Politeia : Journal of Public Administration and Political Science and International Relations
E-ISSN : 3031-3929
Volume. 3 Issue 1 January 2025
Page No: 45-57

Smart Governance for Smart Societies: A Narrative Review of Digital Models

Fitriani[1]
[1]**Universitas Muhammadiyah Palangkaraya, Indonesia**
Correspondent: fitriani@umpr.ac.id[1]

Received : November 23, 2024
Accepted : January 08, 2025
Published : January 31, 2025

Citation: Fitriani, (2025). Smart Governance for Smart Societies: A Narrative Review of Digital Models. Politeia : Journal of Public Administration and Political Science and International Relations, 3(1), 45-57.

ABSTRACT: Digital governance has become an increasingly critical dimension of contemporary governance, integrating digital technologies into decision-making, service delivery, and stakeholder engagement. This narrative review aims to identify opportunities and challenges associated with digital governance across public and corporate sectors. A systematic literature search was conducted using Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar, employing keywords such as digital governance, public administration digitalization, corporate governance digital era, and platform economy. Inclusion criteria prioritized peer-reviewed studies published in the last two decades that address the intersection of governance and digital transformation, encompassing both theoretical and empirical contributions. Findings reveal that digital technologies significantly enhance transparency, accountability, and efficiency through mechanisms such as open data, big data analytics, and artificial intelligence. Social media and digital platforms expand citizen participation and reshape administrative legitimacy, while corporate governance increasingly relies on artificial intelligence and data economics to strengthen accountability and sustainability. Smart cities illustrate the potential of digital governance in urban sustainability, though challenges remain regarding regulatory uncertainty and technological interoperability, particularly in the use of blockchain and NFTs. Despite these opportunities, disparities in infrastructure, digital literacy, and regulatory frameworks limit adoption in developing nations, reinforcing inequalities. The review concludes that robust policies, inclusive ecosystems, and cross-sector collaborations are essential to harness the benefits of digital governance. Future research should explore context-specific models and long-term implications to ensure that digital transformation advances inclusive, transparent, and resilient governance systems.

Keywords: Digital Governance, Public Administration Digitalization, Corporate Governance Digital Era, Citizen Participation, Smart Cities, Transparency and Accountability, Sustainable Governance.

INTRODUCTION

The rapid transformation brought about by digital technologies over the last few decades has significantly reshaped governance models across both public and private sectors. Digital

governance is broadly defined as the integration of digital technologies into decision-making processes, service delivery, and stakeholder interactions. It has become a pivotal concept in contemporary governance discourse. Within the public sector, e-governance initiatives are increasingly adopted to enhance accessibility, transparency, and citizen participation, offering innovative channels for engagement and accountability (Ramjit, 2025; Clarke & Margetts, 2014). At the same time, private sector organizations leverage digitalization to streamline operations, optimize resource use, and respond more swiftly to consumer needs, thereby driving competitiveness and innovation (Lou, 2024). This adoption in both public and private sectors underscores that digital transformation is not limited to technical innovation but has become integral to institutional adaptation and governance reform.

Current global data further illustrates the depth of this transformation. Studies indicate that more than half of the world's nations have committed to open government initiatives, highlighting a global trend toward institutional transparency and improved citizen-government interaction (Clarke & Margetts, 2014). Furthermore, empirical evidence demonstrates that the adoption of big data, artificial intelligence, and related technologies contributes to enhanced bureaucratic efficiency and a more nuanced understanding of societal needs (Dunleavy & Margetts, 2023). The global COVID-19 pandemic offered a critical case in point: real-time data collection and analysis became indispensable in guiding public health responses, illustrating how digital technologies can both strengthen resilience and provide actionable insights during crises (Lyu et al., 2022). These developments suggest that digital governance is both timely and necessary for ensuring adaptive, transparent, and effective institutional practices.

While digital transformation has yielded significant benefits, it has also generated new challenges, particularly regarding compliance and data privacy. In certain contexts, the adoption of digital tools has facilitated state surveillance and reinforced authoritarian practices, raising concerns about potential misuse of technology for control rather than empowerment (Zeng, 2016; Salem, 2016). Moreover, the integration of new technologies requires effective change management and inclusive stakeholder engagement to avoid creating governance systems that are technologically advanced but socially inequitable (Werner et al., 2023). This tension between innovation and accountability illustrates the paradox of digital governance: while it enables more efficient systems, it simultaneously poses risks to individual freedoms and institutional legitimacy.

