Academic Journal of Management and Social Sciences
ISSN: 2958-4396 | Vol. 14, No. 3, 2026

Governing the Digital Divide: Collaborative Pathways for Urban-Rural Integration in South Korea

Dabean Kim

School of Public Affairs, Nanjing University of Science and Technology, Nanjing, Jiangsu, China

Abstract: This study examines the structural dilemmas and optimization pathways for digitally integrating urban-rural public services through a collaborative governance lens, using South Korea as a critical case. Despite possessing world-class digital infrastructure, Korea's digital-driven integration process remains mired in deep-seated collaborative failure across four dimensions: design, provision, governance, and institutional support. Drawing on New Public Service and Collaborative Governance theories, this research constructs a 4C analytical framework to systematically diagnose these failures and their underlying causes. The findings reveal a fundamental paradox: technological advancement does not automatically translate into governance effectiveness or social inclusion. The success of digital integration fundamentally depends on the congruent evolution of institutions, mechanisms, and social capital. Based on this diagnosis, the study proposes an integrated optimization pathway encompassing mandatory digital inclusion mechanisms, multi-actor provision ecosystems, hybrid governance systems, and robust institutional foundations. These interconnected strategies offer a coherent blueprint for transitioning from techno-centric governance toward a genuinely inclusive, responsive, and sustainable digital future.

Keywords: Collaborative Governance; Digital Divide; Urban-rural Integration; Public Service Digitalization; Digital Inclusion; South Korea.

1. Introduction

The global digital transformation, while fundamentally reshaping governance paradigms, presents a critical paradox: the unilateral application of technology does not guarantee equitable public service delivery and can in fact exacerbate social exclusion through the digital divide [1-2]. This paradox makes bridging the urban-rural service gap a core governance challenge confronting nations worldwide. South Korea offers a particularly salient case study of this digitalization paradox. Despite consistently ranking among the world's foremost leaders in digital infrastructure and e-government development [3], it confronts a stark digital divide: rural elderly populations possess a digital capability index reaching only 71.8 percent of their urban counterparts [4]. This disparity powerfully demonstrates that technological advancement in the absence of inclusive governance frameworks risks entrenching rather than ameliorating existing inequalities [5].

This study's core inquiry therefore centers on examining this technology-institution misfit through a collaborative governance lens [6]. It systematically investigates three interrelated questions: What structural dilemmas impede the digital integration of urban-rural public services? What are their underlying causes? How might collaborative governance mechanisms be optimally restructured to bridge the digital divide and enhance inclusivity [7]? By rigorously analyzing the Korean case, this research aims to diagnose these collaborative failures and construct a viable optimization framework capable of informing both theoretical understanding and practical policy development.

The study's theoretical contribution lies in extending collaborative governance theory into the specific context of digital urban-rural governance, systematically exploring how digital technologies fundamentally reshape relationships among diverse actors [8]. Practically, it serves as a dual mirror for other nations, particularly those like China navigating similar developmental trajectories, offering both a cautionary warning against the technology-first trap and a reference for positive adjustments drawn from Korea's later policy phases [9]. To achieve these objectives, the research employs a mixed-method approach, combining qualitative policy analysis with quantitative data drawn from authoritative Korean national surveys [4] and OECD reports [3] to triangulate findings and ensure analytical validity [10].

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Evolution of Urban-Rural Public Service Integration Research

The scholarly literature on urban-rural public service integration has evolved significantly, progressing from an initial focus on resource equalization toward a contemporary emphasis on digitally driven mechanism innovation. Foundational research established the critical importance of robust financial systems and comprehensive institutional reforms for dismantling the urban-rural dual structure [11-13]. Subsequent scholarship deepened this foundation by highlighting the essential roles of publicness and collaborative governance in achieving systemic transformation [8, 14], with empirical studies confirming that greater integration positively influences resident well-being [15]. As the field matured, scholarly attention shifted toward micro-level innovation, with digital technology emerging as a pivotal enabling force [16-19].

