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Nations define themselves through determining who belongs and who is excluded from their communities of citizens; immigration and citizenship are thus among a nation-state’s core policy areas. Electronic government is an aspect of, and a contributing factor to, an increasingly transnational world where identities and belongings are becoming plural and fluid. The digitization of governmental functions challenges the traditional notions of control and hierarchy; democratic governance itself has had to change and adapt to the pressures of becoming networked globally and internally, beyond the traditional boundaries of the nation-state. For these reasons, examining e-government in immigration policy implementation presents an opportunity to explore the changing notions and expectations of democratic governance and the impact that information technologies in a globalizing world have on the relationship between governments and citizens.

My paper compares the e-government aspects of skilled immigrant worker programs in Canada and the United Kingdom, focusing on their impact on democracy and on the relationship between citizens and government. Using a critical theory approach, I evaluate the Internet-based facets of these immigration policies on three criteria: public value, transparency and democratic participation.

I argue that in both countries the use of the Internet to carry out immigration policies has created a customer-and-provider type of relationship between government and stakeholders, and has not significantly promoted the democratic quality of the relationship. In the case of Canada, client (self-) service is dominant, without this resulting in greater efficiency or democratic value. In the UK customer focus is not the same goal and motivation, e-government in immigration policy is less developed, and there are some opportunities for citizen participation in the policy process. The reasons for these differences can be found in a variety of social, political and institutional factors of which I discuss several in more detail: immigration policy goals and institutions, nature of public administration reform and the stage of e-government development.

Canada’s and UK’s skilled immigrant programs are suitable points for the comparison of e-government in the area of immigration: they are both proactive programs, part of managed immigration policy – as opposed to asylum claims processing where the government’s role is reactive – which allows for a clear view of how governments carry out their policy intentions through the Internet.

Theoretical Framework

E-government is an “evolutionary process” that is inevitably linked to the economic and social characteristics of the political and legislative systems in which it operates. Comparing e-
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government in the domain of immigration policy in the UK and Canada, my paper views it as a part of an environment with multiple and changing influencing factors – political, organizational and social. In my evaluation of e-government practices, I focus, above all, on their impact on stakeholders and on the stakeholders’ relationship with governmental organizations within the context of democratic governance. This multi-faceted, impact-focused approach with an interest in the democratic quality of the relationship between governments and the public is consistent with critical theories of public administration which will serve as the theoretical framework here.

Critical theory is one of the main approaches to studying public administration, along with formal and institutional theories. It utilizes interdisciplinary methods to address the interplay of social, cultural and institutional dynamics, seeking to develop models of how these dynamics working together affect groups and individuals\(^5\), bringing thus a holistic and synergistic approach to analyzing governance and institutional change. Critical theory’s basic underlying assumption is that the core goal of a society is an institutionalized democratic system that empowers every individual and brings justice, reason and freedom; it is thus an emancipating and a radically democratic theory\(^6\). An important reason that makes critical theory suitable to analyzing the role of information technologies in public administration is that e-government in most countries was developed with the declared intents of bringing together different services and organizations together (a holistic and synergetic goal) and focusing on citizens’ needs.

Description of Canada’s and UK’s skilled immigration websites

In this section I describe e-government in the domain of immigration in Canada and the UK, focusing on skilled worker programs and using the relevant components of Hernon and Cullen’s generalized model of e-government. Defining e-government minimally as “the provision of government services and information via the Internet for businesses and citizens” and recognizing its potential for empowering citizens if developed and expanded further, Hernon and Cullen present a model of e-government that consists of seven facets: information provision and services, delivery of services, e-commerce, emergency response, procurement, governance or e-engagement and e-compliance\(^7\). Of these, four are most relevant to online immigration policies - information provision and services, delivery of services, and e-commerce in the Canada and the UK will be discussed next, and governance/e-engagement will be examined in the section dealing with democratic impact.

