

Public Policy and Digital Participation: Their Impact on Government Transparency and Accountability

Andi Asrijal¹, Raden Ajeng Indrawati², Zulkifli³

^{1,2,3} Universitas Cahaya Prima, Indonesia

Article history:

Received: 2025-07-18

Revised: 2025-09-25

Accepted: 2025-10-10

Published : 2025-10-18

✉ Corresponding Author:

Name author: Andi Asrijal

E-mail: andiasri1397@gmail.com

Abstract

This study aims to analyze the relationship between public policy and digital participation and its impact on government transparency and accountability. Using a qualitative approach with a literature review method, this study examines various academic sources and international agency reports to identify conceptual patterns in digital governance practices. The analysis shows that the digitalization of public policy not only accelerates administrative processes but also reforms the governance paradigm towards structural transparency based on open data. Digital participation acts as a democratic mechanism that strengthens social accountability through citizen involvement in direct oversight of public policy. However, challenges such as the digital divide, data security, and information ethics remain obstacles to realizing inclusive digital governance. This study emphasizes that the success of digital public policy is determined by the synergy between technological innovation, public digital literacy, and the government's ethical commitment to openness. Therefore, digital transformation must be viewed not merely as a technocratic agenda, but as an instrument of socio-political reform that strengthens the legitimacy and public trust in government in the global information era.

Keywords: Accountability, Digital Participation, Transparency

1. Introduction

Digital transformation has brought fundamental changes to the global governance system. The shift toward an information technology-based governance model marks a new era of openness and efficiency in public bureaucracy. The use of digital technology simplifies administrative processes, increases access to public services, and optimizes data-driven decision-making. Governments across the globe are beginning to integrate digital systems to facilitate transparency and accelerate inter-agency communication. This shift aligns with the concept of e-governance, which emphasizes the integration of technology, information, and citizen participation as the foundation of modern governance. According to the United Nations E-Government Survey (2022), increased digitalization of public administration has been shown to contribute to increased efficiency, accountability, and socio-political participation. Digital transformation is not merely a technological aspect but also a social phenomenon that demands a paradigm shift in government management. Governments that adapt to digital change demonstrate a higher capacity to face the challenges of bureaucratic complexity and increasingly dynamic public demands (Khan et al., 2025).

The role of digital participation is a crucial dimension in strengthening relations between the state and citizens in the information age. Through various online platforms, the public now has broader opportunities to provide input, critique, and participate in the formulation of public policy. Digital participation expands the space for democratic deliberation, which has been limited by conventional bureaucratic structures. Interactions between government and citizens through digital channels foster

the emergence of a two-way communication model that is more responsive and open to public needs. OECD data (2023) shows that countries with high levels of digital participation tend to have stronger public trust in their governments. This occurs because citizens feel they have an active role in the policy process, rather than simply being objects of political decisions. Digital engagement enables citizens to become crucial actors in maintaining government integrity. The connections established through digital ecosystems create new public spaces where transparency can be tested, accountability strengthened, and political legitimacy renewed (Shenkoya, 2023).

Digital integration into public policy also demands a restructuring of government accountability mechanisms. Accountability is no longer understood as an administrative obligation, but rather as a form of moral and political responsibility for information transparency. With digital technology, every government policy and action can be publicly tracked, audited, and evaluated. This mechanism narrows the scope for corruption and abuse of power. Through open data systems, the public has access to information on budgets, programs, and policy outcomes, the validity of which can be independently verified (Bhanye & Shayamunda, 2025). This process increases social pressure on the government to act more transparently and efficiently. Meanwhile, technology also strengthens the position of civil society in conducting social oversight of the state. This reciprocal relationship creates a more adaptive, open, and trust-based governance ecosystem.

However, the success of digital participation in strengthening transparency and accountability depends heavily on the ability of public policies to address the gap in technological access. The digital divide poses a significant challenge to efforts to achieve inclusive participation. Not all segments of society have the resources, skills, or infrastructure to actively engage in the digital sphere of government (Saldanha et al., 2022). The World Bank (2023) reports that approximately 37% of the global population still lacks adequate internet access, meaning millions of public voices are potentially excluded from the policy process. This situation creates a participation bias that favors educated and high-income groups. Furthermore, low digital literacy can also lead to information distortion, the spread of hoaxes, and the manipulation of public opinion. Without inclusive policies that guarantee equitable digital access, online participation has the potential to deepen social and democratic inequalities (Tahir et al., 2025). Therefore, strategies for equitable digital infrastructure and education are essential for the sustainability of healthy public participation.

