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During a municipal election in 2010, Canadian citizens used a blog to enact an ad hoc campaign funding disclosure request of all candidates. After the election, the municipality implemented formal legislation requiring campaign funding disclosure on their own website. This thesis is a case study that explores how two technologically mediated transparency practices were constituted within and outside the scope of legislation. I draw on Andrew Pickering's (1995) notion of the mangle of practice and Karen Barad's (2003) concept of intra-action to conceptualize these transparency practices as a mangle of entwining intra-connected phenomena. In my exploration of policy in practice I deconstruct transparency practice through a discussion of how transparency mechanisms and social media characteristics intra-act and transform each other into a practice that supersedes the original intent of the ad hoc request and formal legislation. This research queries assumptions about transparency practices and contributes to establishing an interdisciplinary methodology for policy evaluation in technologically mediated environments.
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Glossary of Terms

**Accountability**
“Accountability usually assumes a relationship between two agents – one requesting (or demanding) accountability and one providing it – an accountor and accountee (Messner 2009 p. 921). The relationship between these two agents is a productive entwinement of ethical considerations about how the accountor is made accountable” (Brown p. 30-31).

**Agential cut**
The agential cut is a component of Karen Barad’s (2007) intra-active ideology that challenges the normative ontological assumption that pre-existing entities “interact” by proposing the “boundaries and properties” of phenomena are determined and made meaningful through *intra*-actions. Agential cut is a term used by Barad (2003, 2007) to describe a way to make explicit taken-for-granted distinctions (boundaries, properties and meaning) such as the one between “subject” and “object.”

**Assemblage (heterogeneous)**
In his discussion of posthumanist research, Andrew Pickering (2005 p. 37) identifies the posthuman object of inquiry as a “heterogeneous assemblage.” Acknowledging that he is following the work of Deleuze and Guattari (1987), Pickering (p. 37) describes a heterogeneous assemblage as an “evolving dialectic” or “dance” between human and non-human agencies. Of particular interest to this thesis is how a heterogeneous assemblage evolves.

**Case study method**
Scholars argue that Case Study is not a method but “a decision about what is to be studied” (Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2011 pp. 255-256). Additionally, as Nancy Ettlinger (p. 1029) explains in her 2009 commentary on post-structural case study research, “nontotalizing goals of case-study research entail a dual project of explaining empirical dynamics while clarifying how and why different academic discourses may be helpful towards highlighting different dimensions of a problem. The purpose of case-study research is neither unilaterally empirical nor conceptual; rather, it is necessarily both because empirics and their representations are entwined.” In this thesis I aim to take up a process similar to Ettlinger’s description as a method for making a “decision” about what I study.

**Diffraction**
To imagine an example of diffraction, think about how wave patterns created by the wake of a boat look when passing through something that interrupts them such as a row of small islands. In scientific study, “diffraction grates” that interrupt the waves of light and particles are used to better understand the behaviour of waves and particles. To explain her arguments about *epistemology* and *ontology*, Karen Barad (2007) draws on diffraction and diffraction grates to explain how, by passing something through a grate, it is possible to learn about what is passed through the grate as well as the grate itself (paraphrased from Barad pp. 84-90). In the creation of knowledge, a diffractive approach makes explicit the grate and the patterns in the waves.

**Disclosure**
Susan Hekman explains that “to disclose is to reveal what already exists, what is real, but to do so by means of a particular conceptual apparatus” and furthermore, from a particular perspective
The purpose of shaping this type of disclosure is not to “get it right” but rather, reveal one perspective of one aspect of reality (Hekman 2010 pp. 92-93). Disclosure, argues Hekman (2009 p. 441), “brings together the conceptual and the material into a single process.”

**Discourse**
I use discourse in a number of ways in the thesis.

1. A relatively coherent set of disciplining statements through which power is exercised and a subject emerges within society (combination of Hekman 2010 and Foucault [History of Sexuality, Volume 1]
2. The mapping out of the relationship between words and things in material terms (amalgamated from Hekman 2010 p. 2, 19, and 29)
3. Multiple sets of social practices that linguistically reproduce the material conditions of society (combination of Hekman 2010 and Foucault [History of Sexuality, Volume 1]
4. “Discourses, he asserts, are practices; they exist in a field of non-discursive practices; statements have materiality” (Hekman 2010 p. 61 paraphrasing Foucault [Archaeology of Knowledge]).

**Dissonance**
Dissonance exists when harmony is disrupted or where there is discord.

**Federal Accountability Act**
In 2006 the Canadian Federal Accountability Act was launched to bring “forward specific measures to help strengthen accountability and increase transparency and oversight in government operations” (TBC 2013).

**Hindsight**
In this thesis, hindsight is defined as a process of gaining insight into a past event specifically by obtaining information that is exposed through the passage of time and relevant to that past event.

**Intra-activity, Intra-act, Intra-connections, Intra-active pairs**
In her discussion of the notion of performativity from a posthumanist perspective, Karen Barad (2003 pp. 802-803) employs the term “intra-activity” to explain her argument that difference is not inherent in an individual phenomenon but created through perception of that phenomenon. In this thesis I apply the idea of intra-activity to transparency practice in order to tease out the assumptions and discourse that contribute to its conceptualization and enactment.

**Mangle of practice**
As Andrew Pickering conceives it, mangling a subject is an analytical mapping of the dialectic “dance of agency” between human and non-human agents as they constitutively entwine through practice (Pickering 1995, p. 17). Pickering proposes that as agencies constitutively entwine, a temporally emergent assembly of practices is formed that, when mangled, can be researched and analyzed (Pickering 2005, p. 37).

**Material-discursive**
The term “material-discursive” emerges out of Susan Hekman’s (2009 p. 434-438) argument that Michel Foucault’s work resists the material/discursive dichotomy in postmodern philosophy that
sets representationalism on one hand and linguistic constructionism on the other hand. A material-discursive epistemology hovers in this dichotomy and as Hekman interprets Foucault, is “far from emphasizing discourse to the exclusion of the material or ‘reality’ [and] is always acutely aware of the interaction between discourse and reality” (Hekman 2009 p. 438).

**Materiality**
Within postmodern philosophical discussions the term “materiality” is used to describe “external reality” (Hekman 2010 p. 91).

**Paradox of transparency practice**
Even though accountability (and by association, transparency) is held aloft as a means to secure trust, it is simultaneously dependent on the assumption that financial gains can be made from corrupt practices (Strathern 2000 p. 310; Menéndez-Viso 2009 p. 157).

**Phenomenon**
Susan Hekman explains Karen Barad’s conceptualization of phenomenon as being “constituted through the intra-action between the observer (plus the apparatus of observation) and the object” (Hekman 2010 p. 75)

**Pre-binary**
Inspired by Karen Barad (2003, 2007), this is the notion that before an individual *something* is defined, it is “pre-binary.” For example, before something is divided into “subject” and “object,” what is it?

**Social Media**
“Social media include but are not limited to blogs, wikis (e.g. Wikipedia), social networking sites (e.g. Facebook), micro-blogging services (e.g. Twitter), and multimedia sharing services (e.g. Flickr, YouTube). Social media are often associated such concepts as user-generated content, crowd sourcing, and Web 2.0” (Bertot, Jaeger and Grimes 2010 p. 266).

**Technologically mediated**
I use this term to describe when technological processes are involved in producing something that is not considered by itself to be technological.

**Technologically mediated transparency practice**
Technologically mediated transparency practice takes place when an organization or individual uses technology when making internal aspects of organizational activity externally available (Nyland 2007 p. 500).

**Transparency**
For the purpose of this thesis, “transparency” is a colloquial metaphor (Menéndez-Viso 2009) used to describe how “organizations [or individuals] are called upon to make internal aspects of organizational activity externally available” (Nyland 2007 p. 500). Explains another scholar, “Transparent companies, governments, institutions and processes are seen to be essential in achieving corporate social responsibility (EU 2001; 7), social justice, environmental security, true democracy and wellbeing” (Menéndez-Viso 2009 p. 155).
Transparency practice
The practice of transparency is how an organization or individual goes about making the internal aspects of organizational activity externally available (Nyland 2007 p. 500).
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Chapter 1: Introduction: Two Practices and One Act

In 2010 a group of citizens in a Canadian municipality in Alberta created a web blog (popularly referred to as a blog) to facilitate the disclosure of election campaign funding sources. The election campaign at hand was municipal and thirty candidates were running for 8 positions. Although the provincial Local Authorities Election Act (LAE) does not require candidates to disclose campaign funding details until an election is over, the citizens’ group argued that early disclosure would “help voters make more informed choices on election day” (CB 2010 p. 7). The blog launched a few weeks before the election and contained information about the Act, a list of the candidates’ names and a request for disclosure. As time passed, most candidates posted campaign funding disclosures to the blog and their own websites and the blog author kept track of the candidates who did and did not disclose their campaign funding. The blog received media coverage from local media and the blog author responded to that coverage with a blog post.1 Other features on the blog include a poll asking if the Act should be changed to require pre-election disclosure, a twitter feed, and a list of enthusiastic statements made by candidates about the blog’s stated purpose. At the time of writing, the blog remains on the web and is, among other things, a public online record of a grassroots initiative to pre-implement a legislated transparency practice during a municipal election.

Also on the web is the municipality’s formally produced version of online campaign funding disclosures for the same election. Located on the municipality’s website, and posted after the election, these disclosures are presented on a single web page containing links to scanned and uploaded PDFs (Portable Document Format) of paper disclosure forms2 filled out by candidates. The information required by these forms is confined to the candidate’s

1 In the blog, the blog author responds to a critical article about the blog published in the local paper and that article is not available in the publication’s on-line archives.
2 See Appendix A for a sample municipal website disclosure form.
identification and disclosure of dollar amounts and funding sources required by the *Local Authorities Election Act*. By bringing together and considering the informal ad hoc practice of disclosure on the citizens’ blog with the formal audit-centred practice of disclosure on the municipality’s website, exploration into contemporary transparency practice is possible.

One of the goals of this study is to see if an interdisciplinary approach combined with post-structural theory can address the shortcomings of traditional policy research approaches and expose the material consequences of policy implementation in technologically mediated policy environments. This study explores how two transparency practices were assembled with policies, technologies and people within and outside the scope of legislation during a municipal election. The setting is online and the data are text and technological structures created and shaped by the practices of an informally organized group of citizens, municipal election candidates, municipal employees and journalists. I focus on two online sites: the citizens’ blog and the municipality’s webpage containing links to scanned and uploaded PDFs of completed campaign donation disclosure forms. My exploration takes the form of a case study of a mangle of practice (Pickering 1995) to interpret the collected technologies and content of the two transparency practices: the citizens’ blog and the municipality’s website. Contextual information is also gleaned from public sources and included to expand upon a discussion of relevant phenomena such as how the candidates elected in 2010 approached development issues in the following months. Together, I consider this collection of information my data about two connected but discreet transparency practices, data that I can explore post-structurally as an entwinement of policy, people and technologies.

There are two aspects to my inquiry – a theoretical one and an empirical one. Theoretically, I want to know if by utilizing Andrew Pickering’s (1995) mangle of practice
theory, and Karen Barad’s (2003 p. 803) notion of intra-action, I can conceptualize my case study as a mangle of entwining *intra*-connected phenomena (that culminate in two linked but distinct transparency practices). Then, guided by Susan Hekman’s (2009 p. 441) practice of disclosure and Barad’s (2003 p. 803) idea of diffraction, what will happen if I explore the mangle by surfacing assumptions and expectations in order to parse out how transparency practice as a set of specific acts works in this case study? Empirically, I am curious about the opportunity to explore two practices of transparency implemented with technological mediation using the same Act – one practice ad hoc and one formal. Using this opportunity, I seek to discover what happens when these linked but distinct practices are juxtaposed and consequently shed light on what is shared between them by identifying their common elements and teasing out how those elements are entwined differently through each practice. Both my theoretical and empirical approach to this research grow from my commitment to contributing to a larger project of developing post-structural interdisciplinary methodologies that are useful for policy evaluation in technologically mediated environments.

By working with some of the ideas of Pickering, Hekman and Barad, I attach this work to a branch of philosophy that provides a framework for researchers to remain grounded in the material consequences of discursive practice. To accomplish this I am guided by Hekman’s (2010, p. 127) idea of how “disclosure in the social realm describes the relationship between the material, the discursive, the technological, and the practices they constitute.” In order to fully coax Pickering’s mangle of practice into the social realm where practice “is neither strictly discursive nor strictly material but represents the intra-action between the two” (Hekman, 2010, p. 123), I mangle and disclose two forms of technologically mediated transparency practice as a version of the “truth.” This version of the truth is crafted with the assistance of analysis.
developed in a paradigm that includes the belief that everything is interconnected and co-constructed. My exploration of the entwining intra-connected phenomena is purposed with a focus on unpacking normative assumptions and dissonance in transparency practice, asking questions about its implicit functions and about the material consequences of those functions.

The mangle of practice also informs the structure of this thesis. Unlike the structure of most theses, this study is presented in a non-linear way. In hope of demonstrating how layered both the theory and the empirical site are, I interlace literature review, methodology, background and analysis throughout the chapters. Contained as a case study bounded by the events before and after the municipal election in 2010, this non-linear demonstration of layered theory and data resonates with the work of Pickering, Barad and Hekman who each in their own way, resist conventional ideas of knowledge creation.

For this case study, I am also interested in the political culture of the two transparency practices that are grounded in municipal politics while enacting world-wide reform. In Canada an incorporated *municipality* is: “a town, city, or district having local self-government” or a way of describing a “community of such a town, etc.” (OED 2011). As the most local form of government in Canada, municipalities were initially incorporated in the East in the late 1700s and not until the late 1800s in the West – well into and as a part of the settling of Canada (McAllister 2004 p. 25-27; Tindal and Tindal 2009). Municipal governments were implemented as a means for local autonomy and a system for administering an ever-growing list of programs and regulations in small settlements scattered across the continent (McAllister 2004 p. 25; Tindal and Tindal 2009). As time passed and populations grew, municipalities amalgamated and have been legislated with more and more responsibility (Tindal and Tindal 2009 p. 21). Simultaneous with present-day municipal growth has been the growth of corporate developers vying for
lucrative opportunities in real estate and expanding municipal infrastructure (Tindal and Tindal 2009 p. 19).

With multiple sources of profit at stake, the threat of corruption also grows and with it, shifting public management values. The latter have shaped and reformed practices for addressing abuse of public trust into a quantitatively-focused audit-culture. This audit-culture practice regulates transparency in municipal activities such as elections and legitimizes financial reporting while eclipsing or ignoring relevant qualitative information. Engagement in an audit-culture eventually prompts the question “if municipal operations meet the tests established by the oversight agencies but fails to meet the needs of the public, what have we gained?” (Tindal and Tindal 2009 p. 315). This is a good question, but it is based on assumptions informing how governments define the “needs of the public.” As private sector profit-centred values colonize public sector practices, political definitions of who the public is and what we as the public need, is changing.

Researchers evidence the last thirty years of public-sector reform by reconfigurations of public service provisioning such as, selling public utilities and services; creation of private-public partnerships; and outsourcing public services while initiating fee-for-service practices (Tindal and Tindal 2009 pp. 289-290). This reconfiguration of services reflects and reifies a world-wide public-sector adoption of private-sector values of competition, entrepreneurship and value-for-money priorities (Neyland 2007 p. 504; Simon-Kumar 2011 p. 459; Tindal and Tindal 2009 p. 292). Consequently, at the local level municipal governments are “viewed as vehicles for service delivery, focused on the preparation of business plans and the pursuit of whatever alternative delivery options are the most economical” (Tindal and Tindal 2009 p. 19). The service delivery model of government is co-implemented with transparency processes informed
by private sector values such as “performance measurement, bench-marking, and the search for best practices” (Tindal and Tindal 2009 p. 292). These outcome-focused transparency measures surface the concern that “not all government programs lend themselves to quantitative measurement and, further, government decisions need to be based on more than these measures” (Tindal and Tindal 2009 p. 295); a concern shared by this case study.

By hovering between the everyday assumptions and ideals of what transparency practice accomplishes and what an orientation toward outcome in practice produces, I seek to bring dissonance into view. The citizens’ blog was created primarily to prevent the election of a municipal council who will have a pro-development agenda. Despite almost all candidates participating and complying, months after the election the council voted in favour of annexing land for development. With the benefit of hindsight, this case study makes it possible to explore one example of how common expectations of the capacity of transparency practice to make relevant information available to the public are not met. Hindsight also brings to light assumptions about the relevance of disclosed information. Through this case study, I offer some critical insight into what contemporary transparency practice is and discuss the dissonance between that, and what it actually accomplishes.

In the next chapter I describe the concepts I use to explore transparency practice. The work of Pickering, Hekman and Barad assist me in developing a framework that teases out assumptions and dissonance. Hekman and Barad also provide a way to conceptualize a material-discursive perspective that keeps material consequences of theory – and policy – in mind. Chapter 2 explains how the mangle of practice, disclosure, diffraction and intra-activity work together as a framework for analysis of transparency practice. I surface themes of ambiguity and dissonance in Chapter 3 while reviewing the literature on transparency practice and then I use
Barad’s idea of intra-activity and themes in the literature to develop three intra-active pairs that later assist in structuring my discussion in Chapter 5. Chapter 3 also includes discussion of current research on social media and some of the characteristics of social media that work with mechanisms of transparency practice. In Chapter 4, I explain what thinking the data means in this case study, present my research design, and describe my data. In Chapter 5, I use hindsight and the intra-active pairs to highlight assumptions of relevance that contribute to the dissonance between commonly held ideals about transparency practice and how it actually functions. Finally, in Chapter 6, I review the benefits of using the framework I present in Chapter 3 and the methodology I discuss in Chapter 4.
Chapter 2: Theoretical Framework

In this exploration of transparency practice it is important to me to use concepts rooted in theory that can help me examine how phenomena co-create each other. The reason this is important is because it opens up the focus of this research in a way that invites a nuanced approach to a subject that is quantitatively regulated and charged with morality and righteousness. By drawing on the theoretical concepts of Pickering, Hekman and Barad I am able to identify what is entwined together to create this particular transparency practice and then consider how it shapes what is normatively taken for granted to be a stand-alone phenomenon. To unearth the assumptions that fortify normative expectations of transparency practice, I focus this framework with three intra-active pairs drawn from themes in the literature I discuss in Chapter 3. For now, I want to introduce the concepts I use to set my theoretical intent for this research.

One of the primary sources used to assist with developing a framework for exploring this study’s data is Susan Hekman’s (2010) book entitled The Material of Knowledge. In her book, Hekman argues that knowledge creators need to take responsibility for the material consequences of the work they do. She builds her argument on the ideas of an array of philosophers including two that I also found helpful in developing this framework: Andrew Pickering and Karen Barad. This framework centers Hekman’s interpretations of these philosophers’ ideas and the argument for disclosure as she builds on the connections she sees between them. This framework also draws on selected source works of Pickering and Barad. To accomplish this case study I approach research as “an event mediated by inquiry” (Hekman 2010 p. 29). To establish this position as a researcher and explore my data I engage Andrew Pickering’s (1995) mangle of practice theory to define the parameters of my case study and ascribe to Susan Hekman’s (2010) notion of material-discursive disclosure and draw on Barad’s ideas of diffraction to guide the
thinking of my data. Barad’s (2003 p. 803) idea of intra-activity assists me with teasing out the mechanisms and assumptions at work in the mangle of transparency practice that I explore with my data. In developing this framework my goal is to engage theory that acknowledges the material consequences of its practice.

**Mangle of Practice**

Pickering (2005 p. 37) proposes that as heterogeneous agencies (e.g., human and non-human) constitutively entwine, an assemblage is formed over time that can be researched and analyzed as a mangle of practice. Unlike Pickering, I do not hold myself as a researcher outside the mangle. Instead, I draw on Barad’s philosophy to consider myself and my case study to be one part of the universe attempting to make itself intelligible to you, another part of the universe. In the mangle there are no binaries and the smallest ontological unit is a phenomenon (Barad 2003 p. 815). With this in mind I imagine my case study and me-as-researcher are co-constituted in the larger mangle of academic practice because, as Hekman (2010 p. 126) says, “mangles are everywhere.”

With regards to the research I am conducting (and by conducting, creating) Pickering’s framework enables me to emphasize co-creative relationships between technologies, people and policy in my analysis. By epistemologically centering relationships, intra-action and collaboration, I accept a fluid and fluctuating ontology rather than seeking to reveal an absolute truth (Hekman 2010 p. 93). While comparing and contrasting the ad hoc transparency practice of the citizens’ blog with the formal implementation conducted via the municipal website, I deconstruct assumptions and mangle technological mediation and transparency practice to explore their entwined constituents.

**Disclosure**
For Hekman (2009 p. 441), Foucault’s “understanding of the relationship between discourse and reality is embodied in the concept of ‘disclosure.’” The concept of disclosure resonates particularly well with an exploration of transparency practice because “to disclose is to reveal what already exists, what is real, but to do so by means of a particular conceptual apparatus” and furthermore, from a particular perspective (Hekman 2009 p. 441; Hekman 2010 p. 92). The purpose of shaping this type of disclosure is not to “get it right” but rather, reveal one perspective of one aspect of reality (Hekman 2010 pp. 92-93). Disclosure, argues Hekman (2009 p. 441), “brings together the conceptual and the material into a single process.” Thus, this case study is a mangle that includes the concepts and perspective used to disclose the analysis. Additionally, by maintaining a holistic perspective, it will be possible to disclose not only what is there, but perhaps point to what is missing as well.

In tandem with Pickering, one of Hekman’s (2010 p. 107) philosophical goals is to bring materiality back into theory without losing the insights of social constructionism. She conceptualizes disclosure as a way for knowledge producers to connect their epistemological practice to material consequences. “We cannot argue for absolute truth,” she writes, “but we can make arguments grounded in the material consequences of the disclosure we practice” (Hekman, 2010 p. 93). Hekman wants researchers to practice with the awareness that academic knowledge creation can create or erase ontologies (Hekman 2010 p. 94). Disclosure, then, is the practice of bringing to light the assumptions, situations, theoretical orientations and so on that constitute subject (Hekman 2010 p. 92) and analysis.

Based on the assumption that ontology is fluid, plural and material, disclosure does not yield an absolute truth. No disclosed perspective is right or wrong; rather each disclosure (or case study) makes known a different aspect of the overall mangle of practice. Moreover, it becomes
“possible to compare the material consequences of the different disclosures of the same reality” (Hekman 2010 pp. 90-92). With this, disclosure potentially opens a path between absolutes and concerns about relativism. The mangle provides the conceptual framework to explore the entwined and assembled transparency practice, and disclosure allows this framework to exist in the texts and technological structures of the blog and website (Hekman 2010 p. 93). My case study will not result in absolute truth about transparency practice, rather it will offer insights that grow from the interaction between what I have defined as data, how I focus this framework and my own knowledge and perspective.

**Diffraction**

Although Hekman does not mention Barad’s notion of diffraction in her book, I believe it influences her idea of disclosure. Explored in her article on post-humanist performativity and in her book *Meeting the Universe Halfway*, Barad (2003 and 2007, respectively) explains Donna Haraway’s idea of diffraction as, among other things, a way to ethically practice research by challenging binaries such as social and science, and subject and object:

> Diffractively reading the insights of feminist and queer theory and science studies approaches through one another entails thinking the “social” and the “scientific” together in an illuminating way. What often appears as separate entities (and separate sets of concerns) with sharp edges does not actually entail a relation of absolute exteriority at all. Like the diffraction patterns illuminating the indefinite nature of boundaries—displaying shadows in “light” regions and bright spots in “dark” regions—the relation of the social and the scientific is a relation of “exteriority within.” This is not a static relationality but a doing—the enactment of boundaries—that always entails constitutive exclusions and therefore requisite questions of accountability. (Barad 2003 p. 803).

We are not merely differently situated in the world; “each of us” is part of the intra-active ongoing articulation of the world in its differential mattering. Diffraction is a material-discursive phenomenon that challenges the presumed inherent separability of subject and object, nature and culture, fact and value, human and nonhuman, organic and inorganic, epistemology and ontology, materiality and discursivity. Diffraction marks the limits of the determinacy and permanency of boundaries. One of the crucial lessons
we have learned is that agential cuts cut things together and apart. Diffraction is a matter of differential entanglements. Diffraction is not merely about differences, and certainly not differences in any absolute sense, but about the entangled nature of differences that matter (Barad 2007 p. 381).

Creating the intra-active pairs out of my literature review on transparency practice and then using them to assist with structuring analysis is my way of diffracting Barad’s work through Pickering’s mangle of practice. The intra-active pairs deliberately embody a pre-binary perspective. Additionally, by creating and applying the intra-active pairs I make explicit my presence in this research—“an event mediated by inquiry” (Hekman 2010 p. 29). Additionally, I have attempted to disclose the diffractions where the data interact with my own perspectives, assumptions, memories, politics and beliefs. I develop my own approach to research ethics in lieu of detailed institutional guidance for gathering data from the internet. I do not resist my bias or attempt to insulate it from the research; instead I disclose it as part of the process of creating my research. To me, it is impossible to conduct research without a bias but that does not mean this research lacks rigour; rather, it means that part of the rigour is being explicit about how my bias interacts with my data to constitute analysis. Disclosure then may be the story of diffraction.

**Intra-activity**

I employ the idea of intra-activity both methodologically and conceptually. Methodologically I use this idea to include myself in the mangle of this research project and resist the binary of researcher-subject. Not only am I interested in how intra-activity describes the inseparability of the observer and the observed, I am also interested in it a means of conceptualizing phenomena as pre-binary (Hekman 2010 p. 75). As Barad (2003 p. 815) explains, it is “through the specific agential intra-actions that the boundaries and properties of the ‘components’ of phenomena become determinate and that particular embodied concepts become meaningful.” It is with this in mind that I was inspired to create intra-active pairs. Each of the
three pairs is developed from paradoxical themes I identify in the literature on transparency practice. They are visibility-invisibility; performance-audience and trust-coercion. Each intra-active pair holds open a field between two ideas through which I can disclose transparency practice, surface its dissonant nature and explore its intra-connected relationships with technological mediation.

