



DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION THROUGH DATA INTEROPERABILITY TO STRENGTHEN TRANSPARENCY, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND SUSTAINABLE PUBLIC TRUST

Joao da Silva Belo

¹ Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universidade Nacional de Timor Lorosa'e, Dili, Timor-Leste

Email : belo.silvajoabelo@gmail.com

E-ISSN : 3109-9777

Received: August 2026

Accepted: August 2026

Published: August 2026

Abstract :

This study systematically examines how data interoperability enables digital transformation in public administration to strengthen transparency, accountability, and sustainable public trust. A Systematic Literature Review (SLR) was conducted following PRISMA 2020 and PRISMA-S principles. Scopus was used as the primary database, with complementary citation searching. Relevant studies were identified through title, abstract, and keyword searches and synthesized using thematic and mechanism-oriented analysis. The findings reveal three central patterns: digital transformation often remains fragmented because of legacy systems, organizational silos, inconsistent standards, and limited institutional coordination; data interoperability functions as a socio-technical and institutional capability rather than merely a technical connection; and interoperability requires data quality, shared standards, governance, stewardship, and institutional capacity. Interoperable data can strengthen transparency through improved information accessibility and consistency and accountability through traceability, monitoring, and auditability. However, public trust is not an automatic outcome of digitalization but depends on information quality, service quality, responsiveness, inclusiveness, transparency, and institutional performance. The study's novelty lies in positioning governed data interoperability as the connective mechanism linking digital transformation with governance outcomes. It contributes an integrated framework for theory, policy, and future empirical research.

Keywords: digital transformation; public administration; data interoperability; transparency; accountability; public trust; data governance.

INTRODUCTION

Digital transformation is reshaping public administration from fragmented bureaucratic systems toward governance that is increasingly connected, data-driven, and citizen-oriented. Transformation is no longer limited to converting manual procedures into online services; it also encompasses the integration of digital infrastructure, organizational processes, data resources, and governance capabilities across administrative boundaries. However, recent research indicates that data silos, inconsistent standards, fragmented infrastructure, privacy concerns, and legacy systems remain major barriers to the integration of digital government (Androutsopoulou et al., 2026). In developing countries, these challenges are compounded by disparities in institutional capacity and digital maturity. Quang (2026) therefore conceptualizes national digital data governance as an institutional-capability challenge requiring



alignment among strategic objectives, implementation foundations, governance architecture, coordination, and institutional conditions. Accordingly, the success of digital transformation depends not only on technology adoption but also on the government's ability to create a coherent data environment in which data can be exchanged, understood, and reused.

Within this context, data interoperability constitutes both infrastructure and a governance capability that enables government systems and organizations to share information in a coordinated manner. Nevertheless, interoperability is often treated primarily as a technical issue, even though evidence indicates that digitalization can proceed without cross-system integration. Azevedo et al. (2025) found that local government financial management systems may achieve relatively advanced automation while remaining weakly integrated with other modules and digital government applications. Mutiarin et al. (2024) likewise showed that the effectiveness of interoperability in local government depends on agreed information models and governance arrangements. More broadly, Madaki et al. (2024) identified interoperability, organizational resistance, resource constraints, security, and implementation capacity as recurring barriers to IT integration in e-government in developing countries. These findings suggest that the central challenge of transformation is not merely a shortage of applications, but the inability to connect distributed data ecosystems.

The governance value of interoperability becomes increasingly important when digital transformation is intended to strengthen transparency and accountability. Digital platforms can improve access to and traceability of information, but the existence of a platform does not automatically produce meaningful openness. Information must be integrated, consistent, timely, and properly governed. Hassani & MacFeely (2023) emphasize that comprehensive digital data governance provides the foundation for the quality, usability, and reliability of official data. Androutsopoulou et al. (2025) show that open governmental data and analytical technologies can support transparency and public-sector innovation while simultaneously creating challenges related to data quality, privacy, governance, and institutional capacity. Raca et al. (2022) further demonstrate that open government data quality determines whether data reuse can meaningfully contribute to transparency and accountability. Thus, interoperability should be understood as part of the institutional infrastructure that makes public information coherent, accessible, and traceable.

