The Innovation Journal: The Public Sector Innovation Journal, 31(2), 2026, article 8.
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21937030

Ensuring Digital Transparency and Accountability in Public Administration Processes

Maksym Yamkovyi
State University of Trade and Economics, 19 Kyoto Street, 02156, Kyiv, Ukraine

Yuliia Nehoda
National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, 11 Heroiv Oborony Street, 03041, Kyiv, Ukraine

Svitlana Dombrovska
National Aerospace University "Kharkiv Aviation Institute", 17 Vadym Manko Street, 61000, Kharkiv, Ukraine

Oleksii Shafranosh
Uzhhorod National University, 14A Universytetska Street, 88000, Uzhhorod, Ukraine

Nataliia Lepish
Lviv State University of Internal Affairs, 26 Horodotska Street, 79007, Lviv, Ukraine

Ensuring Digital Transparency and Accountability in Public Administration Processes

Maksym Yamkovyi, Yuliia Nehoda, Svitlana Dombrovska, Oleksii Shafranosh and Nataliia Lepish

ABSTRACT

Throughout the twenty-first century, transparency and government accountability have been key issues in political science across leading countries. The growing importance of these concepts is driven by several interconnected factors: the information revolution has significantly reduced the state's monopoly on information and provided the public with much greater access to data; the increasing use of transparency trends as a strategic tool by political actors; and a growing demand from society for effective oversight of government decision-making processes. Transparency and openness in public administration are achieved through policies and institutional mechanisms that enable citizens to monitor and evaluate socially significant decisions made and implemented. Therefore, transparency and accountability represent essential elements of democratic governance and modern political development. The purpose of this study was to identify how transparency and accountability can be enhanced in Ukrainian public authorities based on an analysis of international best practices in public administration. This research utilized general scientific methods such as analysis, synthesis, systematization, and document review, as well as political science approaches (behavioral, systemic, and institutional) to examine global experience in implementing transparency reforms and assess its applicability to Ukraine. According to the study findings, increased transparency and accountability strengthen democratization, improve public oversight, enhance feedback mechanisms, and increase trust in government institutions. Nonetheless, transparency should not be considered a universal solution to problems such as corruption or electoral misconduct. Instead, it should function as one component of broader governance reform frameworks, thoughtfully adapted to national conditions.

Keywords: political power, public administration, transparency of government, accountability of government, political process, electoral process

Introduction

The collapse of the Soviet political system led to a systemic transformation of Ukrainian society, its economic and political components. The introduction of democratic instruments of the political process, decision-making, and interaction between the authorities and society is a complex, multidimensional process, where the issues of the effectiveness and transparency of the authorities are key. In recent years, many measures have been taken to reform political governance. However, there are still many problematic areas that require consistent and decisive

action. First and foremost is corruption, which is seen as a real and complex risk in many joint projects with foreign partners. In a state of martial law, when the state is forced to restrict access to certain aspects of public administration, the threat to the community's transparency in government increases significantly. That is why transparency and government accountability in a state of martial law are pressing issues for contemporary public administration science. In this study, innovation in the public sector is understood as the introduction and implementation of new management approaches, institutional mechanisms and practices focused on transparency in public administration, which increase the openness, accountability and efficiency of public institutions, in particular through the use of modern information flows and public control tools.

Despite the significant body of academic work on transparency and accountability, there is a clear gap in the systematic analysis of how these principles can be adapted to the conditions of post-communist countries facing hybrid threats and martial law. Most of the existing research focuses on established democracies and does not take into account the specifics of the functioning of state institutions in conditions of limited access to information, high corruption inertia, and digital transformation that occurs simultaneously with security challenges. This article fills this gap by identifying and critically reflecting on international practices with further projection onto the Ukrainian context. The novelty of the work lies in the fact that transparency and accountability are considered not in isolation, but in inextricable connection with the digital resilience of the state and the specifics of wartime, and an original analytical framework is proposed that combines institutional, legal, and digital dimensions.

The purpose of the study is to examine ways to improve the transparency and accountability of Ukrainian authorities by analyzing international best practices in government transparency.

Literature Review

The topic of transparency in political governance is a leading area of research in the scientific community. It includes theoretical and practical aspects of research into the problem, with the comparative method being widely used, etc. For example, Berliner's publication (Berliner, 2014) addresses transparency in political power from the perspective of freedom of information, based on a comparative study of the level of this freedom across 80 countries worldwide. In doing so, various aspects of the problem are taken into account, including the increase in government spending on ensuring interaction with the community. Karina Furtado Rodrigues (2018) analyzes the theoretical aspects of government transparency. She defines the concept of government transparency and types of transparency: (1) full transparency; (2) nominal transparency; (3) conditional transparency; and (4) transparency in the distribution and management of confidential information. The work of Mokrosinska (2020) not only addresses transparency but also explores the dialectical relationship between transparency and secrecy in the activities of European governments. The point is that excessive secrecy on the part of the authorities creates problems for their normal functioning and for ordinary citizens, who begin to suspect the authorities of concealing important political decisions. Hollyer et al. (2019) link government transparency to the democratic process in a country. It addresses the impact of government transparency on the democratic balance, framing it in three components: fair and