The dynamics of digital participation also raise questions about the authenticity and legitimacy of aspirations expressed online. Digital activities often face issues of identity authenticity, political representation, and the ethics of public communication. The phenomenon of clicktivism or pseudo-activism on social media is an example of digital participation being instantaneous and lacking substantive commitment (Lathifah et al., 2024). This can undermine the essence of democratic deliberation, as high levels of participation do not necessarily reflect meaningful engagement. The government must be able to distinguish between symbolic participation and substantive participation that truly contributes to policy formulation. This approach requires mechanisms for verifying and curating public aspirations to ensure that the resulting policies remain representative and accurate. Furthermore, digital systems also need to be supported by data governance that guarantees user privacy and security to maintain public trust. A balance between openness and data protection is key to the sustainability of credible digital participation (Fadri & Fil, 2024).

Public policies responsive to the digital era must be designed based on the principles of information ethics and social justice. The use of technology should not be seen merely as an instrument of efficiency, but also as a means to strengthen democratic values and human rights. Governments are required to implement transparent data policies, strengthen data governance mechanisms, and ensure easily understood public access to public information. A Transparency International (2024) report shows that countries with strong digital transparency systems tend to have lower levels of perceived corruption. This openness strengthens the relationship between the state and citizens within a framework of institutional trust. The implementation of digital policies based on ethical values encourages the creation of a culture of responsible governance free from information manipulation

(Mauni, 2025). Digital transparency is not simply a technological strategy, but a manifestation of a moral commitment to government integrity.

In addition to the ethical and fair dimensions, the effectiveness of digital public policy is largely determined by the government's ability to sustainably manage citizen participation. Strong digital participation requires an efficient feedback system to ensure public aspirations are truly accommodated in the decision-making process (Yanto et al., 2024). Ignoring citizen input can lead to digital apathy and undermine government legitimacy. Therefore, the government must establish mechanisms that ensure consistent public engagement, from the planning stage to policy evaluation. Strategies such as interactive online forums, open digital surveys, and collaborative participatory platforms have been proven to improve the quality of public policy. Sustainable participation also requires cross-sector collaboration between government, academia, and civil society to create a transparent and accountable digital ecosystem. This collaborative relationship ensures that digital participation is not merely a communication tool, but also a social learning process that strengthens democratic governance.

The future direction of digital public policy demands a balance between technological innovation and strengthening the values of transparency and accountability. The government must be able to adapt to rapid changes in the digital ecosystem without losing its moral orientation toward the public interest. Well-managed digital participation will strengthen the foundations of deliberative democracy, where citizens play an active role in monitoring, assessing, and shaping the direction of state policy. The use of open data and transparent technology is a strategic instrument for fostering public trust in public institutions. However, this can only be achieved if the government is able to enforce honest, secure, and accountable information governance. The synergy between inclusive public policy and active digital participation is the primary foundation for creating a government that is adaptive to global change. Through this approach, the concept of good governance can be concretely realized through digital collaboration between the government and the public.

2. Method

This research method uses a qualitative approach with a literature review to examine the relationship between digital public policy, public participation, and its implications for government transparency and accountability. A qualitative approach allows for a contextual and interpretive understanding of social phenomena, in line with Creswell's (2018) view that qualitative research focuses on the meaning and understanding of human experience. The literature review method is conducted through a systematic analysis of previous research to identify patterns, gaps, and relationships between concepts in digital governance.

Data sources were obtained from accredited scientific journals, reports from international organizations such as the OECD, UNDP, and Transparency International, and relevant national policy documents. According to Kitchenham (2004), a systematic literature review is a scientific process for collecting and evaluating previous research to comprehensively answer research questions. Sources were selected purposively based on their credibility, thematic relevance, and empirical contribution to digital transparency issues.

