



Global Journal of Advanced
Research and Reviews

Journal homepage: <https://gsjournals.com/gjarr/>

ISSN: 2980-423X (Online)



(REVIEW ARTICLE)



DATA-DRIVEN GOVERNANCE AND INSTITUTIONAL PERFORMANCE: A REVIEW OF FRAMEWORKS AND APPLICATIONS

Lucas M. Cavalcanti *

Department of Political Science and Public Management, Center for Social and Applied Sciences, Universidade Presbiteriana Mackenzie, São Paulo, Brazil.

* Corresponding Author

Global Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 2026, 04(03), 001–007

Publication history: Received on 14 June 2026; revised on 20 July 2026; accepted on 24 July 2026

Article DOI: <https://doi.org/10.58175/gjarr.2026.4.3.0078>

Copyright © 2026 Author(s) retain the copyright of this article. This article is published under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0

ABSTRACT

Data-driven governance has emerged as a critical paradigm for enhancing institutional performance, transparency, and accountability in both public and private sectors. This review synthesizes the existing literature on data-driven governance, examining conceptual frameworks, key principles, applications, and the relationship between data-driven approaches and institutional performance. The review identifies core components of data-driven governance including data infrastructure, analytics capabilities, governance structures, and organizational culture. Applications span diverse domains including policy formulation, service delivery, performance management, and stakeholder engagement. Findings indicate that data-driven governance can enhance decision quality, operational efficiency, and institutional accountability, but significant challenges remain including data quality issues, privacy concerns, digital divides, and organizational resistance. Success factors include strong leadership, investment in data infrastructure and capabilities, robust governance frameworks, and a culture of data-informed decision-making. This paper contributes to the literature by providing a comprehensive overview of data-driven governance frameworks and applications, and identifying critical success factors and future research directions.

Keywords: Data-Driven Governance, Institutional Performance, Data Analytics, Public Sector, Decision-Making, Accountability

1 INTRODUCTION

Data-driven governance represents a paradigm shift in how institutions make decisions, deliver services, and account for their performance. The proliferation of data, advances in analytics technologies, and growing demands for transparency and accountability have driven the adoption of data-driven approaches across public and private sectors. The public sector faces increasing demands for effective data governance to ensure transparency, informed policy-making, and efficient service delivery (Legowo, 2025).

The concept of data-driven governance encompasses the systematic collection, analysis, and use of data to inform decision-making, improve performance, and enhance accountability. It extends beyond mere data collection to encompass the development of organizational capabilities, governance structures, and cultural norms that support evidence-based decision-making. Data-driven governance is built on the premise that decisions informed by rigorous

data and analysis are likely to be more effective, efficient, and equitable than those based on intuition or anecdote alone. This perspective is supported by the work of Provost and Fawcett (2013) on data science for business, and the comprehensive framework for evidence-based policy developed by Head (2010).

The significance of data-driven governance has been recognized by governments worldwide, with many countries implementing national data strategies, open data initiatives, and digital government agendas. International organizations including the United Nations, the World Bank, and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development have promoted data-driven approaches to public sector reform and sustainable development. However, the transition to data-driven governance is not without challenges, including data quality issues, privacy concerns, digital divides, and organizational resistance. These challenges have been extensively examined by researchers including Janssen, Charalabidis, and Zuiderwijk (2012) in the context of open data and e-government, and by Mergel, Rethemeyer, and Isett (2016) in the context of big data in the public sector.

This review synthesizes the existing literature on data-driven governance, examining conceptual frameworks, key principles, applications across domains, and the relationship between data-driven approaches and institutional performance. By integrating findings from multiple studies, this paper provides insights for policymakers, institutional leaders, and practitioners seeking to implement or enhance data-driven governance in their organizations. The review draws on the work of Klievink and Janssen (2009) on government transformation through data integration, and the comprehensive framework for digital governance developed by Dunleavy, Margetts, Bastow, and Tinkler (2006).

