POLITICAL PARTICIPATION AND E-PETITIONING: AN ANALYSIS OF THE POLICY-MAKING IMPACT OF THE SCOTTISH PARLIAMENT’S E-PETITION SYSTEM

ABSTRACT

Worldwide, representative democracies have been experiencing declining levels of voter turnout, lower membership levels in political parties, and apathy towards their respective political systems and their ability to influence the political process. E-democracy, and specifically E-petitioning, have been touted as a possible solution to this problem by scholars of electoral systems. In 1999, the Scottish Parliament reconvened for the first time in nearly three hundred years, and quickly set out to change the way politics were handled in Scotland by launching the world’s first online E-petition system. Analyzing the Scottish Parliament’s E-petition system, and assessing the extent to which it fulfilled the aspiration and goals of its designers serves as a litmus test to see whether it is an effective medium to increase public political participation, and whether it could be replicated in other democratic countries.

Data was collected from the Scottish Parliament’s E-petitioning website, which hosts all the E-petitions and details of who signed them, each E-petition’s path through the Parliament, who sponsored the petition, and other important information. Since success of an E-petition is highly subjective due to the original petitioner’s own desired goals, three case studies of E-petitions and a data analysis were utilized to evaluate the system. Results suggest that the Scottish Parliament’s E-petition system has engaged Scots in the political process, given them a medium to participate in meaningful policy formulation, and produced tangible changes in policy through E-petitions.

INTRODUCTION

Contemporary representative democracies are experiencing declining levels of voter turnouts for elections, political participation, and membership in political parties.[[1]](#footnote-1) In response, many democratically elected governments are searching for ways to increase the legitimacy of their political systems (Gronlund, 2002). “E-democracy” has been presented as a promising solution to this perceived decline in democratic legitimacy.

An early innovator in E-democracy, and specifically E-petitioning, has been the Scottish Parliament (Caldow, 2004). The Parliament was founded in 1998, and was designed not to replicate the adversarial Westminster system employed in London, but to emphasize a new style of politics, characterized by a unicameral chamber and an electoral system to facilitate multiparty representation in the parliament (Norton, 2011, p. 279). The operational rules of the new Parliament were formulated in, “Shaping Scotland’s Parliament” (The Scottish Office, 1998), which notes five guiding principles for the Parliament to conduct its work: power sharing, accountability, access, participation, and equal opportunities. The Consultative Steering Group, which authored “Shaping Scotland’s Parliament”, believed petitions would help deliver these principles to Scots. To that end, they ensured that the submission of petitions had clear, simple rules, specified how petitions would be handled, and committed to keep all petitions and the Parliament’s responses in the public domain (The Scottish Office, 1998). It also states, “It will also be important to develop a culture of genuine consultation and participation if people in Scotland, particularly those who do not currently engage in the political process, are to be encouraged to participate,” (McMahon, 2004, p. 236). In addition, this new style of politics was a desire to transform the political process in Scotland to make it more open, transparent, inclusive, consultative, and participatory (Bonney, 2003, p. 459). The fact that the Parliament had been established in 1999, well into the age of the Internet, has given it a huge advantage in terms of incorporating these new technologies into its procedures (Seaton, 2005, p. 333).