2.2. Digital Technology: Empowerment, Alienation, and the Korean Context

The literature examining digital technology's role reveals a complex and often contradictory interplay between empowerment and alienation. Digital government reforms demonstrably transform service supply models by shifting from traditional unidirectional service delivery toward multi-actor value co-creation [10, 20]. Empirical evidence confirms

that digital economic development can enhance public service quality, though this effect exhibits significant regional heterogeneity and diminishing marginal returns [21-22]. Critically, however, this empowering effect is distributed unevenly; in rural areas, digitalization frequently exacerbates rather than ameliorates service gaps due to persistently insufficient access and weak quality management systems [23]. This alienation phenomenon stems from fiscal pressures constraining local governments [24] and the inherent risk that existing service fragmentation evolves into entrenched data silos within the digital age [25-26]. Korean scholarship particularly emphasizes the imperative of balancing technological advancement with social inclusion, positioning the elimination of the elderly digital divide as a key metric for evaluating collaborative governance success [27-29].

2.3. Collaborative Governance as an Analytical Framework

Collaborative governance has emerged as a central analytical framework for addressing these multifaceted challenges. This paradigm conceptualizes governance as an institutional arrangement wherein multiple actors collectively create public value through structured consultation and negotiation [30, 8], necessitating networked patterns of interaction that transcend traditional single-authority models [31]. Research has extensively examined the roles and interactions of diverse actors, identifying the need for varied supply models and clearly delineated responsibility allocation as essential prerequisites for effective collaboration [32-33]. Successful collaboration fundamentally depends on robust information sharing mechanisms and institutional integration [5, 34-35], with comprehensive analytical frameworks developed specifically for the Korean context [7]. This body of scholarship ultimately aims to overcome service fragmentation [26] and achieve genuinely inclusive governance, with citizen participation and digital inclusion serving as critical moderating factors [29, 36-37].

2.4. Research Gaps and the Present Study's Contribution

Despite this rich scholarly tradition, significant gaps remain in the existing literature. Most studies treat digital technology as an instrumental variable or collaborative governance as a passive institutional backdrop, failing to integrate both paradigms for deep analysis of their mutual shaping within the specific context of urban-rural integration [10, 8]. Research focusing on Korea predominantly examines national-level digital government strategies or smart city initiatives, lacking in-depth empirical analysis of the cross-level, cross-sectoral micro-mechanisms through which specific collaborative governance arrangements actually resolve the urban-rural dual structure [27, 5, 7]. This study addresses these gaps by integrating digital empowerment and collaborative governance into a unified technology-institution-actor analytical framework, leveraging the Korean case to identify mechanisms capable of resolving collaborative dilemmas and promoting genuine digital inclusion.

3. Research Findings and Analysis

3.1. Policy Evolution: From Infrastructure to Inclusion

Systematic analysis of South Korea's policy trajectory reveals a clear paradigm shift across three distinct phases. The Initial Phase from 2000 to 2010 was characterized by what may be termed national strategy-led infrastructure prioritism. Through massive state investment, the government rapidly constructed a nationwide digital highway, elevating rural internet access from approximately 51 percent to over 71 percent. However, this engineering success operated as a centralized supply model that systematically excluded rural communities, creating a fundamental disconnect between infrastructure deployment and actual service needs. The Expansion Phase from 2011 to 2019 shifted toward service integration through Smart Village projects aimed at embedding ICT into rural life. While rural internet usage reached nearly 90 percent, significantly narrowing the urban gap, computer ownership plummeted to just over 61 percent, revealing an emergent digital access vacuum precipitated by the rapid transition to smartphones. These projects suffered from techno-centric design assumptions and inadvertently created isolated data silos. The Deepening Phase from 2020 to the present, driven by the Korean Digital New Deal, marks a decisive shift toward human-centered inclusive innovation. This strategy emphasizes seamless network coverage, nationwide digital literacy cultivation, and fostering localized innovation. Current data confirms that the internet usage gap has narrowed further, yet a persistent computer ownership gap and its notable volatility reveal that digital inclusion remains a dynamic, multi-dimensional challenge demanding ongoing policy attention.

