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Abstract


The key focus is to examine the process through which electronic government (the use of ICTs in the public sector) is shaped in policy and practice. The history of electronic government has two sides. When it comes to the implementation of what can be regarded as rather uncomplicated projects, electronic government has many good stories to tell. Conversely, when it comes to more ambitious ideas, the story is quite different. Many problems have been raised and, since the 1990s, there has been a steady stream of new big ideas in electronic government, leaving behind a trail of uncompleted projects. My research has shown that this phenomenon could be explained by using the policy entrepreneurship lens. Electronic government ideas are not introduced from the top; nor are they implemented “as is”. Instead, they are shaped in the implementation process. Advice given to governments is to focus on smaller ideas and apply holistic thinking. In this thesis I provide some insights into why this is easier said than done. Electronic government aims to promote change to develop the public sector and society. However, change cannot be provided by government actors only; governance must provide the work that the “institutions” cannot do. It is the relationship between government and governance that holds the clues to the phenomenon. To make people act, they must be inspired. Great promises can provide motives for this. However, when acting, policy entrepreneurs may lack the decision-making powers needed; instead, they have the power to influence. Nevertheless, to do this they must act in a certain way. Because of their lack of decision-making powers, they need to be sensitive to timing and be responsive. They also need to promote their ideas in a way that makes sense to others so that they can gain their support. This can, indeed, result in increased complexity and the acceleration of the process.
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Prologue

The photograph on the cover was taken by me. The cat in the picture was the best cat ever. I loved her so much and this thesis is dedicated to her. Smilla, du fattas mig! Du fattas mig is Swedish. It means that a part of you is missing and this is actually the case here. When Smilla died she took a piece of me with her. I also called her Smiles because she was, indeed, the smile in my life. Luckily, her sister is still going strong and she is the best cat in the world, too.

The photography’s connection to this thesis can be explained in many ways: first, through the dedication, and second, the meaning of it. The public sector is big and complex and it could be anticipated that the actions performed by small groups of people do not matter that much. This thesis shows, however, that they do. In fact, they can change many things. In comparison with the wasp, Smilla is big. Nevertheless, the wasp could, indeed, have some impact on her and I believe that this is something that should be recognized. Yet, that was not something that bothered Smilla; she was a fearless cat that used to caught snakes, and wasps. The question is then, how electronic government is impacted by “wasps”? This could be something to bear in mind when reading this thesis. To succeed with electronic government (if there is such a possibility) will require a lot of hard work and this work must be carried out by dedicated, persistent people who are willing to struggle with this. If you are determined enough, you can find a way to achieve what you want, even if it is very difficult.

Determination has also played a central role in the writing of this thesis. The work has not been easy - it has been quite a struggle - but if you want something badly enough, you can find the means to do it. This has always been a guiding ideal in my life and it has, indeed, come in handy when writing this thesis. When I started my research in 2008, I thought that it would go much more smoothly and be much easier. My then boyfriend Johan had also started writing a thesis. Actually, he was a couple of years ahead of me. I remember reflecting over the fact that he did not seem to get anywhere with the work and I thought that the process was a bit too slow. For me, the work of writing a thesis would, of course, be much more straightforward. I would just write it; how hard could it be? Boy, was I wrong. The word easy and writing a thesis should not be mentioned on the same page. Writing a thesis is a challenge, truly. Throughout the process I have repeatedly doubted ever being able to finish. I still do, in some sense. Something that I have realized is that no matter how much you
read, there is always something more that you should have read too. This has been a very frustrating circumstance in this work, causing me to feel unsatisfactory about myself and my efforts. I believe that the outcome of reading more has been to make me more aware of my unawareness.

I am going to use this prologue as an opportunity to say a little bit about the process of writing this thesis. Namely, I feel that it is a good idea to do so because writing a thesis is not about the end product, the thesis. I have come to realize that it is about the journey and what you learn on this journey. I guess you could say that everything started in the final year of my undergraduate degree. The primary goal then was a master’s degree but there was also the thought of applying for a Ph.D. position in the future. At that time, I was really interested in research philosophy and research method and, when I became aware of an advanced level course in phenomenological writing, I was intrigued. However, it was not in the same city as I currently lived and taking the train was a bit of a struggle because there was no direct train from where I lived. I realized that a lot of time would be spent travelling, time I would rather spend on philosophizing. Hence, the problem needed to be solved and the solution was to convince Johan to take the course as well. That meant that we could car-pool and it also gave us the opportunity to engage in philosophical discussions together. If I remember things correctly, I believe that it was at that moment we also started to watch the TV show “The Great Philosophers”. One thing that he and I had in common was the complete appreciation of coffee. Hence, we spent quite a lot of time at the local coffee place and, while having coffee, we engaged in philosophical discussions. These discussions meant a lot to me, so thank you Johan for being such a good philosopher!

The philosophical discussions that we were having contributed to making me determined to apply for a Ph.D. position. The opportunity to do so showed up when the Informatics department at Örebro University advertised for Ph. D students at precisely the same moment I finished my master’s degree. In the car, on my way home after having defended my master’s thesis at a seminar in Karlstad, my phone rang. It was Åke Grönlund, professor in Informatics, who offered me the opportunity to realize this dream. I was really grateful for getting the chance to write a thesis then and I still am, because even though the journey has been a struggle I would not have wanted to miss it for the world. Besides giving me the opportunity to do so, I am also truly greatful for everything Åke has
taught me; he was, namely, my main supervisor for the first three years (until the licentiate degree).

Stepping back in time, because in this story we have not quite reached the time of the licentiate degree, being a Ph.D. student was a new thing. It was quite confusing at first: what was I expected to do? I had no clue really. One good thing was, however, that in this land of confusion I had a companion by my side, Hannu Larsson. He became a Ph.D student at the same time as me and in the beginning we studied the same case. In particular, I remember one occasion after a project meeting when we reflected upon our confusion. I asked him, “Do you know what a MAS/MAR is?”.

“No, I have no idea,” he replied and that was okay; we were both as confused as each other. If I remember this correctly, it took about ten project meetings before I managed to get the answer to this question. It turned out to be the municipality’s charge nurses (i.e. the nurses responsible for the other nurses).

The first part of the Ph.D journey, up until the licentiate degree was, indeed, baffling. However, after that, it became even more confusing. The first case study was more or less given to me, but after the licentiate I was expected to find a new case study on my own. This was not easy and it took quite some time before I managed to do so. During this process of uncertainty I became very stressed. I felt that the clock was ticking and nothing had happened. I felt that I had come to a terminal point and something had to be done. The solution was to change supervisors to get new input and Karin Hedström became my main supervisor instead. However, by the time this change was implemented, the problem had already solved itself. A few weeks before I had taken part in a seminar about open data at the County Administration Board and, at that seminar, I got the idea to arrange an open innovation competition and to study the outcome.

So, I had new supervisors and the constellation that was supposed to take me to the end of the journey was Karin, Jenny and Katarina, three very intelligent women from whom I have learnt a lot! I especially want to thank Karin for believing in me, for her patience, and for always being available when needed. The focus in the beginning was, however, on making me like my work again and, when reflecting upon it now in the rear view mirror, I realize that the process of getting me to like my work again also meant that everything became a little bit crazy. Writing the papers was easy; there was a clear structure to follow. Writing the cover paper was another matter. People had told me that writing the cover paper to
the thesis involved more freedom than writing the papers. I believed in this and took this opportunity to truly act upon my creativity. The result was a cover paper that did not correspond to a thesis in Informatics at all; it was more a product of every strange thought that had popped up in my head throughout the process (because of me being a philosophical person). Hence, there was a need to step back and reflect upon the task. The question is then, do I regret anything? No, I do not because, through this, I have learnt a lot. I have learnt that there are times when creativity is good and should be encouraged, but there are also times when you should be more rational and instrumental. Writing a thesis should be fun, and it has been, but you should also stick to some rules.

Because of this detour, there was limited time to get the material ready for my pre-defence and, to be honest, it was not actually ready when the time for the pre-defence came along. So, I really want to thank Ulf Melin from Linköping University for his fantastic job at this seminar. He could have been very critical about my work because of its semifinished status, but instead he gave constructive feedback from which I benefited greatly when wrapping everything up.

What else then? Have I described the process (or my personal life) as straightforward yet? You could also throw in the fact that I sold my old house, hiring a real estate agent that pretended to arrange showings of the house, but in reality he never showed up. To sell the house was, consequently, not easy and it took some time (a year roughly spent with preparing for continuous no-shows). Meanwhile, I decided to buy a new house and the choice fell on a house that was in desperate need of renovation. It was an old school that no one had lived in since it stopped being a school in the 1940s. Since then, it had rained in for over 10 years, the electrical system was from the turn of the century and the house was completely missing insulation. A really good idea I thought, since I did not have so many other things to do. I was just writing a thesis. Besides this, I also initiated a personal revolution, changing pretty much everything about my life. Straightforward? Not a bit! But I do not think it should be either because I have learnt so much throughout this process about so many things; about life for sure, but also a profession, about how society works. Hence, it has been a tremendous personal development.

How did I manage then? With help from a lot of people to whom I am truly grateful. Besides the people being involved in the writing process, many more have been involved in my personal process. When I was given the position, I knew no one in Örebro city, so to have such fantastic col-
leagues has been really great. Take for example Ida, the greatest rock star in the world! To have gotten to know you is also one very important part of this process. You always care for people and I really appreciate that you have put up with me forcing you to celebrate my birthday (for instance) and we will have so much fun in Livorno, Florence and Pisa this summer! There has also been Agneta, also always caring for others. Thank you for believing in me and helping out with the extension of my employment after the licentiate. Also, thank you for the birds, they mean so much to me.

Thereafter we have everyone in the Informatics corridor, all truly great people! Thanks to Andreas, for accompanying me up the grey stairs; Annika, for saying that she liked my licentiate thesis (it meant a lot to me to hear that!); Kai, for supporting craziness; Ella, for giving me advice on how I should take care of my trademark on Facebook; Fredrik, for letting me know the best strategy to quickly become a professor; Johan A, for making sure the corridor had such a good atmosphere and being the happiest person there (happiness is contagious); Johan P, for taking care of my plant and providing some additional stress in the final part of writing this thesis; Josefine, for having style (I really dig your style); Mathias, we really do not need another travel system but thank you for the fun that it has been to order such a thing together; Siraj, for showing me how to not eat shrimps; and Iryna, Olga and José, for being exceptionally good co-workers. Furthermore, everyone in the Research School of Public Affairs has also contributed greatly and so have all people involved in the cases that I have studied. Perhaps the greatest thanks should go out to them, for it is they who have made writing this thesis possible! To mention a few, Charlotta, Björn, Joakim, Anders, Ulrika, Inga and Lars.

Looking outside academia, there are also people from my private life who need a big thanks, including Åsa for correcting me when doing something “wrong” in life. I have some examples of this but I do not think that it would be appropriate to include them in this thesis. If I should ask you, you should probably advice me not to so I follow this advice. And thanks to Anna for taking part in a short but intensive journey from one point of life to another. I thank my family too, of course, for raising me to be who I am.

There are many more people who deserve thanks, but I recognize that I need to draw the line somewhere, so I just want to say thank you to everyone who has been involved in my life. Lastly, meeting a new boyfriend in the six final weeks before finishing a thesis could, perhaps, not be rec-
ommended either, but I am really happy to have done so anyway. I love you.

I am aware of me being very self-revealing in this prologue and that was my intent. I hope I have managed to make some people smile because of it. For me, it is important to provide a smile for Smiles each and every day.
1. Introduction

In a broad sense, electronic government can be described as a symbol for the idea of a modern society (Giritli-Nygren & Lindblad-Gidlund, 2009). It is a global phenomenon that represents both a multi-disciplinary research field and trends in practice. The concept of electronic government covers all the functions related to the use of information and communication technologies (ICTs) in the public sector (Yildiz, 2007). Research on the use of technology in governments has been performed during the last three or four decades. What is new in electronic government is that issues of information, technology and politics are being raised together, issues that none of the main referent fields (computer science, information systems, public administration and political science) are well equipped to deal with jointly (Heeks & Bailur, 2007). These aspects must, however, be considered collectively, as electronic government studies must go beyond organizational borders (Grönlund, 2005).

The phenomenon of electronic government emerged in the 1990s (Bannister & Connolly, 2012). Since its introduction, the idea of electronic government has had penetrating power; the phenomenon has been received enthusiastically and the potential is great (Giritli-Nygren & Lindblad-Gidlund, 2009). The result has been a global sphere of action, with electronic government being diffused at supra-national, national and local levels (ibid). However, electronic government is a vague concept that does not provide clear directions for action (Torres et al., 2005; Heeks and Bailur, 2007; Yildiz, 2007; Giritli-Nygren & Lindblad-Gidlund, 2009). At every level, the “idea” of electronic government must, therefore, be interpreted when put into practice (Giritli-Nygren & Lindblad-Gidlund, 2009).

The term government covers several aspects of managing a country, or parts of a country (Grönlund, 2005). These aspects extend from daily operations to strategic management. Hence, electronic government must also cover these same aspects (ibid). Sometimes, the term governance is used instead. However, there is no generally agreed-upon definition of governance (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). Some use it to widen the scope of electronic government, saying that it is more correct to use governance than government because the goals of electronic government do not just relate to more efficient operations but also to better quality of services, and increased and improved citizen participation in democratic processes (Grönlund, 2005). A democratic government consists, namely, of three interrelated spheres: the political, the administrative, and the civil society.
Each of these spheres contains individuals, organizations, technical systems, social relations and value systems (ibid). However, the terms government and governance can also refer to two different outlooks on public policy making (von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg, 2011). In this context, the term government refers to processes that involve politicians and administrators employed by the state to produce politics, whilst governance involves more actors and governing in collaboration, i.e. the network control that is characteristic of contemporary Western society (ibid). The latter description is the view on governance that I take in this thesis. Drawing upon it, my definition is hence: Governance refers to governing in collaboration between governmental and non-governmental actors.

Governments are perceived as early adopters and at the cutting edge of ICT deployment (Bannister & Connolly, 2012). However, the history of electronic government has two sides. When it comes to the implementation of what can be regarded as rather uncomplicated projects, electronic government has many good stories to tell, with many successful applications and systems. Conversely, when it comes to more ambitious ideas that aim to reform the way the public sector operates on a fundamental level, the story is quite different. Many problems have been raised and, since the 1990s, there has been a steady stream of new ambitious ideas in electronic government, leaving behind a trail of uncompleted projects (ibid). Apparently, there is a need to understand why this is happening. However, the first two decades of research output in electronic government were heavily criticized for frequently having too narrow a focus (Grönlund, 2010; Dawes, 2009; Heeks & Bailur, 2007; Yildiz, 2007; Grönlund & Andersson, 2006; Torres et al., 2006; Torres et al., 2005). According to the criticism, the then existing body of research failed to provide this understanding. The research could be used to understand what was happening in electronic government, but not why (Dawes, 2009). To change this situation, many researchers highlighted the need for a new direction. One example was the suggestion that electronic government research should to a greater extent address public administration concerns, such as the politics-administration dichotomy, intergovernmental relations and governance in general (Yildiz, 2007).

Mounting criticism has led to the research agenda being significantly deepened and widened, and additionally the whole body of research being dramatically increased (Scholl, 2014). Actually, half of the estimated body of research in the field was published in the period 2009 to 2013 (ibid). Accordingly, most knowledge in electronic government research has de-
developed relatively recently. In this period, the topical direction has been towards electronic and transformational government (including open government), ICTs in all its forms (such as institutional architecture and interoperability as a proxy), participation, services and the digital divide (ibid). The field has now matured. Nevertheless, as I show in this thesis, there is still one important gap to be filled: the examination of governance processes, i.e. governing in collaboration between governmental and non-governmental actors.

Electronic government is a vague concept, so when electronic government is put into practice the idea of it needs to be translated (Giritli-Nygren & Lindblad-Gidlund, 2009). The outcome is that the idea travels through different policy documents (ibid). Policy documents are statements of intent that are used to set the agenda. The policies themselves are usually visionary to inspire people (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). Hence, the electronic government idea is interpreted through and captured in policies. The interpretation process involves grasping the next step as well as the essence of the idea itself. According to Giritli-Nygren and Lindblad-Gidlund (2009), operative leaders play an important role in translating the idea and adapting it to local conditions. This sense-making of electronic government through managers’ perceptions affects which strategies they propose to change and results in situations of ambiguity. The way in which electronic government transforms depends on how local implementers interpret the vision, and how leaders transform their perceptions into management strategies (ibid).

In early literature on public administration, the politics-administration dichotomy was explained in terms of politicians making policy decisions and assigning implementation to government agencies (Wilson 1887). This is, however, an ideal situation that distinguishes the decision-making process from the implementation process (Sannerstedt, 2001; Svara, 2006). In practice, the implementation process usually involves a chain of decision-making processes, which makes it difficult to predict the outcome (Sannerstedt, 2001). To study implementation, one of two different perspectives is usually used: the top-down or bottom-up perspective. The starting point in a top-down perspective are the policy makers’ intentions. The starting point in a bottom-up perspective are, instead, the actual actions that take place throughout implementation (ibid). Policies aim to change things and to address particular problems. When new challenges arise, changes are made to policies. This is called policy change (Mintrom & Norman, 2009). Today, policy change is, according to many researchers, usually
initiated by bottom-up approaches in some way (Mintrom & Norman, 2009; Olsson, 2009; Sabatier, 2007; Hajer, 2003). Consequently, policy changes are no longer controlled from the top; they are rather the result of informal actors’ complex processes (Olsson, 2009). One example of such a process is the impact of policy entrepreneurs (Wihlborg, 2011a; Mintrom & Norman, 2009).

Sabatier (2007) described the process of public policy making as a very complex one, involving hundreds of actors from governmental institutions, political parties, interest groups and legislatures at different levels of government, as well as journalists, researchers and others. These actors have different goals, perceptions of the situation and policy preferences. Consequently, policy disputes are inevitable; they could, for example, be about legislative issues, litigation or administrative regulation. The disputes are usually over the problem, the solution, its impact, or other possible solutions. Furthermore, the disputes involve deeply held values, interests, money and, at some point, authoritative coercion. Most actors present evidence that supports their view in order to distort the situation to their advantage. It is through this process that electronic government is shaped and it is, therefore, essential to understand it. According to Wihlborg (2011a), it is important to make visible the motives and forces of change that contribute to changes in society. Electronic government research lacks knowledge about this. Existing research has investigated closely related issues, but the majority of studies have seen ideas as coming from the top, with the work performed from the bottom, rather than as a process of mutual shaping between the two.

In this thesis, I examine how electronic government ideas transform in policy and practice according to a governance perspective. Drawing upon findings in political science about the policy process, it becomes clear that policies impact on practice and that practice impacts on policy making. This is a process of vagueness which I bring out into the light to discuss and create a nuanced and detailed picture. Through doing this, I provide an understanding of the policy process and how it impacts on electronic government. Thus, I have studied two empirical electronic government cases that have the goal of transforming the public sector in some way. In the first study, the goal was health care integration and in the second study, the goal was a more open local government. In the analysis, I draw upon the concept of policy entrepreneurship. The study of policy entrepreneurship is related to the shift from a government focus to a governance perspective on public policy. One contribution of this thesis is, there-
by, to show how using the lens of policy entrepreneurship contributes to making more visible the motives and forces of change that contribute to changes in society. I developed an analytical framework that can be used for this. In so doing, I have provided a tool for examining governance processes. Furthermore, this thesis contributes by providing some additional insights into the phenomenon of the abandonment of ideas in electronic government in favor of other similar ideas. For example, Bannister and Connolly (2012) said that the success of electronic government lies in understanding this phenomenon. My research has shown that, through using the policy entrepreneurship lens, insights into understanding this phenomenon are gained. In summation, in this thesis I aim to examine the policy process through using the lens of policy entrepreneurship to understand how governance impacts on electronic government.
2. Electronic government and governance

In this thesis, I focus my attention on ambitious electronic government ideas and the role of governance in the shaping of these ideas. To put these ideas into context I will briefly touch upon different perspectives on electronic government to bring some light to what electronic government is or is perceived to be. Electronic government may refer to narrower or broader areas (Torres et al., 2006). The narrow approach often focuses on service delivery, such as the electronic delivery of government information, while the broader approach embraces the whole range of issues related to ICTs’ capacity to transform public administration (ibid). Below are two different definitions:

Def. “Electronic government is simply using information technology to deliver government services directly to the customer 24/7. The customer can be a citizen, a business or even another government entity” (CNN Tech, 2000).

Def. “The term “electronic government” focuses on the use of new information and communication technologies (ICTs) by governments as applied to the full range of government functions. In particular, the networking potential offered by the Internet and related technologies has the potential to transform the structures and operation of government” (OECD, 2001).

The different outlooks can be explained by the motives of the organizations that present them. CNN Tech has the aim of providing the latest technology news while the OECD has the aim of economic co-operation and development. In 2003, the OECD made an attempt to classify electronic government. According to this classification, there are four types of definition. The first concerns online service delivery. The second concerns the use of ICTs in government. In the third type, electronic government is defined as a capacity to transform public administration. Thus, this definition deals with how a new form of government can be built around ICTs. The fourth definition focuses on how electronic government can be used to achieve “better government” (OECD, 2003). Consequently, the last definition takes on an external perspective, as better government must be measured from the outside, in terms of what good it does for society (Grönlund, 2010).

Hence, electronic government can be divided into two groups. The first involves projects that aim to make daily operations within an organization more efficient without changing the rationale of this organization (Grön-
The second involves more ambitious projects that are part of a goal to reform the way the public sector operates at a fundamental level (ibid). The ideas in the second group can, in turn, be divided into two categories: integration and governance (Bannister & Connolly, 2012). All these ideas are aimed at changing how the public sector operates. Ideas related to integration are, for instance, desiloisation, interoperability, the one-stop shop, seamless government and portals. They are part of a wider picture of joined-up government or whole-of-government. In the second group, governance ideas, e-collaboration, e-consultation, e-participation, e-voting and on-line voting are common examples. The ideas in this group include such concepts as deliberative democracy and creative commons (ibid). The perspective on governance here is, hence, more wide ranging than just policy making. In essence, what is meant by electronic government and governance is not clear-cut. The meaning of electronic government is discursive; electronic government is a politically constructed concept seen as a core issue in public administration (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010).

2.1 A historical outlook on the pursuit for reform

Governments have been using computers since around the 1950s, but it was when governments “discovered” the Internet and its potential that the research field of electronic government was created (Bannister & Connolly, 2012). Electronic government is, consequently, a relatively new phenomenon (usually the perception is that it emerged in the 1990s). However, the visions related to electronic government are not new. Since the 1980s, the public sector has been the target of several reform agendas aiming to change the way the public sector works through the use of information and communication technologies (van Veestra, 2012). The drive for reform is due to dissatisfaction with the organizational logic of bureaucracy, the most common form of government administration, as this logic is considered to inhibit change. Thus, in the 1980s, the reform agenda known as New Public Management gained attention. The goal of New Public Management was decentralization, as this was believed to make the public sector more flexible. It was seen that ICTs could support a decentralized organizational structure and the use of ICTs thereby became, intertwined with these objectives (ibid).

New Public Management did not, however, live up to expectations (van Veestra, 2012). On the contrary, there was greater fragmentation as individual government agencies were now only accountable for their own
activities and tasks. The outcome was an increase in stovepipes (organizational borders constituting barriers to cooperation) instead of enhanced coordination. Consequently, there was a theory-practice discrepancy or a rhetoric-reality gap (ibid). However, a lesson learned from New Public Management was that more attention should be given to the concept of public value, which is the driving force behind the current reform agenda. This agenda has been called many different names: for example, Public Value Management (van Veestra, 2012), New Public Service (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2000), New Public Administration (Bourgton, 2007) and Digital-Era Governance (Dunleavy et al., 2005). However, the concept of public value lacks a theoretical grounding (van Veestra, 2012). Its nature is not firmly established. However, when talking about it there does seem to be a general idea of “delivering common good outcomes”.

If we look at the faith in technology to contribute to public sector reform, this faith has existed for at least 50 years and can be traced back to Leavitt and Whisler (1958). The desired transformation has been defined as “multi-level, multi-dimensional, and long-term organizational change, through the implementation of IT for reform purposes in order to achieve a situation that is qualitatively different than before” (van Veestra, 2012). The promise of this transformation has been repeated over and over in the literature (for example, Irani et al., 2007), but according to many there is no empirical evidence of it (Bannister & Connolly, 2012; Lips, 2012; Heeks & Bailur, 2007; Andersen & Henriksen, 2005; Grönlund 2005). On the contrary, those researchers who have opposed this transformation have said that, historically, the innovations used in electronic government have been more instrumental than transformative and that few of the reforms carried out have gone beyond the improving existing business systems and processes. To make it happen, it has been considered important to see government and citizens as one decision-making entity, i.e. to get away from the view that government is a service provider and citizens are customers (Heidelberger, 2009). Accordingly, citizens should take part in and guide the development (ibid).

One problem is, however, that independent silos of government have existed for the past 150 years, and they have done so because they are a natural part of government administration (Lips, 2012). Generally speaking, we are eager to identify societal transformation and we like to believe in a better future (Beniger, 1986). For instance, Castells (2005) stated that we are mentally framed in an evolutionary view of human development. We come from the Enlightenment, we are led by reason and equipped with
technology, we evolve from the agricultural society to the industrial society and thereafter to the post-industrial society (which has been called many names) and it is here that humans will finally have their “dignified dwelling” (Castells, 2005).

Transforming society is, however, a daunting task. Nevertheless, people in general seem to be very fond of the idea of transformation. During the period 1950 to 1984, James Beniger (1986) identified no fewer than 75 named and believed transformations. Some of these are: the computer revolution (1962), the technological society (1964), the communications age (1975) and the information society (1981). Belief in ICTs is widespread and includes radically different views, promises and conclusions.

When it comes to the current reform agenda, it is presented as a solution that can overcome problems of both bureaucracy and New Public Management. It will do so by focusing on creating public value that benefits society as a whole (van Veestra, 2012). This value should be defined in such a way that it has meaning for people, rather than being what a public sector decision maker might presume is the best for citizens (ibid). According to Hui and Hayllar (2010), governments tend to act on their own authority without significant and genuine engagement with those who ultimately will pay for and collectively benefit from their services, i.e. the citizens. Consequently, a move towards better and more accountable governance is necessary. Hui and Hayllar (2010) advocated bottom-up approaches. By these, they refer to citizens’ initiatives, i.e. initiatives that really do start from the bottom and move up. Change must be driven by better feedback and citizens’ voices must be heard, they say, because top-down design can no longer meet the public’s expectations. On the contrary, a top-down approach creates a growing gap between what citizens expect from government and what they believe they are actually getting (ibid). Apparently, it is necessary to ask people what they value. In the current reform agenda, there is, therefore, a strong focus on citizenship and participation. Citizens will need to be part of the processes that determine what public value is (van Veestra, 2012; Hui & Hayllar, 2010).

Generally speaking, governments are early adopters and are at the cutting edge of ICT deployment (Bannister & Connolly, 2012). The European Union, in particular, is keen on investing in such efforts (ibid). However, as described, the history of electronic government has two sides: uncomplicated projects have resulted in many good services being offered to citizens, whilst more complicated projects have struggled (ibid). Since the 1990s, electronic government has, according to Bannister and Connolly,
left behind a trail of uncompleted projects. Furthermore, there has been a tendency to embrace new ideas and new technological developments before older ones have been fully exploited. Bannister and Connolly (2012) stated that the force that motivates and drives this is the fascination of governments with new technologies and ideas. The promise of the future is always more exciting to contemplate than the disappointments of the past. The result is a distraction from, or excuse for, avoiding having to deal with the challenges that earlier visions represent. “Old” ideas are downgraded or abandoned in the rush to adopt new ideas. However, these ideas do not necessarily offer any obvious better solutions to current problems than existing ones. Governments should therefore go back and complete the job, unless there is a really good reason not to. If the plans obviously are not going to work then, of course, they should be abandoned, but if they are good ideas they should be implemented properly. Governments should think holistically rather than having a technology fascination-driven mindset (ibid).

