

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AS AN INSTRUMENT FOR LOCAL GOVERNMENT DECISION-MAKING: OPPORTUNITIES, RISKS, AND GOVERNANCE CHALLENGES

Mujahidin

Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Indonesia

Email: mujahidin@ipdn.ac.id

(Received: December 8, 2025; Revised: January 11, 2026; Accepted: January 19, 2026)

Abstract

This study aims to analyze artificial intelligence as an instrument for supporting local government decision-making, with particular attention to its opportunities, risks, and governance challenges. The study focuses on AI use in public services, licensing administration, and community-needs analysis, while emphasizing that AI must not replace the role of authorized public officials in governmental decision-making. This research uses a qualitative method with an exploratory-descriptive approach and conceptual governance framework development. Data were collected from secondary and documentary sources, including recent peer-reviewed journal articles, policy documents, institutional reports, regulatory materials, and scholarly works related to AI, automated decision-making, digital governance, local government administration, explainable AI, and public-sector ethics. The data were analyzed using thematic analysis by classifying findings into AI opportunities, algorithmic risks, human oversight, explainability, administrative accountability, institutional readiness, and ethical safeguards. The findings show that AI can support bureaucratic decisions by improving document screening, service-priority classification, licensing risk assessment, complaint analysis, eligibility recommendation, and identification of community needs. The study also finds that AI may create risks of algorithmic bias, opacity, privacy violation, automation bias, and administrative exclusion. The main contribution of this study is the formulation of a human-supervised AI decision-support framework consisting of data governance, AI-based administrative analysis, human verification, accountable decision-making, and citizen redress mechanisms.

Keywords: administrative accountability; artificial intelligence; decision-making; local government; public governance.

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence is increasingly becoming an important instrument in local government decision-making, especially in the context of digital governance, public-service reform, and bureaucratic modernization. Local governments are required to respond to increasingly complex public problems through decisions that are faster, more accurate, data-informed, and accountable. These decisions cover various administrative domains, including public services, licensing, social assistance, population administration, infrastructure planning, complaint management, and analysis of community needs. In this context, AI offers opportunities to support bureaucratic decisions by processing large volumes of data, identifying patterns, classifying service requests, predicting administrative risks, and providing decision recommendations to public officials [1], [2]. The growing relevance of AI in public administration is also related to the need to shift from intuition-based and fragmented decision-making toward evidence-based and responsive governance [3], [4]. Previous systematic studies have emphasized that AI in public governance must be understood not only as a technological innovation, but also as an institutional, managerial, ethical, and social transformation [5], [6].

The use of AI in local government decision-making is closely related to the demand for better public-service quality and administrative efficiency. In public services, AI can support chatbots, automated document verification, complaint classification, eligibility screening, queue management, and service-priority analysis. In licensing, AI can help detect incomplete applications, classify risk levels, identify potential regulatory violations, and support faster administrative review. In community-needs analysis, AI can process citizen complaints, public-service data, social media content, demographic information, and spatial data to identify emerging problems and priority interventions. Studies on AI-based self-service technology, public-sector chatbots, and citizen acceptance show that AI can improve responsiveness when systems are designed with usability, fairness, transparency, and institutional accountability [17], [18], [19]. Research on digital public services and sentiment analysis also indicates that public-sector innovation

increasingly depends on the ability of government institutions to read citizen needs, interpret service experiences, and translate digital feedback into administrative improvement [26], [27].

At the same time, AI-based decision support creates significant risks for public governance. Decisions made by local governments are not merely technical outputs; they involve legal authority, public interest, administrative discretion, and citizens' rights. If AI is used without clear governance boundaries, it may produce algorithmic bias, opaque recommendations, privacy violations, administrative exclusion, or excessive dependence on automated systems [11], [16], [21]. These risks become more serious in licensing, social assistance, and public-service prioritization because AI-supported recommendations may determine whether citizens receive permits, benefits, services, or administrative approval. Algorithmic transparency and explainability are therefore crucial because citizens must be able to understand why an AI-supported administrative recommendation affects them [12], [13]. Public acceptance of algorithmic decision-making also depends on whether citizens perceive the system as fair, accurate, trustworthy, and procedurally legitimate [14], [15]. For this reason, AI can support decision-making, but it cannot replace the constitutional, legal, and ethical responsibility of public officials.

