

Toni Carbo

## Information Rights: Trust and Human Dignity in e-Government

### Abstract:

The words "Rights," "Trust," "Human Dignity," and even "Government" have widely varying meanings and connotations, differing across time, languages and cultures. Concepts of rights, trust, and human dignity have been examined for centuries in great depth by ethicists and other philosophers and by religious thinkers, and more recently by social scientists and, especially as related to information, by information scientists. Similarly, discussions of government are well documented in writings back to Plato and Aristotle, with investigations of electronic government (often referred to as e-government) dating back only to the early 1990s with the advent of the Internet and the World Wide Web. At first e-government was described in glowing, positive terms. Little, if any, attention was paid to two critical questions: 1) Will people trust e-government? and 2) How will cultural differences affect individuals' trust in government and their perceptions of government's effect of their human dignity? Examinations of trust and distrust by individuals within organizations have addressed questions of motives and intentions, expectations of behavior, protection of interests, confidence in accuracy and reliability of information, vulnerability, and reciprocity, among other complex topics. Establishing e-government services often requires going through several phases: 1) publish (using ICT to improve access to government information), 2) interact (broadening participation in government through 2-way communications, and 3) transact (making actual services available online; and 4) transform (fundamentally changing government to make it truly citizen-centric). Building and maintaining trust in e-government require developing an understanding both of the many levels of interactions where trust must be earned and of cultural differences. Another challenge in developing such a framework is that e-government, itself, is very dynamic, changing rapidly over time. Trust in content or a system available one day may not carry over when the content and/or system changes dramatically. Components of a framework must include the following dimensions: conceptual domains, cultural dimensions, information content dimensions, and system dimensions. Of course, these dimensions must be considered within the context of rapidly changing governments, ICT services, the digital divide, and other factors. This paper provides a very brief overview of some of the notions of trust and distrust, concentrating on those concerning trust as it relates to notions of power, trust in organizations, and trust in information and information systems as one part of a framework to address the question of trust in e-government. It also makes a few recommendations for how to build citizen-centric e-government to ensure information rights through a focus on human dignity, fundamental human rights, and earning trust.

### Agenda

Rights, Trust and Human Dignity .....	169
Rights and Human Dignity .....	169
Trust .....	169
Government and e-Government .....	171
Governments .....	171
E-government .....	171
Recommendations .....	172

### Author:

Prof. Toni Carbo:

- School of Information Sciences and Graduate School of Public and International Affairs, University of Pittsburgh, 602 IS Building, 135 N. Bellefield Ave., Pittsburgh PA 15260 USA
- ✉ [tcarbo@sis.pitt.edu](mailto:tcarbo@sis.pitt.edu)

## Rights, Trust and Human Dignity

The words, "Rights," "Trust," "Human Dignity," "e-Government" (electronic or digital government), and even "Government" have widely varying meanings and connotations, differing across time, languages, and cultures. Notions of rights, trust, and human dignity have been examined for centuries in great depth by ethicists and other philosophers and by religious thinkers, and more recently by social scientists and, as related to information, by information scientists. Similarly, discussions of government are well documented in writings back to Plato and Aristotle, with investigations of electronic government (usually referred to as e-government) dating back only to the early 1990s with the advent of the Internet and later of the World Wide Web (WWW). Much of the work on e-government has been undertaken by political scientists, economists, lawyers, and information scientists. This paper will not provide an extensive review of previous studies, but will instead provide one individual perspective (one from an individual from a limited, Northern and Western background). It will draw upon some writings on trust and human dignity and relate them to information rights and the development of e-government.

### Rights and Human Dignity

Although certainly well known to the readers of this journal, it bears repeating that the Fundamental Moral Experience integrates basic respect for human beings and incorporates compassion, hope and affectivity. This is the foundation for many philosophical concepts and religious beliefs and for Information Ethics, and this foundation affirms the notion that each individual has basic rights and is deserving of respect and the preservation of human dignity. Early examples range from Aristotle to Tibetan Buddhism and, in 1948 were articulated in the United Nations Declaration of Human Rights. For example, the Dalai Lama refers to the concept of *nying je*, generally translated as compassion, but connoting ". . . love, affection, kindness, gentleness, generosity of spirit, and warm-heartedness." In its Article 1, the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights also states:

*All human beings are born free and equal in dignity and rights. They are endowed with reason and conscience and should act towards one another in a spirit of brotherhood.*