The relationship between digital transformation and accountability also remains dispersed across the literature. Ma (2026) shows that digital public management reform and information accessibility are associated with administrative transparency and citizens' trust. Cahyani et al. (2026) position digital information mechanisms as instruments for strengthening transparency, accountability, and corruption prevention in local government. Through an integrative review, Wijaya et al. (2026) demonstrate that digital transformation reshapes public-sector accountability through changes in information flows, monitoring, institutional responsibility, and stakeholder relationships. However, these studies have not adequately integrated interoperability as the mechanism

connecting data infrastructure with governance outcomes. A similar gap is evident in the literature on public trust. Nurlinah et al. (2025) found a positive relationship between government digital transformation and citizen trust and participation in Gowa, whereas Ariansyah et al. (2026) showed that higher e-government maturity does not necessarily correspond to greater trust in public officials. John et al. (2026) likewise identify service, system, information, and data quality as important determinants of trust in open government data environments. These divergent findings indicate that technology alone is insufficient to explain sustainable public trust.

The literature therefore reveals a clear synthesis gap. Digital transformation, data interoperability, transparency, accountability, and public trust have all been extensively studied, but they largely remain within separate research streams. Studies of digital transformation emphasize organizational modernization, services, and technology adoption; interoperability studies focus on system integration, data exchange, and standards; transparency and accountability research emphasizes openness, oversight, and responsibility; while public trust research often examines service quality, integrity, responsiveness, and government performance. Madaki et al. (2024) primarily address barriers to IT integration, Wijaya et al. (2026) focus on accountability in digital transformation, and Raca et al. (2022) emphasize open-data quality. Few syntheses position data interoperability as the linking mechanism between digital transformation and outcomes related to transparency, accountability, and public trust.

This study addresses this gap by conceptualizing interoperability as a socio-technical and institutional condition that connects digitalization with public governance. Interoperability is understood not merely as the ability of systems to exchange data, but also as the capacity of data to be understood semantically, used across processes, governed through clear rules, traced, and accounted for across organizations. This perspective positions transparency and accountability as governance outcomes that can be strengthened through integrated information flows, while public trust is treated as a conditional and cumulative outcome rather than an automatic consequence of digitalization. The novelty of the study lies in integrating the five constructs within a single mechanistic perspective and distinguishing technical interoperability from governed interoperability. The synthesis also considers different levels of analysis, ranging from inter-organizational data exchange to citizens' perceptions, as well as variation across developed and developing-country contexts.

Accordingly, this systematic literature review aims to synthesize conceptual and empirical evidence on the relationships among digital transformation, data interoperability, transparency, accountability, and sustainable public trust. Specifically, the review identifies dominant research patterns and theoretical perspectives, examines how interoperability is defined and operationalized, analyzes the mechanisms linking interoperability with transparency and accountability, and examines technological, institutional, and

contextual conditions that shape its implications for public trust. The synthesis is expected to provide a more integrated research framework to guide future empirical studies and strengthen understanding that successful digital transformation in public administration depends on the government's ability to convert dispersed data into information that is integrated, high-quality, traceable, and accountable.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) to identify, assess, classify, and synthesize empirical and conceptual evidence on digital transformation in public administration through data interoperability to support transparency, accountability, and sustainable public trust. Reporting follows PRISMA 2020 and PRISMA-S to ensure that the processes of searching, screening, appraisal, extraction, and synthesis are traceable and reproducible (Page et al., 2021; Rethlefsen et al., 2021). An SLR was selected because the literature lies at the intersection of digital government, public administration, information systems, data governance, open government, and institutional trust, requiring a systematic procedure rather than a conventional narrative review (Snyder, 2019; Xiao & Watson, 2019). The unit of analysis is the scientific publication, with attention to four levels: infrastructure/data, organizations, governance outcomes, and citizens/society. The analytical framework distinguishes digital transformation as the driver, data interoperability as the mechanism/enabler, transparency and accountability as governance outcomes, and public trust as a social outcome. This distinction is important because interoperability is positioned as a linking mechanism rather than merely a technological outcome (Androutsopoulou et al., 2025; Quang, 2026; Wijaya et al., 2026).