***

To implement my theoretical framework that consists of the disclosure, diffraction and intra-activity, I designed my research as a case study that I analyze as a mangle of technological mediation and transparency practice. To explore the mangle from a perspective that evokes disclosure, diffraction and intra-activity, I drew from the literature on transparency an analytical lens of three intra-active pairs. I present these intra-active pairs in the next chapter and then discuss the technological mediation of social media and how I want to consider it for this research. I am curious if technologically mediated transparency is simply a combination of social media and transparency practice, or if it should be regarded as an autonomous phenomenon. I will plot a course through the mangle of technologically mediated transparency practice with an intra-active perspective and using diffraction and disclosure, argue that social media is an amplifier that can iteratively transform transparency practice. Viewing the case study as a heterogeneous mangle of technological mediation and transparency practice makes it possible to see some of the productive connections between, and distinct functions of, both transparency practice and social media respectively.
Chapter 3: Transparency, Accountability and Social Media

There are only two articles that explicitly address technological mediation and transparency practice that I found helpful for this research: Using ICTs to create a culture of transparency: E-government and social media as openness and anti-corruption tools for science by Bertot, Jaeger and Grimes (2010) and WikiLeaks: power 2.0? Surveillance 2.0? Criticism 2.0? Alternative Media 2.0? A political-economic analysis by Fuchs (2011). To compensate for not finding specifically relevant literature, I present a literature review that describes transparency practice and then social media technologies while centring concepts that are useful for this particular research into both these phenomena, together. The description of transparency practice includes: an examination of transparency’s ambiguous relationship to accountability and how I treat that relationship for the purposes of this research and a discussion of dissonance in contemporary transparency practice and how public management reform has contributed to it. Then, having established its relationship with accountability, the theme of dissonance and the influences of public management reform, I introduce the three intra-active pairs of transparency practice that will assist in structuring my analysis from an intra-active perspective. In the forth section of this chapter I provide a definition of social media, discuss trends in social media research, make links between social media technologies and public management reforms and show how characteristics of social media work productively with the dissonance in transparency practice.

Transparency and Its Relationship with Accountability

A primary component of understanding transparency practice is examining its relationship with accountability and there is widespread ambiguity in the literature about this relationship (Menéndez-Viso 2009 p. 155). This ambiguity is difficult to negotiate yet is one of the most compelling intellectual encounters I had in this study. To begin with, there is a lot of
overlap between research about transparency and accountability. Much of the research I draw on such as the work by Daniel Neyland (2007), John Roberts (2009) and Marilyn Strathern (2000), explores transparency and accountability together while focusing on transparency. Other research, such as the studies I use by Martin Messner (2009) and Leslie Oakes and Joni Young (2007) focus on accountability yet share ideas and themes with research that focuses on transparency. So, while this case study focuses on transparency, I draw on relevant analysis from research that focuses on accountability as well as transparency. I deemed research about accountability to be relevant when it shared themes with research about transparency that I was interested in such as dissonance. Broadly speaking (and I will expand on this in the following section) transparency and accountability are interdependent and while accountability is quantitative, transparency is esoteric and is often taken up in a way that idealizes the ethical qualities of how quantitative reporting is conducted.

In the literature I read for this study, transparency is rarely conceptualized outside of accountability and that in itself is an important insight into understanding what it is. Furthermore, how it is conceptualized with accountability is ambiguous and inconsistent and that is also significant because it makes it challenging to develop a definition for this research. Like other researchers (e.g., Neyland 2007 p. 501; Oaks & Young 2008 p. 768-9), I found analysis of the conceptualization of transparency and accountability to exist widely in the literature across multiple disciplines and to be interpreted with an array of theories and concepts. My goal in this chapter is to chart a particular interdisciplinary path through the literature that privileges my concerns around about dissonance in transparency practice. This charted path also privileges my assumptions about my data being best served by a discussion that focuses on transparency more
than accountability. My assumptions are guided by the tag line of the citizens’ blog: “dedicated to election transparency” (CB 2010 p. 1).

In general, researchers tend to agree that transparency and accountability are interdependent (Free & Radcliffe 2008; Menéndez-Viso 2009; Strathern, 2000). However, that interdependence has different faces depending on the perspective it is viewed through. In his deconstruction of transparency and accountability practices, Neyland (2007 p. 501) writes, “a great deal of accountability research ... focuses on problems associated with transparency.” In other words, as I mentioned above, this is one of the reasons why discussions of accountability can be applied to transparency. Additionally, Neyland’s statement demonstrates how even though transparency depends on accountability; it also guides accountability – which is confusing.

If one conceptualizes transparency as a mechanism within a practice of accountability, then Armando Menéndez-Viso’s (2009 p. 159) argument that regulation and reporting regimes shape an association between transparency and the idea(l) of legitimacy makes sense. It has become common to assume that if an organization or process is declared to be transparent then there exist a set of regulations governing the organization and because of this regulation, the organization becomes more legitimate. Additionally, Strathern (2000 p. 313) sees transparency as a technology or artefact of accountability and states that an ipso facto example of transparent administration is the common audit process. She points to audits as an example of transparency embedded in a practice of accountability – “audit is transparency made visible.” In other words, transparency is constructed as both an audit process and an outcome of accountability (legitimacy).
Roberts (2009 pp. 962-3) explores transparency as a form of accountability. He shows how ongoing refinement of accountability is believed to increase or enhance transparency. Robert’s (2009 p. 962) argument is premised on the normative assumption that if existing information is exposed (read transparent), then a “true and fair view of organizational results” will be made available. Roberts (2009 p. 968) shows that transparency becomes problematic when it is taken up as “adequate and sufficient as a form of accountability” which might suggest that there is a difference between accountability that is transparent by how it is practiced and accountability that is built specifically for transparency; the latter being more of a performance than a process. Overall, within the literature, transparency is presented with an ambiguous role in its relationship to accountability as a mechanism facilitating the practice of accountability, as both a process and an outcome of accountability, and as a form of accountability.

A loop in which accountability and transparency are mutually supportive and interchangeable is created by this ambiguity. In my exploration of the mangle of technological mediation and transparency practices, I work in this loop, focusing primarily on transparency while recognizing its equivocal relationship with accountability. So, to chart this interdisciplinary path through the literature, in the next section I begin with literature about accountability that assists with developing an alternative understanding of transparency, an understanding that is grounded in its significant yet ambiguous relationship with accountability.

The notion of transparency has a lot to do with how accountability is imagined so in order to describe transparency and its relationship with accountability I need to first discuss accountability. Accountability is usually operationalized as a mechanism of responsibility or culpability within various economic processes at every level of public and private financial practices in much of the economic world. Accountability usually assumes a relationship between
two agents – one requesting (or demanding) accountability and one providing it – an accountor and accountee (Messner 2009 p. 921). The relationship between these two agents is a productive entwinement of ethical considerations about how the accountor is made accountable. In his exploration about the limits of accountability, Messner (2009 p. 930) argues: “having to account in a particular way in order to be considered a legitimate member of a community means that other ways of justifying one’s behavior are marginalized.” Or as John Roberts (2009 p. 959) elaborates, “accountability involves being recognized on the other’s terms.” What is key to realize here is that the terms, or goals and criteria used in practices of accountability privilege what is valued by who or what occupies (or assumed to occupy) the role of the accountee (Messner 2009 p. 933; Neyland 2007 p. 500) not the accountor.

In their ethnography of the accountability practices of Hull House, a transition house located in Chicago in the late 1800s, Oakes and Young’s (2008 p. 784) make the observation that normatively speaking, once an accountee has met the goals and criteria they are absolved from “any further efforts with respect to accountability.” Although this insight is being applied to accountability, the implications for transparency are similar because goals and criteria also determine the limitations of the obligation to be transparent. Another way to describe this is as a closed system or, as Messner (2009 p. 933) argues, the interplay of an ethical ideal and an actual practice creates a liminal space where “things appear problematic, ambiguous, and laden with tensions” (Messner 2009 p. 933). One of the tensions that churn in this liminal space is the paradoxical insight that even though accountability is held aloft as a means to secure trust, it is simultaneously dependent on the assumption that financial gains can be made from corrupt practices (Strathern 2000 p. 310; Menéndez-Viso 2009 p. 157). With these snake-eating-its-tale
ideas in mind it becomes possible to imagine why ambiguity characterizes discussions of transparency’s relationship with accountability.

In an attempt to break into this liminal and closed system of accountability, Alnoor Ebrahim (2009 p. 886) asks the question: “is there a difference between how accountability is imagined and how it actually operates?” This question can also be asked about transparency practice. With this question, Ebrahim points to the theme of incongruence – a theme that I found in both the literature on transparency and accountability and decided to focus on in this study. The basic shape of incongruence is the dissonance between common assumptions (or imaginings) about how a particular practice is implemented and how it is actually operationalized. If there is a difference between how accountability is imagined and how it operates, and I believe there is, I suspect that one of the main contributors to that difference is ideals about transparency practice and its ambiguous relationship with accountability.

**Dissonance and Public Sector Reform**

In the research I reviewed for this study, scholars tend to explore a range of perspectives and ideas, or ideals, of transparency and/or accountability and trouble the dissonance between these ideals and what is actually practiced (e.g., Ebrahim 2009 pp. 891, 889-890; Meijer 2009 p. 263; Menéndez-Viso 2009 p. 157; Neyland 2007 p. 513; Strathern 2000 pp. 314-315). Like the researchers listed above, I am curious about how this dissonance happens; that is, how dissonance is constituted within transparency practices and how despite that dissonance, it is widely deployed alongside accountability as a regulating tool in both the public and private sectors. In the following section I discuss how public management reform has contributed to the theme of dissonance in research that focuses on both transparency and accountability (while keeping in mind the ambiguity in transparency’s interdependent relationship with accountability).
Global shifts in public management discourses that began in the 1980s (Hood 1995 p. 93) are a major factor contributing to dissonance in transparency and accountability practice. The shift can be characterized essentially as a move from “process accountability toward a greater element of accountability for results” (Hood 1995 p. 94). Alexandra Dobrowolsky (2009 p. 1) describes this transformation as a “highly influential market rationality that has grown in depth and scope to encompass a daunting array of economic, political, social and cultural phenomena.” In other words, in about thirty-five years, public management policy and practice made transparency and accountability a priority and defined it with a framework based on private sector practices such as efficiency, outcome-focused reporting and regulatory processes. One powerful example, founded in the midst this global reform in 1993, is the transnational organization called Transparency International. The organization reinforces normative conceptualizations of transparency (alongside accountability) with its Corruption Perception Index (TI 2010). The Index is calculated using the results of polls that assess the perception of corruption and its impact on the ability to do business in a given country from a capitalist and financial media perspective (Getz & Volkema 2001 p. 17). The index as a practice brings to light one potentially harmful feature of market-based transparency practices on human society: the omission of measures for qualitative governance such as citizen rights, equality, welfare and justice (Haque 2000 p. 602). So, while transparency practice is imagined to expose social injustice, if organizations are not held accountable for social injustice then from the perspective of transparency, injustice becomes invisible.

Contemporary practice of transparency and accountability is produced (between discourse and application) in an environment characterized by the transfer of business and market principles and management techniques from the private into the public sector… a slim, reduced, minimal state in
which any public activity is decreased and, if at all, exercised according to business principles of efficiency. … Epistemologically, it shares with STE [standard textbook economics] the quantification myth, i.e. that everything relevant can be quantified; qualitative judgments are not necessary (Drechsler 2005 p. 2).

Along with moving toward private sector sensibility, present day government agendas emphasize ideas like social capital, efficient public management and a reaffirmation of the (redefined) role of the state (Armstrong 2009; Drechsler 2005; Mahon 2009). In Messner’s (2009 p. 921) research on the accountable self, his discussion of the differences between accountability conceptualized as being for another or for oneself provides a useful way to look at a potential schism in contemporary public management reforms. Drawing on the work of Shearer from 2002 Messner (2009 p. 921) explains that “economic discourse is an inadequate basis for ethics of accounting since, broadly speaking, it portrays individuals as guided purely by their self-interests and as being unaccountable to a more comprehensive (social) good.” This portrayal fuels and is fueled by normative discursive frameworks of accountability which Ebrihim (2009 p. 888) identifies as coercive. Coercive frameworks are characterized as being associated with legislation and emphasizing disclosure where the main goal is limiting opportunism (Ebrihim 2009 pp. 888, 890) – an apt description of the policy framework intersecting in the site of this study.

Clinton Free and Vaughan Radcliffe (2008 p. 193) argue that contemporary Canadian transparency and accountability policy frameworks got a boost from the “sponsorship scandal.” 3

In their qualitative study on the reopening of the Canadian Federal Office of the Comptroller General (OCG) in response to the sponsorship scandal, Free and Radcliffe (p. 193) argue that

---

3 “The ‘sponsorship scandal’ refers to the political fallout from a government program that sponsored cultural events in Quebec in order to promote national unity. A number of significant contracts with advertising and public relations firms in Quebec with close ties to the Liberal Party of Quebec resulted in very little work done by these firms, while money was funnelled through these agencies and donated to the Quebec Liberal Party. The scandal came to a head when the auditor general issued a report in February 2004 pointing out significant wrongdoing. Quebec Superior Court Justice John Gomery was appointed to lead a commission to investigate the scope of this scandal and to provide recommendations” (Beaudoin, Lunau & Ngo 2007 p. 3).
this event was leveraged by a government that “sought to re-orient the focus on public sector accountability away from inputs and processes and toward accountability for results.” Reforms implemented by the revived OCG created “a new class of financially and managerially oriented civil servants, changing the nature of decision-making within the civil service so that policy matters are balanced with financial considerations at all stages” (Free & Radcliffe 2008 p. 190). Indeed, it is arguable that the Canadian government leveraged the perceived crisis to resource public management reform. After all, while the sponsorship scandal cost Canadians about $100 million in lost funds, the subsequent Gomery Inquiry cost $80 million (Free & Radcliffe 2008 pp. 189, 203).

Additionally, in 2006 the then new Federal Accountability Act was launched to bring “forward specific measures to help strengthen accountability and increase transparency and oversight in government operations” (TBC 2013) and in tandem with this, the federal Accountability Action plan was launched which proposed $164 million in spending over two years (Free & Radcliffe 2008 p. 204). Within the context of global reform, this abundance of spending signals Canada’s adoption of what Christopher Hood (1995 p. 95) outlined in his article on public management reform as “a shift in emphasis from policy making to management skills, from a stress on process to a stress on output, from orderly hierarchies to an intendedly more competitive basis for providing public services...with more emphasis on contract provision.” Roberts (2009 p. 962) explains that by turning measures into targets the notion of transparency becomes just another form of accountability – and not a sufficient one at that. Moreover, as Strathern (2000 p. 315) states, embedding transparency in the practice of auditing is not actually a good process for understanding organizations.
Transparency practice as it is operationalized today was conceptualized and implemented throughout the reconfiguration of public management practices; as a product of the shift from process-centred to outcome-centred goals and criteria. That is to say, while the government was becoming more transparent, it was also redefining its priorities and as a result, the parameters of transparency. The redefinition of priorities and reconfiguration of transparency parameters contributes to the dissonance between the ideals of transparency practice and what it actually does because commonly held ideals have not been reconfigured. Strathern (2000 p. 315) articulates this dissonance when she writes, “the language of accountability takes over the language of trust.”

Reading these researchers’ discussions on dissonance in transparency and accountability practices, I identified how public management reform has contributed to the set up for dissonance. For example, from a perspective of operationalization, Free and Radcliffe (2008) discuss how changes to discourse and practices of accountability have shifted in the last thirty years to specifically emphasize transparent administration. One of the side effects of this emphasis is that by enacting transparency, “regimes of accountability are difficult to challenge” and this is not because they are achieving superior levels of honesty, but because in order to be transparent, governments change their priorities and policies to conform to outcome-based transparency practices (Free & Radcliffe 2008 p. 203) that are void of process. In other words, the information disclosed through outcome-based transparency practice cannot promote accountability about process and inputs.

The reader might argue that current public management practices are practical – that in economic times like these the government is better off embracing private sector values and focussing on the bottom line. Besides, what would transparency look like if it was configured to
expose something other than financial transactions such as policy process? A lot can be
determined from following the money – what more can the public ask for? Maybe, the reader
might argue, this dissonance can be resolved if commonly held ideals about transparency are
updated to match what is being practiced. Yet, if commonly held ideals were updated, something
valuable might be lost – that which is not reducible to numbers.

As part of charting an interdisciplinary path through the literature, and to provide an
example of what an alternative transparency practice might look like, a practice that is not
outcome-based, I once again reference the work of Oakes and Young (2008). Although their case
study focuses on an alternative form of accountability, given their analysis it is relevant to apply
their ideas to an alternative transparency practice as well. In the management documents from
Hull House, a transition house located in Chicago in the late 1800s, Oakes and Young (2008)
find a practice of accountability that is shaped by an ongoing reflexive narrative that
demonstrates a connectedness between private and public relationships – the connectedness “of
an individual to others” (Oakes & Young 2009 pp. 770, 774).

Jane Addams [Hull House manager] stressed qualitative narrative
descriptions rather than quantitative accounts because she believed that
donors and volunteers would be inspired to contribute if she simply
described the activities of Hull House and then adequately explained their
purposes. She appears to have believed the value of such activities was
easily revealed by detailed descriptions and that no quantification of their
benefits or values was needed. The worth of a settlement was not viewed as
something easily reduced to quantitative measures of costs and benefits.
(Oakes & Young 2008 p. 781)

By privileging quantification of activities, outcome-centred accountability practices disconnect
the individual from their community by reducing everything to numbers. Numbers can never tell
qualitative stories. Numbers turn everything into a success or failure and make it impossible for
the subtler, nuanced and difficult choices to be explained or appreciated.

Oakes and Young (2008 pp. 770-772) argue that accountability as it is practiced today
lacks reflexivity. According to these researchers, contemporary audit culture-based accountability practice requires an individual to abstract themselves from the situation at hand as well as from their own personal history to provide an objective and quantitative report on whatever actions are being scrutinized (Oakes & Young 2008 p. 774). While such reports readily document an organization’s success in meeting its goals, at the same time they absolve individuals of any obligation to reflect on the process of meeting goals (Oakes & Young, 2008, p.784). Objective and outcome-based accountability does not acknowledge “the concrete and the particular other” and subsequently excludes what is “processual and discursive” (Oakes & Young 2008 pp. 774, 784).

The accountability practice that Oaks and Young (2008) describe recognizes others, and it is unlike contemporary outcome-based practices because it is not wholly based on performance and outcome. Instead, it is “not exclusively directed towards others: external stakeholders or hierarchical superiors” but involves “an ongoing internal dialogue” (Oakes & Young 2008 pp. 785-786). The researchers link this dialogic type of accountability to a flexibility that allowed Hull House to meet the ongoing emerging needs of its clients and community (Oakes & Young 2008). This idea of a reflexive, qualitative accountability practice resonates with everyday contemporary ideals of what transparency practice is expected to accomplish. By de-emphasizing outcomes and reporting on information relevant to connections between the individual and their community, information presented through transparency practice might begin to serve the purpose it is commonly, if not naively, expected to serve.

Although these scholars do not discuss transparency, the accountability practice at Hull House demonstrates a kind of built-in transparency. For example, the records include narrative writing about Hull House programs that failed and reflections on why they failed which in turn
contributed to decisions about future programs (Oakes & Young 2008 p. 779). This type of reporting epitomizes commonly held ideals of transparency while simultaneously demonstrating how transparency can work with accountability; it is a way of reporting that exposes imperfect internal process that can be connected to financial outcomes if required. This example also illustrates how activities, decisions and processes are worth reporting on even if they cannot be quantified. Moreover, the criteria and goals for accountability are not externally set, instead “accountability involved an ongoing internal dialogue” that was “a process of articulating the choices made and justifying or explaining the reasons for these choices” (Oakes & Young 2008 p. 786). What Oakes and Young’s research demonstrates, even though they do not identify it as such themselves, is transparency practice that exposes process rather than credit and debit; a practice that reveals imperfection, speculation and complicated decision making.

However, this is not how transparency practice is operationalized in contemporary organizations. To explore the two examples of transparency practice in this study, I developed three intra-active pairs from the literature. I present the intra-active pairs in the next section and in Chapter 5; I use the pairs in my discussion of dissonance and the technological mediation and transparency practices of the citizens’ blog and municipal website.

**Intra-active Pairs of Transparency**

Defining who the accountee and the accountor are in transparency practice is a fundamental theme in the literature I reviewed for this study. Accountors and accountees can be individuals, groups, organizations, citizens, corporations or oneself. The relationship between accountors and accountees is a realm where ethical considerations are important and consequently, material consequences unfold. Also, like any relationship, it intersects iteratively with discourse so, to explore the dimensions of these intersections I applied Barad’s notion of intra-activity and I developed intra-active pairs. Each pair represents an intersecting discursive
dimension in the relationship between accountors and accountees and creates a space in which I can locate my attention between binaries. By focusing my attention on the space between binaries I seek to contemplate the constitutive pre-binary phenomena at play and examine the assumptions of transparency practice co-constituted between accountees and accountors.

**Visibility-invisibility**

Visibility and invisibility emerged for me as a theme in the critical literature by researchers commenting on the notion of transparency. First, transparency is often defined as a practice of making the otherwise invisible visible (Neyland 2007 p. 401; Roberts 2009 p. 957) and second, transparency is itself questioned as being invisible (Menéndez-Viso, 2009, p. 156; Neyland 2007 p. 501). These two discussions can blur together as demonstrated by Menéndez-Viso (2009 p. 156) in his argument that “being completely transparent is tantamount to being invisible and invisibility has always been a very desirable property for offenders.” In trying to understand the relationship between the function of transparency and the assumed-ready-to-be visible information leads Strathern (2000 p. 310) to ask, “What does visibility conceal?” Neyland (2007 p. 504) suggests that while transparency functions to make information visible it does so by making other information invisible. In their arguments these scholars demonstrate that it is important not to assume that information is autonomous and waiting to be revealed through transparency. As Roberts (2009 p. 962) explains, the assumption that good governance depends on ever increasing transparency or “in finding ways of seeing more sharply or more completely” is dangerous because there may be nothing more to see. The theme of visibility-invisibility helps with this research project by guiding my exploration of how the dissonance between ideals and practice of transparency function.

**Performance-audience**

Performance and audience as a theme pair intersects with the theme of visibility and
invisibility at the threshold where information actually becomes visible. In the literature, an important question is asked repeatedly, exemplified by Neyland’s (2007 p. 500) articulation: “Do transparency reviews make available an accurate rendering of organizational practice or do they produce representations of activity for specific transparency criteria?” The question of who the act of transparency is being performed for is important to consider with regard to the outcome-centred practices of an audit-centred reporting culture. Indeed, quantitative performance is a privileged value in outcome-based transparency practices (Free and Radcliffe 2008 pp. 189, 191). In his discussion of transparency mediated by the internet, Meijer (2009 p. 256) explains:

Transparency through technological media is … not seen as a way of showing what has actually happened but is just a way to generate more powerful images to influence policy processes …. In that sense one can argue that agency websites do not reduce uncertainty about agency performance but form an attempt to dominate informal assessments of performance by citizens. In a radical perspective this could mean that the representation itself becomes more important than the practice it is representing [emphasis added].

Discussing the relationship between performers and spectators in the context of transparency, Strathern (2000 p. 316) states that “auditors, for their part, are very conscious that they create auditees.” Neyland’s (p. 508) research on audit practices leads her to conclude that if transparency is about making internal information available externally then transparency really depends on what is, through organizational modeling, considered internal and external in the first place. “Doing well in an audit,” writes Neyland (p. 508), “is about managed performance.” Another way to consider this might be to say that during transparency practice, when invisible information crosses a threshold and is constituted as visible, it generates an audience through its performance. This leads me to ask, is transparency practice a public performance of something that was previously private or is it the creation of entirely new package of information? This question, and the theme of performance-audience, helps with this research project by guiding my
exploration of how the dissonance between ideals and practice of transparency manifests.

**Trust-coercion**

The tension between trust and coercion emerges in the literature when researchers are discussing ethical questions about the ideals of transparency. In his research on the normative logics of accountability regimes, Ebrihim (2009, p. 887) identifies coercion as a fundamental aspect of accountability practice in two of the three regimes he describes. Coercive regimes are characterized by dependence on legislation, punishment such as sanctions for non-compliance and emphasize disclosure (Ebrihim 2009 p. 888). Coercion then can be a product of transparency practice. Although, for anyone or any organization wanting to be perceived as trustworthy, explicit acknowledgement of coercion will be avoided because it can be interpreted as resistance or potential corruption. In his article on transparency as a “moral metaphor,” Menéndez-Viso (2009 p. 157) argues that it was not until the twentieth century that transparency became a “public virtue” that holds aloft the “possibility of accessing reality as it is.” If trust co-constitutes transparency practices, it seems to as a tool of coercion – as Roberts (2009 p. 968) argues – “we do not typically associate the pursuit of high ideals with violence and yet I think that accountability as transparency is often characterized by an anxious paranoia.” Transparency can be a deliberate performance of trustworthiness so not only is transparency an optical metaphor (Menéndez -Viso 2009 p.155), it is also an optical illusion. With any magic trick it is exciting to learn how it works. The themed pair of trust-coercion helps with this research project by guiding my exploration of how the dissonance between ideals and practice of transparency is motivated.