These oft-repeated principles must always provide the foundation for discussions of trust, information rights, and governance at all levels. The World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS) used this foundation in their international discussions to shape their common vision of the Information Society:

*. . . to build a people-centred, inclusive and development-oriented Information Society, where everyone can create, access, utilize and share information and knowledge, enabling individuals, communities and peoples to achieve their full potential in promoting their sustainable development and improving their quality of life. . .*

The Declaration also states:

*. . . reaffirm the universality, indivisibility, interdependence and interrelation of all human rights and fundamental freedoms. . . . also reaffirm that democracy, sustainable development, and respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms as well as good governance at all levels are interdependent and mutually reinforcing."*

In reviewing these statements, several points of focus emerge: 1) the emphasis on the Fundamental Moral Experience and the concepts of freedom, equality, dignity and rights; 2) the critical need for compassion (or more broadly, *nying je*) and the spirit of brotherhood; and 3) the importance of a people-centered society with the key role throughout entire life-cycle of information to empower individuals to achieve their full potential and improve the quality of their lives. With this basic set of principles in mind, we can address the notions of trust and its role in effective e-government.

### Trust

Views of trust as a foundation for social order span many disciplines, including psychology, philosophy, several social sciences, and business and management.<sup>1</sup> Examinations of trust and distrust by individuals within organizations have addressed questions motives and intentions, expectations of behavior, protection of interests, confidence in accuracy and reliability of information, vulnerability, and reciprocity, among many complex topics. As Sissela Bok has so eloquently stated: "Whatever matters to

<sup>1</sup>For example, Lewicki et al., 1998; Baier, 1986; Doney et al., 1998

human beings, trust is the atmosphere in which it thrives."<sup>2</sup> However, Baier reminds us that

*. . . not all the things that thrive when there is trust between people, and which matter, are things that should be encouraged to thrive. Exploitation and conspiracy, as much as justice and fellowship, thrive better in an atmosphere of trust. There are immoral as well as moral trust relationships, and trust-busting can be a morally proper goal.*<sup>3</sup>

Of course, there are many levels and types of trust and these levels and types of trust often change over time based on changes in relationships, personal experiences and other factors. For example, building on the work of Fiske and others, Sheppard and Sherman,<sup>4</sup> propose four fundamental grammars, or relational forms based on human relationships (communal sharing, authority ranking, equality matching, and market pricing) and depth of relationship (shallow dependence, shallow interdependence, deep dependence, and deep independence). They define trust as: ". . . the acceptance of the risks associated with the type and depth of the interdependence inherent in a given relationship."<sup>5</sup>

They also note that: "In all relational forms, however, trust involves the belief that features of the other, the relationship, or the context in which the relationship is embedded will mitigate the risks associated with that relational form."<sup>6</sup> Pettit, while noting that trust can be used in connection with relying on natural phenomena as well as with relying on people, indicates that the most general use of trust

*. . . would equate trust with confidence that other people will treat you reasonably well, confidence that they will not waylay or cheat you, for example. We speak in this sense of trusting our fellow citizens or trusting the institutions under which we live.*<sup>7</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Bok, 1978, 31.

<sup>3</sup> Baier, 1986, 231-232.

<sup>4</sup> Sheppard and Sherman, 1998, 423-425.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., 425.

<sup>6</sup> Ibid., 426.

<sup>7</sup> Pettit, 204.

His focus is on "active reliance." These are cases in which

*. . . you rely on others to the extent of making yourself vulnerable to them, voluntarily or under the force of circumstances . . . you rely in your own individual right on another person. . . . in other cases you may rely . . . on a corporate or collective agent that itself involves a number of people.*<sup>8</sup>

Understanding trust within the complex series of relationships in which an individual lives and works is key to understanding the interaction of an individual with a government and its representatives. The different types of relationships, levels of government, individuals within the governments and interactions among people all raise a series of issues directly relevant to ethical reflection and moral actions in developing and implementing e-government systems and services. Equally important is the need to address the notions of risk, reliability and vulnerability as essential components of trust. What level of risk is an individual taking by placing trust in an institution and/or information? What are the consequences if that trust is violated? How does one measure the reliability of information? How vulnerable is one willing to be to trade off access to services or information? These and other related questions should be addressed at the beginning of planning and well before implementation.

