

---

## E-Governance and Social Equity: Rethinking Policy Perspectives of Welfare Delivery Mechanism

**Dr. Amir Mahmood**

Assistant Professor, Department of Public Administration, Veer Kunwar Sing University, Ara, Bihar.

---

**DOI : <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20213141>**

---

### ARTICLE DETAILS

**Research Paper**

**Accepted:** 29-04-2026

**Published:** 10-05-2026

---

**Keywords:**

*E-governance, Social Equity, Welfare Delivery, Policy Perspectives, Digital Inclusion, Governance Reform*

---

### ABSTRACT

The integration of e-governance into welfare administration has reshaped policy approaches to service delivery by promoting efficiency, transparency, and streamlined access. Digital platforms now mediate key aspects of social welfare distribution, from beneficiary identification to application and grievance redressal. While these transformations are often framed as inherently progressive, they also demand critical reconsideration from a social equity perspective. This paper seeks to rethink prevailing policy assumptions by examining how digital governance structures influence patterns of inclusion and exclusion in welfare policy access. The study explores the extent to which current policy frameworks adequately address structural disparities related to socio-economic status, geographic location, gender, digital literacy, and technological infrastructure. It analyses how the shift toward digital interfaces may simultaneously expand outreach while creating new barriers, including procedural complexity, authentication challenges, and limited institutional accountability. Through a policy-analytical lens, the research evaluates the responsiveness of governance mechanisms in ensuring equitable outcomes rather than merely administrative efficiency. By situating e-governance within broader debates on justice and inclusion, the paper argues for a reorientation of policy perspectives toward human-centred and context-sensitive approaches. It emphasises the importance of integrating digital access support, participatory



mechanisms, and complementary offline channels to safeguard equitable welfare delivery. In due course, the study contributes to ongoing discussions on inclusive governance by proposing directions for policy reform that align technological innovation with social equity objectives.

---

---

## **Introduction:**

The emergence of information, education, and technology in developing countries such as India has become crucial for growth and development. Its impact on people is evident in the promotion of user-friendly administration through Information and Communication Technology (ICT). This paper focuses on the effective implementation of e-governance through ICT to serve the common citizen, enabling governments to deliver services in a transparent, cost-effective, and accessible manner. Citizen participation through electronic devices in accessing government services enhances accountability and responsiveness. ICT also facilitates modernisation and the participatory nature of governance. The primary objective of e-governance is to reach the unreached, ensuring administrative accessibility anytime and anywhere. Ultimately, it promotes efficient service delivery with maximum output and minimal effort — a process often described as digital democracy.

The global financial and economic crisis that began in 2008 compelled governments to prioritize cost-efficiency while striving to enhance the quality of public services. Over the past two decades, significant investments have been made in the development of e-government initiatives aimed at improving service delivery. Governments adopted these initiatives with the expectation that integrating Information and Communication Technology (ICT) into public administration and streamlining business processes would result in greater efficiency, effectiveness, and mutual benefits for both citizens and the state. However, e-government projects have not always achieved their anticipated outcomes. Many initiatives fail to deliver the full range of promised advantages, and citizens do not automatically adopt or actively use the available digital services. This creates a dilemma between the high expectations associated with e-government, the relatively low user uptake, and dissatisfaction with service quality.

Growing societal expectations have compelled governments to enhance efficiency and effectiveness while simultaneously placing greater emphasis on user needs, demands, and satisfaction. As a consequence, governments have had to reconsider and redesign their strategies for the development and delivery of public services.

The adoption of a citizen-centric approach to public service provision raises important questions.



1. How can governments promote and sustain a more participatory and inclusive model of service development and delivery to ensure that public services effectively respond to citizens' needs? Furthermore, how can Information and Communication Technology (ICT) be utilised to design service-delivery frameworks and supportive tools that enable individuals to customize and personalize services according to their specific requirements?
2. In what ways can the public service restructure itself into an integrated and cohesive system that engages citizens on their own terms, rather than according to the rigid administrative structures, traditions, and institutional cultures of government?
3. How can existing divisions of responsibility and organizational frameworks within the public service be reconsidered and redesigned to support a holistic, whole-of-government approach to public service development and delivery?

This represents a fundamental transformation in thinking and approach toward public service development and delivery, signalling the emergence of a new governance paradigm.