In the literature across disciplines, the relationship transparency has with accountability is characterized by different and sometimes contradictory ways of describing how these two practices work together. Some researchers see transparency as a form of accountability while
others see it as an outcome. Nested in this ambiguity is another theme in the literature that I focus on in this review: dissonance. One of the reasons for the dissonance between what transparency is commonly imagined to achieve and how it actually functions is the influence of public sector reforms implemented in the 1980s that emphasize outcome-based reporting and de-emphasize process. Oakes and Young’s (2008) research on an American settlement house in the 1800s provides an alternative example of what transparency practice might look like if it focused on decision making process and personal reflection. This example seems to match closely with contemporary ideals of transparency, demonstrates that transparency can have a productive role alongside accountability and it also provides a contrast to contemporary transparency practice that is fraught with paradox. Contemporary transparency practice is ambiguous, dissonant and paradoxical and the three intra-active pairs, visibility-invisibility, performance-audience and trust-coercion create an opening for discussing this elusive subject. Implicit in each of these intra-active pairs is an accountee and an accountor and keeping that in mind helps with exploring the mechanisms of transparency practice such as who or what is responsible for establishing the criteria or goals of disclosure. In Chapter 5, these insights about dissonance and the intra-active pairs will assist with my intra-active analysis of technological mediation and transparency practice.

***

What happens when the ambiguity, dissonance and paradox of transparency practice become technologically mediated? What happens when accountee and accountor have access to social media that can collapse time and space? Although this curiosity is almost redundant because of how normalized social media technologies are, it is also important because technological mediation is a new condition of practice not yet widely examined or understood.
from an academic perspective (Farrel 2012 p 47). What does it mean that the particular transparency practices in this case study are implemented almost exclusively through technologies of social media? What is technologically mediated transparency? Is technologically mediated transparency a phenomenon unto itself? To explore these questions I turned to the literature on social media and social change.

**Social Media Technologies**

There is little literature on the topic of transparency practice and social media technologies. To explore social media technologies for the purpose of conceptualizing them with transparency practice, I turned to literature on social media coupled with social change, politics or anti-corruption and looked for research across disciplines that would inform this study. I begin this section on social media technology by defining social media. Then I explain some trends in emerging social media research and discuss optimistic assumptions about social media’s role in politics and social change (Fuchs 2011 p. 6). I conclude this section by discussing space, specifically what happens when virtual spaces are used to facilitate social change where participants are located in a small geographical area – a specific condition of my own data. I also touch on private ownership of virtual spaces and the implications of public assembly in privately owned virtual spaces.

**What is Social Media?**

The citizen’s blog is part of a larger family of technologies known as “social media” which, along with anything on the internet, is an aspect of the information and communication technologies (ICT) sector.

ICTs …offer new avenues for openness by providing access to social media-content and interactions that are created through the social interaction of users via highly accessibly Web-based technologies...Social media include but are not limited to blogs, wikis (e.g. Wikipedia), social networking sites (e.g. Facebook), micro-blogging services (e.g. Twitter),
and multimedia sharing services (e.g. Flickr, YouTube). Social media are often associated such concepts as user-generated content, crowd sourcing, and Web 2.0. (Bertot, Jaeger and Grimes 2010 p. 266)

The online Oxford English Dictionary’s definition of a weblog is an accurate description of the citizens’ blog in this case study: “a frequently updated web site consisting of personal observations, excerpts from other sources, etc., typically run by a single person, and usually with hyperlinks to other sites; an online journal or diary” (OED 2011). The citizens’ blog also has the following characteristics considered common to most blogs: “(a) posts organized in reverse chronological order, (b) readers are able to respond, (c) links to other sites are provided, and (d) some author information usually accessible via a side-bar” (Eastham 2011 p. 354). One key difference between blogs and websites is that a blog is interactive while a website is “a document or a set of linked documents, usually associated with a particular person, organization, or topic, that is held on such a computer system and can be accessed as part of the World Wide Web” (OED 2011). Website is an apt description of the municipal website in this case study.

**Social Media Research Trends**

Over the last decade or so, as the relationship between social media and politics has been drawn into academic analysis, researchers have worked in a variety of disciplines using and developing an array of theories to analyze the relationship. Most useful for my case study is research utilizing critical and post-structural theoretical concepts to explore how social media and social change interact, intra-act and co-constitute (or not) each other. In the literature, scholars are concerned about idealistic notions of social media’s “inherent” ability to promote social change (Etling, Faris & Palfrey 2010 p. 38). Henry Farrell (2012 p. 36) proposes that scholars “stop thinking about the ‘Internet’ as a proper name, and instead start thinking of it as a bundle of characteristics that we can in principal disentangle from each other.” In his
Foucauldian analysis of WikiLeaks, Christian Fuchs (2009 p. 1) states: “the fact that an internet-based political project has had the power to become the subject of world politics shows the relative importance of political online communication today and illustrates the importance of studying WikiLeaks in the area of media and communication and Internet studies more broadly.” Moreover, Fuchs (2011 p. 2) suggests “it is necessary to critically assess WikiLeaks based on a political economy framework in order to evaluate its limits and potential” rather than emulate the “deterministic optimism” of Manuel Castells, a high profile communications scholar. Bearing in mind these critical perspectives, my approach in developing a strategy for conceptualizing social media as part of the mangle of practice is to explore how social media characteristics of the citizens’ blog and the municipal website entangle with transparency practice.

One of the reasons these scholars are calling for a critical and deconstructive approach to analysis is because the mushrooming literature on social media is dominated by technological determinism (Fuchs 2012 p. 387). As well, sentiments regarding how social media enables world democratization through massive interactive information sharing tend to be misleading (Fuchs 2012; Karatzgianni 2006; Powell 2011). In his article on the dialectical relationship between technology and society, Fuchs (2012 p. 387, 389) requests that researchers “decentre the analysis from technology and start with the analysis of societal structures” and acknowledge that “capitalism, crisis and class are the main contexts in unrests, uproar and social media today.” Social media is a technology that is not neutral (McGuire 2006 p. 256) nor is it inherently good or bad. Fuchs’ (2012 p. 387) conceptualization (rooted in political economy) of the relationship between technology and society as a dialectic means that the mangle of practice is also a useful approach here. Both Fuchs’ dialectic and Pickering’s mangle share a perspective where phenomena are co-shaped in a field opened between binaries. Recognizing how phenomena are
co-shaped avoids “technological fetishism” (Fuchs 2012 p. 388) which can conceal social violence by blaming and praising technologies for political phenomena. One such dialectic is the relationship between ICTs and public management reform.

**ICTs and Public Management Reform**

ICTs are implicated in discussions about reforms in public management discussed earlier in this chapter. In their analysis of management reforms in Canada, Free and Radcliffe (2008 p. 191-192) see a trend of shifting resources away from social services toward private sector style accounting technologies. They describe emerging public management reforms as being constituted by, among other things, public management’s adoption of abstract technological mechanisms (Free & Radcliffe 2008 p. 201). In his research about public management reform, Wolfgang Drechsler (2005 p. 7) describes how these abstract technologies are transforming how information is shared and perceived:

> The written form does not become less real if it takes the form of an e-mail or website rather than of a letter or physical ledger; in a way, perhaps more so, because it is more accessible. Hierarchy and subsidiarity, control and information flow, but also standardization and the division of labor were never as easy as with ICT.

The idea that accessibility creates an illusion of legitimacy is an example of how technology can contribute to the creation of illusions. For example, by replacing humans with automated phone and web-based services, ICTs have played a role in facilitating public management’s adaptation of private sector values by downsizing government while creating an illusion of service. Immediate access to an array of standardized choices for service presents abundance and accessibility in the pace of “being on hold”. However, by dehumanizing and distancing human services interfaces, responsibility is offloaded (and labour is divided) to the service user, who is forced to shape themselves to fit into rigid menu options or web-based forms. This influences behaviour and changes the practices of both service users and service providers.
ICTs assist with public management reform’s goal of offloading government services to the private sector is by forcing the service user do the work that used to be done by human staff. This shift is commonly promoted to the public as “e-government” that improves government transparency through access to information (Bertot, Jaeger & Grimes 2010 p. 264) and while that may or may not be true what is of note here is that this shift moves the responsibility of providing information and appropriate services from the public sector to the private individual. Moreover, ICTs are often privately owned which means that an effect of public management reforms is an increase in private sector-owned technology being used by private individuals to engage with public services. So, on one hand it seems as if the public sector is shrinking but on the other hand, social media technologies are exponentially connecting people which create a wider awareness of social interconnection. The next step is to explore the space where that social interconnection is happening.

**Social Media Spatiality**

One way to discuss the ubiquitous and invisible nature of ICTs including social media is to explore the idea that social media is a *place* that is almost everywhere while at the same time being nowhere. This is valuable for my case study because social media is part of the *setting* of this study. I am specifically interested in this conceptualization of social media because it creates an opportunity to talk about conditions of space and time (Silverstone 2004 p. 444; Powell 2011 p. 92). Through social media technologies, it is possible to send information across distances to any number of people connected to the internet, instantly. When this immediacy is combined with the coercive qualities of transparency practice such as public shaming, it is possible to see how in situations created, for example by the citizens’ blog, social media technologies can amplify mechanisms of transparency practice. Social media technologies interact with human activity and create a place-of-immediacy that does not offer the familiar safety valves of time
lags and spatial displacements.

Silverstone (2004 p. 444) discusses the moral impact of creating a place-of-immediacy. As I have said, virtual spaces hold the potential for anyone who has access to social media technologies to communicate with anyone else who has access, instantly. Nested in this potential is what Silverstone (2004 p. 444) describes as the “misleading elision between two kinds of distance: the spatial and the social.” While spatial distance collapses vis-à-vis social media technologies, social distance takes on non-human, hyper-proportions and this, claims Silverstone (2004 p. 444), is a moral issue:

The technologically enabled transformation of time and space which marked the entry into the modern world certainly provided new conditions and possibilities for communication, communication that provided connection despite physical separation. Yet the contradictions of the heart of such communication become even more profound the more we insist that electronic mediation brings no penalty when it comes to understanding and caring for the other. ... My point is that distance is not just a material, a geographical or even a social category, but it is, by virtue of all these and as a product of their interrelation, a moral category (Silverstone 2004 p. 444).

Although I do not agree with holding historical and non-technological connection up as a kind of morally ideal practice of human connection, I do agree with in Silverstone that social media places are material, geographical and social and that in social media places, morality is finding a new (and by new I do not imply improved) complexity. I posit it is the culmination of these novel phenomena that create the experience of using social media as being in an “out there” (yet “in here”) place.

In his discussion of how electricity has contributed to the shaping of contemporary urban environments, Scott McGuire (2005 p. 126) makes a number of points that are also helpful in exploring the novel phenomenon of place in social media technologies. For example, social media technologies, like electricity, tear apart the assumed space-time envelope and change how people plot “the coordinates of self, home and community” (McGuire 2005 p. 136). In terms of
electricity, this replotting was required because of “spatiotemporal experiences of industrial modernity –acceleration, fragmentation, and simultaneity” that gave rise to an overlap of “material and immaterial spatial regimes” (McGuire 2005 p. 135, 134). While, navigating overlapping spatial regimes may not be that new to contemporary Western societies, I believe social media is contributing to a regime that, like electric light when it was first introduced, is transforming “appearances, rhythms, and modes of social inhabitation” (McGuire 2005 p. 127). To put it simply, social media technologies are changing how humans do almost everything.

McGuire’s (2005 p.134) notion of overlapping spatial regimes is specifically suitable for talking about the configuration of social media spatiality constituted by the citizens’ blog and the municipality. The overlapping quality of social media spatiality makes it also possible for the experience of an “in here” (yet “out there”) place. I found a smattering of scholarly analysis of what happens when collective desire for social change is combined with social media in “contextually rooted” movements (Karatzogianni 2006 p. 196). In other words, when people using the social media technologies live geographically close to each other, relative to human scale, such as in a small town or neighbourhood. In his research on digital inequality in urban neighbourhoods, Keith Hampton (2010 p. 1128) uses social cohesion to measure “collective efficacy” and finds that:

By focusing on individual attributes, research on digital inequality has overlooked the role of place and context in the reproduction of inequality. This article argues that unique affordances of the Internet undermine ecological constraints on social and civic inequality. Specifically, to an extent not achieved through previous media, the Internet reduces the transaction costs of local communication.

Hampton’s insight is relevant to my case study because it sheds light on the notion that combined (and overlapped); locality and social media constitute unexpected phenomena in terms of collective action. The idea of resourcing communication suggests to me that a powerful
characteristic of social media technologies is how it can collapse time parallel to collapsing space. Such a collapse is potentially significant in situations where social media technologies are engaged by a collective desire for social change that is rooted in a geographically limited locale.

In his discussion of the “political power of social media” Clay Shirky (2011 pp. 1, 3) suggests taking an environmental view of social media technologies that recognize “the value of tools for local coordination.” Of all the conceptualizations of social media as a place, I find the notion of an environment the most useful because it invites ideas about the material-discursive relationships between environments, their inhabitants including humans and technologies. For example, in their longitudinal study of links between “internet connectivity and community participation,” Gustavo Mesch and Ilan Talmud (2010 pp. 1095, 1107) conclude that while social media technologies are a “new venue of community participation,” the most important variable in facilitating community involvement is membership. So, while social media technologies are a constituent in social change, they are not responsible for social change. As Shirky (pp. 6-7) points out, virtual or geographic space is not as important as being organized in space and “access to information is far less important, politically, than access to conversation.” In short, social media technologies are useful for social change, but only when they facilitate the exchange of relevant information between people who share a common goal or interest.

The conversations needed to bring about social change often require many voices. When people assemble to promote political transformation, either in person, virtually, or both, they are taking up a practice that is considered a fundamental right and a crucial ingredient in democracy. What then, does it mean if the social media technologies tools constitutive of the social media environment are mostly privately owned (Shirky 2011 p. 10)? Prior to this moment in the evolution of technology, humans have commonly gathered in public spaces, such as city squares
(for political rallies and debate), the aprons of government buildings (for public input into legislation), and the streets (for demonstrations and protest). This present-day blending of the private and the public is discursively connected with the shift of private sector values into public sector practices. It also suggests that as the future becomes the past, some public sector values may be worth preserving and eventually (re)introduced into the growing private sector ethos.

***

In the larger picture, public management reform implemented over the last thirty years has shifted public sector priorities to align with private sector values while utilizing ICTs (including social media technologies) to reduce the costs of service provision and share large quantities of information in the name of transparency practice. I have demonstrated that it is unhelpful to assign social media technologies with value-laden labels such as “good” or “bad.” Instead, it is useful to consider how characteristics of social media intersect with practice. In this study, characteristics of social media such as illusions of legitimacy, the collapse of space and time and the creation of a virtual space overlapping with geographic space intersect with transparency practice where citizens use social media (a blog) to amend and implement provincial legislation as an intervention during a municipal election. ICTs are also used by the municipal staff who, to implement provincial legislation, post campaign funding disclosure forms filled out by candidates to the municipality’s website. Although almost everything that happens in contemporary society is technologically mediated, until there is more research and understanding about the intersection of ICTs, policy and practice it is prudent to avoid taking for granted the presence of technological mediation as part of the environment of practice. From the perspective of the mangle, a practice itself can be considered “technologically mediated” if it is
in a co-constitutive dialectic (mangle) with technology where both practice and technology are mutually transformed through implementation.

This case study deconstructs the idea of transparency practice while exploring its co-constitutive relationship with social media technologies. In the next chapter I present my methodology for completing this task and explain how I designed this case study to apply the theoretical framework I outlined in Chapter 2. I will also go into more detail about the citizens’ blog, municipal website and contextual information that comprise the data used for this study and I return briefly to the intra-active pairs and describe how they were used for analysis.
Chapter 4: Methodology, Research Design and Data Description

In this chapter I present an interdisciplinary approach to researching policy in a technologically mediated environment. As a student of policy I do not think traditional policy evaluation processes are effective in contemporary technologically mediated policy environments. Traditional processes are ineffective because they do not fully take into account the co-constitutive relationships between policy and technology or the material consequences of these relationships. One of the reasons these relationships are not taken into account is because research processes are often confined to one disciplinary perspective that compartmentalizes its subject (Brown & Cloke 2006 p. 281; Carpentier 2009 p. 311; Madge 2007 p. 655 and Nancy Tuana 2008 ). One of the goals of this study is to see if an interdisciplinary approach combined with post-structural theory can address the short comings of traditional policy research approaches and expose the material consequences of policy implementation in technologically mediated policy environments. As a familiar approach for interdisciplinary research and policy evaluation, case study method provides a ready container for a mangle-of-practice study.

Chapter 4 is divided into three sections: Methodology, Research Design and Data Description. In the first section, Methodology, I discuss how I use the notion of “thinking the data” in combination with the mangle of practice, intra-activity and case study method to build an inter-disciplinary approach to this study. In the second section, Research Design, I describe both the virtual and geographical setting of this study and reflect on the overlap between them. This section also includes a discussion about the ethical concerns I have about the privacy of the people who created the citizens’ blog and how, in lieu of specific directions for internet research⁴

---

⁴ When I applied for approval from University of Victoria’s HREB (Human Ethics Research Board) I was informed that policies regarding internet research were under review and would be updated in the near future. When I discussed my concerns with a HREB staff person I was encouraged to develop the ethical approach presented in this chapter. The amount of research being conducted on line has grown exponentially in a short period of time and it is not surprising that traditional policy processes are only just catching up.
from my university’s research ethics board, I drew on the literature to guide me in making a
decision to partially anonymize my data. In the balance of this section I explain how I defined
my data, collected it and worked with it using the three intra-active pairs. In the third section of
this chapter, Data Description, I describe the five appendices that contain the data (citizens’ blog,
municipal website and contextual information) I used for this study.

Methodology

Thinking the Data

It has been an eye opening experience for me to learn about the politics of competing
philosophical paradigms that influence contemporary academic research in the humanities and
social sciences. As a self-described feminist for over two decades it has been a challenge to
accept the idea that most researchers who use dominant knowledge creation tools rooted in
positivism do not consider it necessary to justify their methodology while those who draw on
feminist practices, do. To resist what initially felt like an act of self-marginalization, I wanted to
create knowledge from within an interdisciplinary feminist materialist paradigm as if that were
the paradigm from which *everyone* conducted research. I wanted to write (without explanation)
from the assumptions that all research is biased and the boundaries between researcher and
subject are an oppressive illusion or social construction. However, with insight gained through
the literature I have read, I now understand and agree with the value of this process. In fact, it
would be a contradiction of Barad’s notion of “knowing in being” (Jackson & Mazzei 2012 p.
120) to not provide a sense of my location, motivation, political beliefs and perspectives. As
Alecia Youngblood Jackson and Lisa Mazzei (2012 p. 120) explain in their chapter on Karen
Barad and other similar theorists,

> [t]here is an important sense in which practices of knowing cannot fully be
> claimed as human practices, not simply because we use nonhuman elements
> in our practices but because knowing is a matter of part of the world making
> itself intelligible to another part. Practices of knowing and being are not
isolable; they are mutually implicated. We don’t obtain knowledge by standing outside the world; we know because we are of the world.

Moreover, my experiences as an activist have taught me to consider the creation and cultivation of new systems to be a more effective means of resistance than trying to subvert existing oppressive systems. In other words, instead of devoting energy to criticizing systems and processes that I want to change I prefer to contribute to the creation of systems and processes that I want to participate in. So, I consider this thesis a contribution to the collective effort\(^5\) to establish “a theoretical position that moves to an articulation of a new theoretical approach” (Jackson & Mazzei 2012 p. 120).

In their book, *Thinking with Theory in Qualitative Research: Viewing Data Across Multiple Perspectives*, Jackson and Mazzei (2012) employ the term “thinking this data” to describe the process they use to take up multiple theorists’ concepts for analysis. To describe how they think data with Barad, they discuss shifting away from looking at interview text as something they are being “told” by their participants “toward what is *produced* in this intra-action” (p. 126). For the purpose of thinking about transparency practice, I shed light on what is being produced by exploring some of the intra-actions that produce it. Exploring the intra-actions yields insight into the entanglement of normative assumptions, technologies and socio-political ecologies that assemble into a particular transparency practice and allow me to discuss what is being produced *in addition to* what is commonly believed to be some form of regulated sharing of relevant information and creation of trustworthiness. Like Jackson and Mazzei, I try to answer questions of *how* rather than *why* while attempting to hover between the discursive and material and accept phenomena as pre-binary (2010 p. 126).

\(^5\) This collective effort is being labelled by some as “new materialism” and characterized by an ontological shift described as post-humanist in which humans are de-centred and research is an emergent interplay of human and non-human agents co-producing phenomena (Jackson & Mazzei 2012 p. 112-113).
There are several threads woven through this theoretical approach that influence how I think my data (Jackson & Mazzei 2012 p. 125). I pull in Pickering’s (1995, 2005) mangle of practice to amplify the interdisciplinary qualities of case study method and to shift this method off its normative underpinnings. For this research, the case is the mangle. The mangle challenges “hegemonic dualist ontology” (Pickering 2005 p. 37) by establishing a temporally emergent and heterogeneous assembly of human, technological and discursive entities as “a bona fide object that one can study, internally differentiated though it is” (Pickering 2005 p. 37). Although originally designed for researching science, the mangle of practice is, by Pickering’s (p. 37) invitation, potentially applicable in any discipline. As such, the mangle is for me both a useful way to describe the entwinement of people, legislation, technology and discourse that constitute my research subject and a vehicle for me to research with an interdisciplinary perspective.

Being explicit about my interdisciplinary perspective is important to me because it is arguably the only legitimate way to create knowledge at the intersection of people, policy and technology. In his discussion of the discipline of “media studies” as it is evolving in Europe, Nico Carpentier (2009 p. 311) makes a compelling point when he writes:

… we can say that the heart of a discipline is empty, but at the same time filled by a continuous stream of practices at the level of research, pedagogy, representation and (public) intervention. Different paradigms, pedagogical ideologies, individuals and organizations struggle for control of the empty heart of the discipline, in order to position themselves on the discipline’s throne of knowledge, only to be dethroned soon after or to have the phantasm disrupted by the presence of other academic discourses or institutions with similar claims...We simply cannot ignore the establishment of academic hegemonies that generate a combination of stability and exclusion.

Carpentier (p. 312) goes on to explain that the discipline phantasm is complemented by the phantasm of fragmentation and that between them is an “oscillatory process” that can be used to “generate enough openness to enter into multi-, cross-, inter-, and transdisciplinary dialogues,
and enough closedness to avoid being incorporated by other disciplines.” By describing my perspective as interdisciplinary, I inhabit this oscillatory space acknowledging the presence of disciplines such as communications, philosophy, political science and management studies and thinking diffractively through them; recognizing no particular throne. My intent is to make a rigorous and critical contribution to interdisciplinary research practice for exploring technologically mediated policy environments.

By being able to view my case study as a mangle of practice it becomes compatible with the theoretical framework I have built with ideas from Hekman and Barad. As Hekman (2010 p. 78) writes in *The Material of Knowledge*, “Barad’s analysis goes a long way toward revealing how the mangle operates.” Hekman’s re-interpretation of the mangle coaxes it fully into the social sciences and by reading it through (Jackson & Mazzei 2012 p. 130) Barad’s concept of intra-action, Hekman opens the mangle so I, the researcher, can become entwined in it too. From this position I am sensitized to analyze my data while taking responsibility for how “experimenting and theorizing are dynamic practices that play a constitutive role in the production of objects and subjects and matter and meaning” (Barad 2007 p. 56).

**Case Study Method**

Case study method helps me conduct research from an interdisciplinary perspective – a perspective that Nancy Tuana (2008) argues should be taken up by all theorists in order to “understand and live responsibly in the world we are of and in” (Tuana 2008 p. 194). One of the goals of this project is to explore and promote the importance of interdisciplinary research in technologically mediated policy environments. Toward that goal, I have aimed to design this project in a way that nourishes an interdisciplinary approach by choosing methods that are not tethered tightly to any particular set of theories. Indeed, that might be why case study method is not always considered a research method unto itself, however I consider it my best option
because it provides a means for establishing scope and developing “a holistic understanding” of a phenomenon (Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2011 pp. 255-256). In fact, case study method is a viable strategy for this research for a few different reasons. Its flexibility and specificity is compatible with Pickering’s mangle of practice and Hekman’s notion of disclosure and its interdisciplinary applicability (Yin 1994 p. xxi, 3) is useful for researching at this intersection of policy, people and technologies. I use case study method because it gives me room to develop an interdisciplinary approach for holistically presenting an analysis of technological mediation and two transparency practices constituted around a unique political event. Using case study method to encapsulate this research provides an excellent way to draw borders around a unique phenomenon of multiple intersecting agents. The mangle of practice and case study method are both “nontotalizing” (Ettlinger 2009 p. 1018) approaches to research and fit snugly together. The case study method is a familiar container which I build on to develop and present an innovative approach for analyzing complicated contemporary phenomena.

In her commentary about how case study method can be used for exploring exceptional circumstances with a “nontotalizing” approach to research, Nancy Ettlinger (2009 p. 1018) argues that academic theory discourse is socially constructed and just as available for being analyzed from a Foucauldian perspective as any discourse. Taking this approach to academic theory means “empirical research becomes more complex than connecting empirics to a conceptual framework” and requires scholars to take up a “nontotalizing perspective” that interrupts the dominant relationships between data and theory (Ettlinger 2009 pp. 1018-1019).