3.2. Practical Applications: Technology Reshaping Services

Analysis of three key sectors illustrates both the transformative potential and inherent limitations of digital integration. In smart healthcare, AI-powered remote diagnosis and IoT-based monitoring have significantly improved rural access to specialist care and enabled proactive chronic disease management. Nevertheless, this sector faces persistent limitations including data fragmentation, systematic exclusion of individuals with limited digital skills, and financially unsustainable service models. In digital education, public platforms have successfully expanded rural students' access to diverse courses and educational resources. However, a stark gap persists between high access levels exceeding 96 percent and low digital capability below 66 percent among vulnerable groups, particularly the elderly at under 56 percent and farmers and fishermen at under 72 percent. This pronounced usage gap powerfully demonstrates that infrastructure alone cannot guarantee equitable educational outcomes. In smart living, rural mobility services and unmanned delivery systems aim to solve last mile logistical challenges, enhancing convenience and social inclusion. These services, however, face significant risks of excluding digitally vulnerable populations and struggle with financial viability under current market conditions and comprehensive legal frameworks.

3.3. Evolving Characteristics of the Digital Divide

Multi-source data analysis reveals that Korea's digital divide has fundamentally transformed from a visible access gap into a more complex, multi-dimensional capability and benefit gap. While infrastructure coverage is now near-universal with over 95 percent internet usage, persistent disparities in computer ownership and access quality reveal

deeper structural inequalities in access to productive digital tools. A pronounced scissors gap in actual usage demonstrates that despite high access levels, rural elderly digital capability reaches only approximately 63 percent of urban peers, leading to functional exclusion from complex service interactions. A dual structure in public satisfaction persists, with supply-side quantitative metrics such as penetration rates fundamentally misaligned with demand-side qualitative experiences including ease of use and sense of security. Finally, a structural bias in resource allocation is evident: the 2021 Digital New Deal budget allocated over 68 percent to hardware infrastructure, with less than 6 percent directly funding digital inclusion initiatives, reflecting a persistent heavy hardware, light software path dependency that continues to shape policy outcomes.

3.4. Diagnosing Collaborative Governance Dilemmas

Applying the 4C analytical framework, this study diagnoses four interlocking dilemmas that collectively constitute Korea's collaborative governance failure. Collaborative Design suffers from pervasive technological arrogance: top-down planning exhibits entrenched urban bias, designing complex interfaces that systematically exclude rural elderly populations; departmental data silos prevent meaningful integration; and user participation remains formalized and substantively hollow. Cooperative Provision remains trapped in a government monolith. The singular state supply model creates unsustainable fiscal burdens and actively stifles innovation. Invisible barriers, including regulatory ambiguity and procurement misalignment, effectively block private sector entry. Social organizations remain locked in administrative dependency, unable to develop as autonomous partners. Coordinated Governance experiences pervasive digital silencing. Online feedback platforms create insurmountable threshold effects, excluding rural voices; interaction remains fundamentally unidirectional, creating a participation illusion; and digital platforms actively hollow out grassroots autonomy by dis-intermediating local institutions. Collaborative Support is crippled by institutional lag: fragmented laws create paralyzing legal uncertainty for data sharing; systemic data vulnerabilities progressively erode public trust; and the complete absence of collaborative incentives in performance metrics actively punishes cross-boundary cooperation.

3.5. Causes of Collaborative Failure

These diagnosed dilemmas stem from deep-rooted structural, institutional, and social causes. Design failure originates in a top-down administrative system that prioritizes uniformity over contextual sensitivity, a dysfunctional interest game wherein data hoarding constitutes rational behavior, and an institutional absorption deficit that systematically fails to translate rural voices into actionable policy. Provision failure is driven by rigid fiscal structures that lock in state monopolies, the inherent low-profitability of rural markets repelling private capital, and the survival logic of administrative dependency that fundamentally cripples social organizations' developmental capacity. Governance failure is caused by demographic-structural traps wherein population aging concentrates skills deficits, the strategic hollowing out of local autonomy by centralized platforms, and a fundamental socio-technical mismatch between online engineering logic and offline relational culture. Support failure results from a fragmented legal system lacking a unifying Digital Government Act, dual technical and managerial security vulnerabilities creating systemic risk, and the complete absence of collaborative performance evaluation systems that render cooperation irrational within prevailing bureaucratic calculus.