THE SCOTTISH E-PETITION SYSTEM

The Scottish Parliament, in partnership with the International Teledemocracy Centre at Napier University and BT Scotland, developed the web-based E-petitioner, a tool to encourage public participation in governance through the use of online electronic petitioning (Mactintosh, Malina, & Whyte, 2002, p. 271). The E-petitioner tool has the functionality to create a petition; to view/sign a petition; to add background information, to join an integrated discussion forum; and to submit a petition (Beddie, Macintosh, & Malina, 2001, pp. 700-701). Anyone is able to file an E-petition on any issue within the Scottish Parliament’s remit. Just one signature is required for an E-petition to be filed with the Parliament’s Public Petitions Committee. The committee has nine Members of the Scottish Parliament with the power to decide the admissibility of a petition, what action should be taken upon an admissible public petition, and keep under review the operation of the petitions system (The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee, 2010). The committee provides an avenue for individuals, community, interest groups, and other organizations to participate fully in the democratic process in Scotland by raising issues of public concern with the Parliament (McMahon, 2004, p. 236). The Public Petitions Committee also maintains a staff whose sole purpose is to assist petitioners, give advice about the process, and how to word the petition itself. There is no age limit required to file an E-petition, and they can be submitted in any language and any format (The Scottish Parliament, 2010). Petitioners, however, cannot resubmit an E-petition on the same or ‘substantially similar’ issue within a year after their petition was closed (The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee, 2006).

The Public Petitions Committee lists every E-petition filed with the committee on the Scottish Parliament’s website, which are searchable by their respective identification numbers. The E-petition summary page includes all the relevant information pertaining to the petition: who filed the petition, whether or not it was filed on behalf of a group or organization, the number of signatures the petition received, the date it was lodged with the Parliament, and the petitioner’s statement outlining its aims and general information about the E-petition. Below that is the petition summary page, which is updated by the Public Petitions Committee and details each time the petition is discussed and the actions taken by the committee. Links are provided for information gathered, committee meetings, reports, written questions, and other events pertaining to the E-petitions. The data was collected and compiled into a dataset, which was used to examine the E-petition system.

The first task that the nine MSPs that sit on the Public Petitions Committee must perform is to review whether the Scottish Parliament has the power to deal with the issues brought up in the E-petition. For instance, if the subject of an E-petition deals with foreign policy, the Scottish Parliament has no power to hear the petition as this power resides with the British Parliament. In addition, the Public Petitions Committee cannot rule out a petition on the grounds that they do not believe it to be a good idea or disagree with what its aims may be. One signature is all that is required for an E-petition to be lodged with the Scottish Parliament. This eliminates barriers restricting the issues a petition may raise, and virtually allows anyone to file an E-petition with the Scottish Parliament. There is no uniform duration for an E-petition, and while the Public Petitions Committee is still reviewing it, an E-petition is known as open.

The Public Petitions Committee categorizes each E-petition into a corresponding issue, allowing them to understand which policy areas petitioners are concerned with, making the process more expedient by knowing which relevant committee or government body to send the E-petition to for review and response. In addition, the committee communicates with the petitioner during the process updating them on the progress of the petition, and in some cases inviting them to provide evidence or argue the petition’s merits to the committee at the Parliament. Once a decision has been reached about the issues raised in the petition, the E-petition is closed and the petitioner is notified the reasons why.

The final outcome of E-petitions are important to examine, and I have categorized the outcomes of closed E-petitions as follows: closed after initial Public Petitions Committee consideration, closed after initiating Committee report or inquiry, closed after contributing to Committee report or inquiry, referred to other Committee and closed, closed on basis of Executive response, closed and considered under planned legislation, closed on basis of other Committee response, closed on basis of other Public Body response, closed on basis of Scottish Government response, closed due to parliamentary activity or outside activity, closed due to petitioner response or request, E-petition withdrawn, closed due to issues raised in E-petition implemented, and closed due to petitioner non-response. Figure 1 illustrates the possible steps an E-petition could take.




Figure 1: E-petition Possibilities Chart

Source: (The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee, 2006).

E-PETITION DATA ANALYSIS

From 2000 to 2011, during three sessions of the Scottish Parliament, 385 E-petitions were lodged with the Public Petitions Committee. These E-petitions dealt with a wide range of issues, were submitted by different individuals and groups, and had different policy impacts. As a result, it is important to analyze the E-petition data provided by the Public Petitions Committee in order to determine whether or not the system has fulfilled what it was designed to do. This will provide evidence of the extent to which it has allowed for public participation in policy formulation.