The purpose of this interruption is to evade the goal of creating a single truth and instead recognize the array of options for analysis and use a “imbricated approach” in which theory and data is interwoven, grounded and in turn built on to create an “unfolding and explication of
multiple realities tied to different discourses, rather than a battle of theories to find the Truth and evidence it” (Ettlinger 2009 p. 1019). The modest scope of this particular research project limits its imbricate-ability, yet I seek to present a research design that can potentially attempt to take on what Ettlinger (p. 1019) describes as the double project of “explaining empirical dynamics while clarifying how and why different academic discourses may be helpful towards highlighting different dimensions of a problem.”

With this in mind, Pickering’s mangle of practice and Hekman’s notion of disclosure seem like a natural fit with case study method. Furthermore, with an approach such as this, the complicated and uncharted territory of technologically mediated policy environments may be explored both theoretically and practically and this is valuable when the material consequences of discourse and theory are being considered. In terms of scope, case study method allows me to explicitly define and take responsibility for the borders of my subject (by including I am also excluding) which in turn keeps me in scope as well and that is ethically valuable to this process that is essentially “a part of the universe making itself intelligible to another part” (Barad 2003 p. 824).

To make myself and my research intelligible, I draw on Hekman (2010 p. 127) who states that “disclosure in the social realm describes the relationship between the material, the discursive, the technological, and the practices they constitute.” As I define it, this case study is primarily a collection of texts and technologies generated during a municipal election. Additionally, I reference contextual material such as relevant legislation, municipal planning documents and media articles that are associated with the geographical location and politics connected to the municipal election – and case study method allows for this variety of data. These contextual materials provide hindsight that invites my analysis to reach for deeper insights
into the intra-connections co-constituting the phenomena I am researching. Altogether, this data is material and discursive and by disclosing a version of the mangle I can tease out a truth about material consequences at the intersection of technological mediation and transparency practice. By defining the edges of my case study to maximize my potential interests and skills as an interdisciplinary researcher I intend the mangle of practice exploration that I have defined to offer practical insight and food for ontological and epistemological thought.

Ettlinger (2009 p. 1019) describes case study method as an “epistemological approach underpinned by the ontological premise that exceptional circumstances otherwise understood as ‘deviations from a norm’, ‘noise’, ‘outliers’ or ‘inconsequential cases’ count.” That is to say, unique situations matter in understanding human experiences so, case study method is ideal for exploring the uncommon phenomenon of a group of citizens using social media technologies to implement provincial election campaign funding disclosure legislation alongside a sanctioned municipal implementation. The purpose of exploring such a unique event is not to prove or disprove anything but rather to unravel the rush of assumptions that flow quickly into the void of unexpected phenomena. In deconstructing transparency practice conducted in a technologically mediated environment by the citizens and the municipality, I use case study method as a vehicle to connect my knowledge and skills with this unique phenomenon. The mangle, coupled with Hekman and Barad’s ideas help explore two linked but distinct transparency practices and offer a coherent analysis that points out assumptions about transparency practice and social media technologies. By pointing out these assumptions in analyzing this case study I develop a potential template for detecting assumptions in future analysis at the intersection of technology, people and policy.

**Research Design**
A significant effect of the technological mediation of transparency practice in this case study is how it is implemented primarily on the internet. In the following section, I briefly describe how I familiarized myself with my data and organized it for analysis. I define the virtual and geographic *settings* of my data and explain why I chose some virtual components to exist as setting only and not content. Following the description of this study’s setting is a significant discussion about my choice to partially anonymize my data because of *searchability* – a unique characteristic of collecting data in a technologically mediated research environment. In recounting my data collection processes I discuss my use of contextual information and how it provides hindsight for analysis. At the end of this section I return to the intra-active pairs from Chapter 3 and connect them with my theoretical framework to prepare them as tools for analysis.

**Analysis and Familiarization**

The full content of both the citizens’ blog and municipal website were downloaded as HTML and PDF files and backed up onto my external hard drive in April, 2012. Contextual materials were collected using the same process. To initially familiarize myself with the text of the blog I electronically numbered the pages and printed the PDF file and read it through numerous times. Quotes cited from the citizens’ blog include the page number generated at this stage of data collection. At this stage I also created aliases for the candidates so that as I compiled information I would not re-use personal identification. I then printed out the PDFs of the formal disclosure forms each candidate submitted to the municipality after the election and wrote the appropriate alias on each one. Since these forms are not numbered, in citations they are identified by the candidate alias. By physically working with the texts generated virtually, I sought to resonate with a material-discursive “onto-epistemology” (Barad 2007 p. 185).

**Research Site**
In many ways, the research site or setting for my data is a blend of social media and geographic spaces that exist “out there” and “in here.” The “in here” is primarily in my mind as an imagined complex comprised of a combination of images from the web and memories of a rural municipality of similar size where I worked in Ontario several years ago. To describe this blended setting I turned to current literature that has yielded an array of descriptors for virtual spaces (Hampton 2010 p. 1113). Blogs are sometimes referred to as being in the “blogosphere” (Castells 2007 p. 252) and blogs and social networks are often considered to be in “cyberspace” and there are other conceptualizations of this locale such as Athina Karatzogianni’s (2006 p. 191) “cyberstate” and what another scholar calls, “third space” (Powell 2011 p. 103). As I discussed in Chapter 3, and as both Karatzogianni and Shirky (2011 p. 7) argue, researching the relationship between social media and social change needs to include what is happening off-line. It is the overlap between virtual and geographical space that is the setting for this study and I could not find a term to describe such a setting. For the purpose of this research, I describe it as overlapping virtual and geographically local spaces.

I know the geographically local landscape of the municipality only through statistics, photographs and Google satellite and street view. The municipality comprising the research site for this study exists in a technological dimension where contextual materials are available and electoral transparency is practiced through text and communications on a blog and a municipal website. Information about the municipality is posted on the municipality’s website (MFF 2012 p. 1; SGM 1998):

- population is almost 25,000;
- 300 acres of land is available for industrial/commercial development;
- there are 2 local newspapers and 3 radio stations;
• three regional telecommunications companies provide internet:
• there are six settlements and the main one has the same name as the municipality;
• from 2006 to 2011 it was the fastest growing municipality in Canada;
• there are 13 pre-schools, 5 elementary schools, 2 high schools and two hospitals;
• employment primarily includes agriculture, construction, professional services, home-based business and municipal government;
• outdoor recreation includes 91 parks, 48 playgrounds, 10 ball diamonds, 5 skating rinks and 1 skateboard park;
• it is 20 km from a major Canadian city; and
• it is located in a valley where its only water source is a river.

Virtually speaking, what makes up the “space” of virtual spaces? As a part of the virtual setting, the citizens’ blog includes hyperlinks to a Facebook page and a Twitter feed that I consider relevant as virtual surface area. To access the Facebook page I logged in using my own Facebook account and printed the citizen’s Facebook page to PDF and saved it to my own computer (April 20, 2012). At the time of being saved, the Facebook page had fourteen members and there were seven posts starting in 2007 and ending in 2010. The Facebook page was created years prior to the election by the group that eventually initiated the citizens’ blog. In my experience as a Facebook user I consider the citizens’ group’s page to have a very small profile with very little activity. The Facebook page discussion centred on the purpose of the citizens’ group (that eventually started the blog) and the larger community’s ongoing commitment to sustainability. It was removed from Facebook sometime during the fall of 2012. After assessing the quality, quantity and relevance of the content of this virtual entity, I decided that for the
purposes of this research it co-constituted the setting but was not significant enough in content to include as part of the data; so, it is excluded.

The Twitter feed spans the period leading up to the election and sees no activity after the election results are posted. It is visible on the blog page as a side-bar and includes links to research on climate change; references to communities in other places that are facing water source shortages; a public service announcement about high water levels in the local river; links to media articles about local politics and election transparency resources. These tweets generally relate to the agenda of the citizens’ group that initiated the blog and offer a sense of virtual context and expand user connection surface area that can be both local and global. Like the Facebook page, these tweets contribute to the virtual setting but are not directly relevant to the case study so they are excluded from the data. Both the Facebook page and the Twitter account are ambient mechanisms in the project of technologically mediating transparency practice on the blog and could easily be considered valuable data for another research project.

**Ethical Considerations About Data Collection**

Since joining my program in 2010 and learning about the creation and circulation of research my gut-feelings about knowledge creation now also takes the form of arguments I can make through a set of concepts. Foremost in my mind while designing this study were considerations about what constitutes ethical and useful research. When I think about research ethics I am concerned about personal and collective privacy as well as questions about the material consequences of knowledge creation. When I think about what is useful research I am taking up my responsibility for what Barad (2007 p. 185) describes as “being part of the world in its differential becoming.” In other words, as Barad (2007 p. 185) explains, “the possibilities for what the world may become call out in the pause that precedes each breath before a moment comes into being and the world is remade again, because the becoming of the world is a deeply
ethical matter.” For my research to be ethical I required myself to make each decision, not just the ones about data collection but also the ones about epistemology and ontology, as if I would be held accountable for them by my peers, my teachers, my community and the people whose work created the text and technologies I gleaned for my data.

My primary concerns lay with the intent of privacy of the individuals who generated the texts and technologies that I have gleaned for data. In developing my ethical approach to this research I assumed that none of this text or these technologies was produced to facilitate my research project. With this in mind I wanted to shield the identity of the individuals and the municipality because I do not consider their identities to be a part of my data. Conducting research on the internet is, in terms of policy evaluation time frames, still relatively new so research ethics policies are only beginning to catch up. In the meantime, the ethical considerations applied to the data for my case study will contribute to the small and helpful scholarly discussion on the complexities of ethically unregulated internet research. When I began to look for ethical guidance from my university I found that in terms of data collection it is currently believed that text itself is non-living, non-interactive and uninfluenced by the researcher (Hesse-Biber & Leavy 2011 p. 228). Furthermore, “passive analysis” of internet content (“such as studies of… [online] discussion groups without researchers involving themselves”) is not subject to the existing Tri-Council Policy Statement: Ethical Conduct for Research Involving Humans (HREB 2011; Kitchin 2003 p. 403). To put it another way, existing policy exempts from ethical approval any “research limited to the use of materials in the public domain and for which all applicable copyright, patent, or other legal requirements and approvals have been either fulfilled or received” (HREB 2011). So, I turned to the literature and found
guidance from social media scholars that addressed the privacy of computer users generating the material used for my research data.

**Blogger Privacy**

![Diagram](image)

*Figure 1: Essential elements and blog research design questions (Eastham, 2011).*

In her article on using blogs for research data, Linda Eastham (2011) provides a tool (Figure 1) for evaluating bloggers’ intentions for privacy. In applying this tool to the blog that I used for this research, a path is created as shown by the shaded boxes in Figure 1 above. Within this model, the intentions of the blog’s designers were to create a public blog. This particular reading is supported by the stated intent of the blog which was to be a site of emerging public disclosure of election campaign funding and to provide a record for the future so “we can all now watch as well, how decisions are made by successful candidates later, knowing full well who funded their campaigns” (CB 2010 p. 3). With that said, unlike the majority of the blogs Eastham
is writing about, the citizens’ blog contains the real names of people – the election candidates – and also the name of one member of the citizens’ group who created the blog (although I did not follow up to find out if that person’s name is a pseudonym or not) (CB 2010). So, I had to think about my options for protecting the identities of the self-identified blog author and candidate participants.

I began by thinking through the process of how I might protect the identity of the blog creator and candidate participants and concluded that it is most likely impossible while maintaining the integrity of my data. For example, any text string in my thesis that is a direct quote from my data may be entered into a search engine and with one click, the identity of the municipality and candidates is revealed. To attempt to avoid this, I would have to paraphrase text I want to cite from my data (Kitchin 2003 p. 411; Madge 2007 p. 660) and while that may be possible in some research, it is not a viable solution for this project. I also considered how I might describe my research subject in a way that preserves its significance but fully protects its identity. Do the vague descriptions such as: “In 2010 a group of citizens in a Canadian municipality created a web blog (popularly referred to as a “blog”) to facilitate the disclosure of election campaign funding sources” provide sufficient disguise? Probably not, is the answer, if someone really wanted to figure out what and who I am writing about. Yet, to use a more vague description would render my data unintelligible.

In his research article on Facebook conducted with a cohort of students who attended Harvard College, Michael Zimmer (2010) shows how, despite the efforts of a team of researchers to preserve the cohort’s anonymity, the site of the research was quickly discovered. What leads to identifying the site was a “cultural fingerprint” provided by “a complete set of taste labels” (Zimmer 2010 p. 317). This suggests that even if I avoided using direct quotes from the blog and
described it in vague terms, because of its unique nature my data may have a fingerprint that could easily be tracked. To obscure the fingerprint of my data I could fabricate details, and indeed this is considered a valid practice for protecting identity (Madge 2007 p. 660), yet I believe this would also compromise my data not to mention the irony of employing fabrication while researching transparency.

I believe it can be argued that the blog falls into the category of “letters to the editor” which are considered to be in the public domain and a part of public discussion (Eastham 2011 p. 356; Kitchin 2003 p. 406). What then are the implications of naming the municipality and the blog website? The blog author and the candidate participants may discover their words have become the subject of a master’s thesis. While I can speculate that for some blog participants, discovering this might potentially be upsetting or off-putting, I know my work will not be any more critical than that of the local media or other critics the blog author responded to:

[In response to media] Instead of welcoming this initiative, we find it interesting that the [local media name] took the opportunity to slam us in two of its editorials. [local media name] Publisher, <publisher name>, (who, incidentally was one of the campaign donors disclosed as a result of this website) says in his column that the website is “trying to take the public away from the issues at hand” (CB 2010 p. 3).

[In response to other critics] Judging by the reaction, the resulting efforts to try and discredit it or expose the creators of the site as biased, there are some people who are unhappy about this level of transparency in government. We wonder why (CB 2010 p. 3).

In fact, unlike the media and the unnamed critics, my research focus is more on how transparency is implemented in a technologically mediated environment and as part of public management discourses, and less on particular local politics. Furthermore, as Amy Bruckman (2002 p. 228) suggests, by not naming the blog I may actually be denying the blog author and the citizen group “rightful mention” (see also Kitchin 2003 p. 409). And, as Heather Kitchin (p. 413) reminds her readers “it is important not to conflate the author and the text.”
To check my decision against another element of ethical research practices I asked myself if I am preserving the dignity (HREB 2011) of the blog participants. Indeed, I am building a critique of transparency as it is practiced, and using text from the blog to support my argument, and I am also arguing how the blog contributes alternative, qualitative principals to transparency practice. Even if the support for that argument fails, underlying these claims is my personal conviction that citizen participation in politics is fundamentally valuable and that my responsibility as a researcher lies not in critiquing citizen engagement itself, but rather the assumptions and discourse that facilitate and shape it. In sum, I do not anticipate that this case study will have a negative impact on “the multiple and interdependent interests” or dignity (HREB 2011) of the individuals involved in the blog.

**Site Disclosure**

So, based on the following points, disclosing the blog’s physical and virtual location seemed to be an acceptable option:

- the blog is in the public domain and its authors intended it to be searched and viewed by the public;
- there is no indication that the blog author or blog participants are collectively members of a vulnerable group (HREB 2011);
- I have no intention to interact with the blog’s creator or participants; and
- I have no intention to search for additional personal information about the individuals who created the blog and participated in it.

However, upon further consideration, disclosing the identity of the blog did not intuitively feel like the right thing to do! For me, research has been a technologically mediated process where search terms hold a powerful sway over what is possible. Throughout every step of the process I
have typed in search terms, as for example, to glean my data, find academic literature and locate documents on my own computer. In the larger world of information and communication technologies the amount of available data is growing exponentially. At the same time, sophisticated search tools are also being developed and data is becoming increasingly organized around its search-ability. It is with this in mind, along with several other considerations, that I made the decision to not identify the municipality that is centre to my research. This way, if someone is searching for information about this municipality, this project will be less likely to appear in the topmost search results.

This approach is inspired by Bruckman’s (2002 p. 228) work on internet research ethics – reducing risk. Bruckman (p. 227) identifies that on the internet, what is private and public or published and unpublished, lies along a continuum. To work with this continuum she suggests different levels of “disguise” that can be generated to protect or semi-protect the identities of research subjects (Bruckman 2002 p. 228). Since I have determined that my data are in the public domain and its authors intended it to be accessed by the public, I do not obscure it with fabrication but I refrain from identifying it in my research.

I quote directly from the blog and while that means most individuals reading my thesis will have quick access to my data source, it will remain up to them (you, as the reader) to find it. Conversely, it is unlikely anyone looking for information about the municipality will come across this thesis. In this way I am doing my best to preserve the blog’s stated intent to be an accessible, searchable public document but not explicitly a research subject. Yet, because it is possible for anyone reading this to find my data source, my approach also improves the potential for the blog’s creator and participants to receive some form of “rightful mention.” This position
also enables me to invite the audience of this research to share responsibility for identifying the subject.

Should it come to pass that the author of the blog or candidates who participated in it discover my master’s thesis and approach me or the University of Victoria then I will stand behind my analysis and speak to any concerns. My research ethics do not stop at the end of the thesis process. The ethical location I inhabit with this research is intended as an emerging space that I hope will become a meaningful contribution to the discussion of ethical internet research.

As more research is conducted with web-based data it will be important for researchers and ethics regulators to understand the nuances of virtual private and public spaces. As a contributor to the practice of knowledge creation, it is important to me to challenge sterile separations between researchers, their subjects and knowledge consumers. I believe challenging these separations enacts an intra-active practice and brings into question dominant notions of absolute truth. It is with this in mind that I am prepared to discuss my research with the creators and/or participants of the citizens’ blog (and the consumers of this research) as co-creators of the knowledge I am producing.

**Collecting data: Citizens’ Blog, Municipal Website and Contextual Information**

Two internet locations exist that hold information about the transparency practice I am interested in exploring. One is blog created by local inhabitants of a municipality using a privately owned, open source online blogging tool called WordPress and the other is a website hosted by the government of the municipality. Based on the website address of the blog, it appears it is hosted on a WordPress server and I was unable to determine who hosts the municipal website. The blog is the site of the transparency practice I identify as being ad hoc or

---

6 The uniform resource locator (url) of the website includes the sequence “wordpress.” If it were hosted on a non-WordPress server the url would not include this sequence. The sequence, “wordpress,” is a unique identifier. The reverse is not true. If the address were a registered domain, WordPress could still be the host.
out of scope of existing legislation and the municipal website is the site of the transparency practice I identify as being formal or in the scope of legislation. After receiving approval from the University of Victoria’s Human Ethics Research Board (HREB 2011) I collected the texts from the blog and the website by using Backstreet Browser and Adobe Acrobat and saved them as files on my own computer. The citizens’ blog did not maintain all its structure through this translation and I had to adapt it for my needs. To compensate for that, I spent time browsing through the actual online blog interacting with the text in its original structure as an internet user.

My own access to the internet gives me admission to the citizens’ blog and municipal website. The municipality has its own website and on it I can access the information that I identify as data as well as background information about the transparency practices implemented within the assumed scope of legislation. I have named this portion of my data the municipal website. In April, 2012, after I downloaded the texts to my own computer, I made a backup of all the files on my external to hard drive.

The blog was created and maintained by people who live in the municipality. They describe themselves as citizens (CB 2010 p. 3) so I describe this portion of my data as the citizens’ blog. This transparency practice was conducted in two basic steps. Candidates emailed election funding disclosures (and other texts) to an email address posted on the blog and then the blog author7 copied and pasted the email text (or some portion of it) into a WordPress blog post. Once the email was transformed into a blog post it became available to the public which, in normative terms and sort of established by the Act, constitutes transparency.

7 On the internet it is possible for one person to appear as many or, in this case, many people to appear as one – it is impossible for me to be certain who is the author or how many authors there are. When I refer to “the blog author” I draw on my own experience as an activist and imagine at least two people sharing the responsibility of managing the blog but I keep a singular descriptor because that is how the blog author represents itself.
Within the scope of legislation, election transparency on the municipal website was practiced through a two-step process. The first step, as laid out in the legislation, entails candidates (or someone assisting them) completing a Form 21 Campaign Disclosure Statement and Financial Statement (see Appendix A) and submitting it to the municipal office. The second step requires municipal staff to scan and upload each form submitted by the candidate to the municipal website as a “PDF” (Portable Document Format). Once uploaded, these documents become available to the public which, in normative terms and established by the Act, constitutes transparency.

A number of online documents that I glean from the internet are contextual material for this research. I define contextual material as documents that expand my particular awareness of the heart of my data described in this chapter. There is an array of these texts ranging from purposefully relevant to general background. I have drawn on primarily local media available on the web, the municipal website and information found by browsing the internet to follow how transparency practice has operated in this particular election. For example, the Local Authorities Election Act – the legislation used to implement transparency on both the municipal website and citizens’ blog – is included in this thesis as relevant contextual material. I also reviewed documents referred to in the blog such as the Sustainable Growth Model\(^8\) (SGM 1998) which the citizens’ blog author cites as one of the reasons to pre-implement transparency.

I also followed up on specific stories about issues related to the citizens’ blog in the fall of 2012 which I summarize and include in Chapter 5 as hindsight. The purpose of including texts that capture hindsight in the data is to identify some of the material consequences (or effects) of transparency practice. When transparency practice exposes information about transactions to the

\(^8\) This document is no longer available on the municipality’s website and it has been replaced by a web page entitled “Sustainable [town name] What’s Next?” that includes discussion of recent public consultation and information about plans for long term development and water usage.
future it potentially imposes a kind of accountability on the people and/or organizations that participated in the transaction. To collect hindsight data I searched for media articles linking members of the local council (elected in the election when the citizens’ blog was created) with issues referred to on the blog and in the Sustainable Growth Model such as population, water supply and residential zoning. The hindsight data contributes to my exploration of popular assumptions and expectations of specific transparency practices.

Prior to this research I had never heard of this municipality so these data include my own transformation of awareness. Along with contextual materials and practices, my own experience working within and around municipal politics (and politicians) is implicitly present. I coordinated two grants for a community foundation in Ontario a few years ago. The municipality in my data reminds me a lot of the municipality I worked with in Ontario and I often draw on memories of people and processes when I think my data for this thesis (Jackson & Mazzei 2012 p. 126). One of the things I learned from my experiences in Ontario is how municipal council members operate within a complicated and often frustrating system of bureaucratic constraints and municipal finances. My experiences led me to become less critical of council members’ choices because I gained first-hand understanding of the impact of public management reforms such as provincial downloading of economic responsibility onto municipalities. In this way, my memories discursively influence how I disclose this research; I am critical, and sympathetic.

**Working With the Data: Intra-Active Pairs**

Along with reading the text through the methodological concepts of the mangle and disclosure, I worked with the data by using the intra-active pairs that I identified from the literature and theory as a structure through which to think the data. With my theoretical framework in mind, I used different coloured pens to underline and annotate the text strings that came into focus. Once the text was annotated, I returned to my computer and organized the data
into tables using Microsoft Word 2007. I worked with two tables. One tracked each candidate by research alias, blog post, disclosures about campaign funding on the blog/the municipal website, and notable quotes. The second table collected and organizes text strings into intra-active pair categories (e.g., visibility-invisibility). As I worked my now-organized-into-tables data through intra-activity, bits of text came into focus as potential examples of discursively constituted material consequences as described by Hekman (on Barad and Pickering) (Hekman 2010).

The majority of my analysis was technologically mediated. I worked with multiple windows open on my computer desktop so that I could review the data tables while I referenced the intra-active pairs in the literature review. Around me on my two desks I kept the works of Hekman, Barad and Pickering nearby so I could consult them as I pondered and wondered my way through the mangle of technological mediation and transparency practice. My analysis process took about five weeks and over time I found that if I worked for about two hours and then had a break I would experience clarity about what I had been working on prior to breaking. I purposefully engaged this process and consider it to be essential as part of my analysis!

To create a structure within which I could work with the data – think the data – I used the three intra-active pairs presented in Chapter 3. These intra-active pairs created a structure through which I could deconstruct transparency and mangle it with technological mediation. The pairs themselves arrived in my mind when I began to work with the literature on transparency. As these intra-active pairs took shape I considered Virginia Braun and Victoria Clark’s (2006 p. 82) definition of a theme as “some level of patterned response or meaning within the data set.” To induce, deduct and iteratively intuit the patterns in my data I drew on Jennifer Attride-Stirling’s (2001 p. 386-7) conceptualization of thematic networks that allow “a sensitive, insightful and rich exploration of a text’s overt structures and underlying patterns.” I created the
intra-active pairs from the literature with a framework shaped by critical literature about transparency practice, social media, and corruption and by an epistemological perspective that resists absolute or static truths. The intra-active pairs create space for multiple interpretations, meanings or ways of knowing of which this thesis explicitly explores a selection.

As I read the literature on transparency I was thinking diffraction with Barad’s notion of intra-activity and how she and other philosophers argue that the primary ontological unit is not a static thing but rather, a phenomenon (Barad 2003 p. 815; Tuana 2008 p. 191). That in turn inspired me to consider the possibility of pairs that emulated the idea that phenomena are pre-binary (Hekman 2010 p. 75). What came to mind was that if I made the binaries obvious it might be easier to perceive the phenomena from which they are constituted. The three intra-active pairs that I eventually distilled from the literature lent structure to my analysis of the data – an analysis that strives to hover in pre-binaries, between disciplines and reach insightfully toward a material-discursive understanding of transparency practices in a technologically mediated policy environment.

Data Description

This case study explores how transparency is discursively practiced outside and within an assumed scope of legislation during a municipal election. Although most of my data of these two practices exists as technologically mediated texts, their technologically mediated presence is only possible because of off-line phenomena. While working with this data I tried to keep in mind humans at home and work, systems of government, computer hardware and generation of electrical power that are just a few examples of some of the off-line phenomena that co-constitute the presence of what has become the majority of the data for this research.

