

E-GOVERNANCE AND SOCIAL MEDIA IN TERMS OF GOVERNANCE PROCESSES

Yönetişim Süreçleri Açısından E-Yönetişim ve Sosyal Medya

Dilek ŞAHİN*

Öz

Bu çalışmadaki temel amaç yönetişim sürecinin bilgi iletişim teknolojileri temelinde gelişen e-yönetişim ve sosyal medya mecraları aracılığıyla yerel yönetimsel süreçlere vatandaş katılımının geleneksel bürokrasinin sınırlılığını aşmak açısından paradigma değişikliğinin kapılarını araladığını ortaya koymaktır. Söz konusu süreçleri açıklamak için Habermas'ın "iletişimsel eylem" kuramı bize faydalı kavramsal araçları sunmaktadır. Çalışmada içerik analizi yöntemi ile literatür taraması yapılarak yönetişim süreci açıklanmaktadır. Yönetişim olgusu, yönetişim yaklaşımları, elektronik yönetişim ve sosyal medya odağında iletişimsel eylemin ve işbirliğinin gerçekleşme zemini olarak açıklanmaktadır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: E-yönetişim, Sosyal Medya, İletişimsel Eylem Teorisi, Yönetişim Yaklaşımları, Kamusal Katılım, Kamusal Karar Alma Süreci

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of this study is to reveal that the governance process opens the doors of paradigm change in terms of overcoming the limitations of traditional bureaucracy in citizen participation in local administrative processes through e-governance and social media platforms developed on the basis of information and communication technologies. Habermas' theory of "communicative action" provides us with useful conceptual tools to explain these processes. In this study, the governance process is explained by making a literature review with the content analysis method. The phenomenon of governance is explained as the ground of realization of communicative action and cooperation in the intersection of governance approaches, electronic governance and social media.

Keywords: E.governance, Social Media, The Theory of Communicative Action, Governance Approaches, Public Participation, Public Decision Making

* Doktora Öğrencisi, Ankara Hacı Bayram Veli Üniversitesi, d_sahinn@yahoo.com,
ORCID: 0000-0002-8879-0830

INTRODUCTION

Today with the development of technology, as the relationship between societies becoming more intense, “the administration” phenomenon is undergoing a transformation, and the speed of this change is accelerated by the internet and information technologies. In the multipolar world after 1990, the importance of cooperation and participatory processes in administrative processes, in other words, governance has begun to be understood more. With the effective use of information and communication technologies in public administration and the increase in interaction in administrative processes, the concept of “electronic governance” has been added to the concept of “governance”. With the electronic governance process developing in the internet and electronic government infrastructure, the social structure undergoes a radical change, and with the use of social media in public processes, electronic governance creates an architecture that increases the dimensions of participation.

In the study, first of all, Habermas’s “The theory of communicative action”, which forms the theoretical and conceptual base of our study, will be explained. Later, the emergence and development process of the concept of “governance” will be explained and the concept of governance will be presented in terms of governance approaches. As an important pillar of the governance process, the e-governance process and the social media phenomenon will be discussed at the level of information and communication in the process of citizen participation in public administration. Then, it will be evaluated in terms of communicative rationality and cooperation by revealing how the process of public participation in e-governance and social media and the process of public participation in local administrative processes takes place interactively.

1. THE THEORY OF COMMUNICATIVE ACTION

“The theory of communicative action” was developed by Habermas based on the Marxist concepts of “infrastructure” and “superstructure” in the analysis of social relations of production, as taking “intersubjective communication” as a basis. Habermas is one of the contemporary representatives of critical theory. Critical theory was created by thinkers who were the representatives of the school of critical thought, known as the Frankfurt School, which was founded in the 1920s, who developed a critical perspective against the consumer society produced by industrial capitalism. The concepts of “communicative rationality”, “communicative action”, “lifeworld” and “argumentation” take place on the basis of communicative action theory (Demir, 2009: 63).

One of the mainstays of communicative action theory is “communicative rationality”. Habermas introduced the concept of “communicative rationality” against the portrayal of “instrumental mind” as the basis of modern exploitation and domination. Here, the subject-centered mind is replaced by a communicative mind based on intersubjective relations and reconciliation. Communicative action is based on the language of everyday life based on communication, awareness and understanding others as the founding element of language and agreement (Habermas, 2019: 475, 523-530).