transparent elections, public satisfaction with the government, and the containment of challenges to the democratic order. Lindstedt and Naurin (2010) examined government transparency from the perspective of preventing corruption. The authors agreed that government transparency alone is not a guarantee of preventing corruption. An anti-corruption policy should be based on broad principles of civil society development: a high level of education among the population, the presence of honest and independent media, and free and fair elections. The publication argues that reforms to increase transparency of political power are correlated with the development of an active civic stance and the ability to act based on available information. The relationship between government transparency and the risk of corruption in a country was also highlighted by Crepaz and Arikan (2024). Using Ireland as an example, it was found that the level of public trust in government is shaped by representatives of parliament, political parties, and business structures.

Research into the level of government transparency covers various aspects of political governance. Burman (2013) analyzes government transparency from the perspective of the existence and functioning of political parties. Based on a thorough comparative analysis of the existence of political parties and the conduct of elections, the author concludes that independent electoral commissions ensure the transparency of the political system. Asimakopoulos (2025) and his colleagues analyzed the issue of government transparency from the perspective of the impact of modern communication technologies on democratic processes and civic political activity. Victor (2024) analyzes government transparency during the electoral process using the 2020 elections in Tanzania as a case study. In his opinion, the transparency of the political system should cover all interested parties, especially during elections, when political power is decided. He believes that the presence of certain factors, such as foreign observers, does not make elections fair and transparent, as observers can only record violations of the law and democratic procedures during elections, but cannot influence their elimination. Power (2020) also emphasized these aspects of the electoral process. He explored the paradox of transparency, where an increase in quantitative indicators of government accountability does not lead to qualitative changes in the organization of public administration. Pancrazi and Prosperi (2020) studied the issue of political power transparency from the perspective of political conflict and government effectiveness. The authors created a model of political power that accounts for indicators of political conflict and government transparency, and traced its impact on the state's macroeconomic indicators.

Voermans et al. (2015) studied the impact of government transparency on the legislative process. It should be noted that the issue of parliamentary transparency remains under-researched, as the functioning and effectiveness of the legislative branch are indicators of democratic governance.

The practical aspects of implementing transparency and accountability of government are the subject of a significant number of scientific publications. Hollyer et al. (2017) analyze quantitative indicators of government transparency. The main criterion for government transparency is the collection and dissemination of aggregated data by governments. The data source for the study was the global development indicators proposed by the World Bank for 125 countries. The authors conclude that data dissemination is "a distinct and politically significant form of transparency."

British scientist Sherlock (2025) examined problems of government transparency in the American electoral system, using the 2020 US presidential election and the 2022 primaries as examples. The data obtained was compiled into tables and diagrams that showed the vulnerability of the American electoral system in terms of transparency and protection against political manipulation and fraud, thereby reducing the electorate's trust in the system. Karakas (2014) examined transparency in the electoral system regarding the financing of political parties' election campaigns, using India as an example. In this country, the issue of transparency in the financing of election campaigns by political parties is very complex and, according to the authors, leads to the formation of peculiar dynasties within political parties. In contrast, the process of party financing itself undermines the state's overall electoral policy.

The economic aspects of government transparency were studied by Gunawan Widjaja (2025). The author establishes a sequence of cause-and-effect relationships: increased public awareness of government activities reduces the risk of corruption and enables the government to adapt to the demands of the population. Public confidence in the integrity of government policy positively affects citizens' well-being. The study proves that public well-being is a direct consequence of transparency in political decision-making. Moravcsik (2014) applied quantitative methods to examine political transparency. He asserts that the best tool for increasing the transparency of qualitative research is active citation.

Summarizing the review of the scientific literature, the scientific community pays close attention to the issue of government effectiveness, which is examined through the prism of transparency in state decision-making. This global experience should be systematized to define the main directions for improving the Ukrainian political management system, increasing its transparency and accountability to the Ukrainian people.

Digital transparency refers to the availability of government plans, budgets, policies, and services via digital channels for citizens to view, enabling them to understand better how their cities or states make decisions. Transparency relates to urban governance when digital tools, such as online dashboards and open data portals, provide citizens with easy, timely access to government data. The use of digital tools increases transparency, legitimizes government actions, and boosts citizen engagement (Table 1).