4. Discussion: Pathways to an Inclusive and Collaborative Digital Future

Addressing Korea's collaborative governance dilemmas requires a fundamental restructuring of how public services are designed, delivered, and evaluated. Drawing on the 4C framework, this discussion outlines an integrated pathway toward a more inclusive digital future that addresses each dimension of the diagnosed collaborative failure.

First, service design must be fundamentally reshaped at its source. A mandatory Digital Inclusion Review Mechanism, featuring an independent oversight body and a pre-launch Digital Inclusion Impact Assessment wielding substantive veto power, would ensure all public platforms are rigorously tested against the needs of vulnerable populations before approval. To dismantle entrenched data silos, legally binding inter-agency data sharing agreements within a federated governance model must designate clear data stewards with defined responsibility for specific datasets. Design processes themselves require systematic inversion through a reverse participation protocol, embedding rural users as permanent co-creators via ethnographic research, standing advisory panels, and mandatory rural-first piloting that ensures services are developed with communities rather than imposed upon them.

Second, service provision must move decisively beyond the unsustainable single-state model toward a genuine multi-actor ecosystem. This requires evolving Public-Private Partnerships into long-term, outcome-based Digital Service PPPs that explicitly reward inclusion and innovation. Rural digital social enterprises must be deliberately cultivated through a dual-track strategy combining long-term core funding with preferential public procurement access that recognizes their unique community-embedded value. A targeted Digital Service Voucher scheme would empower rural residents, particularly elderly populations, as active consumers with genuine choice. By injecting purchasing power into otherwise unattractive rural markets, this demand-side mechanism incubates a competitive local service economy responsive to diverse community needs.

Third, governance must deliberately stitch together digital efficiency with human connection. A legally mandated dual-track service system, wherein high-quality offline channels constitute a permanent rights-based feature rather than a grudging afterthought, functions as trusted hubs collecting rich contextual feedback that continuously informs platform improvement. A formalized Digital Agent system embedded at the most granular administrative level bridges the last meter for those unable to navigate digital systems independently. A two-tiered framework combining traditional institutional safeguards with mandatory Algorithmic Impact Assessments makes automated decision-making auditable and responsive, transforming user experience into a driver of systemic learning.

Finally, a robust institutional foundation is essential for sustaining these transformations. Framework legislation such as a Digital Inclusion Promotion Act, alongside targeted

privacy law revisions clarifying public interest exemptions for data sharing, provides the legal confidence necessary for collaboration. A full-lifecycle security framework embedding privacy-enhancing technologies by design, rigorously evaluated against accessibility metrics, ensures that protecting citizens does not mean excluding them. A transformed performance evaluation system integrating weighted digital inclusion indicators into cross-sectoral assessments makes collaboration a rational core function rather than a high-risk gamble. Together, these interconnected pathways offer a coherent blueprint for transitioning toward a digital future that is not merely technologically advanced but fundamentally fair, resilient, and deeply responsive to all citizens.

