



Impact of E-Governance Systems on Transparency and Accountability in Online Admissions and Digital Financial Management in Educational Institutions

¹Priya Vats, ²Dr. Balajee Chari

¹Research Scholar, ²Assistant Professor

**Department of Commerce & Management, NIILM University, Kaithal,
Haryana, India**

¹priyavatsjii@gmail.com, ²balajeechari@gmail.com

<https://doi.org/10.64882/ijrt.v14.i1.1812>

ABSTRACT

E-governance, understood as the application of information and communication technologies (ICT) to the structures, processes and relationships through which institutions are directed and held answerable, has moved from a peripheral efficiency measure to a central instrument of administrative reform in the education sector. This review paper examines the ways in which e-governance functions as a tool for enhancing transparency and accountability in educational administration, and compares the trajectories, drivers and outcomes observed in publicly funded and privately managed institutions. The paper synthesises scholarship spanning public administration, information systems and higher education studies. The review is organised around four themes: the maturity and adoption of e-governance systems within educational organisations; the mechanisms through which digital platforms generate transparency; the reconfiguration of accountability, compliance and regulatory reporting; and the comparative evidence distinguishing public from private institutions. Three summary tables map e-governance maturity stages to core administrative functions, consolidate the findings of selected studies, and set out a dimension-by-dimension comparison of the two institutional types. The synthesis indicates that public institutions typically adopt e-governance under statutory disclosure and audit pressure, producing transparency that is broad in coverage but frequently shallow in usability, whereas private institutions adopt under competitive and efficiency pressure, producing deep internal process integration accompanied by narrower external disclosure. In both settings, the availability of data emerges as a necessary but insufficient condition for accountability: institutional culture, leadership commitment, data literacy and the presence of credible grievance redressal mechanisms determine whether digital records are converted into genuine answerability. The paper concludes that e-governance is best understood as enabling infrastructure rather than an automatic corrective, and identifies future research directions concerning algorithmic accountability, interoperability standards, longitudinal impact assessment and the governance of learning analytics.

Keywords: e-governance; transparency; accountability; educational administration; higher education; digital transformation; public institutions; private institutions



INTRODUCTION

The Evolving Landscape of Educational Administration

Educational administration has undergone a structural reorientation over the past two decades. What was once a largely paper-based, hierarchical and locally bounded activity concerned with enrolment registers, examination ledgers and departmental correspondence has become an information-intensive enterprise spanning admissions, academic delivery, finance, human resources, research management, quality assurance and external regulatory reporting. Institutions of all types now operate within an environment characterised by expanding student numbers, diversified funding streams, intensified competition for reputation and enrolment, and a rising expectation that administrative decisions will be documented, defensible and open to review. The administrative apparatus that supports these functions has correspondingly grown in complexity, and with that growth has come a familiar set of pathologies: procedural opacity, duplicated record-keeping, delayed grievance resolution, discretionary decision-making at the counter level, and information asymmetry between administrators and the students, parents, faculty and funders whom they serve.

Digital transformation has been advanced, in policy discourse and in institutional strategy alike, as the principal response to these pressures. Yet the literature makes clear that transformation in higher education is neither uniform nor automatic. Alenezi (2021) observes that digital transformation in universities extends well beyond the procurement of software and requires the coordinated redesign of pedagogy, administration, culture and leadership. Bygstad, Øvrelid, Ludvigsen and Dæhlen (2022) similarly describe a dual digitalisation in which the academic and administrative domains of the university evolve along separate technological tracks that must eventually be reconciled within a common digital learning space. Rodríguez-Abitia and Bribiesca-Correa (2021) find that levels of digital maturity across universities vary substantially, and that organisational culture and leadership commitment explain more of that variation than technological availability does. Against this backdrop, the administration of education has become an arena in which questions about governance, disclosure and answerability are increasingly settled by the design of information systems rather than by the design of committees.