The evolution of e-government, or e-governance, has been an integral part of political and public sector reform agendas in several countries, including India, since the 1990s. During this period, emphasis was placed on integrating Information and Communication Technology (ICT) into administrative systems, based on the belief that technological advancement would contribute to more efficient, transparent, and effective governance.

### **Objective:**

1. To examine the role of e-governance in promoting social equity in welfare service delivery and to rethink policy frameworks to ensure inclusive and citizen-centric governance.
2. To evaluate whether digital welfare platforms reduce or reproduce existing social inequalities, particularly among marginalized and vulnerable groups.
3. To investigate how policy frameworks can integrate equity-oriented principles into the design and implementation of e-governance systems.
4. To suggest policy reforms and institutional mechanisms that ensure inclusive, participatory, and socially just digital welfare delivery.

### **Review of Literature:**

The relationship between e-governance and social equity has emerged as a significant area of scholarly inquiry, particularly in developing countries like India where welfare delivery systems aim to reach



diverse and marginalised populations. Literature on this theme broadly engages with three interconnected debates:

- a) digital transformation of welfare administration,
- b) equity and the digital divide, and
- c) citizen-centric governance and accountability.

Early scholarship on e-governance (Heeks, 2001; Fountain, 2001) conceptualised digital government as a tool for improving efficiency, transparency, and accountability in public administration. E-governance was viewed as part of New Public Management reforms, aiming to reduce bureaucratic delays and corruption through digitised service delivery. In India, initiatives such as Digital India, Aadhaar, and Direct Benefit Transfer (DBT) have been widely studied as transformative instruments in welfare governance (Bhatia & Bhabha, 2017).

However, Heeks (2003) also introduced the concept of the “design–reality gap,” emphasizing that many e-governance projects fail due to mismatch between technological design and socio-administrative realities. This critique remains central in assessing equity outcomes.

Scholars argue that ICT-enabled systems reduce leakages, streamline service delivery, and enhance monitoring mechanisms (Bannister & Connolly, 2014). In welfare schemes such as MGNREGA now VB RamG, PDS, and social pensions, digitization has improved record-keeping and transparency through online portals and real-time tracking.

A significant body of literature highlights the risk that e-governance may reproduce or deepen existing social inequalities (Norris, 2001; Warschauer, 2003). The digital divide—based on income, education, gender, geography, and digital literacy—creates unequal access to digital welfare systems.

In the Indian context, studies have shown that marginalized groups, including rural populations, women, Scheduled Castes, and minorities, often face barriers in accessing digital platforms due to limited connectivity, lack of awareness, and infrastructural constraints (Rao & Nair, 2019). Authentication failures in Aadhaar-linked welfare systems have raised concerns about exclusion errors (Drèze et al., 2017).



Thus, while e-governance promises inclusion, scholars caution that technology-driven welfare delivery may inadvertently exclude the very beneficiaries it aims to serve unless supported by inclusive infrastructure and human facilitation mechanisms.

Recent scholarship shifts from efficiency-centered models to citizen-centric frameworks (Osborne, 2010; Dunleavy et al., 2006). This perspective emphasizes co-production, participatory governance, and user satisfaction in digital service delivery.

E-governance is increasingly understood not merely as automation but as a platform for democratic engagement and accountability. Studies suggest that grievance redressal portals, social audits, and online feedback systems enhance citizen voice and strengthen social equity (Fung, 2015). In India, platforms such as UMANG and MyGov demonstrate attempts to promote participatory digital governance. However, the effectiveness of such platforms depends on digital literacy, institutional responsiveness, and trust in public institutions. Without these, participatory mechanisms remain symbolic rather than transformative.

Policy literature also examines how digitisation reshapes welfare targeting and accountability mechanisms. Direct Benefit Transfers (DBT) are often praised for minimizing corruption and ensuring timely transfers (World Bank, 2016). Yet, critics argue that over-reliance on biometric authentication and centralised databases can undermine social equity if grievance mechanisms are weak (Khera, 2019). Scholars advocate for a balanced approach—combining technological efficiency with human intermediaries, community institutions, and offline support systems to safeguard equity. The emerging Policy Perspectives in contemporary research increasingly argues for a “whole-of-government” and “inclusive digital governance” approach. This includes:

- a) Designing accessible digital interfaces
- b) Strengthening digital literacy programs
- c) Ensuring last-mile connectivity
- d) Incorporating offline alternatives
- e) Institutionalizing participatory monitoring

The shift reflects a movement from technology-centric governance to equity-centred digital governance.