Data analysis was conducted using a thematic analysis approach to identify key themes, as suggested by Braun and Clarke (2019). The main themes examined include digital transformation of government, digital citizen participation, public transparency, and digital policy challenges. Each theme was then compared to identify theoretical and empirical relationships that enrich our understanding of the dynamics of digital public policy.

To ensure the validity of the results, the study employed source triangulation and literature credibility evaluation, as Denzin and Lincoln (2018) suggest. Triangulation enhances validity by combining multiple perspectives. The researchers conducted a critical appraisal of each piece of literature to assess the reliability of the methodology and the quality of the data.

The following is a summary of the research stages:

Research Stage	Activity Description	The main purpose
Issue Identification	Determining the focus on digital public policy, participation, and accountability.	Determine the direction of analysis.
Literature Collection	Explore relevant academic sources and policy documents.	Collecting empirical and conceptual data.
Thematic Analysis	Grouping findings into main themes.	Develop a conceptual map.
Triangulation & Validation	Compare sources to ensure reliability.	Strengthening the validity of the results.
Synthesis & Conclusion	Drawing theoretical and practical implications.	Produce scientific recommendations.

This approach produces a conceptual synthesis that is not only descriptive but also reflective of risks such as participation bias, digital exclusion, and data ethics issues. According to Yin (2014), the strength of qualitative research lies in its ability to interpret complex phenomena contextually. Thus, this method provides a scientific basis for understanding how public policy and digital participation can mutually reinforce each other in building transparent, inclusive, and sustainable governance

3. Result

Digital Governance and Reorientation of Public Policy toward Structural Transparency

The global advancement of digital technology has significantly transformed the paradigm of public policy from a conventional bureaucratic model toward a data-driven and transparent governance framework. According to the United Nations E-Government Development Index (EGDI) 2022, there has been a substantial improvement in the implementation of e-government across 193 UN member states, with a global average score of 0.6109 on a scale of 1 representing a 2.7% increase compared to 2020. This progression underscores that digitalization is no longer an optional reform but a structural necessity for open government.

Empirical data also reveal that nations with advanced digital integration systems such as Estonia and Denmark report public trust levels exceeding 70%, well above the global average of 45% (OECD, 2023). These countries have successfully developed interoperable systems that ensure public data verification, reduce administrative duplication, and improve policy monitoring. Similarly, Transparency International (2024) notes that countries with high levels of public data transparency correspond to stronger Corruption Perceptions Index (CPI) performance, as seen in New Zealand and Finland, both recording CPI scores above 85/100.

However, digital access remains uneven. The World Economic Forum (2023) highlights that only 63% of the global population enjoys regular internet access, exposing a persistent digital divide that limits equitable participation in governance. The UN Global Digital Compact (2024) further asserts that the effectiveness of digital governance depends on collaborative efforts between the state, civil society, and private actors in managing digital ecosystems and policymaking.

Digital Participation as a Mechanism For Democratization and Social Accountability

Findings from the United Nations E-Participation Index (EPI) 2022 indicate that 80% of countries worldwide have introduced digital platforms enabling citizens to provide feedback or express opinions regarding public policies. This development signifies the global expansion of digital spaces

for deliberative democracy. According to a Pew Research Center (2023) study, 64% of citizens in democratic nations use social media to access political information, while 38% actively engage in online discussions concerning policy issues.

Additionally, Transparency International (2023) observed that nations adopting digital reporting mechanisms experienced a 23% decrease in bureaucratic corruption cases over the past five years. The following table shows the correlation between e-participation levels and corruption perceptions, illustrating how digital engagement enhances government accountability:

Country	E-Participation Index (2022)	Corruption Perception Index (2023)
Denmark	0.95	90
South Korea	0.92	84
Indonesia	0.71	38
India	0.68	39

Nevertheless, disparities in digital literacy remain a significant obstacle to inclusive participation. UNESCO (2023) reports that only 47% of the global population has intermediate or advanced digital literacy skills, resulting in the exclusion of vulnerable groups from meaningful engagement in online policymaking. This inequality suggest that digital participation may not yet represent all societal layers.