Conceptual Foundations of E-Governance

A useful distinction separates e-government from e-governance. The former refers principally to the electronic delivery of services and the digitisation of transactions, while the latter encompasses the wider transformation of decision-making processes, institutional relationships and mechanisms of participation and control that ICT makes possible. Cordella and Tempini (2015) caution against reading digitisation as the dissolution of bureaucracy, arguing instead that ICT reconfigures bureaucratic rules and embeds them within technological artefacts, so that the values encoded in a system become the operative values of the organisation. Meijer (2015) advances a complementary argument, identifying the barriers to e-governance innovation as predominantly institutional and cultural rather than technical, and proposing strategies that address the political and organisational context of reform.



The conceptual literature has also worked to specify what e-governance is meant to deliver. Twizeyimana and Andersson (2019), reviewing the public value of e-government, distil a set of dimensions that includes improved public services, administrative efficiency, open-government capabilities, improved ethical behaviour and professionalism, and improved trust and confidence in government. Malodia, Dhir, Mishra and Bhatti (2021) integrate these strands into a conceptual framework for the future of e-government that foregrounds citizen-centricity, data-driven decision-making and the co-creation of services. Gupta, Singh and Bhaskar (2016) review the citizen adoption literature and construct a framework in which perceived usefulness, ease of use, trust, and facilitating conditions jointly determine whether digital channels are actually used. Applied to education, these frameworks suggest that an e-governance system realises its governance value only when the constituencies it serves — students, parents, faculty, regulators and funders — both use it and find its outputs credible. A portal that is technically operational but institutionally unused generates neither transparency nor accountability.

Transparency and Accountability as Governance Imperatives

Transparency and accountability are frequently paired in policy language but are conceptually distinct. Transparency refers to the availability, accessibility and intelligibility of information about institutional conduct; accountability refers to a relationship in which an actor is obliged to explain and justify conduct to a forum that can pose questions, render judgement and impose consequences. Transparency is thus a condition that may support accountability, but it does not constitute it. Lourenço (2015), analysing open government portals from precisely this perspective, finds that portals frequently publish substantial volumes of data while failing to present it in forms that would allow an external observer to construct an accountability judgement. Matheus and Janssen (2020), developing what they term a window theory of transparency, argue that open data creates a window onto organisational conduct whose usefulness depends on the size, clarity and positioning of the aperture; poorly designed disclosure can obscure as effectively as it reveals.

Empirical work on the governance effects of digitisation supports a similarly qualified reading. Nam (2018) finds a significant negative association between e-government development and perceived corruption across countries, but reports that the strength of the relationship is moderated by national cultural characteristics. Khan and Krishnan (2021) show that the maturity of electronic government interacts with the corruption embedded in business systems and basic national institutions, indicating that digital systems operate on, rather than independently of, the institutional environment. Adam and Fazekas (2021), reviewing the evidence on emerging technologies and anti-corruption, conclude that the effects are real but conditional, contingent on data quality, enforcement capacity and the presence of actors willing and able to act on disclosed information. Alcaide Muñoz and Rodríguez Bolívar (2015), in a meta-analytic treatment of the determinants of transparency and accountability at the local level, likewise emphasise organisational, political and socio-economic conditioning factors. Educational administration is not exempt from these conditions.



Within educational administration these concepts acquire specific referents. Transparency concerns whether admission criteria and their application are visible, whether fee income and its utilisation are disclosed, whether examination and evaluation procedures can be inspected, whether faculty recruitment follows published norms, and whether the institution's financial and academic performance is reported in a form that stakeholders can evaluate. Accountability concerns whether an aggrieved student can obtain a reasoned response, whether a regulator can verify a claim, whether a governing body can interrogate an administrative decision, and whether any of these forums can impose a consequence. E-governance systems intervene at several points in this chain simultaneously — they generate the record, structure its presentation, mediate the channel through which questions are asked, and increasingly shape the decision itself — which is why their design carries governance implications that extend well beyond administrative convenience.