The literatures demonstrate that while e-governance enhances transparency and administrative efficiency, its impact on social equity remains contested. There is limited empirical research examining how digital welfare systems affect different socio-economic groups at the grassroots level, particularly in rural India. Moreover, few studies integrate administrative reform theory with social justice frameworks in evaluating e-governance outcomes. Therefore, rethinking policy perspectives on welfare delivery requires moving beyond efficiency metrics to incorporate inclusion, accessibility, and participatory accountability as central evaluative criteria.

### **Major E-Governance Initiatives and equity based service: An Analytical Approach:**

The rapid expansion of e-governance initiatives in India reflects a broader global transition toward digital-era governance, where Information and Communication Technology (ICT) is positioned as a catalyst for administrative efficiency, transparency, and accountability (Dunleavy et al., 2006; Fountain, 2001). While these reforms are frequently justified on grounds of cost reduction and service optimization, their implications for social equity remain contested. Social equity, understood as fair and inclusive access to public services, requires that digital transformation address structural inequalities rather than reproduce them (Sen, 1999). A critical evaluation of major initiatives—Common Service Centres (CSCs), Aadhaar, and integrated digital platforms such as UMANG and DigiLocker—reveals a complex interplay between inclusion and exclusion.

### **Aadhaar and the Paradox of Digital Identity**

Aadhaar, India's biometric-based digital identity system, has become central to welfare delivery through Direct Benefit Transfers (DBT). Proponents argue that Aadhaar reduces duplication, leakages, and administrative corruption, thereby enhancing distributive justice (World Bank, 2016). From a public administration perspective, the system reflects an effort to modernize bureaucratic processes through data integration and real-time authentication.

However, critical scholarship highlights the “design–reality gap” in digital governance initiatives (Heeks, 2003). Evidence from welfare schemes demonstrates that biometric authentication failures and data mismatches have resulted in exclusion errors, disproportionately affecting vulnerable populations such as the elderly, manual labourers, and rural residents (Drèze et al., 2017; Khara, 2019). These exclusionary outcomes raise normative concerns about shifting welfare entitlements from rights-based guarantees to technology-dependent access mechanisms.



Additionally, concerns about privacy and surveillance underscore broader questions of informational justice. As digital identity systems centralise data, the absence of strong data protection frameworks may compromise citizen autonomy. Therefore, while Aadhaar enhances administrative efficiency, its contribution to social equity remains contingent upon safeguards, grievance redressal mechanisms, and alternative authentication provisions, UMANG, DigiLocker, API Setu, and Other National Digital Platforms.

### **Platform Governance and Digital Stratification:**

Integrated platforms such as UMANG, DigiLocker, and API Setu represent the evolution of interoperable digital governance ecosystems. By consolidating services and enabling digital document verification, these platforms reduce transaction costs and bureaucratic discretion, potentially strengthening transparency and auditability. Such developments align with the paradigm of digital-era governance that prioritizes integration and user convenience (Dunleavy et al., 2006).

Yet, these platforms presuppose smartphone ownership, stable internet connectivity, and digital literacy—resources unevenly distributed across socio-economic groups. Studies on the digital divide caution that technological standardisation may deepen stratification if vulnerable populations lack the skills or resources to engage effectively (Norris, 2001; Warschauer, 2003). Gender disparities, rural connectivity gaps, and linguistic barriers further complicate equitable access. Interoperability frameworks such as API Setu enhance administrative coordination but also intensify data centralization. Without transparency in algorithmic decision-making and robust accountability mechanisms, automated governance may introduce new forms of systemic exclusion. As Bannister and Connolly (2014) emphasize, digital transformation must be assessed not only in terms of efficiency gains but also in relation to public values and democratic accountability.

### **Digital Access and Last-Mile Governance:**

Common Service Centres (CSCs) were designed to bridge the rural-urban digital divide by providing assisted access to government services through Village Level Entrepreneurs. By mediating between digital systems and citizens lacking digital literacy or internet access, CSCs operationalize a hybrid model of governance that combines technological infrastructure with human facilitation. This aligns with scholarship emphasising user-centred and citizen-centric service delivery (Jaeger & Bertot, 2010).