What is meant by the concept of “lifeworld”, which forms the basis of the theory of communicative action, is the intuitive knowledge that comes from culture, society and the self, apart from the everyday language used in intersubjective relations. The pragmatic meaning and communicative reconciliation of “knowledge”, which originates from cultural accumulation, symbols and codes in the world of life, established in intersubjective communicative terms, becomes valuable (ibid, 681-690). What Habermas wants to convey with communicative consensus is the similarity in the forms of cultural interpretation. It should be emphasized here that the subjects engaged in communicative action constitute the life world consisting of morality and law. Habermas named the area outside the “lifeworld”, namely the structure consisting of economy and state, as a system (Torun, 2018: 180-182).

Another concept that explains the communicative action theory is “argumentation”. Argumentation is based on “persuasion” that provides communicative rationality. According to Habermas, since “rationality” deals with the use of information rather than where it comes from, the process of verifying this information takes place through “argumentation procedures”. Culture is transferred through learning processes based on arguments and reconstructed thanks to cybernetic feedback (Habermas, 2019: 45-48).

2. GOVERNANCE CONCEPT

The concept of “governance” describes a process that expresses a change of understanding in the traditional administration process and emphasizes the mutual relations of social actors (Yüksel, 2000:149-151). According to Jan Kooiman, governance is an order or structure that emerges in socio-political systems as a common result or product of the intervention efforts of all relevant actors interacting with each other. This order cannot be reduced to an actor or a single group of actors. Neither public nor private actors have all the information necessary to solve complex, dynamic and wide-ranging problems, sufficient prior knowledge to

ensure the effective use of certain tools, and sufficient action power to unilaterally dominate a certain management model (Kooiman, 1993: 2).

The concept of governance came to the fore in the 1990s as a result of the restructuring of public administration. The concept was first brought to the agenda in 1989 in the World Bank's report called "Sub-Saharan Africa: From Crisis To Sustainable Development" in order to overcome the crisis of traditional public administration, and to help the democratic management process for the development of Africa in the sense of "good governance". Instead of top-down policies in traditional public administration, it is used in the meaning of managing interactively with the market and civil society (Çukurçayır, 2003: 260).

According to OECD, the concept of governance is defined as the institutional system that determines the use of economic, social and administrative power and authority that a country has (Aktan, 2003: 176). The focus of the concept of governance is transparency, accountability, citizen participation in administrative decisions, cooperation, the rule of law, the mechanisms of globalization and localization that work together, effective management based on heterarchy rather than hierarchy, equality and strategic vision understanding (Özer, 2006: 79-81).

In the governance process, the market and bureaucracy are replaced by "network systems". This system refers to an interactive and flexible process based on the self-organizing powers of non-state actors. The role of the state in the governance process, on the other hand, is based on an understanding that activates steering mechanisms based on the capacities of the actors instead of directly intervening in market relations (Stoker, 1998: 21-22).

One of the main criticisms directed at this concept is the international institutions' taking the authority of socio-economic regulation from nation states under the name of "structural adaptation" and making the position of the national scale controversial. Another issue is that the governance concept does not provide a very clear data set about changing the existing traditional administrative system (Özer, 2006: 85).

2.1 Governance Approaches

The various perspectives put forward as "governance approaches" provide useful conceptual tools for our understanding of governance. To explain these approaches briefly;

2.1.1. Good Governance

The concept of “good governance” first referred in the field of economy. Some western governments and international organizations have used the concept of “good governance” as a necessary part of effective economic modernization. For example, the World Bank is one of the leading representatives of this approach and adds this principle to its loan agreements as a mandatory condition. Development economists defend the idea that development will not only be possible by creating a free market, applying the right economic policies, encouraging investment or implementing the right macro-economic policies, but creating a dynamic economy and it is possible by creating appropriate laws, social institutions and values. In this respect, good governance, as a requirement of development, desires stable regimes, the rule of law, effective public administration and a strong civil society independent of the state. In this context, democracy is an indispensable element of good governance. Multi-party regimes and free elections are also thought as very important elements in the prevention of corruption. What is desired here is to reduce the role of the state and to make the markets work better (Hirst, 2000: 14).

According to the understanding of good governance, what needs to be done to overcome the public administration crisis is a political restructuring, including a pluralistic institutional structure. In the report of the World Bank on the subject, reform is considered necessary in two main areas. The first is the improvements that need to be made in the technical area. This includes the liberalization of the legal system and budgetary discipline. What is meant by budgetary discipline is the reform of public services and the reduction of overemployment in the public sector. The emancipation of the legal system, on the other hand, is the minimum specifications for a legal system in the western sense. In other words, they are issues such as independent judiciary, freedoms and fairness. The second thing to be done is the improvements of the civil society structure. In this respect, it is primarily needed to support non-governmental organizations (NGOs), universities, trade unions and professional organizations. This also includes supporting a pluralistic institutional structure. In this context, the World Bank emphasizes the need to strengthen civil society by promoting accountability, legality, transparency and participation. The report also calls for decentralization of government and strengthening of local governments. Transparency and economic efficiency are the most important tools in the prevention of corruption. Finally, according to the report, the development of democracy can only be achieved by supporting civil society (Williams and Young, 1994: 84-100).