Public and Private Institutions as Distinct Administrative Contexts

The comparative dimension of this review rests on a straightforward observation: public and private educational institutions are subject to different accountability regimes and therefore experience different incentives to digitise. Public institutions are answerable to legislatures, ministries, statutory regulators, audit authorities and, ultimately, taxpayers. Their disclosure obligations are typically prescribed by law and cover budgets, appointments, procurement, admissions and examination outcomes. Their procurement of technology is itself governed by tendering rules that slow acquisition but subject it to scrutiny. Private institutions, by contrast, are answerable primarily to governing boards, fee-paying students and their families, accreditation bodies and, where applicable, corporate owners or trusts. Their disclosure obligations are narrower, and their incentive to digitise arises largely from competitive positioning, cost control and service quality.

These divergent incentive structures have consequences for what e-governance is asked to do. In the public sector the animating question is often whether the institution has complied with rules and can demonstrate that compliance to an external forum; digital systems are consequently built outward, toward disclosure portals, statutory returns and audit trails. In the private sector the animating question is more often whether the institution is operating efficiently and delivering a service that retains its clientele; systems are consequently built inward, toward integrated enterprise resource planning, customer relationship management and analytics. Ingrams, Manoharan, Schmidhuber and Holzer (2020), in a twelve-year longitudinal study of e-government development in global cities, find that transparency-oriented features tend to mature earlier and more evenly than participation-oriented features, a pattern that plausibly extends to educational institutions where publication is easier to mandate than engagement. Meijer (2015) similarly observes that the meaning and reach of digital governance shift with the institutional mandate and culture of the adopting organisation rather than with its technical endowment. This review takes that insight as its comparative premise.

LITERATURE REVIEW



The literature relevant to this review is drawn from three overlapping bodies of scholarship: public administration research on e-government, transparency and anti-corruption; information systems research on adoption, maturity and service quality; and higher education research on digital transformation, datafication and institutional governance. Twenty peer-reviewed sources published between 2015 and 2024 form the evidentiary base. The review proceeds thematically across four subsections, and consolidates its findings in three tables.

Maturity and Adoption of E-Governance in Educational Institutions

Stage models of e-governance maturity remain a widely used organising device, and they translate readily to the educational context. In their simplest form these models trace a progression from static web presence, through transactional service delivery, to vertical and horizontal integration of databases, and finally to transformation of processes and data-driven decision support. Ingrams et al. (2020) provide longitudinal evidence that development along such stages is neither linear nor uniform, and that determinants including administrative capacity, resource endowment and political context shape both the pace and the direction of progression. Kalsi and Kiran (2015), examining e-governance optimisation in the Indian state of Punjab, propose a strategic framework linking maturity to good governance outcomes and emphasise that back-end process reform must accompany front-end digitisation if service improvements are to be sustained.

Adoption research supplies the demand-side counterpart to these supply-side models. Gupta et al. (2016) synthesise the citizen adoption literature and identify perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, trust in the institution and in the technology, computer self-efficacy and facilitating conditions as recurring determinants. Mensah (2019), studying university students specifically, finds that perceived service quality, ease of use and usefulness significantly predict the intention to adopt and use e-government services, which is a particularly relevant result for educational administration because students constitute the largest and most frequent user group of institutional digital services. Rana, Dwivedi, Williams and Weerakkody (2016), examining the adoption of an online public grievance redressal system in India, develop a unified view in which perceived usefulness, social influence and trust drive the use of a channel whose entire purpose is accountability. The implication for institutions is direct: grievance and disclosure systems that are not trusted will not be used, and unused accountability channels produce no accountability.

A further strand concerns the institutional environment in which adoption occurs. Bharosa (2022) describes the rise of GovTech and the associated shift toward platform-based, vendor-mediated public digital infrastructure, raising questions about dependency, standardisation and the locus of control over public data. For educational institutions that increasingly license student information systems, learning management systems and analytics platforms from commercial suppliers, these questions are immediate rather than speculative. Cordella and Tempini (2015) reinforce the point by showing that when procedural rules are encoded in software, the vendor's design choices become the institution's administrative rules.