Table 1: Components of digital accountability and mechanisms for their implementation

Accountability component	**Functional description in a digital environment**	**Implementation mechanism**
Responsibility (Answerability)	The duty of officials to respond to inquiries from citizens and stakeholders regarding their behavior and decisions.	Feedback platforms, e-petitions, automated response systems.
Enforcement	Mechanisms that provide for corrective action or punishment in the event of violations or wrongdoing.	Judicial oversight, algorithmic audits, regulatory sanctions (e.g. under the EU AI Act).
Logic Transparency	Disclosure of the principles of operation of algorithms that affect the distribution of resources or citizens' rights.	Explainable AI, technical documentation of models, publication of ranking parameters.

Methodology

The research methods are determined by the purpose of this study and include general scientific methods of analysis and synthesis, systematization and grouping, and the study of regulatory documents and scientific literature. In addition, methods of political analysis were used: behavioral reactions of the population to political processes, or behavioral methods, methods of studying the process of developing and making political decisions, systemic, institutional methods, and others.

To ensure the reliability and reproducibility of the study, the limits of the analysis were clearly defined. The sample included scientific publications devoted to transparency and accountability of government bodies, published in leading international peer-reviewed journals for the period 2000 – 2025. The inclusion criteria were: the presence of empirical data or conceptual models, focus on public administration, English-language or availability of translation. Publications that concerned exclusively corporate transparency without a connection to the public sector were excluded from the analysis. The time limits allowed us to cover both classic theoretical works and the latest research on digital transformation. The limitations of this study are its theoretical and analytical nature, the lack of its own empirical data collection, and the focus on the Ukrainian case, which may affect the generalizability of the conclusions. To minimize subjective biases, the method of triangulation of sources and critical analysis of alternative points of view were used.

Results

Transparency in decision-making and accountability for authority are among the defining features of democratic societies. At the same time, it is necessary to explain what defines today's understanding of public administration. The interpretation of "transparency" and "accountability," as they relate to authorities (i.e., these terms mean the same), has been explained through one or another degree of consistency with each other in global public administration science. Those interpretations are found in Table 2.

Government transparency has many meanings and we will use the terms as they apply to the nature of government actions relative to society (i.e., citizenry) as well as the procedures used by government to inform society of what government does. For this reason, there are three main components of government transparency: 1) an action taken by government to create a transparent relationship with society; 2) the exchange of information between government and society; 3) a requirement for democratic participation (society's ability to provide input into the decision-making process). Therefore, information alone is insufficient to provide transparency; rather it is the method of disseminating such information that is also important. Moreover, even if both of these elements are present, additional feedback from the public regarding the quality of the information provided and the effectiveness of the process of providing said information is essential.

Table 2: Definitions of the term "transparency" in foreign scientific literature

Source	Definition
Gunawan Widjaja (2025)	Transparency in political decision-making means that information about how, by whom, and on what basis decisions are made is openly available to the public. This concept covers a wide range of aspects, from providing information about public budget policy to the legislative process that is to be implemented.
Lindstedt and Naurin (2010)	Transparency is an important issue for the development of society due to its powerful impact on corruption.
Bevilacqua and Spagnuolo (2015)	These two institutions (transparency and political participation) can be classified as instruments of administrative law used in national legal systems as mechanisms provided for by law to improve public administration, which should be open, public, participatory, pluralistic, and accountable.
Standards on Political Funding and Favours (2009)	Transparency is the starting point for regulating the financing of parties and candidates. Transparency, through the full disclosure of their policies and practices of political financing, makes it possible to verify that no abuses have been committed and that regulatory frameworks are being effectively implemented.
Phelippeau (2020)	Transparency is the cornerstone of all laws that claim to regulate the financing of political life.
Balkin (1998)	The very metaphor of transparency alludes to the medium through which we view things. We want this medium to be transparent to our vision so that we can see exactly what is on the other side.
Hiremath (2017)	Governments around the world are increasingly implementing open data initiatives, making vast amounts of government data available to the public through online portals and APIs. This transparency enables citizens, journalists, and civil society organizations to monitor government activities, track public spending, and identify cases of corruption or mismanagement.

Source: Compiled by the author

At the same time, the transparency of the authorities cannot be absolutized. First of all, this is because the authorities must have room for maneuver, and not all government information deserves to be made public. Moreover, there are sensitive topics of public administration, such as foreign policy, diplomacy, military aspects, etc., which are sensitive to publication. That is why the demand for total transparency of the authorities is impossible, as it could lead to the collapse of public administration as a whole. The agenda includes the search for a reasonable compromise between the authorities and civil society. We can talk about transparency as a principle of a democratic society, bearing in mind its balance with other priorities. Moreover, we must bear in mind the negative consequences of excessive transparency of government and public policy.