2.2 Interpretation of ideas

In the introduction, I said that I would bring some additional understanding to the phenomenon of the abandonment of ideas in electronic government in favor of other similar ideas. The relationship between this and my research aim is that I examine the policy process and how ideas of electronic government are transformed through governance and policy entrepreneurship. Visionary ideas, such as the ones presented in policies, have a dynamic and cyclical nature (Røvik, 2000). Røvik (2000) talked about the symbolic value of ideas. Ideas with great symbolic value for widespread norms spread quickly; these can include norms of rationality, efficiency, effectiveness, development, democracy and so on. Such ideas are often met with enthusiasm because they represent a “package” that offers a contemporary problem description. Røvik stated that these ideas are on a journey; they have limited duration and are durable as role models for a limited period. Ideas arise and spread, then lose ground and are replaced by new similar ideas that are just presented in a different way (ibid). In terms of electronic government, this phenomenon has been noted by several researchers. For example, Ilshammar et al. (2005) noted that even though the meanings ascribed to computers, the political visions, and the main arguments have changed over time, the plans for action have always remained the same. Ilshammar et al., therefore, talked about electronic government as “old wine in new bottles”. Namely, the arguments for elec-
Electronic government have remained the same, even though technology has undergone revolutionary progress and transformation. The periods noted were the 1960s, 1980s, and the time around the turn of the Millennium (ibid). Through all these time periods, the same solutions were presented, in essence. Rövik (2000) gave two explanations as to why ideas have this dynamic and cyclical nature: the first is that old ideas are replaced by those that are even better and which outclass the old ideas; the second is that the problem scenario has changed and therefore requires new solutions.

Globalization has an impact through the wide dissemination of many ideas (Rövik, 2000). When these ideas are received, they need to be translated. There are few connections between the “world of the ideas” and the actual actions carried out when these ideas are put into practice. Many ideas are unstable, inconsistent, and overlapping (ibid). Drawing upon Rövik’s findings, Giritli-Nygren and Lindblad-Gidlund (2009) incorporated this thinking into electronic government. The potential of electronic government is great. What is talked about is that every promised benefit can be realized. We can have both increased efficiency and improved quality, simultaneously. Hence, there is no talk of contradictions between different goals (ibid). However, when put into practice these visions need to be interpreted. At every level, the people who carry out these diffusion processes interpret the idea (ibid). The interpretation process involves both grasping the next step as well as the essence of the idea itself. Nonetheless, the idea of electronic government in a local context is not necessarily (or even likely) to be the same as the idea of electronic government on a supra-national level or in another local context. Hence, operative leaders play an important role in translating the idea and adapting the “global mega-trend” to local conditions. The outcome is that the idea travels through different policy documents (ibid). To understand this process better, Giritli-Nygren and Lindblad-Gidlund (2009) spoke about people doing this as mediators of mega-trends. By studying leaders in this way, a deeper insight into the local interpretation processes of global mega-trends is gained. It is an enactment process that deals with how ideas become enacted. The idea of electronic government is vague; it does not provide clear directions for acting. Consequently, the way in which electronic government transforms depends on how local implementers interpret the original vision, and how the leaders transfer their perceptions into management strategies. This is an important circumstance to recognize, because
the way in which the overarching idea of electronic government is translated is significant for the overall implementation process (ibid).

2.3 Topical focus and development of electronic government research

Since its introduction there has been a dramatic growth in the volume of research output on electronic government (Scholl, 2014; Heeks & Bailur, 2007). Throughout this process, the electronic government research field has developed and matured substantially (Scholl, 2014). In 2007, Heeks and Bailur presented a very negative image of the state of electronic government research at that time. They said that electronic government research was, at that point, dominated by over-optimistic, a-theoretical work that had done little to accumulate either knowledge or practical guidance. They also argued that the research performed could be perceived as naive. In their review of existing research, they found that the majority of the researchers regarded ICTs as a good thing for government, even though there was lots of evidence of widespread costs and failure. This was completely ignored in the literature, which was explained to be due to the general hype surrounding the field. The conclusion was therefore drawn that many of the papers had an unbalanced positive and technological deterministic view1 (Heeks & Bailur, 2007).

Furthermore, Heeks and Bailur (2007) also found that the great majority of electronic government researchers appeared to undertake little fieldwork, with most of the papers showing a dominance of research methods that required no face-to-face engagement with the realities of electronic government. This was something that could potentially explain the absence of human, social and political elements in electronic government research, because many of the studies carried out at that time had a focus on technology (ibid). Heeks and Bailur (2007) explained the temptation to take “shortcuts” in terms of the area being something of a research gold rush. This had the implication that researchers were under strong time pressure and were tempted to do something quickly rather than do something well (ibid). One conclusion that can be drawn from such limited

---

1 According to technological determinism, technology is seen as a catalyst for change, technology acts upon the social world and any attempt to act upon technology is evidently bound to fail (Leonardi & Jackson, 2004). The key is the denial of social influences on technological development and a commitment to technology’s natural evolution (ibid).
electronic government research is, therefore, that it can only give some insights into what was happening in electronic government at that time, not why it was happening (Dawes, 2009). Yildiz (2007) argued, for instance, that there was a lack of process-oriented studies. He argued that the majority of studies were output- or outcome-oriented. For instance, during the first decade of research, there was a dominance of studies that focused on the observation and evaluation of the output of electronic government initiatives, such as the analysis of government agencies’ websites and online services (ibid). The studies conducted at that time had a strong focus on output instead of developing a deeper understanding about the processes leading to the outcome. Another typical result was the stage model, i.e. a model that describes the stages of electronic government development. The first model was presented by Layne and Lee in 2001. In their study, they argued that electronic government projects evolve through four stages: cataloguing, transaction, vertical and horizontal integration. Layne and Lee’s model has, however, been criticized for being oversimplified (Yildiz, 2007).

Following the presentation of this model, several researchers updated it to better correspond to the goals of electronic government. For example, Andersen and Henriksen (2006) proposed a re-orientation of the model, changing the focus from what is technically feasible to what is beneficial for the end-users. In addition, in 2010, Lee developed a meta-synthesis of twelve e-Government stage models. The goal was to provide a common frame of reference for understanding the developmental stages and perspectives reflected in different models and stages (ibid). This work was intended to be used as a conceptual frame for researchers to evaluate and use to understand the development of e-Government (ibid). However, stage models represent an evolutionary view of electronic government (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). Through this view, the perception is that various administrations are undergoing various stages of development before reaching the highest level (ibid). The consequence of this way of thinking is that the ultimate goal is seen as a foregone conclusion. Thus, less attention is given to finding an alternative development path (ibid).

2.4 Lack of examination of implications of governance on electronic government

In its infancy state, research on electronic government had limitations. As described in the introduction, the focus of research changed during the period 2009 to 2013 and the field matured (Scholl, 2014). Despite this,
there are still some important gaps to cover. According to Madsen et al. (2014), few studies have focused on the actions performed by public sector employees. This is a drawback because of the important role they play in electronic government (as described by Giritli-Nygren and Lindblad-Gidlund (2009)). The way in which electronic government is put into practice is in the hands of the people involved in this process and depends on their interpretation of the ideas. Adopting a governance perspective shows, however, that it is not enough to only study public sector employees, because governance refers to governing in collaboration between governmental and non-governmental actors.

Today, electronic government research covers a variety of topics, such as the task of making sense of electronic government (Giritli-Nygren & Lindblad-Gidlund, 2009; Torres et al., 2006), to conceptualize and describe the character of electronic government (Lee, 2010), how the research field of electronic government has developed (Scholl, 2014) and the examination of the quality and focus of the research as well as what good it does or does not do (Grönlund, 2010; Dawes, 2009; Heeks & Bailur, 2007; Yildiz, 2007). Some researchers have focused on examining the quest for transformation (van Veenstra, 2012; Lips, 2012). Others have looked at who is in charge and who should be in charge (Hui & Hayllar, 2010; Heidelberger, 2009). According to the current reform agenda, it is considered important to see government and citizens as one decision-making entity (Heidelberger, 2009). This relates to governance.

Researchers (Larsson, 2014; Yildiz 2007) have said that there is a need for more research that focuses on governance. Searching for the term ‘governance in electronic government’ shows, however, that there is actually quite a lot of research in electronic government that claims to have this focus. However, when examining the current state of knowledge related to this, I found that the view in electronic government is seldom “one entity”. Instead, it is more of a push and intervention that is initiated by governments and aimed at citizens. In electronic government research, the potential of ICTs to contribute to increased participation and collaboration has, indeed, been investigated. For example, Ojo (2010) stated that the provision of new technology functions as a tool in electronic governance for promoting greater participation. One conclusion that can be drawn from this is that ICTs allow governments to serve citizens. Thus, although the implementation of electronic government may meet initial resistance, it may also change the way that citizens and government relate to each other (Evans, 2006). Technology is perceived to be an enabler;
ICTs can be used to reshape governments’ relationships with citizens (Torres et al., 2006). Furthermore, governments’ portals can be used to facilitate communication between local government and citizens; through this, they can enable participation in collective decision-making (Sandoval-Almazan & Gil-Garcia, 2012). However, progress towards citizen engagement is slow (ibid). Many have found (for example, Wimmer, 2011) that governments struggle to effectively apply innovative technologies with regard to providing open collaboration. Hence, governments seek innovative ways of confronting the challenges of inclusion. In addition, electronic government interventions have been designed to communicate information, deliver services, and offer citizens and businesses additional avenues to interact with and participate in government (Quinn, 2010).

When electronic government research has examined governance it is, thus, usually from a top-down perspective. Included are how governance should be encouraged and stimulated, what interventions are needed, and how tools and services can be developed to increase participation in different ways. Hence, there is a focus on intervention and a push for change. This is not at all odd; the potential of ICTs should be examined to see how best ICTs can be used. Electronic government is about utilizing potential; it is a future-oriented discipline. However, this means that although electronic government research talks about governance, it does not study it. Hence, although existing research related to the involvement of non-governmental actors recognizes governance as a phenomenon, there is still a lack of studies that examine the processes of governance and the implications of governance for electronic government. A related research field is the field of e-participation. In e-participation, the focus is on the participation of citizens (Sæbø et al., 2008). However, groupings of citizens such as voluntary organizations, businesses, lobbyists and pressure groups are not the principal focus (ibid). Additionally, in e-participation, the implementation process is not the area of interest. In particular, the interest is on how electronic tools that have already been implemented can aid participation and collaboration (ibid). As seen, the research presented above has more in common with the research field of e-participation than electronic governance.

There are studies that examine bottom-up approaches to electronic government; what is lacking, however, is the involvement of actors other than governmental actors. For example, Giritli-Nygren and Lindblad-Gidlund (2009) both looked at institutional entrepreneurs (by which they mean organizational leaders with sufficient resources) and how they make sense
of electronic government goals. According to the findings drawn in this research, institutional entrepreneurs play an important role in the enactment process. The entrepreneurs’ imaginary feelings of agreement between their interpretations and the overarching idea make the steps through which the idea is turned into management strategies invisible, and this is considered to be a problem since it is a key in the process. They way in which institutional entrepreneurs understand their organization’s assignments, potential and limitations is, according to Giritli-Nygren and Lindblad-Gidlund (2009), of importance when making sense of electronic government.

Another example that examines bottom-up approaches is the examination of how public servants’ perceptions of their status within technical systems affect their action space (Lindblad-Gidlund & Giritli Nygren, 2011). Public servants are perceived to be crucial in putting transformation into practice, and this research has shown that their commitment to technology plays a crucial part in the implementation process. By way of explanation, the public servants’ formal position provides some action space, but this action space varies according to their position in relation to technology. ICTs create action space and, consequently, both the formal position and how the public servants position themselves in relation to technology impacts on the action space. ICTs give people the power to act and create a certain amount of action space outside the boundaries of formal position and power. However, people’s formal position affects their interpretation of technology; many in formal subordinate positions see themselves as having an active action strategy, while those in formal dominant positions have a passive relation with technology. Actors in subordinate positions need, however, to struggle and work hard to get anywhere. Thus, the findings in this article (ibid) confirm that much of the work is performed from the bottom up by dedicated people.

Nevertheless, to look at the bottom-up approach by studying only government actors is not enough. Viewing implementation from a governance perspective on policy making shows that more actors are involved in putting electronic government into practice. Consequently, they also affect, along with public servants. They make interpretations of the situation and they create the action space needed to be able to take part. Such actors have been called, for example, policy entrepreneurs and their actions have been studied in political science (by for example Wihlborg (2011a); Minn trom and Norman (2009) and Kingdon (1984)). In electronic government, however, there is a lack of research looking into this, i.e. there is a lack of...
research that adopts a governance perspective on policy making. The need for a new direction was highlighted by Yildiz (2007) who suggested that electronic government should to a greater extent address public administration concerns such as the politics-administration dichotomy, intergovernmental relations and governance in general. The first two of these, organizational and administrative concerns, have been investigated. With regard to governance, however, there is still a gap. There is some research that has studied the phenomenon of governance, but with regard to governance processes and governance impact on policy making such research is scarce in comparison with the common focus on government actors’ work and top-down initiatives. Accordingly, when examining governing in collaboration, the focus has mainly been on government actors and, when examining the involvement of non-governmental actors, the research has focused on governments’ interventions for increased participation, i.e. they have lacked the governing in collaboration aspect. What is needed, therefore, are studies that examine the intersection between the two.

Electronic government research should examine the potential of ICTs. However, there is a need to understand the implications of governance. Electronic government is not “delivered” to citizens. There is perhaps an overarching idea, and tools for participation can be provided, but electronic government is not determined by governments. It is not a top-down approach and there is, therefore, a need to create understanding about the processes through which electronic government actually occurs. One way of acquiring the knowledge that I am seeking is by looking at the concept of policy entrepreneurship. Policy entrepreneurs are considered to be essential actors in contributing to change in governance settings. Policy entrepreneurship is therefore a suitable lens to apply. However, when searching for existing research with this focus, I found few examples.

One example is the research carried out by Chen et al. (2013). According to his research, few electronic government projects have the potential to achieve the public innovation diffusion goal. To succeed, implementation should be carried out in a decentralized manner and the right change agent should be assigned to the project. The reason is that the burden on the change agent is tremendous. Therefore, Chen et al. (2013) highlighted the need for policy entrepreneurs, saying that they have the characteristics needed to push through innovation, despite there being few material rewards. Hence, Chen et al. (2013) recognized the need for policy entrepreneurs, but still considered projects to be assigned.
Another study of the role of policy entrepreneurs in contributing to electronic government has been put forward by Mele (2008). She focused on examining why programmes for change start and how they operate. Hence, her research has the process focus needed. The location for her study was Italy and, despite political instability, the studied change program did not fall apart. This could be explained by the transformation in the way the change programme was perceived during its existence. In the beginning, the change programme was perceived as being technical. Later, it transformed into a change programme for increased transparency, country competitiveness, and bureaucratic reform. Through this transformation support for the status quo, i.e. resistance for change, turned into support for change. This change of support and the changing perception of the programme were thought to be due to a considerable set of activities performed by policy entrepreneurs.

In summation, there is a lack of research that examines governance processes in electronic government. Such research could be performed by applying the lens of policy entrepreneurship. In this thesis, I develop an analytical framework that can perform this task. By doing so, I provide a tool for examining governance processes. Furthermore, I also use this tool to examine how policy entrepreneurship impacts on policy making. Regarding continuity in research, this thesis also provides some additional understanding regarding a phenomenon previously examined by Bannister and Connolly (2012). The phenomenon relates to why some electronic government ideas are downgraded or abandoned in favor of new ideas that either do different things or offer obviously better solutions to current problems. Some explanations of this phenomenon have been provided. I discuss these explanations in relation to my own findings.
3. The political context and policy entrepreneurship

In this chapter, I give an overview of policy analysis literature to provide the theoretical foundation of this thesis. The topical focus is on describing the policy process, its involved actors, and how the political context has developed from traditional government to one in which there is greater governance involvement. Today, more actors are involved in the policy process and this contributes to increased complexity. In the postwar era in Western societies, the official setting for policy making was representative democracy, a differentiation between politics and bureaucracy and the idea that policy making should be based on expert knowledge (Hajer, 2003). As presented in the introduction, in early literature on public administration the politics-administration dichotomy was explained in terms of politicians making policy decisions and assigning implementation to government agencies (Wilson 1887). This is not how it works in practice (Sannerstedt, 2001; Svara, 2006). This view distinguishes the decision-making process from the implementation process; however, in practice, the implementation process usually involves a chain of decision-making processes (Sannerstedt, 2001).

3.1 The policy process

Sabatier (2007) described public policy making as a process in which problems are conceptualized, then brought to government for a solution to be found and alternative solutions are formulated. This process results in a selection of the best alternatives, which are captured as a policy. The policy is thereafter implemented and evaluated. This is the rational view of the policy process (ibid). In this model, goals are formulated before the means are considered. The policy developed is the one considered to be the best strategy to achieve the goals and the policy is based on a complete analysis in which all possible alternatives have been considered. Sabatier is critical to this process. In this view of the policy process, theories and research play an important role (ibid). However, there are also other views. Lindblom (1959) talked about the incremental model in which goals and means are considered collectively. The policy selected is the one that all actors agree upon (a decision based on consensus). The ambition is a good policy rather than the best policy, and the formulation of that policy is based on comparisons with similar policy problems.

To understand the policy process is not easy. As described in the introduction, the process of public policy making is very complex and could,
Governments in control? Potentially, involve hundreds of different actors with different goals, perceptions of the situation, and policy preferences (Sabatier, 2007). Consequently, policy disputes are inevitable; most actors will present evidence that supports their view to distort the situation to their advantage. To make it even more complicated, the time span of policy processes extends over a decade or more. Thus, a decade is the minimum duration of policy cycles (since a policy cycle consists of problem definition, implementation and evaluation). The process is, indeed, complicated and difficult to understand (ibid). In addition, the political process varies depending on the level of government and country (Svara, 2006). The governmental structure, political dynamics, and cultural values are different in different countries. Nevertheless, one central aspect to understanding the process is to examine the relationship between the different actors involved (ibid). In this chapter, I therefore provide a theoretical foundation for this. First, I focus on the relationship between politicians and administrators, who are the main actors according to the government perspective. Thereafter, I widen the scope by looking at policy entrepreneurship, an essential lens when studying governance (Mintrom & Norman, 2009). Thus, the quality of policy making, the consistency between policy intent and the impact of policies when implemented, and the effectiveness, equity, and efficiency of the administrative process are affected by the nature of interaction and the relative influence of the actors involved (Svara, 2006).

3.2 Different relationships between politicians and administrators

Svara (2006) has reviewed the literature related to the relationship between politicians and administrators in the political process. The outcome of this is the identification of four standard models: 1) The separate roles model, 2) The autonomous roles model, 3) The responsive administrator model, and 4) The overlapping roles model. In practice, however, there is usually a combination of the models. Formally, in all democratic government structures politicians occupy a superior position to the top administrator; however, the actual working relationship can take on different characteristics, from administrative subordination to high administrative independence and intermediate positions between these two extremes. It is important to recognize that the models present different outlooks on the same relationship; however, subordination does not necessarily mean political interference in administration, nor does high administrative independence mean that administrators are in control. The choice is not whether they are either subordinated or independent; they can be both.
The actual relationship can be characterized by mutual influence and interaction. Hence, in practice, it is more complicated. Rather than it being a case of one model or the other, we need to understand the different possible relationships that may exist, to provide this understanding the models are useful. The determination of separateness comes from examining roles and norms for behavior. Roles refer to the functions performed, such as making policy versus policy implementation, allocating resources versus managing resources and so on. When roles are separate, politicians make policies and administrators implement them. Furthermore, politicians allocate resources and administrators manage them. When roles overlap, both politicians and administrators perform these functions (ibid). It is important to look at the roles and consequences of different relationships because of their impact on legitimacy in decision-making.

The first model to be considered is the separate roles model. Strict separation, as presented by Wilson (1887) and Goodnow (1900), has often been presented as an ideal because differentiation between politics and administration defined in the strictest terms is hard to defend in practice. Whilst the underlying logic of the dichotomy concept can be accepted, its insistence on complete separation cannot. With, for example, Putnam’s (1975) “classical bureaucrats”, separation is not complete, but there is a difference in worldview between the politician and the administrator, and a clear differentiation of sphere. Nevertheless, in the separate roles model, administrators have an influence and their contribution to policy decisions is recognized (albeit in modest terms). According to the model, politicians bring values and administrators bring facts to the policy process (Aberbach et al., 1981). Politicians set goals, whilst administrators choose methods for meeting the objectives of these goals, i.e. administrators have an impact in that they choose strategies and they also have professional competence. They are perceived as being politically neutral. In this model there is a risk of important principles and sources of evidence being ignored. One example of this model in practice is New Public Management (the reform agenda presented in chapter two). New Public Management has most in common with this model.

The second model is the autonomous roles model. As in the separate roles model, administrators are perceived to be distant from politicians. However, in the autonomous roles model, administrators act on their own interest and have their own perceptions of public interest rather than that translated by politicians. According to this model, administrators (particularly at a local government level) cannot, reasonably be seen as under the
control of politicians. On the contrary, they can resist control and under-
mine the goals of political leaders (Golden, 2000). A common perception,
according to this model, is that administrators and bureaucracies are out
of control. They are unresponsive and self-interested, and the result is a
bureaucratic regime (Wood & Waterman, 1994).

The third model is the responsive administrator model. In contrast with
the previous two models the responsive administrator model lacks clear
separation between administrators and politicians. Administrators try to
please their political masters and politicians interfere in the administrative
sphere. Politicians can get involved in making decisions about policy im-
plementation, but more commonly administrators try to act in expected
and wished for ways. Politicians seek responsive competence and adminis-
trators have an interest in providing it. Hence, there is an expectation of
loyalty and administrators are expected to believe in political aims rather
than being neutral bureaucrats. One risk in this model is, therefore, the
risk of competence being sacrificed because of responsiveness (Alberbach
& Rockman, 1993).

In the fourth model, the overlapping roles model, there is a shared in-
fluence of politicians and administrators. This is the result of extensive
interaction, overlapping functions and reciprocal influence. Administrators
are involved in policy matters and politicians are involved in choices asso-
ciated with administration. In fact, Self (1972) has argued that none of the
standard bases for distinguishing the roles of administrators and politi-
cians hold up in practice. According to him, their roles always overlap.
Policy versus details, generalized rules versus specifics, and ends versus
means can involve both politicians and administrators dependent on cir-
cumstances. For local government to be effective, mutual understanding
and joint working are essential (Svara, 2006). Most local top administra-
tors believe that administrators should work to enable the municipality to
adapt to changes in society (Mouritzen & Svara, 2002). Hence, they
should be strategic leaders of their government and there is growing evi-
dence that administrators actually are entrepreneurs who introduce policy
innovation (Doig & Hargrove, 1990; Schneider & Teske, 1992). The
problems associated with this model are that the roles are unclear and that
it becomes uncertain as to which values guide actions, values presented by
the politicians or the administrators?
3.3 Legitimacy according to the government perspective

As described, the quality of policy making, the consistency between policy intent and the impact of policies when implemented, and the effectiveness, equity, and efficiency of the administrative process are affected by the nature of interaction and relative influence between politicians and administrators. When there is separation, administrators may be “ignored” and their advice excluded from decisions. This means that administrators are not just responsive, they are also “manipulated”. As described, administrators possess professional skills. Therefore, politicians and administrators must and should work together to promote effective and efficient administration (Farazmand, 1997). However, an extreme version of the overlapping roles model, where roles completely overlap, is as much a conceptual model as the separate roles model. In practice it does not need to be one case or the other; often the two exist in combination. Differentiation is important despite interaction, independence does not need to be accompanied by distance, and responsiveness is expected but does not necessarily undermine professionalism and independence (Svara, 2006). The models presented should, hence, be seen as models, and there is a need to accept that these characteristics can be combined and co-exist in practice. Commonly, politicians and administrators interact, but in ways that preserve the unique contribution of each set of actors (Svara & Brunet, 2003). Usually, top administrators have their own views of public interest and they are expected to advocate them when making recommendations. Hence, their knowledge is beneficial to the policy process and this is how their influence is legitimized. In practice, the administrators and politicians bring aspects of separation, responsiveness and autonomy in varying degrees to the fundamental condition of overlapping roles (Svara, 2006). The conventional view is that the separate model is the normative but, according to Mouritzen and Svara (2002), the overlapping roles model is actually the norm, a conclusion that is based on empirical evidence. Taking advantage of all possible skills and professionalism is beneficial to the policy process; however, the influence of administrators could also be problematic from a democratic point of view.

According to the autonomous roles model, administrators can act on their own interest and their own perceptions of public interest, rather than that translated by politicians. The result then is a bureaucratic regime because of the lack of control over administrators (Wood & Waterman, 1994). When administrators “control” politicians in a bureaucratic regime, the result is low political control and politicized administrators who
are openly and actively involved in the political sphere. This means that they can actually undermine the goals of political leaders (Golden, 2000), i.e., undermine goals that are democratically supported. If they act in a manner contrary to representative democracy, their power and influence can be problematic. Additionally, when administrators are actively involved in policy making it becomes unclear which values govern and who has the most power and influence. Nevertheless, when working as intended, shared influence is beneficial. Hajer (2003), for example, talked about deliberative policy analysis as: “a varied search for understandings of society to facilitate meaningful and legitimate political actions, agreed upon in mutual interaction, to improve our collective quality of life”. With regard to quality of life, he referred to the impacts of particular actions.

3.4 From government to governance

Today, the policy process is even more complicated in that it does not only involve politicians and administrators. Historically, three elements have been involved in defining policy making (Hajer, 2003). First, a stable political order has been assumed. Second, there should be knowledge produced in politics that is not political in itself, but scientific. Third, there should be interventions that are problem focused and aimed at changing the given course of events (ibid). However, society is changing and this has an impact on policy making. These requirements are no longer something that can be taken for granted. Today, policy making occurs, according to Hajer (2003), in an 'institutional void'. Here, Hajer (2003) referred to the fact that, on their own, the established institutional arrangements lack the power needed to deliver the requested and required policy results. They are, instead, part of a network of governance in which non-political actors play an increasingly important role (ibid).

The context of policy making is, consequently, expansive. Historically, it has been a nation-state concern. Nowadays, however, we can talk about a network society (Castells, 2005). The result is that legitimacy is constrained, because decisions that are formally legitimate can be questioned by people (not only politicians and administrators) who feel that they have a legitimate say in the matter (Hajer, 2003). Constitutionally, they have no rights, but they can still question legitimate decisions and, by doing so, make them no longer legitimate in a sense. This changing context has turned the relationship between policy and politics on its head. According to this perspective, policy is no longer the outcome of politics; politics is the result of policy initiatives made by the public (ibid).
These two different outlooks on public policy making are, as previously described, called government and governance (von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg, 2011). Government refers to the processes that involve politicians and administrators who are employed by the state to produce politics. Governance involves more actors and refers to governing in collaboration, i.e. the network control that is characteristic for contemporary Western society. Hence, governance creates a new arena for new forms of collaboration and ways of acting (ibid). Characteristically, governance relates to increased globalization, as well as local and regional self-government, increased flexibility for networks, market economic governance and seeing the citizen as a customer (Wihlborg, 2011a). Hence, governance changes the conditions for political engagement. In governance, politics is seldom focused on finding one solution that fits all; instead, different actors and organizations are given more opportunities to solve matters in a way they feel appropriate. Essential for governance structures is cooperation between different actors and networks, and an openness that allows different issues to be raised on the political agenda. In the political context, networks can be used both to organize political work and to govern and there are two ideal types of networks: issue networks and policy communities. Issue networks deals with issues (policy), whilst policy communities focus on changing political structures in general. However, few networks are one or the other; there is usually a mix. Issue networks deal with a certain issue over a limited period of time; policy communities aim to change structures and are usually stable over a longer period of time. One other distinguishing factor is that issue networks are usually more open to participation than policy communities (ibid).

Networks have always existed in the political context to develop new ideas, but their role today is to also shape and implement policies (von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg, 2011). Networks are a central part of contemporary political practice in Western societies and this challenges democratic ideals. In that regard, networks are normally open so that it is possible to leave them; however it is not always possible to get included in them (ibid). Hence, in networks, power is not equally distributed. Networks can keep actors shut out who could, if let in, have the ability to change things (von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg, 2011).