Table 1. E-governance maturity stages mapped to educational administration functions



Maturity stage	Governance characteristic	Typical educational administration application
Stage 1: Web presence	One-way publication of static information	Prospectus, fee structure, academic calendar, statutory disclosure pages, faculty listings
Stage 2: Interaction	Downloadable forms and basic enquiry channels	Downloadable admission forms, e-mail helpdesks, published examination notifications
Stage 3: Transaction	Two-way completion of services online	Online admission and fee payment, examination form submission, transcript and certificate requests
Stage 4: Integration	Interlinking of internal databases and external systems	Institutional ERP linking admissions, examinations, finance, HR and library; automated regulatory returns
Stage 5: Transformation	Process redesign, participation and analytics	Grievance dashboards, participatory feedback loops, learning analytics, automated audit trails, open institutional data

Mechanisms of Transparency in Digitally Administered Institutions

Transparency in educational administration is produced through several distinct mechanisms, and the literature suggests that these mechanisms differ in both their effectiveness and their failure modes. The first is proactive disclosure: the routine publication of institutional information such as budgets, audited accounts, admission criteria, seat matrices, examination results, faculty qualifications, research output and accreditation status. Lourenço (2015) demonstrates that proactive disclosure through portals is common but often poorly designed for accountability purposes, with information fragmented across pages, published in non-machine-readable formats, or presented without the contextual detail required for interpretation. Matheus and Janssen (2020) frame this as a problem of window design: disclosure that is technically complete may still fail to render organisational conduct visible in any meaningful sense.

The second mechanism is process traceability. When admission, examination, procurement and personnel processes are executed within an integrated system, each decision leaves a timestamped record attributable to an identified user. This form of transparency is internal rather than public, but it is arguably more consequential for administrative integrity because it removes the discretion that undocumented processes permit. Cordella and Tempini (2015)



note that this is precisely where ICT reinforces rather than dissolves bureaucratic rationality, converting informal discretion into rule-governed action. The third mechanism is comparative visibility: the publication of standardised indicators that permit comparison across institutions, whether through national ranking frameworks, accreditation portals or open data initiatives. Williamson (2018) analyses the construction of big data infrastructures in higher education and shows how the selection of indicators for such comparison is itself an act of governance, privileging what is measurable and reconfiguring institutional priorities around it.

The fourth mechanism is responsiveness to enquiry, encompassing right-to-information regimes, complaint portals and structured feedback channels. Rana et al. (2016) show that the value of such channels depends heavily on user trust and perceived responsiveness. Twizeyimana and Andersson (2019) situate all four mechanisms within a broader account of public value, noting that improved openness contributes to public value only insofar as it is accompanied by improvements in service and in ethical conduct. Taken together, this literature supports a qualified conclusion: digital platforms substantially lower the cost of making information available, but the translation of availability into intelligibility, and of intelligibility into scrutiny, depends on design choices and institutional will rather than on the technology itself.

Accountability, Compliance and Regulatory Reporting

Accountability in educational administration operates along several axes simultaneously. Upward accountability runs to regulators, funders, ministries and accreditation bodies; downward accountability runs to students, parents and the wider community; horizontal accountability runs to peers, academic councils and internal audit functions; and professional accountability runs to disciplinary norms. E-governance systems affect each axis differently, and much of the literature concerns the upward axis because it is the most heavily instrumented.

Regulatory reporting is the clearest case. Accreditation and quality assurance frameworks require institutions to submit standardised data on enrolment, faculty-student ratios, infrastructure, financial position, research productivity and student outcomes. Where an integrated system is in place, these returns can be generated from live operational data rather than reconstructed retrospectively, which reduces both reporting burden and the opportunity for selective presentation. Kalsi and Kiran (2015) argue that such back-end integration is the decisive determinant of whether e-governance delivers governance improvements or merely relocates existing inefficiencies. Where integration is absent, however, digitisation can produce a distinctive pathology in which multiple unreconciled databases yield inconsistent figures, undermining rather than supporting the credibility of institutional reporting.