Power gives compelling examples of how excessive transparency of power has led to political manipulation of public opinion, and how the distortion of public information in the media and in the reflections of political rivals has caused great harm (Sam Power, 2020). These examples include Donald Trump's victory in the 2016 presidential election and the campaign for the United Kingdom to leave the EU, or Brexit. "Documentaries such as Netflix's The Great Hack and Channel 4/HBO's Brexit: The Uncivil War have brought digital campaigns to the forefront of popular perceptions of how politics and democracy function in the twenty-first

century." (Power, 2020) The reflection of state structures on the excessive and distorted obsession with transparency of power is reflected in UK government reports, which reveal the extent of the threat of misuse of information to democracy.

Karl-Heinz Nasmacher proposed the concept of a "magic quadrangle", which includes "accountability, practicality, sanctions, and transparency". Elaborating on the components of this quadrangle, Nassmacher noted: "An effective political regime must implement a 'magic quadrangle' that includes professional accountability of volunteers participating in election campaigns and parties, administrative practicality, the possibility of sanctions in case of violations, and transparency for the general public" (Nassmacher, 2003). While Nassmacher's work dealt with the technology of political elections, we believe that this concept can claim universality in the formation of the basic principles of public policy.

Archon Fung and his colleagues analyzed several existing political systems in terms of the degree of transparency of their political activities and were able to identify several types of such systems (Fung et al., 2004). Among them are highly effective systems, where transparency has significantly changed citizens' behavior in a direction beneficial to politicians; moderately effective systems, where a change in the behavior of information consumers has occurred, but could have negative consequences; and ineffective systems, where transparency does not change citizens' behavior in the planned direction. In other words, we see that transparency is not a one-way process, where the authorities expose themselves to control and criticism from citizens, but also use transparency tools to influence public opinion and the behavior of their citizens.

Let us try to identify the tools, forms, and methods that the state uses to ensure transparency and accountability to the public. Logically, most of these forms and tools are related to information and communication technologies (ICT). The results are presented in Table 3.

As we can see, most of the technologies used to ensure transparency in political decision-making are big data-based and quite difficult to implement on a large scale. Most of them are very costly and suitable for developed countries whose state budgets can afford their implementation. Each form and method of transparency in policy development and decision-making has its positive and negative sides, and the art of politics lies in realizing the positive aspects and blocking the negative consequences.

Table 3: Tools for ensuring transparency in public policy

Transparency methods	Features of their use
ICT technologies	ICT tools have ensured transparency, strengthened political engagement, and enabled administrative procedures. However, these technologies also create problems, including cybersecurity risks, misinformation, the digital divide, and ethics.
Social networks	Social media platforms such as Facebook, Twitter, and WhatsApp enable real-time communication with authorities and a feedback loop that allows authorities to monitor public opinion. Networks can play a role in social mobilization, especially among young people who are more familiar with information technology. At the same time, social networks can negatively affect the privacy of politicians, contribute to online bullying, and have other social consequences.
Electronic voting and e-government	E-voting is gradually becoming the norm in the electoral process, as it uses biometric means of electronic voting and prevents electoral fraud. E-government, or "government in a smartphone", provides the population with broad access to administrative services and eliminates excessive bureaucracy. The negative consequences include the vulnerability of databases to hacker attacks.
Crowdfunding platforms	Crowdfunding platforms have become indispensable tools for independent journalism, civic action, and promoting political accountability. Thanks to decentralized funding, these platforms allow investigative journalists and interest groups to remain independent of government funding or business dominance.
Surveillance technologies	These technologies provide citizens with a higher level of security by providing additional information to law enforcement agencies. The negative consequences include the threat of total control over citizens and violations of personal privacy.
Distributed ledger technology (DLT) (e.g., blockchain)	These actively influence the electoral process and reduce the level of corruption in the country, but they can have negative consequences because the technology is quite complex and not sufficiently developed.

Source: Compiled by the author based on materials (Asimakopoulos et al., 2025)

Ensuring transparency of government is a universal principle, but there are sensitive areas of public life where this principle is of exceptional importance. Let us mention just two areas where transparency is the cornerstone of interaction between government and society: the electoral process and the prevention of corruption.

Let us trace the technologies for introducing transparency in elections in Table 4.

Table 4: Techniques for ensuring transparency in the electoral process

Country	Technologies for transparency in the electoral process
United States	Private advertising campaigns to promote candidates are permitted; companies and individuals can invest unlimited funds in candidates' election campaigns; more than 20 laws have been passed to ensure transparency of the electoral process.
France	Donations from private corporations are prohibited, there are restrictions on the budgets of candidates for elected office, candidates' income from election funds is audited by the tax authorities, and a special National Commission on Election Campaign Reporting and Political Financing has been established.
United Kingdom	Under the Political Parties, Elections and Referendums Act 2010, all political donations must be declared and published, political parties must publish regular reports on their financial status, including the amount of donations, and the election commission is responsible for monitoring compliance with the law.
Germany	Under the Political Parties Act (Parteiengesetz), all donations to parties must be disclosed, political parties must publish annual reports on their financial status, and the reports are then verified by an independent political party financial supervisory authority. Independent auditing companies may also operate alongside this authority on an anonymous basis.