Related to the issues of risk, reliability and vulnerability is the question of power. For this paper, particular emphasis is placed on those concepts of trust and distrust related to notions of power, of individuals, information content and institutions. For example, as Baier notes:

*Trust alters power positions, and both the position one is in without a given form of trust and the position one has within a relation of trust need to be considered before one can judge whether that form of trust is sensible and morally decent.*<sup>9</sup>

Related to trust, of course, is the topic of privacy, especially the different understandings of the concept of privacy by people from different cultural backgrounds. Because this topic is being discussed

<sup>8</sup> Ibid., 204

<sup>9</sup> Baier, 1986, 240

in depth by others in this issue, it will not be included in this paper.

With human rights, dignity and trust as the foundation – all within a rapidly changing global society – we can begin to address the role of government and the use of technology to provide government information and services. Technology has been a fundamental component of governments from the earliest days of using the technology of the human voice (such as within Greek and Roman forums, in town meetings, or through town criers or travelling story tellers and historiographers); to the use of film, teletype, and radio during the first half of the 20<sup>th</sup> Century; to early presidential debates on television, 24-7 news networks, satellites, and other technologies beginning in the 1970s. The introduction and widespread use of Information and Communication Technologies (ICT), especially the Internet and the WorldWide Web (WWW) have provided opportunities for improved governance and for governments that are more focused on their citizens.

## Government and e-Government

### Governments

In considering the interaction between individuals and their governments, it is important to consider the level of government (e.g., local, groupings of local such as county, provincial or state, national, regional and international, and others); the types of interactions (e.g., gathering information, making a transaction, providing information, etc.); and the sociocultural aspects (e.g., language, cultural background of the individual, etc.). Of course, individuals may interact with different levels of government and for different purposes over time, and, individuals have both perceptions of their own power, risks, and vulnerability, which may differ from their actual power, risks, and vulnerabilities. The nature of the government, the government's stated mission, its actual practices (which very often differ from stated missions), and – most importantly – the nature and practices of the individuals, themselves, are all critical factors in the effectiveness of the government and its services. All of these are enhanced and expanded by the use of ICT, which adds many other dimensions including, but not limited to: 1) wide variations in access as a result of the Digital Divide, differing information literacy skills, disabilities, restrictions placed by governments, differing laws for intellectual property protection, numerous policies on transparency, etc.; 2) language and

cultural factors; 3) variations and limitations in content resulting in omission of indigenous knowledge or of material in appropriate formats (such as those for oral cultures); 4) differing norms for moral conduct (e.g., payments to government employees seen by some as appropriate gratuities and by others as corruption); 5) variations in perceptions of credibility of information in digital form (See, for example, the extensive study by Metzger et al.<sup>10</sup>; and 6) lack of understanding of how to manage the life-cycle of digital information, especially the need for policies and practices for the preservation and removal of it. Early attempts to use ICT in providing government information and services did not consider all of these factors as fully as needed, but the movement to electronic or digital government, usually referred to as e-government moved ahead rapidly, beginning in North American and Europe and spreading quickly to most other continents.

### E-government

E-government is "the use of information and communication technologies (ICT) to transform government by making it more accessible, effective and accountable."<sup>11</sup> Establishing the highest quality e-government services usually requires going through several phases: 1) publish (using ICT to improve access to government information), 2) interact (broadening participation in government through 2-way communications, and 3) transact (making actual services available online). In its *E-Government Handbook for Developing Countries*, InfoDev and CDT argue that successful transformation of government, not yet fully achieved, requires process reform, leadership, strategic investment, collaboration, and civic engagement. Among the key challenges for success is building "trust within agencies, between agencies, across governments, and with businesses, NGOs and citizens."<sup>12</sup> This *Handbook*, while somewhat dated now, is still a very valuable resource for those interested in developing citizen-centric e-government. Building and maintaining the trust referred to in the *Handbook* requires developing an understanding both of the many levels of interactions where trust must be earned and of the uniqueness -- including important cultural

<sup>10</sup> Metzger et al., 2003.

<sup>11</sup> InfoDev and Center for Democracy and Technology, 2002, 1.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.* 15.

differences, vulnerabilities, potential risks, and the power -- of the individual citizen.