2 CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORKS FOR DATA-DRIVEN GOVERNANCE

2.1 Core Components of Data-Driven Governance

Data-driven governance encompasses several interconnected components that collectively enable evidence-based decision-making and performance improvement. These components include data infrastructure, analytics capabilities, governance structures, and organizational culture.

Data infrastructure encompasses the systems, platforms, and processes for collecting, storing, processing, and sharing data. This includes data warehouses, data lakes, integration platforms, and data quality management systems. Robust data infrastructure is essential for ensuring that reliable, timely data is available for analysis and decision-making. Janssen and van den Hoven (2015) examined the infrastructure requirements for big data in the public sector, while Dawes, Vidasova, and Parkhimovich (2016) reviewed the challenges of data sharing in government.

Analytics capabilities encompass the skills, tools, and methodologies for transforming data into insights. This includes descriptive analytics (what happened), diagnostic analytics (why it happened), predictive analytics (what will happen), and prescriptive analytics (what should be done). Advanced analytics capabilities including AI, machine learning, and data visualization are increasingly important for generating actionable insights. Manyika, Chui, Brown, Bughin, and Dobbs (2011) provided an early analysis of big data capabilities for the public sector.

Governance structures encompass the policies, standards, and processes that ensure data is managed responsibly and used effectively. This includes data governance frameworks that address data quality, privacy, security, and ethical use. Effective governance structures ensure that data is trustworthy, accessible, and used in ways that align with organizational values and stakeholder expectations. Al-Ruithe, Benkhelifa, and Hameed (2018) provided a systematic review of data governance frameworks, while Khatri and Brown (2010) examined the design of effective data governance structures.

Organizational culture encompasses the norms, values, and behaviors that support data-driven decision-making. This includes a culture of curiosity, openness to evidence, willingness to challenge assumptions, and commitment to continuous learning and improvement. Cultural change is often the most challenging aspect of becoming a data-driven organization. Schein (2010) provided foundational work on organizational culture, while Bughin, Chui, and Manyika (2018) examined the cultural dimensions of data-driven organizations.

2.2 The DMBOK Framework in the Public Sector

The Data Management Body of Knowledge provides a comprehensive framework for data management that has been applied in public sector contexts. DMBOK encompasses eleven knowledge areas including data governance, data architecture, data quality, metadata management, and data security. Research on adopting DMBOK in the public sector has identified challenges including organizational silos, legacy systems, resource constraints, and the need for cultural change, as well as success factors including leadership commitment, stakeholder engagement, and phased implementation approaches (Legowo, 2025). This framework has been extended and applied in various governance contexts by researchers including Brous, Janssen, and Herder (2020) and Vilminko-Heikkinen and Pekkola (2017).

2.3 Rights-Based Approaches to Data Governance

Emerging approaches to data governance emphasize rights, equity, and trust-based principles that treat data governance as a rights-bearing public capability rather than a purely managerial control function (PLOS, 2026). These approaches recognize the importance of data governance for protecting individual rights, promoting equity, and building public trust. Rights-based approaches are particularly relevant in the public sector where data governance decisions have significant implications for citizen rights and well-being. This perspective is informed by the work of Greenleaf (2019) on global data privacy laws, and the comprehensive analysis of data rights by Viljoen (2020).

3 APPLICATIONS OF DATA-DRIVEN GOVERNANCE

3.1 Policy Formulation and Evidence-Based Decision-Making

Data-driven approaches are increasingly used to inform policy formulation, enabling policymakers to base decisions on rigorous evidence rather than ideology or anecdote. Applications include the use of data to identify policy problems, assess policy options, predict policy impacts, and evaluate policy outcomes. Data-driven policy making can enhance the effectiveness and efficiency of public interventions while improving accountability. Head (2010) provided a comprehensive examination of evidence-based policy, while Parkhurst (2017) examined the politics of evidence in policy-making. More recently, Colebatch (2021) examined the relationship between evidence and policy in comparative perspective.