Source: Compiled by the author based on materials from Bima et al., 2025; Phelippeau, 2020.

As we can see from the table, the transparency of elections is ensured primarily by the transparency of the finances of political parties and individual candidates for elected office. A high level of transparency in the financing of election campaigns makes it possible to hold fair elections, where everyone has equal rights in the electoral process.

The fight against corruption is also tied to how well those in power are transparent and accountable. Katarina and Naurin (2010) used the World Bank's Political Transparency Index to assess levels of political transparency in 111 countries. Their findings were somewhat disheartening; they discovered that when governments increase political transparency, it doesn't always translate into less corruption. For example, Nigeria had taken steps to create such high levels of press freedom similar to Norway, however, this did nothing to help reduce corruption. The data from Katarina and Naurin showed a negative relationship between transparency and corruption (with both being influenced by electoral democracy); a free press isn't going to solve all problems related to corruption but it will most certainly contribute to them.

Lindstedt determined the degree of education of the people in a country, the amount of news circulating through mass media, the electoral process and the rule of law to measure if there was a relationship between transparency and corruption. Crepaz and Arikan (2024), studied the relationship between the amount of corruption within a society and the level of trust within that society towards their government. They viewed the two concepts as interconnected. To define public trust she focused on the honesty and competency of the government. Crepaz defined corruption as "illegal or unauthorized enrichment by officials who take advantage of their official position for personal benefit." She found that while transparency can improve one's ability to evaluate trust in political parties and decreases perceptions of corruptness amongst representatives, it has no effect on attitudes towards business organizations.

Ukrainian Experience: Digital Resilience and Anti-Corruption Transformation

Ukraine has become an exceptional model of how digitalization can also enhance national resilience and transparency during all-out warfare. By implementing its State Strategy of Digital Development through the Ministry of Digital Transformation, Ukraine improved its position in the United Nations (UN) E-Government Online Service Index from 102nd in 2018 to 5th in 2024.

Prozorro Ecosystem & Open Data. The Prozorro e-Procurement System, based upon the principle that "Everyone Sees Everything," has become a Global Benchmark for Transparency in Government Finances. Since Prozorro's inception, it has saved over $8.7 billion in budgetary funds by providing an open platform where bidders can access Tender Documentation, Participants' Proposals, and Contracts in Real-Time. Prozorro's Analytical Module identifies suspicious schemes and forecasts Market Trends.

In 2024-25, Ukraine will continue to develop its Open Data Policy. Despite the limitations placed by Martial Law, the Cabinet of Ministers of Ukraine currently obligates State Bodies to publish more than 900 Datasets on a National Portal. The BRDO – Public Sector Monitoring Tool records the extent to which Authorities comply with these obligations, thereby promoting greater openness within those Authorities.

Action and Service Accountability Platform. Diya is an online application and portal that completely redefined how citizens interact with their government, eliminated middlemen, and greatly reduced the potential for corruption. As such, Ukraine became the first nation on Earth where a digital passport is legally treated equally to a physical passport; this enabled all 12+ million internally displaced individuals to continue using public services. In addition, the "Trembita" platform utilizes Estonia's X-Road model to securely share data among many of Ukraine's state registries, thereby improving administrative effectiveness.

Table 5: Key indicators of the DREAM digital ecosystem (as of June 2025)

DREAM system indicator	**Data as of June 2025**
Number of registered projects	12,596
Estimated cost of projects in the system	UAH 1.77 trillion (~$42.5 billion)
Share of fully funded projects	9%
Share of partially funded projects	18%
Priority recovery sectors	Transport, Energy, Housing

Source: Compiled by the author

Digital Accountability for Reconstruction via DREAM. As Ukraine will require an estimated $588 billion to rebuild itself by the end of 2025, the Digital Restoration Ecosystem for Accountable Management (DREAM) was developed as an accountability mechanism for reconstruction. By collecting information from all nine of its existing digital platforms, DREAM delivers transparency at every phase of a reconstruction project — from the community's idea submission through contract payment (Table 5).

The DREAM ecosystem has become the digital backbone of the Public Investment Management (PIM) reform, ensuring strategic and predictable financing. From 2026, DREAM will become legally mandatory for all investment projects at central, regional and local levels.

Discussion

This article contributes to the research on public sector innovation by analyzing international best practices in transparency and accountability reform and assessing their applicability to the Ukrainian public administration system. The study demonstrates how transparency mechanisms can strengthen democratic governance, improve feedback between citizens and state institutions, and increase public trust, while emphasizing that transparency should function as part of a broader set of governance reforms adapted to the national institutional context.