Recent studies have examined AI adoption, decision-making, and algorithmic governance in public administration. Alshahrani et al. [1] show that AI can support government decision-making across various functions, while also raising challenges related to governance, ethics, skills, data, and accountability. Rizk and Lindgren [2] explain that automated decision-making in public administration creates tensions between efficiency and fairness, transparency and privacy, as well as standardization and discretion. Alon-Barkat and Busuioc [3] emphasize the need to examine behavioral dimensions of algorithmic decision-making, including automation bias, algorithmic burdens, citizen trust, and public accountability. Madan and Ashok [4] identify key tensions in AI adoption and diffusion in public administration, especially between innovation, public value, fairness, privacy, and organizational capacity. Zuiderwijk et al. [5] also stress that AI in public governance must be analyzed through institutional, ethical, social, and technical perspectives. These studies provide an important foundation for understanding AI as a decision-support instrument that requires strong governance rather than unrestricted automation.

Other studies provide more specific insights into AI governance, explainability, organizational readiness, and public-sector capability. Van Noordt and Misuraca [6] map the use of AI in the public sector and show that AI implementation varies across administrative functions and institutional contexts. Ahn and Chen [7] demonstrate that AI-augmented public administration depends on government employees' perceptions and willingness to use AI in organizational settings. Maragno et al. [8] show that AI implementation in public-sector organizations is shaped by affordances, constraints, data quality, and managerial alignment. De Almeida and dos Santos Jr. [9] explain that public organizations need structured AI governance to operationalize ethical principles and risk management. Tangi et al. [10] further emphasize that AI-augmented government transformation involves sociotechnical implications that require organizational change, not only technological adoption. Sandoval-Almazan et al. [20] also highlight that public managers' AI competencies are essential for local government implementation, while van Noordt and Tangi [22] show that AI capability influences public value creation within public administration.

The literature also shows that AI governance must be connected to broader principles of responsible and sustainable public-sector decision-making. Attard-Frost et al. [23] demonstrate that AI governance initiatives require institutional coordination, policy alignment, and clearer implementation mechanisms. Wilson and van der Velden [24] propose sustainable AI as an integrated model to guide public-sector decision-making, especially in balancing innovation with social responsibility. Yigitcanlar et al. [25] show that public perceptions of AI in local government services are shaped by perceived benefits, risks, trust, and service relevance. Studies on digital public services and sentiment analysis further indicate that AI and data-driven tools can assist governments in understanding service quality and citizen experience, but they must remain connected to administrative responsibility and public value [26], [27]. Although these studies have discussed AI adoption, automated decision-making, explainable AI, algorithmic transparency, public trust, organizational readiness, and ethical governance, there remains a gap in explaining the proper boundary of AI use in local government decision-making. This study addresses that gap by analyzing AI as an instrument for supporting, not substituting, local government decision-making. Its novelty lies in proposing a governance perspective that places AI within a human-supervised administrative framework, where algorithmic recommendations may inform decisions, but final responsibility, discretion, legality, and accountability remain with public officials.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This study employs a qualitative research design using an exploratory-descriptive approach **and** conceptual governance framework development. The qualitative approach is appropriate because the study does not aim to test the technical accuracy of a specific AI algorithm or measure causal relationships statistically. Instead, it seeks to examine how artificial intelligence can be used as an instrument to support local government decision-making in public services, licensing, and community-needs analysis. The exploratory-descriptive approach allows the study to analyze the opportunities, risks, and governance challenges of AI-supported bureaucratic decisions. Conceptual framework development is used because the novelty of this study lies in formulating a governance model that defines

the proper boundary of AI use, especially to ensure that AI supports public officials without replacing their legal authority, administrative discretion, and public accountability.

The case study of this research focuses on AI-supported decision-making in local government administration. Local government is selected as the unit of analysis because it directly manages public-service delivery, licensing administration, social assistance, complaint handling, and community-based policy responses. The study examines AI use in several administrative functions, including automated document screening, service-priority classification, licensing risk assessment, citizen complaint analysis, eligibility recommendation, and identification of community needs through digital data. These functions are analyzed not as autonomous decision-making systems, but as decision-support mechanisms that provide information, recommendations, or risk classifications for public officials. In this study, the final administrative decision is conceptually positioned as the responsibility of authorized public officials, while AI is treated as an assistive instrument within a human-supervised governance framework.