Challenges of Inclusivity, Data Ethics, and Sustainability in Digital Governance

In the context of contemporary governance, the integration of digital technology presents a dual reality one of unprecedented opportunity and complex challenge. While digital transformation has enhanced administrative efficiency and transparency, it has simultaneously revealed persistent inequalities, ethical dilemmas, and sustainability issues within the global policy landscape. Addressing these dimensions is essential for ensuring that digital governance contributes not only to innovation and efficiency but also to equity, justice, and long-term institutional resilience.

The World Bank (2024) reports that approximately 2.9 billion people globally remain without internet access, predominantly in rural and low-income regions. Such gaps hinder the inclusivity of digital governance. Furthermore, the Global Data Protection Index (2023) identifies that only 65 out of 194 countries possess comprehensive personal data protection frameworks, revealing critical vulnerabilities in data ethics and governance.

The European Commission on AI Ethics (2024) adds that 42% of public algorithmic systems in Europe fail to comply with fairness and explainability standards, raising concerns about algorithmic bias and policy inequity.

According to the OECD (2023) and World Bank (2024), sustainable digital governance is measured across four key dimensions, as presented in the following table:

Dimensions	Sustainability Indicators	Description
Access and Inclusion	Internet Penetration, Digital Literacy	Evaluates citizens' affordability and ability to utilize digital technology.
Ethics and Privacy	Data Protection Regulation, Independent Oversight	Assesses data security and fairness in public information management.

Public Transparency	Open Data Index, Public Information Accountability	Analyzes the openness and reliability of digital policy dissemination.
Government Responsiveness	Digital Response Speed, Public Participation Evaluation	Examines the extent to which citizen input is integrated into policymaking.

4. Discussion

The Structural Shift toward Data-Driven Transparency

In the evolving landscape of global governance, digital transformation represents not merely a technological advancement but a paradigmatic shift in how transparency, accountability, and legitimacy are operationalized. The proliferation of data-driven decision-making tools has redefined the very structure of public administration, displacing traditional bureaucratic secrecy with algorithmic openness. This transition, reflected in the increasing E-Government Development Index (EGDI) scores worldwide, underscores governments' growing reliance on digital infrastructures as instruments of efficiency and integrity. For instance, Estonia and Denmark have institutionalized open-data ecosystems that enable real-time verification of governmental processes, reducing discretionary authority and corruption risks. Such developments demonstrate that the integration of digital technology, when rooted in institutional ethics, fosters the reconstruction of public trust and administrative legitimacy. According to Setiawan (2024), transparency in the digital era must extend beyond mere disclosure of information toward the continuous traceability of fiscal and procedural decisions. In this regard, algorithmic governance becomes a mechanism of verifiable accountability that transforms administrative logic into a system governed by measurable performance standards. Therefore, the movement toward data-driven transparency should be seen as both a technological and normative evolution shaping the moral architecture of modern governance.

Building upon this foundation, the persistence of the digital divide reveals that transparency remains an unevenly distributed privilege rather than a universally accessible right. Although digital reforms have revolutionized governance models in high-income nations, approximately 40% of the global population still lacks stable internet connectivity (World Economic Forum, 2023). This structural disparity not only limits participation in digital policy ecosystems but also reinforces pre-existing socioeconomic inequalities. In regions with minimal infrastructure and digital literacy, transparency mechanisms risk becoming exclusive, accessible only to the digitally privileged. Consequently, achieving true openness requires addressing the equity dimension of technological innovation through inclusive digital literacy programs and community-based access initiatives. Policies aimed at enhancing public participation must therefore focus on the democratization of information as a public good, not merely as an administrative efficiency measure. As Mulyadi (2025) argues, sustainable transparency necessitates a comprehensive inclusion strategy that ensures equal opportunities for all citizens to engage with digital governance. Thus, bridging the digital divide becomes a moral imperative to prevent transparency from evolving into a new form of inequality.