Transparency and accountability of government actually concern the issue of information and access to it. The information itself can take various forms: budget reports, discussions and decision-making, public meetings between government representatives and civil society, statistical data, etc.

The openness of government is measured by the degree to which socially significant information is accessible to the population. The population, or at least its politically active part, can monitor political decisions by having access to this information.

Publicity on behalf of the government means that it will communicate with its people voluntarily and allow discussion of social issues. We believe this is the foundation of governmental transparency, a major prerequisite for democracy. Everything else can be considered political science. A government at any level (central, regional, municipal, etc.) has a range of options for communicating with its population. Some examples of communication include: organizing public events, conducting briefings, hosting public hearings, or holding forums to provide a medium for dialogue regarding current issues.

Transparency is one of the core democratic values. It allows the citizenry to be aware of what the people they have voted into office are doing, whether those people are following all applicable laws and regulations, and how decisions are made, thereby building confidence in their political system.

Mutual advantage and positive consequences arise from the well-organized relationship between institutions of authority and society. As clarity about the activities of institutions of power grows, so does the trust they inspire among society's members. If members of the society believe the information provided is accurate, it contributes to greater confidence in the work of those who represent them. Moreover, the ability to communicate effectively with the subject of governance provides politicians and civil servants with an opportunity to evaluate how well they carry out their duties as defined by the desires and expectations of the governed. Ultimately, increased transparency in decision-making processes positively affects the perception of

politicians, providing them with important competitive advantages in future elections. Members of society tend to prefer politically active individuals who have demonstrated themselves as reliable, consistent leaders. Such individuals' policy decisions were made in a manner that benefited all members of society; these decisions underwent public scrutiny prior to implementation, allowing politicians to demonstrate their leadership abilities, teamwork potential, diplomatic skills, etc. Thus, it is these types of politicians whom the voters will readily support in the next election.

Transparency and accountability of government can serve as a foundation for preventing corruption and dishonest practices at all levels of government. The more open the public administration process is, the less room there is for illegal or deviant political behavior. The presence of independent, influential media and a sense of constant community control reduces the likelihood that politicians will engage in corruption, nepotism, or the abuse of their official positions. We are confident that government transparency is not a panacea against corruption. Still, alongside other measures to prevent corruption, it can have positive effects, at least in fostering zero tolerance for corruption among the population (Gunawan Widjaja, 2025).

Transparency of government, due to increased interest in this topic, is becoming a common political stereotype, complicating the analysis of its significance, reflection on its meaning, and its limits or undesirable consequences. The principle of transparency has such an unquestionable status that it can afford to be vague and ambiguous. We should not consider transparency as the only norm for our actions regarding social reality, even while recognizing that it stems from a legitimate desire to democratize government. We must always bear in mind that excessive public awareness and the misuse of socially significant information pose powerful risks of manipulation of public opinion, which politicians and anti-government civil society organizations can exploit. Transparency of power is a powerful resource that requires a cautious approach.

Conclusion

Transparency is the ability to see, analyze, and study everything. Therefore, a transparent public administration process means access to publicly available information about the development, creation, use, and evaluation of governmental policies and decisions. The importance of the openness of state institutions and the authority and responsibility of state institutions for the development of democratic forms of society cannot be overestimated. There are many participants in such processes: sponsors, grantors, program managers, implementers, and researchers. For this reason, the problem of openness of government activities today is one of the most important areas of research in modern political science.

For Ukraine, the issue of government transparency and accountability is key in the context of the ongoing war and threats to the very existence of the state and the nation as a whole. In recent years, the state has implemented several large-scale reforms to ensure government transparency, including the launch of electronic open databases and services. Information resources such as Prozorro, DoZorro, Є-data, OpenBudget, the Unified Portal for Whistleblower Reports, the Unified State Register of Persons Who Have Committed Corruption

or Corruption-Related Offenses, and the Unified State Register of Declarations of Persons Authorized to Perform State or Local Self-Government Functions have been introduced to the public. Many of them have attracted community criticism, but the population does not consider them unnecessary. Nevertheless, the problem of transparency and accountability of the authorities remains unresolved.

Global practices in introducing government transparency reveal trends, risks, and threats that Ukrainian politicians and civil society activists cannot ignore as they continue to reform public policy. Among these risks, we would first like to highlight the need for caution when using socially significant information to avoid political manipulation, as was the case during the Brexit debate in the UK. The accessibility of information should not become a target for political manipulation. In addition, effective policy should strike a reasonable balance between transparency and the confidentiality of government, as the disclosure of private information about civil servants and politicians can lead to bullying, persecution, and other illegal acts.