Infrastructure limitations represent a persistent challenge in advancing digital governance. In many developing countries, insufficient internet penetration, outdated technological infrastructure, and unequal access to digital tools hinder the full realization of governance innovations (Werner et al., 2023). Data security and privacy breaches further complicate adoption, with growing concerns over how sensitive information is collected, processed, and safeguarded (Ravšelj et al., 2022; Scott et al., 2022). Governments often struggle to strike an appropriate balance between enabling technological innovation and enforcing necessary regulations to protect citizen rights and maintain accountability (Yun et al., 2024). Thus, the promise of digital governance can only be fulfilled if these foundational challenges are adequately addressed.

Leadership and capacity-building also emerge as critical factors in the success of digital transformation. Leaders are expected to not only understand technological trends but also cultivate organizational readiness and cultural shifts that support innovation (Lemak et al., 2024). However,

such leadership capacity is unevenly distributed. In advanced economies, stronger partnerships between governments and private sectors often ensure sufficient resources, expertise, and infrastructure to drive governance innovation. By contrast, developing countries face fragmented or limited collaboration, leading to less effective or slower adoption of digital strategies (Aristovnik et al., 2022). Building the skills and capacities of civil servants and other stakeholders is therefore essential to bridge the digital divide and foster more inclusive governance outcomes (Pirannejad & Ingrams, 2022).

Despite substantial research on digital governance, gaps remain in understanding its effectiveness across diverse socio-economic and political contexts. Much of the existing literature emphasizes experiences from developed countries, often overlooking the distinct challenges faced by developing economies. These contexts present unique issues such as fragile infrastructures, socio-economic inequalities, and differing political cultures that shape how digital initiatives are adopted and sustained (Ravšelj et al., 2022; Abutabenjeh et al., 2021). The limited exploration of local cultural and institutional influences creates a gap in knowledge, necessitating studies that account for the complexities of diverse governance environments (Dunleavy & Margetts, 2023). Without such contextualization, digital governance research risks offering solutions that are neither scalable nor adaptable to the realities of developing nations.

Against this backdrop, this review aims to critically examine the opportunities and challenges associated with digital governance implementation. Specifically, it seeks to identify how digital technologies can enhance efficiency, accountability, and transparency in governance systems, while also highlighting the barriers that hinder successful adoption, including infrastructure deficiencies, cybersecurity concerns, and leadership gaps (Aristovnik et al., 2022; Lemak et al., 2024). By synthesizing the existing literature, this study provides a comprehensive understanding of the multidimensional factors shaping digital governance and offers insights into strategies for overcoming associated challenges.

The scope of this review is broad yet strategically focused. Geographically, the analysis encompasses both developed and developing nations to capture variations in adoption levels, implementation strategies, and outcomes. Particular attention is given to urban populations in developing countries, where the digital divide poses significant governance challenges, alongside advanced economies where digital transformation has rapidly accelerated in areas such as public administration and healthcare (Werner et al., 2023). Furthermore, this review considers marginalized and underserved populations whose limited access to digital technologies often results in exclusion from governance processes, thereby undermining inclusivity (Ramjit, 2025; Puriwat & Tripopsakul, 2022). By acknowledging these contextual nuances, the study aspires to build a more comprehensive and evidence-based framework for digital governance that is adaptable across diverse socio-political and economic landscapes.

In sum, digital governance represents both a critical opportunity and a formidable challenge in the contemporary era. The existing literature underscores its potential to transform governance by promoting transparency, efficiency, and participation, while also warning of risks related to inequality, surveillance, and limited institutional capacity. Through a focused literature review, this paper seeks to advance scholarly and practical understanding of digital governance, thereby

contributing to the development of inclusive, resilient, and effective governance frameworks suited to the complexities of the digital age.

