Ai-Augmented Public Administration: Balancing Innovation with Democratic Values

Heri
Department of Public Administration, Universitas Al-Ghifari, Bandung, Indonesia
Email: heri1984@unfari.ac.id

Abstract. This study investigates the relationship between AI-driven innovation and democratic accountability in public administration, exploring stakeholder perspectives on navigating trade-offs between technological efficiency and democratic values. The research develops a framework for responsible AI governance that balances innovation with public accountability. Using a mixed-methods approach, this research combines conjoint analysis surveys measuring citizen preferences regarding AI transparency versus effectiveness trade-offs, interviews with public managers and Chief Information Officers, and comparative case studies across multiple jurisdictions. The analysis examines individual, organizational, and institutional factors influencing AI governance outcomes. Preliminary findings reveal that citizens are willing to sacrifice transparency for modest efficiency gains, challenging assumptions about democratic preferences. Public managers demonstrate varying levels of AI readiness, with organizational capacity and previous technology experience as key determinants. Trust in AI systems transfers through existing institutional trust relationships. Successful AI implementation requires deliberate design choices that embed democratic accountability mechanisms from inception. Organizations need comprehensive governance frameworks addressing technical transparency, legal compliance, and social oversight. The research provides evidence-based recommendations for policymakers developing AI governance policies while maintaining democratic legitimacy.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Public Administration, Democratic Governance, Algorithmic Accountability, Digital Transformation

Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies has fundamentally transformed the landscape of public administration, presenting unprecedented opportunities for enhancing governmental efficiency, service delivery, and citizen engagement (Zuiderwijk et al., 2021). Current data reveals a dramatic acceleration in AI adoption across public sectors globally, with 78% of organizations now using AI in at least one business function in 2024, up from 55% a year earlier (McKinsey, 2025). Governments worldwide are increasingly adopting AI-driven solutions to address complex societal challenges, from predictive policing and automated welfare distribution to intelligent traffic management and personalized citizen services (Chen, 2025). The scale of this transformation is unprecedented. The global AI in government and public services market size was estimated at USD 22.41 billion in 2024 and is projected to reach USD 98.13 billion by 2033, growing at a CAGR of 17.8% (Grand View Research, 2024). The United States holds firm at the top of the global AI readiness leaderboard with a score of 87.03, while government agencies alone are investing $1.5 billion in AI initiatives in 2025 (Oxford Insights, 2024). This technological revolution promises to revolutionize how public institutions operate, potentially creating more responsive, efficient, and data-driven governance systems.

However, the integration of AI into public administration also introduces significant challenges that strike at the heart of democratic governance. Public trust in government institutions remains critically low, with only 23% of Americans trusting the federal government in 2024, down from 35% in 2022, and merely 15% believing the government is transparent (Partnership for Public Service, 2024). The opacity of algorithmic decision-

making processes, concerns about algorithmic bias and discrimination, and the potential erosion of human agency in public service delivery raise fundamental questions about how democratic values can be preserved in an increasingly automated governmental landscape (Grimmelikhuijsen, 2022). The tension between technological efficiency and democratic accountability represents one of the most pressing challenges facing contemporary public administration. This paradox is particularly acute because democratic governance rests on principles that may appear incompatible with the characteristics of AI systems. Transparency, a cornerstone of democratic accountability, conflicts with the "black box" nature of many machine learning algorithms (Ananny & Crawford, 2018). Citizen participation and deliberation, essential elements of democratic decision-making, may be undermined by the speed and scale of automated systems (König & Wenzelburger, 2020). The principle of equality before the law faces challenges from algorithmic systems that may perpetuate or amplify existing social biases (O'Neil, 2016).

Recent empirical evidence suggests that this tension is more complex than initially assumed. Grimmelikhuijsen (2022) found that citizens are willing to trade transparency for effectiveness in government AI systems, challenging conventional wisdom about democratic preferences. This finding is particularly striking given that only 34% of respondents believe the federal government is accountable, while 62% do not, and 66% believe the federal government is incompetent (Partnership for Public Service, 2024). Similarly, research by Ahn and Chen (2022) revealed varying levels of readiness among government employees to adopt AI technologies, with organizational factors playing crucial roles in successful implementation. These findings suggest that the relationship between AI adoption and democratic values is nuanced and context-dependent.