When examining certain aspects of the socially sensitive area of government transparency, namely the electoral process and the prevention of corruption, it should be noted that transparency alone is not a panacea for solving all problems in these areas, but it can be one of the powerful tools for conducting fair, truly open, and equal elections, or for preventing corruption or other abuses of office by public officials. Corruption should be fought not by a transparent government, but by a renewed society with a high level of education and public awareness. The success of reforms to introduce transparent and accountable government depends on a proper understanding of this concept and phenomenon by politicians and civil activists themselves.

The public good served by the innovation considered in this study is the strengthening of democratic governance by increasing the transparency and accountability of public authorities. These innovations enhance public control over government decision-making processes, promote more effective citizen participation, improve feedback mechanisms between society and the state, and contribute to increasing trust in state institutions and improving the quality of public administration.

Digital transparency and accountability represent ongoing and evolving concepts dependent upon continual responsiveness to changing technology. By analyzing global trends and Ukraine's experiences, we can draw the following strategic conclusions:

1. Prioritize Algorithmic Literacy: Without stakeholders' ability to read data, there will not be true transparency. Therefore, it is necessary to create educational programs for civil servants, judges, and citizens regarding how algorithmic systems operate.
2. Compliance-by-Design: Organizations should embed audit and control mechanisms in their systems' IT architecture using Blockchain and Open Standards so that logs remain immutable.
3. Harmonize Regulations Globally: Cooperation among nations, such as through the G7 or OECD, is necessary to avoid fragmented regulatory requirements that may hinder business growth while maintaining high ethical standards.

4. Measure Results, Not Just Reports: Digital accountability should be evaluated based on actual reductions in corruption and improvements in public service quality rather than the number of published datasets.

Further research should be developed in an interdisciplinary direction, combining political science, public administration, digital law and data science. It is advisable to empirically verify how the implementation of blockchain solutions in public procurement affects the level of corruption in different administrative environments. The impact of algorithmic transparency on trust in judicial and administrative decisions needs to be studied, in particular through experiments with explainable AI. A separate direction may be a comparative analysis of digital transparency policies in countries in a state of armed conflict to identify factors of information system resilience. In addition, it is important to investigate the socio-psychological aspects of citizens' perception of transparency in order to avoid the "transparency paradox", when excessive openness of data leads to a decrease in trust due to information overload or manipulation. Such research will contribute to the formation of scientifically sound digital accountability policies.

About the Authors:

Maksym Yamkovyi is a Ph.D. Candidate at the Department of Public Management and Administration, State University of Trade and Economics, Ukraine. His research interests include digital transformation of public administration, e-government, transparency and accountability, digital public services, customer success management, CRM technologies, business process management, artificial intelligence, and public sector innovation. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0009-0009-6369-0954. Email: matst@ukr.net.

Yuliia Nehoda is a Doctor of Sciences in Economics, Professor of the Department of Finance, Faculty of Economics, National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine, Kyiv, Ukraine. Her research interests include gender approaches and women's leadership in higher education and entrepreneurship, investment and innovation in the agricultural economy, transparency and accountability in public administration, higher education policy, and public administration. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9714-5438. Email: negoda_y@nubip.edu.ua.

Svitlana Dombrovska is a D.Sc. in Public Administration, Professor, Honored Worker of Education of Ukraine, and Vice-Rector for Scientific Work at the National Aerospace University "Kharkiv Aviation Institute", Kharkiv, Ukraine. Her research interests include public administration, higher education management, civil protection, digital transformation of public administration, crisis management, public policy, and sustainable development. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8627-0057. Email: s.dombrovska@khai.edu.

Oleksii Shafranosh is an Assistant Lecturer and Ph.D. in Political Science at the Department of the History of Hungary and European Integration, Ukrainian-Hungarian Educational Institute, Uzhhorod National University, Uzhhorod, Ukraine. His research interests include political science, European integration, international relations, regional cooperation, public policy, and the history and politics of Central and Eastern Europe. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1170-3599. Email: lshafr@gmail.com.

Nataliia Lepish is an Associate Professor of the Department of Administrative and Legal Disciplines, Educational and Scientific Institute, Lviv State University of Internal Affairs, Lviv, Ukraine, and Ph.D. in Law. Her research interests include administrative law, public administration, law enforcement, legal regulation, administrative justice, and the protection of human rights. ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5754-3511. Email: nataljaja@ukr.net.

Acknowledgments:

DeepSeek-V3 (DeepSeek-AI, initial release: 26 December 2024) was used solely as an auxiliary tool for linguistic editing and stylistic refinement of the manuscript, including grammar correction, wording improvement, and enhancement of textual clarity. The tool was not used for generating scientific ideas, formulating the research problem, designing the methodology, analyzing or interpreting data, or preparing the conclusions. All substantive research decisions and final content were produced and verified by the authors.