3.5 Policy change in contemporary western society
In general, policy making is problem oriented; it aims to address particular problems. When new challenges arise, changes are made to existing poli-
cies to handle these new challenges. Usually the changes are small and incremental, but they can also be major, when established systems are judged inadequate (Mintrom & Norman, 2009). This is, as previously explained, called policy change. Policy change in contemporary Western society is initiated by bottom-up approaches in some way (Mintrom & Norman, 2009; Olsson, 2009; Sabatier, 2007; Hajer, 2003). It is nowadays as much a result of the actions of citizens and enterprises than of direct government intervention (Hajer, 2003). Policy changes are no longer controlled from the top; they are the result of informal actors’ complex processes (Olsson, 2009). Values and beliefs play a crucial role in terms of their input in the policy process. Consequently, what can impact on policy change are shifts in policy core beliefs, rather than formal decision-making powers implemented from the top. In fact, from the top, values and beliefs are institutionalized and more or less taken for granted as long as the system works. The policy change processes are, therefore, usually initiated from the bottom and they are also typically systematic (Hajer, 2003).

According to Hajer (2003), polity is nowadays negotiated; it is the outcome of discursive interactions. Agenda-setting actions are performed in new political spaces. As such, unstable practices are created to solve problems that cannot be resolved by the established institutions in a way perceived to be legitimate and effective. The new actors involved intervene and deliberate to impose their will and, by so doing, they also change the institutional rules and norms of appropriate behaviour. Their impact has, thus, a double effect in changing the rules of the game (ibid).

An institutional void (a lack of the power of the established institutional arrangements to deliver the policy results on their own) is most obvious in new political themes such as environmental politics, genetics and biotechnology (Hajer, 2003). Today, there is a global information flow that imparts an awareness of what is going on to a larger number of people than before (Kirby, 2013). Information spreads quickly, particularly when it is sensitive. The outcome is that more people want to have a say in what is going on and this, in turn, means that governments no longer have a monopoly on decision-making. Pressure groups are using new strategies to achieve their goals (Hajer, 2003). Furthermore, there is a new spatiality of policy making and politics. Today, governance is multi-level and, characteristic of this, involves cooperation between different levels. Multi-level governance is not hierarchical, which means that intervention can be applied to different levels. Thus, the person or organization that intervenes is able to choose the level perceived to be most effective (Wihlborg, 2011a;
Mintrom & Norman, 2009; Hajer, 2003). It was the European Union that gave civil society a new entry point into politics and the European Union is known for 'big business' (Hajer, 2003). To make policy making even more complicated, it can no longer call for a scientific investigation to be carried out to resolve complex problems, because scientific expertise cannot, according to Hajer (2003), be regarded as absolutely reliable.

3.6 Policy entrepreneurship

Policy change is, consequently, the diffusion of new solutions. One way of explaining policy change is through the concept of policy entrepreneurs (Mintrom & Norman, 2009). The concept of entrepreneur comes from the technology and business context (von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg, 2011). The "traditional" entrepreneur's motive is usually to earn money, start businesses, and/or engage in personal development. Being entrepreneurial is to be a role model. An entrepreneur's commitment does not, however, have to revolve around earning money. It could just as well be ideological; for instance, working for animal rights, starting sports clubs or forming cooperative kindergartens. These activities are usually performed by social entrepreneurs and such work is performed on the edges of the political sphere (ibid).

As described, today's politics is much more complex than "traditional government" and when politics is viewed from a governance perspective, the need for entrepreneurs increases. It is, thus, essential that someone promotes and drives change when politics allow for it (von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg, 2011). Hence, governance opens up a new form of entrepreneur. In international research, policy entrepreneurship has been discussed since the 1980s. The concept was launched by Kingdon (1984) and Schneider and Teske (1992) to create an understanding of how Kingdon's idea of "windows of opportunities" could be applied. Kingdon (1984) argued that policy entrepreneurship plays an essential role in putting issues on the political agenda. Research on policy entrepreneurship was later taken up by Mintrom (1997). When Kingdon (1984) talked about policy entrepreneurship, he was vague and imprecise and his theories have, therefore, been considered difficult to apply in practice. In this thesis, I have, therefore, mainly used the literature by Mintrom and Norman (2009) and Wihlborg (2011a) to explain policy entrepreneurship.

According to Mintrom and Norman (2009), a policy entrepreneur is a person who advocates policy change. It could, for instance, be an actor seeking to participate in policy making through influencing decision mak-
ers. One particular distinguishing feature of policy entrepreneurs is the person’s desire to significantly change the current ways of doing things in the area of interest. A policy entrepreneur is, hence, a change agent and a driving force for action (ibid). This view has also been promoted by Wihlborg (2011a). Thus, characteristic of entrepreneurs is an emphasis on doing new things, either to implement changes or start new businesses (von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg, 2011). Entrepreneurship (an entrepreneur’s activities and business conditions) can be divided into two categories: entrepreneurship by necessity and entrepreneurship by opportunity (Schumpeter, 1943). Both necessity and opportunity are motives for change. Entrepreneurship is, thus, never characterized by “business as usual”; this is something on which entrepreneurship research is completely unanimous (Schumpeter and followers).

In the same spirit as the traditional view on entrepreneurs, policy entrepreneurs are motivated and dedicated people who, through involving others, manage to initiate change (Mintrom & Norman, 2009). Policy entrepreneurs are individuals or small teams that draw attention to policy problems to initiate policy change. However, to get anywhere, many actors need to get involved; consequently, policy entrepreneurs need to be convincing. Policy change could, of course, be initiated for other reasons, but often policy entrepreneurs are involved, especially when change aims to disrupt the established way of doing things. In essence, if the changes are small they are probably not brought about by policy entrepreneurs, but if they are major they probably are. Policy entrepreneurs have a willingness to invest their resources, time, energy, reputation and sometimes even money in the hope of future returns, such as for career progression. They take advantage of “windows of opportunity” and, consequently, they need to be sensitive to timing issues; opportunities must be recognized. To succeed, policy entrepreneurs operate in networks, because they need a good understanding of the policy context. They need to understand the context without being so involved that they lose their critical perspective and motives for promoting change. Therefore, they form teams consisting of both insiders and outsiders. To gain support, they build momentum for change through presenting evidence that a crisis is at hand and by highlighting failures of current policy settings. To solve this crisis and any problems, they present innovative solutions, build coalitions of supporters and secure legislative action. They do this by demonstrating the workability of a policy proposal, i.e. they take an idea and turn it into action. The aim is to influence actors with decision-making powers such as presidents, gover-
nors, legislators, council members, bureaucrats and so on. Legislators, for example, are influenced by making them focus on the consequences of inaction instead of the consequences of action (ibid).

Politics is about policy content and the structure in which a policy was created (Wihlborg, 2011a). The policy entrepreneur can impact on policy in both these respects. Their motives are to promote a certain view or a common good (in contrast with the business entrepreneur whose motive is usually to earn money). Hence, policy entrepreneurs challenge and overturn structures and norms. The result is the creation of new activities and new structures that are considered (by those creating them) to better correspond to contemporary society’s functional requirements (ibid).

One particularly frustrating inhibitor for policy entrepreneurs is incrementalism, i.e. change happening in small steps (Mintrom & Norman, 2009). The strategy in such settings is to keep track of small victories and explain to supporters how these small steps will, eventually, result in the desired outcome. When policy change appears blocked at one level, policy entrepreneurs usually try another. Actually, despite what has been said, policy change usually occurs incrementally. In contrast with policy entrepreneurs are people who promote positive images of current policy settings and, in so doing, promote stability (ibid).

Policy entrepreneurs can be located in or out of government, in elected or appointed positions, in interest groups or research organizations (Mintrom & Norman, 2009). The actions of policy entrepreneurs do follow certain patterns: 1) they draw attention to policy problems, 2) they present innovative policy solutions, 3) they build coalitions of supporters, and 4) they secure legislative action (ibid). Policy entrepreneurs frequently push the limits of the law in innovative ways to make things that are impossible today possible over the longer term (von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg, 2011).

General research on policy entrepreneurship does not make a distinction between different types of “policy” entrepreneurs. However, Wihlborg (2011a) has made a distinction between entrepreneurs in policy and entrepreneurs in politics. In particular, she referred to the two ideal types of governance networks (as presented in 3.4), saying that entrepreneurs can feel passionate about either the cause or the political structures. If an entrepreneur acts in a political way to create new structures and opportunities for others, then they can be seen as a political entrepreneur. If their focus is more on developing a specific issue (policy content), then they can be seen as a policy entrepreneur. However, a policy entrepreneur...
can be transformed into a political entrepreneur during the policy-making process through the knowledge gained about the political context. To understand entrepreneurship in policy and politics, it is important to consider the role played by time and space (ibid). The amount of attention paid to a certain issue can depend on its level and, as previously explained, in multi-level governance an actor can choose the level most suitable for the cause. Hence, governance gives actors the opportunity to act in an untraditional way; the person acting does not have to act according to given structures. Policy entrepreneurs usually operate on a local level, because knowledge of the local context is important for them. Policy entrepreneurs cannot, therefore, be moved and be entrepreneurial from some other place, as local knowledge and local trust are prerequisites for them to dare to be entrepreneurial. Political entrepreneurs, on the contrary, may be able to be entrepreneurial outside their local context because of their more general knowledge of the political structures. It is important for entrepreneurs to have the guts to change and this emphasizes the importance of trust. There has to be trust for the other members of the network as well as for the political structures. This is why ‘best practice’ is difficult when it comes to entrepreneurship in policy and politics, why entrepreneurship cannot be taken out of context, and why entrepreneurs’ actions cannot be generalized. However, one thing that can be generalized is that there is often a forgiving attitude towards entrepreneurs. The general attitude is that they contribute to something good, and minor errors and unexpected behavior can, therefore, be excused. This is one important part of entrepreneurship, as it allows for entrepreneurs to dare to be different (ibid).

Nevertheless, as in the government perspective, there has to be legitimacy; someone must be responsible for the work carried out. However, the more that society and politics are characterized by governance, the more difficult it becomes to determine who is responsible for what (Wihlborg, 2011b). In government structures, responsibility is clearly defined. Most commonly there is hierarchical responsibility, which means that whilst the person at the top of a hierarchy has the responsibility, people below have a personal responsibility to act according to principles established in the hierarchy. There can also be collective responsibility, when a whole organization or a group of people together has responsibility. This applies to, for example, municipalities. In contrast with the clear responsibility structure in the government perspective, when policy entrepreneurs are involved there are seldom clear hierarchies; instead, the work must be meas-
ured and evaluated based on clearly defined goals. Goals in policies are usually not clear, but when policy goals are implemented this is usually performed in projects; hence, to create projects is a way that concretizes policy goals. In governance structures, project work is more common than in government structures and it is, therefore, according to Wihlborg (2011b), more clear what to do in governance than in government. In government, the work is more or less everything related to public administration. In governance, the goals are specified in more clearly defined projects.

3.6.1 Regulation of self-regulation
To govern an entrepreneur is, actually, a self-contradiction (Wihlborg, 2011b). The essence of entrepreneurship is to do something in a different way, to be innovative and then no one else can be in control (ibid). However, networks are expected to coordinate their efforts; the responsibility that they do so lies, however, on the networks themselves (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). As presented, governance can contribute with a lot of benefits, for example, it can carry out important change processes that government actors and institutions cannot do on their own. Through governance, there is openness for many issues and solutions to be placed on the political agenda; to have a comprehensive view on what is happening is therefore difficult and this, in turn, means that having a strategic approach to the work is easier said than done. Nevertheless, to let actors in networks drift away and act completely without governing is something that should be avoided; the work carried out in networks should not lose connection with the political decision-making process (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). Still, there is a very fine balance act in this. The networks’ strength is that they are self-organizing and self-governing and, accordingly, the challenge for anyone trying to control these networks is to provide strategic government without undermining autonomy (ibid). To do this calls for different management strategies other than mere regulation and order from a government (ibid).

Löfgren and Sørensen (2010) talked about the meta-control of networks; by this, they referred to “regulation of self-regulation” to make the networks coordinate their efforts. This is perceived to be a way to combine decentralized and self-organized networks with a centralized strategic leadership in an age characterized by a fragmented public administration (ibid). For this, there are both passive and active strategies that can be used and these strategies could both aim to set the agenda and to support
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the work without affecting the content. These strategies are not competing but supplementary. In essence, meta-control is about communicating some limits to the otherwise self-organized networks (ibid).

Some passive approaches are, for example, that a political leadership can pronounce some overarching policy objectives that the network will try to fulfill and, in so doing, make the networks co-responsible for meeting the political objectives (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). In policies, the importance of consensus is provoked and, through this, the networks are gently pushed in a certain direction. In addition to this, there could also be the allocation of administrative resources that the networks can freely dispose of in order to reach the overarching objectives. These strategies are passive and characterized by a low level of intervention. A low level of intervention also applies to influence through discursive narratives. Through discursive narratives, the network is allowed to operate in peace, but the content is affected along with the composition of actors. When using discursive narratives an effective approach is to tell about a “new age”, to create a systematically arranged representation of reality. Using a high production of future visions creates, namely, a common understanding of where we are going and why. The aim is, hence, to inspire self-governing networks with mental images that bring up classic dilemmas in public administration, such as availability, customer orientation, cost-effectiveness, aging of the population, and so on. Such mental images produce a story that the actors can relate to, and they create meaning and identity. Conferences, for instance, can be a way to disseminate a certain language and perspective. Furthermore, funding opportunities for public and private actors to create networks for research and development in public administration can be offered and, in so doing, set the agenda of the work. Meta-control of networks could also be applied through performance measurement, which is a way to ensure that the network actors are aware of what is desirable; competition can get actors to work in a certain direction. This approach applies, hence, to the actors’ competitive spirit. However, this can also result in the pursuit of a place at the top of the measurements rather than to develop services of use. Finally, one last passive strategy is to develop technical and organizational standards that the networks directly or indirectly are forced to follow (ibid).

Besides passive strategies, there could also be active strategies (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). Networks are based on negotiations between the involved actors and this means that they are unstable and that there is a risk of failure. The networks must be able to manage internal conflicts and
active support from political leaders can facilitate this process by mediating, initiating contacts and the provision of administrative support. These strategies mean involvement in the work; however, this involvement is performed without trying to impose a personal agenda. Hence, it is a low degree of intervention aiming at supporting existing work, i.e. to get the network to work. Support for networking through the creation of groups is common in electronic government. In this strategy a political leadership takes the first steps; thereafter the political leadership steps back and leaves the work to the network (ibid). Thus, the political leadership controls who should be in the network.

Another active strategy is when the political leadership actively participates in the work of the network through taking part in debates and negotiations to explain the overarching objectives (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). However, such involvement raises some dilemmas because these actors usually have more power than the other actors, which means that they can dominate negotiations and thus undermine the negotiating climate and culture of cooperation that characterizes networks. Hence, direct participation means a balancing act, overregulation challenges the self-organization of the network, while a low level of regulation may mean that the political leadership loses the ability to influence. Active participation in networks is, however, unusual in the Scandinavian context of electronic government. The political leadership usually stands outside; if they participate, they do so in a limited and advisory way (ibid). The reason is that if the consensus within the network is jeopardized this can have the consequence that members withdraw from the network.

### 3.6.2 Legitimacy and democracy

To control networks is complicated and it is even more challenging to aim for the democratic control of networks (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). Seen from a representative view of democracy, network governance undermines representativeness (ibid). However, networks are not necessarily a threat to democracy; rather, they can be seen as a supplement, something that connects disconnected devices in the political system. They can function as a way to build bridges between civil society and representative political decision-making, which is a different view of what is considered to be democratic and strictly representative. If a network is considered to be democratic it should be in the control of a democratically elected politician who uses some of the strategies available for meta-control of the network. Furthermore, the network control must also be democratically
based, i.e. various interests involved should have the opportunity to influence the choice of representatives, and prevent representatives from running their own personal agendas. Additionally, citizens should have the opportunity to hold the network accountable for its actions, and the network must be transparent. In essence, there should be opportunity for dialogue between citizens and the network, and the network should be open to the influence of the views of citizens. In addition, internal processes should be subject to democratic demands. These requirements are, however, not realistic demands; neither is it desirable that all these requirements are met. In electronic government practice, networks do not live up to these demands; in fact, politicians rarely have much to say about electronic government because it is mainly a technical issue for engineers and officials (ibid).

As described, actors in networks play an important part in contemporary policy making and, when they do so, democratic ideals are challenged. This raises the question of equality. For example, can anyone do this? The answer is no. Networks can include actors from the public, private and voluntary sectors, or sometimes only public actors. Usually, networks are open in that it is possible to leave them, but it is not always possible to become included in them. Hence, power is not equally distributed. Which actors should be included could be dictated, or they could be self-organized, consisting of a group of people that knows and trusts each other. Clearly, governance impacts on the policy process in many ways and, through governance, it gets blurry about whose values guide actions.
4. Research method

In the previous chapter, I gave an account of the theoretical foundation in this thesis. Now, I will present the research process, i.e. how I have worked with this theoretical framework and my cases to develop findings to address the identified research gap. In this first part of this chapter I give an introduction into the research process, thereafter in the following subsections I go more into detail about it.

Concerning research philosophy, I have applied the interpretive perspective and, concerning method, I have applied two qualitative case studies: one ethnographic case study and one storytelling case study. Interpretive research does not aim to state how things are on a general scale; it is aimed at understanding a phenomenon through the meanings that people assign to it (Myers & Avison, 2002). This perspective has, therefore, received some criticism. Researchers in interpretive traditions have been called journalists or soft researchers (Koch, 1998). In information systems (IS) research the criteria of positivism have been applied to interpretivism, which has weakened the claims of interpretivism and attention has been drawn to the method rather than the interpretation (Yates, 2003). Positivist research provides a clear path as to how the quality of the research should be evaluated (Richardson & Coulthard, 2005). For interpretivism, the path is not all that clear (ibid).

To find the right criteria for interpretive research, there is a need to turn to the origins of qualitative research (Richardson & Coulthard, 2005). Qualitative research originated in anthropology and sociology and it is key in such research to develop understanding. However, the pursuit of understanding is an unending activity in constant change and variation. Social reality and our knowledge of it is something negotiated; it is an outcome of mediation that implies a need to capture the sayings and doings of people (ibid). Furthermore, we must also understand ourselves. Understanding is how we gain knowledge and we understand from whom we are. Consequently, we cannot separate the two (ibid). Subjectivity is, hence, important in interpretive research. People are part of their stories and this is something that must be recognized. When we share stories, we are transformed. We may share our story, and a new story emerges and we gain understanding. In interpretive research in general, and in storytelling research in particular, there is a pursuit of multiple voices (Kendall & Kendall, 2012).
Furthermore, one suggestion presented has been that the quality of qualitative research should be evaluated from scientific rigor (the quality or state of being strict in conduct and believable) and practical relevance (Marton, 2013). Practical relevance is especially important in electronic government since it is a research field that is situated between the worlds of academia and practice. The debate of balance between scientific rigor and practical relevance has existed within the IS research field for some time now (ibid). IS researchers have paid great attention to scientific rigor in the pursuit to make IS accepted as an academic field and it has been at the cost of producing output that is relevant for IT professionals (Marton, 2013; Richardson & Coulthard, 2005). In this thesis, I have tried to keep this balance. My pursuit has been to describe the research process as transparently as possible (applies to scientific rigor) and I have tried to take the requirement for practical relevance seriously. Details about this will be provided in this chapter.

In case studies, a contemporary phenomenon is investigated in its real-life context and usually the boundaries between the phenomenon and context are not evident (ibid). The two case studies here were selected to fit the research focus. I have talked about two categories of electronic government: “small” and “big” ideas. Bannister and Connolly (2012) have grouped electronic government’s “big ideas” into two broad groups: integration and governance. The two cases that I studied correspond to both groups: The first case was aiming at implementing an electronic health record in Swedish health care. This case involved several of the ideas in the integration group. Actually, it related to both desiloisation and interoperability; desiloisation because of the pursuit to enable a horizontal work flow in the vertically oriented health care structure and interoperability through the sharing of patient data over health care boundaries and systems. The second case aimed to make local government more open through the availability of open public data. I placed this project in the governance group (according to Bannister and Connolly’s definition of governance), because of the pursuit of increased participation, transparency and accountability. The cases were selected to respond to the call for research focusing on governance (as presented in the introduction and chapter two). The first case was multi-level and involved government actors mainly. The second case was carried out on a local government level, and involved both public and private actors. Hence, the two cases complemented each other concerning focus, level, and structure.
This thesis is a compilation thesis and its findings have been developed gradually, first in the four constituting papers (two for each case), and thereafter in two new analyses in this cover paper. The first case study was conducted as an ethnographic case study (see 4.1 for details). Empirical data was gathered in a number of ways and the data was analyzed using different methods (as further described below). The second case study was a storytelling case study (see 4.2 for details) and in this study too the data was collected in a number of ways. Furthermore, the data was analyzed using different methods (as further described below).

In qualitative research, the distinction between data gathering and data analysis is not as clear as in quantitative research (Myers & Avison, 2002). The reason is that data gathering and data analysis usually affect each other in qualitative research. Therefore, it is common to speak of **modes of analysis** rather than data analysis. Myers and Avison (2002) stated that there are many different modes of analysis; however, two common ones are: 1) hermeneutics and 2) narrative and metaphor. I have applied both: the analysis in the first case study (papers one and two) rests upon the grounds of hermeneutics, while the analysis in the second case (papers three and four) rests upon the grounds of narrative and metaphor.

In short, in hermeneutics the pursuit of meaning is essential and this meaning is gradually developed through repeated interpretations of the text. In the first paper, the empirical material was analyzed inductively using thematic structural analysis to explore the material. Thematic structural analysis is an analytical tool inspired by the thinking of the French philosopher Paul Ricoeur, which has been further developed by Lindseth and Norberg (2004). The basic idea is that the meaning of a text emerges more clearly if the text is structured so that those parts that seem to have similar content are brought together (Ricoeur, 1976). The aim is, hence, to highlight an underlying coherence. This analysis method rests upon the philosophy of hermeneutics; meaning is sought and this meaning emerges through repeated interpretations (Lindseth & Norberg, 2004). For more details, see paper one. In the second paper the data was analyzed through applying Dawes' (2009) framework. One view on electronic government research is that the complex processes of governance are not considered enough (Yildiz, 2007). One attempt to depart from the technology-driven views that have dominated electronic government research and development is that carried out by Dawes (2009). Her framework was developed to create a tool for analysis that can be used to address the complex and
fundamental questions of governance (according to the definition of governance used by Dawes). For more details, see the second paper.

The analysis in paper three rests upon the grounds of narrative and metaphor. In narrative and metaphor, symbolism and stories play an important role (Myers & Avison, 2002). In many interpretive research approaches a common method used for analysis is to break down into parts the material to be analyzed and then put these parts back together again (Kendall & Kendall, 2012). This was, hence, done in the analysis of the first case. Critics of such approaches have said that the result is that fragments of the research are presented instead of the full story (ibid). In storytelling analysis the goal is to capture the vividness of the story and this can be done through the use of episodes (ibid). In the third paper the data was analyzed using Kendall and Kendall’s (2012) storytelling framework. This framework consists of 18 story elements through which the story should be interpreted. The aim is to reveal all the elements that a full story usually consists of, i.e. to look upon the story from many perspectives. Three mechanisms should be investigated: the purpose of the story (‘through elaboration of the myth’), the telling of the story (‘through vividness’), and the order of the story (‘through the use of episodes’). A core concept in storytelling analysis is to focus on ‘myths’, which can be seen as ‘hymns to progress, and as utopian visions’ (Bekkers and Homburg, 2007). Myths can address the past, the present, as well as the future (ibid). When interpreting the material according to these three mechanisms, a storyline was used to link them. For more information, see the third paper. The analysis in the fourth paper drew upon the storytelling analysis performed in the third paper. The case process had been analyzed and understood according to the constructed story and that story showed the need to be investigated further in relation to three core concepts: policy, process and people. The reason for this is that the previous analysis had shown that they are deeply interrelated. For more information, see paper four.

After writing these four papers, work on the new analyses (see 4.3 for details) was initiated. Since I had been working with the cases for quite a while, I had developed some ideas about them and I wanted to investigate the validity of these ideas. The ideas concerned how actions performed by people in projects impact on the character of the projects. Through the papers it had become clear that the ideas in the projects were shaped in the implementation process and I wanted to study how that, in turn, impacted on policy making. Hence, the relationship between policy making and policy implementation was the area of interest and, to understand this
better, I decided to draw upon the perspective of governance and the lens of policy entrepreneurship. The connection between the papers and the cover paper will be more carefully described in 4.3.

Throughout the full process of writing this thesis I have, hence, used different methods for collecting material and different methods for analysis. Several frameworks have been used. The governance framework was developed for electronic government research, the storytelling framework for interpreting organizational dimensions of information systems, and the policy entrepreneurship framework was developed through borrowing knowledge from the research field of political science. Electronic government is a multi-disciplinary research field and, to understand it, it is important to look upon it from different perspectives.

4.1 The National Patient Summary case: an ethnographic case study
The first case studied in this thesis was that of the Swedish National Patient Summary project. The project aimed to make patient records interoperable, initially in Sweden, but later also within the EU (Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, 2006). The Swedish public sector is decentralized as it is divided into 20 county councils and 290 municipalities. The motivation for such decentralization is because it is believed to increase citizens’ ability to have an influence through their election of local representatives. The division of the public sector into 310 political entities also acts as a safeguard against regimentation and the concentration of power, as the county councils and municipalities often have a different political majority than the parliament (SALAR, 2007). A societal demand on the Swedish public sector is for it to be effective; however, it receives sharp criticism (Lantz & Schultz, 2009). A growing public sector eats up a huge portion of the GDP and, according to the critics, this sectorization has led to it becoming impenetrable and impractical to administer (ibid). Sectorization is especially evident in health care (SALAR, 2009b). Responsibility for health care is shared between the state, the county councils and the municipalities. The state is responsible for the overall health care policy and the supervision of care providers, while the county councils are responsible for organizing the medical part of health care. The day-to-day care of older people and the support and services offered to people discharged from hospitals are handled by the municipalities. Contributing to the difficulties in organizing effective health care processes, decisions in the public sector are taken within each municipality and county council as they are self-governing bodies. This strong decentralization of the Swedish
health care system contributes to the difficulties in organizing effective health care processes. In total, there are nine regional hospitals, 70 county hospitals and just over 1,000 health care centres (ibid). Besides the problems that this is causing for organizing effective health care processes, it also means that patients may be forced to seek care in different departments and from different care providers. A patient may, for example, be referred on from the emergency room to surgery, and then on to post-operative treatment, rehabilitation, residential care and perhaps even domestic help. Along the way there will be many meetings and, at each meeting, the patient has to give an account of his or her medical history (Lantz & Schultz, 2009). It was this problem that the National Patient Summary sought to address through making health care interoperable regarding patient information.

During the pilot implementation, the project was halted as a result of a suspension enacted by the Data Inspection Board. It turned out that the project broke the law (at least according to the interpretation of the law made by the Data Inspection Board). This situation had, therefore, to be straightened out before the large-scale implementation could be carried out. The problem was that, according to the law, before patient information can be shared the patient has to consent to this. However, that was not possible in practice since a lot of patients cannot communicate consent because of medical reasons.

In the study of this case I applied an ethnographic approach in which I collected data by means of interviews, participant observations, group meetings, personal meetings, and through observations of public presentations. Ethnographic research comes from the discipline of social and cultural anthropology, where an ethnographer is required to spend a significant amount of time in the field (Myers, 1999). Fieldwork notes and the experience of “living there” become an important addition to any other data-gathering techniques that may be used (Myers, 1997). This study began in 2008 and ended three years later, in 2011. My choice of ethnographic methodology was motivated by the fact that it is not possible to analyze complex projects such as the National Patient Summary without really good insight and this can be achieved with extensive fieldwork. In order to be able to develop insight, it is important to know the project’s trajectory, as well as the background to the many decisions made in the project, including cause and outcome. In ethnographic studies, the extent to which the researcher becomes immersed in the life of the social group under study is a key issue and I describe how this turned out for me in
more detail in 4.1.2, after the presentation of how I gathered empirical material.