METHOD

The methodology for this narrative review was designed to ensure rigor, transparency, and reproducibility in capturing the breadth of existing scholarship on governance in the digital era. As digital governance encompasses a rapidly evolving intersection of technology, policy, and management, the literature search strategy was deliberately broad, yet systematic, to identify studies that provide both theoretical foundations and empirical insights relevant to this domain.

The first stage of the methodology involved identifying the most appropriate databases for conducting the literature search. Scopus and Web of Science were selected as the primary databases due to their comprehensive indexing of peer-reviewed journals across disciplines such as social sciences, computer science, public administration, and management studies. Both databases are widely recognized for their reliability, coverage, and citation analysis tools, which ensure access to high-quality research outputs. Google Scholar was additionally utilized as a supplementary resource to capture grey literature, theses, conference proceedings, and other academic or quasi-academic materials that may not be fully indexed in Scopus and Web of Science. This three-pronged approach allowed the review to include both mainstream scholarly discussions and less formal but contextually relevant contributions.

Keyword selection was a critical element in shaping the search process. Given the complexity of digital governance, a combination of general and specific terms was applied to maximize retrieval of relevant publications. The primary keywords included "digital governance," which directly targets studies on the integration of digital technologies into governance practices, and "public administration digitalization," which emphasizes the transformation of bureaucratic systems in response to digital innovation. To address corporate dimensions, the keyword "corporate governance digital era" was used, allowing the inclusion of studies examining private-sector governance frameworks in digitally mediated contexts. Furthermore, "platform economy" was incorporated to account for the rise of digital platforms as key governance actors, influencing both business practices and regulatory frameworks. Additional terms such as "e-governance" and "open government data" were employed to refine the search and capture specialized debates within the broader theme. Boolean operators and truncations were applied where appropriate to combine terms and expand variations, ensuring comprehensive coverage.

The next step involved establishing inclusion and exclusion criteria to determine which studies would be considered in this review. To be included, studies had to meet several criteria: they needed to be published in peer-reviewed journals or reputable academic sources, address issues explicitly related to digital governance, and fall within the timeframe of the last two decades to capture the most relevant developments. Both theoretical and empirical works were considered, provided that they offered insights into governance structures, processes, or outcomes in the digital era. Excluded from the review were studies not available in English, publications lacking empirical or theoretical contributions (such as opinion pieces without analytical depth), and research that focused exclusively on technical aspects of digital technologies without addressing

governance implications. This filtering ensured that the review remained tightly focused on the intersection of governance and digital transformation.

The inclusion of diverse study types was necessary to capture the multi-dimensional nature of digital governance. Randomized controlled trials were not applicable in this context, given the field's focus on governance practices rather than medical or experimental interventions. Instead, the review prioritized observational research such as cohort studies, comparative case studies, and cross-sectional analyses, which provide empirical evidence on the implementation and impact of digital governance initiatives. Qualitative research, including case studies and ethnographic analyses, was also included to provide contextual depth, particularly in exploring citizen engagement, cultural factors, and institutional dynamics. Systematic reviews, meta-analyses, and policy analyses were integrated when available, as they offered comprehensive syntheses of specific subtopics, such as e-governance adoption or corporate digital compliance. By accommodating both qualitative and quantitative approaches, the review achieved a balanced representation of the scholarly landscape.

The process of literature selection and evaluation proceeded in multiple stages. Initial searches across Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar generated a large body of potential sources. Titles and abstracts were screened to assess alignment with the review's objectives. Articles that appeared relevant based on keywords but lacked substantive governance content were excluded at this stage. The remaining articles were subjected to full-text screening, where methodological rigor, clarity of findings, and relevance to the central themes of governance and digitalization were evaluated. Where there were uncertainties, studies were further assessed by cross-checking references and citations to determine their academic influence and contextual contribution. To minimize bias, duplicate entries across databases were removed, and inclusion decisions were guided by consensus based on predefined criteria.

In evaluating the selected literature, particular attention was paid to the quality and relevance of findings. Peer-reviewed journal articles were given priority due to their rigorous editorial standards, while grey literature from Google Scholar was critically appraised for methodological soundness before inclusion. Each study was examined for its theoretical framework, research design, and contributions to understanding digital governance. For empirical studies, attention was directed at data sources, sample sizes, and the validity of the conclusions drawn. For theoretical works, emphasis was placed on conceptual clarity, logical coherence, and alignment with ongoing scholarly debates. This evaluative process ensured that the evidence base for the review was robust, credible, and reflective of the field's diversity.