9 Although I describe the citizens’ blog and municipal website transparency practices as being “outside” and “inside” of the scope of legislation respectively, neither would have been possible without the legislation.
In this section I describe the five appendices of data (Appendix B to F) included with this study. This data includes content from the citizens’ blog, the municipal website and the section of the Act relevant to the two linked but distinct technologically mediated transparency practices I am researching.

**Description of Appendix B: Citizens' blog: Stated purpose**
Appendix B contains text from the “About” section of the citizens’ blog and shows the connections between the blog’s purpose and the Sustainable [town name] Growth Model. Prioritizing sustainability in municipal practices is the primary focus of the transparency practice initiated by the citizens’ blog – to potentially expose candidates whose funders are assumed to ignore sustainability (such as real estate development companies). Appendix B also contains the “What are the rules?” section of the citizen’s blog which shows the connections between the blog and the Act. This text identifies the temporal amendment the citizens’ blog makes to the Act and the connections that amendment has with moral values and informing citizens who are exercising their right to vote.

**Description of Appendix C: Sections 147.4(1) and (3) - Local Authorities Election Act, 2000 pp 90-91**
Appendix C is contextual material. It contains the section of provincial legislation that the citizens’ blog amends in order to implement transparency practice prior to the election. It also shows the basis for the disclosure form criteria, that is, the formal establishment of what is relevant.

**Description of Appendix D: Candidate disclosures**
Appendix D lists the alias of each candidate, their status after the election (elected or not), the amounts of funding they each disclose to the municipal website and the citizens’ blog, clips of text that reflect the candidates’ compliance and/or resistance to the citizens blog’s
implementation of the Act and clips of text posted to the blog as disclosures of campaign funding amounts and sources. I included the value of “Compliance-Resistance” column because of the blog’s emphasis on inferring that compliance is an indicator of transparency. This emphasis is demonstrated through text written by the blog author and the use of an asterisk to identify candidates the blog author determined “were either resistant or non responsive to calls for election disclosure” (CB 2010 p. 1) and the use of the asterisk is also recorded in this table.

**Description of Appendix E: Election and disclosure statistics**

Appendix E contains numerical descriptions that illustrate some characteristics of the unique profile of this election (just as any election has a particular profile) as well as the citizens’ blog’s success in engaging candidates. In terms of the election characteristics, thirty candidates for eight positions could suggest that there is a lot of interest in how this municipality is politically managed. The small percentage of women is in alignment with Canada’s overall lack of women-identified politicians and frustrating to observe. In terms of the blog’s success in engaging candidates, it is notable that the number of candidates who participate in the blog is almost the same as the number who, in compliance with the Act, participate in the municipal transparency practice. Twenty-eight candidates are accounted for as disclosing on the municipal website and eight of them are required by the Act to disclose details about campaign funding amounts and sources; the remainder are self-funded. Twenty-six candidates participated in the Citizens’ blog and 9 of them disclose details above and beyond what is required by the Act which is a notable outcome of the citizens’ blog’s implementation of transparency. Ten candidates made supportive statements about the blog and/or use the blog as a means to communicate to volunteers and/or voters and this statistic is included because of the blog’s emphasis on compliance as an indicator of transparency.
Description of Appendix F: Text of "What candidates are saying about this site"

Appendix F contains the text of a section of the blog called “What Candidates are Saying About This Site.” This section shows how the blog author draws on a common marketing strategy (testimonial) to create legitimacy for the blog. Candidate aliases are included for each quote. Appendix F also showcases the apparent eagerness of some candidates to disclose to the blog. The latter is included as another demonstration of the blog’s emphasis on compliance as an indicator of transparency and to support my discussion of the performance of transparency.

***

In this chapter I started by presenting my methodology, research design and data collection/familiarization processes. Major discussions included the virtual setting of this study, considerations around anonymizing data and describing and defining the scope of my data. Then I returned briefly to the intra-active pairs (visibility-invisibility; performance-audience and trust-coercion) to explain how they work with my theoretical framework to assist with analysis. Finally, I described the relevance of the five tables of data included at the end of this document in Appendices B to F. The overall goal of this research design is to develop an interdisciplinary and post-structural approach to exploring policy in technologically mediated environments. Toward this goal I combine the mangle of practice with case study method and apply the idea of intra-activity to conduct research that resists dualities such as theory and empirical object and researcher and subject. I resist these dualities by including myself and my bias in the research process and surfacing the iterative and co-productive relationship between the concepts of technology and policy rather than compartmentalizing them. In the next Chapter I present the outcome of this research design – an exploration of technological mediation and two transparency practices from an interdisciplinary and post-structural perspective.
Chapter 5: Discussion

In this chapter I use my theoretical framework to intra-actively mangle technological mediation and two transparency practices (citizens’ blog and municipal website). I begin with hindsight created using contextual information generated months after the citizens’ blog and municipal website were implemented. This information (primarily articles by local media) exposes dissonance in the ad hoc transparency practice in this particular study. I then juxtapose the two linked but distinct transparency practices of the blog and the website to expand on how dissonance is facilitated in a technologically mediated practice environment. At play here are also the characteristics of social media technologies working with public management reforms to shift definitions of what is private and public. Analysis of the two juxtaposed transparency practices using the intra-active pairs assists in identifying assumptions such as the notion that information disclosed through transparency practice is contextually relevant. I then argue that in this case, technologically mediated transparency practice is a performance of trustworthy disclosure that rests on the assumption that what is disclosed is relevant to preventing or stopping corruption.

What is Visible in Hindsight?

In the fall of 2010, the citizens’ blog was created in hopes of preventing the election of a municipal council that would favour development. Two years later, in the fall of 2012, I followed up on the web to find out what the council elected in 2010 had decided in terms of development. I call the outcome of gathering this information hindsight and present it here to disclose dissonance and discuss how the time collapsing characteristics of ICTs functions with transparency practice. Additionally, this contextual information grounds this research in the material consequences unfolding at the scale of human lives in the municipality where the citizens created the blog.
To collect the contextual information that I am presenting as hindsight I drew on information available on the municipality’s website, local media and subsequent forays onto the internet to follow particular threads of a discussion. The first thread begins in 1998 when the municipality in focus for this study committed to a Sustainable Growth Model that included a population cap; a commitment to living within the limits of the local water source; maintaining a small-town atmosphere; and an explicit overall commitment to sustainability (SGM 1998). In 2010, the uncertain future of the growth model and accompanying concerns are offered by the creator(s) of the citizens’ blog as a primary motivation for creating the blog and demanding transparency:

Members of the group have recently been concerned about the dismantling of the Sustainable [town name] Growth Model, whereby population and industrial growth (and profit) would take priority over environmental and social sustainability. Recent full-page ads in the [city name] Sun and in the [local media name] pressuring elected officials and the public in [town name] to make decisions that would financially benefit a private corporation, also raise significant questions about long-term planning in the [town name] area and the water supply issue. As wealth and power of special interest groups can be used to influence elections and municipal decision making, in the name of transparency, we are asking candidates for both Mayor and Town Council to “show us the money!” We believe that all candidates in the upcoming municipal election should publicly disclose all campaign donations and funds given to them since the last election. This should be done in the interests of transparency and to help voters make more informed choices on election day. (CB 2010 p.7)

The above blog text was posted in 2010 and collected for this research in the spring of 2012. In September 2012, I returned to the web setting of the data and explored the current activities of the municipal council with regards to the population cap; limiting growth within the limits of the local water source; maintaining a small-town atmosphere; and having an overall commitment to sustainability. Reported in the local media was a recent story about how the council voted 5-2 in favour of removing the population cap and annexing land for development (Gandia 2012; Patterson 2012). All the candidates who voted in favour of this change
participated in the citizen’s blog (most voluntarily and some by proxy\textsuperscript{10}) and disclosed their campaign donations prior to the election (CB 2010 pp. 1-3). One of the candidates who voted in favour of annexation in 2012 (Patterson 2012) is candidate U, who disclosed to the blog in 2010 that he received a donation from a building development company and then donated the same amount to the local foodbank in the name of the building development company (CB 2010 p. 2). This candidate was also quoted on the citizens’ blog as writing, “posting all contributions publicly on the [blog] at this time goes a long way in negating perceived biases and promotes election transparency” (CB 2010 p. 4).

By sharing this information as hindsight and quoting candidate U, I am not suggesting he intended to mislead voters. The complicated details surrounding council members’ decisions to vote for or against annexation are nuanced, contextual and cannot be summarized by assuming annexation is all good or all bad.\textsuperscript{11} The reason I disclose this as part of the contextual information for this research is point to the dissonance between commonly held ideals about transparency practice and how it actually functions. At a superficial level, based on his posts to the citizen blog, it might appear that candidate U acted as if he was in agreement with the citizens’ blog’s anti-development cause and then later contradicted himself. However, an interview with candidate B (elected in the 2010 election) who also voted for annexation in 2012

\textsuperscript{10} In some cases, candidates’ names are listed on the citizens’ blog with links to their respective websites. On these websites candidates were apparently disclosing funding sources and amounts. But, by the time I collected my data, these sites were no longer available on the internet. Correspondence from most of these candidates is never posted to the blog so I consider them as participants “by proxy.”

\textsuperscript{11} For example, in 2008 Mike Holmes – host of HGTV’s Holmes on Homes – submitted a proposal to build a sustainable community in this municipality that would house 1,500 people in 458 homes (Procenko 2008; Campbell 2012). Concerns about limited water supply and rural population density prompted an appeal from the municipality’s principal town to prevent the development, eventually leading to mediation with the developer and the municipal district (Bascombe 2012; Patterson 2012). In 2011, mediation failed and in January of 2012 the province ruled against the town’s appeal to stop the development (Bascombe 2012; Campbell 2012). In the fall of 2012 one of the councilors voting in favour of annexation (candidate B in this study) reflected on the failed appeal and is quoted as stating, “the province will not stand in the way of developments. ... The only way to manage the future growth of our community is by bringing those lands within our jurisdiction” (The Eagle, 2012). As such, annexation is rationalized as a potential tool for sustainable development.
suggests annexation may actually prevent exponential development in this municipality. So, transparency practice based on quantitative information (campaign funding sources) was not really capable of revealing the complicated pressures acting on these candidates.

In this case, the assumption that quantitative information exposed through transparency practice is relevant contributes to dissonance in transparency practice. When the blog author writes that revealing campaign funding sources prior to the election will help citizens make the right decision when it is time to vote (CB 2010 p.7), he is operationalizing that assumption. The blog author’s operationalization of this assumption builds on the Act that requires all elected candidates to disclose information about campaign funding amounts and sources. Provincial legislation requires disclosure to ensure that election candidates are not being unfairly influenced by private interests. The relevance of quantitative information is embedded in government policy influenced by public management reforms that have adopted outcome-centred private sector values. Data in this study and others (e.g., Oakes and Young 2008) suggest that quantitative information does not expose relevant information about what is influencing an individual’s decisions. What is critical to understand is that the tracking and auditing of quantitative information is a scrim behind which decisions are made based on relevant qualitative information that is never disclosed.

One of the ways transparency practice works is by creating a record that can be reviewed as time passes. Prior to ICTs, professional auditors (and other stakeholders) could review accounting documents and compare current transactions with past transactions to find inconsistencies. Accessibility and durability of information is amplified by ICTs which makes the practice of comparing current information with past information a lot easier. A feature of technologically mediated practice environments is the amplified capacity to publish and keep
available information (specifically, on the internet) and then as time passes, compare it to current information. This amplified temporal mechanism of transparency practice intersects with the citizens’ blog and the abundance of information available on the internet to allow any stakeholder, including me, hindsight. For some, hindsight may superficially suggest that candidate U was not sincere and that points to how assumptions about the relevance of quantitative information disclosed through transparency practice in a technologically mediated environment may lead to misunderstandings. What is made visible in hindsight provides insight into the inadequacy of outcome-centred practice and the dissonance between ideals and implementation of transparency practice. One of the inadequacies of outcome-centred practice is the disconnection between being transparency and being accountable.

**Two Transparency Practices and One Act: Linked but Distinct**

The municipal website and the citizens’ blog are linked but distinct transparency practices implemented with ICTs. At first blush, the municipal website and citizen’s blog seem like very different practices facilitated with totally different web technologies. Yet from some perspectives, the only major difference between the municipal website version of transparency and the citizens’ blog version is the shift of the deadline for funding disclosure from post-election to pre-election. The citizens’ blog and website are connected to the same election, involve the same candidates and voters, and draw on the same Act. However, the citizens’ blog disclosures tend to be informal narratives that include personal as well as financial disclosures which is even more interesting in the face of the formalized and quantitative municipal disclosures. Moreover, exploring how, at times, these two transparency practices expose significantly different “truths” or disclosures from the same sources sheds light on the mechanisms and assumptions working in transparency practice. Interesting, too are the interactions between transparency practice mechanisms and the characteristics of the technology
(blog or website) used for implementation. As I thought through my data more deliberately, the points of contrast and comparison between these two data sets became one of the most significant insights of my analysis and I explore them in detail with the intra-active pairs.

Using the intra-active pairs to structure my analysis I juxtapose these linked but distinct practices and show how these two practices share a number of elements that in each practice entwine differently and, through those differences, shed light on what is common between them. Moreover, the explicit enactment of assumptions and expectations about transparency on the citizens’ blog became an asset in understanding how these assumptions and expectations more subtly play out in a formal implementation of transparency on the municipal website. For a researcher, it is rare for data to provide an opportunity to explore two practices of transparency implemented with technological mediation using the same Act – one ad hoc and one formal. To begin the process of juxtaposition, the list below describes significant similarities and differences between the two practices.

**Similarities**

- The *Local Authorities Election Act* (2000) is referenced as the provincial policy behind the process for implementing transparency practice.
- Both practices were implemented during the same municipal election in 2010.
- Both practices include the same election candidates submitting information to someone who then publishes that information on the internet (as either a PDF on the municipal website or a post on the citizens’ blog).
- Candidates participate in each practice by generating information to fulfill quantitative disclosure criteria in addition to the names of funding sources.
**Differences**

- In addition to the *Act*, the blog draws on explicit public shaming to encourage compliance.

- The *Act* does not require those who consider themselves to be *self-funded* with less than $10,000 to disclose campaign contribution details; however, many self-funded candidates disclose information to the blog.

- Along with funding sources and amounts which are required by the *Act*, the blog also measures candidates’ disclosures qualitatively, for example, by assigning value to each candidate’s willingness to participate and the municipal website does not.

- PDF disclosure forms on the municipal website are filled in by hand and this is the only non-typed text in all the data.

- PDF disclosure forms on the municipal appear to be scanned *as is* whereas candidate emails to the blog author may have been edited prior to being posted on the citizens’ blog.

- Candidates disclose campaign funding information to the citizens’ blog by sending an email to an email address provided on the blog. Then, the blog author cuts and pastes the email (or a portion of the email) into the blog as a post. The contents of the emails shared on the blog include an array of text communication along with funding amounts. These narrative disclosures contrast significantly with the formal, static and quantitative nature of the disclosure form PDFs uploaded to the municipality’s website. Each candidate communication is heterogeneous while disclosures to the municipal website are standardized by the disclosure form.

- The heterogeneity of the candidate blog posts include supportive comments about the blog and the practice of transparency, concerns about election spending, explanations
about being self-funded or funded by family members, expressions of gratitude for
funding or donations of services and in one case, a declaration of the receipt of funding
from an unwanted donor and the subsequent donation of those monies to a local food
bank.

Exploring these two practices of transparency assists with specific understandings of how
dissonance between ideals about transparency practices and how it functions, work. Whereas the
municipal website contains links to a finished product (completed campaign funding disclosure
forms), the citizens’ blog presents an interactive process between candidates and the blog author
that reveals ideals at work in the processes of transparency practice. For example, on the
citizens’ blog, the blog author explicitly rates candidates’ by their speed and perceived
willingness to disclose and those who appear to be unwilling are discussed by name and
identified with an asterisk¹² (CB 2010 pp. 1-3). By identifying slowness to respond to the blog as
a sign of a candidate’s unwillingness to participate in transparency practice, the blog author
seems to be providing information about each of these four candidates’ conscience. The blog
author’s act fulfills commonly held ideals about transparency practice’s ability to expose
qualitative truths such as the nature of a candidate’s conscience. The blog author’s rating of
candidates’ willingness to disclose also suggests that quantitative disclosures alone are not
satisfactory. Quantitative disclosures are not satisfactory to the blog author because there is not
necessarily a direct link between quantitative disclosures and accountability. Yet, it is
predominantly quantitative disclosures alone that are required by provincial legislation and
presented on the municipal website.

¹² 4 candidates receive an asterisk and they are noted in Appendix D in the “Compliance-Resistance” column. In
Appendix G, the use of the asterisk in the blog text is displayed similar to how it would be viewed on the web.
Technical mediation facilitates the blog author’s implementation of provincial legislation and transparency as much as it assists the municipal staff with their fulfillment of the same regulations. The blog author receives emails from candidates and then extracts from those emails what he considers relevant information which includes quantitative information about campaign funding and qualitative information such as positive comments about the blog and transparency practice. What is ironic is that the blog author’s process is not transparent. For example, as a reader of the blog it is impossible to know if the blog author publishes everything that candidates write or is selecting positive quotes from emails sent by candidates he favours. The municipality’s process appears to be more transparent. Candidates’ disclosure forms appear to be scanned as is and uploaded to the municipal website. The majority of them are filled out by hand and on some forms there are numbers scratched out and calculations re-written beside them which appear raw and unedited when compared to the selected candidate quotes posted on the citizens’ blog. By editing emails and posting selected quotes to the blog, the blog author utilizes multiple forms of ICTs to present his ad hoc and subjective interpretation of transparency practice. By scanning the mostly hand-written disclosure forms and posting them as PDFs on the municipal website, municipal staff presents a formal and objective interpretation of transparency practice. In each practice ICTs enhance the implementation of transparency but do not facilitate or prevent transparency, people do that.

Next, by focusing on the similarities and differences of the two linked but distinct practices (citizens’ blog and municipal website) of transparency through the structure created with the three intra-active pairs: invisibility-visibility; performance-audience and trust-coercion more insights into dissonance in normative transparency practice are surfaced. This process leads to further considerations about what is relevant information, the shifting of private sector values
into public sector practices and the influential threat of corruption and how it shares the landscape of private and public domains with transparency.

**Thinking Data Through Intra-active Pairs**

The intra-active pairs structure the presentation of my analysis. They have influenced how I think my data and “produce an understanding of the reality that we share” while I attempt to stay grounded in the material consequences of the knowledge I create with this research (Hekman 2010 p. 93). The three intra-active pairs interact but by temporarily treating them as discrete I am able to explore this mangle of two linked but distinct transparency practices. Recall that although these intra-active pairs may each suggest a binary, I do not engage them as polarities. Instead, I consider them intra-active in the sense that the poles do not exist prior to the phenomenon emerging in the field between them.

**Visibility-invisibility**

What is made visible through transparency practice is not always relevant or accurate. On the municipal website there are eight municipal disclosure statements available as downloadable PDFs (for an example, see Appendix A). The eight municipal disclosures are primarily quantitative reports in which elected candidates have listed the donations they received in cash (or in kind) and, for all donations over $100, listed the names of each donor. When corroborating the municipal disclosure statements with the disclosures on the blog it is possible to see how what is exposed – made visible – by the requirements of the disclosure form, may or may not reveal relevant information about a candidate’s campaign funding. It is also possible to see how despite its mandate, the blog sometimes fails to provide a forum for disclosure of relevant information. The best example of how the blog fails to provide for the disclosure of relevant information can be gleaned by comparing the municipal disclosures and blog disclosures provided by candidates V and U. Both of these candidates receive donations from local
development companies and both of them find a way to avoid using the donations, but unless disclosures from both the municipal website and the citizens’ blog are reviewed, it is impossible to discover this information.

On the citizens’ blog, an asterisk identifies candidates who, in the experience of the blog author, “were either resistant or non responsive to calls for election disclosure” (CB 2010 p. 1). Candidate V has an asterisk next to her name because she is reported as “refusing to disclose” and, according to the blog author, only discloses after “negative comments started coming in to the website” (CB 2010 p. 3). 13 Although candidate V’s “refusal” is eventually explained in her ongoing communications posted to the blog, the asterisk stays next to her name. In fact, it can be seen on the blog’s final disclosure report which is the first text visible to anyone reviewing the blog (CB 2010 p. 1). So, in viewing what is visible about candidate V on the citizens’ blog, a voter could not be blamed for considering that candidate V may not be trustworthy.

To justify her non-disclosure to the audience of the citizens’ blog, candidate V writes that she employed a third party to handle all her donations because she “did not want to know any information” (CB 2010 p. 6). 14 In addition to her explanation, she does disclose the amounts of donations from “personal friends” (see Appendix D) but she does not mention receiving a donation from a development company and, as far as the blog is concerned, does not indicate she is aware of it prior to the election (CB 2010 p. 6). She writes to the blog that when she reviews her donations after the election she will disclose the details and she does – in her municipal disclosure statement. And, in spite of the implications of the asterisk next to her name on the citizens’ blog, candidate V’s municipal disclosure statement shows she received and returned a

---

13 No such comments are visible anywhere on the blog as I found it in 2012.
14 Candidate V does not explain her strategy to the blog so it is impossible to know for sure why she did not want to know who her donors were until after the election. What is interesting to me how this strategy enacts a sort of anti-transparency.
$500 donation from a development company (MEI 2010 Candidate V). Yet, the only way to know that candidate V rejected campaign funding from a developer is to review the disclosure forms on the municipal website; this information is invisible on the blog. And, what is made visible on the blog is that candidate V was reluctant (or slow) to disclose and therefore may not share the blog’s concerns about unsustainable development.

The situation for candidate U is the opposite of candidate V’s experience. His municipal disclosure statement identifies a donation of $1,000 from a development company (a different company than the one who donated to candidate V) and there is no indication that he did anything other than spend it (MEI 2010 Candidate U). However, on the citizens’ blog, candidate U discloses that while he accepted this $1,000 donation, he in turn donated it to a local food bank (CB 2010 p. 2). So, the only way to know that candidate U rejected campaign funding from a developer is to review the citizens’ blog. Witnessing the disclosures of candidates V and U on the citizens’ blog and municipal website reveals how contradictory information is disclosed about the same candidates running in the same election and casts doubt on the relevance (and accuracy) of information made visible in these two transparency practices.

Candidate V has to amend the municipal disclosure form to ensure the visibility of the source of her returned donation. Beyond offering a blank to fill in the dollar amount of donations “returned,” on the municipal disclosure form (see Appendix A)
the form does not specifically ask candidates to disclose the source of returned donations. Candidate V overcomes this limitation of quantitative criteria by creating a table in her municipal disclosure form with a column value of “returned” and then lists her $500 development company donation in that column (see Figure 2). This an example of how disclosure mediums potentially shape disclosure content by not asking for certain information or even the creation of specific disclosure content in order to fulfill specific criteria. Candidate U could have also found a way to include his donated campaign donation to his municipal disclosure form, but he did not. Perhaps this is because the information that he donated the development company’s campaign contribution to a foodbank was already visible on the blog where it had served the purpose of casting a favourable light on his campaign.

In this example of Candidate U and V’s disclosures, transparency practice is as much or more about how and what information becomes visible or invisible as it is about the presented information itself. Along with politics, social media plays a role in how visibility and invisibility are manifested. Social media technology interfaces create visibility or invisibility by potentially creating barriers to accessing the information. For example, people who have not learned to use, or have access to, the internet would not have access to the campaign funding disclosures on the municipal website. Another way technology creates barriers is through structure, as for example, by how much text fits on the first page of a blog where is most likely to be read by an internet user. Yet another characteristic of social media that impacts visibility and invisibility is the abundance of information made available and the dissonance between the accessibility and abundance and actual relevance of information:

[t]he Internet provides information about virtually everything thus creating the most perfect illusion of transparency. However, net users do not see companies or parties through their screens. They get but texts, pictures,
graphs, and they do not know immediately whether they correspond to reality or in which way (Menéndez-Viso 2009 p. 159).

Thus, the complexity of politics and social media technologies are entwined in transparency practice that is generating visibility and invisibility.

Social media technologies amplify the mechanisms in transparency practices that conceal while revealing (Strathern 2000 p. 310). One specific concealing-while-revealing transparency practice that entwines with social media technology in this case study is the municipal disclosure form. The municipal disclosure form (see Appendix A for a sample) asks for specific information such as the names of donation sources when the donation exceeds $100 or the total amount of returned contributions but the form does not ask for the names of donors whose donations are returned. Nor does the form ask for information about candidates’ political agendas. The ready accessibility of these forms on the web promotes a sense of abundant and legitimate information (Menéndez-Viso 2009 p. 159; Drechsler 2005 p. 7) yet the forms themselves do not necessarily yield relevant information.

Although there are no forms used on it, the citizens’ blog also privileges certain information. An example of information that is made visible is candidates’ resistance or non-response to requests for pre-election transparency and this is achieved, as mentioned earlier, by placing an asterisk next to their name (see Appendix G). The structure of the citizens’ blog also contributes to this visibility because the list of candidates’ names, with asterisks, is visible on the first, most recent page of the blog – what anyone visiting the blog sees first. In transparency practice, visibility and invisibility intra-act through mechanisms, sometimes technologically mediated, that select, format and structure information. In terms of exposing wrong doing, sometimes information made visible through transparency practice is not actually relevant (while relevant information remains invisible) and this creates dissonance between commonly held
ideals of transparency practice and how it actually functions. In the next section I will focus on how the selection, formatting and structure of information in technologically mediated practice environments creates an illusion of relevance that invites specific behaviour that is symbiotic with these mechanisms.