The review strategy specified Scopus as the primary bibliographic database, with Web of Science as a supplementary source and Google Scholar for citation discovery. The documented evidence set was then examined using the predefined eligibility, appraisal, extraction, and synthesis procedures. A total of 41 initial references provided by the researchers were used as a seed set for backward and forward citation tracing and relevance verification. The primary search string is:

```
TITLE-ABS-KEY(("digital transformation" OR "digital government" OR "e-  
government" OR digitalization OR digitalisation) AND ("public administration"  
OR "public sector" OR governance) AND (interoperability OR "data  
interoperability" OR "interoperable data" OR "data integration" OR  
"information interoperability" OR "system interoperability") AND (transparency  
OR accountability OR "public trust" OR "citizen trust" OR "trust in  
government"))
```

the sensitivity search used combinations of the core concepts of digital transformation, public administration, data interoperability, transparency/accountability, and public trust. The main publication window was 2015 to the date of the search, while seminal older studies were retained when identified through citation chaining and considered to make important conceptual contributions (Rethlefsen et al., 2021).

The inclusion criteria covered peer-reviewed journal articles and reviews addressing government/public administration, digital transformation or e-government, interoperability/data integration, and/or outcomes related to transparency, accountability, open government, traceability, or public trust. Purely technical studies and studies from non-governmental sectors were excluded unless they provided mechanisms that were clearly transferable to public governance. English-language publications were prioritized to improve comparability. The selection process involved identification, deduplication, title/abstract screening, and full-text assessment. Duplicates were removed based first on DOI and subsequently on title-author-year. Where formal screening records are available, reasons for full-text exclusion are documented. Because the source manuscript does not retain the underlying database export or screening log, no unverified database-level PRISMA counts are imputed.

To maintain transparent reporting, the numerical information below is limited to counts directly documented in the manuscript. The 41 records are the researcher-supplied seed set used for backward and forward citation checking, whereas 29 refers to the unique studies explicitly represented in the present qualitative/thematic synthesis. These figures are not presented as independently verified Scopus or Web of Science retrieval and screening counts.

Table : 1 Documented Evidence-Selection Summary

PRISMA Stage	Number
Records identified from the documented seed/evidence set	41
Records screened	41
Records excluded after title/abstract screening	12
Studies included in qualitative/thematic synthesis	29

Note: The documented counts above distinguish the 41 researcher-supplied seed records from the 29 unique studies explicitly represented in the current synthesis. Because database exports and screening logs are not retained in the source materials, the manuscript does not claim a database-verified PRISMA flow or reconstruct unobserved exclusion counts.

The quality of empirical studies was assessed using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) 2018, whereas conceptual and architectural studies were assessed using a relevance and rigor checklist covering clarity of objectives, construct definitions, methodological coherence, evidence traceability, contextual adequacy, limitations, and bias (Hong et al., 2018). Appraisal was not used as a single mechanical score; instead, it was used to weigh the strength of evidence and conduct sensitivity checks. Data extraction employed a structured matrix recording bibliographic information, study design, digital transformation, interoperability, transparency, accountability, public trust, context, and evidence quality, with coding focused on mechanisms and relationships among constructs. Synthesis combined descriptive mapping, thematic synthesis, and relational synthesis through a deductive-inductive approach; the initial framework followed the main constructs, while additional themes were derived from recurring patterns in the evidence (Thomas & Harden, 2008). The analytical pathway examined was digital transformation, data interoperability,

transparency/accountability, public trust, with attention to moderators, boundary conditions, contradictions, and feedback mechanisms. Evidence from Indonesia showing both positive and contrasting findings regarding the relationship between e-government maturity and trust was retained so that the synthesis would not assume a linear relationship (Ariansyah et al., 2026; Nurlinah et al., 2025).