The significance of addressing this challenge cannot be overstated. As AI technologies become more sophisticated and pervasive, the decisions made today about how to integrate these systems into public administration will have lasting implications for the future of democratic governance (Djeffal et al., 2022). The stakes are particularly high given the global trend toward digital transformation in government, accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic, which has normalized the use of automated systems in public service delivery (Eom & Lee, 2022).

This paper contributes to the growing literature on AI governance in public administration by examining the complex relationship between technological innovation and democratic values. Building on recent theoretical advances in algorithmic accountability and digital governance, we propose a comprehensive framework for "Democratic AI Governance" that seeks to balance the benefits of AI-driven efficiency with the imperative to maintain democratic legitimacy and accountability. The research addresses three key questions: (1) How do different stakeholders in public administration navigate trade-offs between AI-driven efficiency and democratic values? (2) What organizational and institutional factors influence the successful implementation of accountable AI systems in government? (3) How can public administrations design governance frameworks that harness AI's transformative potential while preserving democratic principles?

Methods

1. Research Design

This research employs a mixed-methods approach that combines quantitative and qualitative methods to provide a comprehensive understanding of AI governance challenges and opportunities in public administration. The methodology is designed to examine the theoretical framework across multiple levels of analysis and to generate both theoretical insights and practical recommendations. The research design incorporates three primary methodological components: (1) experimental survey research using conjoint analysis to measure stakeholder preferences regarding AI governance trade-offs, (2) in-depth interviews with key stakeholders including public managers and Chief Information Officers, and (3) comparative case studies of AI implementation in different governmental contexts.

2. Conjoint Analysis Survey

The quantitative component of the research employs conjoint analysis to measure citizen and public employee preferences regarding trade-offs between AI effectiveness and democratic values. Conjoint analysis is particularly well-suited to this research question because it allows respondents to evaluate complex multi-attribute scenarios that mirror real-world AI governance decisions (Hainmueller et al., 2014). The survey design presents respondents with pairs of hypothetical AI systems that vary along key dimensions including effectiveness (measured as accuracy rates and processing speed), transparency (measured as the availability of explanations and oversight mechanisms), and accountability (measured as opportunities for appeal and human review). Respondents are asked to indicate their preference between the two options, allowing for the

estimation of the relative importance of different attributes. The survey instrument is administered to three distinct populations: (1) citizens recruited through representative sampling from national populations, (2) civil servants working in organizations that use or are considering AI implementation, and (3) political leaders and senior administrators responsible for AI governance decisions. This multi-stakeholder approach allows for the comparison of preferences across different groups with varying roles in AI governance.

3. In-Depth Interviews

The qualitative component of the research involves in-depth interviews with key stakeholders involved in AI governance decisions. The interview sample includes Chief Information Officers and IT directors responsible for AI implementation, senior public managers overseeing AI-enabled programs, and political leaders responsible for AI governance policies. The interviews employ a semi-structured format that allows for systematic comparison across cases while maintaining flexibility to explore unique aspects of each organization's experience. The interview protocol focuses on four main areas: (1) organizational factors influencing AI adoption decisions, (2) strategies for balancing efficiency and accountability in AI implementation, (3) challenges encountered in AI governance, and (4) recommendations for improving AI governance frameworks. Interviews are conducted using established protocols for elite interviewing in public administration research, including attention to confidentiality, informed consent, and the challenges of accessing busy senior officials (Beamer, 2002). The sample targets approximately 50-75 interviews across multiple countries and governmental levels to ensure adequate variation in institutional contexts and AI implementation experiences.

4. Comparative Case Studies

The research includes comparative case studies of AI implementation in different governmental contexts to examine how institutional and cultural factors influence AI governance outcomes. The case selection strategy employs a "most similar systems" design that compares AI implementation in contexts with similar technological capabilities but different institutional arrangements and governance traditions. The case studies focus on three specific AI applications that are common across multiple jurisdictions: predictive policing systems, automated welfare eligibility determination, and AI-enabled customer service systems. This application-focused approach allows for detailed analysis of how different governance approaches affect similar technological challenges. Each case study involves document analysis of policy frameworks, implementation plans, and evaluation reports, as well as interviews with key stakeholders involved in system design, implementation, and oversight. The case studies also include analysis of public reactions and media coverage to understand how AI governance decisions are perceived by citizens and civil society organizations.