Transitioning from access to empowerment, it becomes evident that transparency cannot exist in isolation from social participation and civic agency. Technological openness, while essential, must be complemented by mechanisms that translate access into actionable engagement. Without civic understanding and participatory frameworks, data transparency risks degenerating into a symbolic gesture rather than a substantive democratic tool. Empirical evidence from OECD (2023) suggests that nations integrating open-data initiatives with citizen feedback systems demonstrate higher levels of trust and accountability. This correlation highlights that transparency functions optimally when citizens are not passive recipients of data but active interpreters and co-creators of public knowledge. Therefore, governments must shift from a one-way dissemination model toward an interactive ecosystem where citizens exercise their informational rights as agents of governance. Embedding participatory digital platforms within the public administration system thus transforms transparency from a bureaucratic

ideal into a dynamic social process. Through this participatory turn, the notion of openness evolves into a dialogic relationship between state and society.

As this analysis progresses, the sustainability of digital transparency emerges as contingent upon the balance between technological innovation, ethical responsibility, and legal accountability. The rapid proliferation of algorithmic decision-making introduces new vulnerabilities such as data bias, privacy infringement, and opacity in automated reasoning. Hence, ethical governance frameworks—such as algorithmic audit systems and independent oversight bodies—are indispensable for maintaining the integrity of digital administration (Mulyadi, 2025). The experiences of Finland and New Zealand, which consistently rank high on both the Transparency Index and the Corruption Perceptions Index (Transparency International, 2024), illustrate that ethical safeguards reinforce institutional legitimacy. When transparency is grounded in ethical accountability, it transcends its procedural form to become a moral contract between citizens and institutions. This alignment between openness and responsibility ensures that data is not weaponized for political or commercial exploitation. Ultimately, sustainable digital transparency depends on the synchronization of technical efficiency, moral prudence, and participatory inclusivity. Only through this integrated vision can digital governance mature into an equitable, ethical, and enduring framework for democratic accountability.

Digital Participation and Democratic Legitimacy

In contemporary governance, digital participation has emerged as a defining element of democratic renewal, reshaping how citizens interact with institutions and influence policy outcomes. The integration of participatory technologies—ranging from e-consultations to open deliberation platforms has transformed the traditional boundaries between the state and the public sphere. As governments increasingly adopt digital tools for public engagement, the democratic process becomes more accessible, transparent, and responsive to societal needs. According to OECD (2023), nations that integrate participatory infrastructures into their administrative systems exhibit higher citizen trust and policy legitimacy. This correlation underscores the role of digital participation not merely as a supplement to democracy but as a structural foundation of governance in the digital era. Moreover, the proliferation of e-governance platforms demonstrates that participation, when technologically mediated, can amplify marginalized voices and enhance inclusivity in policy formulation. However, the effectiveness of such systems depends on citizens' digital literacy, trust in institutions, and access to participatory channels. Thus, digital participation constitutes both an opportunity for democratic deepening and a challenge for institutional adaptation.

Building upon this premise, the quality rather than the quantity of participation becomes the central determinant of democratic legitimacy in digital governance. While many governments celebrate the expansion of online engagement, empirical evidence suggests that superficial or tokenistic participation often leads to participatory fatigue and disillusionment among citizens. Mulyadi (2025) notes that effective digital participation requires the institutionalization of clear feedback loops, ensuring that citizen input genuinely informs decision-making rather than serving as a procedural formality. The World Bank (2024) further emphasizes that feedback transparency—how governments communicate responses to citizen input—directly affects perceptions of fairness and legitimacy. Consequently, the design of participatory mechanisms must prioritize deliberative depth over numerical engagement, ensuring that every interaction contributes substantively to policy improvement. This approach redefines participation as a dialogic process of co-governance, where power and knowledge are distributed across institutional and civic domains. By embedding deliberative feedback into governance architecture, digital participation transitions from symbolic inclusion toward

transformative democratic practice. Therefore, participation's legitimacy lies not in its scale but in its structural integrity and responsiveness.