The E-petition system was designed to allow ordinary people, not affiliated with any group or organization, to voice their concerns and have meaningful participation in policy formulation in Scotland. However, a troubling concern was the possibility that E-petitions would open a new avenue for interest groups and powerful organizations to lobby the Parliament, abusing a system designed to give political voice to non-participative citizens (Silcock, 2001). Another worry pertaining to the E-petition system was whether individuals who had never used the system before would file them, or if a group of experienced petitioners would utilize the system repeatedly to achieve their policy goals (Silcock, 2001). Would a system designed to improve democratic participation actually help stifle it? This analysis will help address these important questions about the E-petition system, and provide answers to them.

The first E-petition was filed with the Scottish Parliament in 2000, and in 2004 the E-petition system was officially launched by the Parliament. The number filed grew each year until 2008, peaking at 92. After 2008, the number filed dropped down to 66 in 2009 and 62 in 2010. It is interesting to note, however, that 2002 saw no E-petitions filed with the Parliament. On average, 38.5 E-petitions were lodged each year from 2000-2010.

**Figure 2: E-petitions Lodged with the Scottish Parliament, 2000-2010**

The average E-petition received 955 signatures. The most signatures a single E-petition received was 23,144. Over 56% of E-petitions received more than 100 signatures, almost 20% received more than 1,000 signatures, and 2.1% received more than 10,000 signatures. E-petitions garnering only one signature made up 14.5% of all filed.

Figure 3 also shows the policy areas assigned by the Parliament to E-petitions. The largest single E-petitions policy area concerns Health and Community Care, making up 21.3% of E-petitions filed, while Justice and Home Affairs consisted of 14.3% of E-petitions filed, and Transport and Arts, Culture, and Sport as the next highest, both sharing 8.1% respectively.

**Figure 3: Corresponding Issue Assigned to E-petitions**

An E-petition must be submitted by an individual; however whether or not the petitioner filed it on behalf of a larger group or organization is an important indicator of who is utilizing the E-petition system. Figure 4 shows the entities that raised E-petitions with the parliament. Individuals not affiliated with any group or organization filed 55.3% of all E-petitions. 14.3% of E-petitions were filed by community organizations, and only 22.9% were filed on behalf of interest groups. Repeat petitioners constituted 11.4% of individuals filing E-petitions, while one-time petitioners made up 88.6%. The most E-petitions a single individual has filed is 5, so this arena has not yet become a new political opportunity structure. This is an encouraging sign, as citizens with no prior experience with the E-petitions process are navigating the system successfully and participating in policy formulation with few repeat players.

Figure 5 illustrates the outcomes of closed E-petitions. The most frequent outcome for E-petitions (18.2%) was for them to be closed on the basis of the Scottish Government’s response. This can be understood as the Scottish Government informing the petitioner that after careful consideration, they have no plans on implementing the issues raised. E-petitions that were closed after initial Public Petitions Committee consideration made up 12.7%. E-petitions in this category did not fall under the Scottish Parliament’s powers, and were subsequently closed. 4.4% of E-petitions were closed and considered under planned legislation, usually resulting in the issues raised being tacked on to existing legislation in the Parliament. E-petitions that were closed due to the issues raised in the petition being implemented constituted 12.7%. Taken as a whole, 84.9% of E-petitions fell under the Scottish Parliament’s powers, were reviewed by government committees, bodies, or outside organizations, and entered the political discussion.

Figure : Entities E-petitions Filed on Behalf Of

**Figure 5: E-petition Outcomes**

While only 12.7% of E-petitions were closed as a result of the issues raised being implemented, it indicates that E-petitions do have the ability to affect policy formulation, that the Scottish Parliament takes E-petitioning seriously, and that E-petitions have the ability to become or change laws. This is a positive sign, as someone that is considering submitting an E-petition, yet is skeptical of its potential to change anything, could view this statistic and be encouraged to submit it. Individuals who were not affiliated with any group or organization submitted 55.3% of all E-petitions. This is a positive indicator that regular citizens are utilizing the system in order to achieve the changes in policy they seek. Also, with interest groups filing 22.9% of E-petitions, fears that they would use the system to lobby the Parliament and increase their power seem unfounded. First-time petitioners, who had no prior experience with the system, filed 88.6% of E-petitions. This signifies that the E-petitions process is accessible, and not intimidating for citizens to use.