The data used in this study are collected from secondary and documentary sources. The main sources consist of peer-reviewed journal articles published within the last five years, policy documents, institutional reports, regulatory materials, and scholarly works related to artificial intelligence, automated decision-making, digital governance, local government administration, public-service innovation, licensing, algorithmic accountability, explainable AI, and public-sector ethics. Data collection is conducted through document identification, relevance screening, thematic classification, and content analysis. The data are analyzed using qualitative thematic analysis by classifying the findings into several themes: AI opportunities in bureaucratic decision-making, risks of algorithmic bias and opacity, human oversight, explainability, administrative accountability, institutional readiness, data governance, and ethical safeguards. The results of the analysis are then used to construct a human-supervised AI decision-support framework for local government, emphasizing that AI may assist administrative reasoning, but final public decisions must remain accountable to law, ethics, and authorized public officials.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

a. AI as a Decision-Support Instrument in Local Government Administration

The findings show that artificial intelligence can support local government decision-making by improving the speed, accuracy, and consistency of administrative analysis. In public-service delivery, AI can assist officials in classifying citizen requests, identifying service priorities, verifying administrative documents, detecting incomplete submissions, and providing automated responses through chatbots or virtual assistants. These functions are especially relevant for local governments that manage large volumes of service requests with limited human resources. AI can reduce repetitive bureaucratic tasks and allow public officials to focus on more complex administrative issues that require discretion, negotiation, and contextual judgment. This finding is consistent with Chen et al. [17], who show that AI-based self-service technology can improve public-service delivery when it is designed to support user experience and service accessibility. It also aligns with Ju et al. [19], who demonstrate that government chatbots can strengthen citizen interaction when their design reflects responsiveness and appropriate communication characteristics.

In licensing administration, AI can support decision-making by identifying risk levels, screening application completeness, detecting potential regulatory violations, and recommending whether an application requires standard review or more intensive examination. Licensing decisions often involve complex administrative requirements, legal standards, technical documents, and risk considerations. AI can help local governments process these requirements more efficiently, especially when applications are numerous and heterogeneous. Yet, the findings indicate that AI should only provide preliminary assessments or recommendations. The final licensing decision must remain under the authority of public officials because licensing is not merely a technical process; it involves legal responsibility, administrative discretion, and protection of public interest. This position is closely related to Rizk and Lindgren [2], who explain that automated decision-making in public administration produces tensions between efficiency and fairness, standardization and discretion, as well as automation and administrative legitimacy.

AI also has strong potential in community-needs analysis. Local governments can use AI to process citizen complaints, public-service records, demographic data, geospatial information, and digital feedback to identify emerging public problems. Natural language processing and sentiment analysis can help classify complaints, detect recurring service issues, and map citizen dissatisfaction. Verma [27] argues that sentiment analysis of public services can support smart society development by helping governments understand public needs and service experience. Criado et al. [26] also emphasize that digital public services represent an important form of innovation in public administration when they are connected to institutional learning and service improvement. The findings of this study confirm that AI can make local government decision-making more evidence-informed, but its value depends on whether AI outputs are actually used within accountable administrative procedures.

b. Risks of Algorithmic Decision Support in Bureaucratic Governance

The analysis finds that the use of AI in local government decision-making creates several risks, particularly algorithmic bias, opaque recommendations, privacy violations, automation bias, and administrative exclusion.

Algorithmic bias may occur when AI systems are trained using incomplete, outdated, or socially biased datasets. In local government services, biased data may affect eligibility recommendations for social assistance, priority classification for public services, or risk assessment in licensing. If the data used by AI systems do not represent vulnerable groups, informal workers, marginalized communities, or citizens with limited digital access, AI-supported decisions may reproduce existing inequalities. Valle-Cruz, García-Contreras, and Gil-García [21] warn that the negative impacts of AI in government include discrimination, accountability gaps, and overreliance on intelligent algorithms. Saura et al. [16] also emphasize that behavioral data used in government AI systems can create privacy and ethical risks.

