

Artificial Intelligence in Public Governance: Its Impact on Citizens' Trust and Government Legitimacy

Mahmoud Khalifa*

Professor of Political Science, Applied Science University, Bahrain.

Received 12 Nov, 2025

Revised 5 Dec. 2025

Accepted 22 Jan. 2026

Published: Jun. 2026

Cited as:
M. Khalifa

WRP. Sci. J. Vol.9 No. 1 (2026)
PP 1-10.

DOI: 10.18576/ WRPSJ/090101

Abstract: Artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming public governance by enabling record-breaking decisions with implications for citizen consensus and government legitimacy long sought. This study analyzes how AI-enabled governance influences these interrelated principles through a comparative policy study of Singapore and the United Arab Emirates — leaders in AI adoption. Using the PESTLE framework, the analysis reveals how AI complements the authorities' transparency, commitment, fact-dissemination, and citizen participation, potentially strengthening public trust and legitimacy. However, the findings show that those outcomes depend on context-specific elements and implementation techniques. A.I. The rapid autonomy and complexity of AI systems pose challenges to citizen knowledge and acceptance, requiring adaptive governance models that can manage risks of misinformation, cyber threats, and social inequalities. This underscores the importance of comprehensive regulatory frameworks with per-firm and policy measures to protect the digital security landscape of AI integration in authorities, emphasizing the need for carefully nuanced approaches that align technology diffusion with societal values.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Public Governance, Government Legitimacy.

1 Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) enables the systematic use of data, algorithms, and other advanced technologies to make decisions and provide services that significantly affect the lives of citizens, shaping the future of public governance. Examples of AI-enabled public governance appear in numerous domains including science and technology, public health, the economy, security and crime prevention, transport and logistics, trade and industrial development, tourism, smart cities, building, etc. The overarching aim of this analysis is to examine the conditions under which AI-enabled public governance affects citizens' trust and government legitimacy. How AI influences the relationship between public governance and trust is not thoroughly examined.

*Corresponding author: E-mail: Mahmoud.khalifa@asu.edu.bh

AI-enabled public governance can generate important social and economic benefits, but it can also raise formidable challenges concerning ethics, values, privacy, algorithmic design, and security. Questions of AI governance are insufficiently addressed. The impact of AI on citizens' trust and legitimacy remains poorly understood despite a strong and intensifying interest amongst scholars, governments, and the public. It is imperative to comprehend AI's influence on the public governance transformation and on trust and legitimacy. The research constitutes an important scientific contribution to both foundational theory and governance practice. It enriches the literature by generating a framework describing how AI affects trust and identifying guiding principles for augmenting legitimacy. Understanding how AI influences the trust–legitimacy nexus improves insight into the governance of advanced technologies in general, particularly those whose implications unfold over extended periods. The guidance provided assists decision-makers in pursuing desirable outcomes for governance and society in the AI era.

2 Theoretical Framework

The initial buffet of AI adoption engendered hope amongst technocrats within the public sphere. Such hope quickly diminished as failures and unfulfilled expectations mounted. Consequently, widespread disillusionment arose, touching both AI and dedicated AI governance programs.¹

The absence of rigorous and widespread examination into the effects of AI adoption on governance legitimacy and citizen trust deeper ennobled the inquiry regarding its significance. The articulated inquiry and eventual commitments hewed substantially to assumptions reflected within the prior scholarly body and hinged in particular upon the highly informed and educated nature of potential users. A considerable and chronic trust deficit in government constituted the impetus for inquiry engagement and formal guidance. It was clear that citizen governmental trust constituted a vital, pivotal, multi-faceted phenomenon that transcended the AI domain, yet the advancement agenda was better served by a secondary focus on an apparently prominent and consequential implementation domain².

2.1. How does AI influence citizens' trust in government

The exploration of the nexus between AI, trust in government, and governmental legitimacy spans various dimensions, yielding diverse conceptualizations of the mechanism. One prevalent perspective posits that AI may either bolster or undermine trust in institutions, depending on how authorities employ the technology.³ An increase in public trust in government arises from citizens perceiving AI as beneficial to their collective well-being and the government's mission (Zhang & Dafoe, 2019). Conversely, when AI is employed primarily for surveillance or promoting harmful agendas, public trust may diminish, leading to the assertion that trust plays a significant role in promoting AI utilization.