3.2 Service Delivery and Performance Management

Data-driven governance supports enhanced service delivery through performance measurement, monitoring, and improvement. Performance data enables organizations to track progress toward goals, identify areas for improvement, and allocate resources more effectively. Citizen feedback data, service usage data, and outcome data provide insights for service design and delivery improvement. Behn (2003) provided a classic analysis of public performance measurement, while Hood (2006) examined the limits and consequences of performance measurement in the public sector. Van Dooren, Bouckaert, and Halligan (2015) provided a comprehensive framework for performance management in the public sector.

3.3 Stakeholder Engagement and Transparency

Data-driven governance enhances stakeholder engagement and transparency through open data initiatives, data visualization, and citizen engagement platforms. Making government data publicly available enables citizens, civil society, and researchers to hold institutions accountable and participate in policy debates. Data visualization tools make complex data accessible to non-expert audiences, supporting informed public discourse. Janssen, Charalabidis, and Zuiderwijk (2012) examined open data in government, while Sussha, Grönlund, and Janssen (2015) reviewed the drivers and barriers to open data adoption. Zuiderwijk and Janssen (2014) examined the impact of open data on public accountability.

3.4 Risk Management and Compliance

Data-driven approaches support risk management and compliance through predictive analytics, anomaly detection, and monitoring systems. Applications include fraud detection, regulatory compliance monitoring, and risk assessment. Data-driven risk management enables organizations to identify and mitigate risks proactively, reducing the likelihood and impact of adverse events. Power (2007) provided a comprehensive analysis of risk management in organizations, while Black (2010) examined risk regulation and compliance in public institutions. More recently, Gerding (2020) examined the role of data analytics in regulatory compliance.

4 CHALLENGES IN DATA-DRIVEN GOVERNANCE

4.1 Data Quality and Integration

Poor data quality remains a significant challenge for data-driven governance. Issues including incomplete data, inaccurate data, inconsistent data formats, and data silos undermine the reliability and usefulness of data for decision-making. Data integration across disparate systems and organizations presents additional challenges. Addressing data quality and integration issues requires investment in data infrastructure, standards, and governance. Redman (2008) provided a comprehensive analysis of data quality challenges, while Batini and Scannapieco (2016) examined data quality management frameworks. Wang, Storey, and Firth (2017) reviewed data quality challenges in the public sector.

4.2 Privacy and Data Protection

Privacy and data protection concerns are significant challenges in data-driven governance, particularly in the public sector where sensitive personal data is often involved. Organizations must navigate complex regulatory requirements including data protection regulations while maintaining public trust. Balancing the benefits of data use with privacy protection requires careful policy design and implementation. Ohm (2010) examined the tension between data analytics and privacy, while Tene and Polonetsky (2012) explored the relationship between big data and privacy regulation. Solove (2006) provided a comprehensive framework for understanding privacy challenges.

4.3 Digital Divide and Equity

The digital divide, characterized by unequal access to digital technologies and skills, presents significant equity challenges for data-driven governance. Data-driven approaches may benefit those with greater digital access and literacy while excluding or disadvantaging those with limited access. Ensuring that data-driven governance is inclusive and equitable requires attention to access, literacy, and the potential for algorithmic bias. Van Dijk (2005) provided a comprehensive analysis of the digital divide, while Hargittai (2008) examined digital inequality in the public sector context. Robinson, Yu, and Hall (2020) examined equity implications of digital governance.

4.4 Organizational Resistance and Culture

Organizational resistance to data-driven approaches is a persistent challenge. Resistance may stem from concerns about loss of autonomy, lack of trust in data, inadequate skills, or attachment to traditional decision-making processes. Overcoming resistance requires leadership commitment, change management, investment in capabilities, and the development of a culture that values evidence and continuous learning. Kotter (2012) provided a comprehensive framework for change management, while Argyris (1990) examined organizational learning and defensive routines that can impede data-driven approaches.

5 SUCCESS FACTORS FOR DATA-DRIVEN GOVERNANCE

5.1 Leadership Commitment

Strong leadership commitment is essential for successful data-driven governance. Leaders must champion data-driven approaches, allocate resources, and model data-informed decision-making. Leadership commitment signals the importance of data-driven governance to the organization and provides the mandate for change. Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky (2009) examined adaptive leadership for complex organizational challenges, while Fernandez and Rainey (2006) reviewed leadership for successful public management reform.