Empirical assessments indicate that CSCs have expanded the reach of welfare and financial services in remote regions. However, infrastructural limitations, inconsistent connectivity, and variations in operator capacity create uneven service quality. Moreover, dependence on intermediaries may inadvertently perpetuate asymmetrical power relations, especially when service charges or informal practices emerge. As Norris (2001) and Warschauer (2003) argue, digital inclusion requires not only physical access but also meaningful capability enhancement. Thus, while CSCs mitigate certain dimensions of the digital divide, their impact on equity depends on sustained institutional support and regulatory oversight. A detail of services shown in table no.1.

<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Primary Objective</b>	<b>Mechanism of Service Delivery</b>	<b>Positive Equity Outcomes</b>	<b>Equity Risks / Challenges</b>	<b>Overall Equity Assessment</b>
<b>Common Service Centres (CSCs)</b>	Provide last-mile digital access in rural and underserved areas	Physical service points operated by Village Level Entrepreneurs (VLEs) offering assisted access to G2C services	Expands rural access; reduces geographic barriers; supports digitally illiterate citizens; promotes rural entrepreneurship	Connectivity gaps; inconsistent service quality; informal service charges; dependency on intermediaries	Moderately positive for inclusion, but dependent on infrastructure and regulatory oversight
<b>Aadhaar (Digital Identity System)</b>	Streamline beneficiary identification and reduce duplication in welfare schemes	Biometric-based authentication linked to welfare databases and Direct Benefit Transfers (DBT)	Reduces leakages; improves targeting; speeds up benefit transfers; enhances administrative efficiency	Biometric failures; exclusion errors; privacy concerns; data security and surveillance risks	Efficiency gains significant, but equity outcomes conditional on safeguards and grievance redressal
<b>Direct Benefit Transfer (DBT)</b>	Ensure direct transfer of subsidies to beneficiaries	Bank-linked digital payment system integrated with Aadhaar	Reduces corruption; minimizes intermediaries;	Financial exclusion for unbanked populations; authentication	Potentially equity-enhancing if financial



			ensures timely payments	failures; transaction costs in remote areas	inclusion and banking access are ensured
<b>UMANG (Unified Mobile App)</b>	Provide integrated access to multiple government services	Mobile-based digital platform aggregating services	Convenience; reduced transaction costs; increased transparency; centralized access	Smartphone dependency; digital literacy gaps; language barriers	Inclusive for digitally literate users; risks stratification without assisted access
<b>DigiLocker</b>	Digital storage and verification of official documents	Cloud-based document repository linked to government databases	Reduces paperwork; prevents document loss; speeds up verification processes	Limited access among digitally marginalized groups; cybersecurity risks	Enhances efficiency but requires digital literacy and secure data frameworks
<b>API Setu &amp; Interoperable Platforms</b>	Enable seamless data exchange across government departments	Integrated data-sharing architecture	Faster processing; reduced duplication; improved auditability	Centralization of data; lack of transparency in algorithmic decision-making	Strengthens governance efficiency; equity depends on data protection and accountability measures

Table no. 1

### State-Level Major E-Governance Initiatives:

The Indian states have taken the lead in implementing innovative e-governance initiatives aimed at improving public service delivery and enhancing transparency. In Andhra Pradesh, the MeeSeva platform, and in Telangana, the Dharani Portal, provide a wide array of online services, including digitised land records, thereby increasing administrative efficiency and accessibility. Karnataka's Bhoomi Project was among the earliest initiatives to computerise land records, benefiting farmers by

ensuring transparency and reducing bureaucratic delays. The initiatives and implications are shown in the table no. 2