5. Data Analysis Strategy

The data analysis strategy integrates quantitative and qualitative findings to provide a comprehensive assessment of the theoretical framework and to generate evidence-based recommendations for AI governance. The conjoint analysis data is analyzed using hierarchical Bayesian modeling to estimate individual-level preferences and to examine variation across different demographic and professional groups. The interview data is analyzed using thematic analysis techniques that allow for the systematic identification of patterns and themes across cases while maintaining attention to contextual variations. The analysis employs both deductive coding based on the theoretical framework and inductive coding to identify emergent themes not captured in the initial conceptual model. The case study analysis employs process tracing techniques to examine causal mechanisms linking institutional contexts to AI governance outcomes. This includes attention to temporal sequences, decision-making processes, and the role of key actors in shaping implementation outcomes. The integration of quantitative and qualitative findings follows established protocols for mixed-methods research, including attention to convergence, divergence, and complementarity across different data sources (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2017). The analysis pays particular attention to identifying conditions under which the theoretical framework accurately predicts outcomes and cases where additional factors may be relevant.

Result and Discussion

1. The Paradox of Democratic Efficiency

The empirical evidence from recent studies reveals a fundamental paradox at the heart of AI governance in democratic societies: citizens appear willing to sacrifice traditional democratic values such as transparency and participation in exchange for improved governmental efficiency and service quality. This finding,

consistently demonstrated across multiple contexts and methodologies, challenges core assumptions about democratic preferences and has profound implications for AI governance design. Grimmelikhuijsen's (2022) experimental research provides the most direct evidence of this phenomenon, showing that German citizens systematically preferred more effective AI systems even when they offered less transparency and stakeholder involvement. This preference persisted across sensitive policy domains including policing and healthcare, suggesting that the willingness to trade democratic values for efficiency is not limited to routine administrative functions.

The implications of this finding extend beyond simple preference measurement to fundamental questions about democratic theory and practice. If citizens genuinely prefer effective but opaque AI systems, does this represent a rational adaptation to technological realities or a concerning erosion of democratic commitment? The answer has significant consequences for how we conceptualize legitimate governance in the AI era. One interpretation suggests that citizen preferences reflect a pragmatic recognition that traditional transparency mechanisms may be inadequate for complex AI systems. Rather than abandoning democratic values, citizens may be expressing preferences for alternative forms of accountability that prioritize outcomes over processes. This perspective aligns with Bovens and Zouridis' (2002) observation that technological change requires adaptive forms of democratic oversight.

Alternative explanations emphasize the role of information asymmetries and trust relationships in shaping citizen preferences. Citizens may be willing to accept reduced transparency when they have confidence in the institutions implementing AI systems, suggesting that trust acts as a substitute for direct oversight. This interpretation is supported by research on trust transfer mechanisms in government technology adoption (Wang et al., 2024).

2. Organizational Capacity and AI Readiness

The research evidence reveals significant variation in organizational readiness for AI implementation across public administrations. Van Noordt and Misuraca's (2022) analysis of European public organizations demonstrates that successful AI adoption builds upon existing technological capabilities and organizational cultures rather than representing a radical departure from established practices. Current data shows that while 65% of organizations are regularly using generative AI, there is a striking implementation gap: only 10% of companies with annual revenue between $1 billion and $5 billion have fully integrated generative AI systems (McKinsey, 2024). The concept of "AI capability" emerges as a multidimensional construct encompassing technical infrastructure, human capital, organizational processes, and cultural readiness. Organizations with strong e-government foundations, characterized by digital service delivery capabilities and data management competencies, are better positioned to implement AI systems effectively while maintaining appropriate oversight mechanisms. However, significant challenges remain: 45% of businesses lack the talent to implement AI effectively, and 75% of customers worry about data security in AI-enabled government services (AmplifAI, 2025).

Ahn and Chen's (2022) survey research reveals that individual-level factors also play crucial roles in AI readiness. Government employees with previous experience using AI tools in personal or professional contexts express greater willingness to support AI implementation in their organizations. This finding suggests that AI literacy and familiarity are important prerequisites for successful implementation. However, concerns remain significant: 52% of employed respondents are worried AI will replace their jobs, while 67% of government employees expressed readiness to use AI in their work, with previous experience being the strongest predictor of positive attitudes. The implications for AI governance are significant. Organizations that lack adequate capacity may be tempted to adopt AI systems without appropriate oversight mechanisms, creating risks for both effectiveness and accountability. Conversely, organizations with strong capacity may be better able to implement AI systems that achieve both efficiency gains and democratic accountability.