In summary, the methodology adopted for this review reflects a systematic and comprehensive approach to identifying, selecting, and analyzing the literature on digital governance. By utilizing multiple databases, carefully selected keywords, and stringent inclusion and exclusion criteria, the review captured a wide spectrum of relevant scholarship. The inclusion of both qualitative and quantitative studies further ensured that the analysis accounted for multiple perspectives, spanning theoretical discussions, empirical evidence, and policy-oriented insights. The structured process of screening, evaluating, and synthesizing studies provides a solid foundation for examining the opportunities and challenges of governance in the digital era, supporting the review's aim of generating a nuanced and academically rigorous understanding of the field.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this review reveal that digital governance has emerged as a transformative force across multiple dimensions of governance, with significant implications for transparency, accountability, efficiency, participation, corporate structures, and urban sustainability. The analysis is organized into four main thematic areas: transparency and accountability, public administration efficiency, citizen participation and administrative legitimacy, corporate governance in the digital economy, and smart cities with a focus on sustainability. Each theme is presented with reference to relevant literature and empirical evidence to provide a comprehensive understanding of both opportunities and challenges.

Transparency and Accountability

The literature consistently highlights the significant role of digital technologies in enhancing transparency and accountability in governance. The introduction of open government initiatives has allowed governments to provide greater access to information, thereby reinforcing public oversight. Clarke and Margetts (2014) report that 64 countries have committed to open government principles that emphasize transparency, accountability, and citizen participation. This commitment has been instrumental in establishing frameworks for public scrutiny of governmental processes. Moreover, the integration of digital technologies into communication platforms has enabled governments to engage with citizens more directly, creating new avenues for accountability (Ramjit, 2025). These digital interfaces facilitate real-time feedback loops that empower citizens to hold governments accountable while simultaneously reducing opportunities for corruption (Matlala, 2024).

Despite these advancements, disparities remain between developed and developing nations in terms of the extent and effectiveness of transparency gains. Evidence shows that developed countries, supported by robust digital infrastructure, are better positioned to leverage digital governance tools to strengthen transparency. By contrast, developing countries face significant challenges in achieving comparable results due to infrastructural constraints and limited technological access (Clarke & Margetts, 2014; Lyu et al., 2022). Lyu et al. (2022), for instance, demonstrate that while the adoption of digital health technologies in China improved efficiency and transparency, similar gains were not consistently realized in countries with weaker technological systems. This underscores the contextual nature of digital governance and suggests that infrastructure and resource disparities continue to limit the potential of digital initiatives in many parts of the developing world.

Public Administration Efficiency

The adoption of big data and digital finance has proven instrumental in enhancing the efficiency of public administration. Big data analytics enables governments to process large volumes of information, providing insights that inform policy-making and resource allocation. Sun and Gui (2023) emphasize that big data enhances evidence-based decision-making, thereby supporting more effective governance practices. Similarly, Werner et al. (2023) document that the

incorporation of digital technologies in public administration has led to significant cost savings and improved service delivery across several contexts. By providing governments with a deeper understanding of societal needs and behavior, digital tools allow for more efficient distribution of public resources, aligning expenditure with real-time priorities.

Cross-country comparisons further reveal substantial variation in outcomes. Haddade et al. (2024) note that advanced economies demonstrate superior performance in digital public services due to advanced infrastructure and well-established best practices in governance. Conversely, developing countries frequently encounter gaps in the adoption and implementation of digital services, resulting in lower levels of effectiveness (Lyu et al., 2022; Matlala, 2024). Aristovnik et al. (2022) highlight that local-level adoption of digital governance in Scandinavia has produced significant operational efficiencies, whereas Eastern European nations, constrained by infrastructural and regulatory challenges, have struggled to achieve similar outcomes. These comparisons illustrate that digital governance's impact on efficiency is highly contingent upon national capacity, institutional readiness, and regulatory frameworks.