A more finely grained examination of the mechanisms suggests a distinction between citizens' trust in

¹ Choung, H., David, P., & S. Seberger, J. (2023). A multilevel framework for AI governance in *The Routledge Handbook of Global and Digital Governance Crossroads: Stakeholder Engagement and Democratization*, Edited by Preeti Shroff-Mehta, Jagdish.N Sheth, John Garrison, Shailendra Raj Mehta, Routledge, London

² Andrews, P., de Sousa, T., Haefele, B., Beard, M., Wigan, M., Palia, A., Reid, K., Narayan, S., Dumitru, M., Morrison, A., Mason, G., & Jacquet, A. (2022). *A Trust Framework for Government Use of Artificial Intelligence and Automated Decision Making*.

³ Laux, J., Wachter, S., & Mittelstadt, B. (2023). Trustworthy artificial intelligence and the European Union AI act: On the conflation of trustworthiness and acceptability of risk. Available at ncbi.nlm.nih.gov

the AI application itself and their trust in the institution using it. The former depends on the performance of the AI system and its prior experience with it, while the latter pivots around the motivation or agenda of the governmental institution. (Wang et al., 2024)

A second perspective posits that the implementation of AI modifies decision-making procedures rather than influencing the content of decisions per se. Such procedural transformation, when systematically detailed and effectively communicated, is believed to augment the authorities' legitimacy. Here, the key concern shifts from trust to legitimacy, indicating that AI adoption may be rationalized on legitimacy grounds, irrespective of trust considerations. This perspective also implies that AI, by changing procedures, has the potential to impact legitimacy

2.2. Does AI improve transparency and accountability

The increased reliance on digital technologies, particularly Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Public Governance can enhance governmental transparency and accountability, but there are not only challenges that hinder these benefits to citizens. AI provides Governments with data analytics which allows them to detect deviation from established policies. The use of Natural Language Processing (NLP) and sentiment analysis can enable dialogues between citizens and governments through social media or other channels. These can provide inputs to the legitimising function of Citizens' Trust ⁴.

Specifically, the incorporation of AI is hypothesized to enhance governmental transparency and accountability through various interlinked mechanisms. It is worth analyzing the effectiveness of AI in improving transparency, accountability, and the possible trade-offs respectively, referring to external governmental information, citizens' participation, governmental constant monitoring on practices, and citizens' channels and perceptions, alongside the influence of AI.

Transparency is defined as the extent to which governmental activities (policymaking, regulations, service provision, etc.) are accessible by citizens. AI can improve transparency through enhancing the availability of governmental information, procedures of getting governmental information, and channels to express feelings and needs by citizens. Citizens' Trust is enhanced when citizens get clear understanding of the governments' actions and motivations because the accessibility of governmental-related information plays a significant role in citizens' evaluation of governmental behaviours⁵.

The proliferation of AI technologies initiated a "data-driven society", governments collect and analyse citizens' and corporate behaviours from various digital platforms and datasets. The availability of data regarding governmental-related information has accelerated dramatically. In addition to the availability of data, the process of acquiring such data and behavioural interactions with governments has become more efficient, AI technologies can provide precisions and shorten the length of time in collecting, copying, and retrieving. Through the analysis of citizens' and corporations' behaviours in these data, governments have the capability to understand the preferences and basic reflections of citizens and corporations on governmental policies and practices.⁶

2.3. Mechanisms Linking AI to Trust and Legitimacy

The proposed causal pathway is that AI in public governance and administration enhances citizens' trust in government, which, in turn, increases government legitimacy. The relationship between AI and

⁴ Andrews, P., de Sousa, T., & et al. (2022). Op cit..

⁵ Olsen, H. P., Hildebrandt, T. T., Wiesener, C., Larsen, M. S., & Flügge, A. W. A. (2024). The right to transparency in public governance: Freedom of information and the use of artificial intelligence by public agencies. *Digital Government: Research and Practice*, 5(1), 1-15

⁶ Kloppenburg, S., Gupta, A., Kruk, S. R., Makris, S., Bergsvik, R., Korenhof, P., ... & Toonen, H. M. (2022). Scrutinizing environmental governance in a digital age: New ways of seeing, participating, and intervening. *One Earth*, 5(3), 232-241

citizens' trust is determined through AI's impact on four dimensions of government behaviour: transparency, accountability, information provision, and citizen participation. Each of these dimensions can be perceived differently by citizens and will, therefore, have different implications for government legitimacy. The pathway can be expressed in the following way. For government legitimacy to be increased through the gate of trust, citizens must first perceive that government AI applications improve public transparency, accountability, information provision, and citizen participation. Given the enduring public urgency over legitimacy, this pathway is analyzed first. AI has clear potential to bolster the four dimensions that shape trust and also cover the legitimization gaps created by the digital transformation of the past twenty years. Still, the shift from information—insufficient for trust—to genuine engagement—the ultimate goal of the social contract—is where many governments currently face a significant challenge.⁷