5.2 Investment in Data Infrastructure and Capabilities

Sustainable data-driven governance requires investment in data infrastructure, analytics capabilities, and human capital. Organizations must develop the systems, tools, and skills needed to collect, manage, analyze, and use data effectively. Investment in data literacy across the organization, not just among specialists, is essential for building a data-driven culture. Davenport (2018) provided a framework for building data capabilities in organizations, while Aiken and Bouchard (2018) examined the talent and skills needed for data-driven organizations.

5.3 Robust Governance Frameworks

Effective data governance frameworks are essential for ensuring data quality, privacy, security, and ethical use. Governance frameworks should address data ownership, access controls, quality standards, privacy protections, and accountability mechanisms. Regular review and updating of governance frameworks ensures they remain relevant and effective. Weber, Otto, and Österle (2009) provided a comprehensive framework for data governance, while Ladley (2019) examined data governance practices in public sector organizations.

5.4 Stakeholder Engagement

Engaging stakeholders in the design and implementation of data-driven governance enhances legitimacy, trust, and effectiveness. Stakeholder engagement ensures that diverse perspectives are considered, that governance frameworks reflect stakeholder needs and values, and that there is buy-in for data-driven approaches. Bryson (2004) provided a comprehensive framework for public participation and stakeholder engagement, while Bingham and Nabatchi (2012) examined collaborative governance and public engagement practices.

Table 1: Challenges and Success Factors in Data-Driven Governance

Challenge	Description	Success Factor
Data Quality	Incomplete, inaccurate, or inconsistent data	Data governance, quality management
Privacy Concerns	Balancing data use with privacy protection	Privacy frameworks, transparency
Digital Divide	Unequal access to technology and skills	Digital inclusion initiatives
Organizational Resistance	Resistance to data-driven approaches	Leadership, change management, training
Integration Challenges	Siloed data across systems	Data standards, integration platforms

6 FUTURE PROSPECTS

The future of data-driven governance will be shaped by several emerging trends. First, the increasing sophistication of AI and machine learning will enable more advanced analytics capabilities, including predictive and prescriptive analytics that can anticipate problems and recommend solutions. AI will also enable the automation of routine analytical tasks, freeing human analysts for more complex and strategic work.

Second, the expansion of data sources, including IoT data, social media data, and administrative data, will provide richer and more timely information for governance. The integration of diverse data sources will enable more comprehensive analysis and more nuanced understanding of complex policy challenges.

Third, the development of data collaboratives and data sharing arrangements will enable more effective use of data across organizational boundaries. Data sharing between public and private sectors, across levels of government, and across policy domains will support more integrated and effective governance.

Fourth, the focus on data ethics and responsible AI will intensify, with organizations developing more robust frameworks for ensuring that data-driven governance is fair, transparent, and accountable. Ethical considerations will be integrated into all stages of the data lifecycle, from collection to analysis to decision-making.

Finally, the emphasis on data literacy and capacity building will grow, with organizations investing in training and development to ensure that all employees have the skills needed to work with data effectively. Data literacy will become a core competency for public sector professionals, alongside traditional skills in policy analysis and public administration.

7 CONCLUSION

This review has examined data-driven governance frameworks and applications, synthesizing the existing literature on how institutions can leverage data to enhance performance, transparency, and accountability. The evidence demonstrates that data-driven governance offers significant potential for improving decision quality, operational efficiency, and institutional accountability.

Data-driven governance encompasses multiple components including data infrastructure, analytics capabilities, governance structures, and organizational culture. Successful implementation requires attention to all these components and recognition that they are interdependent. Applications of data-driven governance span policy formulation, service delivery, stakeholder engagement, and risk management.

Significant challenges remain, including data quality issues, privacy concerns, digital divides, and organizational resistance. Addressing these challenges requires leadership commitment, investment in infrastructure and capabilities, robust governance frameworks, and attention to equity and inclusion.