5. Conclusion

This study, grounded in collaborative governance theory and employing South Korea as a critical case, has systematically analyzed the structural dilemmas and underlying mechanisms characterizing the digital integration of urban-rural public services. The research finds that despite possessing world-class digital infrastructure and proactive policy frameworks, Korea's digital-driven integration process remains mired in deep-seated collaborative failure manifesting across four interconnected dimensions. Collaborative Design suffers from elite-driven, top-down planning fundamentally disconnected from rural realities, effectively erecting digital walls. Cooperative Provision remains trapped in a government-centric monopoly that stifles market vitality and meaningful social participation. Coordinated Governance experiences pervasive digital silencing, wherein complex platforms systematically exclude rural voices, particularly elderly populations, reducing participation to mere formality. Collaborative Support is crippled by fragmented legal frameworks, persistent data security vulnerabilities, and the complete absence of incentive mechanisms rewarding cross-boundary cooperation. These findings collectively reveal a core paradox: technological advancement does not automatically translate into governance effectiveness or social inclusion. The success of digital-driven integration fundamentally depends on the congruent evolution of institutions, mechanisms, and social capital.

The diagnosis of Korea's dilemmas offers critical policy insights for nations navigating digital transformation. First, a paradigm shift from technocentrism to human-centered, demand-oriented governance is imperative, requiring mandatory digital inclusion reviews and reverse participation protocols that structurally embed rural voices throughout the design process. Second, government monopolies must be systematically dismantled by fostering multi-actor ecosystems through innovative PPP models, deliberately cultivating rural digital social enterprises, and implementing digital service vouchers that empower consumer choice. Third, bridging the governance digital divide necessitates human-machine collaborative systems, including formalized Digital Agent schemes and legally guaranteed offline access rights ensuring no citizen is left behind. Fourth, robust institutional foundations are essential, requiring accelerated legislation on data sharing and privacy, comprehensive full-lifecycle security frameworks, and collaborative performance evaluation systems that render cooperation a rational, rewarded endeavor.

This study has inherent limitations. As a qualitative single-case study, its generalizability requires validation through comparative research across diverse national contexts. Future studies should integrate quantitative methods to more precisely measure causal relationships between collaborative governance elements and integration outcomes. Furthermore, given rapid technological advances in generative AI and the metaverse, future research must prospectively explore how these emerging technologies might reshape service delivery and governance logic, and how to preemptively construct frameworks preventing new forms of exclusion. Urban-rural public service digital integration remains a dynamic and complex field demanding continued cross-disciplinary inquiry to contribute systematic knowledge and solutions for global digital governance.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Professor Fan Weifeng, for his invaluable guidance and unwavering support throughout this research.

I am also profoundly grateful to my family for their love, understanding, and encouragement during my studies.

References

[1] Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 18(4), 543-571.

[2] Choi, S., & Park, J. (2022). Digital inclusion and social participation of the elderly in Korea: Policy evaluation and future tasks. Journal of Korean Public Administration, 60(2), 45-68.

[3] OECD. (2022). Digital government review of Korea: Delivering human centred and proactive public services. OECD Publishing.

[4] Ministry of Science and Technology, Korea Institute for Advanced Study. (Each year). Digital Divide Survey.

[5] Kim Jun-hyung. (2023). An exploratory study on the impact of information sharing on the operation of collaborative governance mechanism. Korean Review of Organizational Studies, 20(3), 77-114.

[6] Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 22(1), 1-29.

[7] Go Hye-young. (2020). Exploratory study on the development of analytical indicators for cooperative governance in South Korea. NGO Research, 15(1), 43-77.

[8] Luo Zhigang. (2018). The Logical Approach to Urban-Rural Social Collaborative Governance in China. Jianghan Forum, (2), 74-79.

[9] Lee, S. (2021). Bridging the digital divide in rural Korea. Journal of Rural Studies, 83, 45-53.

[10] Wu Kechang, Yan Xinyao. (2020). Digital Governance Driven and Transformation of Public Service Supply Model. E-Government, (1), 76-83.

[11] Gong Tongwei. (2019). Research on the Construction of Urban-Rural Integrated Fiscal Guarantee System. Macro-Economic Research, (9), 89-97.

[12] Wu Changjian. (2017). Institutional Innovation of Urban-Rural Public Service Supply Mechanism. Politics and Law, (6), 101-109.

[13] Cao Jinghui. (2011). Institutional Obstacles and Realization Path of Basic Public Service Equality. Journal of Huazhong University of Science and Technology, 25(1), 48-52.