2.1.2. Network Governance

Network governance approach is the opposite of the traditional hierarchical approach based on authority. It is built on the traditional European sociological tradition. According to this approach, the cooperation of the private sector and civil society becomes important addition to the state in administration. Society and markets have developed the capacity for their self-organization. Another important concept here is the concept of “civil society”. Accordingly, democratic governance will be more effective in societies where civil society is developed and strong (Orhan and Yalçın, 2015: 182).

This approach envisages that services should be provided by a number of networks, partnerships. Such a structure embraces a wide range of actors: trade unions, trade associations, companies, NGOs, local authority representatives and entrepreneurs. Networks are self-organizing structures. In the simplest sense, the “network” is an autonomous and self-governing structure. Networks resist interferences from outside. In this sense, they want to determine their own policies. Therefore, governance in this sense is defined as self-organizing inter-organizational ties (Rhodes, 1996: 660). These networks stand out above all as interdependencies. Governance is a broader concept than administration and describes a structure in which non-state actors are also active. Apart from that, there is a constant interaction between network members. Trust is an essential concept in this interaction. The rules of the game are set together at the end of the negotiations between the members. Finally, the following can be said: networks have some degree of autonomy vis-à-vis the state. They are not fully accountable to the state. They organize themselves. Although the state is not privileged and dominant in the face of networks, it can indirectly direct them (Pierre, 2000: 65).

The biggest criticism of this approach is that it will be very difficult to be effective and practical unless the rules regulating the markets are determined from the upper scale.

2.1.3. Governance as a Socio-Cybernetic System

Another governance approach is the “socio-cybernetic approach”. Accordingly, the governance process is explained with the concepts of cybernetics theory. The socio-cybernetic approach emphasizes the limitations of single-actor management. It indicates that there is no single sovereign authority left today. Instead, various actors are active in various fields. There is a mutual dependency between social, political and administrative actors. They have common goals. Boundaries between

the public, private and third sectors have begun to blur. According to this approach, governance emerges as a result of the interaction of the social and political aspects of management. Management no longer has a superior side. A differentiation has begun in the political system. According to this approach, people now live in a “decentralized” society (Seviçin, 1990: 110-119).

The government or other public institutions are sensitive and respond to any change in their environment. In order to maintain the balance, the state organization tries to adapt itself to the changing environmental conditions. The duty of the state is now to provide political and social interaction and to regulate. The key concepts now prominent here are “self-regulation”, “public and private partnerships”, “collaboration” and “entrepreneurship” (ibid.)

2.1.4. Governance as the “New Public Management”

“The new public management approach” is an approach that envisages the transformation of public managers into entrepreneurs by using market mechanisms in public administration. Accordingly, concepts such as flexibility in management, performance techniques, quality management, efficiency, effectiveness, result-orientedness, transparency and participation come to the fore (Emre, 2003: 166).

In the discipline of public administration, the separation of ‘management-administration’ has been a controversial issue for a long time. In recent years, the ‘public management’ approach has been added as a third way to the separation of public administration and management. This new approach focused mainly on public organizations and limited itself to the executive power. According to the public management approach, the differences between the public and private sectors have lost their meaning in today’s conditions. In other words, developments in market conditions brought the two segments close together. As a result of this, private and public management procedures, operations and objectives have begun to be seen as not different processes. However, this approach went into a crisis towards the end of the 1980s. The biggest reason for this crisis is that this approach has adopted a reductionist methodology. This narrow point of view reduced the field and made new expansions necessary. The self-defining process of the school was realized with the birth of the ‘new public management school’ (Üstüner, 2000: 15-20).

The emergence of the new public management school was with an article by Christopher Hood published in 1991. According to Hood (1991), “New Public Management” is the most important development that has emerged in the international arena in public administration in recent times. In this period, a change in

favor of privatization as well as the phenomenon of locality in services emerged. In public services, as being mainly in information technology there is a rapid transformation in automation. Finally, intergovernmental cooperation has developed (Hood, 1991: 5).