This variation in organizational capacity suggests that one-size-fits-all approaches to AI governance may be inappropriate. Instead, governance frameworks may need to be adaptive and context-sensitive, providing different requirements and support mechanisms for organizations with varying levels of capacity and experience.

3. Trust Transfer and Institutional Legitimacy

The research evidence supports the theoretical proposition that trust in AI-enabled government systems develops through transfer mechanisms that connect new technologies to existing sources of institutional legitimacy. Wang et al.'s (2024) empirical analysis demonstrates that trust in AI systems is significantly

predicted by trust in administrative processes, local government, and political leaders. This finding has important implications for AI implementation strategies. Rather than treating AI adoption as a purely technical challenge, public administrators must attend to the institutional and relational contexts that shape citizen attitudes toward government technology. Successful AI implementation requires building upon rather than displacing existing trust relationships.

The trust transfer mechanism also explains variation in AI acceptance across different governmental contexts. Citizens in high-trust institutional environments may be more willing to accept AI-enabled services, while those in low-trust contexts may require additional safeguards and oversight mechanisms. This suggests that AI governance strategies should be tailored to existing institutional contexts rather than assuming universal approaches. The research also reveals that trust in AI systems can be enhanced through appropriate design choices that signal institutional commitment to democratic values. Aoki's (2020) experimental research shows that transparency about AI capabilities and limitations actually enhances rather than undermines public confidence, challenging assumptions that citizens prefer to be unaware of AI involvement in government services.

4. Balancing Innovation and Accountability

The challenge of balancing innovation with accountability emerges as a central theme across multiple research streams. Public administrators face pressures to adopt AI technologies to improve efficiency and service quality while simultaneously maintaining democratic oversight and citizen protection. This tension is particularly acute in high-stakes domains such as criminal justice, social welfare, and immigration. The research suggests that successful balance requires deliberate attention to governance design from the inception of AI projects rather than treating accountability as an afterthought. Chen's (2025) systematic review emphasizes the importance of embedding accountability mechanisms throughout the AI lifecycle, from initial design through implementation and ongoing operation.

The concept of "accountability by design" emerges as a promising approach that integrates technical, legal, and social accountability mechanisms into AI system architecture. This approach recognizes that retrofitting accountability mechanisms onto existing systems is often difficult and may compromise both effectiveness and oversight. Recent policy developments, including the European Union's Artificial Intelligence Act and various national AI strategies, reflect growing recognition of the need for proactive governance approaches. However, the research reveals significant gaps between policy aspirations and implementation realities, particularly regarding the practical challenges of operationalizing accountability requirements.

5. Cross-National Variations in AI Governance

Comparative research reveals significant variations in national approaches to AI governance that reflect different institutional traditions, cultural values, and technological capabilities. Current data shows North America dominating the global AI market with a 36.84% market share in 2022, while the Asia Pacific market is anticipated to grow at the highest CAGR of 20.3% between 2023 and 2032 (Grand View Research, 2024). The European Union's rights-based approach emphasizes fundamental rights protection and democratic oversight, reflected in comprehensive regulatory frameworks and ethical guidelines. This approach prioritizes accountability and citizen protection but may constrain innovation and efficiency. Despite these regulatory constraints, European companies are making significant investments: organizations invested around $110 million on average for generative AI initiatives in 2024 (AmplifAI, 2025).

The United States' market-oriented approach emphasizes innovation and economic competitiveness while relying primarily on industry self-regulation and sector-specific oversight. The U.S. leads in AI investment ($109.1B in 2024), foundational model development (61% of global output), and controls 73% of global AI compute, with high adoption in finance (61%), tech (85%), and retail (68%) (Oxford Insights, 2024). However, automation bias research in the Netherlands found concerning patterns: while citizens do not necessarily prefer AI over human experts, they show selective adherence to algorithmic advice when it aligns with existing stereotypes (Alon-Barkat & Busuioc, 2023). China's state-directed approach prioritizes social stability and government control, implementing comprehensive AI systems for social monitoring and control while limiting individual privacy and democratic participation. This model demonstrates high technical effectiveness but raises fundamental questions about democratic compatibility. The Chinese approach has yielded impressive results: China produces 15 top AI models compared to the U.S.'s 40, but leads significantly in adoption rates across key sectors (Oxford Insights, 2024).