These interactions are complicated and multi-layered. Individuals interact with other individuals within their local communities (whether geographic or virtual), with their governments at all levels, with other governments, NGOs, and corporations. They also interact with information content, interfaces (such as Web Pages), and information and telecommunication systems. An individual may trust information content, but not the system, thinking it is not secure; a Web Page may offend an individual's sense of dignity causing him or her to distrust the government that created it; or one individual or government may distrust another government's information because that government exercises tight controls over its information and monitors citizens' searches. A conceptual model is needed for use in framing questions of trust and e-government. Attempts at cultural taxonomies (e.g., Doney's framework linking Clark's conceptual domains and related cultural taxonomies with Hofstede's cultural dimensions and associated societal norms and values and his own categories of influence on trust-building process)<sup>13</sup> are useful building blocks but have not been used extensively to address questions such as attitudes toward government.

Another challenge in developing and using such a framework or taxonomy is that e-government, itself, is very dynamic, changing rapidly over time. Trust in content or a system available one day may not carry over when the content and/or system changes dramatically. Components of a framework must include the following dimensions: conceptual domains, cultural dimensions, information content dimensions, and system dimensions. Of course, these dimensions must be considered within the context of rapidly changing governments, ICT services, the digital divide, and other factors. Pertinent to the need to link these dimensions and e-government is the 7<sup>th</sup> Global Forum on Reinventing Government which was held in June 2007<sup>14</sup>. The theme of this forum was "Building Trust in Government," and this forum may well result in new perspectives to help shape this framework.

<sup>13</sup> Doney et al., 1998, 609.

<sup>14</sup> United National 7<sup>th</sup> Global Forum on Reinventing Government, 2007.

## Recommendations

Frameworks and taxonomies, as described above, should be developed and tested in real-world situations in different communities, and **this must be done within the context of the fundamental background of human dignity, basic human rights and earning trust**. It would be useful for collaborations among representatives (both senior officials and individuals at the front line of service provision) of governments at all levels, academics (including ethicists, political scientists, librarians, information scientists, and others), and citizens from differing ethnic, cultural and age groups to be formed to apply these frameworks and taxonomies in developing and assessing different e-government services as they are re-designed to be truly citizen-centric. Building on what has been learned at the first African Information Ethics Conference, earlier conferences, and the work of the International Center for Information Ethics community, collaborations at all levels can be built to address these critical issues. It is only by such collaborative efforts and transformation of government to meet citizens' needs that true information rights can be preserved.

Coetzee Bester kindly wrote the following addition to provide a perspective, as suggested by the reviewers of this article, from an African leader to help others use this article as part of his or her mental blueprint to guide in shaping the e-government of the future in Africa. I am very grateful to him for this very thoughtful addition:

"It is furthermore important to bear in mind that the position in many traditional African communities towards trust in e-governance is based on the description and significance of the concept of trust and human dignity within the framework of the social infrastructure of these communities. Trust for example is sometimes more related to knowledge of the person him/herself or personal interaction with these role players than a declaration on paper. This trust-in-person mindset should direct the information practitioner in Africa towards a relationship with the authority rather than to the position of the authority when trust in e-governance is developed. The grammar and meaning of trust is therefore rather to be found in the cultural relationship to an individual and not necessary based on a researched and scientific prove of an experience.

Information practitioners and policy makers in Africa should be aware of the influences of traditions and cultural dynamics that will impact on the processes towards trust in e-governance. Practical guidelines

to manage the impact will have to be developed but guiding principles towards trust in e-governance would include; a service and development orientation, person-to-person support during the implementation phases of e-governance, language and terminology assistance for users and technical back-up to ensure continuous service. These services would include electricity, well-managed service providers and well-trained staff to assist the users of e-governance.

The growth towards trust in e-governance is a process and not an event or an announcement. In addition to the challenges in creating trust in e-governance the path towards this technology in Africa is filled with thorny issues of new technology and terminology, cultural orientations and traditions as well as a complete different social interaction based on a method of humanity and not yet exclusive use of technology."<sup>15</sup>