Performance-audience

The expectations of an audience invite a certain performance based on mutually agreed upon contextual cues. In virtual spaces, social media technologies make it possible for anyone who has access to the internet to communicate with anyone else who has access, instantly. The citizens’ blog’s influence is propped on an assumption of an unlimited audience of readers and the expectation of candidates performing transparency practice for those readers. The belief in an unlimited audience is demonstrated by the blog author’s posts and the posts submitted by email from the candidates that identify readers of the citizens’ blog as “we,” “you,” “candidates” and “voters.” For example, the citizens’ blog author addresses election candidates as “you” when he writes: “we have received NO RESPONSE from either of the mayoralty [sic] candidates. We kindly ask that you prepare a breakdown of your campaign contributions ... and email them to us” (CB 2010 p. 5). The blog author also identifies other audience members/readers of the blog when stating that as a result of the blog, “voters are now more informed about the electoral process and how campaign funding may affect outcome” (CB 2010 p. 3). When the candidates themselves write emails to be posted on the blog they also identify audience members/readers as “voters” and “candidates.” For example, candidate V opens her posts with “dear Voters and Candidates” and then writes:
Should anyone have questions about my campaign or the issues concerning [town name], I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you to all that have contributed financially along with those who are working so hard on my campaign (CB 2010 p. 6).

As time passes and more posts are added to the blog it becomes a virtual message board for candidates and voters. Additional examples of identifying audience members/readers have been collected from the citizens’ blog text and are shown in Table 1 below. Assuming the anyone can be part of the audience is consistent with the social media technology idea that everyone is connected through the internet. If the audience could include everyone, then the performance needs to be congruent with the expectations of the potential members in the audience. The dyad between the performance and the presumed audience structures the practice of transparency.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who Writes the Statement</th>
<th>the Statement</th>
<th>Audience Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>candidate G</td>
<td>“I am happy to learn that you’re raising this issue” (CB 2010 p. 4)</td>
<td>blog author</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blog author</td>
<td>“our promise to you: we can all now watch as well, how decisions are made by successful candidates later, and knowing full well who funded their campaigns” (CB 2010 p. 3)</td>
<td>voters, candidates, citizens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candidate U</td>
<td>To whom it may concern, I have received a $100.00 donation from &lt;donor name&gt; on Oct 12/10. Thank you very much, &lt;donor name&gt;! This brings my total contributions to a total of $725.00.</td>
<td>a specific donor, (but obviously aware of blog author and voters as potential audience)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is a post on the citizens’ blog entitled “What candidates are saying about this site” (CB 2010 p. 4) that exemplifies how selection, structuring and formatting of information create a performance-audience intra-action of transparency practice. The text from this section of the blog is contained in Appendix F and it includes comments such as: “I like your website and think
this a great idea. All politicians should be transparent” and, “it is very important to me to be as far removed from any potential conflicts of interest as possible” (CB 2010 p. 4). To create this list of quotes, the citizens’ blog author probably selected statements from the disclosure emails sent by candidates to the blog. The tone of the post is a commonplace marketing technique of presenting customer testimonies to promote a product. Testimonies are complimentary and provide evidence for the product and that tone dictates which information the blog author selects and formats and in turn these quotes contribute to the overall tone of the blog. In his article on the impacts of public sector adoption of private sector values, Shamsul Haque (2000) argues that economic- and outcome-centred accountability practices shape citizens into customers. The blog, which is the medium for disclosing financial information, benefits from this collection of comments which simultaneously validate the blog’s purpose, showcase candidates’ commitment to transparency and possibly create peer pressure to candidates who may not have disclosed. The collection of transparency-positive comments assist in framing the information disclosed (financial and otherwise) to the blog in a discourse that suggests legitimacy, honesty and by association, relevance. This list also constitutes a particular audience that will respond to a consumer discourse.

It is impossible to know if a product of transparency practice even existed in an invisible state prior to being made visible to an audience such as an auditor or the general public. In his discussion of how the ideal of transparency “works back on those subject to it” Roberts (2009 p. 958, 966) demonstrates how desire to fulfill ideals leads to the prioritizing of performance over any actual exchange of useful information. For example, were candidates inspired by potential public exposure to declare their commitment to election transparency to the blog author or did they express that sentiment prior to composing an email? A potential audience of everyone
combined with the assumption that visible, accessible information is relevant information inspire the provision of information. If that information is provided primarily to fulfill transparency practice mechanisms it is difficult to draw a line between performance and disclosure. This leads me to argue that sometimes transparency practice is a performance of disclosure, not a process that exposes relevant, pre-existing information.

Juxtaposing the previously discussed example of performance-audience intra-activity in the citizens’ blog with the municipal website makes it possible to see how performance and audience intra-act in the more formal implementation of transparency. On the municipal website there is a list of candidates who “have advised the Returning Officer that they ran an entirely self-funded campaign less than or equal to $10,000” (MEI 2010). On the citizens’ blog, the publishing and relevance of the candidates’ quotes is constructed with help from the blog author and marketing strategies, respectively. On the municipal website, the visibility of which candidates self-funded their campaigns with less than $10,000 is made relevant by a combination of provincial legislation and being presented on a state run website. Provincial legislation is developed by a democratic process that ideally represents the best interest of the public so the list of self-funded candidates is provided by municipal staff because it has been determined by democratic process and the rule of law to be relevant. Unlike the citizens’ blog, the municipal website does not need engage marketing discourses to enhance its legitimacy. Yet, similar to the “What candidates are saying about this site” blog post, the disclosure on the municipal website of a list of candidates who are self funded is sometimes a performance of relevant disclosure.

A performance of the information contained in the list of self-funded candidates on the municipal website is spot lit when cross-checking their names with disclosures on the citizens’ blog. On both the municipal website and the citizens’ blog 20 candidates report being self-
funded however, on the citizens’ blog, several of these candidates make visible additional information about how they are funded. For example, candidate X reports being “financed completely by my fiancé and I” (CB 2010 p.13); Candidate F reports she is “entirely funded by my husband” (CB 2010 p.13); and candidate N explains that in addition to being self-funded, “friends, family and supporters are contributing by handing out pamphlets” (CB 2010 candidate p. 13).15

These disclosures expose how the legislated performance of being “self-funded” is interpreted and performed by candidates to include spousal financial support and volunteers contributing time. While the latter is not that concerning, the first example could be because, depending on who a candidate’s spouse is, there is the possibility of conflict of interest. It is this potential for conflict of interest that leads me to question the information contained in the list of “self-funded” candidates. The intra-activity of performance and audience is more subtle in this example than in the citizens’ blog but it is present. By asking who is self-funded under $10,000 the legislated disclosure form elicits selected information from candidates seeking to fulfill the legal requirements of running in an election. Fulfilling these requirements is a mostly quantitative performance of disclosure facilitated by compliance with election regulations, the municipal staff and the disclosure form’s structure.

In both the citizens’ blog and the municipal website information is selected, formatted and structured to resonate with common discourses and legislation and fill expectations. The citizens’ blog list of “What candidates are saying...” fulfils the created audience’s expectation to believe the blog is desired by candidates who are committed to transparency. Not only are these testimonials presented as relevant, they enhance the overall relevance of the financial disclosures on the blog. Comparatively, the municipal website’s list of self-funded candidates fulfills the

---

15 These quotes are also presented in Appendix D.
Act’s requirements which discursively signal that voters’ best interests are being met. Relevance of the information being disclosed has built-in assumptions of the audience’s expectations for legitimacy and conforming to regulations. Although it is impossible to perceive what information exists prior to being made visible through transparency practice, what is perceivable as a product of transparency practice are two of its intra-active constituents: the performance and the audience.

The selecting, formatting and structuring of information that comprises transparency practice both invites performance and creates relevance by fulfilling assumed expectations of an audience. Moreover, the idea of relevance includes the notion that through transparency practices, an audience may receive information that if necessary, will assist with initiating an existing process for stopping or preventing illegal activity. In the next section I focus on how the assumption of relevance and performance-audience intra-activity are activated by the implicit omnipresence of corruption.

**Trust-coercion**

The third intra-active pair is trust-coercion and it opens a field to think data from the perspective of morality. Given the complexity of implementing a provincial Act, and setting up a blog, I think it is exceptional that a group of citizens successfully engage almost 30 election candidates in an ad hoc transparency practice using a blog. The intra-actions between visibility-invisibility and performance-audience that manifest discursively on the citizens’ blog cannot alone be responsible for candidates’ compliance with the citizens’ blog’s request for disclosure. It is the third intra-active pair (trust-coercion) that reveals the stakes and makes non-compliance too risky for election candidates. Implicit in transparency practice is the threat, or even the existence, of corruption – either being a perpetrator, victim or witness. The citizens’ blog successfully engages candidates because it leverages the implicit threat of corruption and pairs it
with social media’s potential audience of everyone. With a potential audience of everyone, there are too many potential witnesses to suspect wrongdoing so candidates are coerced into participating lest their non-participation be interpreted as a sign of corruption.

From the inception of the citizens’ blog, the blog author leverages a threat of candidates potentially being associated with corrupt practices, to encourage candidate compliance with the blog’s request. This threat is in the text written by the blog author to describe the purpose of the blog:

Our members are concerned citizens asking for accountability and transparency from those who wish to be put in charge of the “public purse” by serving as our elected representatives (CB 2010 p. 4)

While most candidates eagerly revealed their donations as soon as we contacted them, others delayed for days...some are still delaying. We urge you to read through the website to see who responded quickly and who did not. We’ll leave it up to the public to ask “why?” Most importantly, we hope this website will help you decide who gets your vote on October 18 (CB 2010 p. 4)

The blog author writes that citizens of the municipality are keen to elect a council that prioritizes sustainability and infers that candidates who do not share that agenda may hide their pro-development agenda in order to get elected. It is also notable how the blog author implies blog audience members should be suspicious of candidates who have responded slowly to the blog’s request for disclosure.

One of the characteristics of social media technologies that intersect with trust-coercion and amplify its influence is the combination of local geography with virtual space. In his discussion of the “political power of social media” Clay Shirky (2011 pp. 1, 3) suggests taking an environmental view of social media technologies that recognize “the value of tools for local coordination.” Other researchers (Hampton, 2010 p. 1128 and Karatzogianni 2006 p. 196) have also noted how the combination of real-time local community with virtual social media
community yields consistent results when used for social change. In the case of the citizens’
blog, the combination of local and virtual communities enhances both the possibility of being
shamed for refusing to disclose and the importance of being trusted. With a population of around
25,000 (MFF 2012 p. 1), candidates may be well-known and would likely fear being called out
in the media or in person. This fear adds to the coercive power of the blog and the value of being
perceived as trustworthy.

What remain unspoken in the citizens’ blog are elements of a larger discourse whereby
municipal council members who support development potentially receive personal gain by
approving development projects. Emerging in the heat of the election campaign, the citizens’
blog leverages the possibility for a candidate to be associated with potentially corrupt practices at
a crucial time; a phenomenon that has tanked many a political career at the last minute. Thus, the
citizens’ blog coerces candidates while simultaneously providing a social media forum through
which candidates can publicly demonstrate trustworthiness. Social media co-constitutes a
demonstration of trustworthiness with legitimacy through accessibility and abundance.

Candidates are eager to be considered trustworthy. Several candidates share information
on the blog that is above and beyond what is required by legislation. For example, as shown in
Appendix C, candidate X explains to the blog that he has taken a leave from his position with the
government in order to campaign and that if he is elected he will quit his job (CB 2010 p. 13)
and candidate G submits a long discussion that includes a disclosure about shopping locally for
lawn signs and opinions about the large number of candidates running in this particular election
(CP 2010 p. 13).\footnote{This text is also presented in Appendix D.} I have already mentioned how two candidates disclose being funded by their
intimate partners and how candidate U discloses to the blog that he has donated money received
from a developer to a local foodbank. By equating prompt disclosure with trustworthiness, the
citizens’ blog draws comments, if not disclosure of some kind, from almost all the candidates that are not required to disclose details on the municipal website. The citizens’ blog transparency practice co-constitutes coercion and trustworthiness intra-actively and the same phenomenon is also present on the municipal website.

As a condition of being elected in a municipal election, candidates must comply with the Act and submit campaign funding information to the municipality after the election. In his research on accountability practices in American non-profits, Ebrihim (2009 p. 888) identifies this model of accountability as “coercive and punitive” because it relies on “legislative, regulatory, and judicial authority enforced through disclosure requirements and protections and supported by self-regulation.” Given the disclosure requirements candidates participate in as part of transparency practice on the municipal website, the “coercive and punitive” description can be applied to the municipal transparency practice. Using social media technologies, the blog author establishes that compliance with the request for disclosure indicates trustworthiness and on the municipal website, legislation dictates that compliance with the request for disclosure indicates trustworthiness.

As Strathern (2000 p. 314) notes, “the language of accountability takes over the language of trust” and along with trust, relevance is also subsumed. Being considered trustworthy and complying with legislation is a priority for candidates so they do their best to fulfill the requests for disclosure from the citizens’ blog author and the municipality’s campaign funding disclosure Form 21. Form 21 (see Appendix A) requires quantitative information that has been identified through policy process to be valuable for ensuring candidates do not have a conflict of interest. Yet, I question the relevance of some of the information collected on this form. For example, not one candidate in the 2010 election filled out the blank next to “received from fund-raising
functions.” My point is that through compliance with transparency legislation, trust is intraactively created with coercion even though the criteria for disclosure is not necessarily relevant.

Roberts (2009 p. 957, 963) shows disclosure criteria as a process through which local knowledge is decontextualized and translated for “distant others.” This presence of distant others -- those who are not adequately aware of local complexities but expect recognizable reports -- reminds me of the social media audience of everyone. Like distant others, the audience of everyone does not access information that would facilitate understanding the nuanced issues faced by municipal councillors. Municipal councillors seek to gain the approval of the audience of everyone so they perform transparency by meeting criteria and expectations through actions such as donating funding from a development company to a food bank, meanwhile the nuanced issues goes unexpressed.

Transparency practice is promoted, legislated and implemented because of the assumption that without it, corruption will dominate. The lurking presence of corruption fuels compliance with transparency mechanisms but compliance does not necessarily prevent or reveal corruption. A popular definition of corruption is the use of one’s public position, office or entrusted power for illegitimate private gain (Escaleras, Lin & Register 2010, p. 436; Fisman & Miguel 2007 p. 1021; Kaufmann & Vicente 2011 p. 195; Neumann & Graeff, 2009 p. 852; Zhang, Cao & Vaughan 2009 p. 205). Corruption shares a common interest with transparency practice in how information flows between the private and public. According to Jeff Everett, Dean Neu and Abu Shiraz Rahaman (2006 p. 9) the “moral distinction [of what is corrupt] hinges upon the definition of what is private and what is public.” In their case study of public management reform in Nicaragua, Ed Brown and Jonathan Cloke (2005 p. 625) explain that:

a fundamental trait of corruption in Nicaragua (as in all countries) is that it is itself an index of the interrelationship between government and the
Based on this description of corruption, it could be argued that transparency practice is primarily concerned with making information visible by moving it from the private to the public but as demonstrated by both the citizens’ blog and the municipal website, just because information is accessible and abundant, it is not relevant. In other words, while an individual or organization may be deemed trustworthy because of compliance with transparency practice, the information they disclose may not necessarily reveal corrupt activities. So, not only is transparency practice sometimes a performance of disclosure, is a performance of trustworthy disclosure that depends on the assumption that what is disclosed is relevant to preventing or stopping corruption.

**So What?**

In this discussion I started by presenting hindsight comprised of contextual information concerning development in the municipality where the election took place in 2010. With hindsight I showed an economic and political complexity that cannot be translated to the public with idealistic or quantitative-only transparency practices. I also touched on how the incapacity of transparency to assist with accountability motivates the blog author to implement qualitative reporting.

Then, by juxtaposing the two linked but distinct citizens’ blog and municipal website and viewing the data through the three intra-active pairs it became possible to see how in this case, transparency practice sits on assumptions about the disclosure of relevant information that are operationalized discursively through policies and practices. Faith in relevance – even partial relevance – of information disclosed through transparency practice requires buy-in from all participants. Discursive operationalization includes characteristics of technological mediation that amplify buy-in to mechanisms of transparency practice by providing an environment where
it is possible to make idealized information widely visible (and other information invisible) to a potential audience of everyone, instantly. Commonly held ideals uphold that information disclosed through transparency practices is assumed to be relevant for preventing or stopping corruption. In this case, the potential audience of everyone was leveraged by the citizens’ blog to instill fear of being publically shamed into election candidates and consequently solicit their compliance with an ad hoc implementation of legislated transparency practice that did not, in hindsight, disclose information relevant to concerns about candidates’ agendas being pro-development.

Thinking the data through the intra-active pairs I discussed how mechanisms of transparency practice and characteristics of technology intra-act and transform each other to create a practice that moves beyond the original intention of the Act. Creation of this new practice leads me to propose there is value in conceptualizing a single, autonomous phenomenon called *technologically mediated transparency practice*. Specifically identifying a practice as technologically mediated makes explicit the potentially ubiquitous and virtually influential forces of technology. It may also help policy stakeholders better anticipate unexpected outcomes of policy implementation in technologically mediated environments.
Chapter 6: Summary

This case study explored how technologically mediated transparency practice is assembled through social and technological practices within and outside an assumed scope of legislation during a municipal election. In this chapter I summarize the benefits of applying the framework I presented in Chapter 2 and of approaching the study by thinking the data within a case study method. A summary of the contributions of this thesis is provided including a review of the knowledge created by this study, the development of a lens for policy research and ethical consideration for on-line research. Then, I discuss the significance of looking at social media as a mechanism for transparency practice in a municipal election.

Theoretical Framework and Methodology

By using the mangle of practice combined with disclosure, diffraction and intra-activity I was able to analyze my data from an interdisciplinary perspective that helped me holistically explore technologically mediated transparency practice. This exploration is holistic because it spans across disciplines to integrate research on technology and policy and takes into account the material consequences of research and knowledge creation as well as keeping in mind the material consequences of the subjects of exploration – technological mediation and two transparency practices. One advantage of a holistic approach is how it assisted with identifying what is missing and in this case study, I make visible the lack of capacity transparency practice has for making visible relevant information. Finally, to explicitly enact a holistic and intra-active approach to research I position myself as part of the research process by acknowledging my bias and my co-production of the knowledge created and I offer the results as one version of truth, not the truth.

Pickering’s (2005 p. 37) idea of the mangle being a researchable entwinement of heterogeneous, co-constitutive agencies gave me the ability to talk about how technology, policy
and people work together in this case study to co-create an implementation of transparency practice (the citizens’ blog) unanticipated by the provincial Act behind it. Seeing how transparency practice and use of technology are both transformed through co-constitution gave rise to my argument about the creation of an autonomous phenomenon called technologically mediated transparency.

To eventually arrive at the idea that technologically mediated transparency is a unique phenomenon I drew on Barad’s (2003, 2007) and Hekman’s (2010) idea of intra-activity. Conceptually, intra-activity gave me a way to think and write about transparency practice without being confined to thinking about cause and effect in a linear way. This was especially helpful for thinking about transparency practice in a technologically mediated environment because I could identify the mechanisms of transparency practice and characteristics of social media and explore how they intra-acted to constitute the phenomenon of the citizens’ blog. To use the idea of intra-activity in identifying the mechanisms of transparency practice and how they work with characteristics of social media I had to develop a way to apply it to my data.

To apply intra-activity to my data I drew on Barad’s (2007 p. 71) notion of diffraction. My interpretation of diffraction guided me to approach the literature review about transparency practice (and later, the data) by “thinking the ‘social’ and the ‘scientific’ together in an illuminating way” (Barad 2003 p. 803). Barad (2007 p. 381) explains that diffraction “challenges the presumed separability of subject and object” and “marks the limits of determinacy and permanency of boundaries.” I crossed the boundary between theory and data by creating a customized structure for analysis that enacted my interpretation of intra-activity directly on the data through my literature review on transparency practice. The intra-active pairs developed in the literature review on transparency practice are my interpretation of intra-activity and they
structure my discussion through the idea that phenomena is pre-binary (Hekman 2010 p. 57). Conceptualizing transparency practice as emergently constituting visibility-invisibility, performance-audience and trust-coercion helped me tease out how dissonance was working in transparency practice.

The dissonance in transparency practice arises between how it is idealistically perceived to function and what it actually does. Hekman’s (2009) idea of disclosure gave me a tool for focussing on dissonance as one perspective of one aspect of the data (Hekman 2010 pp. 90-93). Using the intra-active pairs, I grounded my argument in the material consequences of the transparency practice in this case study and teased out how the assumption that transparency practice provides information relevant to preventing or stopping corruption contributes to dissonance. Intersecting with this dissonance is the ambiguous relationship between transparency and accountability demonstrated in this case study by the blog author’s attempt to use transparency to create accountability with qualitative reporting. Using hindsight, provided through contextual information, as part of my disclosure of transparency practice on the citizens’ blog and the municipal website assisted in making visible the material inadequacy of transparency practice. As it was implemented on the citizens’ blog and on the municipal website, transparency practice did not have the capacity to communicate the political complexity of the issues intersecting with candidates’ approach to development in the municipality. Together, the mangle, intra-activity, diffraction and disclosure shaped my exploration of the intra-actions that assemble transparency practice as a dissonant performance of trustworthiness.

Using case study method to encapsulate this research provided an excellent way to draw borders around a unique phenomenon of multiple intersecting agents. The mangle of practice and case study method are both “nontotalizing” (Ettlinger 2009 p. 1018) approaches to research and
fit snugly together. Intra-actively speaking, selecting a topic for research is also an act of
deselecting all other topics; by including I am excluding. I decided to include both the citizens’
blog and municipal website transparency practices in this study because by juxtaposing them I
could explore how the two practices share a number of elements that in each practice entwine
differently and, through those differences, shed light on what is common between them. Case
study method afforded me the flexibility to define my topic and be explicit about why I was
drawing the lines I drew. Finally, case study method is not explicitly tied to any particular theory
and it is used widely in and outside of academic research across disciplines. Since I wanted to
draw on a combination of theories and take an interdisciplinary approach I knew case study
method would meet my research needs.

Along with deconstructing transparency practice, another purpose of this case study was
to explore policy implementation in a technologically mediated environment. Using an
interdisciplinary approach combined with my theoretical framework to think my data was
beneficial to this research because it allowed me to draw on my knowledge and understanding of
technology and policy together.

Key to my methodological approach was to, in a diffractive way, include my perspectives
and bias in the mangle of practice as a co-constituent of the research I was conducting and
knowledge I was creating. The predominant result of including myself in the mangle was being
upfront about my sympathies with municipal council members and the development of the intra-
active pairs and the imposition of them as a structure through which to explore the data.
Identifying my own bias and working up the intra-active pairs from the relevant literature on the
subject at hand is a strategy that would benefit the evaluation of any policy implemented in a
technologically mediated environment. After implementing this process to explore transparency
practice on the citizens’ blog and municipal website I believe this approach can be reproduced to explore other technologically mediated policy environments because it renders visible the multiple intra-actions between the following: researcher bias, personal and public assumptions about practice, specific practice mechanisms and the technical characteristics at hand. Bringing these multiple intra-actions into view creates an unconventional lens for policy evaluation that can potentially expose implementation outcomes that might not otherwise be anticipated.

Considering the bias of those who create knowledge and policy opens a door to summarizing how this thesis itself behaves in an ethical context. In Chapter 4, my discussion of using internet content for research data also justifies my decision to remain disconnected from the people who influenced and created the blog and municipal website content. Initiating interviews with individuals involved would open exponential opportunities for adding insight into transparency practice and technological mediation, but that is not this research project. This research project is positioned outside of currently accepted ethical definitions/practices of engaging “human subjects” and attempts to provide a model for working respectfully in this ethically liminal zone. The need for my discussion leading to the decision to reduce the searchability of this study by disguising the geographical source of the on-line data is unique to technologically mediated research. Reducing the searchability of my thesis is an example of anticipating an intra-action between practice mechanisms and technological characteristics and an attempt to influence the outcome of that intra-action. Ethically, this study seeks to be explicit about its strategic use of information and technology so it can resonate with the main discussion of technologically mediated transparency practice.

The Mangle of Technologically Mediated Transparency Practice

One of the larger questions in this case study is whether or not technologically mediated transparency could be considered a single autonomous phenomenon, or two or more distinct
phenomenon interacting. By identifying technologically mediated transparency practice as a concept, policy stakeholders might be prompted to engage a wider range of technological input prior to implementing large-scale initiatives like BC Hydro’s Smart Meter project. The process of thinking the data with intra-active pairs made it possible for me to identify how characteristics of technology and mechanisms and perceptions of transparency practice not only interact, but can transform each other. When this transformation takes place, I believe a new, distinct phenomenon is created. When technology and policy practice transform each other there is a higher likelihood that the momentum of practice will propel the implementation beyond the limits of the original intention of the policy in question, as with the citizens’ blog. When the technologically mediated practice of a policy surpasses the original intentions of that policy the risk of harm is increased. Other examples of technology and practice co-constituting a phenomenon that moves beyond the intention of its original implementation include the use of Robo-calls to misinform voters and Smart Meters to collect electrical usage data. These examples of technologically mediated practice exhibit how technology, policy and people intra-act, resulting in dire consequences and extensive costs to individuals, organizations and/or governments.

In the example of the citizens’ blog, technological mediation is essential in transforming transparency practice into an idealized bid to expose the cloaked intentions of candidates. Eagerness to be perceived as trustworthy by other members of their small community drove

---

17 Smart Meters were a key component of former Liberal Premier Gordon Campbell’s Clean Energy Act of April 2010. Fifteen months after the formal announcement, BC Hydro began installing residential smart meters that wirelessly broadcast household usage statistics directly to BC Hydro. As the initiative progressed, so too did the citizen-led movement (Citizens for Safe Technology Society) to stop it. In response to resistance, BC Hydro changed the installation policy of Smart Meters from mandatory to optional and in July 2013 a class action law suit was launched against BC Hydro by customers who had meters installed without their consent (Luk 2013).

