes and floods (Kavanaugh et al., 2010).
Previous research

• Panagiotopoulos et al. (2013) argue that SM might represent a significant opportunity for **G2C interactions** and policy development improvements.

• Bertot et al. (2010) stress that SM offers opportunities for accountability, transparency, crowd-sourcing solutions and real-time information disclosure.

• A number of studies have analysed the dialogic potential of online communication (Kent et al., 2003; Rybalko & Seltzer, 2010; Bortree & Seltzer, 2009; Park & Reber, 2008; Seltzer & Mitrook, 2007).

• Although the main promise of SM is increased citizen participation, the majority of government communications are still one-way rather than two-way (dialogically) oriented (Haleva-Amir, 2011, Mossberger et al., 2013, Norris & Reddick, 2013).
Conceptual Framework

Public Administration Style

- is defined by an administrative culture and institutional differences - factor for explaining the evolution of public sector reforms (Pina, Lourdes, Royo, 2007; Royo et al. 2014).

- Torres`s (2004) classification of Western Europe administration styles (Anglo-Saxon, Nordic, Germanic, Southern European)
Conceptual Framework

Public Administration Style

Anglo-Saxon, Nordic countries:
• keen on efficiency, effectiveness and value for money, known for their public sector reforms, high transparency, citizen engagement

Germanic and Southern countries:
• rather bureaucratic and hierarchical
Conceptual Framework

Municipality Characteristics

• the number of municipality inhabitants (Inhab_log)

• overall level of development of the local government website (E-gov_offer)

• the level of adoption of Web 2.0 and SM tools by the local government (E-gov_2.0)
Research questions

RQ1: Are there any mutual relationships among YouTube metrics (video uploads, channel views and number of subscribers)?

RQ2: Is there any relationship between YouTube metrics and municipality characteristics?

RQ3: Is there any relationship between YouTube metrics and public administration style?

RQ4: Is there any relationship between public administration style and the prevalent content type?

RQ5: Is there any relationship between a specific video content type and the number of channel views?
Methodology

Sample and Data

• the data of **75 Western European municipalities** across **15 countries** belonging to four different public administration styles (Anglo-Saxon, Nordic, Germanic, and Southern) were collected.
• We checked whether these local governments maintain an official YouTube channel, analysing **30 videos** from each channel and coded them into 16 content types (e.g., cultural activities, city promotion, etc.)
• **Public Administration Style**
• **Municipality Characteristics**
• **YouTube metrics**
### Methodology

#### Independent variables
- YouTube metrics
- YouTube metrics
- YouTube metrics
- public administration style
- content type

#### Dependent variables
- YouTube metrics
- municipality characteristics
- public administration style
- content type
- channel views (YouTube metric)
Methodology

Adopted methods:

• Content analysis
• Descriptive statistics
• Contingency tables
• Pearson`s, Spearman`s coefficients
Findings

• Only 39% **municipalities** (29) have an official YouTube channel
## Findings

### YouTube metrics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Video uploads</th>
<th>Channel Views</th>
<th>Subscribers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Video uploads</td>
<td>1.000 Pearson</td>
<td>0.708** Pearson</td>
<td>0.762** Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Channel Views</td>
<td>0.708** Pearson</td>
<td>1.000 Pearson</td>
<td>0.852** Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subscribers</td>
<td>0.762** Pearson</td>
<td>0.852** Pearson</td>
<td>1.000 Pearson</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Significant at the 1% level. * Significant at the 5% level.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality characteristics</th>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Video uploads</th>
<th>Channel Views</th>
<th>Subscribers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inhab_log</td>
<td>0.467* Pearson</td>
<td>0.699** Pearson</td>
<td>0.505** Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-gov_offer</td>
<td>0.378 Pearson</td>
<td>0.411* Pearson</td>
<td>0.350 Pearson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-gov_2.0</td>
<td>0.428* Spearman</td>
<td>0.411* Spearman</td>
<td>0.389* Spearman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the 5% level. **Significant at the 1% level.
## Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Video Uploads</th>
<th>Subscribers</th>
<th>Channel Views</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anglo-Saxon</td>
<td>117.667</td>
<td>93.07</td>
<td>158.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nordic</td>
<td>78.333</td>
<td>47.07</td>
<td>53.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germanic</td>
<td>192.250</td>
<td>110.67</td>
<td>609.750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern</td>
<td>911.188</td>
<td>1473.62</td>
<td>950.125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>557.621</td>
<td>1151.57</td>
<td>635.793</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Independent Samples Median Test | Sig. 0.036* | Sig. 0.007** | Sig. 0.040* |

*Significant at the 5% level. **Significant at the 1% level.
## Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Type</th>
<th>Anglo-Saxon</th>
<th>Nordic</th>
<th>Germanic</th>
<th>Southern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works and Town Planning</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to the Citizen</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Participation</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Protection and Security</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and training schemes</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activities and Sports</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance issues</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reporting</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing promotion</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Content Type</th>
<th>Mean – Video Views</th>
<th>Std. deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Works and Town Planning</td>
<td>826.654</td>
<td>3329.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>765.237</td>
<td>2840.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attention to the Citizen</td>
<td>234.375</td>
<td>256.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Participation</td>
<td>425.308</td>
<td>555.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Services</td>
<td>369.026</td>
<td>769.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Citizen Protection and Security</td>
<td>2108.824</td>
<td>5250.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transport</td>
<td>629.923</td>
<td>1366.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and training schemes</td>
<td>780.667</td>
<td>1519.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>108.214</td>
<td>83.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>268.063</td>
<td>426.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural Activities and Sports</td>
<td>994.098</td>
<td>3302.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing</td>
<td>268.286</td>
<td>586.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance issues</td>
<td>144.300</td>
<td>145.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial reporting</td>
<td>118.395</td>
<td>89.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing promotion</td>
<td>1189.714</td>
<td>2923.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>431.165</td>
<td>1028.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>752.078</td>
<td>2593.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Independent Samples Kruskal-Wallis Test**  
Sig. 0.000
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Findings

Summary and Conclusions

• ADOPTION: only 39% (29 out of 75) of municipalities embraced this social media platform to disseminate content and instigate a dialogue with the citizens.

• MUNICIPALITY CHARACTERISTICS matter: *YouTube metrics* are correlated with the municipality’s characteristics

• PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION STYLE matters: the highest percentage of adoption and municipality uploads on YouTube by local governments was in the *Southern countries*. (In addition, considering the high numbers of subscribers in those countries, it might be a sign of citizens’ acceptance of such a communication strategy.)

• CONTENT TYPE matters: a particular *content type* might be *more engaging* than others (videos about citizen protection and security, promotional content and videos about cultural activities and sports)
Implications

Research contribution

• this is the first study providing a **general overview of YouTube usage by Western European local governments** by offering insights into the differences and correlations related to the **public administration style, municipality characteristics, and YouTube metrics**

• offers the overview of how the Western European municipalities use YouTube and what factors influence its usage and the responsiveness of citizens (new G2C approaches)
Final considerations

- **SM** is an opportunity for public administrations to interact directly with citizens.
- **Using SM** for G2C is becoming a trend.

Over the last decade we have been witnessing an uptake of local governments using the Internet and SM to communicate and engage with citizens.

- Transparency, participation, collaboration.
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