Furthermore, the sociocultural dynamics of digital participation reveal that technological access alone does not guarantee democratic engagement. Differences in educational background, socioeconomic status, and cultural capital significantly shape individuals' ability to participate meaningfully in digital policy arenas. According to Setiawan (2024), citizens from digitally marginalized communities often experience barriers not only in infrastructure but also in confidence, trust, and perceived efficacy when engaging online. These disparities highlight that participation must be accompanied by empowerment policies that enhance citizens' digital literacy and critical capacity to interpret and contribute to public discourse. As governments expand e-participation initiatives, they must therefore design inclusive frameworks that respect linguistic, cognitive, and cultural diversity. Evidence from participatory models in South Korea and Estonia illustrates that multi-layered engagement strategies—combining digital platforms with community-level deliberation—can foster both inclusivity and effectiveness. Thus, digital participation can only achieve democratic legitimacy when it bridges social inequalities rather than reproducing them. The intersection between technological access and civic empowerment defines the democratic quality of digital governance systems.

As this discussion advances, the sustainability of digital participation ultimately depends on its institutional embeddedness and ethical governance. Without stable policy frameworks and legal safeguards, participatory innovations risk being short-lived experiments vulnerable to political manipulation or technological obsolescence. The OECD (2023) warns that the absence of regulatory standards for online engagement may lead to data misuse, identity exploitation, and erosion of civic trust. To counter these risks, governments must institutionalize transparent governance protocols, ensure data protection compliance, and cultivate civic digital ethics through public education. Moreover, integrating participatory outcomes into formal policy cycles strengthens the legitimacy of decisions and prevents public disengagement. Countries such as Finland and New Zealand, which systematically incorporate citizen feedback into policy revisions, demonstrate that sustained participation enhances both policy quality and institutional credibility. Therefore, the future of democratic legitimacy in digital governance rests upon a balanced integration of participation, protection, and accountability. When citizens are assured that their voices lead to tangible institutional change, participation evolves from a procedural tool into a democratic cornerstone of digital society.

Toward Inclusive, Ethical, and Sustainable Digital Governance

In the current phase of digital transformation, inclusivity has become a central concern in ensuring that technological innovation benefits society equitably. The shift toward digital governance has indeed increased administrative efficiency, yet it has also exposed deep disparities in access to information and technology. According to the World Bank (2024), approximately 2.9 billion people worldwide remain disconnected from the internet, a condition that predominantly affects low-income and rural populations. Such inequalities demonstrate that digital governance, if not managed inclusively, can reinforce social hierarchies rather than dismantle them. Consequently, policies on universal digital access including subsidies for connectivity, community-based digital training, and rural broadband infrastructure are critical components of equitable governance. As Pradana et al. (2025) emphasize, inclusive digital

ecosystems promote participatory justice and enhance citizens' ability to engage in policymaking. Moreover, inclusion transcends physical access; it encompasses the cultivation of digital literacy, critical thinking, and socio-technical empowerment. Therefore, achieving inclusivity in digital governance requires both infrastructural expansion and the democratization of technological competencies across all social strata.

As inclusivity gains prominence, ethical data governance emerges as a parallel imperative for maintaining public trust and institutional legitimacy. Every digital governance initiative generates vast quantities of personal and behavioral data, raising profound ethical and legal questions regarding privacy and consent. The Global Data Protection Index (2023) indicates that only 65 out of 194 countries possess comprehensive data protection legislation, leaving significant gaps in global data ethics enforcement. In this context, governments must develop robust frameworks that ensure data anonymity, informed consent, and proportional use in alignment with democratic values. Husna and Nasution (2025) argue that ethical governance requires not only regulatory compliance but also a normative shift toward transparency and accountability in data handling practices. Establishing independent oversight bodies to monitor digital data flows can mitigate risks of misuse and restore public confidence in government systems. Furthermore, integrating ethical guidelines into algorithmic design can prevent discriminatory or biased outcomes in automated decision-making processes. Thus, the ethical dimension of digital governance forms the moral foundation upon which institutional trust and civic participation are sustained.

Building upon these ethical considerations, the sustainability of digital governance depends on its capacity to balance technological innovation with social and cultural adaptability. The integration of technologies such as artificial intelligence (AI), blockchain, and big data analytics has accelerated decision-making processes but also introduced challenges of algorithmic fairness and accountability. The European Commission on AI Ethics (2024) reports that 42% of public-sector algorithmic systems in Europe fail to comply with the principles of fairness and explainability, leading to potential governance inequities. To prevent such risks, governments must establish algorithmic audit systems that evaluate transparency, accuracy, and bias in digital platforms. As Eke and Ebohon (2020) highlight, sustainability in digital transformation is not solely technical; it also requires integration with cultural values that promote trust, participation, and collective responsibility. In societies with hierarchical or paternalistic traditions, resistance to digital openness often emerges due to perceived threats to authority structures. Therefore, sustainable digital governance must be culturally contextualized, ensuring that technological adoption reinforces rather than undermines social cohesion. This cultural adaptability enables digital governance to evolve as a socially legitimate and enduring institutional model.