[14] Wu Yemiao. (2013). Demand Aversion, Supply Failure and the Dilemma of Urban-Rural Public Service Integration. Humanities Journal, (2), 98-107.

[15] Wu Ruxin. (2017). Urbanization, Basic Public Service Supply and Residents' Subjective Happiness. Population and Development, 23(3), 37-48.

[16] Lu Daoping. (2013). Urban-Rural Public Service Equality in China: Problems and Countermeasures. Jianghan Forum, (12), 26-30.

[17] Yi Chengzhi. (2016). Reconsideration of Urban Nature and Urban-Governance. Exploration and Debate, (10), 91-94.

[18] Xie Xingquan. (2016). Fiscal Decentralization, Urban-Rural Integration and Public Service Supply. Soft Science, 30(10), 31-35.

[19] Song Yuanwu, Xu Shuangmin. (2016). Practice and Experience of Rural Public Cultural Service Supply in Foreign Countries and Its Reference for China. Learning and Practice, (11), 115-122.

[20] Zhou Yu. (2020). Economic Mechanism and Transformation Direction of Public Service Innovation Driven by Digital Technology. Contemporary Economic Management, 42(2), 78-83.

[21] Xu Xiaodan, Hui Ning, Han Xianfeng. (2023). Digital Economy Empowering the Equalization of Basic Public Services. Economic Issues Exploration, (8), 132-146.

[22] Liu Hongbo, Yao Mengjia. (2023). Digital Transformation of Public Services: Driving Factors and Path Selection. Leadership Science, (4), 71-76.

[23] Zhang Peng, Gao Xiaoping. (2022). Digital Technology Driving High-Quality Development of Public Services. Theory and Reform, (5), 82-93.

[24] Yu Jingwen, Chen Xiaoguang, Gong Liutang. (2018). How has fiscal pressure affected the provision of public services by county-level governments? Financial Research (1), 18-35.

[25] Du Chunlin, Zhang Xinwen. (2015). Rural Public Service Supply: From "Fragmentation" to "Integration". Agricultural Economic Issues, 36(7), 9-19.

[26] Li Liwen. (2019). Fragmentation of Public Service Supply in the Transformation of Urban Grassroots Social Management System. Administrative Forum, 26(4), 108-115.

[27] Sung, W. J. (2019). Government innovation and digitally-based public services. Korean Society for Quality Management Conference Proceedings, 70.

[28] Youm, J., Kim, J. H., Lee, S., & Kim, M. (2023). Governance innovation measures for sustainable operation of smart city. Korean Governance Review, 30(2), 1-30.

[29] Kim, M., & Byun, S. (2018). Smart public services and elderly information accessibility. Journal of Digital Convergence, 16(5), 43-53.

[30] Zheng Qiao. (2008). Governance System Innovation in the Construction of Service-oriented Government. National Business Review, (14), 134-135.

[31] Kim, S. J., & Cho, S. T. (2014). A study on role re-establish of state administration. Korean Public Administration History Review, (35), 77-96.

[32] Tang Juan, Cao Fuguo. (2004). Analysis of the Diversified Models of Public Service Supply. Journal of Huazhong Normal University, (2), 14-20.

[33] Li Rui. (2019). On the Diversified Collaborative Cooperation among Government, Market and Society in Public Service Supply. Journal of Economy and Law, (4), 124-132.

[34] Yoo, S., & Jeon, S. (2016). Implementation factors and collaborative governance of disaster management policy. Korean Governance Review, 23(3), 87-115.

[35] Lee, S. Y. (2013). Community business policy process using a collaborative governance approach. Korean Governance Review, 20(2), 149-169.

[36] Ahn, B., Hwang, E., & Kwon, O. (2022). Efficiency of public service delivery. The Korea Association for Policy Studies, 31(2), 351-376.

[37] Fan Bonai, Jin Jie. (2016). The Mechanism of the Impact of Public Service Supply on Public Service Perceived Performance. Management World, (10), 50-61.