A second theme concerns the effect of digital systems on integrity and the misuse of discretion. Nam (2018), Khan and Krishnan (2021) and Adam and Fazekas (2021) converge on the finding that digitisation is associated with reduced corruption but that the association is conditional. Digital systems remove opportunities for petty discretionary rent-seeking at the point of service — the manipulation of admission lists, the alteration of marks, the informal

expediting of certificates — by making such acts leave traces. They are considerably less effective against decisions taken at senior levels, where the relevant discretion is formally authorised and where control over the system itself resides. Adam and Fazekas (2021) emphasise that technology raises the cost of concealment rather than eliminating the underlying incentive.

A third theme concerns the reconfiguration of accountability by datafication. Williamson (2018) argues that the construction of institutional data infrastructures shifts accountability toward metrics that are computationally tractable, with the consequence that dimensions of educational quality resistant to quantification receive diminished attention. This constitutes a genuine trade-off rather than a straightforward gain: the same systems that make administrative conduct auditable may narrow the conception of what institutions are accountable for. Meijer (2015) anticipates this in identifying cultural and institutional barriers as the central obstacles to e-governance innovation, since the introduction of measurement systems alters the internal politics of an organisation in ways that resistance frequently reflects.

Table 2. Summary of selected studies informing the review

Study	Focus and context	Approach	Key finding relevant to transparency and accountability
Lourenço (2015)	Open government portals	Content analysis	Portals publish data but rarely in forms that support accountability judgements
Cordella & Tempini (2015)	E-government and organisational change	Conceptual	ICT reconfigures rather than dissolves bureaucracy; rules become embedded in systems
Kalsi & Kiran (2015)	E-governance optimisation, Punjab, India	Case study	Back-end process reform is decisive for governance gains
Rana et al. (2016)	Online grievance redressal, India	Survey, unified model	Trust and perceived usefulness drive use of accountability channels



Study	Focus and context	Approach	Key finding relevant to transparency and accountability
Nam (2018)	E-government and corruption, cross-country	Panel analysis	E-government reduces corruption; effect moderated by national culture
Williamson (2018)	Higher education data infrastructure	Critical case study	Datafication reorients accountability toward measurable performance indicators
Ingrams et al. (2020)	Global cities, twelve-year panel	Longitudinal index	Transparency features mature earlier and more evenly than participation features
Matheus & Janssen (2020)	Open government data	Systematic review	Transparency depends on the design of the disclosure 'window', not on volume
Adam & Fazekas (2021)	Emerging technologies and corruption	Evidence review	Effects are real but conditional on data quality and enforcement capacity
Rodríguez-Abitia & Bribiesca-Correa (2021)	Digital maturity of universities	Comparative assessment	Maturity varies widely; culture and leadership outweigh technology

Comparative Evidence on Public and Private Institutions

Direct comparative studies of e-governance in public and private educational institutions are relatively scarce, and much of the comparative insight in the literature must be assembled from adjacent findings. The pattern that emerges is nonetheless reasonably consistent. Public institutions adopt e-governance predominantly in response to mandate. Statutory disclosure requirements, audit obligations, right-to-information regimes and centrally administered admission and examination processes create external pressure to publish, and public institutions accordingly score well on breadth of disclosure. The same institutions, however, face procurement rules that lengthen acquisition cycles, budget constraints that limit customisation and maintenance, entrenched administrative practices that resist process



redesign, and staff capability gaps that impede effective use. Meijer (2015) and Ingrams et al. (2020) both identify capacity and institutional culture as principal constraints on the depth of e-governance development, and these constraints bear more heavily on the public sector.

Private institutions display an inverted profile. Their adoption is driven by competition, cost control and the service expectations of fee-paying students, which favours investment in integrated enterprise systems, responsive service interfaces and analytics capable of informing recruitment and retention decisions. Rodríguez-Abitia and Bribiesca-Correa (2021) find substantial variation in university digital maturity that is explained more by leadership and organisational culture than by sector membership as such, but the mechanisms they identify — decision speed, willingness to reallocate resources, tolerance for process change — are generally more available to privately governed institutions. Bygstad et al. (2022) note that administrative and academic digitalisation frequently proceed on separate tracks, a divergence that appears in both sectors but that well-resourced private institutions are better positioned to reconcile.