Overall, the data indicates that over three sessions of the Scottish Parliament, the E-petition system has in fact helped to provide for public access, transparency, power sharing, accountability, and participation. Scots began to involve themselves in the political process through E-petitioning, and it has proven itself to be a viable medium for Scots to express their grievances and to participate in policy formulation. However, the data tells us little about specific E-petitions, and what they have accomplished. To remedy this, the next section will feature two case studies, which will add context to the E-petition process.

E-PETITION CASE STUDIES

In order to add context to the E-petitions process, it is important to examine individual E-petitions to get a better idea of how the system works, and the multitude of outcomes that E-petitions may have. Each petitioner had a specific grievance or change in policy in mind when they filed their respective E-petition, yet their idea of whether it was a success or not is extremely subjective, and varies from petitioner to petitioner. To one petitioner, success could have hinged on whether or not their proposed policy change was implemented or not. To another, success could have been that the subject of the E-petition entered into the political discussion and whether it was implemented or not is of less importance. Thus an examination of representative E-petitions should help shed light on the success and/or failure of petitions. I selected two E-petitions examined here, PE1108 and PE1238, that represent different outcomes petitions experience, and to highlight the actions taken by the Public Petitions Committee. Not all E-petition’s outcomes are as successful (in terms of affecting policy) as PE1108, as PE1238 will show. PE1108 is an example of an E-petition being closed because the issues raised were implemented by the Parliament, and was successful in affecting health care policy in Scotland. It also was a particularistic case directly involving the affairs of one individual, but was much broader in its impact. PE1238 is an example of an E-petition that was not within the Scottish Parliament’s powers, yet was still discussed for its merits. The Scottish Government shut it down, but the petition still entered the political conversation of the Parliament, which is important unto itself. Ultimately, these case studies will give a better idea about how the entire E-petitions process functions.

## PE1108

PE1108 was submitted by Tina McGeever, and lodged with the Scottish Parliament on January 7, 2008. Mike Gray, Tina McGeever’s husband, was diagnosed with bowel cancer and was receiving chemotherapy. However, the cancer spread to Gray’s liver, and he was informed by his oncologist that there were no further treatments available from the National Health Service (NHS) in Scotland, and consequently had only a few months to live (The Scottish Parliament, 2008). However, a drug did exist that could treat advanced bowel cancer, called cetuximab, but was only available privately in Scotland.

In September 2005, the Scottish Medicines Consortium decided that cetuximab should not be recommended for use to treat bowel cancer. In England and Wales, the National Institute for Clinical Excellence ruled in 2007 that cetuximab should not be used for treatment of bowel cancer, but stated that, “Consultants should not stop prescribing…cetuximab for people who were already taking it when the guidance was issued. These patients should be able to carry on taking…cetuximab until they and their consultants decide that it is the right time to stop treatment,” (The Scottish Parliament Information Centre, 2007). The Scottish equivalent of the National Institute for Clinical Excellence, the National Health Service Quality Improvement Scotland, endorsed the National Institute of Clinical Excellence ruling in January 2007. However, the guidelines established by these bodies can be bypassed, as it is ultimately up to each respective clinician to decide whether or not a drug should be used in the treatment of their patient. However, the clinician must still get approval from the National Health Service, who decides whether or not to fund the treatment (The Scottish Parliament Information Centre, 2007).