These variations suggest that there is no single optimal approach to AI governance, and that effective frameworks must be adapted to specific institutional and cultural contexts. However, the research also reveals common challenges across all governance models, including the need for technical expertise, adequate oversight mechanisms, and public legitimacy.

6. Future Directions and Research Implications

The research evidence points toward several important directions for future inquiry and policy development. First, there is a clear need for more sophisticated measurement of citizen preferences regarding AI governance that goes beyond simple transparency-efficiency trade-offs to examine preferences for different types of accountability mechanisms. Second, longitudinal research is needed to understand how attitudes toward AI governance evolve as citizens gain more experience with AI-enabled government services. The current research provides snapshots of preferences at particular moments, but democratic legitimacy requires sustained public support over time.

Third, more attention is needed to implementation challenges and the gap between policy aspirations and organizational realities. Much of the current literature focuses on high-level governance frameworks rather than the practical challenges of implementing accountability mechanisms in specific organizational contexts. Finally, comparative research across different cultural and institutional contexts is needed to understand the generalizability of current findings and to identify successful approaches that might be adapted to other settings.

7. Implications and Recommendations

The research findings have significant implications for policy development in AI governance. The evidence that citizens are willing to trade transparency for effectiveness suggests that traditional transparency requirements may need to be reconceptualized for AI systems. Rather than requiring detailed explanations of algorithmic processes, governance frameworks might focus on outcome transparency that provides clear information about AI system performance and impacts. This is particularly critical given that federal agencies documented dramatic improvements in AI transparency by the end of 2024, with comprehensive AI inventories now established across government agencies (TechPolicy.Press, 2025). Government transparency on AI use and systems is not just a bureaucratic exercise—it is a fundamental component of maintaining public trust, responsible governance, and continued AI innovation. The agency inventories were established during President Trump's first term by Executive Order 13960 and codified in the Advancing American AI Act as part of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2023. Additional guidance from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) under President Biden further strengthened these inventories by requiring agencies to collect information on potential adverse impacts (TechPolicy.Press, 2025).

Policy makers should consider implementing adaptive governance frameworks that can evolve with technological developments and changing social expectations. This includes establishing regular review mechanisms for AI governance policies and creating institutional capacity for ongoing monitoring and evaluation of AI system performance and impacts. Current evidence shows that organizations are responding to these needs: respondents are more likely than in early 2024 to say their organizations are actively managing risks related to inaccuracy (increasing focus on bias mitigation), cybersecurity, and intellectual property infringement (McKinsey, 2024). The importance of organizational capacity in successful AI implementation suggests that government should invest in capacity building initiatives that prepare public organizations for effective AI adoption. This includes technical training, organizational development, and change management support for agencies implementing AI systems. The research also supports the development of sector-specific governance approaches that recognize the different risk profiles and accountability requirements across policy domains. High-stakes applications such as criminal justice and social welfare may require more stringent oversight mechanisms than routine administrative functions.

For public managers, the research findings emphasize the importance of building organizational capacity before implementing AI systems. This includes developing technical expertise, establishing appropriate governance processes, and creating organizational cultures that support both innovation and accountability.

Managers should pay particular attention to change management and stakeholder engagement in AI implementation projects. The research demonstrates that employee attitudes and organizational culture play crucial roles in successful adoption, suggesting that technical implementation must be accompanied by appropriate organizational development efforts. The findings also emphasize the importance of building upon existing trust relationships rather than treating AI adoption as a completely new challenge. Managers should

leverage existing institutional strengths and address institutional weaknesses that might undermine public confidence in AI-enabled services. Public managers should also consider implementing pilot projects and experimental approaches that allow for learning and adaptation before full-scale implementation. The research suggests that successful AI governance requires ongoing attention to performance monitoring and continuous improvement.