Table : 2 Studies Included in the Qualitative/Thematic Synthesis

Study	Evidence focus reported in manuscript	Role in synthesis
Androutsopoulou et al. (2025)	AI-enhanced eGovernment and open governmental data	Transparency / data quality / governance
Androutsopoulou et al. (2026)	Integrated digital-government architecture using open data, AI, and cyber-physical infrastructures	Fragmentation / integrated architecture
Abraham et al. (2019)	Data governance, authority, control, and organizational mechanisms	Governance / data stewardship
Ahmed & Twinomurinzi (2025)	Semantic interoperability in e-government	Semantic integration
Ariansyah et al. (2026)	E-government maturity and trust in public officials	E-government maturity / trust
Azevedo et al. (2025)	Local-government financial-management interoperability	System integration / interoperability
Bernot et al. (2024)	Indonesia Satu Data initiative	Standards / interoperability / institutional inclusion
Figueredo Jr. & Silva (2026)	Digital services and institutional conditions in public administration	Transformation / institutional barriers
Hassani & MacFeely (2023)	Comprehensive digital data governance and official statistics	Data quality / governance
Haug et al. (2024)	Digitally induced change in the public sector	Fragmentation / institutional conditions
Herawati et al. (2026)	Digital transformation in public administration	Transformation maturity / interoperability
Irani et al. (2023)	Legacy systems and persistent complexity in public administration	Legacy systems / fragmentation
John et al. (2026)	Open government data and sustainable public trust	Data/service quality / trust
Lee et al. (2024)	Digital policy framework and public value in digital transformation	Public value / governance framework
Luna et al. (2024)	Digital service delivery from citizens' perspective	Trust / public value / service quality
Ma (2026)	Digital public management reform and administrative transparency	Transparency / digital management

Madaki et al. (2024)	IT integration implementation in e-government in developing countries	Integration barriers / interoperability
Margariti et al. (2022)	Organizational interoperability in public administration	Organizational interoperability
Mutiarin et al. (2024)	Data interoperability in electronic-based local government	Interoperability / governance arrangements
Nurlinah et al. (2025)	Government digital transformation and citizen trust in Gowa	Digital transformation / trust
Panagiotopoulos et al. (2023)	ICT utilization and dynamic capabilities in local government	Organizational coordination / capability
Piñeiro Rodríguez et al. (2023)	Right to information and institutional trust	Transparency / trust
Quang (2026)	National digital data governance in developing countries	Institutional capability / governance
Raca et al. (2022)	Open government data quality and transparency	Data quality / transparency
Rukanova et al. (2023)	Business-to-government information sharing enabled by digital infrastructure	Information sharing / public value
Ruijter (2021)	Data collaboratives and cross-boundary data sharing	Institutional arrangements / governance
Sienkiewicz-Małyjurek & Zyzak (2025)	Digital technologies in public-administration networks	Network coordination
Tan (2023)	AI-compatible open-government data ecosystem	Governance / ecosystem maturity
Wijaya et al. (2026)	Public-sector accountability in digital transformation	Accountability / information flows

To strengthen the research gap and novelty, each study was coded according to five mechanisms: technical exchange, semantic integration, organizational coordination, governance assurance, and trust-related value creation. This coding distinguishes technical interoperability gaps from governance-outcome gaps and examines whether the literature has adequately explained the linking mechanisms between digital integration and transparency, accountability, and trust, which previous research has tended to examine separately (Azevedo et al., 2025; John et al., 2026; Ma, 2026; Madaki et al., 2024; Mutiarin et al., 2024; Nurlinah et al., 2025; Wijaya et al., 2026). Robustness checks included sensitivity searches, citation chaining, comparisons between developed and developing countries, re-examination of studies with lower rigor, and sensitivity analyses by publication year. The final reporting distinguishes documented evidence from information that would require a retained database export or screening log; search strings, eligibility criteria, appraisal procedures,

extraction procedures, and synthesis protocol are reported, while unverified database-retrieval and screening counts are not presented as empirical PRISMA results (Page et al., 2021).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Interpreting the Core Findings

The synthesis indicates that digital transformation in public administration is constrained less by the availability of technologies than by fragmented information environments. Recent reviews show that transformation depends on organizational readiness, governance capacity, interoperability, and institutional conditions rather than technology adoption alone (Haug et al., 2024; Herawati et al., 2026; Figueredo & Silva, 2026). Digitalization may therefore expand while administrative integration remains weak; the decisive issue is whether digital resources can be recombined across organizational boundaries.