Finally, the long-term success of digital governance rests on the systematic evaluation of its social, ethical, and institutional impacts. Governments must move beyond short-term technological metrics toward multi-dimensional evaluation frameworks that assess inclusivity, transparency, and responsiveness. As the OECD (2023) and World Bank (2024) emphasize, sustainability indicators such as digital literacy, data protection, open data accessibility, and citizen feedback integration should serve as benchmarks for good governance. The following table, adapted from these sources, summarizes the core dimensions of sustainable digital governance:

Dimensions	Sustainability Indicators	Description
Access and Inclusion	Internet Penetration, Digital Literacy	Evaluates citizens' affordability and ability to utilize digital technology.
Ethics and Privacy	Data Protection Regulation, Independent Oversight	Assesses data security and fairness in public information management.
Public Transparency	Open Data Index, Public Information Accountability	Analyzes the openness and reliability of digital policy dissemination.
Government Responsiveness	Digital Response Speed, Public Participation Evaluation	Examines the extent to which citizen input is integrated into policymaking.

By institutionalizing these indicators, digital governance evolves from a purely administrative mechanism into a dynamic framework of democratic accountability. Sustainable governance thus reflects not only the technical efficiency of digital systems but also their capacity to protect human dignity, social equity, and collective trust. Ultimately, the path toward inclusive, ethical, and sustainable digital governance demands an ongoing dialogue among policymakers, civil society, and technological innovators ensuring that the digital state remains both technologically advanced and morally grounded.

5. Conclusion, Limitations, and Suggestions

Conclusion

The overall conclusion of this study indicates that the relationship between public policy and digital participation forms a key foundation for sustainable government transparency and accountability. Digital transformation in bureaucracy not only changes administrative mechanisms but also reconstructs governance values toward data-driven structural openness and social collaboration. The successful implementation of digital public policy depends on the extent to which the government is able to integrate information systems, citizen participation, and mutually supportive ethical regulations. Digital literacy and equitable access are determining factors in ensuring that digital participation is not exclusive, but inclusive for all levels of society. Citizen participation through digital platforms expands democratic space and enhances social control over public policy, ultimately strengthening both vertical and horizontal accountability. However, emerging challenges such as the digital divide, data security, and the potential for disinformation require governments to restructure their regulatory frameworks based on data ethics principles. Digital public policy must be designed not only for technocratic efficiency but also to ensure social justice and public trust. The literature review shows that countries with open government systems have lower corruption perception indices and higher levels of citizen satisfaction with public services. Digital transparency has been proven to enhance government legitimacy by enabling citizens to directly monitor, evaluate, and provide feedback on policy processes. Therefore, the synergy between adaptive public policy and deliberative digital participation is a key element towards accountable governance. Developing an ethical and inclusive digital governance system is essential for strengthening democracy in the information age. Therefore, the success of public policy reform in the digital era is measured not only by technological sophistication, but also by the extent to which these innovations can create a transparent, participatory, and socially responsible government.

References

- Bhanye, J., & Shayamunda, R. (2025). The promise of civic-tech: digital technologies and transparent, accountable governance. In *Digitalisation and Public Policy in Africa: GovTech and CivicTech Innovations* (pp. 93-122). Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland.

