

Conclusion

Selina Rathke

This volume consists of a collection of eight studies which discuss the wider topic of transparency. All chapters deal with transparency and how it is determined and shaped in different directions by different people. The particular directions of upwards and downwards transparency emerge as the two major perspectives connecting the contributions. From an upwards transparency perspective, people may want their subordinates to be transparent so that they can be more easily surveilled and observed. Employers may for example have an interest in increasing transparency on their employees. From a downwards transparency perspective, people may want their superiors to be transparent so that they can hold them accountable. Here, citizens may for example demand more transparency from governmental institutions or private enterprises. To sum up, it is people who make and demand transparency and who are at the same time willingly or unknowingly transparent.

This volume's first chapter by Carolyn Gaumet aimed to understand some of the reasons keeping people from striking a balance between privacy and surveillance in an online setting. By bringing forward paradoxes and dilemmas that individuals encounter when using the Internet, it showed how complex and multifaceted the topic of privacy is. The survey conducted helped to understand the respondents' individual habits. Furthermore, it was possible to initially assess how these individual habits can be affected by the respondents' backgrounds as well as by their views on privacy and surveillance. Some paradoxes between conventional beliefs and reality were brought forward, and certain inconsistencies between thoughts and actions were highlighted. The study concluded that surveillance cannot simply be filed within an acceptance versus resistance binary. The Internet, social media, and various apps have brought extra layers and more complexity to surveillance and privacy.

The second study by Elisa Telesca focused on the ways in which national newspapers frame the Right to Be Forgotten (RTBF). Her analysis revealed that while scholarly research presents more technical debates, newspapers discuss this right in terms of both individual conceptions and societal connections. Moreover, the findings support and demonstrate that different cultural values influence how media frame a particular issue. Descriptions of the RTBF adopted by Italian news content reflect how history occupies a central position in the Italian intellectual culture and how importance is given to preserving social standing, individual and family reputation. The protectionist discourse of national enterprises which was adopted by US newspapers when discussing the RTBF, can reflect the strong sense of national pride and collectivity. The UK discourses were found to display beliefs and values closer to the US than to Italy. The focus on the possible abuse of the RTBF by criminals could reflect the UK's Protestant tradition and ethics. Overall, Telesca's findings proved less for a "transatlantic cultural clash" and more for cultural differences on a national level as being the crucial factor influencing the different ways of perceiving and presenting the RTBF.

In the third chapter, Iana Gein investigated how privacy and surveillance issues are portrayed and framed within the German Bundestag's political discourse. A main finding of her study is the identification of a shift in how politicians portray surveillance in their debates. In the beginning of 2014, due to Snowden's revelations, surveillance was intensively discussed as an anti-democratic practice of foreign secret services. However, this frame had a relative short lifespan. After the Charlie Hebdo attack in January 2015,

Bundestag members presented surveillance as an acceptable democratic tool to ensure security and prevent terrorism. This frame reached its peak after the Berlin terror attack in December 2016 and was the most popular frame in 2017.

Two general conclusions can be derived from the findings of Nella Junge's analysis on how the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) may affect businesses' people analytics practices. Firstly, the GDPR is expected to improve the control of employees over their personal data and their overall influence in people analytics projects. Further, one may argue that because employees are expected to gain more control to restrict or grant organizations access to their personal data, their informational privacy is ensured. Moreover, data protection will increasingly be considered by people analytics practitioners. Secondly, while few expect the GDPR to restrict organizations to conduct people analytics, it overall remains rather unclear whether this will be the case in the end. Based on the overall tendency, it can be assumed, however, that organizations which use people analytics are in the process of preparing for GDPR changes, suggesting that the GDPR will have indeed implications for these organizations.

In the fifth chapter, Francesco Lanzone critically examined the extent to which the theory of a political economy of surveillance applies to the case of the EU's GDPR. Here, the study drew on relevant literature in surveillance studies, critical theory and Marxist political economics. Findings highlight the applicability of the current conceptualization of the political economy of surveillance to two out of the three identified topics. Firstly, the analysis showed how the regulation adopted a normative model of informed consent, reflecting the assumption of voluntarism embedded in privacy-self management. Secondly, the study revealed how the concept of data ownership has been translated into policy practice in a way that does not reflect the framework of a political economy of surveillance. Thirdly and lastly, concerning the aspect of profiling, the inquiry highlighted how the normative stance of the GDPR legitimizes the current dynamics of profiling in the advertisement ecosystem, while also aiming to restrict its most discriminatory practices.

In the sixth chapter, Mehmet Aktas carried out a comparative analysis of the European Commission's and the European Parliament's (EP) positions towards amendments of the Regulation on public access to EU institution documents. Findings suggested that different weights attributed to different interests by the two institutions cause the standstill of the revision process. The Commission tries to implement a public access regime which hinders the efficiency of the decision-making process the least. Here, the Commission puts greater emphasis on efficiency than on transparency. The EP, in contrast, has consistently favored transparency and seems to be willing to slow down the decision-making process if necessary.

Marlon van Dijk found several problems in his study explaining why potential benefits of Open Government Data (OGD) in Dutch municipalities have not fully crystallized. The most prominent problems are the absence of national publication standards, the lack of re-usage of the data and an unwillingness to publish OGD. A municipality's unwillingness to publish OGD can be caused by a fear of accountability, fear of misrepresentation and low priority given to OGD. The lack of re-usage can come from the quality of the data itself, the user's unawareness of the existence of this data, or the user's IT literacy deficit. In addition to these problems, several approaches were identified which municipalities can take in relation to the start of OGD (sparked by a political initiative or a third-party project) and their data selection (supply or demand driven). In addition, user feedback is important for two reasons: it can increase the quality of the data and increase a municipality's priority given to OGD.

This volume ended with a chapter by Selina Rathke in which she filled a research gap by developing, presenting and successfully applying a comprehensive comparative framework for analyzing whistleblowing complaint recipients, their responses, roles and responsibilities. Findings suggest that the wrongdoing and the proximity between wrongdoer and recipient are decisive for who the initial recipient is and how he or she responds to the reported wrongdoing. Moreover, direct corrective action seems to be initiated rather by subsequent external recipients than initial recipients. While the developed framework proves useful to reconstruct and compare whistleblowing cases with a focus on the complaint recipient, it moreover allows to increase transparency on these recipients.

To conclude, this volume's contributions show the versatility and complexity of the concept of transparency in different illustrative cases of everyday life. Since transparency is an important element of democratic societies (e.g. Heald, 2006), it comes as no surprise that people play an important and decisive role in ensuring, demanding and regulating transparency. While transparency can be a condition as well as a means and social end, it is the people determining who and what is transparent in which way and why. This volume's contributions reflect different approaches towards analyzing and discussing different directions of transparency and overall demonstrate that the phenomenon of transparency is and remains an inexhaustible and highly relevant domain for research.