18 During the federal election in 2011, “misleading calls about the locations of polling stations were made to electors in ridings across the [Canada]...and the purpose of those calls was to suppress the votes of electors who had indicated their voting preference in response to earlier voter identification calls” (Morse 2013). Voters took the case to court and although electoral fraud was found, election results were not changed (Morse 2013).
candidates to take up social media technologies without precedent, and to disclose not only information required by legislation, but additional information that, they hoped, might further demonstrate their trustworthiness in the forum of the citizens’ blog. With these acts, the originally legislated transparency practice is superseded by the technologically mediated transparency practice which has been transformed by the engagement of blogging tools and social ideals about transparency. By being technologically mediated, the citizens’ blog transparency practice is transformed and in turn, technology is used in new ways. Blogging software was used by citizens to implement provincial legislation and consequently, writing and sending emails became a means used by candidates to comply with legislation. By being coupled with legislation, technologies used by candidates become tools for creating candidate legitimacy and trustworthiness during a municipal election. It is the distribution of communication power to the general public that makes it possible for technology to be used for an ad hoc implementation of transparency practice.

The funding disclosure practice implemented on the municipal website can also be considered technologically mediated transparency practice but on a different scale. The municipal website is an example of how technology is integrated into administrative processes. Prior to the use of ICTs, if disclosures were required, the process candidates engaged for obtaining and submitting disclosure forms would have relied on some form of manual delivery, whereas now it might be possible for candidates to download forms from the internet and submit completed forms using email. In the past, on the municipal side, staff would have used pre-internet paper-based technologies to ensure the information on the forms was available to the public. Now, municipal staff can upload the completed PDF to the municipal website and while this process is not an unusual or innovative use of technological mediation, it discursively links
to a larger, iterative transformation of practice and technology use.

On the municipal website, it is municipal staff that use ICTs to fulfill legislated requirements which is not a notable change in how technology is used, rather it is an example of how technology assists with government procedure. The use of ICTs for increasing efficiency in government procedures and offloading responsibility to private citizens (voters who use the internet to find and view candidate disclosure forms) is in keeping with public management reforms that favour self-serve service provision. In the example of the municipal website, the use of technology reifies public management reforms already in place through the intra-actions of people, technology and policy. The transformational qualities of technical mediated practice are linked discursively through the citizens’ blog and the municipal website.

The municipal transparency practice is impacted by the citizens’ blog’s technologically mediated practice. It is the influence of the citizens’ blog that motivates candidate V to add a table to her municipal campaign disclosure form that identifies the source of the donation she returned. The citizens’ blog may have even influenced her decision to return the donation. If the citizens’ blog had not been created I do not think candidate V would have added the table to her campaign disclosure form. The information supplied on the form would have remained, as it did for other candidates in this election, an outcome of what legislation requires. So, the transformed and technologically mediated transparency practice of the citizens’ blog even influenced how one candidate participated in the municipal practice.

In this case study, the citizens’ blog is a distinct phenomenon of technologically mediated transparency practice and so is the municipal website on a larger scale. While it is beyond the scope of this thesis to discuss at length, it is interesting to note that the social media technologies used by the citizens’ blog author are privately-owned. Against the larger backdrop of public
management reforms that orchestrate the adoption of private-sector values by the public sector, and the threat of corruption – defined as private gains achieved through public office – it appears as if this case study could be one more example of the private and public blending with each other. At this point it is not possible to know what the long-term intra-active implications of private-sector controlled social media spaces being used for implementing public process are, but I expect it will continue to change the nature of politics around the world.
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Appendix

Appendix A
Sample of municipal website disclosure form

Figure 3: Sample of municipal website disclosure form

TOWN OF [CITY]
MAR 15 2011
RECEIVED

FORM 21 CAMPAIGN DISCLOSURE STATEMENT
AND FINANCIAL STATEMENT
Local Authorities Election Act
(Section 147.4)

MUNICIPALITY: _______________________________, PROVINCE OF: _______________________________
Full name of Candidate: _______________________________
Candidate's mailing address: _______________________________
Postal Code: _______________________________

NOTE:
If a candidate's entire election campaign is funded exclusively out of the candidate's own funds and the
candidate's funds are not more than $10,000, the candidate is not required to file this document or open and
deposit the funds into a campaign account.

Campan Period Revenue

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTIONS:
1. Total amount of contributions of $100.00 or less 25
2. Total amount of all contributions of $100.01 and greater, together with the contributor's name and address (attach listing and amount) 200
NOTE: For lines 1 and 2, include all money and valued contributions.
3. Deduct total amount of contributions returned
4. NET CONTRIBUTIONS (line 1 + 2 - 3) 25

OTHER SOURCES:
5. Total amount contributed out of candidate's own funds 1,200
6. Total amount received from fund-raising functions
7. Transfer of any surplus from a candidate's previous election campaign of $500.01 or greater
8. TOTAL OTHER SOURCES (add lines 5, 6 and 7) 1,200
9. Total Campaign Period Revenue (add lines 4 and 8) 1,425

Campan Period Expenditures

10. Campaign Period Expenses Paid 1,425 Unpaid TOTAL 1,425

(suit line 10 from line 9)

Campan Period Surplus (Deficit)

ATTESTATION OF CANDIDATE

This is to certify that to the best of my knowledge, this document and all attachments accurately reflect the
information required under section 147.4 of the Act.

Signature of Candidate _______________________________ Date _______________________________

Forward the signed original of this document to the address of the municipality in which the candidate was
nominated for election.
### Appendix B Citizens' blog: Stated purpose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Citizens' blog: Stated purpose</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**About**
This site was created by members of Citizens for a Sustainable [town name], an organization formed to provide community education and awareness of local and global environmental issues. The group organized a documentary film series and several presentations in 2007-2008, and was later active in opposing the governance structure of the [city name] Regional Partnership.

Members of the group have recently been concerned about the dismantling of the Sustainable [town name] Growth Model, whereby population and industrial growth (and profit) would take priority over environmental and social sustainability. Recent full-page ads in the [city name] Herald and in the [local media name] pressuring elected officials and the public in [town name] to make decisions that would financially benefit a private corporation, also raise significant questions about long-term planning in the [town name] area and the water supply issue. As wealth and power of special interest groups can be used to influence elections and municipal decisionmaking [sic], in the name of transparency, we are asking candidates for both Mayor and Town Council to “show us the money!” We believe that all candidates in the upcoming municipal election should publicly disclose all campaign donations and funds given to them since the last election. This should be done in the interests of transparency and to help voters make more informed choices on election day.

**What are the rules?**
According to the law, all candidates must disclose this information publicly anyway, by filling out a form…but are not required to do so until AFTER the election. We are asking all candidates to “do the right thing” by disclosing the information NOW! Voters in [town name] deserve to know this information so they can make a more informed decision when casting their ballot.
Appendix C Sections 147.4(1) and (3) - Local Authorities Election Act, 2000 pp 90-99

The provincial legislation that governs transparency practice on the citizens’ blog and municipal website was made effective in 2000. The most relevant sections of this legislation to this case study are 147.4(1) and (3) of Campaign disclosure statements:

147.4(1) If a candidate’s election campaign is funded exclusively from campaign contributions from any person, corporation, trade union or employee organization or is funded from a combination of money paid by the candidate out of the candidate’s own funds and campaign contributions from any person, corporation, trade union or employee organization, then, on or before March 1 immediately following a general election or, in the case of a by-election, within 120 days after the by-election, a candidate shall file with the municipality a disclosure statement in the prescribed form, which must include:

(a) the total amount of all campaign contributions received during the campaign period that did not exceed $100 in the aggregate from any single contributor,
(b) the total amount contributed, together with the contributor’s name and address, for each contributor whose contributions during the campaign period exceeded $100 in the aggregate,
(c) the total amount of money paid by the candidate out of the candidate’s own funds,
(d) the total amount of any campaign surplus exceeding $500, including any surplus from previous campaigns, and
(e) a financial statement setting out the total amount of revenue and expenses.

(3) The municipality must ensure that all documents filed under this section are available to the public during regular business hours. (LAE 2000 p 90-91)
### Appendix D Candidate disclosures

**Candidates who have a asterisk (*) next to their name “were either resistant or non responsive to calls for election disclosure” (CB 2010 p. 1).**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alias</th>
<th>Elected</th>
<th>$ Disclosed on Municipal Website</th>
<th>$ Disclosed on Blog</th>
<th>Compliance-Resistance</th>
<th>Disclosure details and/or highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>11,423.48</td>
<td>450.00</td>
<td>is reported on the blog as refusing to disclose &amp; then changing her mind when &quot;negative comments started coming into the [citizens' blog]&quot; gets *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dear Voters and Candidates, Since my last post I have gratefully accepted some additional donations to my campaign. They are posted on my website donors page. I will keep you updated. Thanks to all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[The blog author writes: After much pressure, &lt;candidate V&gt; has agreed to disclose her campaign donors. See &lt;candidate V&gt;’s response:]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dear Voters and Candidates My campaign donations are posted on my website <a href="http://www">www</a>.&lt;candidatename&gt;.com I will keep the information updated along the way. Should anyone have questions about my campaign or the issues concerning &lt;town name&gt;, I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you to all that have contributed financially along with those who are working so hard on my campaign.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dear ? To date my campaign is 100% self-funded and will remain so. Prior to the election I made a decision to have a 3rd party handle all contributions and stated that I did not want to know any information. I can tell you that I have received (sic) $450 from three personal friends. When I am advised of my contributions after the election I will review them and certainly disclose that information (CB 2010 p. 6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>7,298.42</td>
<td>5,475.16</td>
<td>“Posting all contributions publicly on the website at this time goes a long way in negating perceived biases and promotes election transparency.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Late in the election campaign I received a $1000.00 donation cheque from &lt;development company name&gt;. Originally I was going to give the cheque back but recently I decided to cash it and I have donated the full amount to the &lt;town name&gt; Interfaith Food Bank. Thanks to &lt;development company name&gt; for your generous donation to my campaign. (CB 2010 p. 2)&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Note: this candidate also discloses donations from a number of private citizens and donations in kind including a newspaper ad for 2,033.82.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>provides website address and sends email to blog</td>
<td>&quot;did not look for donations&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: This table includes disclosures from candidates who were either resistant or non-responsive to calls for election disclosure. It highlights the compliance and resistance in disclosing campaign finances.
**Candidate disclosures**

Candidates who have a asterisk (*) next to their name “were either resistant or non responsive to calls for election disclosure” (CB 2010 p. 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alias</th>
<th>Elected</th>
<th>$ Disclosed on Municipal Website</th>
<th>$ Disclosed on Blog</th>
<th>Compliance-Resistance</th>
<th>Disclosure details and/or highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>6,376.26</td>
<td>5,250.00</td>
<td>&quot;Thanks for this initiative. I support it all the way.&quot;</td>
<td>[This is my summary] On the blog this candidate lists full names of donors and amounts. Notes on Municipal disclosure form that one cheque bounces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>disclose as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>complies through action but makes no comment</td>
<td>&quot;I have received no donations for my campaign and I don’t plan on accepting any if they are offered.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>disclose as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>“Thank you for bringing forward the very important issue of campaign finance.”</td>
<td>&quot;Friends, family and supporters are contributing and receiving sweat equity by handing out pamphlets on my behalf.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>disclose as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>&quot;I like your website and think this a great idea. All politicians should be transparent.&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;I am currently 100% self-funded. Currently my website listed is incorrect, if you could change to <a href="http://www">www</a>.&lt;candidate W&gt;.ca that would be great. Thank you,&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>disclose as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>“It is very important to me to be as far removed from any potential conflicts of interest as possible.”</td>
<td>&quot;My campaign is being financed completely by my fiancé and I. As a government employee, I’ve even been required to take a leave of absence from my job to campaign, and will have to resign if elected.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>disclose as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>&quot;Thank you for the question regarding campaign financing.”</td>
<td>&quot;I am pleased to disclose that my campaign is entirely funded by my husband, &lt;name of candidate F's husband&gt;, out of our household budget. I set up my website and designed and printed my flyers. He is purchasing the ink, the paper and my signs and any ads I put in the paper.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>disclose as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>complies enthusiastically</td>
<td>&quot;I’m pleased to report that 100% of my campaign is being funded by myself. There is no other personal or corporate donations.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alias</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>$ Disclosed on Municipal Website</td>
<td>$ Disclosed on Blog</td>
<td>Compliance-Resistance</td>
<td>Disclosure details and/or highlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>2,389.67 (includes: $948.79 from friends as paper and printing for leaflets)</td>
<td>900.00</td>
<td>citizens' blog notes that candidate G is first to respond. “I am happy to learn that you’re raising this issue.”</td>
<td>[Disclosure is really long so I have summarized it] Details about funders including a story about &quot;shopping around&quot; for lawn signs and selecting a local business that &quot;as far as I know hasn't given me any preferential treatment that would make her a sponsor.&quot; Comments that &quot;The 2010 election campaign in &lt;town name&gt; is, as far as I know, without precedent. This does not feel like a &quot;small town&quot; election. No longer will people feel they can stand for election to serve their fellow residents unless they have significant sponsorship. And sponsorship, or more correctly, what it can buy, almost certainly has a significant impact on people’s voting choices.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>does not disclose; does not have website listed</td>
<td>gets *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>complies through action but makes no comment</td>
<td>“I have accepted no financial contributions and have answered the request by ‘Citizens for a Sustainable &lt;town name&gt;’ for full disclosure.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>complies through action but makes no comment</td>
<td>&quot;Though I have been offered a couple of modest contributions, I have to this date declined acceptance preferring instead to self-fund my campaign.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>complies through action but makes no comment</td>
<td>&quot;I am entirely self-funded. My website address is <a href="http://www">www</a>.&lt;candidate H&gt;.ca &lt;candidate H&gt;. &lt;contact info&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>complies through action but makes no comment</td>
<td>&quot;I have had no campaign donations to date, has all been self financed.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>1,425.00 (Is disclosure req'd because incumbent? Does not appear to include $50 donation listed on blog)</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>complies through action but makes no comment</td>
<td>&quot;I have received a $50 donation from a resident. I am self-funded at this time.&quot; citizens' blog author writes: &quot;&lt;candidate D&gt; has also not disclosed the name of her donor&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Candidate disclosures

Candidates who have a asterisk (*) next to their name “were either resistant or non responsive to calls for election disclosure” (CB 2010 p. 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alias</th>
<th>Elected</th>
<th>$ Disclosed on Municipal Website</th>
<th>$ Disclosed on Blog</th>
<th>Compliance-Resistance</th>
<th>Disclosure details and/or highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>does not disclose; does not have website listed</td>
<td>even though this candidate does not disclose they do not get *</td>
<td>[Citizens' blog author writes about candidate I: &quot;Another candidate, &lt;candidate I&gt; refused to provide information, demanding the names and email addresses of all members of Citizens for a Sustainable &lt;town name&gt; in return for his donor list (a lot of bluster about nothing, since he says he is 100% self-funded). He later posted a message about being self-funded on his own website, but the administrator of our site had to seek it out–it was not provided to us by &lt;candidate I&gt;&quot;....&lt;candidate I&gt; also cc’ed the &lt;local media name&gt; on all of his correspondence with the Citizens for a Sustainable &lt;town name&gt; making it clear that he would not cooperate. This was not mentioned in the &lt;local media name&gt; article at all.&quot;...and nothing from the candidate is posted to the blog.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>gets *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>Does not disclose on blog; has facebook page listed</td>
<td>“I am glad that there is a website such as this! I am all for accountability and responsible planning, management, and transparency of information.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>complies through action but makes no comment</td>
<td>&quot;To date, my campaign has been soley (sic) funded by myself and my husband, I have not asked for donations, nor have I received any.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>3,220.76</td>
<td>Does not disclose on blog; has facebook page listed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>Does not disclose on blog; has facebook page listed and website</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Candidate disclosures

Candidates who have a asterisk (*) next to their name “were either resistant or non responsive to calls for election disclosure” (CB 2010 p. 1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alias</th>
<th>Elected</th>
<th>$ Disclosed on Municipal Website</th>
<th>$ Disclosed on Blog</th>
<th>Compliance-Resistance</th>
<th>Disclosure details and/or highlights</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>complies through action but makes no comment</td>
<td>“I am self-funded for this campaign.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>“I am more than happy to let you know that I have not accepted any donations to my campaign.” (&lt;candidate L&gt;)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>self-funded</td>
<td>discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog</td>
<td>I do not expect my funding to change, but if for whatever reason it does, I will gladly post any/all donations. Thank you for asking.</td>
<td>&quot;I too was interested to know what some candidates campaigns are costing. Our town is looking very active with signs and people buzzing around! This is an exciting campaign, and it is really tempting to not go out and spend the thousands of dollars that it takes to “get your name out there” With that said, I hope my time is better spent in going door to door to meet the people in town and listen to their concerns and answer any questions that they have. If I haven’t made it to your neighborhood yet, I’m working on it. In the end, however, there is simply no physical way for me to get to every house especially when I don’t want to rush people, and so sometimes we are 10-15 minutes at a door. This is great! I’d rather spend time this way, as I feel that when I leave, people know they have been heard, and that I have a better understanding of what our town’s peoples’ concerns are. If I miss you, I hope that those interested in my views will drop me a question/comment on my website at website.com. For disclosure, this is a website set up for me by my eldest daughter... for FREE! I will personally respond to all emails and would love to hear from you and have the opportunity to earn your support. For the record, my campaign is 100% self-funded. All sign design work and brochures were designed and paid for by myself.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>1,600.00</td>
<td>Discloses to blog that is self-funded then updates blog with two individual donations for 100.00 each.</td>
<td>citizens' blog writes &quot;...nor has &lt;candidate C&gt; revealed the names of his donors. They have provided some information but not fully disclosed.&quot; gets * but discloses</td>
<td>“Up date. As of last night I now have two $100 donations. I want your information correct. Thanks,” “For your information, I am self-funded.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alias</td>
<td>Elected</td>
<td>$ Disclosed on Municipal Website</td>
<td>$ Disclosed on Blog</td>
<td>Compliance-Resistance</td>
<td>Disclosure details and/or highlights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| P     | no      | $100.00                        | $100.00             | complies through action but makes no comment | "As I told the public last night at the Chamber of Commerce Candidate’s Forum I have received one donation of $100.00 towards my campaign expenses. I received the money from <donor name>. I do not expect to receive any other donations. Thank you."
| Q     | yes     | self-funded                    | discloses as self-funded on citizens' blog | complies through action but makes no comment | "Good Afternoon. My name is <candidate Q> and I’m the trustee for <town name>. As of today October 9th 2010, I have received no money for my campaign Happy Turkey Day"
| DD    | no      | self-funded                    | provides own website | “Thanks for keeping democracy alive!” |
### Appendix E Election and disclosure statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Election and disclosure statistics</th>
<th>All totals include mayor and school board trustee positions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># of candidates</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of positions (mayor and seven council members)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of candidates appearing (based on name/photo) to be women</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of candidates appearing (based on name/photo) to be men</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of elected candidates appearing (based on name/photo) to be women</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of elected candidates appearing (based on name/photo) to be men</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of candidates who have an email disclosure or comment posted to the blog</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of candidates who do not participate in citizens’ blog at all</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of candidates marked with an asterisk (*) as being “resistant or non-responsive to calls for disclosure”</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of candidates who disclose information other than donor names and amounts (or info other than required)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of candidates who make comments supportive of the blog, thank volunteers or write directly to voters</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of candidates who state on the blog that they are “self-funded”</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of candidates who submit Form 21 Campaign Disclosure Statement and Financial Statements</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of candidates who advise the municipal returning officer of self-funded campaign less or equal to $10,000</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Text of “What candidates are saying about this site” (CB 2010 p. 4)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Quote</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>“Posting all contributions publicly on the website at this time goes a long way in negating perceived biases and promotes election transparency.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>“I am happy to learn that you’re raising this issue. The 2010 election campaign in [town name] is, as far as I know, without precedent. This does not feel like a “small town” election. No longer will people feel they can stand for election to serve their fellow residents unless they have significant sponsorship. And sponsorship, or more correctly, what it can buy, almost certainly has a significant impact on people’s voting choices.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>“I like your website and think this a great idea. All politicians should be transparent.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>“It is very important to me to be as far removed from any potential conflicts of interest as possible.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>“I will gladly post any/all donations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>“Thanks for your initiative. I support it all the way.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>“Thank you for bringing forward the very important issue of campaign finance.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>“I am glad that there is a website such as this! I am all for accountability and responsible planning, management, and transparency of information.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>“I have accepted no financial contributions and have answered the request by ‘Citizens for a Sustainable [town name]’ for full disclosure.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>“I am more than happy to let you know that I have not accepted any donations to my campaign.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>“Thanks for keeping democracy alive!”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Show Us the Money!

Dedicated to election transparency in [town name]. Follow us on Twitter @showus[town name]

Subscribe to feed HomeNewsAboutFor MayorFor CouncilFor TrusteeCONTACT US

April 2, 2011 in General | Leave a comment
Visit http://www.[town name].ca/default.aspx?cid=1114&lang=1

Mayoral candidates:
[candidate V] *
[candidate U] (elected)

Councillor candidates:
[candidate Y] (elected)
[candidate G]
[candidate D]
[candidate B] (elected)
[candidate C] (elected) *
[candidate P]

The following candidates have advised the Returning Officer that they ran an entirely self-funded campaign less than or equal to $10,000:
- [candidate M]
- [candidate AA]
- [candidate N] (elected)
- [candidate W]
- [candidate X]
- [candidate F]
- [candidate O]
- [candidate T] *
- [candidate BB]
- [candidate Z] (elected)
- [candidate H]
- [candidate R]
- [candidate A]
- [candidate J] *
- [candidate E]
- [candidate J]
- [candidate S] (elected)
- [candidate K]
- [candidate L]
- [candidate CC]

Candidates marked with an asterisk were either resistant or non-responsive to calls for election disclosure.

: VIEW CANDIDATE RESPONSES

Poll
Do you believe Alberta’s election laws should be changed to require that candidates disclose their campaign donors prior to the election?
(polls)

Commenting Policy
Commenting is now closed. We reserve the right to approve or reject all comments submitted to this website. Keep your comments relevant and respectful. Please do not include links to other websites.

Thank you.

Blog Stats
- 7,323 views
Twitter Updates
- RT @greenforyou: French Drought, Just the Tip of the melting Iceberg: Drought is Global #water http://bit.ly/mjLTYG
- [town name] tweeted 2 weeks ago
- RT @greenforyou: New study indicates carbon release to atmosphere ten times faster than in the past #green http://bit.ly/leRefw tweeted 2 weeks ago

It’s that time of year again RT @Town_of_[town name]: Residents are advised to stay away from Sheep River Park http://fb.me/12H5yoOjq #[town name] tweeted 3 weeks ago

Recent Posts
- Election disclosures are posted
- 2010 in review
- Update from Mayor [candidate U]
- Answer our poll on election financing

http://showusthemoney.wordpress.com/ (1 of 11) [20/06/2011 5:40:23 PM]
The stats helper monkeys at WordPress.com mulled over how this blog did in 2010, and here’s a high level summary of its overall blog health:

Crunchy numbers
A Boeing 747-400 passenger jet can hold 416 passengers. This blog was viewed about 6,800 times in 2010. That’s about 16 full 747s.
In 2010, there were 38 new posts, not bad for the first year! There were 4 pictures uploaded, taking up a total of 361kb.
The busiest day of the year was October 13th with 687 views. The most popular post that day was For Council.

Where did they come from?
The top referring sites in 2010 were showusthemoney.org, facebook.com, twitter.com, kenheemeryck.com, and en.wordpress.com.
Some visitors came searching, mostly for showusthemoney.org, show us the money [town name], [town name] election results, www. showusthemoney.org, and showusthemoney.com [town name].

Attractions in 2010
These are the posts and pages that got the most views in 2010.
1. For Council September 2010
2. Update from Mayoralty Candidate [candidate V] October 2010
3. For Mayor September 2010
4. Comments on [local media name] article October 2010
5. Update from Mayoralty Candidate [candidate U] October 2010

To whom it may concern,

Election results
Election Information Sites

Municipal Election Information & Forms
Official Government of Alberta site
Town of [town name] 2010 Municipal Election Candidate Information
Official Information from the Town of [town name]

Vote[town name] blog
Another blog dedicated to the [town name] election.
http://showusthemoney.wordpress.com/ (2 of 11) [20/06/2011 5:40:23 PM]
Show Us the Money!

Late in the election campaign I received a $1000.00 donation cheque from Tri-Star Communities. Originally I was going to give the cheque back but recently I decided to cash it and I have donated the full amount to the [town name] Interfaith Food Bank. Thanks to Tri-Star for your generous donation to my campaign.

Yours sincerely,
[candidate U]
[town name]

Mayor:
[candidate U]
Councillors:
[candidate S]
[candidate B]
[candidate N]
[candidate Z]
[candidate Y]
[candidate C]
Check out this American effort to “Save democracy from politics.” Showusthemoney.org salutes votesmart.org!

http://www.votesmart.org/

We’ve just added the following to our “About” page:

PLEASE NOTE: This site was not the idea of any candidate running for mayor or town council. The idea for the site came from a few members of Citizens for a Sustainable [town name] who were following the [city name] election where disclosure of campaign donations is the norm, instead of a “heretical” idea. No candidates were involved in the creation of this site in any way, shape or form. It was entirely initiated by people not running for any elected position but concerned about the issue of campaign financing. Judging by the reaction, the resulting efforts to try and discredit it or expose the creators of the site as biased, there are some people who are unhappy about this level of transparency in government. We wonder why. The fact remains that voters are now more informed about the electoral process and how campaign funding may affect the outcome. We can all now watch as well, how decisions are made by successful candidates later, knowing full well who funded their campaigns.