In this study I carried out, for example, participant observations. With participant observations I am referring to data gathered through observing the project members at, for instance, project meetings. The participant aspect, in this context, does not imply any participation in the action research sense, i.e. that the researchers should affect the outcome in any way. The participant aspect of ethnography is, instead, about being present and acquiring knowledge about the “natives” and their situation. When collecting the empirical material, the goal was to establish a close relationship with the project members to gain their trust and thus get more out of the continual meetings. I believe that I succeeded with this. To illustrate, I can give two examples. The first is that one of the project members offered, without my prompting, to keep me updated regarding the project’s status, even after the project meetings ended. So, when the temporary shutdown of the patient summary occurred (after the suspension enacted by the Data Inspection Board), she contacted me to inform me about what happened, even though it was in the middle of the summer holiday season. Another example is an invitation that I received to a closed meeting, which was not part of the project meetings. The meeting’s agenda was to decide if the regional project (a project aiming at implementing the patient summary in the whole county) should continue, a decision taken by the county’s directors of social services.

There are different approaches to ethnography. Some say that it is important to ‘go native’ and live just like the local people. Others argue that it is enough to understand the ‘webs of significance’ that people weave within a particular context (Myers, 1999; Harvey & Myers, 1995). During this study, my ambition was to get as close as possible to being indigenous. However, I believe that there is a sliding scale related to this. It is never a case of either one or the other; in other words, whilst you can never completely be a native or a fly on the wall, you can have a desire to be one or the other. If you look at the extremes, at one end it would be to become a full member of the team and at the other to be a completely independent outsider. To become a full member, i.e. someone who takes part in all the work, was of course not feasible. My desire was therefore, instead, to become as natural and integrated a part of the team as possible. I believe that my examples show that this was achieved.
4.1.1 Gathering of empirical material

As presented, empirical material was collected over a period of three years. During the first year, the work consisted mainly of attending project meetings. This was important to develop knowledge about the project. At the beginning of the second year, the first round of interviews was performed. These interviews addressed the project as a whole. The second round of interviews took place at the end of the second year and at the beginning of the third. These were complementary interviews addressing recent events.

To get hold of the end users’ opinions, there was also a group meeting involving nine local end users. In the middle of the study’s third year there was also a group meeting with the municipality’s charge nurses. In addition, empirical material was gathered at personal meetings with the project members and through public presentations made by project members at seminars and conferences. In the third year there was also an expert workshop at the annual Swedish conference for ICTs in health care. During the study, all empirical material was recorded and transcribed. The interviews were transcribed word for word, while the meetings and speeches were summarized (except for selected quotes that were written down exactly).

In total this resulted in a 247 page-long document of empirical material and the goal of gathering all this material was to get as much insight as possible.

The interviews

In total, 14 interviews were held and the interviews lasted between just under an hour for the shortest and just over two hours for the longest. Thirteen of the 14 respondents were key people in the National Patient Summary project (from now on known as ‘the project’), i.e. people with leading positions, both nationally and locally. The remaining interview was with a physician who had openly criticized the project in the media. Although he was not a part of the project team, his inclusion in the interviews was to find out why he was so negative and thereby gain a more balanced view, since the project members were, unsurprisingly, sympathetic to the project.

The aim of the interviews was to dig deep into the ideas and agendas that existed in the project. The interviews were therefore conducted on a one-to-one basis and included a narrative part and a semi-structured part. In the narrative part, the respondent was asked to speak freely about the project. The aim was to find out what the respondent felt were the major issues in the project. It was important to start in this way in order to pre-
vent the respondent from being influenced by the questions. The interview guide for the semi-structured part was based on the understanding gained during the first year’s participations. Participation in project meetings gave an idea about the main issues in the project. These were addressed in the semi-structured part of the interview. In the first round, one key issue concerned perceptions about the benefits of the patient summary. Benefits had been questioned and the answer to this had been adjustments to the goals of the project. In the second round of interviews, the core issue was the law, the legal difficulties, and the requirement for consent.

In this thesis, the first local implementation of the patient summary was studied, i.e. the project pilot, including any preparatory work and the pilot’s outcome. The most interesting actors were therefore involved on a regional and local level; however, the project was an initiative taken by several county councils and there were, consequently, important actors to talk to outside their own region as well; for example, the program director and the head of the commissioning entity. The respondents selected were key people in the project, and, from the local group, the majority of the project members were interviewed. Those not interviewed were included in the study through personal meetings or group interviews. The local project leader was interviewed twice, both in the first round and in the second round of the interviews. Table 1 shows the respondents.

Table 1 The respondents for the interviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National program director</td>
<td>Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (SALAR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of the commissioning entity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local project leader (interviewed twice)</td>
<td>The county council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT director at the county council</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local system administrator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local IT architect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District doctor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local project owner</td>
<td>The municipality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local project coordinator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local IT strategist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local charge nurse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative director for health and social care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical physician (not a project member)</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participant observations
During the project, several project groups were also set up. I attended meetings held by two different groups: one aimed at implementing the National Patient Summary in the municipality; the other was responsible for regional ICT development in care (of which the patient summary was one essential part). I participated in all meetings held by the municipal project group, but selected the relevant regional meetings, i.e. those where the patient summary was on the agenda. In total, I participated in 22 meetings: 12 by the municipal group and 10 by the regional group, each lasting for about two and a half hours. The focus of the municipal meetings was on the pilot implementation of the patient summary. The meetings were held regularly from the start of planning for the pilot, initiated in 2008, until delivery approval. The meetings ended in February 2010.

The project group consisted of charge nurses, IT staff, and managers from different departments within the municipality. The regional project meetings were held once a month and brought together IT staff from all the municipalities in the county. A major issue discussed at the meetings was the “regional project”, the aim of which is to connect all the municipalities to the patient summary (compared with the pilot installation, which only connected one of the municipalities). These meetings were held regularly from September 2008 to October 2010.

Group meeting with the end users
To obtain the end users’ opinions, there was also a group meeting with nine local end users at one of the special housing facilities in the municipality. Present at the meeting, except for myself and the end users, were the head of housing, the project coordinator and the municipality’s communications officer. The end users consisted of one occupational therapist and eight nurses. The group meeting was conducted as a round-table discussion. The topics under discussion were the system to be implemented and views on the expected benefits. The moderator at the discussion was the local project coordinator, and the group meeting lasted for approximately an hour. My role at the meeting was mainly to listen, since the goal of the activity was to get hold of the end users’ opinions. Apart from a presentation that I gave about myself, and answers to questions about my work, my contribution was limited.
Group meeting with the charge nurses
In the middle of the study’s third year there was also a group meeting with the municipality’s five charge nurses. These nurses were all part of the local project team as they have supervisory responsibility for the nurses in the municipality. The reason for grouping them all together was to discuss how they felt about the recent events in the project, which to a large extent addressed the legal issues (for more information see chapter five and paper one and two). Their view was important since it was they who developed the guidelines for how the law should be interpreted and they who were responsible for the end users. The group meeting lasted for two hours. My role in this activity was to ask questions in order to start a discussion in the group to get their opinions regarding the legal issues and related aspects. They were, however, very curious about the results of my research and the outcome was, hence, a mutual exchange of viewpoints on the situation.

Personal meetings
Six personal meetings with the local project members also took place during the study. The first was with one of the local initiators of the project. The rest of the meetings were with the local project owner and administrative director for health and social care, the local IT strategist, the local project leader, one of the local charge nurses and, finally, the local project coordinator. The main difference between the meetings and the interviews is that the aim of the interviews was to gain an understanding of the project, while the purpose of the meetings was to clarify issues, where necessary. The personal meetings lasted for about an hour each.

Public presentations
During the study, the project members held presentations at conferences and seminars. Initially, the municipality organized a seminar on the national e-health agenda. To raise awareness about the project’s progress, they also held presentations at the annual Swedish conference for ICTs in health care. In addition, after the launch of the summary, an online press conference took place. I attended all of these presentations. At the annual conference, many of the national actors who were not interviewed made presentations. By visiting the conference, therefore, I was able to gain a rich picture of what was happening in the field both in Sweden and globally, which has been important to get a comprehensive view of the project in its context. The municipal conference lasted for one day, the press confer-
ence for about an hour, and the annual conference for three days each year. Of the three days, I attended two and selected the ones that were most relevant. I visited the conference in 2009, 2010 and 2011.

At the annual conference held in 2011, a full day was dedicated to discussing the new law. A major part of this day was an expert workshop on the topic, which I attended. The aim of the workshop was to gather together all relevant actors to straighten out the legal issues. Representatives from the Data Inspection Board, the National Board of Health and Welfare, the Swedish Medical Association and Center for eHealth in Sweden were all present at the workshop. The set-up was a panel discussion and an open discussion with the audience. Only invited guests had access to the workshop, but the findings were presented later that same day at a public seminar. The goal of this activity was to gather empirical material about the authorities’ view on the matter; my role in the workshop was, hence, just to listen, not to take an active part in the discussions.

4.1.2 Positioning and reflection
As described, when performing studies at close proximity to the study object (as in case studies and especially in ethnographic case studies), it is important to critically reflect on how the research material is socially constructed through the interaction between the researcher and the participants (Klein & Myers, 1999). In the first case, I spent a long time in the field. Through doing this, I acquired extensive knowledge about the case, which made it possible to question initial preconceived assumptions and parts of respondents’ stories that deviated. For example, at the beginning of the study I was very skeptical about the benefits of the patient summary. I had read a lot of negative opinions in the media that strongly questioned the utility of the summary and this impacted on my outlook on the case. However, after having studied the pilot implementation, I changed my mind. After this I was able to see lots of benefits. This is one example; another is in relation to stories that deviate. Whilst carrying out this study, it was important to be sensitive to nuances in interpretations made by the participants. This is because the municipality, the county council and the national actors all had slightly different views on the project. In the pilot implementation, patient information from the county council was shared with health workers in the municipality. Therefore, when it came to the legal issues, these meant different things for different actors. The municipality expressed more worries than the others since it was the municipal health workers who applied the new law through the
use of the patient summary. Consequently, it was also the municipality who had the overall responsibility for its use. As for the county council, their use of the patient summary was different since they did not access information from another provider (as they were the only information producers in the system during the pilot). Thus, they did not need consent. This circumstance made it very important to balance the statements against each other to gain a general outlook on the problem.

Furthermore, in ethnographic research there is a need to balance nearness and distance (Myers, 1999). In the case study of the National Patient Summary case, this was achieved through me spending a lot of time in the field without actually “living” in the field. This meant that I had opportunities to “escape” and reflect on things between the meetings with the project members. Closeness was achieved through participant observations, personal meetings, interviews and some informal contact with the respondents, while a “critical attitude” was achieved by me distancing myself between meetings and reflecting on the case using different theories.

To validate the findings, I repeatedly turned to the respondents to let them verify that the interpretations made were correct. This was done, for example, through presentations of the research findings to the project team and through discussions at personal meetings. On several occasions, findings were also sent out for comments. At the start of the study’s second year, the first year’s findings were presented to a stakeholder panel. The aim was to get feedback on the analysis. The panel consisted of the local project leader, the project coordinator and the medical director of rehabilitation (one of the municipality’s charge nurses). The outcome of the panel was positive, as the participants agreed that the analysis gave a fair picture of the case. The next step was to initiate the writing process. When a draft was completed, it was sent out to all respondents and local project members with the instruction that comments and reflections were welcome. This resulted in a personal meeting with the medical director of rehabilitation who felt that there should be a more detailed description of the health care processes. The remaining team members responded by email and the outcome of the validation were some minor changes. At the start of the study’s third year, the second year’s findings were validated. The findings were sent out to three of the local project members: the project coordinator, an IT strategist and the medical director of rehabilitation. This resulted in comments on how the research findings should be presented. As the findings then dealt with the legal barriers, the issue was
highly sensitive. The outcome of the validation was a revision of how the findings were presented, namely the words used. After these modifications, the results were presented to the project members through a presentation at the town hall. In addition to these larger occasions, validation also occurred at personal meetings, by asking questions at project meetings and through email correspondence with the project members.

4.2 The open innovation competition case: a storytelling case study
The second case studied in this thesis concerns the idea of open government through the availability and re-use of open public data. This idea was promoted in a Swedish municipality through an open innovation competition. The event triggering the organization of the competition was an open data seminar held by the county council because of their work with the Digital Agenda (the main strategy for electronic government work, which exists at various levels, EU, nationally and regionally). The main target group for the competition was that of citizens, i.e. the project group behind the competition expected public interest in the open agenda. This is a wide-spread expectation. Policies and official reports concerning the open government agenda usually say that the result of making public data available will be public interest in it. For instance, a report from the European Commission stated that opening up public data is believed to foster the participation of citizens in political and social life and be a motor for innovation, growth and transparency (European Commission, 2011a). The European Commission plays an important role at a supranational level and the expectations that they present on public data are major benefits. The re-use of public data is perceived as an economic asset. When launching their “Open Data Strategy for Europe”, the headline of the press release was: “Digital Agenda: Turning government data into gold” (European Commission, 2011b).

Today, there are structural weaknesses in Europe’s economy and the primary goal must, therefore, be to get Europe back on track to achieve a sustainable future (European Commission, 2010). To do that, there are, according to the Digital Agenda, three options: work harder, work longer or work smarter, and there is a need for all three. The third option is, however, “the only way to guarantee increasing standards of life for Europeans” (ibid). One solution is believed to be to increase civil involvement in public affairs and this will result, among other things, from the re-use of information and this information should be made available through the implementation of ICTs (ibid).
The information that the Digital Agenda is referring to is data produced by public bodies and this data is usually called Public Sector Information (PSI). However, public data can also refer to Open Government Data (OGD). The difference between PSI and OGD is the level of openness. PSI is a generic term for information produced by public sector organizations. This information could be sold for re-use, i.e. the owning organizations are allowed to charge for it. OGD is also information produced through government, but the main difference is that it is open, that is, free to be re-used by anyone interested, without complicated licensing (Ubaldi, 2013).

Lately, there has been a move towards an increased level of openness. In 2003, the EU adopted the Directive on the Re-use of Public Sector Information (often referred to as the PSI Directive), the aim of which was to introduce a common legislative framework to regulate how public sector bodies should make their information available for re-use (European Commission, 2012). The PSI Directive is built around two key pillars of the internal market: transparency and fair competition, and it provides a common legislative framework to the European public sector information market (which was previously unregulated). The review of the PSI Directive is one of the key actions of the Digital Agenda for Europe. Later on, in 2009, a review of the PSI Directive was published, which now encouraged Member States to take proactive measures to promote re-use. Furthermore, in December 2011, the Open Data Strategy for Europe was presented, setting out clearer rules on how to make the best use of government-held information (ibid).

The goal of the second case study was to unfold the organizational story of an innovation competition. The case concerns one local government authority’s efforts to realize the open government agenda through making open public data available and promoting its re-use. The agenda was implemented by arranging a competition where citizens were invited to use open data as the basis for developing apps and external web solutions. The competition was staged in 2012, 2013, and 2014 in a Swedish municipality, i.e., on a local government level. It was organized as a public-private partnership.

In the study of the open innovation competition case, I applied a storytelling approach (Kendall & Kendall, 2012). Underlying the idea of storytelling and narrative inquiry is the assumption that individuals’ sense-making and construction of meaning can be captured through the stories they tell (Bailey & Tilley, 2002). Focusing on stories in the research process can result in several benefits; for instance, it makes the research wide-
ly understood (Kendall & Kendall, 2012), it contributes to increase practical relevance (Richardson & Coulthard, 2005; Nielsen & Madsen, 2006), and it contributes to vividness (Kendall & Kendall, 2012).

According to Nielsen and Madsen (2006), the learning from IT projects is generally limited. Usually we are better at planning new projects than we are at learning from previous experiences. Nielsen and Madsen (2006) stated that what is lacking is a narrative perspective that could be used to make sense of past actions through, for instance, the use of storytelling techniques. Ever since communication began, humans have been telling stories. Telling stories functions as a way of explaining the world and making the incomprehensible comprehensible (Bittel & Bettoni, 2014).

Each and every day, employees with different professional backgrounds are bringing their knowledge to organizations and enriching them with new experiences. Consequently, people learn from daily experiences and sharing these experiences with others can lead to a treasure of knowledge. The glue that holds all knowledge together and makes sense of it is tacit knowledge and one of the greatest benefits of storytelling is its ability to capture such knowledge (ibid). Storytelling research fits well within the qualitative interpretive tradition. However, storytelling is more than “ordinary” interpretive research (Kendall & Kendall, 2012). What makes storytelling different from other interpretive approaches is the pursuit for stories. That there are, indeed, benefits of listening to stories was identified in a study of a deliberative public consultation (Walmsley, 2009). The participants were insistently questioning the design of the deliberative event. The reason was that the participants presented rich stories which the researchers could not fit into their predetermined categories, i.e. it was not possible to capture the richness of the participants’ storytelling because of the way the event was designed. One conclusion drawn was, therefore, that more attention should be given to stories (ibid). Using a storytelling approach is especially suitable for this because of its focus on listening to people and allowing them to tell their stories.

Another important part of storytelling case studies is fieldwork (i.e. working closely together with people in the field). Kendall and Kendall (2012) argued that such fieldwork helps us understand a phenomenon in its context, including its members, its interactions, its purpose, how it manages to survive, and what good it does for society and individuals. To actively take part is, accordingly, important. Storytelling case studies are perceived to be a much-needed holistic approach to research focusing on complex relations between people, their context and technology (ibid). In
order to understand human behavior, we need to understand the social context in which it occur (Moen, 2008).

4.2.1 Gathering of empirical data
As a result of the decision to carry out a storytelling case study the empirical material in the second case was gathered through interaction, participation, observations, by conducting interviews with the other project members, as well as through informal discussions with the project members. At the beginning of this case, I interacted. I was actually one of the initiators of the competition and I was actively involved in setting it up for the first time. However, once it was set up I stepped back and left the rest of the work to the other project members. Hence, I did work in the domain in collaborative ways as proposed by, for instance, Kendall and Kendall (2012).

Interaction
The initiative for the competition was taken in spring 2012 after an open data seminar held at the County Administrative Board. After the seminar, a colleague and I arranged a meeting with a representative from the municipality who works on a daily basis with open data. Together, we decided to hold a competition to promote the re-use of local public data. To create the competition, a project group was needed. The next task was, thus, to find people interested in taking part. At the university I turned to the department that deals with external relations. This turned out to be fortunate as they, at the time, were already working with promoting open innovation. Consequently, they became very interested in the idea. In addition, the County Administrative Board and a local IT business became involved. The competition was, hence, a result of collaboration between the university, the municipality, the County Administrative Board and a local IT consultancy business. We all had our own reasons for participating. My reason was to get input for my research, the representative from the municipality participated because the municipality had taken the strategic decision to work with open data, the County Administrative Board was involved because of their work with the Digital Agenda and the local IT business saw it as an opportunity to promote their own company and brand to show that IT can be used to develop societal benefits. The work was, however, voluntary. It was in line with regular work duties for most of us, but it was self-imposed.
Observation and participation

As described above, I was involved in organizing the competition from the beginning. However, before the launch of the first version in 2012 I decided to leave the project group. Thereafter, my involvement was limited and I mainly participated in that sense that I observed and had some informal discussions with the project group. I did not have an impact on the organization of the competition anymore. My participation and observations consisted of attending the Kick-offs, Hackathons, and the evaluation meetings. In addition, in 2013, I also took part in jury work, when the competition was already completed, to get insight into the outcome of it. The difference between me participating and me observing is if I took part in discussions or not. Observing refers to me only being there to watch, while participating refers to me being there and in some sense taking part, although not in an interactive way. The reason why I make this distinction between interaction, participation and observation is just to make it clear that my fieldwork was of a different character at different stages of the case process; it is not to excuse any potential influence. How I influenced the case will, namely, be more carefully described in 4.2.2.

In total, the events in which interaction, participation and observations occurred consisted of 20 project events (Table 2), the aim of which was initially to create the project, thereafter to plan its implementation, and eventually to launch it. Of the 20 project activities one (*) was recorded and transcribed; the others consisted mainly of notes. The notes were minutes from meetings, i.e. they were records of the events that took place during the meetings and the decisions taken.

Table 2 Gathering of empirical material through interaction, participation and observation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project activities</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seminar arranged by the County Administrative Board about Open Data (which led to the idea to the competition)</td>
<td>Observe</td>
<td>April 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First meeting with the representative from the municipality (aim, creating the project and a project group)</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First meeting with one of the representatives from the university (aim, creating the project and a project group)</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>May 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second meeting with the representative from the</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interviews

I also conducted interviews with the project members. These interviews (n=6, Table 3) were of a storytelling character (Kendall & Kendall, 2012) in which the interviewees were asked to narrate their experiences of participating in the project and their work with promoting open public data. When preparing for the interviews, I formulated some themes to follow but there were no predetermined questions; the interviews were instead based on my experiences of interacting and participating. I asked questions to keep the story going and these questions were developed throughout the interview to stimulate further reasoning by alluding to the topic discussed (see Kendall and Kendall (2012) for more details about the storytelling interview process). The different interviews were hence all diverse.
and the topics raised were dependent on the person being interviewed. The interviews were performed after the competition was first setup in 2012 and before the second setup in 2013. On average, the interviews lasted for about one hour each and they were recorded and transcribed.

Table 3 Interviews with project members

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interviews</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interview with the representative from the County Administrative Board</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with the representative from the municipality</td>
<td>December 2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with the representative from the IT consultancy business</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with the project leader from the university</td>
<td>September 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with the representative from the municipality</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with the representative from the County Administrative Board</td>
<td>October 2013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Informal discussions

Throughout the years that the competition has been organized and held, I have had some informal discussions with the project members. The role of these discussions in this thesis has been that I have asked questions to straighten out matters when unsure about the practicalities of them. The role of the informal discussions has, however, not played any important part in gathering empirical material; rather, it has been more of a validating character, asking the project members if I have interpreted them correctly, understood something properly and so on. I have not kept track of such informal discussions, unfortunately, but I anticipate it to be around five to ten occurrences.

4.2.2 Positioning and reflection

As described, I interacted in this case according to the storytelling approach. I was one of the initiators of the competition and, therefore, I need to reflect upon my own role in the competition, especially because of the research focus that I have. In a way you could say that, because of my involvement in the competition, I am studying myself. However, that is not completely true to the actual circumstances. When I became involved, the work had already started. In fact, the municipality had participated in a European competition aiming at making public open data available. Hence, the municipality’s participation in the European competition start-
ed the work. The next step was the seminar that was arranged together with the County Administration Board at which I met the representative from the municipality. Consequently, the work with promoting the availability of open data was already initiated before I became involved and it was included in the municipality’s strategic documents (although in a very limited way, for more details see chapter six). What was not initiated was to “ask for re-use” of the data, something that was perceived as important for making availability easier and it is here that the open innovation competition comes into the picture.

Initially, it was me and the representative from the municipality who developed the idea of arranging a competition. However, we could not do it as just the two of us and, accordingly, a project group was needed. I took part in forming this group and initiating the work of organizing the competition. Hence, I was actively involved in this part. However, when the first competition had been set up, it rather quickly was revealed that public interest for it was limited (only a handful of people attended the Kick-off and none of the entrants showed any interest in the Hackathon). This led me to hesitate over my involvement. I believed, at that point, that taking part was meaningless because I would not be able to use the empirical material in my research. Accordingly, I announced my decision to not continue working with the competition to the project group. The competition took up valuable time of my Ph.D., which I believed I needed to spend on “meaningful” things to be able to finish my thesis in time. This was my feeling at that point and I expected the rest of the project group to follow my example. I did not expect them to continue working, which is what they did.

Out of curiosity, when they arranged the competition again in 2013 I attended the Kick-off. It was a public event, so anyone could come. I came as a spectator; hence, I had no role in it. However, because I came and the project group knew me personally, I was invited to their planned lunch meeting after the Kick-off. At this lunch I listened to their discussion and took part in it, giving my view on matters. I also expressed my wish to take part in the outcome of the competition, which led to the decision to make me a jury member. Furthermore, I also attended the Hackathon. This was also a public event and I participated as a spectator. At this event, I expressed my wish to get invited to the planned evaluation meeting. The project members did not object and this is basically what happened. I started off as an insider but was an observer during the majority of the project process. To sum up, I was one key player in creating a pro-
ject group for the competition, so without me perhaps there would not have been any competition. Still, without them it definitely would not have worked, because I decided to give up on the idea rather quickly. This also shows how I perceived the work with open data on a local level. Before organizing the first competition, my expectations were high; after the outcome of the first competition in 2012, I was more skeptical and pretty much questioned the whole idea of open data re-use on a local level. When the competition was arranged again in 2013, I was still skeptical but, since interest for it had increased annually since 2012, I came to realize that working with the promotion of open data re-use takes time. It is neither easy or impossible, it is something in between. Hence, through studying the case for three years (2012-2014), my interpretation of it has changed. I believe that the current interpretation is the most nuanced outlook on the matter.

4.3 Research progress
I will now give a brief introduction to the findings in the papers. I do this to illustrate the research progress. While working with this thesis there has been gradual development of findings leading to the decision to apply the policy entrepreneurship lens.

4.3.1 Paper 1: Health care integration in practice: An institutionalized dilemma
The focus in the first paper was on scrutinizing how institutionalism played a central part in the patient summary project. As described in the theoretical framework, institutionalism is seen as a barrier to change and this was evident in the first case study. The desire for integration in health care was because of the problems of fragmentation. Health professionals working for different health care providers lacked information about the patients and the desire was to provide this information in an efficient way. This was the goal of the project and this goal was also one of the goals in a national e-health policy. The goal had, thus, political support but this support was not shared by the Data Inspection Board, at least not in the interpretation of its implementation. Hence, there were different belief systems. The project and the National Board of Health and Welfare pointed to the importance of patient safety, saying that information sharing is needed to guarantee safety in health care. The Data Inspection Board emphasized the privacy aspect, saying that information cannot be shared unless the patient has consented to it. These two views clashed and a deadlock occurred. When looking at the case from a government perspective,
in institutionalism provides an answer as to why integration projects are difficult to carry out in practice. As presented in the theoretical framework, despite all talk about governance, much of the work in the public sector is performed in a traditional government structure that is hierarchical and stovepiped. Hence, there is lack of transparency and little room for horizontal collaboration. The investigation of the role of institutionalism in this paper showed that institutionalism is a barrier from multiple perspectives. Laws, regulation, stovepiping, lack of transparency, and the way that the supervising authority worked played an important role in impacting on the outcome. The supervising authority did not involve themselves in the preparatory work; they evaluated the work after it was already done.

4.3.2 Paper 2: Conflicts in implementing interoperability: Re-operationalizing basic values

The focus in the second paper was on investigating the conflicts that occurred in the case as well as the causes of these conflicts. Using a governance framework (Dawes, 2009) showed the root cause of the institutionalism and why the problem turned out to be unsolvable. The reason is that both views (when put against each other) were actually supported. The wish to implement interoperability had political impetus and was supported by the National Board of Health and Welfare, while the Data Inspection Board’s view was supported by the law, the principles for data sharing developed by OECD, as well as an EU Directive (the Data Protection Directive (95/46/EC)).

Globalization has an impact. It was actually the directives coming from the European Commission that provided both the legitimacy for the project and barriers for its implementation. First, the Commission required the member states to implement interoperability; a national e-health strategy had to be developed. However, there was also a requirement to implement the demand for consent before the sharing of personal data in the national laws. Hence, different goals were in conflict with each other.

In the second paper, seven such conflicts were found. The first conflict identified was that information sharing was both promoted and prevented at the same time. Furthermore, the second conflict concerned equality in health care. According to important health care principles, health care should be equal. In health care, patient involvement is perceived as contributing to an increased quality of health care. However, the result of some patients not being able to communicate their consent meant that
they had to be excluded which, in turn, resulted in inequality. The second conflict was that health care is said to be regulated to be equal, but in practice the regulation created inequality. Furthermore, the third conflict had to do with different advice from different authorities. Some authorities said “stop”, while others said “carry on”.

Trust in health care is considered important. However, the use of technologies can have an impact on trust. Previously, patient information was shared by the patient with a physician; now, potentially thousands of employees can retrieve patient information. This has resulted in a debate in the media. The public still thinks that the relationship between the patient and the health care staff should restrict information sharing; hence, previous grounds for trust remain in the public, but these grounds have changed in health care practice. The result is a disagreement on what it is ethically okay to do with patient information. Technologies play a part in this. The fourth conflict is to do with laws not being technology-neutral. In the case, the sharing of information was not prevented; it was the use of technologies for doing this that was prevented. To share information over the phone was legal, but not to share the same information through direct access. Consequently, the use of technologies was being promoted and prevented at the same time. Additionally, the sixth conflict had to do with the speed of things. The implementation of interoperability should happen quickly to realize benefits as soon as possible. However, to change something too quickly affects trust. There is, hence, a need to both speed up things and slow them down. Finally, by summarizing all previous conflicts, a seven conflict was identified. This conflict is that the assignment exists, but not the necessary tools. All these conflicts played a part in the project in that they both contributed to supporting and hindering it. By using the governance framework it became clear that the law is not the problem really; it is a much more complicated issue than that. One conclusion drawn in the second paper was, therefore, that projects such as this aim to push the frontier a bit further forward, to investigate what is possible and what is not.