McGeever’s husband was prescribed cetuximab, but the National Health Service Grampian Health Board refused to fund it on the basis that it was too expensive. As a result, McGeever filed an E-petition on behalf of her husband, “calling on the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to consider the provision, on the National Health Service, of cancer treatment drugs, in particular cetuximab, to ensure equity across National Health Service Boards on the appropriateness, effectiveness, and availability of such treatments,” (The Scottish Parliament, 2008). The E-petition received 632 signatures, and was subsequently lodged with the Scottish Parliament.

The Public Petition Committee’s first move was to invite Tina McGeever and Mike Gray to the Parliament to argue the petition’s merits to the committee, and to get a better understanding of what they were experiencing. This opportunity allowed McGeever to indicate the heavy financial burden they were incurring to fund the cetuximab treatments, £3,400 every two weeks. In addition, Gray stated that, “In a sense, we are here to talk about the wider issue, which is that 400 people annually face the same issue in Scotland. They do not have the means or the money to provide the National Health Service with evidence,” (The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee, 2008).

On February 8, 2008, during the 3rd meeting of the Public Petitions Committee for 2008, the committee’s Convener Frank McAveety stated that:

“This petition came from the powerful case, which was presented to the committee, of an individual who was seeking drug treatment from the NHS. His determination, and that of his family, was the critical factor in their success, but I would like to think that, in some small way, the Public Petitions Committee assisted with the necessary public debate involving the decision makers at health board level. For us, the petition threw up a national issue that we need to focus on, which is about what happens if a particular health board indicates that a drug is not available on the NHS, the rights of appeal that cancer sufferers have and the mechanisms that they must go through, which—given that they face potentially fatal illnesses—could jeopardise their survival. Every day and every week really matters to such people, so we need to expedite the process,” (The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee, 2008).

Endorsing McAveety’s recommendation, the committee launched an inquiry gathering relevant evidence from the Scottish Government and all National Health Service Boards pertaining to the availability of cancer drugs for patients. The inquiry culminated in the Scottish Government’s report, “Better Cancer Care, An Action Plan”. The issues raised by the petition and the subsequent report were debated within the Scottish Parliament on October 1, 2008. In addition, the committee proceeded to question and receive responses from the Scottish Government, the Health and Sport Committee, the Scottish Medicines Consortium, Bowel Cancer UK, NHS Grampian, and NHS Lothian throughout 2009 and 2010.

On March 8, 2011, the Public Petitions Committee closed PE1108, citing the positive progress that had been made. Specifically, the committee stated that:

“The petition…had considerable effect. We have come to the end of what we, as a committee, can do, but in closing the petition we should state clearly and for the record that positive action has been taken as a result of the petition and the committee's inquiry, including the issuing of revised guidance to NHS boards on the arrangements for NHS patients receiving health care services through private health care arrangements. That has provided a framework to support decisions concerning the possible combination of elements of NHS and private care for individual patients. Importantly, the Scottish Government…is developing good, proactive guidance to NHS boards on individual patient treatment requests… I am sure that the committee would like to reflect not only on the positive actions of the Scottish Government but on the indispensable input of the petitioner, Tina McGeever, on behalf of her husband, the late Mike Gray. Without the petitioner and the energy of both individuals directly involved, we would not be seeing the real improvements that I am sure the petition will effect throughout Scotland in respect of patients accessing newly licensed medicines, in the process for considering objectively individual patient treatment requests and in the arrangements for the combination of care that is available to patients. Finally, we should reflect on the fact that all of those real improvements for people throughout Scotland have been effected through the simple process of lodging a petition. The petitioner should take great pride in that,” (The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee, 2011).

It is evident that Tina McGeever’s E-petition facilitated the development of new policy regarding medicines that Scots have access to, and ensuring that someone in Mike Gray’s situation will be able to receive adequate treatment for the illness afflicting them through public and private means. The petition has also been a catalyst in securing individual patients more power in deciding which available treatments to use in treatment of their disease.