'New public management' has two meanings: 'Managerialism (professional management) and 'new institutional economies.' The first describes the application of private sector business methods to the public sector, while the second describes the adaptation of public services to the conditions of competition. The new public management approach is relevant to the governance debate because 'steering' is a phenomenon that is at the very center of public management and in a sense steering is identical with governance. Political decisions and service delivery are actually two different things. Bureaucracy does not work well as it is. Instead, an entrepreneurial management approach is encouraged. Accordingly, the preoccupation of entrepreneurial management is competition, markets, customers and results. This change in the public sector can naturally be summarized as 'less management, more governance' (Rhodes, 1996: 655).

2.1.5. Governance In terms of Institutional Analysis

If we define the concept of "institution" before the "institutional approach", it can be defined as the repeated thinking practices of people; the point that is primarily emphasized here is that institutions are "thought structures" rather than an "organizational structure" (Sowell, 1967: 189). Carden, on the other hand, defines institutions as a system that includes rules that determine the social structure, restrictions that determine the interaction between people, formal and informal rules and regulatory mechanisms (Carden, 2007: 5).

In terms of governance, the role played by a number of institutions in the institutional approach process is emphasized. The extent to which the parliament or other institutions play a role in effective governance is investigated. In the process of creating civil society, institutionalist theory argues that a well-functioning institutional structure is needed. In other words, institutions must be created first (Rhodes, 1996: 655).

Although institutional approaches are effective in defining different organizational forms, they are criticized as insufficient to explain why some organizational forms are chosen among others and evolve over time (Brint and Karabel, 1991: 343).

2.1.6. Governance as a Minimal State

“Governance in the sense of the minimal state” redefines the limitation of the state through privatizations and cuts and public intervention; however, while the share of the public and public expenditures in the Gross National Product has decreased, the share of local governments and national health services has increased partially compared to other expenditures (Martinussen, 1997: 34).

2.1.7. Governance In Terms of Neo-Marxism and Critical Theory

The main emphasis of the neo-Marxist theory, which is positioned at opposite side to the governance approaches, is that “late capitalism has a legitimacy crisis”. According to the neo-Marxist theory, the capitalist state is based on capital accumulation and creates enormous inequalities in society. The Welfare State is structured to raise the living standards of the lower strata of society. According to neo-Marxists, the aim here is to overcome the crisis of capitalism by means of administrative revisions and to ensure the continuation of the system (McIvor, 2020).

3. E-Governance

“E-governance” is a governance process that provides horizontal coordination of all relevant stakeholders in government administration organized as networks, based on a transparent, accountable governance approach dependent on information technologies (Demirel from Dhalewale, 2010: 70).

E-governance, which is based on the interaction and integration of all stakeholders in public administration around the logic of “network organization”, strives to create a management philosophy based on dialogue and cooperation between citizen and state.

The concept of “internet governance”, which is another concept used in the close sense of “e-governance”, refers to a system in which actors such as governments, private sector and non-governmental organizations that are active on the internet network, determine the principles and rules that are valid in network management (Dijk, 2016: 201, 202).

When we examine the practises and applications related to e-governance around the world, we can give example the computer processing and updating of copies of cultivated and leased farmland in the state of Karnataka, the “Ghana Automated Clearing House (GACH) Project” which was created in order to facili-

rate, develop and coordinate the electronic information exchange between public institutions and private sector in Ghana, also Estonia, one of the pilot regions for digital applications, the “e-citizen project” in which public services are transferred to electronic media and “e-ministry” in Malta which is responsible for the execution and development of many electronic-based projects produced in the country and keeping population records online. In Mexico, there is the “e-Mexico” project to reduce the digital divide (Demirel, 2010: 75-80).

When we examine studies on e-transformation in Turkey, an important step was taken by joining the e-Europe+ initiative in 2001. In this context, a plan called “e-Transformation Turkey Project” was put into practice in 2003-2004 for the integration of the public administration into the electronic environment, thereby focusing on the e-government infrastructure works and thus providing a fast, effective and transparent public service. Actions for the information society strategy were determined by the State Planning Organization (SPO) within the scope of the 2003-2004 “Short Term Action Plan”. In this context, the 2006-2010 “Information Society Strategy and its Annex Action Plan”, which includes the period between 2006-2010, was prepared and entered into force (ibid.).

An important issue about e-governance is the establishment of the legal framework that ensures the validity of public transactions conducted on the internet. The existing traditional bureaucratic culture is likely to resist new electronic-based managerial processes. To point out, it is the governance processes that will reduce the conflict between the old and the new methods.