Another important risk is opacity. AI systems may generate recommendations that are difficult to understand by public officials and citizens. This becomes problematic because government decisions must be explainable, contestable, and accountable. Citizens affected by AI-supported decisions must have the right to understand the basis of administrative recommendations, especially when the decision concerns permits, benefits, sanctions, or access to public services. De Bruijn et al. [11] explain that explainable AI in government is challenging because public decisions often involve complex social and legal contexts. Grimmelikhuijsen [12] further shows that algorithmic transparency affects the perceived trustworthiness of automated decision-making. Aoki et al. [13] also demonstrate that the type of explanation provided in algorithmic decision-making can influence citizens' perceptions of fairness, accuracy, and trustworthiness. These studies support the finding that explainability is not only a technical requirement, but also an administrative and democratic obligation.

The findings also show that automation bias can affect public officials. Automation bias occurs when officials rely too heavily on AI recommendations without sufficient critical evaluation. This risk is particularly serious in local governments with limited digital competence or weak institutional procedures for reviewing algorithmic outputs. If AI recommendations are treated as final decisions, public officials may gradually lose their role as responsible decision-makers. Alon-Barkat and Busuioc [3] emphasize that algorithmic decision-making in government must be studied through behavioral dimensions, including automation bias, algorithmic burdens, and citizen trust. Madan and Ashok [4] also show that AI adoption in public administration involves tensions between efficiency, fairness, public value, and organizational capacity. The findings of this study confirm that AI can strengthen bureaucratic decisions only when public officials remain active evaluators, not passive followers of algorithmic outputs.

c. Human-Supervised AI Governance Framework for Local Government Decision-Making

The main result of this study is the formulation of a human-supervised AI decision-support framework for local government. This framework consists of five interrelated components: data governance, AI-based administrative analysis, human verification, accountable decision-making, and citizen redress mechanisms. Data governance refers to the need for valid, updated, interoperable, and ethically managed data. AI-based administrative analysis refers to the use of AI to classify information, detect risks, identify patterns, and generate recommendations. Human verification ensures that public officials examine AI outputs before making decisions. Accountable decision-making means that final administrative decisions must be made by authorized officials and must be legally, ethically, and procedurally justifiable. Citizen redress mechanisms provide channels for citizens to question, appeal, or correct AI-supported administrative decisions.

This framework contributes to previous studies by emphasizing the boundary between AI recommendation and governmental decision. Previous research has widely discussed AI adoption, AI governance, explainable AI, and public-sector digital transformation [5], [8], [9], [10]. This study extends those discussions by arguing that AI must be positioned as an instrument of administrative reasoning, not as a substitute for public authority. The distinction is crucial because local government decisions involve legal mandates, public responsibility, and citizens' rights. Ahn and Chen [7] show that AI-augmented public administration depends on government employees' perception and willingness to use AI. Maragno et al. [8] also argue that AI implementation in public organizations depends on institutional readiness, data quality, and managerial alignment. These findings support the argument that successful AI use requires organizational transformation, not merely algorithmic deployment.

The proposed framework also emphasizes that AI governance must be connected to public value. AI should help local governments improve service quality, reduce administrative delays, identify community needs, and strengthen policy responsiveness. Yet, these benefits must be balanced with fairness, transparency, privacy protection, and accountability. Wilson and van der Velden [24] argue that sustainable AI in the public sector requires an integrated model that guides responsible decision-making. Van Noordt and Tangi [22] also show that AI capability influences public value creation in public administration. In this study, public value is achieved when AI helps officials make better decisions while preserving legality, discretion, and citizen protection.

Based on the overall findings, AI can become a valuable instrument for local government decision-making in public services, licensing, and community-needs analysis. Its main contribution lies in strengthening information processing, administrative consistency, and evidence-based recommendations. Yet, AI must not be allowed to replace the role of public officials in final governmental decisions. The legitimacy of local government decision-making

depends on human judgment, legal accountability, ethical reasoning, and the possibility for citizens to challenge administrative outcomes. For this reason, local governments need clear governance standards for AI use, including data-quality control, algorithmic transparency, human oversight, audit procedures, public explanation, and complaint mechanisms. The study confirms that the future of AI in local government should be human-supervised, legally accountable, and oriented toward public value.