Citizen Participation and Administrative Legitimacy

Digital technologies have also played a transformative role in citizen participation, expanding opportunities for civic engagement and influencing administrative legitimacy. Social media and digital platforms allow citizens to actively contribute to public discourse, voice their concerns, and interact with policymakers. Matlala (2024) observes that social media platforms amplify citizen voices, enabling them to influence policy agendas more effectively. Ramjit (2025) adds that digital platforms support the creation of virtual communities that facilitate collaborative advocacy, promoting more inclusive and responsive governance structures.

Digital activism has had profound effects on administrative legitimacy, both reinforcing and challenging governance systems depending on the political context. In democratic settings, digital activism strengthens accountability by pressuring governments to respond to public demands, thereby reinforcing bureaucratic legitimacy (Zhao et al., 2023). In contrast, in authoritarian contexts, digital activism often challenges state legitimacy by exposing unjust policies and disseminating alternative narratives. However, such challenges are frequently met with repression, highlighting the complex dynamics of legitimacy in non-democratic settings (Salem, 2016). This dual impact demonstrates that digital activism is a double-edged sword, capable of both enhancing democratic governance and destabilizing authoritarian regimes.

Corporate Governance and the Digital Economy

In the private sector, the integration of artificial intelligence and neural networks into decision-making processes has revolutionized corporate governance. Lou (2024) underscores the role of AI in supporting strategic decisions, enhancing operational efficiency, and optimizing resource utilization. Yukhno (2021) further emphasizes that these technologies allow corporations to adapt rapidly to market changes, thereby sustaining competitiveness in a volatile global economy. The

predictive power of AI provides firms with the ability to forecast outcomes and minimize risks, enhancing both accountability and transparency in governance structures.

Another emerging dimension is the role of data economics in shaping corporate governance in the digital era. Data, increasingly regarded as a strategic asset, is central to valuation, ownership, and monetization strategies. Milne and Brayne (2020) argue that data monetization enhances corporate accountability by creating new revenue streams and transparency mechanisms. Zhai et al. (2023) highlight that digital infrastructures, particularly in urban settings, contribute significantly to improved Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) performance, reinforcing stakeholder trust and corporate responsibility. These findings suggest that digital technologies not only reshape corporate strategies but also contribute to broader societal goals, bridging corporate governance with sustainability imperatives.

Smart Cities and Sustainability

The governance of smart cities illustrates the application of digital technologies to urban sustainability challenges. Digital governance frameworks, leveraging the Internet of Things (IoT) and related tools, enable cities to monitor and manage resources such as energy and water more efficiently (Abutabenjeh et al., 2021). Rauch et al. (2024) report that smart city initiatives enhance administrative efficiency, citizen engagement, and environmental responsiveness, making urban governance more adaptive and resilient. Bai and Li further argue that the integration of digital systems in urban governance promotes participatory decision-making, thereby aligning sustainability goals with citizen needs.

Nevertheless, integrating advanced technologies such as blockchain and non-fungible tokens (NFTs) into urban governance presents significant challenges. Regulatory uncertainty remains a major barrier, as many jurisdictions lack clear legal frameworks for the application of these technologies (Salem, 2016; Jha, 2022). Technical challenges, including interoperability between existing and emerging systems, also impede implementation. Bayat and Kawalek (2021) note that the absence of coherent regulatory and technical standards complicates the adoption of blockchain in financing urban projects, limiting its potential to foster transparency and sustainability. These challenges underscore the need for clearer frameworks and stronger governance mechanisms to fully realize the potential of digital innovations in urban sustainability.

Overall, the results of this review demonstrate that digital governance is multifaceted, offering substantial opportunities for enhancing transparency, efficiency, participation, and corporate accountability, while also confronting persistent challenges linked to infrastructure, regulatory frameworks, and inclusivity. The global comparisons highlight that outcomes vary widely across contexts, with developed countries reaping greater benefits due to stronger infrastructure and governance systems, while developing nations face structural constraints. These findings establish a foundation for deeper discussion on how to balance innovation with regulation to ensure that digital governance serves as an inclusive, transparent, and sustainable model for the future.