4. Social Media

Today, with the development of information and communication technologies, the use of internet and web-dialogue-based applications as a public relations tool is further developing in the process of restructuring the public administration. Internet and social media networks have become an indispensable part of public governance processes. Social media, which develops in the web-based environment provided by the Internet, changes the scale of the interaction by enabling two-way communication. In this context, social media platforms, which take up a lot of time in the daily lives of the people, are becoming an important part of the governance process, integrating into the public administration process (Sayımer; 2008: 29, 123).

Social media, as an area where users share content, thoughts, interests and information, cooperate by communicating anytime and anywhere, and where a com-

mon language is formed, is also increasing in administrative processes; supports participatory, democratic processes.

According to the “Digital 2021” report prepared by “We Are Social and Hootsuite”, the rate of time people aged 16-64 using social media in the world is 2 hours and 25 minutes a day. The most visited social media platforms are Facebook, Youtube, Whatsapp and Instagram. There are 4.2 billion people actively using social media in the world (<https://recrodigital.com/>). Considering that people use social media platforms so much, its use in public processes becomes indispensable for effective governance processes.

Today, thanks to the internet and mobile digital technologies, the use of social networks is increasing and citizens’ participation in local administrative processes is encouraged. With the rapid and instant sharing of information, interactive audio-visual communication spaces are formed, and cooperation processes are realized by decreasing the borders between the governed and the governed on this ground. Also, direct communication takes place between the public and the local government by overcoming bureaucratic constraints (Alikılıç, 2012: 62).

Table. Social Media Types

Facebook

It was created in 2004 by Mark Zuckerberg to increase communication among Harvard University students on the internet, and then spread to the whole United States and the world. Today, it is the social media platform with the second highest number of users with 1 billion 350 million users (<https://tr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Facebook>). In an environment where thoughts, photos and videos are shared, friendships are made, and interests are revealed.

Twitter

Founded by Jack Dorsey in 2006, the “twitter” application is a microblogging service where users can send 140-character “tweet” messages to each other.

Youtube

Founded in 2005 by Jawed Karim, Steve Chen, Chad Hurley, the application serves as a video sharing environment.

Instagram

Founded in 2010 by Kevin Systrom and Mike Krieger, the application is used as a photo and video sharing service on social media.

Flickr

Founded by Ludicrop in 2004, the application serves as a photo, video sharing and hosting environment.

Pinterest

It is a social networking platform created by Ben Silbermann, Paul Sciarra and Evan Sharp in 2009, where images are shared and operated with a clipboard system.

LinkedIn

Founded in 2002, it is a social networking and business platform that enables employers and job seekers to meet and exchange information.

Source : (Çağıl, 2017: 20- 30).

The biggest criticism of social media platforms is that social media creates false reality spaces by distorting the realities of daily life; thus, it is that capitalism controls the masses by manipulating reality by hiding its contradictions. Such a society, which internalizes the language and signs of the dominant production relations through the media and mass communication, corresponds to the society that Debord envisions as the “the society of the spectacle” (Debord, 2017: 35-40). In this society, the relationship with reality has begun to distort; a virtual environment in which the society thinks they have freewill is created and thus the addiction of false needs of society increases actually enslaved by increasing their dependence on these false needs.

Morley and Robins (Morley and Robins, 2011: 30), describing social networks as “visual/auditory geography”, by indicating that the virtual and real is articulated with each other on these digital spaces like social media platforms by realizing many activities and transactions in daily life such as information sharing, shopping, banking transactions and social events much faster and more effectively, they respond to criticisms of social media (Bennet & Thornton, 2012: 495-498).

5. Public Participation In Public Decision Making Through E-Governance And Social Media

Social media platforms, as areas where cooperation and interaction are very intense, correspond to the “life world” explained by Habermas, which corresponds

to the cultural consensus that has a strong potential for change in terms of public administration.

The similarity between the “life world”, one of the basic concepts of Habermas’s “theory of communicative action”, and social media channels lies in the fact that they are the ground for the realization of communicative reason. This world of life proposes an ethic of communication that fosters peace, solidarity and reconciliation among individuals (Habermas 2019: 681-690). This morality is based on the primacy of a communicatively established and empathetic mind over a subject-centered mind. Social media forms the current basis of such morality as a field where information, culture and symbols exchange.

According to Habermas, the main problem of modern societies stems from the domination of the living universe by the state and the economic system. According to Habermas, society continues with the simultaneous functioning of the “life world” and “system” structures. In this process, liberation lies in the reorganization of the institutional structure in which system structures suppress the universe of life. It should be emphasized here that the system covering the field of power is not independent of communicative action, but is a structure shaped within it. It can be said that the life world is shaped by the interaction of communication and power (Habermas 2019: 740-755).