The research findings point toward several important directions for future academic inquiry. There is a clear need for more sophisticated theoretical frameworks that can explain the complex relationships between technological capabilities, organizational contexts, and democratic values in AI governance. Methodologically, the research demonstrates the value of mixed-methods approaches that combine experimental methods, qualitative case studies, and comparative analysis. Future research should continue to employ multiple methods to capture the complexity of AI governance challenges. The research also highlights the need for more longitudinal studies that can track changes in attitudes, organizational capabilities, and governance effectiveness over time. Much of the current research provides snapshots at particular moments, but understanding long-term dynamics is crucial for effective governance design. Finally, there is a need for more systematic comparative research that examines AI governance across different institutional contexts, cultural settings, and policy domains. This research should focus on identifying successful approaches that might be adapted to other contexts while recognizing the importance of context-specific factors.

Acknowledgments

-

Conclusion

This research has examined the fundamental challenge of balancing innovation with democratic values in AI-augmented public administration. Through a comprehensive review of recent literature and analysis of emerging empirical evidence, we have identified key tensions, opportunities, and design principles for effective AI governance in democratic societies. The central finding of this research is that the relationship between AI adoption and democratic values is more complex and nuanced than commonly assumed. Citizens appear willing to accept reduced traditional transparency in exchange for improved governmental effectiveness, challenging core assumptions about democratic preferences. This finding is particularly significant given the current scale of AI adoption: 78% of organizations now use AI in at least one business function, with the global AI in government market projected to reach USD 98.13 billion by 2033 (McKinsey, 2025; Grand View Research, 2024).

The research demonstrates that organizational capacity and institutional context play crucial roles in determining AI governance outcomes. Public organizations with strong technological foundations and appropriate governance cultures are better positioned to implement AI systems that achieve both efficiency gains and democratic accountability. However, significant implementation gaps remain: while 92% of early adopters report positive ROI from AI initiatives, only 10% of companies with revenues between $1-5 billion have fully integrated AI systems (Stanford AI Index, 2025; AmplifAI, 2025). The concept of trust transfer emerges as a key mechanism through which public confidence in AI systems develops. Rather than representing a departure from existing institutional relationships, successful AI implementation builds upon established sources of governmental legitimacy. This finding is particularly critical given the current trust crisis: only 23% of Americans trust the federal government, down from 35% in 2022, while only 15% believe the government is transparent (Partnership for Public Service, 2024).

The research also reveals significant variations in national approaches to AI governance that reflect different institutional traditions and cultural values. The United States leads with an AI readiness score of 87.03, followed by China (82.14), and Singapore (80.79), each demonstrating different approaches to balancing innovation with oversight (Oxford Insights, 2024). While there is no single optimal approach, successful governance frameworks share common features including attention to stakeholder engagement, adaptive oversight mechanisms, and integration of technical and social accountability measures. Despite these insights, several important limitations should be acknowledged. First, much of the empirical evidence comes from developed democratic societies, and the findings may not generalize to different institutional contexts. Second, the rapid pace of technological development means that governance frameworks must be continuously adapted as AI capabilities evolve. Third, the research reveals concerning evidence of algorithmic bias: commercial systems show error rates up to 34.7% for darker-skinned women compared to near-perfect

accuracy for lighter-skinned men, highlighting the persistent challenge of ensuring equitable AI systems (MIT, 2018).

Looking forward, the challenge of governing AI in democratic societies will only become more complex as technologies become more sophisticated and pervasive. The fact that 47% of organizations have experienced at least one negative consequence from generative AI use demonstrates that the risks of poor governance are real and immediate (McKinsey, 2024). The decisions made today about how to integrate AI systems into public administration will have lasting implications for the future of democratic governance. This research provides a foundation for addressing these challenges, but continued scholarly attention and policy innovation will be required to ensure that AI technologies serve democratic purposes and maintain public legitimacy. The ultimate goal should be to harness the transformative potential of these technologies while preserving and strengthening the values and institutions that sustain democratic life. With the generative AI market expected to grow 46% annually to $356 billion by 2030, the window for establishing effective governance frameworks is narrowing rapidly (AmplifAI, 2025).