## References

- Accenture. Leadership in Customer Service: Building the Trust. 2006. [http://www.accenture.com/xdoc/en/industries/government/acn\\_2006\\_govt\\_report\\_FINAL2.pdf](http://www.accenture.com/xdoc/en/industries/government/acn_2006_govt_report_FINAL2.pdf).
- Baier, Annette. "Trust and Antitrust" Ethics. 96(2) 1986, pp. 231-260.
- Bester, Coetzee. Personal email. June 14, 2007.
- Capurro, Rafael, Frühbauer, Johannes, Hausmaninger, Thomas (eds). Localizing the Internet: Ethical Aspects in Intercultural Perspective. Schriftenreihe des ICIE, Band 4, Munich 2007.
- Cassell, Justine and Bickmore, Timothy. "External Manifestations (sic) of Trustworthiness in the Interface." Communications of the ACM 43(12), p. 50.
- Council for Excellence in Government. E-Government: The Next American Revolution. Washington, D.C., 2000.
- Cox, Richard J. Ethics, Accountability, and Record-keeping in a Dangerous World: Principles and Practice in Records Management and Archives. London: Facet Publishing, 2006.
- Curral, Steven C. and Judge, Timothy A. "Measuring Trust Between Organizational Boundary Role Persons" Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes. 64(2), 1995, pp. 151-170.
- de Laat, Paul B. "Trusting Virtual Trust" Ethics and Information Technology. 7(3), 2005, pp. 167-180.
- Doney, Patricia M, Cannon, Joseph P, and Mullen, Michael R. "Understanding the Influence of National Culture on the Development of Trust" The Academy of Management Review. 23(3), pp. 601-620.
- Economicst Intelligence Unit Ltd., The 2006 E-Readiness Rankings: A White Paper from the Economist Intelligence Unit. 2006. [http://a330.g.akamai.net/7/330/25828/20060531184642/graphics.eiu.com/files/ad\\_pdfs/2006Ereadiness\\_Ranking\\_WP.pdf](http://a330.g.akamai.net/7/330/25828/20060531184642/graphics.eiu.com/files/ad_pdfs/2006Ereadiness_Ranking_WP.pdf).
- Friedman, Batya and Kahn, Peter H. Jr., Howe, Daniel C. "Trust Online". Communications of the ACM, 43(12), 2000, p. 34.
- InfoDev and The Center for Democracy & Technology. The E-Government Handbook for Developing Countries: A Project of InfoDev and the Center for Democracy & Technology. Washington, D.C., November 2002. <http://www.cdt.org/egov/handbook/2002-11-14egovhandbook.pdf>.
- Lewicki, Roy J., McAllister, Daniel J. Bies, Robert J. "Trust and Distrust: New Relationship Realities." The Academy of Management Review. 23(3) 1998, pp. 438-458.
- Marsh, Stephen and Dibben, Mark R. "The Role of Trust in Information Science and Technology." in Blaise Cronin (ed) Annual Review of Information Science and Technology. Medford, NJ: Information Today, Inc., 37, 2007, pp. 465-498.
- Metzger, Miriam J., Flanagin, Andrew J., Eyal, Keren, Lemus, Daisy R. and McCann, Robert M. "Credibility for the 21<sup>st</sup> Century: Integrating Perspectives on Source, Message, and Media Credibility in the Contemporary Media Environment. In Pamela J. Kalbfleisch (ed) Communication Yearbook 27, London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers, 2003, pp. 293-335.
- Nissenbaum, Helen. "Securing Trust Online: Wisdom or Oxymoron?" Boston University Law Review. 81, June 2001, pp. 635-664.
- Pettit, Philip. "The Cunning of Trust" Philosophy and Public Affairs, 24(3) 1995, pp. 202-225.
- Ross, Seamus and McHugh, Andrew. "The Role of Evidence in Establishing Trust in Repositories. D-Lib Magazine 12(7/8), 2006. <http://www.dlib.org/dlib/july06/ross/07ross.html>
- Sheppard, Blair H. and Sherman, Dana M. "The Grammars of Trust: A Model and General Impli-

<sup>15</sup> Bester, Coetzee, 2007.

*cations.*" The Academy of Management Review 23(3), 1998, pp. 422-437.

United Nations. 7<sup>th</sup> Global Forum on Reinventing Government. "Building Trust in Government" Vienna 26-29 June 2007.

United Nations. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, 10 December 1948.  
<http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html>.

World Summit on the Information Society. Declaration of Principles. 12 December 2003.  
<http://www.itu.int/wsis/docs/geneva/official/dop.html>.

Zogby International. Honesty and Trust in America Survey. Zogby International, 22 May 2006.  
<http://www.zogby.com/Lichtman%20Final%20Report%205-22-06.pdf>.