3 Methodology

Governments increasingly interact with their constituents through algorithmic decision-making systems, spanning areas such as welfare provision, education, urban management, social policies, climate change, and food supply. To dissect mechanisms linking artificial intelligence (AI) to trust and legitimacy, the key constructs of AI-enabled governance must be specified. AI-controlled or -aided platforms automate decision-making processes traditionally performed by state officials across diverse public domains. These systems operate under algorithmic content generation and selection models, applying rules—explicit and implicit—to determine desired outputs. The principal goal of such AI interventions within public governance is economic or societal improvement, influencing issues like: policy or service generation; management of communications, information, suggestions, or recommendations; propagation of propaganda, news, or disinformation; and audience composition, prioritization, and sequencing.

Selection criteria focus on nations employing these emerging technologies and fostering conducive environments for their adoption. The United Arab Emirates (UAE) emerges as a frontrunner; AI ranks highly among its policy priorities, with both the President and Prime Minister articulating long-term visions.⁸ By 2031, the UAE aspires to assume global leadership in AI deployment. In the Asia-Pacific sphere, Singapore parallels the UAE in prioritizing AI, augmented and autonomous decision-making, and remains technologically comparable.⁹ Data-gathering centres support AI agendas in both contexts and facilitate indicators for real-time monitoring. Singaporean policy discourse extends beyond trust to discussions on trade-offs between adoption and suppression, and surfaces concerns regarding misinformation.

3.1. Comparative case studies (UAE, Singapore)

Artificial Intelligence has become a critical topic in the governance agenda on a global scale. Significant investments in national Artificial Intelligence strategies and policies are made to encourage research, development and adoption of Artificial Intelligence. Public Organizations from different countries use Artificial Intelligence for automated service delivery, big data prediction of social behaviour and sentiment analysis of citizens and service effectiveness. Following national technological direction, public organizations from the U.A.E. and Singapore have also adopted

⁷ Laux, J., Wachter, S., & Mittelstadt, B. (2023). Op cit.

⁸ Rocco, S. (2022). Implementing and managing Algorithmic Decision-Making in the public sector (No. ex93w_v1). Center for Open Science.

⁹ Choung, H., David, P., & S. Seberger, J. (2023). Op cit

Artificial Intelligence as a tool to enhance public service delivery in these two countries. An examination of how these two countries adopted Artificial Intelligence in those two case studies offers interesting insights about Artificial Intelligence in public governance. The focus on the U.A.E. and Singapore case studies is due to the extensive use of Artificial Intelligence as an enabler to enhance public service delivery according to the 2022 Government Artificial Intelligence Readiness Index report. The United Arab Emirates ranked at 16th position, while Singapore was ranked at the 1st position among twenty-five countries.¹⁰ Three dimensions were used in the selection method: the approach taken and governance strategies adopted by the two countries, readiness level to engage in Artificial Intelligence associated heavy data, and finally, the socio-technical context that supports these efforts.¹¹ Data were collected from secondary sources to allow comparison on Artificial Intelligence adoption between the two countries. Specific case studies were done on how Artificial Intelligence was used in service delivery related to Economic and Financial Sustainability and Health and Welfare. In both the U.A.E. and Singapore, Artificial Intelligence is used to enhance public service delivery through the prediction of potential fraud mis-send message, misuse exemption requests and similar frauds against social welfare.

Overall, Artificial Intelligence usage on public governance is gaining global momentum. Public Organizations from various jurisdictions are investing in Artificial Intelligence projects. The U.A.E. and Singapore, as nations with considerable investment and coverage in the implementation of Artificial Intelligence projects, are worthy subjects for further exploration.