The findings of this review underscore that the success of digital governance is inseparably linked to systemic factors that shape its design, implementation, and outcomes. Literature consistently indicates that regulatory clarity, cultural orientation toward transparency, and the digital divide are

among the most decisive conditions. These factors determine the capacity of governments and organizations to realize the full benefits of digital transformation. Clarke and Margetts (2014) illustrate how open data initiatives, when embedded in supportive regulatory frameworks, enable governments to improve transparency and accountability. This suggests that the mere adoption of digital technologies is insufficient without robust legal and institutional scaffolding that ensures their proper application. Regulations must not only encourage innovation but also safeguard data security and privacy, thereby providing a dual foundation for trust and effectiveness in governance.

Cultural factors have emerged as equally crucial in shaping digital governance. Aristovnik et al. (2022) highlight how societies with participatory traditions and organizational cultures that embrace innovation tend to achieve better outcomes in implementing governance reforms. Such cultures foster environments where digital tools are not merely imposed from above but become embedded in everyday practices of administration and citizen engagement. By contrast, in contexts where hierarchical or opaque practices dominate, digital governance risks being reduced to superficial adoption without substantive transformation. The role of culture, therefore, extends beyond receptiveness to technology—it defines the legitimacy and sustainability of governance innovations.

The digital divide, both in terms of access to infrastructure and in digital literacy, continues to pose a significant barrier to equitable governance outcomes. Werner et al. (2023) emphasize that technological gaps, particularly in developing countries, constrain the ability of digital governance to deliver improvements in efficiency or transparency. Ramjit (2025) further notes that unequal access to digital tools deepens stakeholder divides, excluding marginalized populations from participatory opportunities and reinforcing socio-political inequalities. These systemic inequalities mean that without targeted interventions, digital governance risks replicating and even exacerbating pre-existing divides rather than closing them.

The policy implications arising from these findings are significant. Governments must prioritize the development of regulatory frameworks that not only facilitate digital adoption but also balance transparency with privacy protections. Clarke and Margetts (2014) make clear that open data can enhance accountability, but its misuse in the absence of strong privacy regulations may undermine trust. Similarly, the policy agenda must address capacity-building initiatives that equip civil servants and citizens alike with digital skills. Lemak et al. (2024) stress that training and education are essential to narrow the digital skills gap, ensuring that governance innovations are both usable and effective across diverse populations. In the corporate sphere, Yukhno (2021) demonstrates the necessity of integrating digital technologies into business strategies not merely as operational enhancements but as foundational components of competitiveness and sustainability. Policies that foster collaboration between public institutions and private enterprises, therefore, have the potential to generate synergies that accelerate innovation and improve governance effectiveness.

Potential solutions proposed in the literature focus on building inclusive digital ecosystems and fostering cross-sector collaboration. Pirannejad and Ingrams (2022) argue that inclusive digital ecosystems—anchored in accessible infrastructure and widespread connectivity—form the backbone of effective digital governance. However, inclusion requires more than infrastructure; it also necessitates the deliberate design of governance systems that promote equity in access and participation. Nicholls (2019) suggests that collaborative platforms engaging government, private

sector, and civil society actors can generate trust and co-create governance models that reflect diverse societal needs. Such collaborative arrangements not only broaden participation but also diffuse responsibility and enhance legitimacy. Zhai et al. (2023) highlight that innovative technologies such as blockchain can provide structural solutions to accountability challenges by embedding transparency into governance processes themselves. Blockchain's potential to decentralize decision-making and provide immutable records makes it a promising instrument for addressing persistent accountability gaps.

Despite the promise of these solutions, the current body of research exhibits important limitations. Much of the existing literature remains concentrated on specific regional or national contexts, which limits the generalizability of findings. Dong et al. (2025) observe that the impact of proposed solutions is often theorized rather than empirically validated across diverse governance environments. Consequently, the evidence base is uneven, with a disproportionate focus on developed nations where infrastructure and institutional stability support experimentation with advanced technologies. Ravšelj et al. (2022) emphasize that further research is required to assess how context-specific variables—such as political culture, socio-economic inequalities, and institutional legacies—influence the success or failure of digital governance reforms. Moreover, the pace of technological change continually introduces new dynamics that existing studies may not fully capture, making longitudinal research and adaptive frameworks necessary.