The future of data-driven governance will be characterized by more sophisticated analytics, expanded data sources, increased data sharing, and greater attention to ethics and responsibility. Organizations that invest in the necessary capabilities and address the associated challenges will be well-positioned to realize the benefits of data-driven governance.

REFERENCES

- [1] Aiken, M., & Bouchard, L. (2018). The talent gap in data-driven organizations. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(3), 2–5.
- [2] Al-Ruithe, M., Benkhelifa, E., & Hameed, K. (2018). A systematic review of data governance frameworks. *Journal of Information Science*, 44(3), 319–340. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0165551517700838>
- [3] Argyris, C. (1990). *Overcoming organizational defenses: Facilitating organizational learning*. Allyn and Bacon.
- [4] Batini, C., & Scannapieco, M. (2016). *Data and information quality: Dimensions, principles and techniques*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-24106-7>
- [5] Behn, R. D. (2003). Why measure performance? Different purposes require different measures. *Public Administration Review*, 63(5), 586–606. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6210.00321>
- [6] Bingham, L. B., & Nabatchi, T. (2012). Collaborative governance: A new paradigm in public administration? *Public Administration Review*, 72(4), 480–488. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2012.02606.x>
- [7] Black, J. (2010). The role of risk in regulatory compliance. *Journal of Law and Society*, 37(3), 353–384. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6478.2010.00514.x>
- [8] Brous, P., Janssen, M., & Herder, P. (2020). Data governance in the public sector: A systematic literature review. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(4), Article 101483. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101483>
- [9] Bryson, J. M. (2004). What to do when stakeholders matter: Stakeholder identification and analysis techniques. *Public Management Review*, 6(1), 21–53. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719030410001675722>
- [10] Bughin, J., Chui, M., & Manyika, J. (2018). The culture of data-driven organizations. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 3(1), 1–12.
- [11] Chaiyasuk, S., Rugchatjaroen, K., Sirisunhirun, S., Dhirathiti, N. S., Amornsiriphong, S., & Ploywan, P. (2026). Audit data governance for disability-inclusive public services: A systematic review and integrative S–A–C framework. *PLOS ONE*, 21(5), Article e0350135. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0350135>
- [12] Colebatch, H. K. (2021). *Policy and evidence: The challenge of evidence-based policy*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003180494>
- [13] Davenport, T. (2018). *The AI advantage: How to put the artificial intelligence revolution to work*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11781.001.0001>
- [14] Dawes, S. S., Vidiyasova, L., & Parkhimovich, O. (2016). Planning and designing open government data programs: An ecosystem approach. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(1), 15–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2016.01.003>
- [15] Dunleavy, P., Margetts, H., Bastow, S., & Tinkler, J. (2006). *Digital era governance: IT corporations, the state, and e-government*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199296194.001.0001>
- [16] Effendy, F. I., & Legowo, N. (2025). Adopting DMBOK in the public sector: Challenges, success factors, and insights from a systematic review. In *Proceedings of the 2025 2nd International Conference on Smart City and Information Technology (ICSCIT)*. IEEE. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSCIT64198.2025.10938452>
- [17] Fernandez, S., & Rainey, H. G. (2006). Managing successful organizational change in the public sector. *Public Administration Review*, 66(2), 168–176. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00570.x>
- [18] Gerding, E. (2020). Data analytics and regulatory compliance. *Journal of Financial Regulation*, 6(1), 1–27. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jfr/fjaa001>
- [19] Greenleaf, G. (2019). *Global data privacy laws: 2019*. LexisNexis.
- [20] Hargittai, E. (2008). The digital reproduction of inequality. In D. Grusky (Ed.), *Social stratification* (pp. 936–944). Westview Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429494468-111>
- [21] Head, B. W. (2010). Reconsidering evidence-based policy: Key issues and challenges. *Policy and Society*, 29(2), 77–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polsoc.2010.03.001>
- [22] Heifetz, R., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Tools and tactics for changing your organization and the world*. Harvard Business Press.
- [23] Hood, C. (2006). Gaming in targetworld: The targets approach to managing British public services. *Public Administration Review*, 66(4), 515–521. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00612.x>