- Bittencourt, J. C. N., Costa, D. G., Portugal, P., & Vasques, F. (2024). Smart Cities for Equitable Societies: Promoting Digital Equality, Trust, and Ethical Governance. *2024 IEEE Smart Cities Futures Summit (SCFC)*, 37-40.
- Eke, D. O., & Ebohon, J. O. (2020). The role of data governance in the development of inclusive smart cities. In *Societal Challenges in the Smart Society* (pp. 603-620). Universidad de La Rioja.
- Fadri, Z., & Fil, S. (2024). Era Digital Dan Dampaknya Terhadap Administrasi Publik. *Reformasi Birokrasi Dalam Administrasi Publik: Tantangan Dan Peluang Di Era Digital*, 61, 61-62.
- Fitriani, D., Budiyan, Y., Hardika, A. R., & Choerunissa, M. (2023). Partisipasi masyarakat dalam proses demokrasi di Indonesia: analisis peran teknologi dan media sosial. *Advances In Social Humanities Research*, 1(4), 362-371.
- Habibani, R. A., & Frinaldi, A. (2025). Inovasi Budaya Organisasi Publik Dalam Era Digital: Peluang Dan Strategi Implementasi. *Social: Jurnal Inovasi Pendidikan IPS*, 5(2), 407-421.
- Husna, S., & Nasution, M. I. P. (2025). Membangun Fondasi Digital: Peran Data Governance dalam Strategi Transformasi yang Berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu Akademik*, 2(3), 207-216.
- Juwandi, R., Sundawa, D., Bestari, P., & Syaifullah, S. (2025). Transformasi Digital Pelayanan Publik: Urgensi Penguatan Etika dan Karakter dalam Kebijakan Inovatif di Banten. *Jurnal Moral Kemasyarakatan*, 10(2), 614-623.
- Khan, F. A., Khan, A. R., & Raza, H. (2025). Role of AI in Enhancing Government Transparency: The Mediating Effect of Digital Accountability. *Inverge Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(3), 188-199.
- Lathifah, H., Frinaldi, A., Asnil, A., & Putri, N. E. (2024). Analisis Akuntabilitas Birokrasi Publik Dalam Sistem Keuangan Daerah Dan Dampaknya Terhadap Kinerja Pelayanan Publik. *Professional: Jurnal Komunikasi Dan Administrasi Publik*, 11(2), 585-592.
- Madamang, I., & Hadmar, A. M. (2025). Dampak Teknologi Digital dan Media Sosial terhadap Demokrasi. *Arus Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, 5(2), 3069-3074.
- Mauni, C. (2025). Peran Teknologi Informasi dalam Meningkatkan Transparansi dan Akuntabilitas Pemerintah Daerah Jawa Timur. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Humaniora*, 3(1), 104-115.
- Mulyadi, D. (2025). Melacak Penerapan E-Government dalam Memperkuat Aspek Transparansi dalam Tata Kelola Pemerintahan Daerah. *Journal of the Research Center for Digital Democracy*, 1(1), 39-47.
- Pradana, A. E., Herawati, A. R., & Dwimawanti, I. H. (2025). Tantangan Kecerdasan Buatan Dalam Implikasi Kebijakan Pemerintah di Indonesia: Studi Literatur. *Jurnal Good Governance*, 51-66.
- Saldanha, D. M. F., Dias, C. N., & Guillaumon, S. (2022). Transparency and accountability in digital public services: Learning from the Brazilian cases. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(2), 101680.
- Setiawan, I., & Arti, N. D. B. (2024). Hubungan inovasi pemerintahan terhadap restrukturisasi pemerintahan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Administrasi Pemerintahan Daerah*, 16(2), 234-248.
- Shenkoya, T. (2023). Can digital transformation improve transparency and accountability of public governance in Nigeria?. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 17(1), 54-71.
- Tahir, M. I., Martini, A., Gunawan, A. A. N., Makbul, Y., Yossa, N., Wiryanto, W., ... & Ilyas, R. (2025). Can digital transformation improve the transparency and accountability of Indonesian public governance. *Available at SSRN 5376221*.
- Umayasari, U., & Amantha, G. K. (2025). Partisipasi Warga Melalui Media Digital dan Implikasinya terhadap Akuntabilitas serta Perumusan Kebijakan Pemerintah Daerah di Lampung. *Journal of Administration, Governance, and Political Issues*, 2(1), 109-124.
- Yanto, P., Jumanah, J., & Sutoto, S. (2024). Analysis Of The Implementation Of E-Participation In Public Policy In Indonesia: Potential, Challenges And Impact On The Quality Of Public Policy. *Populis: Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora*, 9(2), 182-200.