Canada

**Information provision and access**

The website of Citizenship and Immigration Canada, [www.cic.gc.ca](http://www.cic.gc.ca), is a portal where information is arranged according to the needs of the four main types of potential migrants: visitors, students, temporary workers and permanent residents (PR). To skilled workers – the largest group among all PR - the website provides extensive guidance and detailed information on the immigration process, making it possible to complete the entire process without using a consultant or additional sources of information. A significant and quite unique feature of
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Canada’s immigration website is *E-client*: it allows applicants to track the progress of their applications along the different stages of assessment, displaying messages such as “In Progress” and “Approved in Principle”. The option is available to all skilled worker applicants – as well as to sponsored family members and to citizenship applicants - independent of where they reside. The *Newcomer’s Introduction to Canada* on the website provides advice to immigrants at every stage of the immigration process: from preparation guidelines before leaving the home countries and travel tips, to information on Canadian climate and the basic expectations of Canadian employers. In the *What Happens After You Apply section* CIC gives information on the different stages and the factors considered during the application assessment. The website also provides estimates of current processing times and, perhaps of less direct significance to individual applicants, up-to-date reports and statistics on immigration to Canada.

**Delivery of Services**
The service provided by Citizenship and Immigration Canada to potential skilled immigrants is granting the right to live and work in the country, through processing Permanent Resident applications and providing the documentation necessary to enter the country and, eventually, producing the proof of PR Status (a PR Card). Delivery of this service has been taken online to the extent that applicants are able to download, fill out and print all the necessary forms from the CIC website; they are then required to mail the application, along with supporting documents to the respective embassy, consulate or processing centre (if within Canada). At this point, Citizenship and Immigration Canada does not offer the option of submitting online immigration applications.

**E-commerce**
The e-commerce elements of the online immigration process are the fees that candidates pay with the submission of their applications. The CIC website allows for the fees to be paid online through a credit card; the receipt is emailed afterward to the applicant and must be printed out and enclosed with the mailed application.

**The United Kingdom**

*Information provision and access*
Information about immigration to the UK is available through the website of the Border and Immigration Agency (BIA)8, [http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/](http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/), which is accessed through the Home Office Internet portal. The section *Applying* provides details and instructions on how to apply for a variety of services and programs, in different cases: *Asylum, Group Travel, British Nationality, Group Travel, Appeals, Right of Adobe*. Applications to download, fill out and mail are also available. Information on the *Highly Skilled Migrant Programme* is not immediately obvious and not nearly as prominent on the BIA website as it is for the *Skilled Worker Program* on the CIC site - to find out more about it, the potential applicant browsing site needs to go through several screens, to be redirected to a *Working in the UK* page where the *Highly Skilled Migrant Programme* can be found under *Schemes and Programmes*. The website provides a concise description of the program and of the eligibility criteria, and an FAQ section that covers a variety of situations, questions and concerns. A detailed guide is available in MS Word format.
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– again, only findable after browsing through several sections - containing graphs outlining the
process, definition of terms and various other useful tips and clarifications. It is not possible to
check application status online and there is no function similar to Canada’s E-Client; contact
details of the agency – phone number, fax, postal address and email – are available and are
different for general information and for specific case enquiries; clients are, however, advised to
restrict contact to the strictly necessary, in the name of efficiency.

Service Delivery
As is the case with Canada, the UK does not provide complete immigration-related services
directly through the Internet. Application forms are downloaded and mailed and it is not possible
to apply online or by email. In this way, the website serves mostly as a facilitating tool for non-
Internet-based services and as a channel of information about them, and not as an online service
provider in itself.

E-commerce
The UK offers a range of payment options of the fee for obtaining a work and residence permit
through the Highly Skilled Worker Programme – postal order, credit or debit card and cheque –
of which none can be exercised online (credit card payments are processed by means of
applicants providing the card number on the paper application form). At this point then, the
British Internet immigration service does not include any e-commerce elements.

Democratic impact
To evaluate e-government in immigration policies in the UK and Canada, I will analyze
how successful their immigration-related governmental websites are on three criteria: public
value, transparency and citizen participation, focusing on democratic impact, in line with the
principles of critical theory in public administration. A significant aspect of immigration policy
is that stakeholders are not confined to citizens or residents of the state but include foreign
nationals who are participants in the immigration process and are potential citizens, as well as
domestic members of the public who have an interest in governmental policies that are beneficial
to the country in general. Immigration policies then, and their Internet aspects, concern these two
groups of stakeholders whose interests may be different and who should both be considered
when discussing the impact of e-government elements of immigration policies.