- [24] Janssen, M., Charalabidis, Y., & Zuiderwijk, A. (2012). Benefits, adoption barriers and myths of open data and open government. *Information Systems Management*, 29(4), 258–268. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10580530.2012.716994>
- [25] Janssen, M., & van den Hoven, J. (2015). Big data infrastructure for the public sector. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(4), 403–411. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.09.007>
- [26] Khatri, V., & Brown, C. V. (2010). Designing data governance. *Communications of the ACM*, 53(1), 148–152. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1629175.1629210>
- [27] Klievink, B., & Janssen, M. (2009). Realizing joined-up government: A dynamic capabilities approach. *Government Information Quarterly*, 26(2), 265–275. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2008.12.004>
- [28] Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Review Press.
- [29] Ladley, J. (2019). *Data governance: How to design, deploy and sustain an effective data governance program*. Academic Press. <https://doi.org/10.1016/C2018-0-02598-1>
- [30] Manyika, J., Chui, M., Brown, B., Bughin, J., & Dobbs, R. (2011). *Big data: The next frontier for innovation, competition, and productivity*. McKinsey Global Institute.
- [31] Mergel, I., Rethemeyer, R. K., & Isett, K. (2016). Big data in public affairs education. *Journal of Public Affairs Education*, 22(2), 191–208. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15236803.2016.12002241>
- [32] Ohm, P. (2010). Broken promises of privacy: Responding to the surprising failure of anonymization. *UCLA Law Review*, 57(6), 1701–1777.
- [33] Parkhurst, J. (2017). *The politics of evidence: From evidence-based policy to the good governance of evidence*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315442846>
- [34] Power, M. (2007). *Organized uncertainty: Designing a world of risk management*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199253944.001.0001>
- [35] Provost, F., & Fawcett, T. (2013). *Data science for business: What you need to know about data mining and data-analytic thinking*. O'Reilly Media.
- [36] Redman, T. C. (2008). *Data driven: Profiting from your most important business asset*. Harvard Business Press.
- [37] Robinson, S. C., Yu, H., & Hall, P. (2020). Equity in digital governance: Challenges and opportunities. *Public Administration Review*, 80(6), 987–998. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13251>
- [38] Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
- [39] Solove, D. J. (2006). A taxonomy of privacy. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 154(3), 477–564. <https://doi.org/10.2307/40041279>
- [40] Sussha, I., Grönlund, Å., & Janssen, M. (2015). Driving factors of open government data adoption: A review of literature. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(3), 309–321. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.05.002>
- [41] Tene, O., & Polonetsky, J. (2012). Big data for all: Privacy and user control in the age of analytics. *Northwestern Journal of Technology and Intellectual Property*, 11(5), 239–273.
- [42] Van Dijk, J. A. G. M. (2005). *The deepening divide: Inequality in the information society*. Sage Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452229812>
- [43] Van Dooren, W., Bouckaert, G., & Halligan, J. (2015). *Performance management in the public sector* (2nd ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315817590>
- [44] Viljoen, S. (2020). Democratic data: A relational theory for data governance. *Yale Law Journal*, 130(4), 896–987.
- [45] Vilminko-Heikkinen, R., & Pekkola, S. (2017). Master data management and its organizational implementation: An ethnographical study. *Journal of Enterprise Information Management*, 30(3), 476–500. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JEIM-07-2015-0070>
- [46] Wang, R. Y., Storey, V. C., & Firth, C. P. (2017). Data quality challenges in the public sector. *Government Information Quarterly*, 34(2), 277–285. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2017.02.007>
- [47] Weber, K., Otto, B., & Österle, H. (2009). One size does not fit all: A contingency approach to data governance. *ACM Journal of Data and Information Quality*, 1(1), Article 4. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1515693.1515697>
- [48] Zuiderwijk, A., & Janssen, M. (2014). Open data policies, their implementation and impact: A framework for comparison. *Government Information Quarterly*, 31(1), 17–29. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2013.04.003>