4.3.3 Paper 3: The story of the sixth myth of open data and open government

The focus in the third paper in this compilation thesis was on presenting the story of the innovation competition through looking at it from multiple perspectives. To provide a nuanced and detailed picture of the case was, hence, the goal. When doing this another aim was to also scrutinize some myths related to the open-government-through-open-data agenda.
Official reports often overstate benefits and there is frequently a “simplistic” outlook on the task. Potential challenges and barriers are not being considered enough. Public interest is usually taken for granted, but here, it became apparent that this is not always the case. To get people to participate turned out to be difficult. The myth of public interest is constantly being constructed and reconstructed in official reports, but the problem of citizens’ commitment should be recognized. These problems are mainly due to the fact that there is a general lack of knowledge regarding open public data; there is a limited target group at a local government level and there is a lack of incentives. Openness, innovation, creativity and so on are concepts that people usually associate with something good and the public data agenda is therefore persuasive in this regard. Consequently, at an “idea level” open public data appeals to people. However, when it comes to actual re-use, it is much more difficult to engage citizens. For re-use to happen, someone must be willing to devote time and energy.

4.3.4 Paper 4: Policy, Process, People and Public Data

In the fourth paper, the case was analyzed through looking at it from the perspective of three interrelated concepts: namely, policy, process, and people. These three concepts had proven to be of central importance because of the findings in paper three, the conclusion that policies (official reports) have a tendency to overstate benefits, and the myth of public interest. The analysis in paper four was also made in the context of the promise of transformation. Open data is expected to lead to increased transparency and a lot of other benefits; hence, open data will transform the public sector. However, the promise of transformation is not new at all; it has existed for at least 50 years without evidence of it happening, according to many researchers (see paper four for more details). Making government more open is a step-by-step process that is anticipated to begin with the publication of information. The step after this is then anticipated to be increased transparency. I, however, question the connection between these two on the basis of the findings in the case. Just publishing information does not lead to transparency. Whether or not there will be more transparency depends on how the information is used, and especially, whether or not it is used. Public information has always been available for citizens, so this is not actually something new. Maybe you could say that it becomes more available, but this is also an assumption that should not be taken for granted. Making something electronically available is not the same as making it understandable, comprehensible and usable. There-
fore, the paper raised two questions: does making data lead to increased transparency? and is the promise of transformation realistic?

4.3.5 Additional research needed

The result of the papers was to open up the idea that implementing projects of this kind (big ideas) is definitely not a matter of straightforward implementation; on the contrary, many decisions must be made throughout implementation and, depending on these decisions, the outcome is affected. The results of the papers showed that political ends often are unclear, that policies present visionary ideas but there is a lack of guidelines on how to implement these ideas. This supports previous research that said that it is in implementation that electronic government is shaped (Giritli-Nygren & Lindblad-Gidlund, 2009). Furthermore, institutionalism showed that government institutions may function as barriers to change. This means that the people trying to implement change have to struggle. This makes it interesting to look at who performs such work and why, as well as how the actions carried out by these actors impact the character of the work. In the papers I considered the EU reports as setting the agenda. What I did not do is to focus on local interpretations in relation to the view presented by the EU reports. Therefore, this was seen an important thing to do in this new analysis, when doing this, I used the lens of policy entrepreneurship.

4.4 The policy entrepreneurship analytical framework

The policy process is complicated. Given this complexity, the analyst must, according to Sabatier (2007), simplify the situation in order to have any chance of understanding it. Normally, this is done by developing or choosing a framework. Using a framework helps the analyst to focus on critical factors which cannot be dismissed and it helps to select which factors could “safely” be ignored. Sabatier stated that it is important to focus on understanding that which is in focus, because you simply cannot see everything. As described, today’s politics is much more complex than “traditional government” and when politics is viewed from a governance perspective, the need for entrepreneurs increases. It is, thus, essential that someone promotes and drives change when politics allow for it (von Bergmann-Winberg & Wihlborg, 2011). In international research, policy entrepreneurship has been discussed since the 1980s. Early research in this context focused on the entrepreneur; today, the focus is more on entrepreneurship (Wihlborg, 2011a). Wihlborg (2011a) stated that it is important
to focus on function through the actions performed by a group, network or organization. Mintrom and Norman (2009) agreed. They stated that there is a need to look at the actions that policy entrepreneurs engage in, their motives and strategies for doing this, and the impacts of their actions, as well as the interaction between policy entrepreneurs and their specific policy context. Furthermore, Mintrom and Norman (2009) recommended studying more than one case when studying policy entrepreneurship. However, they also stated that studies with this focus quickly become complicated and, therefore, it is good to just focus on one or two policy ideas or norms. In this thesis I focused on two cases; one case aimed at the integration of health care and one case aimed at making a local government more open. Consequently, they represent different ideas, but within the same policy area; the use of ICTs in government.

The analytical framework that I have developed takes all these aspects into account. I have used the literature by Mintrom and Norman (2009) when developing the framework. The reason is that their work does not only focus on policy entrepreneurship; it also examines the relationship between the concept of policy entrepreneurship and theorizations of policy change. This is something, according to Mintrom and Norman (2009) that previous literature on the subject has lacked. In my study, I need both. Mintrom and Norman (2009) stated that it is important to recognize that not all actors who are involved in policy making are policy entrepreneurs. Hence, it is important not to assume that all policy change is driven by policy entrepreneurs. However, policy entrepreneurship follows certain patterns and, here, four elements are central. These elements are to display social acuity and the acts of defining problems, building teams and leading by example. These elements make up the first part of the analytical framework (Table 4). Mintrom and Norman (2009) stated that all policy entrepreneurs exhibit these elements at least to some degree; some policy entrepreneurs are stronger in some of the elements than others. Through using the first part of the analytical framework on the empirical material I will, hence, be able to see how my cases relate to policy entrepreneurship. If they are strongly related, it could be anticipated that other aspects of policy entrepreneurship also apply. Mintrom and Norman (2009) also addressed how policy entrepreneurs’ actions can be understood in the context of five prominent theories of policy change: incrementalism, institutionalism, punctuated equilibrium, policy streams, and the advocacy coalition framework. Hence, if the cases relate well to policy entrepreneurship, I can use the theorizations about policy entrepreneurs’ actions related
to policy change to understand my cases better. This is part two of the analytical framework (Table 5).

Hence, the analytical framework has two aims: 1) The aim of the first part of the framework is to examine my cases in relation to defining elements of policy entrepreneurship. 2) The aim of part two is to investigate how the people in the cases have acted to make an impact, i.e. to look at the cases using the theorizations about how policy entrepreneurs’ actions relate to policy change. The framework was developed in several steps. First, I focused my attention on the four defining elements of policy entrepreneurship. Each of these elements was described in the text. I read through the text to understand it and to synthesize it into a condensed description for each of the elements. Thereafter, I formulated a number of actions on the basis of the text. The reason for formulating the actions was to have something concrete to search for when consulting the empirical material. As a result, 16 actions (4+4+2+6) were identified. The result of this work is the first part of the analytical framework.

Table 4 Part 1: Defining elements of policy entrepreneurship

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Element</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social acuity | Policy entrepreneurs take advantage of windows of opportunity to promote policy change. Consequently, they need to be perceptive and sensitive to timing issues. Opportunities must be recognized before they can be seized. Policy entrepreneurs engage in policy conversations and they have a good understanding of the ideas, motives, and concerns of others. To this they respond effectively. Hence, policy entrepreneurs are well connected in the local policy context. | - to respond to concerns  
- to present innovative solutions  
- to use windows of opportunities  
- to engage in policy conversation |
| Defining problems | Policy entrepreneurs pay close attention to problem definition. How a problem is defined can determine which individuals and groups will pay attention to it. This act could involve presenting evidence that a crisis is at hand, highlighting failures of current policy set- | - to pay attention to problem definition  
- to present evidence of crisis  
- to undermine present policy images  
- to seek support from |
tings and looking for support from allies that are not obvious.

Building teams
Policy entrepreneurs are team players. They have good ability to cooperate, and they construct teams with the skills needed by using their personal and professional networks. They pay attention to both the size and breadth of a coalition to make sure that the right people are drawn in. They recognize that the composition of a coalition can help to deflect the arguments of opponents.

Leading by example
Policy entrepreneurs strive to demonstrate the workability of a policy proposal. Hence, they take an idea and turn it into action and when doing this they are willing to invest in the task in the hope of future return. They have a genuine commitment and one strategy applied could be to switch the focus of others from the consequences of action to the consequences of inaction.

Thereafter, I performed the same procedure for the parts of the paper that present how policy entrepreneurs’ actions can be understood in the context of five prominent theories of policy change. The result was that 11 actions (3+1+3+3+1) were identified. In this part of the framework there are overlapping actions, i.e. actions related to several of the theorizations of policy change.

Table 5 Part 2: Policy entrepreneurship in broader explanations of policy change

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanation</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Incrementalism</td>
<td>The policy entrepreneur’s way of dealing with incrementalism (changes occurring at a slow speed) is to cultivate close contacts with those who are in decision-making positions. Incre-</td>
<td>- to secure cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- to keep track of small victories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- to explain setbacks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mentalism is a frustrating inhibitor to dramatic change. However, policy entrepreneurs respond by keeping track of their small victories and by explaining to others how these small victories eventually will result in the desired outcome.

| Institutionalism | Institutions serve to provide stability. Hence, efforts to secure major change must be informed by insider sensibilities. Therefore, policy entrepreneurs form teams of both insiders and outsiders. | - to secure cooperation |
| Punctuated equilibrium | The policy process is characterized by long periods of stability punctuated by moments of abrupt, significant change. Stability is the outcome of the presentation of positive images of current policy settings which deflect calls for change. The task for policy entrepreneurs to disrupt this is to bring the policy issues into the public domain and invoke interest for them. The challenge is to undermine the present policy images and replace them with new ones that emphasize major problems and a need for change. When policy change appears blocked at one level, policy entrepreneurs usually try another. | - to bring the issue into the policy domain  
- to undermine the present policy images  
- to switch level to get hearing for the cause |
| Policy streams | Policy streams are concerned with why and how certain issues get attention at certain times. The policy entrepreneur’s way of working with policy streams is through linking problems, policy ideas, and politics to draw attention to issues to put them onto government agendas. In this, timing is critical. | - to link problems  
- to getting the idea included on an agenda  
- to be sensitive to timing |
Advocacy coalitions are portrayed as people from a variety of positions who share a particular belief system, i.e. basic values, causal assumptions, and problem perceptions, and who work together in a coordinated and nontrivial way over time. An advocacy coalition is, hence, a group of dedicated people who coalesce around an issue. This means that there is compatibility between explanations of policy change grounded in the advocacy coalition framework (ACF) and policy entrepreneurship. According to ACF, change is anticipated to come from endogenous and exogenous shocks. To have political effect these shocks need to be translated, i.e. they must be presented in a way that increases the likelihood that they will receive the attention of decision makers. Policy entrepreneurs usually display the skills needed to perform this interpretation and translation. This corresponds to how policy entrepreneurs define problems in ways that maximize the opportunities for involving coalition partners.

The next step thereafter was to test the analytical framework on a part of the empirical material. It quickly turned out to suit the purpose well; a majority of the actions could be found, which confirmed my suspicion that drawing upon the concept of policy entrepreneurship would be a good lens to apply.

4.4.1 Evaluation of the use of the framework
As described, when selecting a framework to apply, it impacts on what you see in the empirical material (Sabatier, 2007). Using a framework helps you to focus; it controls what you notice and what you do not pay attention to. In this study, I could have chosen many other frameworks.
To study the “policy process”, there are many suitable frameworks and, as explained, depending on which you use the results will vary. Why I selected policy entrepreneurship will be explained below. However, the fact that there are also other frameworks that could have been applied means that there is the potential to apply another framework using the same material but coming up with a different understanding. Hence, when evaluating the use of the framework chosen, I evaluated what it has contributed, but I do not deny that the use of other frameworks could have been beneficial as well. In fact, Sabatier (2007) proposed the use of different frameworks, because it makes comparisons possible and this contributes to even better understanding.

After the analysis was carried out, I reflected upon how useful it was to provide insights fitting my purpose. The conclusion was that using the framework opened my eyes to things that I would not have seen otherwise. Before applying the framework, my feeling was that the open innovation competition case was the case that had most in common with policy entrepreneurship and that the National Patient Summary case had limited parts. It turned out that it was the other way around. Or, it depends on how you measure “most in line”. What I am aware of when saying this is that the National Patient Summary case had to struggle with more barriers to policy change than the open innovation competition case and, consequently, it also performed more actions represented in the second part of the analytical framework.

Hence, using the framework removed some preconceptions that I had, forcing me to think new, and in that regard it really worked. It provided a deeper understanding of the actions represented in the cases. One thing that I realized was that when just reading about policy entrepreneurship I developed one interpretation of my cases; when applying the framework, I developed another interpretation. This was very interesting. In my naïve view (before applying the framework), the people in my studied cases acted like policy entrepreneurs. By applying the framework I, however, changed my mind slightly. Using it forced me to look upon all aspects of policy entrepreneurship, not just the ones I recognized (and therefore could take in). The result of using the framework was, accordingly, a deeper understanding of the cases in this regard. The first part of the framework aimed to investigate my cases in relation to defining elements of policy entrepreneurship. It turned out that the people in the project performed many of the actions related to this. This, in turn, allowed me to apply theories about policy entrepreneurship in relation to policy change.
in the second part of the framework and through this process, insights about how electronic government is shaped in policy and practice were gained.

However, being an information systems researcher, using a framework from the political science field has both drawbacks and benefits. If I had been a political scientist I would, probably, have had a better understanding of the political context; I would also have had a narrower understanding of information systems issues. Electronic government is a multidisciplinary research field and this is tricky because few people are experts in several research fields. Most likely, you will have more expertise in one field than in another. By choosing a framework taken from the political science field, I became equipped with a tool that could help me with the understanding of the political context in order to focus on the information systems aspects of technology. This was something that I considered to be important because of the fact that, when it comes to governance aspects of electronic government, I believe that understanding these could be a struggle for many information systems researchers who lack expertise in this field. It was the case for me and, therefore, using the framework was really beneficial. Furthermore, policy entrepreneurship is usually rather invisible; to catch sight of the motives and forces of change that contribute to changes in society is not easy. Through using this framework this task is made easier because of the possibility of looking for concrete actions that can be recognized.

4.5 Research ethics

In other sections in this chapter, I have touched upon the subject of research ethics. In this section, I will clarify how I have handled the demands for ethical consideration in my work more explicitly. The guiding star throughout the whole process has been openness: to be as open, honest and transparent as possible. Personally, I am very fond of telling stories, presenting material in a rich way, providing detailed descriptions, and I believe that this has been a strength in my work. To be open is one of the central parts of the guidelines on research ethics presented by the Swedish Research Council (Vetenskapsrådet, 2011). However, to be open is not enough, although it is a good start. Research ethics are not static, what is considered to be ethically okay may change over time and from one situation to another. However, there are some guidelines that apply to all research and I will, in this section, give an account of these. Research ethics are to do with the potential harms and risk of research and what these are
depends on the disciplinary domain (ibid). Depending on the domain, there are different types of considerations that must be made. Some research needs to be reviewed according to the law, while other research does not (ibid). In my case there is no such requirement; instead, it is more a question of good research morals. Research ethics present strategies on how to act in a morally good way (ibid). What this means is that the researcher is expected to do his or her best to conduct research of high quality, free from outside influence and manipulation, and research that is not based not only on personal motives. The guidelines presented by the Swedish Research Council are presented below.

First, the researcher should tell the truth about the research, and consciously review and account for the purpose(s) of the studies. There have been several motives for conducting this research and these motives are both personal and professional. My personal motive when conducting this research has been an interest in the subject and it has been a learning process that has contributed to my personal development. Throughout the process I have, indeed, learned a lot. Furthermore, it has been a matter of pursuing an academic career. There has also been the desire and requirement to contribute to Örebro University, especially the department in which I am working. A consequence of this is that you are required, and indeed want to publish your research in journals with a good reputation, those that are considered to be of high quality and also those that are included when the research results are evaluated and ranked. However, all these motives that I have presented need to be balanced with another motive: to produce research results that are of value to the research community and practice. The research should serve as a puzzle piece in the continued quest for knowledge and this means that the results need to be published. To get research published you need to “mind the gap”, i.e. do something that is needed and requested by the research community. Hence, one’s own interests must be balanced with that of public interest.

It is essential to publish research if it is going to be of use and, since this is a compilation thesis, its goal is completely in line with this need. However, in the second case study, open data has been the focus and the representative from the municipality who works with this topic on a daily basis has twice asked me if my research results will be published in open access journals. I have been forced to say no, because of my personal motives and the motive to contribute with research that counts for the university in the ranking when research results are measured. Open access journals are, generally, ranked lower than non-open access journals and I believe that
this is a problem; the goal of research is to spread new knowledge, but access to it is usually limited. However, throughout the process I have, as previously described, presented research results in other ways too; for instance, in a publicly available anthology, through a speech at the town hall, at a Kick-off organized in the second case, and so on. I have tried to communicate my results but I recognize that I could have done this even more. After my dissertation, I will spend more time on this.

Another guideline is to openly account for commercial interests and other associations. This research has been funded by the Research School of Public Affairs at Örebro University. In turn, this research school is co-financed by Örebro University and Örebro municipality. There are three types of research: basic, applied and commissioned research. This research is basic research, which means that no one has “ordered it”; hence, I have been allowed to seek new knowledge without a certain application in mind. Applied and commissioned research, on the contrary, has a decided aim; its goal is to be of use to the party who has initiated or ordered the research. This has, accordingly, not been the case in my research; I have had the freedom to design the process myself. Of course there have been supervisors involved but their role has been more to guide and make sure that everything is proceeding as expected than to govern the focus of the research process.

As previously said, it has been a personal learning process and the results should be communicated and published to be of use. However, the guidelines from the Swedish Research Council also state that the researcher must refrain from giving an assessment until sufficient evidence to support it has been gained. When it comes to evidence this requirement is straightforward; when it comes to interpretations, however, it is another matter. Interpretations are based on knowledge about the subject and that knowledge is growing. Throughout this process I have changed my mind about things on several occasions but, because the task has been to write a compilation thesis, I have been forced to publish the results continuously. I have not had the possibility to wait until every puzzle piece has been acquired. However, in this, I believe that my supervisors have played an important role, providing the expert knowledge needed when it has been lacking. Hence, when there has been something in the analysis or results that has been “strange”, they have made me aware of it. Furthermore, there has also been the peer review process associated with the publications. This has also aimed to make sure that what is published is of the necessary quality.
There is also another aspect of research guidelines: that which says ‘do not steal research from others’. This can be tricky in practice. When you use a specific source you, of course, give a reference to that source, but sometimes you read something and do not use it. Then, in another context, you do something else and, when analyzing this something else, you come to a conclusion that is based on your current knowledge about the situation. Where this knowledge comes from is, nevertheless, not always that clear. I have one such example. When performing the analyses in this cover paper, I drew one conclusion in the National Patient Summary case that I felt was a new conclusion. Then I read the literature by Mintrom and Norman (2009) again and realized that they actually talked about policy entrepreneurship in this way. I had, hence, not that exact part of their paper in mind when carrying out the analysis and consequently felt that it was my own conclusion based on the empirical material. If I had not read the paper again I would probably also have presented it that way. Now, however, I have changed it to be an activity consistent with the framework instead of something “new”. What, then, am I trying to say? That you sometimes are just not aware of why you start thinking of things, why you think in a certain direction. Results of analysis are based on many things and in interpretive research the researcher is the instrument. You can try to be aware of what you base your interpretations on, but it is not always possible. Anyhow, when I have been aware I have tried to be really careful with referencing and giving credit to the people deserving it. For the other occurrences, I have tried to repeatedly scrutinize for such things, asking myself: where does this come from? Also, here, I believe that my supervisors and the peer reviewers have played an important role.

Next up is the guideline to openly account for your methods and results. I have talked a lot of this previously in this chapter and I hope that I have succeeded with this. It has been a goal from the beginning to be as open and honest about the research and process as possible. Additionally, there is also a guideline stating that the researcher should keep the research organized. Also, this has been an important goal in the research process, because research is about writing and re-writing and sometimes you want to re-use something that was written earlier, or you need to go back to the empirical material to seek new things because of a new perspective. I have, because of this, been very meticulous with version handling of documents, and striving to keep material in a structured way on my computer, and so on. Furthermore, in my work I have been keeping
notes about the process continuously, documenting different parts of the process to make sure that I remember how I did things.

Finally, there is the guideline that the researcher should strive to conduct research without harming people, animals or the environment. When collecting empirical data I have tried to have a deep respect for the informants. One example is that I have tried to be sensitive towards the informants’ feelings and wishes. Before tape recording anything I have always asked for permission to do so. This made me feel a little bit uncomfortable in the beginning, being a new researcher, stepping into a room of people (the meetings) and then putting my hand up in the air, asking for the word to go ahead, and thereafter asking if I could record the meeting. It was truly uncomfortable in the beginning, but I did it anyway. The response to it has been questions, but no objections. People have asked me how the material was to be used and the purpose of the records and research. I have tried to answer their questions as honestly as possible and my answer has been that I will use the recordings for making transcripts and these transcripts will potentially lead to quotes in the research. I have thereafter asked if the people participating want to review the material before publication. The majority of times, people have not wanted this opportunity, but there was one time in the National Patient Summary case when it occurred. It was at the meeting when the interpretation of the law was the subject. In the open innovation competition case it has not occurred at meetings, but at the Hackathon 2014 I used the recorder when the project members reflected upon the outcome of the competition that year. I was then told by one of the participants that he wished to review it before including quotes from that participant.

Hence, most people have not objected or been shown to mind, but when people have asked questions I have taken that as a sign and their questions have affected how I have handled things. For instance, they have motivated me to provide more information about how material will be used, to tell more about the purpose of recording, the purpose of the research and how the recordings will be stored and shared, and to promise an opportunity to review before publication. If participants were still skeptical I would not have recorded the event, but that has not occurred; rather, I believe that people have mainly been curious about why I want to record them (with the exception of the objection presented at the meeting addressing the topic of the law).

When it comes to not harming the environment, the case is more sad. Definitely we do not live in a paper-free society. Throughout this process,
lots of printing has been carried out, but I have tried to do it as little as possible. Additionally, I have also strived to take the train to meetings and not the car. As seen, many of these guidelines and activities are related to morals. They are more or less common sense; however, that does not mean that you do not need to take them into account and talk about them. Talking about the level of printing may seem irrelevant, but I do believe that the environment is important and to not harm it more than “necessary” should, definitely, be a goal of all work.
5. The national patient summary case and policy entrepreneurship

As presented, the National Patient Summary case took shape in a contemporary policy stream. Things were happening on a global scale, the European Commission promoted interoperability in health care and this provided the window of opportunity that the project needed. As presented in the theoretical framework chapter, policy entrepreneurs need windows of opportunity and, therefore, they wait for a development in the political stream to use to their advantage. This was something that was happening in this case. The initiative to the case had been taken years before the launch of the national e-health policy. However, the case needed national support to get the legal prerequisites to allow the project to be launched.

5.1 Analytical framework part 1: Defining elements of policy entrepreneurship

In this first part of the analytical framework, I investigate the National Patient Summary case through looking at it in relation to four defining elements of policy entrepreneurship: social acuity, defining problems, building teams and leading by example.

Social acuity
According to the theoretical framework, social acuity plays an important role in policy entrepreneurship. In the analytical framework, I identified four activities related to this: 1) to respond to concerns, 2) to present innovative solutions, 3) to use windows of opportunity, and 4) to engage in policy conversation.

According to the program director, the National Patient Summary project was originally initiated because of explicit criticism of the fragmented system architecture in the Swedish health care system. Such criticism was voiced years before the launch of the e-health agenda. In Sweden there are several suppliers of medical records, and patient information is stored separately by different health care providers. This makes coherent record keeping impossible. This is perceived to be a problem from a patient safety perspective, because information needs to be linked so that health care providers have access to the entire care process and all essential facts. Hence, a general interest in sharing patient information over organizational boundaries had existed for years. This led several actors and organiza-
tions to develop ideas on how to solve the information-sharing problem in the decentralized Swedish health care system. Work on the first version of the patient summary was initiated in 2004. At that time, the aim of the project was to learn more, rather than to develop an application for actual use.

“The criticisms against the fragmented system architecture were very clear and the effects obvious, the care providers lacked access to patient information.” – The program director

Evidently, the National Patient Summary case started with frustration over how information sharing was carried out in health care. In other words, the solution they developed was a response to existing concerns. However, at this point in time, the project was carried out on a regional government level, so lacked the national support needed. In 2004, the idea of the summary was presented to county council directors, who endorsed and approved funding for the project. Regional government level support existed and an interest organization for IT in health care was commissioned to implement the project, which was seen as a project with the aim to learn more. The timetable was set for one year and a small system pilot was launched in October 2005. Four county councils participated in the pilot, and knowledge and experience gained in previous regional attempts to share patient information across organizational boundaries were reused. One of the county councils had, for example, had a project where the aim was to make patient records available on the Internet for the patients themselves. However, that project was halted by the Data Inspection Board, because it broke the then present law. Also, for the small system pilot, the law turned out to be an obstacle, but the project received an exemption, because it was seen as an experimental project. A few doctors and nurses participated in the pilot and, after the project ended, there was an attempt to evaluate the benefits; however, due to the small numbers, it was decided that it was unreasonable to draw any conclusions on the matter. Instead, the most important lesson found was that it was clear that the law needed to be changed. For this to happen, the project needed national support and luckily the timing was good as things were now happening on a national and global scale.

Previous efforts had, hence, shown that the law was a major barrier. However, when the developed proposal for changes in the law was submitted to the Ministry of Health and Social Affairs in 2006 it coincided with an ongoing review of the health care laws. The result was that the
proposal became a supplementary directive to the investigation in progress and this opened a window of opportunity for the project to secure legislative cooperation. Nevertheless, an important circumstance to recognize is that the initial aim of the review of the law had a different purpose. Its main goal was to create a coherent legislation by replacing two previous laws with one new one. But, after the amendment, the task was expanded to also include an analysis of the feasibility and utility of creating a “one for all” health care providers’ cohesive record. In this work, the importance of balancing the individuals’ need for protection of personal privacy and the benefits to society and patient safety with coordinated record keeping was stressed. The result of the investigation was the new Patient Data Act (2008:335). The law replaced the two previous laws, the initial aim, and another change was that this new law also allowed so-called coordinated record keeping, which means that a health care provider under certain circumstances may make all or part of a health record available to other health care providers.

The support for coordinated record keeping was, most likely, coming from changes happening in health care on a global scale. In parallel with the Swedish project, a major health care reform was initiated within the EU. The goal was interoperability in health care and the European interoperability policy’s aim was to facilitate the exchange and sharing of prescriptions and other relevant patient information electronically across national borders, both in planned and emergency care (Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, 2006). The underlying reason was increased citizen mobility and citizens’ legal rights to receive care in another EU country if their own country fails to meet urgent health needs in a timely manner. To better accommodate this right, the EU commission required member states to produce and present a strategy for e-health management by the end of 2005. The result was the Swedish National Strategy for e-Health, an e-health policy launched in spring 2006 as a direct response to the directive (ibid). The ideas in the strategy were inspired by the work done and, as the goal of the patient summary was similar to the goal of the EU, the project became a part of the national e-health agenda. Hence, there was another window of opportunity, this time to secure national support and, hence, the project management did not hesitate to use it. At first, there was another project that would be used to address the demand for interoperability in health care among the EU member states. This project was called epSOS and it was, when initiated, the largest EU project ever in health care. Sweden coordinated the project, which originally involved 12 mem-
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was planned to go on for three years, from 2008 (Ministry of Health and Social Affairs, 2006). Initially, the National Patient Summary project’s focus was on achieving interoperability between health care providers at regional government level in Sweden, but the project management felt that having two similar projects would be devastating; it would divide the target image. According to the program director, the epSOS project was considered spectacular on a political level and, therefore, it received attention. This was something that made the project management of the patient summary worried. Accordingly, there was a need to secure cooperation and this work was initiated by the patient summary project. The result was successful and the decision was taken to use the patient summary both in Sweden and in the EU.