<b>State</b>	<b>Initiative</b>	<b>Key Focus Area</b>	<b>Mode of Delivery</b>	<b>Governance Impact</b>	<b>Social Equity Implications</b>
<b>Andhra Pradesh</b>	MeeSeva	Integrated citizen services, certificates, land records	Online + service centres	Streamlined service delivery; reduced bureaucratic delays	Improved rural access, but dependent on digital literacy and connectivity
<b>Telangana</b>	Dharani Portal	Land records management	Fully online land portal	Transparency in land transactions; reduced disputes	Benefits landowners; concerns for digitally marginalized farmers
<b>Karnataka</b>	Bhoomi Project	Computerization of land records	Digital land database + kiosks	Reduced corruption and middlemen in land administration	Increased farmer empowerment; initial literacy barriers
<b>Kerala</b>	Akshaya & FRIENDS	Digital literacy + multi-service centres	Assisted service centres	Promoted digital inclusion and citizen awareness	Strong equity model due to literacy focus and assisted access
<b>Tamil Nadu</b>	e-Sevai & e-District	Welfare services and certificates	Online + service centres	Faster processing and transparency	Enhanced rural outreach; digital divide remains a



					challenge
<b>Madhya Pradesh</b>	Gyandoot & MP Online	Rural connectivity and online services	Kiosks + web portals	Bridged rural-urban digital gap	Assisted access improves inclusion; infrastructure gaps persist
<b>Maharashtra</b>	SETU & MahOnline	Licensing, payments, citizen services	Online + facilitation centres	Improved transparency and efficiency	Urban-rural access imbalance may affect equity
<b>Gujarat</b>	e-Dhara & Jan Seva Kendras	Digitized land records + single-window services	Digital platform + centres	Simplified land transactions; single-point access	Greater transparency; requires digital awareness
<b>Rajasthan</b>	e-Mitra	Certificates, bill payments, grievances	Kiosks + online services	Strengthened grievance redressal and service efficiency	Widely accessible; fee structures may impact poorest users
<b>Uttar Pradesh</b>	Lokvani	Digital grievance redressal	Online + rural kiosks	Enhanced citizen voice and accountability	Empowered rural citizens; literacy barriers remain
<b>Bihar</b>	Vasudha Centres	Rural e-governance outreach	Assisted service centres	Extended digital services to underserved districts	Supports inclusion; infrastructure and training constraints
<b>Odisha</b>	Bhulekh & e-	Land records +	Online	Improved land	Equity

	District	welfare services	platforms	transparency and service delivery	depends on rural connectivity and awareness
<b>West Bengal</b>	BanglarMukh	Integrated citizen information/services	Online portal	Centralized access to state services	Digital literacy gaps affect full participation
<b>Punjab</b>	Suwidha Centres	Single-window citizen services	Physical centres + online	Reduced procedural delays	Assisted access enhances inclusion
<b>Delhi</b>	e-District & e-SLA	Time-bound service delivery	Fully online + monitoring system	Increased accountability and administrative efficiency	High digital readiness; exclusion risk for digitally illiterate populations

Table no.2

### Reframing Equity in Digital Welfare Governance:

The foregoing analysis suggests that e-governance initiatives operate within a tension between efficiency-oriented reform and equity-oriented welfare commitments. While digital systems can reduce corruption and improve service delivery, they may simultaneously generate technological barriers that exclude marginalised populations. Social equity, therefore, requires a recalibration of policy perspectives from technology-centric governance to inclusion-centric design.

A hybrid governance model—combining digital infrastructure with human facilitation, offline alternatives, and participatory accountability mechanisms—offers a more balanced approach. Embedding equity principles into digital architecture entails ensuring accessibility, affordability, multilingual design, robust grievance redressal systems, and comprehensive data protection regulations.

In sum, e-governance initiatives in India represent neither an unequivocal success nor a categorical failure in advancing social equity. Rather, they illustrate that technology is a mediating



instrument whose distributive consequences depend on institutional design, implementation capacity, and socio-economic context. Future policy discourse must therefore integrate social justice frameworks into digital governance evaluation, moving beyond metrics of transaction volume and cost efficiency toward inclusive and participatory welfare outcomes.

### **Conclusion and Recommendations:**

The comparative analysis of state-level e-governance initiatives in India demonstrates that digital transformation has become a central pillar of administrative reform and public service modernisation. Across states, initiatives such as land record digitization, single-window service centres, online grievance systems, and integrated service portals reflect a broader commitment to transparency, efficiency, and citizen-centric governance. These reforms collectively complement national programmes like Digital India and illustrate the federal dynamism of India's digital governance architecture.