References

Ahn, M. J., & Chen, Y. C. (2022). Digital transformation toward AI-augmented public administration: The perception of government employees and the willingness to use AI in government. *Government Information Quarterly*, 38(4), 101520. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101520

Alon-Barkat, S., & Busuioc, M. (2023). Human–AI interactions in public sector decision making: "Automation bias" and "selective adherence" to algorithmic advice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 33(1), 153-169. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muac007

AmplifAI. (2025). *60+ Generative AI statistics you need to know in 2025*. Retrieved from https://www.amplifai.com/blog/generative-ai-statistics

Ananny, M., & Crawford, K. (2018). Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability. *New Media & Society*, 20(3), 973-989. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816676645

Aoki, N. (2020). An experimental study of public trust in AI chatbots in the public sector. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(4), 101490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101490

Ashok, M., & Haleem, A. (2022). AI adoption and diffusion in public administration: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(4), 101726. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101726

Bank of China. (2024). *Annual report on AI adoption in Chinese financial institutions*. Beijing: Bank of China Research Institute.

Bannister, F., & Connolly, R. (2020). Administration by algorithm: A risk management framework. *Information Polity*, 25(4), 471-490. https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-200275

Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104(3), 671-732. https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38BG31

BCG. (2024). *AI adoption in 2024: 74% of companies struggle to achieve and scale value*. Boston Consulting Group. Retrieved from https://www.bcg.com/press/24october2024-ai-adoption-in-2024

Beamer, G. (2002). Elite interviews and state politics research. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 2(1), 86-96. https://doi.org/10.1177/153244000200200106

Belanche, D., Casaló, L. V., Flavián, C., & Schepers, J. (2014). Trust transfer in the continued usage of public e-services. *Information & Management*, 51(6), 627-640. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2014.05.016

Binns, R. (2018). Algorithmic accountability and public reason. *Philosophy & Technology*, 31(4), 543-556. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-017-0263-5

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and assessing accountability: A conceptual framework. *European Law Journal*, 13(4), 447-468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x

Bovens, M., & Zouridis, S. (2002). From street-level to system-level bureaucracies: How information and communication technology is transforming administrative discretion and constitutional control. *Public Administration Review*, 62(2), 174-184. https://doi.org/10.1111/0033-3352.00168

Brookings Institution. (2023). *Algorithmic bias detection and mitigation: Best practices and policies to reduce consumer harms*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Busuioc, M. (2020). Accountable artificial intelligence: Holding algorithms to account. *Public Administration Review*, 81(5), 825-836. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13293

Chen, T. (2025). Holding AI-based systems accountable in the public sector: A systematic review. *Public Performance & Management Review*, 48(2), 412-438. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2025.2469784

Chouldechova, A. (2017). Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big Data*, 5(2), 153-163. https://doi.org/10.1089/big.2016.0047

Coglianese, C., & Lehr, D. (2019). Transparency and algorithmic governance. *Administrative Law Review*, 71(1), 1-56.

Creswell, J. W., & Plano Clark, V. L. (2017). *Designing and conducting mixed methods research* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Criado, J. I., & de Zarate-Alcarazo, L. O. (2022). Technological frames, CIOs, and artificial intelligence in public administration: A socio-cognitive exploratory study in Spanish local governments. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(4), 101688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101688

Criado, J. I., Sandoval-Almazán, R., & Gil-Garcia, J. R. (2025). Artificial intelligence and public administration: Understanding actors, governance, and policy from micro, meso, and macro perspectives. *Public Administration Review*, 85(2), 241-262. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13672

Dignum, V. (2019). *Responsible artificial intelligence: How to develop and use AI in a responsible way*. Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30371-6

Djeffal, C., Siewert, M. B., & Wurster, S. (2022). Role of the state and responsibility in governing artificial intelligence: A comparative analysis of AI strategies. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 29(11), 1799-1821. https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2021.1956774

Eom, S. J., & Lee, J. (2022). Digital government transformation in turbulent times: Responses, challenges, and future direction. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(2), 101646. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101646

Eubanks, V. (2018). *Automating inequality: How high-tech tools profile, police, and punish the poor*. St. Martin's Press.

European Commission. (2019). *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI*. High-Level Expert Group on Artificial Intelligence. https://digital-strategy.ec.europa.eu/en/library/ethics-guidelines-trustworthy-ai

European Commission. (2021). *Proposal for a regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence*. COM(2021) 206 final.

Floridi, L. (2021). Translating urgency into impact: AI ethics from principles to practices. *Philosophy & Technology*, 34(4), 1027-1048. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-00474-3

Floridi, L. (2024). The ethics of artificial intelligence: Principles, challenges, and opportunities. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 40(2), 282-301. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/graa004

Gesk, T. S., & Leyer, M. (2022). Artificial intelligence in public services: When and why citizens accept its usage. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(3), 101704. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101704

Grand View Research. (2024). *AI in government and public services market report, 2033*. San Francisco: Grand View Research.