“…and therefore we came pretty quickly to the conclusion that if we do anything in Sweden that should be a pilot in Europe, then it should be based on the national patient summary, no subspecies, no different solutions.” – The program director

Hence, the project management presented an innovative solution and used it to address several problems (concerns) simultaneously: first the criticism of the fragmented Swedish health care and then the wish for member states’ interoperability. Indeed, they did engage in policy conversation. In this, their sensitivity to timing played an important role. Previously, there had not been legal support, but now there was a promise of it.

Defining problems

According to the theoretical framework, the act of defining problems is important in policy entrepreneurship. In the analytical framework, I identified four activities related to this: 1) to pay attention to problem definition, 2) to present evidence of crisis, 3) to undermine present policy images, and 4) to seek support from unexpected allies.

The strategy to also address the wish for interoperability between member states meant that the goal of the patient summary changed. The patient summary should, hence, no longer just meet the needs of different care providers in Sweden; it should also meet the needs of the EU. Thus, the inclusion in the strategy and the epSOS project expanded the goals.

2 Later, the project was extended to 2013 and to involve 23 different European countries; 20 EU member states and three non-EU member states. Also, the budget was increased to € 36,000,000 (epSOS, n.d.).
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Additionally, the involvement in the strategy also meant that an action plan for the years to come was urgently needed. The e-health strategy had other important goals as well, one such was to develop a common technical infrastructure for Swedish health care. This work was actually at the top of the agenda. When it came to the patient summary, on the contrary, there were differences of opinion. Some argued that it was most strategically correct to first work out the prerequisites and then the applications, but the discussion ended with the recommendation that the patient summary should be included in the plan for 2007 to 2009. The motive for this was to win joint funding by the county councils and the summary acted, hence, as an incentive, as it was felt that it would be easy to demonstrate the benefits coming from the summary.

“It has been clear from the beginning that we cannot just deliver the infrastructure because then this national initiative would die, we must be able to also deliver business benefits.” – IT director at the county council

Thus, the project management rejected the idea of first focusing on the prerequisites and later on the applications. They highlighted the potential failures of this strategy to secure the implementation of their own strategy. Furthermore, in October 2006, before the action plan had been decided upon, the interest organization initiated the procurement of the information system that would be used to provide the National Patient Summary, though they were too impatient to wait for the completion of the action plan. This led to major opposition, because the decision was not anchored with those who would fund the project, i.e. the county councils. A discussion was initiated as to whether the procurement should be discontinued or not, but it was concluded that it was impossible to go back since this would send out the wrong signals. Additionally, this was not the only dissatisfaction with the interest organization. The system vendors also complained and stated that the timetable was too tight. All the commotion surrounding the procurement led to the ownership being questioned and it was understood that a joint management was needed. A new project management was therefore created within the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions (SALAR), i.e. on a national government level, around 2006-2007. Now, the project was steered at a national level, over the county councils. The initiative for the patient summary was, hence, taken by a rather small group of people but, throughout the process
of formalizing the project, more people and organizations become involved. Coalitions were created to secure the project.

In addition to the organizational problems, there was also another challenge. Even at this stage, it was not yet clear as to the exact nature of the patient summary. To come to an agreement about this, the decision to develop a proper specification was taken in spring 2007. Previously, the project’s focus had been on the county councils and examples used to illustrate the benefits were straightforward. One example used was a person who went skiing on vacation, had an accident and was forced to seek health care from a county council other than their own. The usefulness of the summary in this situation was contested since it is clear what has happened and how it can be fixed. Instead, some argued that the problem that needed to be solved was the sharing of information between and within the health care principals in a region. Since the main stream of health care transactions is between the municipalities and the county council, the municipal perspective took a strong hold of the project. In Swedish health care, the heaviest burden is care for the elderly. According to the national program director, the majority of the county council’s resources go to a minority of the population, namely the elderly.

“The largest flows of health care transactions are between the municipalities and their county council, 80% of the county council’s resources go to 20% of the population, the elderly” – The national program director

The problem with the transfer of patient information between the municipalities and the county council existed in all counties, while the problems within and among counties varied from county to county. Insight into this led to a change of focus. The new focus was on sharing information across, but also within, the main authorship boundaries and it was decided that the National Patient Summary should work equally well for both needs. Hence, the nature of the patient summary changed again. Originally, its aim was to share patient information between county councils; now it was between municipalities, county councils and EU member states as well. In this project, the members did indeed pay attention to problem definition. To secure cooperation was considered essential and, therefore, the project was repeatedly adapted to fit new needs. This also meant the involvement of unexpected allies; for example, EU member states through inclusion in the epSOS project. Regarding any crises, there was no crisis as such at this time, just the risk of not getting the project funded and sup-
ported and this was considered enough to reverse the order of the projects, the National Patient Summary and the infrastructure project.

**Building teams**
According to the theoretical framework, the act of building teams is important in policy entrepreneurship. In the analytical framework, I identified two activities related to this: 1) to work in teams, and 2) to create coalitions.

Focus in the project was now on delivery, to avoid being trapped in a long development process with no result. The next step in the project was therefore to find a county council and a municipality that were willing to undertake a major task with tight deadlines. The choice fell on a municipality and county council that had earlier expressed interest in the project. The reason for their interest was the already established collaboration between the two providers. To aid the cooperation, a care planning system was used, but there was also a need for a system that could ease the exchange of medical information. This information was currently provided on paper, a process that was perceived to be time consuming. On top of that, when information was not available, much time was spent on the phone trying to get hold of the necessary facts. To get them interested in the project was, consequently, not difficult and this was the last step in the process of building teams. National support was secured, as well as regional and local. The coalitions needed were developed, showing the team-playing capabilities of the people involved.

**Leading by example**
According to the theoretical framework, leading by example plays an important role in policy entrepreneurship. In the analytical framework, I identified six activities related to this: 1) to demonstrate workability, 2) to turn ideas into action, 3) to make investments, 4) to be genuinely committed, 5) to switch the focus, and 6) to secure cooperation.

To be able to try the National Patient Summary system before delivery approval, it was determined to test deploy it for a limited time in an implementation pilot. However, before this pilot implementation could start, the municipality and the county council had to prepare for the new system. The timetable was tight, which meant that it was only possible to implement things that could be dealt with in a short time. In the previous small system pilot, a number of information quantities were identified, but to meet the needs of the link between the municipality and county council
(one of the project’s new goals), the summary needed to be expanded with more information quantities.

The first version of the National Patient Summary was expected to be ready in March 2009, but it turned out that the security solutions that should be used with the summary were delayed. This led to the decision, in fall 2008, to run the system with a temporary security solution during the implementation pilot. This became a critical stage in the project. Originally, the idea was to also test the common security solution during the implementation pilot, but since it was considered disastrous to wait for something that no one knew when it was going to be ready, it was decided to use the temporary solution instead. It was considered truly important to turn the idea into action to be able to demonstrate its workability. The new date for the launch was set to May 4, 2009.

Nor, after this, was there an end to the problems. In the planning of the implementation pilot, there was an additional difficulty concerning the new law. It turned out that in order to share information across organizational boundaries, the patient must be able to consent to this. This constituted a problem as the patient summary now, in the pilot implementation, was intended to be used to facilitate the information flow in elderly care. Among these patients, there were many who could not make or communicate such a decision for medical reasons, e.g. dementia. As the new law strictly required consent, the problem had to be solved. In the law there were exceptions for emergency situations, but no regulations about what happens in everyday care if the patient is not able to consent. The municipality therefore turned to two different lawyers, but neither of them could find a solution. The law clearly stated that consent was needed, with no exceptions. Previously, in the manual paper-based system, the municipality’s health workers had assumed that the patient implicitly had given consent to care when it was not possible to get consent. To solve the problem, it was decided that the same solution would apply now; assumed consent. This was, hence, an innovative solution to the problem and the rationale behind this decision was the reasoning that the purpose of changing the law must have been to improve care and facilitate care situations. Hence, excluding a large group of patients corresponded poorly with the assumed aim. Drawing on this rationale, a guideline for presumptive consent was drafted by the municipality’s charge nurses. That is, health workers were to assume that there is implicit consent for sharing information if considered by the staff to be beneficial to the patient. This shows genuine commitment in the task.
To get others to believe in this solution to secure cooperation, references were made to the regulations that were developed for guiding the practical application of the new law. The prescription said that if consent is not obtainable from a person over 18 years of age due to “lack of decision-making powers because of, for example, illness, pain or loss of consciousness”, then the fact that the patient has applied for care constitutes the basis for assumed consent (SALAR, 2009). It could be perceived as uncertain as to whether this exception referred to emergency situations or daily care, but it was anyhow considered to be a solution to the problem and the project management felt comfortable with how the problem was solved. The focus was switched from the strict requirement of consent in the law to the more vague interpretation of the guidelines. With this feeling that the problem had been solved, the pilot implementation of the patient summary was launched.

The implementation pilot was launched on May 4, 2009 and it continued as planned to the end of August that same year. Accordingly, the first implementation took place after five years of paving the way. During the pilot, medical information provided by the county council was shared with health professionals in the municipality. According to the project managers, surprisingly few technical errors occurred in the pilot and, since none of them were serious, but were easy to fix, the National Patient Summary was approved as scheduled on August 31, making the investment an established system. In the pilot, the municipality got access to the county council’s patient information via the patient summary. The step after was to plan for new investments to let the county council access the municipality’s information, a step that began to be planned for in autumn 2009. Parallel to this, there were also preparations going on to connect the remaining municipalities in the county to the patient summary in the so-called regional project, since only one municipality became connected through the implementation pilot.

5.2 Analytical framework part 2: Policy entrepreneurship in broader explanations of policy change

In this part of the analytical framework, I investigate the National Patient Summary case through looking at it in relation to how policy entrepreneurs respond to concepts related to policy change, such as incrementalism, institutionalism, punctuated equilibrium, policy streams and theory about advocacy coalitions.
Incrementalism
According to the theoretical framework, incrementalism is a frustrating inhibitor for policy entrepreneurs. In the analytical framework, I identified three activities related to how policy entrepreneurs try to handle this: 1) to secure cooperation, 2) to keep track of small victories, and 3) to explain setbacks.

During the pilot, the National Patient Summary was used by 360 local nurses and occupational therapists in the municipality. Based on the conditions, the project management was pleased with its use, although there were two limiting factors: The first is the requirement for a health care relationship. The second is the demand for consent; in other words, unless the patient has consented (at least, those who can), the system may not be used. In addition to this, there must also be a reason to use the system, if no exchange has occurred between the county council and the municipality, there is no new information to download and hence no incentive to use the system. Hence, the project management kept track of the small victories and explained why the summary was not used more. After the delivery approval, the pilot was considered as successfully completed and the running of the patient summary continued as a regular operation.

Institutionalism
According to the theoretical framework, policy entrepreneurs’ actions related to institutionalism are to secure cooperation.

As presented, institutionalism played a central role in the project. Therefore I will now present how the project management dealt with this circumstance. In the fall of 2009, the Data Inspection Board scrutinized the operation. The verdict, presented the following summer, was that presumptive consent cannot be used for direct access. Their interpretation of the law was, hence, different than that of the project management. The National Board of Health and Welfare’s handbook states: “The Patient Data Act contains no specific provisions how adults, designated as ‘decision incapable’, should be informed of coordinated record keeping” (National Board of Health and Welfare, 2009). It is a fact that the decisions of incapable persons were omitted and it is this that the Data Inspection Board took note of. Because these persons were not addressed by the new law, the Board claimed that the Personal Data Act – a much more restrictive law – would apply instead. This meant that the new regulations developed for the Patient Data Act were not applicable, which in turn took away the legal grounds for allowing direct access. To allow for coordinat-
ed record keeping, the law needed to be changed. This did, however, not help, since the new law did not contain information on how the situation around the decision incapable should be handled, and therefore the law could not be applied to that patient group.

“No, no, no, they say, it cannot be done. It is not the Patient Data Act that decides in this case but the Personal Data Act and it says that a clear consent from the individual is required. If there is no consent, the data may not be disclosed.” – Local IT strategist

The Data Inspection Board made this interpretation of the legislation. The consequence of the Data Inspection Board’s statement was, therefore, a temporary shutdown of the patient summary in summer 2010. To solve the problem, the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions formulated a request to the government concerning a change to the Patient Data Act. The problem was, however, that legislative changes take time. The project management examined the possibility of a temporary exemption to include those incapable of making decisions; however, the Data Inspection Board refused. Below, one of the local project members recounts a part of the discussion at the meeting.

“We had really prepared well prior to the meeting. We had held meetings and made suggestions, but then they say ‘no, unfortunately it is not possible, these are the facts’ and it just *poof* my goodness then we can close the shop? Should these people get lower quality care than the others? ‘Well’ they say, ‘we just interpret the law’. So it was actually a bit sad to leave with this news.” – Local IT strategist

Hence, there was definitely a case of institutionalism in this project. The Data Inspection Board’s focus is to secure privacy and this has the consequence that they mainly interpret laws from this perspective. Therefore, they do not take other potential benefits into account, at least not in a way that matters; if something threatens privacy, their job is to remove this threat. By doing so they promote stability. The local project management’s perception after the meeting with the Data Inspection Board was that the only solution was a change of legislation to be able to use the summary with decision-incapable persons. To only be able to use the patient summary for patients who can consent was considered to be a huge drawback, since geriatric care is the largest part of the Swedish health care. The original plan was that the implementation of the patient summary should be
performed at a rapid pace in the other county councils and municipalities soon after the piloted. But, because of the legal problems, the decision was taken to stop all further implementations until the problems were solved.

“What is needed in this case is a change in the law and that work is in progress.” – Local project coordinator

The perception after the meeting with the Data Inspection Board was hence that a change of legislation was needed. However, the National Board of Health and Welfare wanted to have the interpretation made by the Data Inspection Board examined through a judicial process and, therefore, they advised that the law be applied so that the applied interpretation could be tested in court. The next step in the project was therefore to review and clarify the guideline for presumptive consent. The new version added that the health workers should try to iron out the problem by asking relatives of patients before taking the decision. Still, even this was against the Data Inspection Board’s interpretation, as they stated in their supervision report that:

“If a person lacks capacity to understand the meaning of consent, processing of personal data cannot be based on an agreement from a relative” (Data Inspection Board, 2010).

In summary, one authority gave one piece of advice to the project while another authority provided completely contradictory advice. This is the result of different belief systems and focus. Not surprisingly, the project management decided to follow the advice from the National Board of Health and Welfare. After the review of the guideline, the operation of the patient summary was resumed. Hence, in December 2010, the National Patient Summary was back in service and once again used to facilitate information sharing between the municipality and the county council. In addition, the work with large-scale implementation was resumed. During the project, the management had held meetings with both the Data Inspection Board and the National Board of Health and Welfare but, as stated by the local project leader, it had not been possible to come up with any solutions.

“National authorities have not been willing to deal with the issue. I can actually think that this is an opportunity, because now things happen. So I see the positive in this respect, even though it is unfortunate that it would become like this.” – Local project leader
Hence, there was a move to get the authorities' involvement earlier in the project to secure cooperation, but, unfortunately, it was not possible.

**Punctuated equilibrium**

In the analytical framework, I identified three activities related to punctuated equilibrium: 1) to bring the issue into the policy domain, 2) to undermine the present policy images, and 3) to switch level to get a hearing for the cause.

The goal after the Data Inspection Board's review was not to give up; rather, it was to “win the battle”. To proceed with the project, the project members were, consequently, forced to push a political agenda of adjusting the laws to enable interoperability. This situation meant that the project members got a political role. This statement was, for instance, made by the head of the Center for eHealth in Sweden:

“Now, as the summary [national patient] is introduced, we see some things that must be fixed in the law. We continue to drive change and expect that the government will make the adjustments.”

– Head of the Center for eHealth in Sweden

To succeed with this, one very important part was to undermine the present policy's image. Throughout the project, large political and economic investments were made, which required that the project did not fail. To make sure of this, the project management used the patient summary as a steering mechanism to switch focus from action to inaction by the supervising authorities. The rationale behind this was that if the summary could not be used for the majority of the elderly, the project benefits would be drastically reduced, which in turn would have implications for the large-scale implementation. The reason is that if the municipalities cannot use the summary for their patients, they have no use of the summary, and hence no incentives to implement it. This would, definitely, have been a “crisis” in view of the frequent references to the patient safety perspective. Hence, the project management carefully painted the image of a crisis and brought the issue out into the public domain³. The goal was to secure cooperation and to change rules in practice; not how they were written in the law, but how the law was interpreted when applied in practice. There were, consequently, negotiations regarding what was considered most

³ There were many articles in media at the time, for instance, in the e-health magazine “IT i Vården”.
important and the result was a change in the perception of privacy. A new way of thinking about patient safety and privacy was promoted and others were “prompted” to adopt this value perspective as well. This advice was therefore given to the health care providers that were connected to the summary after the pilot, i.e. that they must do the same. The reason behind this was the belief that if everybody interprets the law in the same way, and acts in the same way, then the pressure will be more effective. The outcome of this was that the patient summary was implemented on a large scale. All county councils and 184 of 290 municipalities became connected with the summary (ITiVården, 2014).

The project managed, accordingly, to change the rules in practice and to implement interoperability. However, what they did not succeed with was to get the summary accepted by health care professionals. Initially in the project, there was a “struggle” to show benefits, so the nature of the summary had to change to motivate its implementation. Despite this, the assumed benefits were obviously not recognized by health care professionals. The actual use of the summary after large-scale implementation was very low (ITiVården, 2014). This led to the decision to close the patient summary in 2014. This decision was taken after the total cost of 132 million SEK (approximately 14,500,000 EUR) was spent on development and operation (ibid). Hence, punctuated equilibrium played a part in the project. The management tried to bring the issue out into the public domain to provoke an interest for it, and an interest for interoperability in health care. Initially in the project, the benefits of the summary were contested, which made the project management try another level (the EU and the local, to more clearly show the benefits). With this they succeeded in that the summary was implemented; however, they did not succeed to get health care to adopt a new way of working.

Policy streams
According to the theoretical framework, policy streams provide opportunities for policy entrepreneurs. In the analytical framework I identified three activities related to this: 1) to link problems, 2) to get the idea included on an agenda, and 3) to be sensitive to timing.

In summary, there was initially a struggle to get the project accepted. It was when the window of opportunity opened that the project got accepted. Sensitivity to timing played an important role. Interoperability in health care had not been possible previously, but now it was included in a national e-health policy and, thus, it received national support and politi-
cal impetus. As described, the project management effectively linked different problems; those of the EU and those of the municipalities. This strategy worked in that the summary was implemented. The outcome was, hence, a change in perception of privacy. This, probably, makes it easier for future efforts. This project has pushed the barrier for what is possible a bit further forward, in all likelihood making the impossible possible in the future. The issue managed to get attention because the timing was right. According to theorizations on policy streams, certain issues get attention at certain times and this case confirms this.

**Advocacy coalitions**

According to the theoretical framework, theories about advocacy coalitions can be applied to policy entrepreneurship. I identified one activity related to this: 1) to interpret a situation to maximize attention. As previously described, this happened in this case. To get the support needed, the solution had to be adapted: first, to address global needs and thereafter to address local needs. To defend the benefits only on a regional level turned out difficult; these benefits were contested and, consequently, the project had to take this circumstance into account. Originally, the project’s aim was to share patient information between county councils; now, it was between municipalities, county councils and member states as well.

**5.3 Summary discussion and conclusions: the impact of policy entrepreneurship in the National Patient Summary case**

As presented, the results of the papers gave insight into the fact that implementing projects of this kind is definitely not a matter of straightforward implementation. On the contrary, many decisions must be made throughout implementation and, depending on these decisions, the outcome is affected. The results of the papers showed that political ends are often unclear; implementation involves many strategic decisions and, through these, the work can change in character. This supports previous research that states it is in the implementation that electronic government is shaped (Giritli-Nygren & Lindblad-Gidlund, 2009). The project was the result of an initiative taken at a regional level, but which received national support (inclusion in a national policy). However, the troubles of the project had most impact on a local level. Despite efforts to try to change the prerequisites to allow for the project, it turned out to be illegal, at least according to one interpretation of the law. Hence, the project came to a
dead end. Through being persistent, the project members managed, any-
how, to change the view of the supervising authority. The law was not
changed, but the rules in practice were.

As shown, the case has a lot of things in common with policy entrepre-
nurship and, if it has these things in common, what else can the case an-
ticipate to have in common? I believe that four things are essential when
elaborating on this: the responsiveness of policy entrepreneurs, their ten-
dency to be different, the need to speed up things and the forgiving atti-
dute towards entrepreneurs which makes them dare to act in this way.

Policy entrepreneurs need windows of opportunity. As shown in this
case, the idea of interoperability in health care existed years before the
national e-health policy, but the project needed the political impetus that
the national policy could provide. To get it, the project had, however, to
change character. Hence, policy entrepreneurs need to be responsive; they
need to promote their solutions in a way that makes sense to get others to
support them. Policy entrepreneurs often lack decision-making powers
and, therefore, they need to be on good terms with those who have them,
even if it means adapting the ideas somewhat. In this case, there was a
need to broaden the scope, to make the summary useful on more levels to
be able to sell the idea. This, however, increased complexity, but it also
provided the opportunity needed. Policies are often visionary and that
means that the solutions presented to address them must be as well. 
Hence, ideas can become more ambitious as a result of this.

This is on top of the fact that entrepreneurship by itself is drastic. En-
trepreneurship is never business as usual; it always aims to significantly
change things. The efforts are not small scale, they are ambitious big ideas.
The wish is to overturn structures and norms. To go with the flow is simp-
ly not an option for an entrepreneur. Policy entrepreneurs think in a dif-
ferent way than most others and this, I believe, may explain what hap-
pened in this case after the large-scale implementation. Previous research
has shown that organizations are sticky, they are not eager to change
(Curry et al., 2006). Change can happen, but it takes time, and this is in
conflict with policy entrepreneurship. Policy entrepreneurs must act when
the timing is right, and they must turn ideas into action quickly to show
the ideas’ workability. Hence, there is a need to speed up things.

Responses to visions can be accepted rather quickly, because visions are
not realities. On the contrary, when it comes to actually changing practi-
calities, acceptance is harder to find. Doing things in a different way re-
quires the changing of minds and this do not happen instantly. It can, in
fact, happen afterwards and this may explain why certain projects are perceived as failures. However, whether or not they truly are failures depends on what we expect from them. If we expect them to be accepted instantly and to be complete successes, received with enthusiasm, I believe that many change projects are damned to fail.

To implement interoperability in health care is, indeed, complicated. The quest has inherent conflicts, and there are contradictory goals involved. This means that difficult decisions must be made and for someone to take them requires political guts. Policy entrepreneurs have guts but they do not have the powers to take such decisions. Politicians have power, but politicians do not have the “guts” or ability because they are expected to act in a legitimate way. There is a forgiving attitude towards entrepreneurs, but that does not apply to politicians, who must be accountable. However, through the influence of policy entrepreneurs, minds can begin to change and this could provide the acceptance needed for politicians to dare to act. Or, another solution could be that the influence of policy entrepreneurs, on the contrary, contributes to hinder people from acting. Policy entrepreneurs present crises to get their will through; the outcome of this could be that people with dissident minds are silent (this actually happened in this case). The result is that policy entrepreneurship does contribute to changing things and, through this, it can make things that are impossible today possible tomorrow. However, changing minds takes time and I believe that, in many cases, it happens too late and this is why change projects frequently appear as failures. My question is, however, are they really? The National Patient Summary was implemented, and that means that the conditions for interoperability in health care changed. So, even though this project was cancelled, it could very well have contributed to making the next effort a lot easier and this is a good thing, I believe. Nevertheless, through policy entrepreneurship things could, perhaps, get a little bit crazy, but maybe that is what we need. Stickiness in the public sector and its organizations effectively prevents change and this could mean that drastic measures are needed if something is to happen.
6. The open innovation competition case and policy entrepreneurship

The event triggering the organization of the open innovation competition studied in the second case was an open data seminar held by the county council because of their work with the Digital Agenda. This was the policy stream in which the open innovation case took shape. Also, in this case, things were happening on a global scale, with the European Commission promoting availability and the re-use of public data, and the development of national and regional digital agendas. As presented in the theory chapter, policy entrepreneurs need windows of opportunity and, therefore, they wait for a development in the political stream to use to their advantage. In this chapter, I describe how they interpreted and used this policy stream.

6.1 Analytical framework part 1: Defining elements of policy entrepreneurship

In this first part of the analytical framework, I investigate the open innovation competition case through looking at it in relation to four defining elements of policy entrepreneurship: social acuity, defining problems, building teams and leading by example.

Social acuity
According to the theoretical framework, social acuity plays an important role in policy entrepreneurship. In the analytical framework, I identified four activities related to this: 1) to respond to concerns, 2) to present innovative solutions, 3) to use windows of opportunity, and 4) to engage in policy conversation.

The open government agenda is fairly new, but it has, since its introduction, spread quickly (Alanazi & Chatfield, 2012). The active promotion of open government policies and open data was initiated around 2009 (ibid). Today, 63 countries are connected to the Open Government Partnership, an international platform for governments committed to becoming more open, accountable, and responsive to citizens (Open Government Partnership, 2014). Furthermore, the European Commission promotes this agenda heavily through their Digital Agenda for Europe. Nationally, in Sweden the work with promoting open data has been assigned to the eGovernment Delegation. On a national level in Sweden, the most important policy ad-
dressing the work related to electronic government is the Swedish Digital Agenda (Government Offices of Sweden, 2011). This agenda states:

“The transparency of public decision-making, management of cases and the availability of public information should increase. Public information and e-services are community-wide resources that can be used by other players and thereby contribute to the growth of society. By improving the conditions so that companies and nonprofit organizations can, in a simple way, use the information and services for the development of own services, these services can complement the government's services and meet the changing needs of society. The government wants to improve the conditions so new and innovative e-services can be developed by stakeholders other than government agencies. This improves the conditions for development of new and innovative e-services. Furthermore, it is a key platform for growth. In the public sector there are extensive records that are a unique resource for Sweden. By better making them accessible Sweden can strengthen growth in small and medium sized IT companies. Access to the information must be made secure, and privacy must be protected, which requires that new standardized information structures are developed.”

Hence, today, information resources are not perceived to be used in the best possible way in the public sector. Besides this, the transparency of public decision-making needs to increase (Government Offices of Sweden, 2011). It is to these concerns that the project group in the open innovation competition case responded and the response was to organize an open innovation competition. This was an innovative solution to the “problems” and a way to engage in the policy conversation.

The initiative for the competition was taken in spring 2012 after an open data seminar held at the County Administrative Board. The seminar was an activity organized because of the County Administrative Board’s work with the Swedish Digital Agenda. I attended the seminar as it was in line with my research focus. At the seminar, I met with the representative from the municipality who also work on the eGovernment Delegation by promoting the open data agenda (i.e. he works both on a national and local level with the agenda). Together we decided that it would be a good idea to arrange a competition and decided to set up a new meeting and plan for this (how to recruit more people interested in taking part, etc.).
Hence, the Digital Agenda opened up a window of opportunity for the competition.

To recruit project members was easy. When hearing about the idea, the feedback was very positive. All project members saw it as a strategically important question and shared the view of the benefits of transparency and increased innovation; however, they had slightly different entry points to this. The project leader saw it as an opportunity to increase innovation (leading to good ideas and economic growth), the local IT company saw it as an opportunity to promote their own work and brand, as well as a way to promote the city and region as a place where interesting things happen. The representative from the municipality participated because of his regular work with promoting open data as a way of making local government more open, and the County Administrative Board was involved because of their work with the Digital Agenda (a strategy for electronic government work).

The competition was considered to be a good means for achieving several of the things wished for: first, to get public organizations to publish open data; second, to make the truly important quest visible to a greater audience in order to create more followers; and third, to show the benefits of re-use, i.e., to “prove” the workability of the idea.

Defining problems
According to the theoretical framework, the act of defining problems is important in policy entrepreneurship. In the analytical framework, I identified four activities related to this: 1) to pay attention to problem definition, 2) to present evidence of a crisis, 3) to undermine present policy images, and 4) to seek support from unexpected allies.