However, the equity implications of these initiatives are uneven and context-dependent. States that have adopted assisted access models, such as Kerala's Akshaya, Bihar's Vasudha Centres, and Punjab's Suwidha Centres, appear better positioned to address digital exclusion by combining technological infrastructure with human facilitation. In contrast, states relying predominantly on fully online platforms risk reinforcing existing socio-economic divides, particularly where digital literacy, internet connectivity, and smartphone penetration remain limited.

Land record digitization initiatives—such as Bhoomi (Karnataka), e-Dhara (Gujarat), and Dharani (Telangana)—have significantly improved transparency and reduced bureaucratic discretion. Yet their distributive benefits are more accessible to digitally capable users, potentially marginalizing small and resource-poor farmers. Similarly, grievance redressal platforms like Lokvani and e-Mitra strengthen participatory governance, but their transformative potential depends on administrative responsiveness and user awareness.

Overall, the analysis suggests that e-governance initiatives are not inherently equitable or exclusionary; rather, their social justice outcomes are shaped by design choices, institutional capacity, and socio-economic conditions. Digital governance enhances efficiency and procedural transparency, but social equity requires deliberate policy integration of accessibility, digital literacy, infrastructural investment, and grievance redressal mechanisms.

Therefore, the future of state-level e-governance in India lies in adopting a *hybrid and inclusion-oriented model*—one that balances technological advancement with human facilitation and safeguards



against digital exclusion. Only through such an approach can ICT-driven governance move beyond administrative modernisation toward genuinely inclusive and participatory development.

**Inclusivity and Equity-Oriented E-Governance need to be focal point:**

The comparative analysis of state-level e-governance initiatives highlights that technological modernisation alone is insufficient to ensure social equity. To transform digital governance into a socially just and inclusive framework, the following policy recommendations are proposed:

a) Adopt a Hybrid Service Delivery Model:

Governments should institutionalise a hybrid model that combines digital platforms with assisted service centres. While online portals enhance efficiency, physical facilitation centres (such as CSCs, Suwidha Centres, and Vasudha Kendras) remain essential for digitally marginalized populations. Maintaining parallel offline or assisted mechanisms will help prevent technological exclusion.

b) Strengthen Digital Infrastructure and Last-Mile Connectivity:

Equitable access requires universal broadband connectivity, particularly in rural and remote areas. Public investment in reliable internet infrastructure, electricity supply, and secure digital hardware is critical. States should prioritize underserved districts to reduce regional disparities.

c) Enhance Digital Literacy and Capacity Building:

Digital literacy must be integrated into governance reforms. Programs similar to Kerala's Akshaya model should be replicated to empower citizens—especially women, elderly individuals, Scheduled Castes, Scheduled Tribes, and economically weaker sections—to independently access digital services. Training for frontline officials and kiosk operators is equally important to ensure responsive service delivery.

d) Ensure Accessibility and Inclusive Design:

E-governance platforms should incorporate multilingual interfaces, disability-friendly features, and simplified user experiences. Policies must mandate universal design principles to make services accessible to individuals with limited literacy or physical impairments.

e) Institutionalize Robust Grievance Redressal Mechanisms:



Digital grievance systems must be transparent, time-bound, and accountable. Integration of Service Level Agreements (SLAs), as seen in Delhi's e-SLA model, should be expanded across states. Clear escalation mechanisms and human oversight are necessary to address service denials and authentication failures promptly.

f) Safeguard Data Privacy and Strengthen Legal Frameworks:

As digital governance increasingly relies on centralized data systems, comprehensive data protection regulations and cybersecurity safeguards are essential. Citizens must have transparency regarding data usage, storage, and consent. Independent oversight bodies should monitor compliance and prevent misuse.

g) Monitor Equity Outcomes through Disaggregated Data:

Policy evaluation should move beyond transaction volume metrics to include equity indicators. Governments should collect and publish disaggregated data based on gender, caste, region, income, and disability to assess whether digital reforms are reducing or reinforcing inequalities.

h) Encourage Participatory Policy Design:

Citizen feedback mechanisms, social audits, and community consultations should be embedded into the design and evaluation of e-governance initiatives. Engaging civil society organizations and local bodies can enhance accountability and ensure that digital systems reflect ground realities.

i) Promote Inter-State Learning and Best Practice Sharing:

States should establish collaborative platforms to exchange successful models of inclusive e-governance. Replicating best practices—such as assisted service centres, literacy integration, and grievance monitoring systems—can accelerate equitable digital transformation nationwide.