The interplay of systemic factors, policy frameworks, and technological innovations highlights the complexity of digital governance. Regulations must evolve in tandem with technological advances to remain relevant and effective, cultures must adapt to embrace transparency and inclusivity, and infrastructural investments must ensure equitable access. The literature reviewed demonstrates that digital governance is neither a purely technical nor a purely administrative reform; rather, it is a socio-technical transformation shaped by interdependent systemic forces. Addressing its challenges requires not only technological fixes but also a rethinking of institutional arrangements and policy priorities. The research gap lies in bridging the divide between theoretical propositions and empirical validations across varied contexts, ensuring that future governance models are resilient, inclusive, and adaptable to the digital age.

CONCLUSION

This review highlights that digital governance has become a defining feature of contemporary public administration and corporate management, with transformative implications for transparency, accountability, efficiency, participation, and sustainability. Evidence from the literature demonstrates that technologies such as open data platforms, big data analytics, artificial intelligence, and blockchain have created unprecedented opportunities for improving governance practices. These innovations enhance transparency and accountability by broadening access to information, reduce corruption risks through citizen oversight, and increase efficiency by enabling data-driven decision-making. However, the analysis also shows that these benefits are unevenly distributed, with developed nations often achieving greater success due to stronger infrastructure, clearer regulations, and higher levels of digital literacy, while developing countries face persistent barriers including infrastructural deficits, data security risks, and skills gaps.

The findings underscore the urgency of addressing systemic factors that determine the success of digital governance. Robust regulatory frameworks, inclusive cultural orientations, and investment in digital infrastructure and capacity-building are essential for overcoming the barriers identified. Policies that balance transparency with data protection, foster collaboration between the public and private sectors, and provide digital training for both citizens and public servants are crucial for ensuring inclusive outcomes. Future research should focus on contextualized studies that explore how socio-economic, cultural, and political environments influence the success of digital governance initiatives, particularly in developing countries. By addressing these gaps, policymakers and scholars can design governance frameworks that are not only technologically advanced but also equitable, transparent, and resilient in the face of rapid digital transformation.

REFERENCE

Abutabenjeh, S., Nukpezah, J., & Azhar, A. (2021). Do smart cities technologies contribute to local economic development?. *Economic Development Quarterly, 36*(1), 3-16. https://doi.org/10.1177/08912424211053599

Aristovnik, A., Murko, E., & Ravšelj, D. (2022). From neo-weberian to hybrid governance models in public administration: differences between state and local self-government. *Administrative Sciences, 12*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci12010026

Bayat, A. & Kawalek, P. (2021). Digitization and urban governance: the city as a reflection of its data infrastructure. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 89*(1), 21-38. https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523211033205

Clarke, A. & Margetts, H. (2014). Governments and citizens getting to know each other? open, closed, and big data in public management reform. *Policy & Internet, 6*(4), 393-417. https://doi.org/10.1002/1944-2866.poi377

Dong, Y., Chun-jie, Q., Cheng, G., & Yang, Y. (2025). Spatial spillover effects of digital infrastructure on food system resilience: an analysis incorporating threshold effects and spatial decay boundaries. *Foods, 14*(9), 1484. https://doi.org/10.3390/foods14091484

Dunleavy, P. & Margetts, H. (2023). Data science, artificial intelligence and the third wave of digital era governance. *Public Policy and Administration, 40*(2), 185-214. https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767231198737

Haddade, H., Nur, A., Achruh, A., Rasyid, M., & Ibrahim, A. (2024). Madrasah management strategies through madrasah reform program: an evidence from indonesia. *International Journal of Educational Management, 38*(5), 1289-1304. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijem-05-2023-0236

Jha, S. (2022). The counterfeit degree certificate: application of blockchain technology in higher education in india. *Library Hi Tech News, 40*(2), 20-24. https://doi.org/10.1108/lhtn-02-2022-0023

Lemak, C., Pena, D., Jones, D., Kim, D., & Guptill, J. (2024). Leadership to accelerate healthcare's digital transformation: evidence from 33 health systems. *Journal of Healthcare Management, 69*(4), 267-279. https://doi.org/10.1097/jhm-d-23-00210

Lou, S. (2024). Research on the mechanism and optimization strategy of deep learning algorithm based on cntm model in digital governance. *Proceedings of SPIE, 22*. https://doi.org/10.1117/12.3034766