4. CONCLUSION

This study finds that artificial intelligence has significant potential to support local government decision-making, particularly in public-service delivery, licensing administration, and community-needs analysis. AI can improve the speed, consistency, and analytical quality of bureaucratic decisions by classifying citizen requests, verifying administrative documents, detecting service priorities, screening licensing risks, and processing public complaints or digital feedback. These functions indicate that AI can strengthen evidence-informed administration and help local governments respond more effectively to complex public needs.

The findings also confirm that AI-supported decision-making creates serious governance risks when it is not regulated through clear institutional boundaries. Algorithmic bias, opaque recommendations, privacy violations, automation bias, and administrative exclusion may occur when AI systems rely on incomplete data, lack explainability, or are used without sufficient human supervision. These risks are particularly important in local government because administrative decisions often affect citizens' access to permits, benefits, public services, and legal recognition. For this reason, AI should not be positioned as an autonomous decision-maker in government administration.

The novelty of this study lies in the formulation of a **human-supervised AI decision-support framework** for local government. This framework consists of five main components: data governance, AI-based administrative analysis, human verification, accountable decision-making, and citizen redress mechanisms. The framework emphasizes that AI may assist administrative reasoning by generating recommendations, classifications, and risk assessments, but final decisions must remain under the authority and responsibility of public officials. This position distinguishes the study from previous research that often focuses on AI adoption, technological efficiency, or automated decision-making without sufficiently emphasizing the legal and ethical boundary between algorithmic recommendation and governmental authority.

The study contributes to the literature on digital governance and public administration by reinforcing the idea that AI implementation must be evaluated not only through efficiency, but also through legality, fairness, explainability, public value, and administrative accountability. In practical terms, local governments need to establish clear rules for data quality, algorithmic transparency, audit procedures, human oversight, and complaint mechanisms. Public officials also need sufficient digital competence to interpret AI outputs critically rather than accepting algorithmic recommendations as final decisions.

This study has limitations because it uses a qualitative and documentary-based approach. The proposed framework has not yet been tested through fieldwork, interviews with local government officials, or empirical evaluation of AI-supported administrative systems. Future research should examine the application of this framework in specific local government sectors, such as licensing, social assistance, population administration, public complaints, or basic-service delivery. Further studies may also use mixed methods by combining interviews, surveys, system analysis, and citizen satisfaction data to measure how AI affects decision quality, bureaucratic accountability, service fairness, and public trust.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Alshahrani, A. Griva, D. Dennehy, and M. Mäntymäki, "Artificial intelligence and decision-making in government functions: Opportunities, challenges and future research," *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, vol. 18, no. 4, pp. 678–698, 2024, doi: 10.1108/TG-06-2024-0131.
- [2] A. Rizk and I. Lindgren, "Automated decision-making in public administration," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 3, Art. no. 102061, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2025.102061.
- [3] S. Alon-Barkat and M. Busuioc, "Public administration meets artificial intelligence: Towards a meaningful behavioral research agenda on algorithmic decision-making in government," *Journal of Behavioral Public Administration*, vol. 7, no. 1, 2024, doi: 10.30636/jbpa.71.261.
- [4] R. Madan and M. Ashok, "AI adoption and diffusion in public administration: A systematic literature review and future research agenda," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 1, Art. no. 101774, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2022.101774.
- [5] A. Zuiderwijk, Y.-C. Chen, and F. Salem, "Implications of the use of artificial intelligence in public governance: A systematic literature review and a research agenda," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 3, Art. no. 101577, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2021.101577.