PE1108 is an excellent example of what an individual can accomplish by filing an E-petition. The combined efforts of Tina McGeever and the late Mike Gray demonstrates that it is an effective medium to communicate grievances and propositions for policy formulation within Scotland that can deliver tangible results. PE1108 displays the Public Petition Committee’s role in the E-petition process, investigating the government bodies and policies, and in effect, championing the petition’s cause. This is not to say that are on the petitioner’s side, but are extremely committed to performing their remit effectively. However, it is worthy to note that the petition took a little over three years to come to a conclusion, and that during this time, Mike Gray passed away due to cancer. Although it was not the most expedient process, it did deliver the results the petitioner desired.

## PE1238

PE1238 was filed by Deryck Beaumont on behalf of the Scottish Palestine Solidarity Campaign, and lodged with the Parliament on February 23, 2009. The E-petition received 248 signatures, and called for, “the Scottish Parliament to urge the Scottish Government to urge the UK Government to expel the Israeli Ambassador from the UK until Israel shows it is prepared to accept that it is not above international law,” (The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee, 2009). Even though the E-petition dealt with foreign policy, a power reserved to the British government at Westminster, the Public Petitions Committee agreed to seek comment from the Scottish Government. Bill Butler, a member of the Public Petitions Committee stated:

“I do not want to shut the petition down. I wish to assure the petitioner, who sent his e-mail on Monday 16 March 2009, that none of my committee colleagues wishes to shut the petition down or to silence the petitioner or those who agree with him. It is absolutely an important issue. The petitioner has a point in the sense that, although the matter is reserved, the terms of the petition are such that it is appropriate for us to deal with it…I think that we should write to the Scottish Government, asking for its view on the thrust of the petition,” (The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee, 2009).

The Public Petitions Committee received comment back from the Scottish Government, which responded saying that removing the Israeli ambassador would not further the effort to make peace between Israel and Palestine. However, as the Scottish Parliament had no power to hear the petition, this was a moot point. On June 19, 2009, PE1238 was closed due to the Scottish Government’s response. However, it is important to note that although the E-petition did not fall under the Scottish Parliament’s power, and that the Public Petitions Committee members may not have agreed with the petition, they still believed that it was important for the merits of the petition to be discussed. The Public Petitions Committee’s effort to ensure PE1238 was reviewed is evidence of its commitment to the process, and their desire to ensure that every petition is considered for its merits. In addition, it is possible that Beaumont deliberately submitted the petition to start debate about the Israel-Palestine issue, and to score political points for the Scottish Palestine Solidarity Campaign. The importance of the E-petition did not hinge on the issues raised being implemented, but on its ability to foster debate on the subject within Scotland.

It is clear that the E-petition process has allowed individuals such as Tina McGeever, Deryck Beaumont, and hundreds of others to participate in policy formulation with the Scottish Parliament. It has facilitated public debate with the Parliament, and given a new outlet for citizens and groups to voice their grievances and concerns. Increasing public participation in the democratic process was one of the goals of the new Scottish Parliament, and the development and use of its E-petitioning system has fulfilled this function. The case studies have demonstrated the tangible changes in policy that E-petitioning can bring, and further cements its critical role in creating a participative Parliament.

CONCLUSION

The Scottish Parliament’s efforts to be a modern institution that can concurrently provide public access, participation, transparency, accountability, and power sharing to its citizens has been furthered by its E-petition system. The world’s first E-petition system delivers the key values of the Parliament to the populace in a technologically innovative democratic structure. The E-petition system advantageously uses the Internet as a medium to allow for a new type of public participation in policy making, which has been fruitful in providing a method for citizens to engage in meaningful participation and policy formulation with their government. As the data analysis and case studies demonstrated, Scots have successfully used E-petitions to participate in policy formulation with the Parliament. During three sessions of Parliament from 1999-2011, 385 E-petitions were filed with the Scottish Parliament. 12.7% of E-petitions had the issues raised implemented, yet 84.9% of E-petitions fell under the Scottish Parliament’s powers, were reviewed by government committees, bodies, or outside organizations, and entered into the political discussion. The case studies added context to the E-petition process, giving concrete examples of petitions filed with the Public Petitions Committee, and what their outcomes were. Tina McGeever, whose husband suffered from cancer and was prevented access to a potentially life saving drug through public means by their local NHS board, submitted PE1108 in an effort to ensure equity among NHS boards on the availability of drugs. She was successful, and the Scottish Parliament took several measures to rectify this issue. Many petitioners, such as Deryck Beaumont, have submitted E-petitions that have not brought the changes desired, but these petitioners still participated in policy formulation and had a medium to raise their concerns with the Parliament.