Theme 1: Fragmented Digital Transformation and Government Data Silos

The evidence supports interpreting fragmentation as an organizational-change and legacy-system problem. Haug et al. (2024) show that government digital transformation is often cumulative and incremental, so local digitization does not necessarily reconfigure cross-organizational information flows. Irani et al. (2023) likewise show that legacy systems create persistent complexity because they are embedded in routines and architectures. In Brazil, Azevedo et al. (2025) found stronger development of core financial-management modules than cross-system interoperability, indicating that internal system maturity can coexist with weak inter-organizational integration. Thus, application-level digital maturity may overstate system-wide transformation.

Theme 1: Organizational and Network Conditions

The persistence of silos also reflects coordination and capability constraints. Panagiotopoulos et al. (2023) show that integration, coordination, learning, and reconfiguration capabilities support ICT utilization in local government, while Sienkiewicz-Małyjurek & Zyzak (2025) emphasize coordination in public-administration networks. Indonesian evidence from the Satu Data initiative indicates that standardization, interoperability, stakeholder inclusion, and administrative arrangements are central, but policy and administrative bottlenecks remain significant (Bernot et al., 2024). Quang (2026) similarly frames national digital data governance in developing countries as an institutional-capability problem. Together, these findings support a digital-silo paradox: more digital applications do not necessarily produce more integrated administration.

Theme 2: Data Interoperability as a Socio-Technical Capability

The second finding shifts interoperability from a technical property to a socio-technical and institutional capability. Margariti et al. (2022) show that organizational interoperability requires more than system connectivity, while Ahmed & Twinomurinzi (2025) document growing emphasis on semantic interoperability and formal representation of government-domain knowledge. Ruijter (2021) adds that cross-boundary data sharing requires institutional

arrangements, and Tan (2023) highlights governance roles, design values, and ecosystem maturity. Together with Panagiotopoulos et al. (2023), the evidence suggests that interoperability emerges from the interaction of technology, shared meaning, organizational coordination, learning, and governance.

Theme 3: Data Quality, Standards, and Governance

Interoperability produces value only when exchanged data are reliable and governable. Hassani & MacFeely (2023) treat comprehensive digital data governance as essential for coherent and reusable data, while Abraham et al. (2019) conceptualize governance through authority, control, decision rights, and organizational mechanisms. Raca et al. (2022) show that open-data quality is a condition for meaningful reuse and transparency. Bernot et al. (2024) and Quang (2026) reinforce that standards require institutions capable of coordinating adoption and resolving conflicts. Lee et al. (2024) and Rukanova et al. (2023) further connect information sharing and digital infrastructure with public value. Hence, data quality and governance are upstream conditions for interoperability and downstream governance outcomes.

Integrated Interpretation and Governance Outcomes

Across the three themes, the evidence supports the pathway fragmented digitalization, interoperability capability, governed data integration. Technology enables exchange, but institutional capability determines whether exchange becomes durable and usable. This explains why similar digital systems can generate different outcomes across contexts. It also implies that transparency and accountability depend on prior data integration: governed interoperability can improve information consistency, visibility, traceability, monitoring, and auditability, consistent with Ma (2026) and Wijaya et al. (2026). The value of interoperability is therefore relational rather than purely technical.

Implications for Public Trust

The trust pathway is conditional rather than automatic. Piñeiro Rodríguez et al. (2023) show that exercising the right to information can affect trust in specific institutions without necessarily increasing general institutional trust, while Luna et al. (2024) show that citizens evaluate digital services through transparency, accountability, fairness, and broader public-value considerations. Accordingly, interoperable data can create conditions for sustainable trust by strengthening credible transparency and accountability, but trust still depends on information quality, service quality, responsiveness, inclusiveness, and institutional performance. The present SLR therefore rejects a simple technology, trust assumption.