3.2. Mixed methods (policy analysis).

Policy analysis is undertaken as policy indicators and policy signals are also relevant and complementary to the study of citizens' trust. A separation between policy indicators and policy signals follows from the need to capture the interaction between AI-enabled policy and citizens' social experiences regarding governance. Policy analysis and indicators are collected on a PESTLE basis (involving Political, Economic, Social, Technological, Legal, and Environmental factors, with the first two included already). PESTLE enables systematic coding of policies in various jurisdictions while ensuring a broad consideration of all AI-related opportunities and risks that may influence trust. A preliminary list of Aigovernance and AI-transmission policies is drawn from documentation of AI initiatives and strategy reports in both jurisdictions, for instance, accompanying Singapore's AI Strategy. A framework to evaluate and score the importance of these policies emerges from insights into AI governance regulations spread throughout the literature, for instance, the OECD's key recommendations or European proposals on AI supervisions. Policy signals are captured through qualitative content-analyses of these similar documents, deliberating on how government efforts to foster AI opportunity and mitigate risks intertwine with societal trust in government, potentially signalling citizens' trust. Proposed arrangement exhibits resilience towards competing interplays with coexisting societal shifts that also catalyse public trust formation. The preliminary list of analysed jurisdiction-focal documents includes occasions within the time-frame under study for both countries, enabling co-evolution analysis as actors confront similar issues and concerns derived from AI turn-around without public pressures decaying.¹²

¹⁰ Papagiannidis, E., Merete Enholm, I., Dremel, C., Mikalef, P., & Krogstie, J. (2023). Toward AI Governance: Identifying Best Practices and Potential Barriers and Outcomes.

¹¹ Jr Ramizo, G. (2021). Practical Lessons for Government AI Projects. available at osf.io

¹² Nagy, J., Do Thi, H. T., & Toth, A. J. (2023). Life Cycle, PESTLE and Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis of Membrane Contactor-Based Nitrogen Recovery Process. *Membranes*, 13(1), 87.

4 Government Legitimacy in the AI Era

Public perceptions of government legitimacy typically consider both substantive and procedural dimensions of legitimacy. The substantive dimension refers to the acceptance of policies adopted by governments or organisations, while the procedural dimension pertains to the trustworthiness of the processes employed to reach such decisions.¹³ The introduction of algorithms into public governance has implications for citizens' acceptance of a variety of government services, such as unemployment benefits, pension schemes, and public housing applications. These digital public services often do not have well-defined governance structures, leaving citizens unable to assess decision-support processes or governance. Research indicates that the degree to which an AI-mediation service is perceived as fair correlates positively with confidence in the algorithm itself and trust in the corresponding public authority.¹⁴

AI is likely to play a crucial role in crisis management, as seen during the COVID-19 pandemic. Decision-support systems have been employed to optimise supply chains, manage healthcare system loads, and encourage citizens to remain at home. The establishment of such systems to manage anticipated government strategies generates new legitimacy requirements, as AI-enabled support systems must remain transparent in tracing both the applied models and the underlying data utilised. A strong demand exists for systems that can protect populations from organic risk (e.g., dangers to life or health) while avoiding excessive intrusion into citizens' personal and social dimensions—large-scale monitoring of citizens' movements, actions, or contacts remains a highly sensitive issue.¹⁵

4.1. Procedural Versus Substantive Legitimacy

Public administration scholars typically distinguish between procedural and substantive legitimacy.¹⁶ Procedural legitimacy assesses the fairness of norms and processes governing decision-making, whereas substantive legitimacy evaluates the fairness of achieved outcomes.¹⁷ For algorithm-supported decision-making, the distinction is especially pertinent. AI systems are becoming increasingly capable of learning and improving autonomously, further accelerating the rate of algorithmic change and diminishing the opportunity for pre-deployment human scrutiny. Consequently, AI technologies tend to facilitate greater and faster redistributions of power and resources—processes long assumed to occur under human control—while generating a widening gap between automated processing and human understanding. In this context, the implications of algorithmic support for a given decision, along with the associated questions of legitimacy, can depend heavily on the volume of prior data. In high-data settings such as socio-economic assistance or process optimization, legislation remains a crucial determinant from a substantive standpoint.

4.2. Legitimacy and Public Acceptance of AI-Mediated Services

Implementation of AI in government services has an impact on the legitimacy of both the services and

¹³ Rocco, S. (2022). Op cit

¹⁴ Andrews, P., de Sousa, T., & et al. (2022). Op cit..

¹⁵ Sharmin, S., Biswas, B., Tiwari, A., Kamruzzaman, M., Saleh, M. A., Ferdousmou, J., & Hassan, M. (2025). Artificial Intelligence for Pandemic Preparedness and Response: Lessons Learned and Future Applications. *Journal of Management*, 2, 18-25.