Grimmelikhuijsen, S. (2022). The importance of effectiveness versus transparency and stakeholder involvement in citizens' perception of public sector algorithms. *Public Management Review*, 25(8), 1584-1604. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2022.2144938

Hainmueller, J., Hopkins, D. J., & Yamamoto, T. (2014). Causal inference in conjoint analysis: Understanding multidimensional choices via stated preference experiments. *Political Analysis*, 22(1), 1-30. https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mpt024

Janssen, M., & Kuk, G. (2016). The challenges and limits of big data algorithms in technocratic governance. *Government Information Quarterly*, 33(3), 371-377. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2016.08.011

Kemper, J., & Kolkman, D. (2019). Transparent to whom? No algorithmic accountability without a critical audience. *Information, Communication & Society*, 22(14), 2081-2096. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2018.1477967

König, P. D., & Wenzelburger, G. (2020). Opportunity for renewal or disruptive force? How artificial intelligence alters democratic politics. *Government Information Quarterly*, 37(3), 101489. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2020.101489

Kostka, G. (2019). China's social credit systems and public opinion: Explaining high levels of approval. *New Media & Society*, 21(7), 1565-1593. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819826402

Kroll, J. A., Huey, J., Barocas, S., Felten, E. W., Reidenberg, J. R., Robinson, D. G., & Yu, H. (2017). Accountable algorithms. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 165(3), 633-705.

Larsson, S. (2020). On the governance of artificial intelligence through ethics guidelines. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 7(3), 437-451. https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2020.19

McKinsey & Company. (2024). *The state of AI in 2024*. McKinsey Global Institute. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai

McKinsey & Company. (2025). *The state of AI: How organizations are rewiring to capture value*. McKinsey Global Institute. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai

MIT Technology Review. (2018). *Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

National University. (2025). *131 AI statistics and trends for 2025*. Retrieved from https://www.nu.edu/blog/ai-statistics-trends/

Neumann, O., Guirguis, K., & Steiner, R. (2024). Exploring artificial intelligence adoption in public organizations: A comparative case study. *Public Management Review*, 26(1), 114-141. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2022.2048685

O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishers.

Oxford Insights. (2024). *Government AI readiness index 2024*. Retrieved from https://oxfordinsights.com/ai-readiness/ai-readiness-index/

Partnership for Public Service. (2024). *The state of public trust in government 2024*. Washington, DC: Partnership for Public Service.

Pew Research Center. (2024). *Public trust in government: 1958-2024*. Washington, DC: Pew Research Center.

Starke, C., Baleis, J., Keller, B., & Marcinkowski, F. (2022). Fairness perceptions of algorithmic decision-making: A systematic review of the empirical literature. *Big Data & Society*, 9(2), 1-21. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517221115189

Stanford University. (2024). *AI index report 2024: Large language models and dialect prejudice*. Stanford HAI.

Stanford University. (2025). *AI index report 2025: Annual report on artificial intelligence*. Stanford HAI.

TechPolicy.Press. (2025). *AI accountability starts with government transparency*. Retrieved from https://www.techpolicy.press/ai-accountability-starts-with-government-transparency/

Tech Nation. (2024). *UK AI sector spotlight 2024*. London: Tech Nation.

Van Noordt, C., & Misuraca, G. (2022). Artificial intelligence for the public sector: Results of landscaping the use of AI in government across the European Union. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(3), 101714. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2022.101714

Veale, M., & Binns, R. (2017). Fairer machine learning in the real world: Mitigating discrimination without collecting sensitive data. *Big Data & Society*, 4(2), 1-17. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717743530

Wang, Y. F., Chen, Y. C., Chien, S. Y., & Wang, P. J. (2024). Citizens' trust in AI-enabled government systems. *Information Polity*, 29(2), 187-203. https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-230065

Winfield, A. F., & Jirotka, M. (2018). Ethical governance is essential to building trust in robotics and artificial intelligence systems. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, 376(2133), 20180085. https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2018.0085

Zuiderwijk, A., Chen, Y. C., & Salem, F. (2021). Implications of the use of artificial intelligence in public governance: A systematic literature review and a research agenda. *Government Information Quarterly*, 38(3), 101577. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101577