Theoretical and Practical Contributions

The main theoretical contribution is to position data interoperability as a governance-enabling mechanism within digital transformation theory, linking technical infrastructure with institutional outcomes. The review distinguishes technical interoperability from governed interoperability, the latter requiring semantic consistency, organizational coordination, governance authority, stewardship, and data quality. This extends public-value reasoning by identifying interoperable information infrastructure as an upstream condition of

value creation. In practice, governments should assess digital maturity through digital availability, organizational integration, and governed interoperability, while investing in standards, stewardship, metadata, quality controls, and cross-agency coordination. Tan (2023) and Androutsopoulou et al. (2025, 2026) indicate that expanding open-data and AI ecosystems makes governance capacity more important.

Research Agenda and Novelty

The review identifies a research agenda for testing interoperability maturity as a mediator between digital transformation and transparency/accountability, with data quality, institutional capability, and organizational coordination as potential moderators. Multilevel and longitudinal designs are especially relevant because Haug et al. (2024) and Herawati et al. (2026), indicate that transformation is cumulative and that longitudinal and comparative evidence remains limited. The novelty of the present review lies not in claiming that any single construct is new, but in integrating fragmented literatures into an explanatory governance pathway that moves from technology adoption toward data-governance and institutional-integration logic.

CONCLUSION

This systematic literature review shows that digital transformation in public administration cannot be adequately assessed by the number of applications, portals, or electronic services, because digitalization can still occur under conditions of system fragmentation, data silos, divergent standards, limited coordination, and uneven institutional capacity. The main finding positions data interoperability as a linking mechanism that enables digital resources across organizations to be converted into integrated administrative information. Effective interoperability encompasses not only technical connectivity but also semantic alignment, process integration, organizational coordination, data standards, governance, and the distribution of responsibilities. Its benefits depend heavily on data quality, stewardship, access rules, traceability, and institutional capacity. On this foundation, interoperability can strengthen transparency through improved access to and consistency of information and enhance accountability through traceability, monitoring, auditability, and attribution of responsibility, whereas public trust emerges more conditionally through data quality, service quality, responsiveness, inclusiveness, transparency, accountability, and institutional performance.

The scholarly contribution of this study lies in integrating the literature on digital transformation in public administration, interoperability and data governance, and transparency, accountability, and public trust into a single governance-mechanism chain. The study introduces a distinction between technical interoperability and governed interoperability; the latter not only enables data exchange but also ensures that data can be understood, maintained, reused, overseen, and held accountable across organizations. This perspective explains why governments may possess advanced digital technologies while continuing to experience data silos and weak coordination, while also showing

that the relationship between digital transformation and public trust is neither automatic nor linear. Methodologically, the SLR strengthens the use of mechanism-mapping synthesis to identify relationships among constructs and to generate a more focused agenda for empirical testing.

This study has several limitations because the synthesized literature is heterogeneous in design, definitions, measures, contexts, and levels of analysis; consequently, the findings are better understood as conceptual and mechanistic patterns than as universal effect estimates. The dominance of English-language literature, limitations in database coverage, and the prevalence of cross-sectional studies, case studies, and institutional analyses also constrain generalization and long-term causal inference. Future research should empirically examine digital transformation maturity, interoperability, data governance, transparency, accountability, and public trust as distinct constructs, testing interoperability as a mediator and data quality, institutional capacity, organizational coordination, and digital inclusion as conditions that may shape these relationships. Multidimensional, longitudinal, and cross-country comparative studies across levels of government are needed to assess the sustainability of interoperability effects. Overall, the review indicates that the success of digital transformation is not determined by the volume of technology adopted, but by the government's ability to integrate data, processes, and responsibilities across organizational boundaries, making governed data interoperability a key mechanism through which system modernization can become public-governance transformation that supports more sustainable transparency, accountability, and public trust.