And our promise to you:

We resolve to report back to you when the final donor lists are filed with Elections Alberta and provide you with as much information as possible as to the accuracy of the reporting of campaign funds. As Tony Seskus has said in The [city name] Herald, “the best vote is an informed vote.”

Read the article here: http://www.[city name]herald.com/columnists/Seskus+Donor+disclosure+audit+reform+trends+bode+well/3650837/story.html

[local media name] article

There is an important factual error and a couple of puzzling omissions in this week’s [local media name] article about the <citizens’ blog> website. You’ll find the article on the website buried near the back of the first section of the newspaper, on page 29, under the headline, “Funding lobby falls flat.” Read the article here.

The article states “All candidates have provided information to the site.” This is not correct. One candidate, [candidate T] did not respond. Another candidate, [candidate I] refused to provide information, demanding the names and email addresses of all members of Citizens for a Sustainable [town name] in return for his donor list (a lot of bluster about nothing, since he says he is 100% self-funded). He later posted a message about being self-funded on his own website, but the administrator of our site had to seek it out— it was not provided to us by [candidate I]. Incumbent [candidate D] has also not disclosed the name of her donor, nor has [candidate C] revealed the names of his donors. They have provided some information but not fully disclosed.

All of this information has been available on the <citizens’ blog> website for all to see for several days. [candidate I] also cc’d the [local media name] on all of his correspondence with the Citizens for a Sustainable [town name] making it clear that he would not cooperate. This was not mentioned in the [local media name] article at all.

An interesting omission

Along with the error in the article, there is also another interesting omission. The [local publication name] article failed to mention that mayoralty candidate [candidate V] at first stated at a public forum and then in an email posted on the website that she would not reveal her donors until AFTER the election. When negative comments started coming in to the website about her decision, she then changed her mind. We would have liked to see an unbiased reporting of this sudden and public change of heart.

Let’s be clear. Citizens for a Sustainable [town name] is not running for public office. Our members are concerned citizens asking for accountability and transparency from those who wish to be put in charge of the “public purse” by serving as our elected representatives. Instead of welcoming this initiative, we find it interesting that the [local media name] took the opportunity to slam us in two of its editorials. [local media name] Publisher, <publisher name>, (who, incidentally was one of the campaign donors disclosed as a result of this website) says in his column that the website is “trying to take the public away from the issues at hand.” The
accompanying editorial says campaign financing is a “non-issue” although the editorial writer admits that “the potential of improprieties is always present in an election” and “If Mike Holmes...started throwing money at specific candidates, it would be an election issue.” We’d like to know how [town name]ians would know if Mike Holmes was “throwing money” at candidates, without full disclosure as initiated by the <citizens’ blog>?

Success or failure?
We believe this website has been a success. Almost every single candidate has come forward and disclosed their donations, many of them providing us with positive feedback on the initiative. We have achieved what we set out to do, which is bring the important concerns about government transparency and accountability to the attention of the candidates running for public office and to the voters in [town name]. The headline saying this initiative has “fallen flat,” couldn’t be further from the truth.

While most candidates eagerly revealed their donations as soon as we contacted them, others delayed for days...some are still delaying. We urge you to read through the website to see who responded quickly and who did not. We'll leave it up to the public to ask “why?” Most importantly, we hope this website will help you decide who gets your vote on October 18.

What candidates are saying about this site
“Posting all contributions publicly on the website at this time goes a long way in negating perceived biases and promotes election transparency.” ([candidate U])

“I am happy to learn that you’re raising this issue. The 2010 election campaign in [town name] is, as far as I know, without precedent. This does not feel like a “small town” election. No longer will people feel they can stand for election to serve their fellow residents unless they have significant sponsorship. And sponsorship, or more correctly, what it can buy, almost certainly has a significant impact on people’s voting choices.” ([candidate G])

“I like your website and think this a great idea. All politicians should be transparent.” ([candidate W])

“It is very important to me to be as far removed from any potential conflicts of interest as possible.” ([candidate X])

“I will gladly post any/all donations.” ([candidate CC])

“Thanks for your initiative. I support it all the way.” ([candidate Y])

“Thank you for bringing forward the very important issue of campaign finance.” ([candidate N])

“I am glad that there is a website such as this! I am all for accountability and responsible planning, management, and transparency of information.” ([candidate E])

“I have accepted no financial contributions and have answered the request by ‘Citizens for a Sustainable [town name]’ for full disclosure.” ([candidate BB])

“I am more than happy to let you know that I have not accepted any donations to my campaign.” ([candidate L])

“Thanks for keeping democracy alive!” ([candidate DD])
has encouraged [town name]’ candidates to post donation info on their own websites and to send it to ShowUsTheMoney.org. They will also be asked to update the information as new donations come in.

Contact info:
<citizen EE>
Member, Citizens for a Sustainable [town name]

The following letter has been sent to all candidates for town council and mayor, as well as the [local media name].

October 4, 2010
Dear [town name] candidates, As was noted in our press release issued on October 1, 2010, Citizens for a Sustainable [town name] is requesting all candidates in the [town name] Municipal Election disclose their campaign donations and all political funds donated to their office since the last election. In the name of transparency, we believe that the voting public has a right to know who has contributed to political campaigns – municipally, provincially, and federally.

We have now received responses from all candidates for town council (many thanks to those who have responded so far) with the exception of the following six:
[candidate T]
[candidate R]
[candidate I]
[candidate B]
[candidate C]
[candidate P]

We also have received NO RESPONSE from either of the mayoralty candidates. We kindly ask that you prepare a breakdown of your campaign contributions (all funds donated since the last election, with names and amounts) and e-mail them to us at citizens4sustainable[town name]@gmail.com.

Alternatively, we ask that you post donation information on your own websites, notifying us via email that you have done so, and that you update the list as need be. Please provide us with the URL address for this information. Thank you for your commitment to transparency.

Best regards,
Citizens for a Sustainable [town name]
www.ShowUsTheMoney.org
Contact us at: Citizens4sustainable[town name]@gmail.com

October 5, 2010 in Mayoralty Candidates | Tags: Alberta, [candidate U], elections, [town name], politics | Leave a comment
Visit <candidate U’s> website disclosure page here.

To whom it may concern,
I had a donation of 50 shirts made to my campaign. These shirts are printed with “I support [candidate U] for Mayor” on the front. I was told the total cost for these shirts was $204.00. They were donated by Cheryl and Mark MacMillan. Thanks to Mark and Cheryl! Total contributions to my campaign now are $2237.34.
Yours truly,
-[candidate U]

UPDATED October 15, 2010:
To whom it may concern,
<donor name redacted>, on behalf of his family, has placed a full newspaper ad in the [local media name] in support of my campaign for Mayor of [town name]. While I have not received any actual funds in my hands so to speak, nor will any money pass through my hands, I am declaring this as a donation to my campaign. The total value is $1308.82. The total value of my donations is $2033.82. I will declare more donations if they come in.
-[candidate U]
To whom it may concern,
I am [candidate U] and I am a mayoral candidate in the Town of [town name] election 2010. My campaign donations to date are as follows:
1. $200.00 from Carol Henderson.
2. $25.00 from Myrna Pauls.
The rest of my campaign is self-funded. If more donations roll in I will inform you.
Yours sincerely,
[candidate U]

October 7, 2010 in Mayoralty Candidates | Tags: Alberta, [candidate V], elections, [town name], politics | Leave a comment
[candidate V] is no longer notifying this website of her updated donor list. We did notice that some new names have been added. See her donor list at: http://www.bethkish.com/index.php?action=donors
UPDATED October 12:
Dear Voters and Candidates,
Since my last post I have gratefully accepted some additional donations to my campaign. They are posted on my website donors page. I will keep you updated. Thanks to all.
[candidate V]

UPDATED October 10:
After much pressure, [candidate V] has agreed to disclose her campaign donors. See [candidate V]'s response:
Dear Voters and Candidates
My campaign donations are posted on my website www.[candidate V].com I will keep the information updated along the way. Should anyone have questions about my campaign or the issues concerning [town name], I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you to all that have contributed financially along with those who are working so hard on my campaign.
[candidate V]

Dear ?
To date my campaign is 100% self-funded and will remain so. Prior to the election I made a decision to have a 3rd party handle all contributions and stated that I did not want to know any information. I can tell you that I have recieved (sic) $450 from three personal friends. When I am advised of my contributions after the election I will review them and certainly disclose that information.
[candidate V]

October 9, 2010 in General | Leave a comment
CANDIDATE HASN'T REVEALED DONORS
[ ] [candidate V], Mayoralty
[ ] [candidate U], Mayoralty
[ ] [candidate M]
[ ] [candidate Y]
[ ] [candidate AA]
[ ] [candidate N]
[ ] [candidate W]
[ ] [candidate X]
[ ] [candidate F]
[ ] [candidate O]
[ ] [candidate G]
[ ] [candidate T]
[ ] [candidate BB]
[ ] [candidate Z]
[ ] [candidate H]
[ ] [candidate R]
[ ] [candidate D]
[ ] Gary Louhery
[ ] [candidate I]
[ ] [candidate E]
[ ] [candidate J]
[ ] [candidate B]
[ ] [candidate S]
[ ] [candidate K]
News

Posted October 6, 2010 — Sheldon Chumir Foundation holds an informational event on “Your Right to Know”

The event is entitled “Your Right to Know-Government Accountability & Freedom of Information” on Thursday, October 14, 2010, 7 – 9 p.m. at the Metropolitan Conference Centre, Speakers: Frank Work & Heather MacIntosh. Free event – dessert reception. For more information see attached poster. Registration required.

About

This site was created by members of Citizens for a Sustainable [town name], an organization formed to provide community education and awareness of local and global environmental issues. The group organized a documentary film series and several presentations in 2007-2008, and was later active in opposing the governance structure of the [city name] Regional Partnership.

Members of the group have recently been concerned about the dismantling of the Sustainable [town name] Growth Model, whereby population and industrial growth (and profit) would take priority over environmental and social sustainability. Recent full-page ads in the [city name] Herald and in the [local media name] pressuring elected officials and the public in [town name] to make decisions that would financially benefit a private corporation, also raise significant questions about long-term planning in the [town name] area and the water supply issue. As wealth and power of special interest groups can be used to influence elections and municipal decisionmaking, in the name of transparency, we are asking candidates for both Mayor and Town Council to “show us the money!” We believe that all candidates in the upcoming municipal election should publicly disclose all campaign donations and funds given to them since the last election. This should be done in the interests of transparency and to help voters make more informed choices on election day.

What are the rules?

According to the law, all candidates must disclose this information publicly anyway, by filling out a form…but are not required to do so until AFTER the election. We are asking all candidates to “do the right thing” by disclosing the information NOW! Voters in [town name] deserve to know this information so they can make a more informed decision when casting their ballot.

The rules state:
“A candidate whose campaign is entirely self-funded has a funding cap of $10,000 in a campaign period...A candidate must declare campaign contributions funded from any person, corporation, trade union or employee organization by completing an Election Candidate Campaign Contribution and Disclosure Statement Form. Campaign contributions by any person, corporation, trade union or employee organization to a candidate shall not exceed $5,000 in any year.”

RT @greenforyou: French Drought, Just the Tip of the melting Iceberg: Drought is
Global #water http://bit.ly/mjLtYG #[town name] tweeted 2 weeks ago
RT @greenforyou: New study indicates carbon release to atmosphere ten times faster than in the past #green http://bit.ly/

http://showusthemoney.wordpress.com/about/ (1 of 2)
[20/06/2011 5:40:37 PM]
About « Show Us the Money!

For candidates who do not have their own website, we are happy to post the information on this blog. We are also more than happy to link to each candidates own website or blog where the information can be found. Please check back with us regularly for updates or follow us on Twitter @showus[town name]

We resolve to report back to you when the final donor lists are filed with Elections Alberta and provide you with as much information as possible as to the accuracy of the reporting of campaign funds. As Tony Seskus has said in The [city name] Herald, “the best vote is an informed vote.”

We also have a Facebook Group you can join at: http://www.facebook.com/#!/group.php?gid=4561327683:

leRefw tweeted 2 weeks ago
It’s that time of year again RT @Town_of_[town name]: [town name] tweeted to stay away from [river name] River Park http://fb.me/12H5yoOjq #[town name] tweeted 3 weeks ago

Recent Posts
Election disclosures are posted
2010 in review
Update from Mayor [candidate U]
Answer our poll on election financing
Election results
Election Information Sites
Municipal Election Information & Forms
Official Government of Alberta site
Town of [town name] 2010 Municipal Election Candidate Information Official Information from the Town of [town name]
[town name] Election Blogs
Vote[town name] blog Another blog dedicated to the [town name] election.

No comments yet Comments feed for this article
Leave a Reply
Cancel reply

Notify me of follow-up comments via email.
Notify me of new posts via email.
Theme: Tarski by Ben Eastaugh and Chris Sternal-Johnson.

Subscribe to feed.
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For Mayor « Show Us the Money!

Show Us the Money!
Dedicated to election transparency in [town name]. Follow us on Twitter @showus[town name]

For Council
The following are the 26 candidates for Town Council:
(Listed in alphabetical order):
LeRefw tweeted 2 weeks ago
. It’s that time of year again RT @Town_of_[town name]: Residents are advised to stay away from Sheep River Park http://fb.me/12H5yoOjq #[town name] tweeted

3 weeks ago

Recent Posts
. Election disclosures are posted
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. Update from Mayor [candidate U]
. Answer our poll on election financing
. Election results

Election Information Sites
. Municipal Election Information & Forms
. Official Government of Alberta site
. Town of [town name] 2010 Municipal Election Candidate Information Official Information from the Town of [town name]

[town name] Election Blogs
. Vote[town name] blog Another blog dedicated to the [town name] election.

No comments yet Comments feed for this article
Leave a Reply
Cancel reply
Notify me of follow-up comments via email.
Notify me of new posts via email.
Show Us the Money!

Dedicated to election transparency in [town name]. Follow us on Twitter @showus[town name]

CONTACT US
Our email address is:
citizens4sustainable[town name]@gmail.com
If you are a candidate for Mayor or Town Council in [town name], please send us your list of campaign donors by Tuesday, Oct. 5. We are offering to post this information on our website/blog for you or provide a link to the information on your website, if you supply the URL address. We also recommend that you update your donor list as new donations come in. Thank you! Please send the information to our email address:
citizens4sustainable[town name]@gmail.com

Show Us the Money!

Dedicated to election transparency in [town name]. Follow us on Twitter @showus[town name]

Election disclosures are posted
April 2, 2011 in General
Visit http://www.[town name].ca/default.aspx?cid=1114&lang=1

Mayoral candidates:
[candidate V] *
[candidate U] (elected)

Councillor candidates:
[candidate Y] (elected)
[candidate G]
[candidate D]
[candidate B] (elected)
[candidate C] (elected) *
[candidate P]

The following candidates have advised the Returning Officer that they ran an entirely self-funded campaign less than or equal to $10,000:
• [candidate M]
• [candidate AA]
• [candidate N] (elected)
• [candidate W]
• [candidate X]
• [candidate F]
• [candidate O]
• [candidate T] *
• [candidate BB]
• [candidate Z] (elected)
• [candidate H]
• [candidate R]
• [candidate A]
• [candidate I] *
• [candidate E]
• [candidate J]
• [candidate S] (elected)
• [candidate K]
• [candidate L]
• [candidate CC]

Candidates marked with an asterisk were either resistant or non responsive to calls for election disclosure.
Election disclosures are posted
April 2, 2011 in General
Visit http://www.[town name].ca/default.aspx?cid=1114&lang=1
Mayoral candidates:
[candidate V] *  
[candidate U] (elected)
Councillor candidates:
[candidate Y] (elected)  
[candidate G]  
[candidate D]  
[candidate B] (elected)  
[candidate C] (elected) *  
[candidate P]
The following candidates have advised the Returning Officer that they ran an entirely self-funded campaign less than or equal to $10,000:
• [candidate M]  
• [candidate AA]  
• [candidate N] (elected)  
• [candidate W]  
• [candidate X]  
• [candidate F]  
• [candidate O]  
• [candidate T] *  
• [candidate BB]  
• [candidate Z] (elected)  
• [candidate H]  
• [candidate R]  
• [candidate A]  
• [candidate I] *  
• [candidate E]  
• [candidate J]  
• [candidate S] (elected)  
• [candidate K]  
• [candidate L]  
• [candidate CC]
Candidates marked with an asterisk were either resistant or non responsive to calls for election disclosure.

Answer our poll on election financing
October 19, 2010 in General | Tags: Alberta, elections, [town name], politics

Update from Mayoralty Candidate [candidate V]
October 7, 2010 in Mayoralty Candidates | Tags: Alberta, [candidate V], elections, [town name], politics
[candidate V] is no longer notifying this website of her updated donor list. We did notice that some new names have been added. See her donor list at:

UPDATED October 10:
After much pressure, [candidate V] has agreed to disclose her campaign donors. See [candidate V]’s response:
Dear Voters and Candidates
My campaign donations are posted on my website www.bethkish.com
I will keep the information updated along the way. Should anyone have questions about my campaign or the issues concerning [town name], I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you to all that have contributed financially along with those who are working so hard on my campaign.
[candidate V]
Response from [candidate L]
October 11, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate L]

Hi,
This is [candidate L]. I am running for council and I am more than happy to let you know that I have not accepted any donations to my campaign. I am paying for this out of my own pocket.

News
Posted October 6, 2010 — Sheldon Chumir Foundation holds an informational event on “Your Right to Know”
The event is entitled “Your Right to Know-Government Accountability & Freedom of Information” on Thursday, October 14, 2010, 7 – 9 p.m. at the Metropolitan Conference Centre, Speakers: Frank Work & Heather MacIntosh. Free event – dessert reception. For more information see attached poster. Registration required.

RighttoKnowPoster_20101014

For Mayor
The following two candidates are running for Mayor of [town name]: (Listed in alphabetical order by last name)
[candidate V] – www.website.com
After initially refusing to disclose her donors, [candidate V] changed her mind and had been submitting emails to this website with a link to her list of campaign donors, until recently. She has now stopped notifying us or her campaign donors as she adds them to her website, but you can visit her website to find out the information. See [candidate V]’s last note to this website below. We have not received any updates since Oct. 12:

UPDATED October 10:
Dear Voters and Candidates
My campaign donations are posted on my website www.webiste.com. I will keep the information updated along the way. Should anyone have questions about my campaign or the issues concerning [town name], I look forward to hearing from you. Thank you to all that have contributed financially along with those who are working so hard on my campaign.
[candidate V]

[candidate U] has provided his donor list. In response to our request, he has added a disclosure page to his website, as well. It can be viewed here.

He also urged all of the candidates to disclose this information publicly at a forum on October 5th in [town name]. Read his responses here:

Response from [candidate M]
October 3, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate M]
I’m self-funded and did not look for donations.
[candidate M]

Response from [candidate Y]
October 1, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, "[candidate Y]"

Hi,
If you could please post my campaign contributions to your site that would be much appreciated.
Contributor and Amount
Joyce and John Gogo $75.00
Adele Downs $ 75.00
Bill and Phyllis Pastoor $ 100.00
Bridget Pastoor $ 5,000.00
That’s it for me. So far.
Thanks for your initiative. I support it all the way.
[candidate Y]
Response from [candidate AA]
October 3, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate AA]
My name is [candidate AA] and I am running for [town name] Councillor.
I have received no donations for my campaign and I don’t plan on accepting any if they are offered.
[candidate AA]

Response from [candidate N]
October 1, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, "[candidate N]"
Thank you for bringing forward the very important issue of campaign finance. I for one am not accepting any financial help or received any campaign donations. Friends, family and supporters are contributing sweat equity by handing out pamphlets on my behalf.
Thank you
[candidate N], CMA

Response from [candidate W]
October 3, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate W]
Hello,
I like your website and think this a great idea. All politicians should be transparent. I am currently 100% self-funded.
Currently my website listed is incorrect, if you could change to www.bencrook.ca that would be great.
Thank you,
[candidate W]

Response from [candidate X]
October 3, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate X]
My campaign is being financed completely by my fiancé and I. As a government employee, I’ve even been required to take a leave of absence from my job to campaign, and will have to resign if elected. It is very important to me to be as far removed from any potential conflicts of interest as possible.
[candidate X]

Response from [candidate F]
October 2, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate F]
Hello,
Thank you for the question regarding campaign financing. I am pleased to disclose that my campaign is entirely funded by my husband, <name of candidate F’s husband>, out of our household budget. I set up my website and designed and printed my flyers. He is purchasing the ink, the paper and my signs and any ads I put in the paper.
Best wishes,
[candidate F]

Response from [candidate O]
October 2, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate O]
I’m pleased to report that 100% of my campaign is being funded by myself. There is no other personal or corporate donations.
[candidate O]

[candidate G] first candidate to respond
October 1, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [candidate G], [town name], politics, Alberta, elections
I am happy to learn that you’re raising this issue. The 2010 election campaign in [town name] is, as far as I know, without precedent. This does not feel like a “small town” election. No longer will people feel they can stand for election to serve their fellow residents unless they have significant sponsorship. And sponsorship, or more correctly, what it can buy, almost certainly has a significant impact on people’s voting choices.

Here is my list of sponsors:
1. New Horizon Core Storage Ltd. My very good friend is the president of this company. He and his wife live in [city name] and do not work in (and as far as I know, have no connections with) realty, property development or any related field.
Their only interest in [town name] is (as far as I know) their 16+ year friendship with me and my family. They kindly offered to pay for the production of my leaflets (value approximately $900).
2. There is no no.2 I am paying for my own campaign.
   ● I am delivering as many leaflets by hand as I can, using as much help as my conscience will allow me to ask for. I will pay Canada Post to deliver the remainder.
   ● I shopped around and had Expressions Canada (Kerri Van Heli) do my lawn signs. Hers is a small local business. I appreciate her service – as far as I know, she hasn’t given me any preferential treatment that would make her a sponsor.
   ● I paid for my single advert in the [local media name]. I may be able to afford one more, smaller ad.
   ● I don’t have any “campaign staff” other than a few friends and family members who have hand-folded some of my 9000 leaflets.
   ● I will likely create colour versions of my leaflet to hand out at the forums (yes – I will pay for them myself).
I believe that this is “full disclosure” – and then some! I believe that an election should be decided on the issues and the positions that the candidates declare on those issues. Raising the publicity bar in this election will undoubtedly prevent many people from considering running next time around.

Regards
[candidate G]

Response from [candidate BB]
October 3, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate BB]
I am self-funded.
[candidate BB]

Response from [candidate Z]
October 1, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, “[candidate Z]”
Though I have been offered a couple of modest contributions, I have to this date declined acceptance preferring instead to self-fund my campaign.
[candidate Z]

Response from [candidate H]
October 3, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate H]
I am entirely self-funded.
My website address is www.allenjenkins.ca
[candidate H]
222 Woodhaven Drive
[town name], AB T1S 1S7
Tel: 403-995-1424

Response from [candidate R]
October 5, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate R]
I have had no campaign donations to date, has all been self financed
[candidate R]
Response from [candidate D]
October 3, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate D]
I have received a $50 donation from a resident. I am self-funded at this time.
[candidate D]

Response from [candidate J]
October 3, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate J]
Good Afternoon,
To date, my campaign has been solely (sic) funded by myself and my husband, I have not asked for donations, nor have I received any.
[candidate J]

Response from [candidate K]
October 3, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate K]
I am self-funded for this campaign.
[candidate K]

Response from [candidate CC]
October 2, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, "[candidate CC]"
Hello,
I too was interested to know what some candidates campaigns are costing. Our town is looking very active with signs and people buzzing around! This is an exciting campaign, and it is really tempting to not go out and spend the thousands of dollars that it takes to "get your name out there". With that said, I hope my time is better spent in going door to door to meet the people in town and listen to their concerns and answer any questions that they have. If I haven’t made it to your neighborhood yet, I’m working on it. In the end, however, there is simply no physical way for me to get to every house especially when I don’t want to rush people, and so sometimes we are 10-15 minutes at a door. This is great! I’d rather spend time this way, as I feel that when I leave, people know they have been heard, and that I have a better understanding of what our town’s peoples’ concerns are.
If I miss you, I hope that those interested in my views will drop me a question/comment on my website at website.com. For disclosure, this is a website set up for me by my eldest daughter... for FREE! I will personally respond to all emails and would love to hear from you and have the opportunity to earn your support.
For the record, my campaign is 100% self-funded. All sign design work and brochures were designed and paid for by myself.
I do not expect my funding to change, but if for whatever reason it does, I will gladly post any/all donations.
Thank you for asking.
[candidate CC]

Response from [candidate C]
October 5, 2010 in Councillor Candidates | Tags: [town name], politics, Alberta, elections, [candidate C]
Updated October 6 at 5:23 p.m.
Update. As of last night I now have two $100 donations. I want your information correct.
Thanks,
[candidate C]

For your information, I am self-funded.
[candidate C]
Response from [candidate P]

As I told the public last night at the Chamber of Commerce Candidate’s Forum I have received one donation of $100.00 towards my campaign expenses. I received the money from Mayor Bill McAlpine. I do not expect to receive any other donations. Thank you.
Councillor [candidate P]

Response from [candidate Q]

October 9, 2010 in Trustee Candidates | Tags: Alberta, elections, Laurie Copland, [town name], politics, schools

Good Afternoon
My name is [candidate Q] and I’m the trustee for [town name]. As of today October 9th 2010, I have received no money for my campaign.

Happy Turkey Day
[candidate Q]
[town name] Trustee

For Trustee

The following two candidates are running for school board trustee in Ward 4:
[candidate Q] – View campaign donors here.