The comparative weakness of the private sector lies in external transparency. Where disclosure is not mandated, competitively sensitive information — fee utilisation, faculty turnover, placement methodology, admission discretion, governance composition — tends not to be published, and the accountability forum contracts to the governing board and the paying customer. Alcaide Muñoz and Rodríguez Bolívar (2015) show that transparency levels are strongly conditioned by political and institutional pressure; where such pressure is weak, transparency is correspondingly weak, irrespective of technical capability. Bharosa (2022) adds a further consideration relevant to both sectors: reliance on commercial platform providers concentrates control over institutional data in vendors whose own operations are opaque, complicating accountability regardless of ownership. Malodia et al. (2021) and Twizeyimana and Andersson (2019) both suggest that the resolution lies in reframing digital governance around public value and citizen-centricity rather than around either compliance or efficiency alone — a framing that indicates convergence as the desirable trajectory for both institutional types.

A final comparative observation concerns the accountability of the adoption process itself. In public institutions the decision to procure a student information system or an examination platform is subject to tendering scrutiny, and the resulting contract is typically a matter of public record; the decision is slow but visible. In private institutions the same decision is taken swiftly within the governing board and is rarely disclosed, so that the criteria by which a system was selected, the data-sharing terms agreed with the vendor and the cost borne indirectly by students remain outside stakeholder view. This asymmetry compounds the disclosure gap identified above, because the vendor relationship increasingly determines what data an institution holds, in what form it can be extracted, and whether it can be migrated or independently audited (Bharosa, 2022). Comparative work on educational e-governance would therefore benefit from treating procurement and vendor governance as a distinct dimension of analysis rather than as a technical preliminary to it.

Table 3. Comparative profile of e-governance in public and private educational institutions



Dimension	Public institutions	Private institutions
Primary adoption driver	Statutory mandate, audit and regulatory compliance	Competition, cost control and student service expectations
Procurement and funding	Tender-bound, budget-constrained, slower acquisition cycles	Board-approved, faster acquisition, greater customisation capacity
External disclosure	Broad in coverage; mandated; often low in usability	Narrow and selective; limited to accreditation and marketing needs
System architecture	Frequently fragmented; module-wise adoption; legacy systems retained	More often integrated enterprise systems with unified databases
Speed of change	Slow; constrained by procedure and institutional culture	Faster; constrained mainly by cost and internal capability
Accountability orientation	Upward, toward regulators, auditors and the public	Inward and downward, toward boards and fee-paying students
Principal risks	Under-utilisation, data inconsistency, compliance-only use	Opacity to external stakeholders, vendor dependence, metric narrowing
Stakeholder participation	Formally provided but often weakly operationalised	Service-oriented feedback; limited governance participation

Read together, the three tables suggest that neither sector holds a general advantage. Public institutions produce more transparency and less integration; private institutions produce more integration and less transparency. Since accountability requires both an evidentiary record and an external forum with access to it, each sector is deficient in a different constituent of the same relationship.

CONCLUSION

This review has examined e-governance as an instrument for enhancing transparency and accountability in educational administration, and has compared its adoption and effects across public and private institutions. Four conclusions follow from the synthesis.

First, e-governance is enabling infrastructure rather than an automatic corrective. The literature consistently reports conditional effects: digitisation reduces opportunities for discretionary misconduct and lowers the cost of disclosure, but the magnitude of these gains depends on data quality, enforcement capacity, cultural context and the presence of actors prepared to act on what is disclosed (Adam & Fazekas, 2021; Khan & Krishnan, 2021; Nam,



2018). Institutions that treat system deployment as the completion of a reform rather than its beginning should expect limited returns.