REFERENCES

- Abraham, R., Schneider, J., & vom Brocke, J. (2019). Data governance: A conceptual framework, structured review, and research agenda. *International Journal of Information Management*, 49, 424–438. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.07.008>
- Ahmed, S. M. Y., & Twinomurizi, H. (2025). Semantic interoperability in electronic government: A bibliometric analysis and systematic review. *Electronic Government, an International Journal*, 21(2), 180–209. <https://doi.org/10.1504/EG.2025.144733>
- Androutsopoulou, M., Askounis, D., Carayannis, E. G., & Zotas, N. (2025). Leveraging AI for enhanced eGovernment: Optimizing the use of open governmental data. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 16(3), 12998–13033. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-024-02317-w>
- Androutsopoulou, M., Askounis, D., Carayannis, E. G., Zotas, N. R., & Kokkinakos, P. (2026). An integrated architecture for digital government transformation: Leveraging open data, AI, and cyber-physical infrastructures. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-026-03412-w>
- Ariansyah, K., Muttaqin, M., Pusvita, V., Takariani, C. S. D., Darmanto, D., Budhirianto, S., & Nuryana, M. M. (2026). Revisiting e-government and public trust relationship: Does higher maturity of e-government promote

- greater trust in public officials? *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 20(2), 374–394. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-07-2025-0219>
- Azevedo, R. R. D., Lino, A. F., Carrara, L. G. C., Aquino, A. C. B. D., & Cardoso, R. L. (2025). Interoperability of financial management systems in local governments and opportunities for digital transformation. *Revista de Administração Pública*, 59(2). <https://doi.org/10.1590/0034-761220240249x>
- Bernot, A., Tjondronegoro, D., Rifai, B., Hasan, R., Liew, A. W. C., Verhelst, T., & Tiwari, M. (2024). Institutional dimensions in open government data: A deep dive into Indonesia's Satu Data initiative and its implications for developing countries. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 47(6), 1399–1429. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2024.2377609>
- Cahyani, T. D., Kurniawan, W., Nuryasin, I., Rismara, N. A., & Ujilast, F. A. (2026). When technology meets transparency & accountability: A strategy to prevent corruption in local government. *Legality: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 34(1), 306–320. <https://doi.org/10.22219/ljih.v34i1.42538>
- Figueredo Jr., E., & Silva, L. C. S. (2026). Challenges of digital services in public administration in the era of digital transformation: A systematic literature review. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy*, 17, 11926–11955. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-026-03277-z>
- Hassani, H., & MacFeely, S. (2023). Driving excellence in official statistics: Unleashing the potential of comprehensive digital data governance. *Big Data and Cognitive Computing*, 7(3), 134. <https://doi.org/10.3390/bdcc7030134>
- Haug, N., Dan, S., & Mergel, I. (2024). Digitally-Induced Change in the Public Sector: A Systematic Review and Research Agenda. *Public Management Review*, 26(7), 1963–1987. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2023.2234917>
- Herawati, A. R., Larasati, E., & Dwimawanti, I. H. (2026). Digital transformation in public administration: A hybrid bibliometric and nested systematic literature review. *Quality & Quantity*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-026-03081-6>
- Hong, Q. N., Fàbregues, S., Bartlett, G., Boardman, F., Cargo, M., Dagenais, P., Gagnon, M.-P., Griffiths, F., Nicolau, B., O'Cathain, A., Rousseau, M.-C., Vedel, I., & Pluye, P. (2018). The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT) Version 2018 for Information Professionals and Researchers. *Education for Information*, 34(4), 285–291. <https://doi.org/10.3233/EFI-180221>
- Irani, Z., Abril, R. M., Weerakkody, V., Omar, A., & Sivarajah, U. (2023). The impact of legacy systems on digital transformation in European public administration: Lesson learned from a multi case analysis. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40(1), 101784. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101784>
- John, D. R., Hsu, F.-M., & Chen, Y.-J. (2026). Public trust and sustainable digital governance: Examining open government data in Caribbean small island developing states. *Sustainability*, 18(12), 6307. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su18126307>
- Lee, J.-Y., Kim, B., & Yoon, S.-H. (2024). A conceptual digital policy framework via mixed-methods approach: Navigating public value for value-driven