Public value
In the opinion of Ian Kearns, e-government should be regarded as a part of government in
general and should be evaluated in the same way that public policy is evaluated. Criticizing
prevailing e-government evaluation models as insufficiently concerned with measuring those
aspects that are truly relevant, Kearns introduces the concept of “public value” as an
assessment criterion, defining it as a “yardstick against which to measure public performance
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and a framework for thinking through what the objectives of public policy ought to be […]”

Among the sources of public value, according to Kearns, are the provision of a high-quality services and the achievement of publicly desired outcomes.

From the point of view of immigration applicants, the website of Citizenship and Immigration Canada is fairly easy to navigate, information on the Skilled Worker Program is clearly presented and the available online services are well-designed. If we assume, however, that the main interest of applicants is a quick, inexpensive and uncomplicated immigration process, then the website does not deliver much public value to them. Using e-government techniques has not helped decrease processing times for immigration to Canada – currently, it takes from 26 to 64 months to process Skilled Worker applications. Access to the information on the CIC website is also restricted by language barriers – the site is available in English and French which reflects the institution’s needs and bilingualism legislation in Canada; the majority of its users, however, the potential immigrants, come from non-English-speaking countries. Also, as the process of immigration to Canada has been almost entirely digitized, it would be very difficult to complete it without access to the Internet, and the levels of Internet access in many of Canada’s top immigration source countries are quite low - for instance, only 10.4% of China’s population could access in Internet in 2007. With a concentration of Canadian embassies and consulates in Europe – perhaps an inheritance from times when immigrants to the country were mostly of European origin – present-day candidate-immigrants have very limited non-digital avenues for learning of and applying for the Skilled Worker Program. From a general public point of view, expectations for cost-saving from using e-government in immigration have also not materialized: the fees collected from Skilled Worker applicants (close to $1,000 per applicant, amounting to about $130 million for the 132,000 skilled workers who came in 2005) are substantial and are used by CIC as “recoverable” revenue – to pay for the processing of applications (separate from CIC employee salaries). Finally, the little integration on the CIC website of governmental levels and other organizations or private businesses involved in immigrant settlement is detrimental to both immigrants and the public as it does not take advantage of technology to make the process of successful integration less complex and costly.

Navigating the website of UK’s Highly Skilled Immigrant Programme (HSIP) requires patience and well-developed Internet research skills, to locate the relevant information and to distinguish among the many forms and guides that are presented in the same sections of the website. This said, the website of the Border and Immigration Agency provides some value to immigration applicants as it facilitates completing the process without having to contact a British representation office abroad, while listing the several avenues for getting in touch directly with the department, to receive more information or to file the application. At roughly comparable fee levels, processing times for the HSIP are extremely short compared to Canada’s: according to the
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program’s webpage, 50% of applications are completed within five weeks and 90% - within fourteen weeks from submission; we cannot conclude, however, that e-government is solely responsible for the efficient processing of applications – another factor would be the volume of immigrants accepted through the program which is much smaller than that of Canada’s Skilled Worker Program\textsuperscript{19}. In terms of value to the general public, a main difference between the UK and Canada is that in the UK, not a traditional immigrant-receiving country, the public concern with security and control of immigration makes it necessary to look at public value from this perspective rather that being concerned solely with the delivery of desired immigration levels at an acceptable cost. The website of UK’s Borders and Immigration Agency is very successful in this respect – by combining, not only digitally but organizationally as well, border controls and law enforcement with immigrant selection, the agency addresses the current prevailing concerns and needs of the general public.