The Scottish Parliament’s E-petition system has relevance for representative democracies worldwide. As citizens living in these countries have largely grown more apathetic towards the political process, their political participation levels have declined as well. Governments attempting to solve this dilemma have investigated different means of reengaging their citizens through technology, yet few have had the success that the Scottish Parliament is currently experiencing through its E-petition system. This political reinvigoration of a nation that, for nearly three centuries, did not have its own Parliament has caught the attention of other governments. For example, in 2011 both the British Parliament and United States Executive Branch launched E-petition websites. However, both of these systems fall short of the inclusiveness that the Scottish system provides, with each requiring 100,000 and 25,000 signatures respectively in order for E-petitions to be considered. It is doubtful that they can replicate the success of the Scottish model without the commitment to allowing the public to participate in meaningful policy formulation, eliminating barriers preventing certain issues from entering the political conversation, and providing the transparency that the Public Petitions Committee allows throughout the process. The exercise of public political participation will amount to little more than a novelty if governments do not take the public’s E-petitions seriously. However, the E-petition systems of the United States Executive Branch and the British Parliament indicate that more governments are exploring the use of E-petitioning to reengage their citizens in the political process. The E-petition system has been exported to other nations, and active participation relationships between government and citizens are being fostered as a result.

The Scottish Parliament pioneered the use of E-petitions, and continues to demonstrate that they are committed to improving the process, as in 2011 the Public Petitions Committee is updating the E-petitions website. Currently, the Scottish Parliament is in its fourth session, and E-petitions have been suspended until the new site has been fully developed. However, as the Public Petitions Committee’s track record has proven, the new website should certainly improve upon the old one, and the process as well. Moving forward, as technology advances and Internet access increases, E-petitioning has the potential to become the standard that democratic governments use to engage citizens in the political process. Scotland has shown that E-petitioning, if conducted in the proper manner, can allow citizens to have meaningful participation in policy formulation with government, and it will be interesting to see if the rest of the democratic world can replicate their successes.

REFERENCES

Adams, N., Macintosh, A., & Johnston, J. (2005). E-Petitioning: Enabling Ground-Up Participation. *Challenges of Expanding Internet: E-Commerce, E-Business and E-Government* , 265-279.

Bonney, N. (2003). The Scottish Parliament and Participatory Democracy: Vision and Reality. *The Political Quarterly* , 459-467.

Caldow, J. (2004). *e-Democracy: Putting down Global Roots.* New York: Institute for Electronic Government, IBM.

Gronlund, A. (2002). E-democracy and E-government: State of the Art. *IFLA 68th Council and General Conference August 18-24* (pp. 1-6). Glasgow: International Federation of Library Associations and Institutions.

Hansard Society for Parliamentary Government. (2011, February). *Digital Democracy in Scotland and Wales: Lagging or Leading?* Retrieved July 5, 2011, from Hansard Society: http://hansardsociety.org.uk/blogs/edemocracy/archive/2011/02/17/digital-democracy-in-scotland-and-wales-lagging-or-leading.aspx

International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance. (18, May 2009). *Voter Turnout*. Retrieved September 2, 2011, from International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance: http://www.idea.int/vt/

International Teledemocracy Centre. (2000). *e-Petitioning for the Scottish Parliament*. Retrieved June 30, 2011, from International Teledemocracy Centre: http://itc.napier.ac.uk/ITC/ProjectInfo.asp?ID=5

Linder, R., & Riehm, U. (2009). Electronic Petitions and Institutional Modernization. *eJournal of eDemocracy and Open Government* , 1-11.