At this point, social media channels, which we can describe as the “life world”, undertake a more important task than ever and open the doors of this liberation. This area also coincides with the “public space” where social integration is achieved, which is one of the main discussion areas of Habermas’s studies. At the current level of public administration, social media networks have become an indispensable part of public governance processes in terms of the public sphere of communication. As an area where a common language is formed, social media also realize the public participation in public administration processes easier than ever before.

Internet-based technologies that enable mutual interaction in public administration and developing social media and e-governance processes increase the functionality of democratic, transparent and participatory democracy by creating dialogue channels between citizens and the state. The public influence on administrative processes by using social media environments and the development of cooperation mechanisms correspond exactly to the processes that create the culture of compromise that Habermas’ stress with the life world.

Social media is based on the “communicative rationality” that Habermas mentioned as a field that has its own rules and language, operates with users’ content production, and forms the basis for the formation of a common mind. The language created here and collectively created system continue with “argumentation procedures” for social media.

With the active use of social media in public administration, the mechanisms of influence on administrative decisions and participation of the public in administrative decisions increase and an effective area is formed in terms of governance processes. Social media and e-governance processes enable symmetrical communication and enable the active participation of the public in local administrative processes. Thus, social media exists as one of the most important areas for the collaboration and creative action of collective intelligence.

Social media platforms offer the opportunity to learn people’s preferences and encourage the democratic decision making process and implementation of these decisions. Thanks to the internet, mobile technologies, digital applications and social media, which are among the means of e-governance, strong communication and interaction areas emerges by ensuring the rapid and effective participation of citizens in local administrative processes, regardless of place and time.

In the face of developments in scientific and technological areas, it is not only the government that we encounter in the production and distribution of public services; but also private and voluntary organizations and even international organizations are involved and interdependence is increasing inevitably, so that horizontal organization models emerge by increasing intercultural relations and interaction strengthening the cooperation process of civil society.

Governance processes are very important basically in terms of creating a reconciliation ground between the state and the market, operating networks formed on the basis of cooperation, ensuring that the ways of adapting the traditional administration styles with the information age and creating and providing a roadmap on how to overcome possible new contradictions.

Different legal problems arise in the e-governance process, especially in social media platforms on dimension of interaction and communication level based on the Internet. Especially the inadequacy of legal regulations against violations of rights such as unauthorized access to personal data and the unauthorized use of this data, and the difficulty of prosecuting those who commit cyber crimes are among the difficulties in this area. The point that should be mentioned here is that

social media platforms and e-governance process should be supported in terms of freedom of expression, right of communication, access to information, and democratization of communication (Başaran, 2019: 14-17). However, it should be taken into account that this right is not an unlimited area of freedom, and the establishment of its legal framework is also necessary for the use of these rights. (Dijk, 2016: 199).

CONCLUSION

The participation of the public in the public decision-making process reaches very different dimensions today by exceeding the boundaries of time and space thanks to e-governance and social media designed on internet-based digital and web-based applications. Establishment of an effective, participatory, transparent, accountable, democratic environment in the public administration process and cooperation between the governing and the governed is possible thanks to e-governance. It is clear that in order to overcome the difficulties of the traditional administration process, it is necessary to benefit from the effect of social media platforms together with the e-governance process.

In terms of public administration, it is necessary to encourage the participation of the public in decision making process, implementation and supervision, especially using electronic governance mechanisms. In addition, non-governmental organizations should take an active role as one of the actors that will strengthen the governance process by creating the infrastructure of organized society

Although it is clear that citizens generally prefer traditional participation methods within the framework of the established bureaucratic culture, this problem is overcome by the new generation's tendency to use technological systems and providing data security on the Internet by means of stronger systems. Thus the intensive use of social media platforms by the "z generation" increases the operability of e-governance processes.

EXTENDED SUMMARY

At the current level of information and communication technologies, public administration processes are also changing; so it has been possible more effective, efficient, faster and higher quality forms of public service delivery and more effective participation of citizens in these processes. Governance processes that aim at the interactive participation of citizens in public administration processes form the basis of common sense and cooperation through digital technologies, electronic governance processes based on the internet and mobile devices, and social media.

The main purpose of this study is to reveal that the governance process opens the doors of paradigm change in terms of overcoming the limitations of traditional bureaucracy in citizen participation in local administrative processes through e-governance and social media platforms developed on the basis of information and communication technologies.