**Transparency**

Transparency is a necessary precondition for accountability; it is thus an essential part of democratic governance. Transparency involves allowing, on the part of a government, for its activities to be examined and understood by those who have the rights or expectations to be able to do so\textsuperscript{20}. In a digital era governments are hard pressed to operate in an environment where secrecy is hard to maintain; through the Internet, citizens ultimately know a lot more about the activities of governments than they would without digitization. Transparency goes beyond availability of information to include the government’s commitment to opening to scrutiny its goals, processes and outcomes\textsuperscript{21}. The availability of information that accompanies governance in a digital environment, but not opportunity to influence policy creates friction and a sense of powerlessness on the part of citizens\textsuperscript{22}.

It is common that actors within the government are convinced that all citizens need and want is quality service.\textsuperscript{23} This assumption, inherent in many public service reforms, together with the premise that security is of utmost importance, serves as justifying basis for restricting access to information that is meaningful to the democratic process.\textsuperscript{24} The tendency is especially evident in immigration policies where it is assumed that the state has the right and the responsibility to manage information in ways that would ensure public safety while delivering the desired volume of immigrants through quality service at an acceptable cost.

In the case of Canada, customer service prevails as a consideration which limits the availability of information that would make the activities of CIC transparent to the public. From applicants’ point of view, the CIC website explains the decision-making process regarding immigration applications generally and allows them, through E-client, to see the stage of processing of their applications; however, it provides no insights as to how and why decisions are made in specific cases. Upon further research on the website one can find CIC’s actual policy

\textsuperscript{19} Since the point-based Highly Skilled Immigrant Program was only introduced in 2005, statistics comparable to the numbers of Skilled Worker immigrants to Canada are not available yet; a number that gives an idea of the volume of non-refugee immigrants to the UK would be, for instance, the number of all work permits issued in 2005 – 137,000 which includes economic migrants as well as family members and students in the UK. http://www.ind.homeoffice.gov.uk/aboutus/newsarchive/latestimmigrationfigurespublishe
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implementation manuals used by immigration officers, explaining the mechanics of the process but not furthering accountability - again, transparency of why particular cases are handled in a certain way, is lacking. From the perspective of the Canadian public, a lot of factual information, such as reports, statistics, laws and regulations, is available on the CIC website. However, Canadians are not offered much insight into the immigration policy-making process through the website, and the questions of why certain immigrations goals and priorities as well as policy implementation mechanisms are chosen remain unanswered.

The United Kingdom’s immigration website is very similar to Canada’s in its degree of transparency. It appears somewhat less generous in making clear to applicants the terms for selection as skilled immigrants – though it lists the general criteria such as education and work experience that would bring points in the selection grid, the information is not quite as detailed as CIC website’s explanation of how exactly the points are awarded. As far as information on individual cases’ decision-making process is concerned, UK’s Borders and Immigration Agency website, like CIC’s, does not provide much information. The British public can access a wide range of legal documents and immigration policy enforcement guides on the website; as well, many annual reports and a limited stock of immigration statistics are available, but little or no information on how policy decisions are made.

As the cases of Canada and the UK prove, focusing on service delivery can reduce transparency – and democratic accountability – as governments, providing information on their service objectives and processes, fail to inform citizens on the actual initiatives, polices and partnerships that take place to in order to accomplish these outcomes; often the organizational changes necessary to accomplish the widely announced client service goals remain obscured.

Citizen participation / E-engagement

Citizen participation in e-government necessarily involves the possibility for contacting the respective governmental department through the Internet. A widespread practice is providing an opportunity for feedback; however, feedback for service through the website or about the website itself is mostly customer-oriented and has little to do with democratic governance. More closely related to participation in policy-making are public e-consultations – collecting opinions of member of the public on policy issues or proposed policy changes. Public consultations in general are not perfect tools for democratic participation: for instance, New Public Management-inspired models of public consultation focus on individuals, and not on groups, considering individuals as consumers rather than citizens; they also tend to select individuals to represent particular social or cultural groups in an essentialist way that does not further true representation.

E-government can make public consultations more meaningful to democratic governance: e-consultations have the benefit of allowing for the collection of a large volume and vast range of opinions, thus making it less expedient to select individuals as representatives of groups.