Henceforth, the e-governance initiatives in India reflect substantial advancements in modernising public administration. Nevertheless, improvements in digital efficiency do not automatically ensure equitable outcomes. The impact of technology on society depends largely on [how] it is *designed*, how *accessible* it is, and the strength of the institutional safeguards in place—factors that can either reduce or exacerbate existing social inequalities. A shift toward an equity-focused model of digital governance is essential. By integrating technological advancements with inclusive design, assisted service delivery, effective grievance redressal systems, and vigorous data protection measures, Indian



states can connect e-governance as a meaningful tool to promote social justice and inclusive development.

### References:

- Bannister, F., & Connolly, R. (2014). ICT, public values and transformative government: A framework and programme for research. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(1), 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.06.002>
- Bhatia, A., & Bhabha, J. (2017). Poverty and the Aadhaar card: Marginalisation or empowerment? *Economic & Political Weekly*, 52(50), 75–84.
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.03.005>
- Drèze, J., Khera, R., & Somanchi, A. (2017). Aadhaar and food security in Jharkhand: Pain without gain? *Economic & Political Weekly*, 52(50), 50–59.
- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New public management is dead—Long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), 467–494. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui057>
- Fountain, J. E. (2001). *Building the virtual state: Information technology and institutional change*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Fung, A. (2015). Putting the public back into governance: The challenges of citizen participation and its future. *Public Administration Review*, 75(4), 513–522. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12361>
- Heeks, R. (2001). *Understanding e-governance for development*. Institute for Development Policy and Management.
- Heeks, R. (2003). Most e-government-for-development projects fail: How can risks be reduced? *iGovernment Working Paper Series*, University of Manchester.



- Heeks, R. (2006). *Implementing and managing eGovernment: An international text*. Sage Publications.
- Jaeger, P. T., & Bertot, J. C. (2010). Designing, implementing, and evaluating user-centered and citizen-centered e-government. *International Journal of Electronic Government Research*, 6(2), 1–17.
- Khera, R. (2019). Aadhaar failures: A tragedy of errors. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 54(20), 45–53.
- Norris, P. (2001). *Digital divide: Civic engagement, information poverty, and the Internet worldwide*. Cambridge University Press.
- Osborne, S. P. (2010). *The new public governance? Emerging perspectives on the theory and practice of public governance*. Routledge.
- Rao, S. S., & Nair, P. R. (2019). Digital inclusion and e-governance in India: Issues and challenges. *Information Technology for Development*, 25(3), 1–15.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- United Nations. (2022). *United Nations e-government survey 2022: The future of digital government*. United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs.
- Warschauer, M. (2003). *Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide*. MIT Press.
- World Bank. (2016). *Digital dividends*. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0671-1>
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism*. PublicAffairs.
- Bannister, F., & Connolly, R. (2014). ICT, public values and transformative government: A framework and programme for research. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(1), 119–128. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.06.002>
- Drèze, J., Khera, R., & Somanchi, A. (2017). Aadhaar and food security in Jharkhand: Pain without gain? *Economic & Political Weekly*, 52(50), 50–59.



- Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). New public management is dead—Long live digital-era governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 16(3), 467–494. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mui057>
- Fountain, J. E. (2001). *Building the virtual state: Information technology and institutional change*. Brookings Institution Press.
- Heeks, R. (2003). Most e-government-for-development projects fail: How can risks be reduced? *iGovernment Working Paper Series*, University of Manchester.
- Jaeger, P. T., & Bertot, J. C. (2010). Designing, implementing, and evaluating user-centered and citizen-centered e-government. *International Journal of Electronic Government Research*, 6(2), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.4018/jegr.2010040101>
- Khera, R. (2019). Aadhaar failures: A tragedy of errors. *Economic & Political Weekly*, 54(20), 45–53.
- Norris, P. (2001). *Digital divide: Civic engagement, information poverty, and the Internet worldwide*. Cambridge University Press.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press.
- Warschauer, M. (2003). *Technology and social inclusion: Rethinking the digital divide*. MIT Press.
- World Bank. (2016). *Digital dividends*. World Bank. <https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-0671-1>