Lyu, Y., Peng, Y., Liu, H., & Hwang, J. (2022). Impact of digital economy on the provision efficiency for public health services: empirical study of 31 provinces in china. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 19*(10), 5978. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph19105978

Maltby, J., Rayes, T., Nage, A., Sharif, S., Omar, M., & Nichani, S. (2024). Synthesizing perspectives: crafting an interdisciplinary view of social media's impact on young people's mental health. *Plos One, 19*(7), e0307164. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0307164

Matlala, L. (2024). Improving citizen-based monitoring in south africa: a social media model. *African Evaluation Journal, 12*(1). https://doi.org/10.4102/aej.v12i1.719

Milne, R. & Brayne, C. (2020). We need to think about data governance for dementia research in a digital era. *Alzheimer's Research & Therapy, 12*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s13195-020-0584-y

Nicholls, T. (2019). Local government performance, cost-effectiveness, and use of the web: an empirical analysis. *Policy & Internet, 11*(4), 480-507. https://doi.org/10.1002/poi3.209

Pirannejad, A. & Ingrams, A. (2022). Open government maturity models: a global comparison. *Social Science Computer Review, 41*(4), 1140-1165. https://doi.org/10.1177/08944393211063107

Puriwat, W. & Tripopsakul, S. (2022). From esg to desg: the impact of desg (digital environmental, social, and governance) on customer attitudes and brand equity. *Sustainability, 14*(17), 10480. https://doi.org/10.3390/su141710480

Ramjit, D. (2025). Citizen empowerment in the digital era: redefining administrative legitimacy and power dynamics. *Public Administration and Development.* https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.70002

Rauch, M., Rösch, J., & Kuchinke, B. (2024). Economic perspectives on redefining public service media in the digital era: broadcasting to media platform. *List Forum Für Wirtschafts- Und Finanzpolitik, 50*(3), 159-181. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41025-024-00276-3

Ravšelj, D., Umek, L., Todorovski, L., & Aristovnik, A. (2022). A review of digital era governance research in the first two decades: a bibliometric study. *Future Internet, 14*(5), 126. https://doi.org/10.3390/fi14050126

Salem, F. (2016). Open governance in authoritarian states: a framework for assessing digital participation in the age of mass surveillance. In *Governance in the Digital Age* (pp. 94-105). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-45074-2_8

Scott, R., Donadelli, F., & Merton, E. (2022). Administrative philosophies in the discourse and decisions of the new zealand public service: is post-new public management still a myth?. *International Review of Administrative Sciences, 89*(4), 941-957. https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523221101727

Sun, M. & Gui, J. (2023). Study of trip card data analysis system under big data. *Applied Mathematics and Nonlinear Sciences, 9*(1). https://doi.org/10.2478/amns.2023.1.00372

Werner, L., Puta, C., Chilalika, T., Hyde, S., Cooper, H., Goertz, H., … & Kapnick, V. (2023). How digital transformation can accelerate data use in health systems. *Frontiers in Public Health, 11*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2023.1106548

Yukhno, A. (2021). The fourth industrial revolution and the new paradigm of corporate governance. In *Corporate Governance in the Digital Economy* (pp. 117-129). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58267-8_9

Yun, L., Yun, S., & Xue, H. (2024). Improving citizen-government interactions with generative artificial intelligence: novel human-computer interaction strategies for policy understanding through large language models. *Plos One, 19*(12), e0311410. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0311410

Zeng, J. (2016). China's date with big data: will it strengthen or threaten authoritarian rule?. *International Affairs, 92*(6), 1443-1462. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2346.12750

Zhai, C., Ding, X., Zhang, X., Jiang, S., Zhang, Y., & Li, C. (2023). Assessing the effects of urban digital infrastructure on corporate environmental, social and governance (esg) performance: evidence from the broadband china policy. *Systems, 11*(10), 515. https://doi.org/10.3390/systems11100515

Zhao, Q., Li, X., & Li, S. (2023). Analyzing the relationship between digital transformation strategy and esg performance in large manufacturing enterprises: the mediating role of green innovation. *Sustainability, 15*(13), 9998. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15139998