In 2012, the competition was mainly promoted through social media, the project’s web page, and advertising. Promotion was indirect in nature and sought to reach out to a broad audience. With this, however, the project group did not succeed. Only a handful (n=9) of people attended the Kick-off and none of the participants showed any interest in the Hackathon. When the registration period expired there were very few entrants, which led to the decision being made to extend the registration period. Sadly, this turned out to be counter-productive as it did not result in any new entrants, just the loss of some who were previously interested. The entrants could participate in two categories: a) by developing a completed service, or b) by sending in an idea for a service that could be developed in the future. In total, there were six contributions: four apps and two ideas.
Some of these contributions were the result of pressure, i.e., people was directly asked to contribute. Before launching the competition, the project group thought that the marketing carried out was enough. Clearly, it was not and the project group was forced to learn the lesson that it is difficult to reach out with the public data agenda. Thus, there is a need for even more marketing. However, they did not hesitate to arrange the competition again.

The project members believed in the idea of open data and open innovation. However, they also recognized the potential difficulties in realizing the agenda. To get data published was seen as important, but they also acknowledged that there is a “chicken and egg” situation; to get organizations to participate in this agenda, the benefits need to be clear (which they will be through re-use, but this requires data). The conclusion was therefore drawn that it would be challenging and that it, probably, would take time:

“It’s a chicken and egg situation. So you have to have some respect for it, it does not go in two weeks, it’s a few years before getting this out, and before getting up re-use it is difficult to argue for open data internally in the organization.” – The representative from the municipality

This was a conclusion drawn after the first competition, when the low public response to the cause had become clear. The strategy was, therefore, to recruit unexpected allies that could join the cause. One strategy chosen was to approach secondary schools in the region. The hope was that secondary school pupils would be easier to reach out to, so long as it fitted in with their school workload. In this aim, the project management succeeded. An agreement was made with secondary school teachers who, thereby, became intermediaries (and unexpected allies) for the task, as it was now their job to recruit pupils as entrants. To manage this, the agenda had to be presented in such a way that the teachers could see the educational benefits of taking part. Through succeeding with this a new situation was created; there was a “promise” of entrants (which would lead to re-use). This, however, also changed the target group for the competition. Previously, the goal was to reach out widely; now the focus was narrower.

In this case, there was no real crisis. The major challenge was to get the public to participate. The project members recognized the consequences of low public response as a threat to the cause, but not as a crisis as such. They also acknowledged the relationship between the amount of data...
available for re-use and the public response. In this case, there were no present policy images to undermine, but there was a lack of policy support, and this policy support was considered important. To get the local public organizations’ cooperation in publishing data, this work had to be seen by the organizations as an integral part of their daily work and not as something voluntary. In 2012, when the first competition was launched, local policy lacked such support. In 2012’s version of local policy there were just a few sentences regarding openness. The topic had a limited role and no real weight. Consequently, the project members wanted to give that work more focus. In 2013, the open agenda had more emphasis and the work with open data was included, stating that creating open data should be an integral part of the business and any exceptions had to be justified. Organizing the competition contributed to this.

Building teams
According to the theoretical framework, the act of building teams is important in policy entrepreneurship. In the analytical framework, I identified two activities related to this: 1) to work in teams, and 2) to create coalitions.

In the autumn of 2013 the competition was arranged once again. The organization of the competition for 2013 saw a number of changes, as a result of the lessons learned. In 2012, a cash prize had been offered (20,000 SEK, approximately €2300); however, this had not seemed to provide sufficient motivation for people to compete, so this cash reward was removed. Instead, in 2013, the prize was to have the opportunity to take part in an agile project in an IT company, i.e., the winner was thus offered the opportunity to create business connections which could potentially lead to employment. Another lesson was that any marketing needed to be more direct. One strategy chosen was therefore, as presented, to approach secondary schools in the region. This was also one of the reasons for changing the nature of the prize, because it was believed that career opportunities would appeal more to pupils and teachers. The focus on pupils also meant it was necessary to change the categories of the competition. In 2013, it was possible to compete in one of two categories; one for pupils and one for others. It was no longer possible to enter with an idea only, because the organizers wanted to avoid having too many categories. There was also a desire to generate more services than in 2012. Additionally, more marketing was performed, including a radio interview, and presentations at a promotion breakfast and on a promotion boat trip.
Team building has played a central role in this case. To “spread the message” and increase knowledge about the agenda have been considered really important. The project members have, therefore, used personal and professional networks and they have also used existing events to promote the own cause to an existing audience; for example, the use of the Global Entrepreneurship Week and the National Conference for the Digital Agenda (see papers three and four for more details). The Chamber of Commerce and Industry’s events have also been used for marketing the competition and in 2013 a representative from them was added to the project group. To get the right people to promote the competition has been considered important; for example, in the first version of the competition the Minister for IT and Energy was asked if she would be willing to act as prize awarde. She could, unfortunately, not do it because it clashed with other activities. When there was low interest in the first year’s Kick-off (nine people present) and Hackathon (no one present), the strategy the following year was to invite interesting key note speakers, i.e. people considered to be “important IT profiles”. This strategy was very successful; the number of participants in the events has increased annually. Participation in the Kick-off increased from nine, to 39, and then more than 150 people for the three years that the competition was arranged (2012-2014). For the Hackathon, the numbers were zero, 10 entrants (but with over 50 people present in total), and 45 entrants (but with over 60 people present in total) for the same years.

Other examples of networking in the case are the inclusion of the secondary school teachers which aimed to create coalitions, and the promotion of the competition on the TV and radio.

Leading by example
According to the theoretical framework, to lead by example plays an important role in policy entrepreneurship. In the analytical framework, I identified six activities related to this: 1) to demonstrate workability, 2) to turn ideas into action, 3) to make investments, 4) to be genuinely committed, 5) to switch the focus, and 6) to secure cooperation.

Turning an idea into action has been the essence of this case. It was the open data seminar that sparked the idea and after the seminar there was agreement that it is important to act upon the agenda, to implement the
visions in practice so as to demonstrate workability. As presented, work on the competition began in autumn 2012. The plan was to arrange a Kick-off, a Hackathon and a prize award ceremony. The aim of the Kick-off was to inform people about the competition and to recruit entrants. The purpose of the Hackathon was to create an event where entrants could meet and be inspired by each other so that the developed services could be as good as possible and to stimulate innovation. The prize award ceremony’s major aim was to present the results of the competition to a large audience. Before the events could be launched, however, it was seen as important to get public organizations to contribute. All municipalities (n=12) in the county were asked to contribute with open data. The task was to make five data sources available, sources which were considered relatively easy to publish. The reasoning behind asking them to publish these information resources was to secure their cooperation by not asking for something too difficult.

Regarding investments, they have mainly concerned the marketing of the competition, the financing of the prizes, and the cost of organizing the events. To market the competition, the project group used social media (Facebook, Twitter and LinkedIn) and a web page was set up. The cost of these activities was very low but, even so, the payment for the registration of domain name was provided by the municipality. Furthermore, an advertisement was placed in the local newspaper and posters were put up at the project members’ work places and on the university campus. The cost of these activities was financed by the department working with external relations at the university. In addition, e-mails were sent out through the Chamber of Commerce and Industry to all IT companies in the region. At the university, the project members also talked to students and asked teachers to talk to their own students about the competition before class. Information about the competition was also distributed through the university’s learning system. None of these activities resulted in any costs. The arranged events had, however, to be financed and the cost of these was financed by the department of external relations at the university and the municipality. The cost of the prizes was financed by the IT consultancy business.

To demonstrate workability has been important, but there has been a bit of a struggle with this because of the low public response. For each year, the competition was evaluated and strategies adapted to get a larger public response. To actually get entrants and developed services has been an important goal, and strategies have been adapted to aid this; for in-
stance, the involvement of the schools and the removing of the idea category. In the 2012 version of the competition it was possible to contribute with an idea about a service. This was removed in 2013, when it was only possible to contribute with a developed service.

“A complete service is something that can be used and it creates value and it is the good examples we need to show that data is used. If we can show that, we can also ensure that more data is created. That is how we start the innovation spinner I think.” – The representative from the municipality

When it comes to bringing the issue into the public domain this has also been an important goal. As presented in Social acuity (in 6.1) this was one of the three important goals. It has also been the most successful part of the competition. Here, public awareness has increased annually. In 2013, nearly four times as many people attended the Kick-off compared with 2012 and, in 2014, nearly four times as many people attended the Kick-off as in 2013. Hence, there has been a growing interest in the competition. In the first year, the media showed no interest in covering the events and in the second year they came but they did not include it in the regional news. In the third year, there were interviews on the radio and on the TV regional news. Throughout this case the project members have been genuinely committed. Despite the low number of entrants they have not given up; on the contrary, their belief is that the quest will be easier for each time arranged and, as presented, the strategy has been to raise knowledge. There has been no need to switch focus, since there has been no one working against this initiative.

6.2 Analytical framework part 2: Policy entrepreneurship in broader explanations of policy change

In this part of the analytical framework, I investigate the open innovation competition case through looking at it in relation to how policy entrepreneurs respond to concepts related to policy change, such as incrementalism, institutionalism, punctuated equilibrium, policy streams and theory about advocacy coalitions.

Incrementalism

According to the theoretical framework, incrementalism is a frustrating inhibitor for policy entrepreneurs. In the analytical framework, I identified three activities related to how policy entrepreneurs try to handle this: 1) to
secure cooperation, 2) to keep track of small victories, and 3) to explain setbacks.

In fact, the act of securing cooperation in this case has mainly concerned getting public organizations to contribute with open data. This task has been successful, with more data sources made available annually. Regarding keeping track of small victories, this has also been a central activity. The number of entrants has been pretty low in all years but general interest in the competition has increased annually and, therefore, the project group has been pleased with the outcome and considered the events to be successful events. Hence, the project group has been happy that the competition has achieved one of its aims: to make this truly important quest visible to a greater audience. They have also been very pleased with the winning services; for example, the service that won the competition in 2013 was considered to be very innovative. This service is called “Project Snow” and it is based on the idea of showing people how snow removal is progressing in the municipality. Unfortunately, the service could not be completed because of a lack of open data regarding the location of the snow removal vehicles. However, since this data could be made available in the future, the jury did not see any problem with this. The jury’s verdict read:

“With an exciting and visionary idea and a great deal of drive and ingenuity, this team has created the foundation for a web service that has a very high potential to create benefits for all transport within Örebro. With high scores in both the evaluation criteria for commercial potential and innovation height Project Snow wins this year’s competition. Project Snow collects information from snow removal vehicles and shows how snow removal progresses. Future thoughts of combining this data source with SMHI⁴ to see when the snow starts to fall shows that the team has really thought the service through. Naturally, there is currently no snow in Örebro, so the service includes only test data. Today there is also the lack of open data regarding the location of snow removal vehicles, but this data exist at least partially in Örebro municipality and could therefore be opened up and there are also plans to become more comprehensive with GPS positioning in the future.”

---

⁴ SMHI is a government agency under the Ministry of the Environment. SMHI offers, for instance, general forecasts and weather warnings.
Concerning setbacks, one important aspect to recognize, according to the project group, is that the talk about large-scale public interest is not really realistic. When talking about public open data re-use, one view that is often brought up is that the benefits will be achieved automatically if data is made available. In this case, it turned out not to be so. To promote data use, a great deal of marketing is necessary. Even then, it is not certain that more re-use will occur. As shown, the re-use of open public data at a local level does not come automatically, at least not on any grand scale and especially not when knowledge of the subject is limited. However, there is no need for this, either. Even if re-use is low, there can, according to the representative from the municipality, be benefits:

“This discussion pops up all the time and it’s as stupid every time. It’s a process that you go through, I’ve been thinking the same thought myself but now I’ve been working on this for a few years and got over it and realize that it might be enough that it’s two people, one person, who can re-use the information for that person can take the information and continue working on it and come to new conclusions that are very interesting for the whole community. Just because a person was able to re-use your raw data, then you have achieved a lot.” – The representative from the municipality

Consequently, the project team has not considered the competition to be a failure; on the contrary, they have been pleased with that which has been achieved. One important goal has been met and that is to increase awareness of open public data and to spread the “mission”. By promoting public data, new “believers” are created; that is to say, people will continue to spread the message and, by doing so, contribute to the agenda without dealing with the data itself. When the project leader talked about the competition at one of the promotion events, this was one of the responses she received (as retold by the project leader):

“... this man that talked to me today he did not even ask about the prizes in the competition, he just liked the mission and wanted to be a part of it. He was not interested in what you could win, he wanted to make a difference.”

In fact, according to one of the project group’s members, a common misunderstanding is the perception that citizens in general would use open public data:
“It’s not ordinary citizens, and it does not need to be either. I do not think it is realistic, it’s someone who wants the information, it may be the media, for example, who wants to write articles and review public sector. Quite often, however, it is someone who wants to write a service, a web service or an app or something like that and it, in turn, can of course be used by ordinary citizens. So usually there is an intermediary between open data and users of open data.” – The representative from the municipality

Citizens in general are, thus, not a reasonable target group for the raw data and this explains why, according to the project group, it was so difficult to arrange the open innovation competition and attract general public interest in taking part. Willingness comes, presumably, when people see that they can, in some way, benefit from the re-use of public data. On a higher level this may well be the case, but on a local level, it is more difficult to see any benefits. If the data comes from, and is about, one specific municipality, it cannot be used to develop a service that is of interest to the wider nation. This limits the potential for re-use according to the representative from the municipality:

“There is a demand at the national level, but not at the municipal level because people do not want to build something for a municipality, they want to build something for Sweden. Then you have to get data from 290 municipalities and it is hard to get data from 290 municipalities and there’s not the same data from 290 municipalities and even if the same data would be it is not in the same format, so you still cannot compare it. Data is not about comparing apples with apples, it’s apples and pears, so you still cannot build a national service.”

Hence, at a local government level, it is difficult to make assumptions about both ability and willingness. Local data has limitations and this is one important aspect to bear in mind. If the services are local, in all likelihood so is the interest in them. The service that won the competition in 2012 (a mobile “geoquiz”) is of use to only a handful of people; thus, if there is no interest for such services, there is no incentive to build them. According to the project leader, the services need to be marketed to get an audience:

“It is much about marketing, if we can offer some coaching of the idea. For example, this service that won the competition last year
we have not been very good at picking it up, it’s about who in the project is responsible for it. If you have a stable project organization someone is responsible for it, we have much left to achieve in this regard. We have to take responsibility to ensure visibility, otherwise it’s no good.”

Consequently, to explain the setbacks, it is important to understand why they occurred and how they can be handled (if they can).

**Institutionalism**

According to the theoretical framework, policy entrepreneurs’ action related to institutionalism is to secure cooperation. However, institutionalism does not apply to this case; this is not a challenge that the project team has been forced to deal with.

**Punctuated equilibrium**

In the analytical framework, I identified three activities related to punctuated equilibrium: 1) to bring the issue into the policy domain, 2) to undermine the present policy images, and 3) to switch level to get a hearing for the cause. The last two barriers have played no role in this case; there has been no present policy to undermine and consequently no need for switching level to get a hearing. To bring the issue into the policy domain has, however, been important, but for other reasons; to raise public knowledge about the agenda, not to fight “enemies”.

**Policy streams**

According to the theoretical framework, policy streams provide opportunities for policy entrepreneurs. In the analytical framework, I identified three activities related to this: 1) to link problems, 2) to get the idea included in an agenda, and 3) to be sensitive to timing.

One expressed wish in the project group (particularly expressed by the representative from the municipality, but shared by the group) was that the municipality should transform from a management organization to a service organization and the work with open data has been considered to be an important part of this. The representative from the municipality also wanted to make the act of publishing open data an integral part of the daily business in the public sector organizations. One important aim was, therefore, the diffusion of the idea to departments within the local government. For the project leader, the most important goal was to increase innovation and she saw open data as a means to this. The representative
from the County Administration Board had similar goals to those held by the municipality, but was more focused on the work in the region, and the IT consultancy business wanted to show how ICTs can be used in a way that society can benefit from. Clearly, the project members had different motives for their commitment. The open data agenda is about innovation, transparency and growth and all these correspond to the desires of the project members. Hence, different problems and wishes have been linked to one agenda. Regarding the municipality, it has, additionally, stated that one of the municipality’s goals is to be at the national forefront of the introduction of e-society (Örebro municipality, 2014a). The municipality’s policy for overall strategies and budget for 2014 presents the approaches for achieving this. According to the policy, the municipality should work for a simpler life for individuals and businesses, with smarter and more transparent management that supports innovation and participation and higher quality, more efficient operations. The main focus in the municipality’s strategic policy is on the municipality’s internal business, but there are also some parts that talk about regional development. According to these, the municipality should drive the work by making the region more open. Openness is perceived as important and, when talking about open data, the policy states: “To contribute to openness, transparency and readily available service, Örebro municipality should to the greatest extent possible; creating open data that is free of charge and without restrictive licensing terms. Exceptions from the management are to be justified. Work on open data is ongoing and the goal is to make it an integral part of the daily business development. Örebro is driving in an effort of national co-ordination of municipal open data along with six other large municipalities and SALAR3. Locally, we are involved in organizing the competition Öppna Örebro Län to encourage the use of available open data (Örebro municipality, 2014a).” Hence, the competition has been seen as an important part of this work, which corresponds to a bigger local and regional agenda.

Consequently, the competition has become part of local policy and this is a direct result of not just arranging the competition, but also of promoting it on a larger scale. The topic of open government and open data has received greater emphasis in the municipality’s strategic policy year on year. In 2012’s version of the local policy there were just a few lines (four) about open government, stating that local government should strive for

---

3 SALAR is the Swedish Association of Local Authorities and Regions.
transparent management, support innovation and participation, as well as work for higher quality and efficiency (Örebro municipality, 2012). In 2013, the open agenda had more emphasis and the work with open data was included, stating that creating open data should be an integral part of the business and exceptions from that had to be justified. The competition was, however, not mentioned yet. Instead, the policy talked about creating open data regarding adapted premises to assist people with disabilities (Örebro municipality, 2013). Nevertheless, as presented in the 2014 version, the competition has been included. Now, the policy has even more emphasis on open data, stating that the municipality should be driving an effort of national coordination of municipal open data. The policy for 2015 (Örebro municipality, 2014b) has not yet been fully established, but there is a draft. In the draft, the open agenda plays a significant role; in fact, it has grown year on year since 2012. One amendment is, for instance, the statement that the municipality now is at the forefront when it comes to open data. Despite this, the policy also states that there is much left to do and that work should be carried out actively.

Work with open data is in its infancy, especially on a municipal level and, as presented in local policy, this municipality wants to be at the forefront, driving the agenda, something they have also achieved (according to own statements). To be sensitive to timing has, hence, been considered important because you cannot be in the front if you do not act quickly. Hence, the window of opportunity has been opened and the project group has acted upon it.

**Advocacy coalitions**

According to the theoretical framework, theories about advocacy coalitions can be applied to policy entrepreneurship. I identified one activity related to this: 1) to interpret a situation to maximize attention. I believe that this has been an important goal in the case. By turning an idea into action and showing its workability in practice it has, in all likelihood been easier to get a hearing for the cause. However, the way in which the internal municipal discussions were held is out of the scope of my empirical data, because I studied the competition. Anyhow, I would say that the competition is the strategy; it is the interpretation and translation of the open government through the open data agenda.
6.3 Summary discussion and conclusions: The impact of policy entrepreneurship in the open innovation competition case

The papers (three and four) concluded that the three concepts of policy, process and people are inseparable, which was also confirmed in this analysis. The role of people is really important in this case. The local government wants to be at the forefront when it comes to open data and they have succeeded. This is the result of hard work in the municipality, but it is also the result of cooperation between the public and the private sectors. The competition involved many different actors, including a private IT consultancy business, several organizations and also teachers and pupils in schools. This case is, hence, a really good example of how people from outside of the government have contributed to developing the public sector, creating a common good and mutual benefits. For instance, the teachers could use participation in the competition in school work, making the pupils more aware of public sector business and how society works. This shows, hence, how one idea can be interpreted by different actors in ways that inspire them to take part. The different actors involved had a mix of motives, and there was one thing to unite all these motives: the promise of open public data.

Organizing the competition and financing it was shared within the project group. For example, the IT consultancy business covered the cost of the prizes, an important part of making it possible to organize the competition. Organization of the competition has contributed to local policy making, and the open data and open government agenda has received greater emphasis annually. Hence, the private IT business and the other actors have contributed to local policy making. This case shows, consequently, how initiatives that have an impact can be taken by people who see the potential in them, rather than being directly assigned. Of the people in the project group, only one actor worked with open data as an actual assignment.

As well as the contribution to policy making, organizing the competition also contributed to the interpretation and translation of the idea of open data. In 2012, the competition aimed to reach out broadly to attract entrants. There was no specific target group in mind. Businesses and students at the university were approached, and the expectation was public interest. Since this did not work out in practice, marketing was targeted in 2013 and secondary schools were approached directly. This meant that the idea had to be presented to make sense to the teachers at the schools;
for them to contribute they had to be able to see meaning in it, i.e. that it was of use for their pupils in their school work. Because the idea of open data is rather vague, this was not a problem. Taking part in a competition such as this could provide the pupils with insights, both into society and the development of services. Furthermore, it also constituted an opportunity for them to take part in something happening outside the school.

The reports from the EU (European Commission, 2011a; European Commission, 2011b) talk about general public interest for re-use, but this did not work out in practice on a local government level; there had to be a specific target group. This meant that the interpretation of benefits was adapted too, because “digging gold” was not realistic on a local level. Neither did the national interpretation work, because it talked a lot about businesses and economic growth, which was not possible because of no interest from businesses to take part. Important is, however, that the goals on a higher level talk about the whole concept of open data, not just the organization of a competition. Arranging a competition is seen as a means, but it is only a part of the whole agenda. Nevertheless, in this case, the interpretation of the idea was adapted because of factual practicalities. An interesting circumstance is that the local interpretation and expectation was more modest than on a higher level, despite the involvement of policy entrepreneurship. In this case, local interpretations could be more modest because there was no need to switch level. The goals and motives were locally connected and aimed at benefiting the region. Hence, the local interpretation was less characterized by big bang thinking than on a higher level. However, in the case, different problems and wishes were linked to one agenda and this shows a positive effect of something being vague and open to interpretation; it allows many different actors to find meaning in it. Through the participation of many, the municipality managed to achieve its goal. Hence, many people contributed to this goal, but for their own and other motives as well.

In policy entrepreneurship, because of sensitivity to timing, it is important to use windows of opportunity. In this case, the goal of the local municipality is to be at the forefront regarding e-society. If you want to be the first, you simply cannot wait. The people working with it must, accordingly, dare to be pioneers and this shows the importance of entrepreneurship. A big difference between this case and many other cases is, however, that this was not a one-off implementation; it was something that occurred annually, with the possibility of adapting strategies and learning from previous efforts. In essence, this case has a lot in common with poli-
cy entrepreneurship, but it also shows that policy entrepreneurship can be characterized by long-term thinking and continuous improvements.
7. Governance and policy entrepreneurship in electronic government

In this chapter, I present the summary discussion and conclusions, the contributions to research and practice, as well as suggestions for further research. In this thesis, I have examined the policy process in electronic government through applying a governance perspective and using the lens of policy entrepreneurship. Drawing upon findings in political science about the policy process it has become clear that policies impact on practice and practice impacts on policy making. This is a process of vagueness which I bring into the light, discuss, and provide a nuanced and detailed picture of. Using the policy entrepreneurship lens in electronic government explains a lot, which I show in this chapter; first through discussing how the essence of policy entrepreneurship contributes to the tendency of thinking big and acting quick in electronic government, and thereafter through challenging the assumptions of governments being in control of electronic government and the view of electronic government as one unified process. To make clear the implications of the findings presented, I will use them to discuss some previous lessons for electronic government.

This thesis addresses the lack of electronic government research adapting a focus on the implications of governance. Furthermore, it also adds to the research carried out by Bannister and Connolly (2012), aimed at understanding why governments and administrations are leaving a large volume of half completed business in their wake and why electronic government ideas are downgraded or abandoned in favour of new ideas that either do different things or offer obviously better solutions to current problems. Some explanations for this phenomenon were provided. The first concerned the speed of technological developments, another is that there could be a bureaucratic game playing as a result of resentments towards work carried out by organizations outside of bureaucracy. By applying a governance perspective and using the lens of policy entrepreneurship, more insights into this can be gained. However, this chapter should not be read as a critique of Bannister and Connolly (2012). Rather, I provide some further insights to widen the scope of strategic thinking. Governments do play an important role in electronic government, but so do other actors’ actions. I see policy making from two sides: top and bottom. Bannister and Connolly provided important insights into the top-down perspective, while my contribution is to also to incorporate a governance perspective, which means governing in collaboration between governmen-
tal and non-governmental actors. My research has shown that when governing in collaboration, the relationship between top and bottom holds important clues to understanding this phenomenon.

7.1 Policy entrepreneurs’ tendency of thinking big and acting quick

The whole idea of ‘transformative’ government has been criticized (Bannister & Connolly, 2012; Lips, 2012). Historically, electronic government has been characterized by many successful systems and electronically delivered services when it comes to implementation of rather uncomplicated projects. Conversely, when it comes to more ambitious ideas several have become stalled or, in some cases, have become (arguably) failed (Bannister & Connolly, 2012). When it comes to technology, governments have a tendency to think big. This has been explained by governments’ fear of being left behind in the latest technology wave (ibid). One piece of advice put forward for governments is therefore to think small and holistic instead (ibid). What governments should focus on is, therefore, to step back and put in place structures which can sustain the long timescales needed to realize those grand visions that are worth realizing and not waste too much time and treasure on those that are likely to deliver little. Developing a good understanding of what works and why, as well as what does not work and why not, is, consequently, a prerequisite to managing the future effectively. This needs thinking that is based in the longer term, and is more holistic, more realistic and less driven by fashion, dogma or the latest app (ibid).

Hence, focus on big ideas in electronic government has been explained by governments’ fascination of technologies. In this thesis, I discuss another potential answer. My research has shown that the tendency to think grand scale and be short-sighted could be explained by using the governance perspective and the policy entrepreneurship lens. According to political science, the policy process is characterized by long periods of stability punctuated by moments of abrupt, significant change (Mintrom & Norman, 2009). This change is often the result of bottom-up approaches (Olson, 2009). Because of the increasing level of governance, these bottom-up initiatives are driven by policy entrepreneurs (Wihlborg, 2011a) who respond to mental images of a new society, a new “time” promoted in policies (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). Usually, policy entrepreneurs lack decision-making powers, but they have other powers; for example, the power to influence (Mintrom & Norman, 2009). However, to do this they must
act in a certain way and I believe that this way of acting holds a very important clue to a focus on big ideas.

First, there are ideas presented in policies that are aimed at encouraging people to act (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). These ideas open windows of opportunity for policy entrepreneurs. However, these ideas are visionary and imprecise and, therefore, are not easy to realize and this means that people trying to act have to struggle (Lindblad-Gidlund & Giritli Nygren, 2011; Wihlborg, 2011a). Stability plays an important part in this. Stability is the contradictory force to change, it is the outcome of the presentation of positive images of current policy setting. Stability deflects calls for change. The task for policy entrepreneurs is, hence, to disrupt this stability to bring the policy issue into the public domain and invoke interest in it. The challenge is to undermine the present policy images and replace them with new ones that emphasize major problems and a need for change. Small ideas do not work for this. Furthermore, small ideas do not provide the driving forces and motives necessary to make the entrepreneur act. Policy entrepreneurs differ from traditional policy makers, because the spirit of entrepreneurship is to think new, to be innovative; it is never characterized by business as usual (Schumpeter, 1943). Policy entrepreneurs’ motives are ideological; they want to change structures and do things in a different (better) way. In today’s network society, entrepreneurs are essential to making things happen, but they do, indeed, steer in an imperial way and as shown, they do this because it is in their spirit and because they have to. Hence, the tendency for over-ambition is promoted both from the top and bottom; from the top, by making people act, and from the bottom by answering this call. The EU is especially known for big business (Hajer, 2003), setting the bar high, and this may mean that actors involved in implementation feel a need to live up to these expectations.