- digital transformation. *Government Information Quarterly*, 41(3), 101961. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2024.101961>
- Luna, D. E., Picazo-Vela, S., Buyannemekh, B., & Luna-Reyes, L. F. (2024). Creating public value through digital service delivery from a citizen's perspective. *Government Information Quarterly*, 41(2), 101928. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2024.101928>
- Ma, J. (2026). Digital public management reform: Assessing the impact of e-government initiatives on administrative transparency. *Telematics and Informatics*, 107, 102418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2026.102418>
- Madaki, A. S. A., Ahmad, K., & Singh, D. (2024). IT integration implementation in e-government public sector in developing countries: A systematic literature review and model development. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, 18(3), 451–472. <https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-02-2024-0043>
- Margariti, V., Stamati, T., Anagnostopoulos, D., Nikolaidou, M., & Papastilianou, A. (2022). A holistic model for assessing organizational interoperability in public administration. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(3), 101712. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101712>
- Mutiarin, D., Eldo, D. H. A. P., Sarofah, R., & Habibullah, A. (2024). Data interoperability in supporting electronic-based governance systems in the local government. *Corporate Law & Governance Review*, 6(4), 43–52. <https://doi.org/10.22495/clgrv6i4p4>
- Nurlinah, Ansar, M. C., & Chowdhury, K. (2025). Impact of government digital transformation on citizen trust and participation: Evidence from Gowa Regency, Indonesia. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*, 7, 1700582. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2025.1700582>
- Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hrobjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
- Panagiotopoulos, P., Protogerou, A., & Caloghirou, Y. (2023). Dynamic capabilities and ICT utilization in public organizations: An empirical testing in local government. *Long Range Planning*, 56(1), 102251. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2022.102251>
- Piñeiro Rodríguez, R., Muñoz, P., Rosenblatt, F., Rossel, C., Scrollini, F., & Tealde, E. (2023). How the exercise of the right to information (RTI) affects trust in political institutions. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40(4), 101838. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2023.101838>
- Quang, N. T. (2026). National digital data governance in developing countries: An institutional capability framework and its illustrative relevance to Vietnam. *Information Development*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02666669261462053>
- Raca, V., Velinov, G., Dzalev, S., & Kon-Popovska, M. (2022). A framework for evaluation and improvement of open government data quality: Application

- to the Western Balkans national open data portals. *SAGE Open*, 12(2).
<https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440221104813>
- Rethlefsen, M. L., Kirtley, S., Waffenschmidt, S., Ayala, A. P., Moher, D., Page, M. J., Koffel, J. B., & Group, P.-S. (2021). PRISMA-S: An Extension to the PRISMA Statement for Reporting Literature Searches in Systematic Reviews. *Systematic Reviews*, 10, 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-020-01542-z>
- Ruijter, E. (2021). Designing and implementing data collaboratives: A governance perspective. *Government Information Quarterly*, 38(4), 101612. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101612>
- Rukanova, B., van Engelenburg, S., Ubacht, J., Tan, Y.-H., Geurts, M., Sies, M., Molenhuis, M., Slegt, M., & van Dijk, D. (2023). Public value creation through voluntary business to government information sharing enabled by digital infrastructure innovations: A framework for analysis. *Government Information Quarterly*, 40(2), 101786. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101786>
- Sienkiewicz-Małyjurek, K., & Zyzak, B. (2025). Digital technologies in public administration networks: Systematic literature review and research avenues. *Administration & Society*, 57(8-9), 1051-1087. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00953997251369090>
- Snyder, H. (2019). Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>
- Tan, E. (2023). Designing an AI compatible open government data ecosystem for public governance. *Information Polity*, 28(4), 541-557. <https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-220020>
- Thomas, J., & Harden, A. (2008). Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8, 45. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45>
- Wijaya, I., Suprpto, S., Rakhman, B., Herianto, D., Yulianti, S., Agriyanto, D., Akmal, A., Kasman, K., Rahman, K., Sembe, S. K., Ifrah, I., Ismail, I., Azhari, Y., Armansyah, B., & Usman, S. (2026). Rethinking public sector accountability in digital transformation: A critical integrative review. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*, 20(3), 75-106. <https://doi.org/10.14453/aabfj.2051>
- Xiao, Y., & Watson, M. (2019). Guidance on conducting a systematic literature review. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 39(1), 93-112. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0739456X17723971>