Second, transparency and accountability are not interchangeable, and conflating them leads to predictable institutional failure. Portals that publish large volumes of poorly structured information satisfy a transparency requirement while leaving the accountability relationship untouched (Lourenço, 2015; Matheus & Janssen, 2020). Effective accountability additionally requires that information be intelligible to its intended forum, that a channel exist through which questions can be posed, and that responses to those questions carry consequences. The evidence on grievance redressal indicates that such channels are used only where they are trusted (Rana et al., 2016).

Third, the public–private comparison reveals complementary deficits rather than a hierarchy. Public institutions, operating under mandate, achieve broad external disclosure but frequently lack the integration, capability and process redesign needed to make internal conduct genuinely traceable. Private institutions achieve deeper integration and more responsive service delivery but restrict external disclosure to what accreditation and market positioning require, contracting the accountability forum to boards and paying clients. Since accountability requires both a reliable record and an external forum able to interrogate it, the two sectors are deficient in different components of the same relationship, and each has something to learn from the other.

Fourth, digitisation reshapes the substance of accountability and not merely its form. As institutional data infrastructures expand, accountability gravitates toward what those infrastructures measure, potentially marginalising dimensions of educational quality that resist quantification (Williamson, 2018). Growing reliance on commercial platform providers introduces a further complication, transferring a measure of control over institutional data and process logic to organisations that are themselves not accountable to institutional stakeholders (Bharosa, 2022; Cordella & Tempini, 2015). Effective governance of educational institutions therefore now requires the governance of their information systems, including deliberate choices about which indicators are constructed, which are published, who may interrogate them and on what terms. E-governance, on this reading, does not resolve the governance problems of educational administration so much as relocate them into a domain where they must be addressed with new competencies.

FUTURE WORK

Several directions merit attention in subsequent research. The most conspicuous gap is the scarcity of direct, matched comparisons of public and private educational institutions using a common measurement instrument. Most existing evidence is either sector-specific or drawn from public administration contexts outside education, and comparative claims must consequently be assembled by inference. Studies that assess institutions of both types on identical dimensions — disclosure completeness, system integration, process traceability, grievance responsiveness and stakeholder participation — would place the comparison on firmer empirical ground and permit examination of whether observed differences are attributable to ownership or to size, resources and leadership.



A second direction concerns longitudinal impact assessment. The literature is dominated by cross-sectional designs that establish association but cannot isolate the effect of e-governance adoption from concurrent reforms. Panel designs of the kind employed by Ingrams et al. (2020) in the municipal context, applied to educational institutions and tracking maturity alongside outcome measures such as grievance resolution time, audit findings and stakeholder trust, would materially strengthen causal inference.

A third direction is algorithmic accountability. As institutions extend automation into admissions screening, plagiarism detection, proctoring, at-risk student identification and resource allocation, the locus of consequential decision-making shifts toward systems whose reasoning is not readily inspectable. Research is needed on how institutions should document, disclose, audit and contest algorithmic determinations, and on what recourse students and staff should have when they are adversely affected. This extends the concerns raised by Williamson (2018) regarding datafication into the domain of automated decision-making, where the accountability deficit is more acute.

A fourth direction concerns interoperability and data standards. Fragmented, unreconciled systems represent one of the most frequently reported obstacles to reliable institutional reporting, and the development of open standards for educational administrative data — covering student records, financial reporting, faculty credentials and outcome indicators — would reduce reporting burden while improving comparability across institutions. Research evaluating existing standardisation initiatives and the governance arrangements that sustain them would be valuable, as would work on the vendor-dependency questions raised by Bharosa (2022).

A fifth direction addresses capability and use. Adoption research demonstrates that trust, perceived usefulness and ease of use determine whether digital channels are actually used (Gupta et al., 2016; Mensah, 2019), yet relatively little work examines the administrative staff and faculty who operate these systems, or the data literacy required for governing bodies to interrogate the information such systems produce. Studies of institutional capability building, and of how governing boards and academic councils actually use dashboards and analytics in deliberation, would connect the technical and human dimensions of e-governance. Finally, research attentive to equity is needed: the assumption that digital channels are universally accessible does not hold across all student populations, and the accountability implications of digitally mediated administration for students with limited connectivity, disability-related access needs or low digital literacy remain insufficiently examined.