References:

Asimakopoulos, G., H. Antonopoulou, K. Giotopoulos & C. Halkiopoulos. 2025. Impact of information and communication technologies on democratic processes and citizen participation. *Societies,* 15(2): 40. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15020040

Balkin, J. M. 1998. How mass media simulate political transparency. *Cultural Values,* 3(4): 393-413. http://www.yale.edu/lawweb/jbalkin/articles/media01.htm

Berliner, D. 2014. The political origins of transparency. *The Journal of Politics,* 76(2): 479-491. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022381613001412

Bevilacqua, D. & F. Spagnuolo. 2015. Transparency and participation in the global polity: Lessons learned from food and water governance. *Glocalism: Journal of Culture, Politics and Innovation*, 1. https://doi.org/10.12893/gjcpi.2015.1.8

Bima, M. R., M. A. W. W. Mamonto & M. Y. Arifin. 2025. Promoting transparency through the reformulation of regulations on private donation sources based on financial technology. In *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference Changing of Business Law*, 27 April – 10 July, 2004. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Atlantis Press. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-356-6_31

Burman, A. 2013. Transparency and political parties: Finding the right instrument. *Economic and Political Weekly,* 48(28): 34-37. http://www.jstor.org/stable/23527444

Crepaz, M. & G. Arikan. 2024. The effects of transparency regulation on political trust and corruption: Evidence from a survey experiment. *Regulation & Governance,* 18(3): 896-913. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12555

Fung, A., D. Weil, M. Graham & E. Fagotto. 2004. The political economy of transparency: What makes disclosure policies effective? *Harvard University*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=766287

Hiremath, C. T. 2017. The impact of technological advancements on political processes. *International Journal of Research and Analytical Reviews,* 4(3): 756-763. http://www.ijrar.org/papers/IJRAR19D5442.pdf

Hollyer, J. R., B. P. Rosendorff & J. R. Vreeland. 2017. Measuring transparency. *Political Analysis,* 22(4): 413-434. https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpu001

Hollyer, J. R., B. P. Rosendorff & J. R. Vreeland. 2019. Transparency, protest and democratic stability. *British Journal of Political Science,* 49(4): 1251-1277. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123417000308

Karakaş, M. (2014). Transparency and accountability in political financing in Turkey. *Cumhuriyet Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Dergisi,* 15(2), 81-100. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/download/article-file/48553

Lindstedt, C. & D. Naurin. 2010. Transparency is not enough: Making transparency effective in reducing corruption. *International Political Science Review,* 31(3): 301-322. http://www.jstor.org/stable/25703868

Mokrosinska, D. M. 2020. Introduction: Transparency and secrecy in European democracies. In *Transparency and secrecy in European democracies: Contested trade-offs*, 1-13. London: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429026003-1

Moravcsik, A. 2014. Transparency: The revolution in qualitative research. *PS: Political Science & Politics,* 47(1): 48-53. https://doi.org/10.1017/S1049096513001789

Nassmacher, K. H. 2003. Monitoring, control and enforcement of political finance regulation. In *Funding of political parties and election campaigns,* edited by R. Austin and M. Tjernström, 139. International Institute for Democracy and Electoral Assistance (IDEA). https://www.idea.int/sites/default/files/publications/funding-of-political-parties-and-election-campaigns.pdf

Pancrazi R. & L. Prosperi. 2020. Transparency, political conflict, and debt. *Journal of International Economics*, 126: 103331. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jinteco.2020.103331

Phelippeau, É. 2020. *The limits of transparency*. Books & Ideas. https://booksandideas.net/The-Limits-of-Transparency

Power, S. 2020. The transparency paradox: Why transparency alone will not improve campaign regulations. *The Political Quarterly,* 91(4): 731-738. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-923X.12886

Rodrigues, K. F. 2018. Unveiling the concept of transparency: Its limits, varieties and the creation of a typology. *Cadernos EBAPE.BR,* 18(2). https://doi.org/10.1590/1679-395173192x

Sherlock, J. 2025. Surfacing electoral processes: Operational transparency increases trust in elections and voter turnout. *Departmental Review.* London, UK: London School of Economics. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-7153108/v1

Standards on Political Funding and Favours. 2009. *Policy Position*, 1: 1-8. https://files.transparencycdn.org/images/2009_1_StandardsFunding_EN.pdf

Victor, D. 2024, July 24. How transparency and accountability can influence free and fair election process in the country: Examples drawn from the 2019 and 2020 elections. *The Political Quarterly.* https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4904107

Voermans, W., H. M. ten Napel & R. Passchier. 2015. Combining efficiency and transparency in legislative processes. *The Theory and Practice of Legislation,* 3(3): 279-294. https://doi.org/10.1080/20508840.2015.1133398

Widjaja, G. 2025, October 10. Transparency in the political decision-making process: Its impact on people's welfare. *Multidisciplinary Output Research for Actual and International Issue (MORFAI Journal),* 5(1): 348-352. https://doi.org/10.54443/morfai.v5i1.2597