- [6] C. van Noordt and G. Misuraca, "Artificial intelligence for the public sector: Results of landscaping the use of AI in government across the European Union," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 3, Art. no. 101714, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2022.101714.
- [7] M. J. Ahn and Y.-C. Chen, "Digital transformation toward AI-augmented public administration: The perception of government employees and the willingness to use AI in government," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 2, Art. no. 101664, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2021.101664.
- [8] G. Maragno, L. Tangi, L. Gastaldi, and M. Benedetti, "Exploring the factors, affordances and constraints outlining the implementation of artificial intelligence in public sector organizations," *International Journal of Information Management*, vol. 73, Art. no. 102686, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102686.
- [9] P. G. R. de Almeida and C. D. dos Santos Jr., "Artificial intelligence governance: Understanding how public organizations implement it," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 1, Art. no. 102003, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2024.102003.
- [10] L. Tangi, A. P. R. Müller, and M. Janssen, "AI-augmented government transformation: Organisational transformation and the sociotechnical implications of artificial intelligence in public administrations," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 3, Art. no. 102055, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2025.102055.
- [11] H. de Bruijn, M. Warnier, and M. Janssen, "The perils and pitfalls of explainable AI: Strategies for explaining algorithmic decision-making," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 2, Art. no. 101666, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2021.101666.
- [12] S. Grimmelikhuijsen, "Explaining why the computer says no: Algorithmic transparency affects the perceived trustworthiness of automated decision-making," *Public Administration Review*, vol. 83, no. 2, pp. 241–262, 2023, doi: 10.1111/puar.13483.
- [13] N. Aoki, T. Tatsumi, G. Naruse, and K. Maeda, "Explainable AI for government: Does the type of explanation matter to the accuracy, fairness, and trustworthiness of an algorithmic decision as perceived by those who are affected?" *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 4, Art. no. 101965, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2024.101965.
- [14] G. Wang, Y. Guo, W. Zhang, S. Xie, and Q. Chen, "What type of algorithm is perceived as fairer and more acceptable? A comparative analysis of rule-driven versus data-driven algorithmic decision-making in public affairs," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 2, Art. no. 101803, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2023.101803.
- [15] A. Decuyper and A. Van de Vijver, "AI: Friend or foe of fairness perceptions of the tax administration? A survey experiment on citizens' procedural fairness perceptions," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 42, no. 1, Art. no. 102002, 2025, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2024.102002.
- [16] J. R. Saura, D. Ribeiro-Soriano, and D. Palacios-Marqués, "Assessing behavioral data science privacy issues in government artificial intelligence deployment," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 4, Art. no. 101679, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2022.101679.
- [17] T. Chen, W. Guo, X. Gao, and Z. Liang, "AI-based self-service technology in public service delivery: User experience and influencing factors," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 4, Art. no. 101520, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2020.101520.
- [18] T. S. Gesk and M. Leyer, "Artificial intelligence in public services: When and why citizens accept its usage," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 3, Art. no. 101704, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2022.101704.
- [19] J. Ju, Q. Meng, F. Sun, L. Liu, and S. Singh, "Citizen preferences and government chatbot social characteristics: Evidence from a discrete choice experiment," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 3, Art. no. 101785, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2022.101785.
- [20] R. Sandoval-Almazan, A. O. Millan-Vargas, and R. Garcia-Contreras, "Examining public managers' competencies of artificial intelligence implementation in local government: A quantitative study," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 4, Art. no. 101986, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2024.101986.
- [21] D. Valle-Cruz, R. García-Contreras, and J. R. Gil-García, "Exploring the negative impacts of artificial intelligence in government: The dark side of intelligent algorithms and cognitive machines," *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, vol. 90, no. 2, pp. 353–368, 2024, doi: 10.1177/00208523231187051.
- [22] C. van Noordt and L. Tangi, "The dynamics of AI capability and its influence on public value creation of AI within public administration," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 4, Art. no. 101860, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2023.101860.
- [23] B. Attard-Frost, A. Brandusescu, and K. Lyons, "The governance of artificial intelligence in Canada: Findings and opportunities from a review of 84 AI governance initiatives," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 41, no. 2, Art. no. 101929, 2024, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2024.101929.
- [24] C. Wilson and M. van der Velden, "Sustainable AI: An integrated model to guide public sector decision-making," *Technology in Society*, vol. 68, Art. no. 101926, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.techsoc.2022.101926.

- [25] T. Yigitcanlar, R. Y. M. Li, P. B. Beeramoole, and A. Paz, "Artificial intelligence in local government services: Public perceptions from Australia and Hong Kong," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 40, no. 3, Art. no. 101833, 2023, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2023.101833.
- [26] J. I. Criado, A. Guevara-Gómez, and J. Villodre, "Digital public services: A study of innovation in public administrations," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 38, no. 3, Art. no. 101583, 2021, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2021.101583.
- [27] S. Verma, "Sentiment analysis of public services for smart society: Literature review and future research directions," *Government Information Quarterly*, vol. 39, no. 3, Art. no. 101708, 2022, doi: 10.1016/j.giq.2022.101708.