Regarding e-participation in immigration policy, the UK has made some progress while in the Canadian case the practice seems virtually inexistent. The CIC website does not contain any elements for participation or feedback. Concerning individual immigration applicants, the Contact Us tab provides the number of the call centre for checking the status of immigration
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applications within Canada, and a referral to the E-Client section of the website. Also, the CIC website does not offer any feedback options or a webmaster email for reporting user problems. No option for participation in policy decisions or for providing opinions is offered to the Canadian public; unlike some other Canadian government departments (Service Canada, Health Canada and Environment Canada, for example), Citizenship and Immigration Canada does not hold public consultations through its website, and does not provide any departmental address, email or phone number.

In the UK, options for involvement, to an extent, in the decision-making process of individual cases are available on the immigration website: the *Urgent Treatment Form* can be downloaded and faxed in extraordinary circumstances; also, importantly, forms requesting the review of decisions made on immigration applications are available – a significant difference from Canada where, legally, *Skilled Worker Program* immigration decisions are not subject to appeal and similar forms do not exist. The *Contact Us* section on the *Working in the UK* page has an option for feedback and complaints on the immigration services the BIA provides, listing the agency’s email, phone number, fax and email address. Separately, feedback on the website can be sent through clicking on the dedicated tab that appears on most BIA website screens. The UK also holds public e-consultations on immigration issues: at the moment, several are active on the website; and an extensive list of discussion papers from past e-consultations, along with summaries of responses, is available. Topics cover a wide range of immigration-related issues: independent and fair assessment of immigrants, refugee integration services, and changes in processing fees, to name a few. It is evident from the website’s archive that Internet public consultations on immigration matters have been an established practice for at least the last five years.

### Influencing factors

Many interplaying factors from the social, institutional and political environments of Canada and the UK have influenced their e-government styles in immigration policy. Below I discuss three of the main influences: immigration policy goals and institutional structures, e-government development and public administration reforms.

*Immigration policy goals and institutions*

Canada has had expansionist immigration policies for most of its existence, aiming at bringing in high levels of immigration to meet its demographic and labour market needs. For several decades now the selection of immigrants has focused on human capital which has made the *Skilled Worker Program* the main immigration stream, bringing in over 100,000 people per year which represents about half of all newcomers to Canada.\(^{28}\) This extraordinarily high volume of immigration calls for standardization of application processing and explains CIC’s attempts to streamline the immigration process through taking online as much of it as possible within the constraints of security and authenticity considerations. The assumption on part of the government that there is a general agreement among Canadians on the direction of immigration policy plays a role in the lack of opportunity for participation in the immigration policy-making and implementation. The federal system that Canada has also shaped e-government - the need for promoting unity and emphasizing central government in federal systems\(^{29}\) is evident in CIC’s
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website: it presents Canada’s immigration program as uniform and eschews regional differences, perspectives or policies, while promoting Canada’s brand as a destination.

The United Kingdom has only been actively recruiting immigrants for several years; traditionally, immigrants to the country arrived as asylum seekers and immigration was not regarded as a service to be provided by the government. The UK is, for this reason, much less equipped than Canada with the institutional machinery to process high numbers of immigration applications. It does not have a dedicated immigration department analogous to Citizenship and Immigration Canada – its Borders and Immigration Agency, called Immigration and Nationality Directorate until recently - is still part of the Home Office, although with recent reforms it has gained an additional degree of executive independence. The fact that in the UK the agency dealing with immigration is part of the department that is responsible for crime, policing and prisons, and that the direction of recent reform, binding together border controls and immigration, and providing increased powers in law enforcement, speaks of the centrality that public safety and security have in British immigration policies and contributes to the explanation why the BIA website does not go further in taking online and opening up the immigration process.

**E-Government Development and Public Administration Reform**

In both Canada and the UK e-government was developed in line with public administration reforms and the two should be examined together.