In this context, the questions of whether e-governance processes and social media channels, which are based on the use of information and communication technologies in decision-making processes related to public administration, play a catalytic role in the participation of the public in administrative processes, are effective in providing data on local administrative problems by increasing the communication/interaction and cooperation mechanisms of the public are revealed.

The method used in the study is to explain the relationship between governance processes and social media on the basis of Habermas's "communicative action theory"; The possible contributions of this process to public administration are revealed. Habermas' theory of "communicative action" provides us with useful conceptual tools to explain these processes. In this study, the governance process is explained by making a literature review with the content analysis method. The phenomenon of governance is explained as the ground of realization of communicative action and cooperation in the intersection of governance approaches, electronic governance and social media.

It is explained that social media channels correspond to the "life world/universe" expressed by Habermas in his "theory of communicative action", and it is stated that this area allows the public to intensify with regard to cooperation and interaction. This lifeworld proposes a communication ethic that promotes peace, solidarity and reconciliation among individuals. This ethos is based on the priority of a communicatively constructed and empathetic mind over a subject-centered mind. In this respect, social media channels constitute the current basis of this communicative ethics as an area where information, culture and symbols are exchanged.

This area, which consists of social media channels, referred to as the life universe, coincides with a cultural consensus that has a strong potential for change in terms of public administration, and forms the basis for the organization of collective intelligence. Social media channels, which have their own rules and language and operate with users producing content, are based on the “communicative rationality” mentioned by Habermas. The language created here and the system created commonly continue with “argumentation procedures” refer to social media. Argumentation is based on “persuasion”, which provides communicative rationality. This exactly reveals the executive power of communicative action, which forms the basis of Habermas’s theory.

In conclusion, this study reveals that public participation in the public decision-making process has gone far beyond the traditional methods used in the past, transcending the boundaries of time and space, thanks to the e-governance process and social media platforms based on internet-based digital and mobile technologies and web-based applications. It seems important people’ submitting requests, complaints and producing solution and suggestions regarding the problems of the place where they live, in terms of conciliatory, democratic, transparent and accountable management processes, through e-governance and social media which includes the internet and mobile digital participation process, and the regulation of web-based and mobile application systems in this regard.

In the study, while it is emphasized that social media channels and e-governance processes should be supported in terms of the right to communication and access to information on the basis of democratic communication processes and freedom of expression, the idea that this right is not an unlimited area of freedom and that the creation of a legal framework is mandatory for the use of these rights is also put forward.

Etik Beyanı: Bu çalışmanın tüm hazırlanma süreçlerinde etik kurallara uyulduğunu yazarlar beyan eder. Aksi bir durumun tespiti halinde Kamu Yönetimi ve Politikaları Dergisinin hiçbir sorumluluğu olmayıp, tüm sorumluluk çalışmanın yazarlarına aittir.

Yazar Katkıları: Dilek ŞAHİN, çalışmanın tamamında tek başına katkı sunmuştur.

Çıkar Beyanı: Yazarlar ya da herhangi bir kurum/ kuruluş arasında çıkar çatışması yoktur.

Ethics Statement: The authors declare that the ethical rules are followed in all preparation processes of this study. In the event of a contrary situation, the Journal of Public Administration and Policy has no responsibility and all responsibility belongs to the author of the study.

Author Contributions: Dilek ŞAHİN has contributed to all parts and stages of the study.

Conflict of Interest: There is no conflict of interest among the authors and/or any institution.