Policy entrepreneurs need windows of opportunity and, when such a window opens, they act. Because of their lack of decision-making powers they need to be responsive, they need to promote their ideas in a way that makes sense to get others to support them. This can, indeed, result in increased complexity, as shown in the National Patient Summary case. When there are barriers to change, policy entrepreneurs need to invent ways to handle these barriers and this also contributes to changing ideas. On top of this, policy entrepreneurship is aimed at overturning structures and norms; it is by itself drastic. Hence, ideas become big because incen-
Sense-making in electronic government is important (Giritli-Nygren & Lindblad-Gidlund, 2009). Electronic government is a fuzzy concept; it does not contain clear directions for acting (ibid). Interpreting how the promise of electronic government should be realized is, hence, up to the people working with it; the diffusion and basis of their interpretation come from their perceptions and factual practicalities. This sense-making of the phenomenon affects what strategies they propose for change. This is an important circumstance to recognize, because how the overarching idea of electronic government is translated is significant for the overall implementation process (ibid). This means that the evolutionary view presented in, for instance, stage models is problematic because it does not consider alternative paths (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). Electronic government is not just a fuzzy concept; it is also a concept with embedded contradictions (Giritli-Nygren & Lindblad-Gidlund, 2009). To implement electronic government is challenging; it is not straightforward.

Bannister and Connolly (2012) stated that mega projects should be avoided. The motive for avoiding mega projects is that they usually fail. One reason for this is that technologies change faster than everything else and that other factors in the change equation represent a relatively slow rate of change in comparison (ibid). Seen from the perspective of governance and policy entrepreneurship, avoiding mega projects could be difficult because of the reasons mentioned. In addition, the involvement of policy entrepreneurship has a tendency to speed up things. Policy entrepreneurs need to be sensitive to timing; when an opportunity is recognized, they must act. Entrepreneurs think in a different way. For others to catch up with this thinking could take time. If it does not happen in time, failure may be unavoidable. However, a push for change could also contribute to changing minds and it could make changes that make what is impossible today possible in the future. Interoperability in health care, for example, is a quest with inherent conflicts and this means that difficult decisions have to be taken. For someone to take them requires political guts. Policy entrepreneurs have guts because of the forgiving attitude towards them (Wihlborg, 2011a). Forgiving attitude does not apply to politicians, who are expected to act in a legitimate way (ibid). However, through the influence of policy entrepreneurs, minds can begin to change and this could provide the acceptance needed for politicians to dare to act, or, on the contrary, hinder people from acting (Mintrom & Norman,
Policy entrepreneurs present a crisis to get their will through and the outcome of this is that dissident minds may be silenced. As seen in both the studied cases, new ways of doing things are not instantly accepted but, if they are given time, acceptance can catch up. This circumstance was also shown in the research carried out by Mele (2008); in the case studied in her research, resistance for change turned into support for change. However, it took some years and there had to be effective promotion of benefits to get to this point. This work was carried out by policy entrepreneurs (ibid).

Two common barriers to policy change are institutionalism and incrementalism. Institutionalism played a central part in the National Patient Summary case, while incrementalism played a central part in the open innovation competition case. The National Patient Summary project was not in line with the law (according to the Data Inspection Board’s interpretation of it); still, it was implemented. Interoperability of patient information in health care was, consequently, resisted by one of the public sector institutions, but the result of the patient summary project was, nevertheless, interoperability in health care. This will, probably, make it easier next time, because now people have started to accept this. In the open innovation competition project, people were not aware of the concept of open data or the possibilities of open data. By being persistent in organizing the competition the interest for it has increased annually and this contributes to better conditions for such efforts in the future.

In my analysis, I have focused on the impact of policy entrepreneurship. However, technologies have played an important role as well. Policy entrepreneurs need windows of opportunity and, as seen in both my cases, the potential of ICTs did contribute to such open windows. ICTs’ potential was used to convince people to participate and support the desire for change. Hence, ICTs did play an important part, but so did the persistence of policy entrepreneurship in getting the ideas accepted. Using the promise of ICTs is persuasive (Leonardi & Jackson, 2004). It is easy to believe in technology, and faith in technology to contribute to public sector reform has existed for a long time (Ilshammar et al., 2005). Two different positions have emerged as a result; one that states that ICTs have capabilities and that the adoption will effect government and society (Irani et al., 2007). This stands in direct contrast with the other, which states that institutional settings, processes, actors and arrangements shape public sector ICT adoption (Lips, 2012). Lately, there has been a growing consensus.
that information technology both forms and is formed by its working environment (Rose & Jones, 2004).

The same applies to ideas about technology and the visions of electronic government. The promise of technologies can be used by governments to inspire action and it can be used by policy entrepreneurs to “legitimize” their actions and create the action space needed. Governance allows actors without power to have power (Mintrom & Norman, 2009) and ICTs make the power even more effective (by widening the action space, according to Lindblad-Gidlund and Giritli Nygren (2011)). The findings that ICTs can function as an enabler for power are not new, but there is a new context because of governance. The context is the increasing involvement of policy entrepreneurs, and how ICTs are used to open windows of opportunity (from both top and bottom), affecting visions of electronic government.

7.2 Governments in control of electronic government?

Much of the existing research in electronic government frequently presents a top-down view, a government perspective. Some researchers (Grönlund, 2010; Dawes, 2009; Yildiz, 2007) have pointed to the need for examining electronic governance, and some researchers (Larsson, 2014) have suggested that the term electronic governance should be used instead of electronic government. Meanwhile, others (including myself in paper two) have suggested that the abbreviation Egov could be used for both. In electronic government, policy making is the result of a mix of government and governance, so to make a distinction solves nothing. Rather, governance should be recognized as an important factor in the shaping of electronic government. When applying a governance perspective, the whole process needs to be viewed in a different way. Ideas are not only provided from the top and implemented “as is”. They are shaped in the implementation process, which affects both policy and practice. This process is, as shown, far from straightforward and we should not expect it to be. Neither should we expect electronic government to be. The analysis of policy entrepreneurship in electronic government is related to the shift from a government focus to a governance perspective on public policy. This is a fairly new phenomenon and examination of it is scarce in electronic government research. However, governance has not replaced government; government provides the framework (opening of windows) within which governance exists (Wihlborg, 2011a) and this means that both perspectives need to be taken into account. Consequently, it is important that governance exists
and this means that we cannot perceive governments to be in control of electronic government. This applies to statements that governments should finish what they have started (presented by Bannister and Connolly (2012)) problematic, because we cannot take for granted that these processes are actually started by government actors only.

Governments can provide visions that inspire people to act, but what happens next is not self-evident. Governments provide motives for policy entrepreneurs; thereafter, policy entrepreneurs initiate change because policy entrepreneurship aims to change things. Hence, the assumption that governments have started the processes can be challenged and so can also their ability to finish these things. Policy entrepreneurship is involved in the change process, but policy entrepreneurs are not the ones that manage and administrate already implemented change; someone else must do that because, according to theory, maintenance is not part of policy entrepreneurship (Wihlborg, 2011a; Mintrom & Norman, 2009). The change initiated by policy entrepreneurs must, hence, be followed up by other people and they may have a completely different outlook on the matter. I believe that this circumstance provides some clues as to the short-sightedness of electronic government. Different people are involved in different parts of the process and to coordinate this process is difficult. In chapter three, some strategies for how to meta-control networks were presented but, as described above, to do this in practice is complicated.

7.3 The view of one unified process

Using the lens of policy entrepreneurship has shown that policy entrepreneurship can contribute by making things happen, promoting consensus, making impossible things possible. Policy entrepreneurship can also contribute to creating benefits for society. However, there are also challenges that need to be recognized; for example, the difficulty of governing policy entrepreneurs (a self-contradiction) and having an overall perspective and control over things happening. Seeing electronic government as one unified process with a government in control is problematic.

Bannister and Connolly (2012) put forward some advice for governments. They stated that governments need to think in terms of continuous improvements rather than big bangs. Besides this, technical rationality and technical determinism should also be avoided at all costs. So, too, should mega projects, and optimism regarding electronic government should be tempered with reality. There is also a need to get the infrastructure right and to learn from the past. In essence, Bannister and Connolly (2012)
argued that “governments need to take stock and learn from the past as well as continuing to gaze, misty eyed, into the future. In many cases this means going back and completing the job”. To do this, governments must think holistically and have long-term planning. Examining electronic government from a governance perspective shows that this will be truly difficult. Bannister and Connolly (2012) recognized the fact that electronic government does not evolve in a technological bubble, saying that politics is everywhere. However, they did not enough take into account the implications of this.

Bannister and Connolly (2012) are far from alone in thinking this way; in fact, electronic government research usually applies a top-down perspective. This is a drawback, because contemporary policy making is not characterized by governments making policies and assigning policy implementation to administrators; instead, there is governing in collaboration between governmental and non-governmental actors. In contemporary Western policy making, it is not clear who makes a policy, who implements a policy, who allocates resources, who manages them, who set goals, who chooses methods for meeting the objectives of the goals, whose values guide actions, or whose interpretations of public value and public interest lay the foundation for the change promoted (as presented in the theoretical framework). The role of politics today is to allow for change, to initiate change; thereafter someone must promote and drive it (Wihlborg, 2011a). This means that there is an increasing need for entrepreneurship (ibid). For society to develop there should be interventions that are problem-focused, aiming to change the given course of events. However, these interventions are not precise; they are visionary ideas aimed at inspiring action (Löfgren & Sørensen, 2010). This is in conflict with conclusions drawn in electronic government research, which state that governments should have clear strategies and objectives regarding electronic government (as expressed by, for example, Shareef et al. (2010)). Today, politics is seldom focused on one solution that fits all; instead, different actors and organizations are given increased possibilities to solve matters in a way they feel appropriate (Wihlborg, 2011a). Hence, there is openness for different issues to take place on the political agenda.

7.4 Implications of governance and policy entrepreneurship on previous lessons

Previously in this chapter I showed that policy entrepreneurship contributes to the tendency to thin big and act quick in electronic government.
Furthermore, I have also shown that the assumption that governments are in control of electronic government and the view of a single unified process can be challenged. The implications of these findings become very clear when examining some previous lessons for electronic government. I used the lessons provided by Bannister and Connolly (2012) to make these implications visible.

**Lesson 1: Avoid technical rationality and technical determinism at all costs**

As shown, policy entrepreneurs need windows of opportunity and ICTs have the potential to be used for this. Using the argument of the great benefits of ICTs, they can aid in the recruitment of supporters. Also, ICTs can widen the action space. Hence, to boost the benefits of ICTs serves several important purposes. Policy entrepreneurs may lack the power needed to do certain things and using the argument of ICTs’ potential could come in handy to create what is needed. As seen in the National Patient Summary case, the benefits of the patient summary in health care were presented in a convincing way to create support for the project. The result was political grounding and the silencing of dissident perspectives. Hence, using the argument of ICT-related benefits did play an important role. In the open innovation competition case there was a lack of knowledge of the open data concept. This made it important to promote it and to get others to believe in it to get the cooperation needed. This case shows how one idea can be interpreted by different actors in ways that inspire them to take part. The different actors involved had a mix of motives, but there was one thing to unite all these motives: the promise of open public data. For example, to make sense to the teachers at the schools and to get them to contribute they had to be able to see meaning in it, i.e. that open data re-use was of use to their pupils in their school work. Because the idea of open data is rather vague, this was not a problem. Taking part in an open data re-use competition could provide the pupils with insights both about society and the development of services. Also, here, the promising potential of ICTs played an important role, and, as the idea was rather indistinct, it could be used to make sense to a variety of actors with different motives. The assumption on which this is built, however, is that the use of ICTs will result in many different benefits. This makes it difficult to avoid technical determinism, because using the argument of technology-related benefits serves an important purpose.
Lesson 2: Avoid mega projects and big bang thinking

As presented, policies need to be visionary to make people act. They present a systematically arranged representation of reality to create mental images of a new age to encourage change and to create a common understanding of where we are going and why. This sets the bar high from the beginning; thereafter, policy entrepreneurs are innovative and their actions are never characterized by business as usual or thinking small. Policy entrepreneurs’ motives are ideological and their aim is to overturn structures and norms to promote a “better” way of doing things. To make the entrepreneur act there must be motives and small ideas do not provide these. Hence, to think big is in the essence of policy entrepreneurship. Furthermore, to think big makes it easier to sell the idea, if something is presented in a grand way, people will probably listen to it. The interplay between the promotion of change and responses to this promotion holds clues to big thinking in electronic government. As seen in the National Patient Summary case, the benefits of the patient summary had to be recognized and accepted. That had the implication that the patient summary had to be usable on different levels of health care: local, regional and between EU member states. At first the idea was to only connect county councils, but the benefits of that were not enough to get the support needed and complexity had therefore to increase. In the open innovation competition case the ambitions have been more modest; thinking has been in terms of continuous improvements rather than a big bang. In this case, it was considered enough that useful services were developed so that this, in turn, could lead to other benefits. This shows the local interpretation of the idea of open data. In this case, big bang thinking was presented in the policy stream while the local interpretation was more modest. Hence, policy entrepreneurship could be both big thinking and characterized more by continuous improvements. However, it is difficult to control the level of big thinking. How big it gets depends on the interpretation of ideas and factual practicalities. If practicalities demand for big thinking, it will, most likely, result in big thinking. In my cases, there was a relation between level and ambition. The National Patient Summary had to promote benefits, which resulted in making the case multi-level and increasingly complicated. The open innovation competition case stayed true on a local level, despite the challenges of so doing and, through this, expectations could be held at a modest level.
Lesson 3: Think long term and holistically
Applying a governance perspective shows that the coordination of efforts is difficult. Policy entrepreneurship aims mainly to promote change. Hence, policy entrepreneurs take part in promoting ideas and putting them into practice, and, in so doing, they show the workability of them. Thereafter, someone else may have to take over. In the National Patient Summary case, regional actors at the county councils took the initiative, but throughout the process an established project management at a national level was created. The role of this management was to continue to carry out the project. The National Patient Summary was implemented on a large scale, but after this something happened. I lack details regarding this, because I studied the beginning of the process only; the part of it where policy entrepreneurship was involved. Hence, the implications of policy entrepreneurship with regard to the request to adapt long-term thinking are that policy entrepreneurship is not about maintenance. In the open innovation competition case there were, however, annual efforts carried out. Nevertheless, these efforts aimed, still, to promote change and show workability. Consequently, the two studied cases were different in this regard. Still, long-term thinking in policy entrepreneurship cannot be taken for granted. This relates, in some sense, to the explanation that a bureaucratic game is being played, as presented by Bannister and Connolly (2012). Bureaucratic game-playing may very well be one explanation. The National Patient Summary case, however, indicated that whilst there may be no resentment, there are difficulties related to the fact that government agencies need to act in a certain way because of legislation while policy entrepreneurs do not, and this can cause deadlock that is impossible to solve. Different actors have different “rules” to follow. The requirement of holistic thinking assumes the coordination of efforts and overarching monitoring. Applying a governance perspective shows that this is difficult in practice.

Lesson 4: Getting the infrastructure right
Getting the infrastructure right could lie outside the scope of the change promoted by policy entrepreneurs; it could, for example, be carried out in a different project. The National Patient Summary case used the window of opportunity created by a health care reform. The patient summary was one of many projects in this reform. In the National Patient Summary case, the summary was to be used with a separate security solution developed in another of these projects. First, the conception was that the securi-
ty solution should be developed and implemented before the National Patient Summary but, because of the wish to demonstrate benefits, the order of the projects was reversed. The patient summary was implemented before the security solution and a temporary security solution was used in the pilot implementation. This shows the importance of recruiting support for the idea. Getting the infrastructure right takes time and policy entrepreneurs need to be sensitive to timing; hence, there is acceleration of actions that could make it impossible to wait for such things as the development of an infrastructure. In the open innovation competition case the need for an infrastructure is concerned with making public data available for re-use. This also means cooperation with others, i.e. to be dependent on others taking part. The open innovation competition took part in promoting the availability and re-use of public data; the task of actually making the data available was up to others. Hence, policy entrepreneurs need to collaborate with others who perform part of the work. There is, therefore, a need to recognize the relationship between different projects and the possibility of a lack of coordination between them. Reform involves, presumably, a range of projects and, because of governance, it is not necessarily the same people that are involved in them, or the same person in control of them all.

Lesson 5: Learning from the past
For this to work, there is also an assumption that someone has a comprehensive perspective on electronic government; hence, in this lesson, we assume governments to monitor that which is happening. Today, there is openness for many different issues to take place on the political agenda; actors and organizations are given increased opportunities to solve matters in a way they feel appropriate. Policy entrepreneurs promote change from their point of view, based on their motives. The result of this is the promotion of many ideas, and presumably some of these are good, while others are not. Furthermore, policy entrepreneurs act in an untraditional way and perhaps without political anchoring. In the National Patient Summary case, the initiative was taken by a small group of actors and it was later that it received political support on a national level. In the open innovation competition case, the idea of organizing a competition was taken by a small group of people working voluntarily with it because they believed in it. The competition got included in the local municipality’s policy eventually, but this happened later, after the competition had been organized for two years. Hence, initiatives are often taken; they cannot be perceived to
be assigned by someone in control of them all. This means that learning from the past can be difficult, or to be precise, it can be difficult to avoid ideas that have not learned.

### 7.5 Contributions of this thesis

In this thesis, I have illuminated the characteristics of the policy process when policy entrepreneurship is involved. In so doing, I contribute to both research and practice by providing an understanding of how complex the policy process in electronic government can be. Electronic government is future oriented, it is aimed at promoting change to develop the public sector and society. However, change cannot be provided by government actors only; governance must provide the work that the “institutions” cannot do. To change things, there has to be a battle between unstable and stable practices. Some work must be carried out by actors not restrained by traditional public sector responsibility and legitimacy. Meanwhile, institutions must function as a safeguard to protect, for example, important values. Hence, there is a battle between stability and change, a wish to change versus a wish to keep things in order. This could be both good and bad, it depends on the situation. The result is that negotiation is inevitable and negotiation is good in the sense that changes need to be scrutinized; however, it could also have the implication that some projects fail because of disagreements. In this process, policy entrepreneurs play an important part. There is a forgiving attitude towards entrepreneurs. In contrast, government institutions and actors are expected to act legitimately and accountably.

Applying a governance perspective to electronic government shows, hence, that all “lessons” that require governments to be in control of electronic government can be difficult to apply in practice. It is important to recognize, however, that there is both a need for a government and a governance perspective in electronic government. Not all work is carried out by policy entrepreneurs but, if work aims to change things fundamentally, there is the possibility of policy entrepreneurship involvement. In this thesis, I have shown how it complicates the policy-making and implementation process. So what can we do then? If governments cannot be perceived as being in control, how should we then address the problems of failing electronic government projects and ideas? This needs further research and my contribution to this area is to provide an understanding of why it may not be possible to solve this problem in such a straightforward way as presented in the above lessons for electronic government. My research has
shown that solving this problem is easier said than done. Through the insights provided in this thesis this phenomenon could be investigated from a new perspective, addressing the complicated task as it is rather than as something clear-cut in character. Meta-control of networks is possible but complicated. As presented in chapter three, there are some strategies that can be applied to try to coordinate networks and to gently steer them in a wished-for direction. The implications of governance and the problems of applying the above lessons mean that how to do this should be further researched. Hence, my research contributes to raising awareness of this need.

The contribution comes from the study of two cases, one local and one multi-level. Usually when studying policy entrepreneurship it is performed on a local level. The National Patient Summary case provides insights into how policy entrepreneurs switch level to get a hearing for their cause. In the National Patient Summary case most actors were government actors; however, they lacked the power needed to change things when necessary and the findings from this case show how ICTs can be used to push for change. These are not new findings, but my research has deepened these insights by showing how entrepreneurship plays an important part in this process. The open innovation competition case was performed on a local level, showing how knowledge about the local context was important, and how personal networks were used to raise awareness to deal with incrementalism. To get more open data published it was important to show the benefits of open public data. However, this turned out to be challenging and the policy entrepreneurs’ role was, accordingly, to be innovative to handle these difficulties. This case was a private-public partnership, which shows how actors from the private sector contribute to public policy making with their own reasons and motives. The competition involved many different actors, including a private IT consultancy business, several organizations and also teachers and pupils in schools. This case is, hence, a really good example of how people from outside of the government contribute to developing the public sector; a general good and mutual benefits provide the incentives for this.

I will now summarize the contributions of this thesis, dividing them into contribution to research, practice and suggestions for further research. However, these contributions are intertwined, so to make a distinct separation is not possible.
Contribution to research
Governance and policy entrepreneurship play an important part in contemporary Western policy making and have an impact on the shaping of electronic government. This is something that should be recognized and I contribute to raising awareness of this. The reason is that it challenges the view of governments being in control of electronic government and the ability to perceive electronic government as one unified process. One contribution of this thesis is, thereby, to show how using the lens of policy entrepreneurship contributes to making the motives and forces of change that contribute to changes in society more visible. In this thesis, I have developed an analytical framework that can be used for this. Furthermore, this research contributes to addressing the gap of research by focusing on the implications of governance. In addition, it adds on to research carried out by Bannister and Connolly (2012), which was aimed at understanding why governments and administrations are leaving a large volume of halfcompleted business in their wake and why certain electronic government ideas are downgraded or abandoned in favour of new ideas that either do different things or offer obviously better solutions to current problems.

Contribution to practice
One important contribution of the research carried out in this thesis is that it makes something that usually is rather invisible more visible. Policy entrepreneurs impact on policy making; they may not have the formal powers and formal legitimacy to do so, but they have the power to influence, both concerning efforts carried out and in changing the rules of the political game. They constitute a power factor in policy making that should be recognized. Democratic ideals, such as, for instance, representativeness and equality, are challenged through this. Policy entrepreneurs aim to change things and policy entrepreneurs’ motives are ideological, which could be at the cost of acting rationally. Policy entrepreneurs promote innovation, new thinking and new ways of doing things. There is a forgiving attitude towards entrepreneurs, so minor unexpected behavior could therefore be excused. In contrast, government agencies and actors are expected to act legitimately and accountably. The benefits of governance in the public sector are, for instance, a varied understanding of society, the involvement of more perspectives and different views on public values and public interest. According to political science, joint working is necessary for local government to be effective. However, it also means that legitimacy is constrained. Through governance, power is not equally dis-
tributed and it is unclear who has the most power and influence, which values guide actions and which roles different actors play. The downside of policy entrepreneurship in policy making is, hence, that the process becomes difficult to control and that it becomes truly difficult to get a comprehensive view on what is happening and to foresee what directions work will take. There are no clear-cut stages through which electronic government will evolve.

**Suggestion for further research**

Applying a governance perspective in electronic government shows, hence, that all lessons requiring governments to be in control of electronic government can be challenged. Statements that governments should have clear strategies and objectives for electronic government are problematic, because it is easier said than done. In essence, all advice for governments that assumes this to be possible will be difficult to apply in practice. In electronic government, much research has this top-down perspective, which is a drawback. It is important to recognize that there is a need for both a government and a governance perspective in electronic government. I contribute to raising awareness of this need. The need for a governance perspective has been raised previously, but the responses to this call have not focused enough on the processes of governance and the implications of governance; hence, such research is still needed. I have contributed to this gap with this study, but more is needed. One limitation of this research is that only one of the two studied cases involved actors other than governmental actors. Both cases concerned policy entrepreneurship but only one related to governance according to the definition used in this thesis. Furthermore, I have not examined how the control of networks could be carried out. Because of the implications of governance and the problems of applying the earlier lessons it is, consequently, important to examine how to do this. I suggest further research to take on this challenge. Hence, my research contributes by raising awareness of this need, too. Governance can contribute with a lot of good and there is, therefore, an openness for many issues to be placed on the political agenda. However, to reduce any negative implications, the work carried out should not be allowed to drift too far away and lose connection with the political process. How to handle this challenge needs to be researched.
Epilogue

An epilogue is a piece of writing at the end of a work of literature, usually used to bring closure to the work. It is presented from the perspective of within the story. The role of an epilogue is to wrap up loose ends. I believe that writing a thesis leaves quite a lot of loose ends, because whilst you do need to be very focused on the research aim, what about everything else? I use this epilogue as an opportunity to speak freely, to give my own personal view on things that I have come to think of when working with this thesis. These views should not be perceived as research results, because they are not; they are my own personal reflections.

First, I will address my cases; thereafter, the aspect that I, in the prologue, asked you to have something in mind while reading. Lastly, I will talk a little bit about the process of writing a thesis again; this time to use it as a metaphor to inspire further reflections and thinking. A little bit more philosophy in life is a good thing!

Concerning the National Patient Summary case, I believe that there is definitely a need for a patient summary in health care. During the period of writing this thesis, I, unfortunately, had to be a patient in health care myself and because of this I made repeated visits to different departments. To speak the truth, it has made me quite upset sometimes to see for myself how little health care knows about me and what others in the same building have done to me before. It is 2015 now and, to me, it is incomprehensible that it is still this way. Interoperability in health care certainly is not a bad idea and as, seen in the case, it is not impossible either. To implement the summary was tricky; it was a challenge indeed. There were many twists and turns throughout the project, but it was implemented. Hence, it is possible. Therefore, in my view, health care should be interoperable. Of course, privacy is important too, but I see no contradiction between interoperability and privacy, just a circumstance to address in a suitable way.

In the open innovation competition case, I initially had a naïve expectation of large public interest. This expectation came from how the open data agenda is usually presented. When saying things such as “a motor for innovation”, expectations are raised above realistic levels. It can be the result, eventually, but I believe that it will be difficult initially because people in general do not know what open data is, or how it can be used. This is certainly not obvious, especially if the data is not “exciting” (and local data seldom is). When I started studying the concept of open data I,
frankly, did not understand it at all. People talked about the major benefits and the development of innovative services, but I could not see the connection between the rather boring ones and zeroes that data is and these great expectations. It took quite a while before I started seeing this, but when I did, I became enthusiastic and my expectations were raised. So, when launching the first competition I expected others to be excited too. I did not think about the lead that I had in knowledge about the subject and I did not remember my initial problems of seeing the potential. I believe that this is a key issue. People who are working with the open data agenda have a great advantage over those who we expect to contribute, especially when the target group is the public, i.e. average citizens. To see the potential can be difficult and, consequently, it has to be shown. Besides, at a local level, the re-use potential of a great portion of the data may be limited. I believe that this could be the case, but I also believe that some of the data could be used to develop really interesting things. In this early stage, awareness, knowledge and data are limited. There is only a portion of all of these three: namely, some awareness, some knowledge and some data and consequently, we can expect only some portion of the benefits. We must adapt expectations to what there actually is in terms of the means. Importantly, though, I do not say that there should be no visions; I just want to incorporate a little bit of realism as well.

In the prologue to this thesis I reflected upon the need to pay attention to “wasps” in electronic government and I also said that Smilla the cat was fearless. In this thesis, the policy entrepreneurs are the wasps. Their actions have implications for electronic government and attention should be paid to this. Their actions are usually rather invisible, but they do challenge legitimacy, accountability, as well as democratic ideals. To recognize their impact is therefore important. However, should we be afraid of their actions and afraid of making mistakes? Ideas repeat themselves and they do so because they represent something good, something wished for. Meanwhile, ambitious projects repeatedly “fail”. When writing this thesis one thought that repeatedly popped up in my head is: are they really failures? Policy entrepreneurship can make things impossible today possible in the longer run. If we look upon these “failures” from this perspective they are not failures. I believe that society is evolved gradually through small steps that are the outcomes of big efforts. Today, politics is not as it was before, so society has changed, good or bad. I do not judge, I just take notice. By doing things differently, the rules of the game change and I believe that this is an outcome as well. Reflect upon my case here and
when doing this, here are some questions: do efforts have to be straightforward? correct? are detours only bad? how do we learn? and what is development?

In the prologue, I also talked about the process of writing this thesis as not being straightforward. I would, without exaggerating that much, say that throughout my work with this thesis, and all the writing and rewriting that it has meant, my thesis would have been over ten thousand pages long if I had not thrown away drafts of text. Hence, a lot of efforts have been wasted. Or have they? I do not think so actually because I have learnt a lot, and this is despite the fact that I have also seemed to repeat my mistakes somewhat. I do things out of creativity. I start writing when an idea pops up in my head, but I do not think that much before I act. My supervisors have probably grown some grey hair because of this. Here, I stop my reasoning because I do not want to “state” anything, just inspire some further reflections and thinking. Straightforward is a key concept to reflect upon, I believe.
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