Canada is considered among the most advanced in the world in e-government; it has been consistently ranked at the top by the technology consulting company Accenture. This praise, however, is based solely on service-delivery criteria and does not involve evaluation of democratic reforms promoting openness, trust and participation. Canadian e-government is characterized by customer focus, a “whole-of-government” approach, and a main goal to improve efficiency. Its main initiative, Government On-Line (GOL), which is still being completed, reflects these two principles. As well, Canada’s public administration reform has proven conducive mostly to client service focus in e-government and much less to decentralization, connectedness or democratic participation. Susan Phillips argues that Canada, usually a follower rather than a leader or innovator in the international system, imitated other countries in both New Public Management (NPM) and post-NPM public administration reforms, adopting them to varied degrees, in a pragmatic and non-ideological way; she suggests that Canada nowadays has a washed-down, lip-service version of the British approach of shared governance. According to this author, Canada did not implement any real reforms of its public administration structures that would allow for more participatory governance in the manner that the “Third Way” did in the UK; instead, it adopted changes with an overemphasis on accountability and service provision by third parties bound by contracts. In her view, one of the reasons for which reform in Canada did not result in shared governance is that the country did
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not develop the architecture that would enable participation\textsuperscript{37}. Translated into e-government in immigration, it is obvious that the interaction between governmental levels necessary for a one-stop service portal is not taking place: \url{www.cic.gc.ca} is entirely focused on federal immigration programs and does not incorporate to any significant degree provincial-level immigration programs or links to local-level organizations that provide settlement services. The lack of opportunities for democratic participation on CIC’s website can also be explained by Canada’s political culture that shaped its public administration reform and its e-government development. Canada has faced four major challenges for institutional change: “inherent operational secrecy” that has prevented experimenting with e-government for achieving democratic goals, weak information management capabilities, adversarial parliamentary process and lack meaningful information reporting processes, and a political culture revolving around control and suspicion on the part of politicians in power.\textsuperscript{38}

Unlike Canada, the United Kingdom is not among the leading countries in e-government development.\textsuperscript{39} The strategies for developing e-government of the late 1990s included the Labour government’s idea of “joined-up” government and the creation the Office of the e-Envoy - steps that followed earlier strategies aimed at improving customer service to citizens and increasing efficiency\textsuperscript{40}. The less developed stage of e-government in the UK, in comparison to Canada, is one of the main reasons why fewer online immigration services are available and the immigration process is less digitized that it is in Canada. Because of the ideas of “joining up” governmental agencies that influenced the development of e-government in the UK, the website of the British Border and Immigration Agency contains more horizontal integration of departments and organizations that the website of Citizenship and Immigration Canada. In Britain, the New Labour “Third Way” philosophy of public administration that emerged after New Public Management paradigms of efficiency and stripped-down government started to be debunked, sought an alternative to both American-style market-oriented individualism and the statist orientation of the previous Labour government\textsuperscript{41}. Decentralization was in the core of public administration reform in the UK; also, many governmental units were restructured and transformed into executive agencies with managerial autonomy from the central government\textsuperscript{42}. These aspects are evident in the style of UK’s immigration e-government: the website is client-oriented but not extremely or exclusively so; links to other departments and organizations that have to do with immigration are incorporated, indicating the “joining up” of governmental levels and the goal to provide a variety of services under one umbrella, and the quasi-independent status of the Borders and Immigration Agency is reflected in the agency’s web page which is related to but separate from that of the Home Office. The degree of democratic participation that the website allows is reflective of the movement towards shared governance that characterized UK’s public administration reforms.

In conclusion, neither Canada nor the UK has utilized fully the potential of e-government to further democracy in immigration policy through increasing public value, transparency and citizen participation. Driven by the imperative to deliver large numbers of skilled immigrants and
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enabled by its well-developed e-government, Canada has created a relationship between the government and immigration policy stakeholders that is overwhelmingly focused on client service – an influence New Public Management ideology - and does little to empower citizens and bring justice and freedom to society. Because of the nature of its public administration reform, its relative lag in e-government development and its institutional structures that reflect a concern with security in the context of immigration policy, the United Kingdom not gone quite as far as Canada in the digitization of immigration programs and the provision of client services online; its immigration website, however, allows for a certain degree of public participation and demonstrates that the Internet can serve as tool to promote democracy in the highly contested realm of immigration policy.