¹⁶ Rocco, S. (2022). Op cit

¹⁷ Skaug Sætra, H. (2020). A shallow defence of a technocracy of artificial intelligence: Examining the political harms of algorithmic governance in the domain of government. *Technology in Society*, 62, 101283.

the government delivering them.¹⁸ Legitimacy can be judged on the basis of procedure and substance; AI-enabled services influence how legitimacy is viewed from these two vantage points. Assessment of procedural legitimacy focuses on the nature of interactions between the service and its users—the problems to which AI-enabled systems respond, the extent to which these problems are well understood and agreed upon by different stakeholders, and the perceived quality of inputs and relationships reflected in the systems.

4.3. Crisis Management, Resilience, and AI

Countries need to adapt to continuously and rapidly evolving threats such as climate change, cyberattacks, misinformation, and pandemics. Resilience refers to the ability of a government to withstand crisis-induced shocks while maintaining constitutional order and legitimacy (Lee et al., 2022). The capacity to function effectively during crises can be reinforced through Artificial Intelligence, enabling faster and higher-quality policy evaluation in implementation. Several services in the United Arab Emirates (UAE) plan to enhance both crisis management and resilience.¹⁹ In Singapore, several AI systems support iterative policy evaluation processes during the implementation of services and support crises by predicting hate speech, misinformation, and location risk levels; ensuring a rapid responses to these stect different scenarios; helping services during the pandemic; providing information to public; and tracking to obtain insights to guide different policy tracks. However, it is critical to incorporate appropriate safeguards for ethics, fairness, transparency, and bias in AI development and deployment during crisis management. Despite the wide availability of AI for such services, the only AI-enabled crisis-management service observed had only been released since July 2022, demonstrating a general lack of deployment.

5 Future Trajectories and Scenarios

Emerging technologies, particularly Web 3.0 and AI, will continue to accelerate the transformation of public service delivery. However, existing governance structures hinder the widespread adoption of innovative solutions, especially in developing and least-developed countries. Policymakers must select suitable and adaptable governance models.²⁰ The social contract is gradually being redefined, impacting the relationship between governments and citizens. The state's role is shifting from exercising unbridled authority to safeguarding citizens' rights and freedoms. Any form of surveillance and collection of citizen data requires the consent of citizens and adherence to privacy laws. Governments should refrain from manoeuvring that fosters distrust and undermines public agency.²¹

5.1. Emerging Technologies and Public Service Delivery

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is a disruptor and game changer for society, the economy, and organisations. Technology has impacted public service delivery through technology-enabled forms. Many emerging technologies, such as BlockChain (BC), FinTech, Internet-of-Things (IoT), the 4th Industrial

¹⁸ Laux, J., Wachter, S., & Mittelstadt, B. (2023). Op cit

¹⁹ Choung, H., David, P., & S. Seberger, J. (2023). Op cit

²⁰ Rocco, S. (2022). Op cit

²¹ Skaug Sætra, H. (2020). Op cit..

Revolution (4IR), Artificial Intelligence (AI), Digital Government, E-Government, Public Service Innovation 2.0, Smart City, and Smart Nation can help to extend, improve, and change public service delivery. Finer, faster, better, and cheaper public governance solutions using emerging technologies are key in enabling and entrusting wider adoption of artificial intelligence technologies. Among many of these emerging technologies are: the exponential growth of mobile broadband; the emergence of Internet, machines or devices, services, sensors, networks, and applications; these emerging technologies are revolutionising human life and activities. Without a doubt, Artificial Intelligence (AI) is the most exciting and potentially disruptive technology today, touching every aspect of human life, the economy, society, and governance. With continuing investment into Artificial Intelligence (AI) by advanced and developing countries lies in global competition and AI public services delivery is no exception.²²

The extensive use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) by Government of the United Arab Emirates (UAE) in relation to public-service delivery and management in complementing-Smart City objective and making-UAE among the world best place by 2071 warrants study on trust and legitimacy of AI deployment and execution in public-service delivery. Singapore and UAE, nation states with multi-tiered governance, have been implementing Artificial Intelligence (AI) policy to facilitate policy planning, facilitate information sharing, and improve service delivery, deliberation and implementation. Government-initiated Artificial Intelligence (AI) strategy is formalised in Dubai by 2017 and Singapore by 2017, enabling Government to leverage Artificial Intelligence (AI) and enhance social-economic well-being across citizen. Enterprise Singapore, statutory board under Ministry of Trade and Industry on 2021 unveils Artificial Intelligence (AI) Governance Framework to assists organisation embarking on technologies. The composite emergence of emerging and intelligent technologies has already changed the conduct of human activities, economic interaction and public-serving delivery at government, public/private and community governance, and business enterprise levels especially during the COVID-19 pandemic period.²³