REFERENCES

1. Adam, I. O., & Fazekas, M. (2021). Are emerging technologies helping win the fight against corruption? A review of the state of evidence. *Information Economics and Policy*, 57, 100950.
2. Alcaide Muñoz, L., & Rodríguez Bolívar, M. P. (2015). Determining factors of transparency and accountability in local governments: A meta-analytic study. *Lex Localis – Journal of Local Self-Government*, 13(2), 129–160.



3. Alenezi, M. (2021). Deep dive into digital transformation in higher education institutions. *Education Sciences*, 11(12), 770.
4. Bharosa, N. (2022). The rise of GovTech: Trojan horse or blessing in disguise? A research agenda. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(3), 101692.
5. Bygstad, B., Øvrelid, E., Ludvigsen, S., & Dæhlen, M. (2022). From dual digitalization to digital learning space: Exploring the digital transformation of higher education. *Computers & Education*, 182, 104463.
6. Cordella, A., & Tempini, N. (2015). E-government and organizational change: Reappraising the role of ICT and bureaucracy in public service delivery. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(3), 279–286.
7. Gupta, K. P., Singh, S., & Bhaskar, P. (2016). Citizen adoption of e-government: A literature review and conceptual framework. *Electronic Government, an International Journal*, 12(4), 333–360.
8. Ingrams, A., Manoharan, A., Schmidhuber, L., & Holzer, M. (2020). Stages and determinants of e-government development: A twelve-year longitudinal study of global cities. *International Public Management Journal*, 23(6), 731–769.
9. Kalsi, N. S., & Kiran, R. (2015). A strategic framework for good governance through e-governance optimization: A case study of Punjab in India. *Program: Electronic Library and Information Systems*, 49(2), 170–204.
10. Khan, A., & Krishnan, S. (2021). Moderating effects of business-systems corruption on corruption in basic national institutions and electronic government maturity. *International Journal of Information Management*, 59, 102349.
11. Lourenço, R. P. (2015). An analysis of open government portals: A perspective of transparency for accountability. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(3), 323–332.
12. Malodia, S., Dhir, A., Mishra, M., & Bhatti, Z. A. (2021). Future of e-government: An integrated conceptual framework. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 173, 121102.
13. Matheus, R., & Janssen, M. (2020). A systematic literature study to unravel transparency enabled by open government data: The window theory. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 43(3), 503–534.
14. Meijer, A. (2015). E-governance innovation: Barriers and strategies. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(2), 198–206.
15. Mensah, I. K. (2019). Factors influencing the intention of university students to adopt and use e-government services: Empirical evidence in China. *SAGE Open*, 9(2), 1–17.
16. Nam, T. (2018). Examining the anti-corruption effect of e-government and the moderating effect of national culture: A cross-country study. *Government Information Quarterly*, 35(2), 273–282.
17. Rana, N. P., Dwivedi, Y. K., Williams, M. D., & Weerakkody, V. (2016). Adoption of online public grievance redressal system in India: Toward developing a unified view. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 59, 265–282.



International Journal of Research and Technology (IJRT)

International Open-Access, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Online Journal

ISSN (Print): 2321-7510 | ISSN (Online): 2321-7529

| An ISO 9001:2015 Certified Journal |

18. Rodríguez-Abitia, G., & Bribiesca-Correa, G. (2021). Assessing digital transformation in universities. *Future Internet*, 13(2), 52.
19. Twizeyimana, J. D., & Andersson, A. (2019). The public value of e-government – A literature review. *Government Information Quarterly*, 36(2), 167–178.
20. Williamson, B. (2018). The hidden architecture of higher education: Building a big data infrastructure for the 'smarter university'. *International Journal of Educational Technology in Higher Education*, 15(1), 12.