REFERENCES

- Akran, C. C. (2003), *Değişim Çağında Devlet, Çizgi Kitabevi, Konya.*
- Alıklıç, Ö. Atabek, U. (2012). "Social Media Adoption Among Turkish Public Relations Professionals: A Survey of Practitioners", *Public Relations Review* (38), pp. 56-63.
- Başaran, F. (2019). "Bir Mücadele Biçimi Olarak İletişim Hakkı: Deneyim, Hatırlama ve Olasılıklar"
- İletişim Hakkı ve Yeni Medya: Tehditler ve Olanaklar adlı kitapta Derleyenler: Tezcan DURNA, Mutlu BİNARK, Günseli BAYRAKTUTAN, um:ag Vakfi Yayınları, Ankara.
- Bennet, R. M. and Thornton, E. N. (2012). "Governance Within Social Media Websites: Ruling New Frontiers", *Telecommunications Policy*, 36(6), 493-50.
- Brint S., Karabel J. (1991), *Institutional Origins and Transformations: The Case of American Community Colleges*, Powell, W.W. and P.J. DiMaggio (Ed.) *The New Institutionalism in Organizational Analysis:1-4*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Carden, W.A. (2007), "Christian Ethics, Formal Institutions, and Economic Growth", *American Review of Political Economy*, 5(1), 34-53.
- Çağıl, A. (2017). *Sosyal Medya ile Dijital Pazarlama*, Dikeyksen Yayın, İstanbul.
- Çukurçayır, A. (2003). "Çok Boyutlu Bir Kavram Olarak Yönetişim", *Çağdaş Kamu Yönetimi-I*, (Ed: Muhittin Acar, Hüseyin Özgür&Muhittin ACAR), Nobel Kitabevi, Ankara, pp. 259-275.
- Debord, G. (2017). *Gösteri Toplumu*, (çev. Ayşen Ekmekçi&Okşan Taşkent), Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Demir, A. S. (2009). "Sosyal Bilimlere Eleştirel Bir Bakış: Frankfurt Okulu ve Pozitivizm Eleştirisi", *Saü Fen Edebiyat Dergisi*, Sayı: 1, 59-73.
- Demirel, D. (2010). "Yönetişimde Yeni Bir Boyut: E-Yönetişim" *Türk İdare Dergisi* , Sayı: 466 Mart 2010, ss.65-94..
- Devendra, D. "E-Governance", e-zest Solutions Pvt. Ltd. www.e-zest.net/presentations/e-governance

- Dijk, J., V. (2016). Ağ Toplumu, (çev. Özlem Sakin), Epsilon Yayıncılık, İstanbul.
- Habermas, J. (2019). İletişimsel Eylem Kuramı, (çev. Mustafa Tüzel), Alfa Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Hood, C. (1991). "A Public Management For All Seasons", *Public Administration*, Vol.69, 3 – 19.
- Kooiman, J. (1993). "Social–Political Governance: Introduction", *Modern Governance: New Government Society Interactions*, Sage Publications, London,
- Martinussen, J. (1997). *Society, State and Market, a Guide to Competing Theories of Development*, Zed Books Ltd, London.
- McIvor, D., W. (2020). Toward a Critical Theory of Collaborative Governance, *Administrative Theory & Praxis*, 42:4, 501-516.
- Morley, D., Robins, K. (2011). *Kimlik Mekanları: Küresel Medya, Elektronik Ortamlar ve Kültürel Sınırlar*, çev. Emrehan Zeybekoğlu, Ayrıntı Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Orhan, G., Yalçın, L. (2015). "Ağlar, Yönetişim Ve Ağ Yönetişi: Tarihsel ve Kavramsal Bir Değerlendirme", Ed. Özer Köseoğlu ve Mehmet Zahid Sobacı, *Kamu Yönetiminde Paradigma Arayışları: Yeni Kamu İşletmeciliği ve Ötesi (171-204)*, Bursa: Dora Basım-Yayım Dağıtım Ltd. Şti.
- Özer, M., A. (2006). Yönetişim Üzerine Notlar, *Sayıştay Dergisi*, Sayı: 63, pp. 59-89.
- Rhodes, R.A.W. (1996), "The New Governance: Governing Without Government", *Political Studies*, 44 :652-667.
- Saymer, İ. (2008). *Sanal Ortamda Halkla İlişkiler*, Beta Yayınları, İstanbul.
- Seviçin, A. (1990). "Yönetim Biliminin Gelişim Süreci İçerisinde Sibernetik Yaklaşım ve Örgütsel Sibernetikler", Yüksek Lisans Tezi, Anadolu Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Eskişehir.
- Sobacı, M. Z. (2007). "Yönetişim Kavramı ve Türkiye’de Uygulanabilirliği Üzerine Değerlendirmeler", *Yönetim Bilimleri Dergisi*, 5: 1
- Sowell, T. (1967). "The Evolutionary Economics of Thorstein Veblen", *Oxford Economic Papers*, New Series, 19(2), 177-198.

Stoker, G. (1998). "Governance As Theory: Five Positions", *International Social Science Journal*, 50, 1:17-29.

Üstüner, Y. (2008). "Kamu Yönetimi ve Ağ Yaklaşımları", *Kamu Yönetiminde Yeni Vizyonlar*, Ed. Bekir PARLAK, Turhan Kitabevi Yayınları, Ankara.

Yüksel, M. (2000). "Yönetişim Kavramı Üzerine", *Ankara Barosu Dergisi*, 58, 3:145-159.

<https://recrodigital.com/>. (accessed January 23, 2022)