5.2. Social Contract Reconfiguration

AI and rapid technological developments intentionally reshape the notion of the social contract. On one hand, AI has addressed a variety of global issues (cancer, resource allocation) and increased productivity through task reallocation, creativity support, and scientific collaboration. On the other hand, expectations, rights, responsibilities, and participative avenues are uncertain.²⁴ Nevertheless, the AI-driven evolution raises concerns about confusion and capability misalignment with citizens under the existing social contract. Adequate power remains at the discretion of a few, and mass surveillance—often justified for collective well-being—has triggered public concern over oppressive use. Still, AI enables agencies to predict behaviours and pre-empt incidents, thus, citizens could redefine the social contract, such as relinquishing certain rights and pursuing certain duties in exchange for equal engagement opportunities and consideration for ethical service design.²⁵

5.3. Policy Recommendations for Strengthening Trust and Legitimacy

Amid growing AI adoption in public governance, enhancing citizens' trust and government legitimacy

²² Mahant, R. (2025). Artificial intelligence in public administration: A disruptive force for efficient e-governance. *Artificial Intelligence*, 19 (01).

²³ Andrews, P., de Sousa, T., & et al. (2022). *Op cit*.

²⁴ Laux, J., Wachter, S., & Mittelstadt, B. (2023). *Op cit*

²⁵ Choung, H., David, P., & S. Seberger, J. (2023). *Op cit*

remains essential. Trust is predicated upon risk, uncertainty, and vulnerability; government legitimacy promotes compliance with laws and regulations as well as the willing acceptance of governmental decisions. While trust is an inherent feature of AI, conditions that precipitate the relinquishment of such trust in the public governance context arise as new algorithmic supply- and demand-side phenomena. Public authorities aiming to secure citizens' trust and government legitimacy should consider the following recommendations.

First, the presence of a comprehensive set of regulations and established national AI strategies addressing algorithm bias, discrimination, and ethical implications is fundamental in the case of AI-based public service uptake. The establishment of accompanying strategies, such as implementing algorithm regulation, grooming home-grown technology suppliers, and incentivizing open data, emerges as a further, significantly prominent step. Second, deploying secure public-facing services, which have emerged as an unintended algorithm-supply-side phenomenon, is recommended. AI-enabled public-facing service systems, such as digital identification system, land management services, job-matching portals, and epidemic control in the Middle East, the number of successful transactions serves as a promising AI-enabled service provider indicator. Third, implementing legally binding measures that oblige large supplier firms to be accountable for data handling is advised.²⁶

6 Conclusion

The findings indicate that in two distinctive and contrasting settings—Singapore and the UAE—AI-enabled public governance has the potential to significantly strengthen government legitimacy and enhance citizen trust, albeit achieved through different mechanisms tailored to each locale's unique context. In Singapore, the adoption of algorithmic tools utilized for efficient service delivery and to facilitate greater access to government grants serves to signal a strong commitment to substantive fairness, reflecting and reinforcing the meritocratic ideals that are deeply embedded within the nation's social contract. Meanwhile, in the UAE, initiatives such as AI-supported platforms like DubaiNow and the National Program for Artificial Intelligence play a crucial role in shaping a forward-thinking, innovation-driven narrative. This narrative is underpinned by mechanisms of procedural legitimacy that aim to engage citizens and boost their trust in government initiatives. The analysis suggests that while AI possesses the transformative potential to meaningfully bolster government legitimacy and foster citizen trust, there exists a contrasting scenario where the deployment of AI could conversely undermine government legitimacy and citizen trust if not handled with care. This scenario underscores the necessity for a nuanced and fine-grained approach to thoroughly unpack and critically assess the multifaceted impact of AI on various individual governments. Such detailed and nuanced investigations are imperative for advancing theoretical insights into governance structures while providing actionable policy guidance that can be used to navigate the complexities of AI integration in public sectors. The examination of AI governance and the functioning of algorithmic systems underscores the pivotal importance of ensuring information access for citizens. This access is vital for enabling them to make well-informed, autonomy-based evaluations of the services provided to them, subsequently helping to foster increased compliance by authorities with principles aimed at enhancing trust and legitimacy within the government framework.