Mactintosh, A., Malina, A., & Whyte, A. (2002). Designing E-Democracy in Scotland. *Communications* , 261-278.

McMahon, M. (2004). E-petitioning the Scottish Parliament. *The Parliamentarian* , 236-238.

Norton, P. (2011). *The British Polity.* New York: Pearson Education.

Seaton, J. (2005). The Scottish Parliament and e-democracy. *Aslib Proceedings: New Information Prospectives* , 333-337.

Silcock, R. (2001). What is e-Government? *Parliamentry Affairs* , 88-101.

The Scottish Office. (1998). *The Consultative Steering Group on the Scottish Parliament: Shaping Scotland's Parliament.* Retrieved September 30, 2011, from Report of the Consultative Steering Group on the Scottish Parliament: http://www.scotland.gov.uk/library/documents-w5/rcsg-00.htm

The Scottish Parliament Information Centre. (2007, December). *SPICe: Briefing for the Public Petitions Committee.* Retrieved October 16, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefingsAndFactsheets/Petitions%20briefings%20S3/PB08-1108.pdf

The Scottish Parliament Information Centre. (2007, October 11). *SPICe: Briefing for the Public Petitions Committee*. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/ResearchBriefingsAndFactsheets/Petitions%20briefings%20S3/PB07-1065.pdf

The Scottish Parliament. (2008, January 8). *PE1108.* Retrieved October 16, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/business/petitions/pdfs/PE1108.pdf

The Scottish Parliament. (2010). *Petitioning the Scottish Parliament.* Retrieved July 6, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/vli/publicinfo/htsapp/Index.htm

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2009, February 23). *Petition 1238*. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/business/petitions/docs/PE1238.htm

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2009). *Public Petitions Committee 3rd Report, 2009 (Session 3): Inquiry into the public petitions process*. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/petitions/reports-09/pur09-03.htm

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2008, January 15). *Public Petitions Committee Official Report 15 January 2008*. Retrieved October 16, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/petitions/or-08/pu08-0102.htm#Col411

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2009, June 16). *Public Petitions Committee Official Report 16 June 2009* . Retrieved October 17, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/petitions/or-09/pu09-1102.htm#Col1892

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2009, March 17). *Public Petitions Committee Official Report 17 March 2009* . Retrieved October 17, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/petitions/or-09/pu09-0502.htm#Col1606

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2008, February 19). *Public Petitions Committee Official Report 19 February 2008*. Retrieved October 16, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/petitions/or-08/pu08-0302.htm#Col497

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2007, October 23). *Public Petitions Committee Official Report 23 October 2007* . Retrieved October 17, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/petitions/or-07/pu07-0602.htm#Col193

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2011, March 8). *Public Petitions Committee Official Report 8 March 2011*. Retrieved October 16, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/petitions/or-11/pu11-0602.htm#Col3553

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2010). *Public Petitions Committee Report: 1st Report, 2010 (Session 3).* Edinburgh: The Scottish Parliament.

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2006). *Public Petitions Committee Report: The Assessment of the Scottish Parliament's Public Petitions System 1999 - 2006.* Retrieved June 29, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://www.scottish.parliament.uk/business/committees/petitions/reports-06/pur06-PPS-assessment-02.htm#ExecSummary

The Scottish Parliament Public Petitions Committee. (2010). *The Public Petitions Committee 1st Report, 2010 (Session 3): Annual Report*. Retrieved October 17, 2011, from The Scottish Parliament: http://archive.scottish.parliament.uk/s3/committees/petitions/reports-10/pur10-01.htm

1. According to the International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance, voter participation levels have dropped in Canada, Germany, the United States, New Zealand, the United Kingdom, France, and Switzerland from the 1940s to the present (2009). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)