References:

²⁶ Stankovich, M. I. R. I. A. M., Behrens, E. R. I. C. A., & Burchell, J. U. L. I. A. (2023). Toward meaningful transparency and accountability of AI Algorithms in public service delivery. *Government Information Quarterly*, early access

- [1] Andrews, P., de Sousa, T., Haefele, B., Beard, M., Wigan, M., Palia, A., Reid, K., Narayan, S., Dumitru, M., Morrison, A., Mason, G., & Jacquet, A. (2022). *A Trust Framework for Government Use of Artificial Intelligence and Automated Decision Making*.
- [2] Chung, H., David, P., & S. Seberger, J. (2023). *A multilevel framework for AI governance in The Routledge Handbook of Global and Digital Governance Crossroads: Stakeholder Engagement and Democratization*, Edited By Preeti Shroff-Mehta, Jagdish.N Sheth, John Garrison, Shailendra Raj Mehta, Routledge, London
- [3] Iwanowska, B. (). *Algorithmic Legitimacy and the Digital State: Rethinking Governance, Trust, and Accountability in the Age of AI*.
- [4] Jr Ramizo, G. (2021). *Practical Lessons for Government AI Projects*. osf.io
- [5] Kloppenburg, S., Gupta, A., Kruk, S. R., Makris, S., Bergsvik, R., Korenhof, P., ... & Toonen, H. M. (2022). *Scrutinizing environmental governance in a digital age: New ways of seeing, participating, and intervening*. *One Earth*, 5(3), 232-241.
- [6] Knowles, B. & T. Richards, J. (2021). *The Sanction of Authority: Promoting Public Trust in AI*.
- [7] Laux, J., Wachter, S., & Mittelstadt, B. (2023). *Trustworthy artificial intelligence and the European Union AI act: On the conflation of trustworthiness and acceptability of risk*. *ncbi.nlm.nih.gov*
- [8] Lee, C. C., Comes, T., Finn, M., & Mostafavi, A. (2022). *Roadmap Towards Responsible AI in Crisis Resilience Management*.
- [9] Mahant, R. (2025). *Artificial intelligence in public administration: A disruptive force for efficient e-governance*. *Artificial Intelligence*, 19(01).
- [10] Nagy, J., Do Thi, H. T., & Toth, A. J. (2023). *Life Cycle, PESTLE and Multi-Criteria Decision Analysis of Membrane Contactor-Based Nitrogen Recovery Process*. *Membranes*, 13(1), 87.
- [11] Olsen, H. P., Hildebrandt, T. T., Wiesener, C., Larsen, M. S., & Flügge, A. W. A. (2024). *The right to transparency in public governance: Freedom of information and the use of artificial intelligence by public agencies*. *Digital Government: Research and Practice*, 5(1), 1-15.
- [12] Papagiannidis, E., Merete Enholm, I., Dremel, C., Mikalef, P., & Krogstie, J. (2023). *Toward AI Governance: Identifying Best Practices and Potential Barriers and Outcomes*. *ncbi.nlm.nih.gov*
- [13] Rocco, S. (2022). *Implementing and managing Algorithmic Decision-Making in the public sector*. osf.io
- [14] Sharmin, S., Biswas, B., Tiwari, A., Kamruzzaman, M., Saleh, M. A., Ferdousmou, J., & Hassan, M. (2025). *Artificial Intelligence for Pandemic Preparedness and Response: Lessons Learned and Future Applications*. *Journal of Management*, 2, 18-25.
- [15] Skaug Sætra, H. (2020). *A shallow defence of a technocracy of artificial intelligence: Examining the political harms of algorithmic governance in the domain of government*. *Technology in Society*, 62, 101283.
- [16] Stankovich, M. I. R. I. A. M., Behrens, E. R. I. C. A., & Burchell, J. U. L. I. A. (2023). *Toward meaningful transparency and accountability of AI Algorithms in public service delivery*. *Government Information Quarterly*, early access.
- [17] Wang, Y. F., Chen, Y. C., Chien, S. Y., & Wang, P. J. (2024). *Citizens' trust in AI-enabled government systems*. *Information Polity*.
- [18] Zhang, B. & Dafoe, A. (2019). *U.S. Public Opinion on the Governance of Artificial Intelligence*.