

Political and Administrative Organizations in the Era of Generative AI

Dr. Houari Laabed¹
Dr. Abdellah Djaafri²

^{1,2} University of Adrar

Email 1 : laabedhouari@univ-adrar.edu.dz

Email 2 : djaafriabdellah@univ-adrar.edu.dz

 1: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2000-8555>

 2: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1609-9557>

Abstract:

This in-depth study examines the structural and epistemological transformations occurring within political and administrative organizations driven by the integration of Generative Artificial Intelligence, marking a paradigm shift from "execution automation" to a "cognitive partnership". The paper analyzes the deconstruction of traditional, vertical Weberian bureaucracy in favor of agile, flat, and networked models that transcend rigid territorial and legal jurisdictions. Furthermore, it explores the expansion of the boundaries of "bounded rationality" in public decision-making via the predictive processing capabilities of big data. Conversely, the study highlights the crisis of algorithmic legitimacy and the dilemma of legal liability arising from the "black box" phenomenon, which hinders accountability. It also warns against "automation bias" and the sovereign and ethical perils of delegating discretionary power to intelligent systems that may institutionalize social biases. Ultimately, the thesis concludes with the necessity of structuring a hybrid governance model that rigorously calibrates algorithmic efficiency against human sovereignty to safeguard democratic legitimacy.

Keywords:

Generative Artificial Intelligence - Algorithmic Governance - Smart Administration - Cognitive Partnership - Black Box - Democratic Legitimacy - Hybrid Model.

Introduction

In recent decades, political and administrative organizations have undergone fundamental transformations driven by the rapid evolution of information and communication technologies. However, the emergence of generative artificial intelligence (Generative AI) has marked a qualitative turning point; it has transcended the mere digitization of services to fundamentally reshape decision-making mechanisms, resource management, and public policy design. AI is no longer a peripheral auxiliary tool; rather, it has evolved into an influential institutional actor capable of generating knowledge, analyzing data, proposing alternatives, and formulating decisions. This paradigm shift raises profound questions regarding the future of traditional political and administrative structures. Within this context, novel paradigms have emerged; such as algorithmic governance, smart administration, and AI-assisted decision-making. These concepts reflect a gradual transition from conventional bureaucratic frameworks toward more agile, data-driven organizations. Nonetheless, this

¹ Received: May 12, 2026; Accepted: July 23, 2026; Published: August 24, 2026



transition introduces complex legal, political, and ethical challenges concerning transparency, accountability, legitimacy, and the safeguarding of rights and liberties.

Hence, this study derives its significance from analyzing the impact of generative artificial intelligence in reshaping political and administrative organizations, while forecasting the institutional model that will characterize public administration in the coming decades.

To what extent does generative AI contribute to reshaping political and administrative organizations, and what is the nature of the new institutional model capable of striking a balance between administrative efficiency and democratic legitimacy? This central problem underscores the necessity of addressing the following sub-questions:

1. What is the conceptual definition of political and administrative organizations within the digital environment?
2. How does generative AI influence the public decision-making process?
3. What are the key organizational transformations imposed by artificial intelligence within public institutions?
4. What are the most prominent risks associated with algorithmic governance?

Research Hypotheses:

- Main Hypothesis:

Generative artificial intelligence contributes to reshaping political and administrative organizations by developing new data-driven decision-making models; however, its success remains contingent upon the existence of an institutional and legal framework that guarantees transparency and accountability.

- Sub-Hypotheses:

1. Artificial intelligence leads to the downsizing of traditional bureaucratic structures.
2. Reliance on artificial intelligence enhances the efficiency and quality of administrative decisions.
3. The absence of legal governance leads to risks associated with algorithmic bias and the erosion of legitimacy.
4. The success of smart organizations necessitates constructing a hybrid model that integrates human judgment with algorithmic analysis.

The practical value of this study manifests in offering a conceptual framework that governments can leverage to advance digital administration, while simultaneously supporting decision-makers in designing robust digital governance policies.

Research Methodology:

To achieve the objectives of this study, the following methodological approaches have been adopted:

- The Descriptive-Analytical Approach: Employed to analyze the conceptual frameworks of political organizations and artificial intelligence.
- The Institutional Approach: Utilized to examine the impact of technology on the structural framework of political and administrative institutions.
- The Foresight Approach: Applied to forecast the future of political organizations up to the horizons of 2040 or 2050.

Section I: The Conceptual Framework of Generative Artificial Intelligence

Since 2022, artificial intelligence has undergone a qualitative paradigm shift with the advent of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Generative AI) models. Moving beyond mere data analysis, these models possess the capacity to synthesize texts, reports, images, and source codes, while concurrently proposing decision alternatives; a feature that distinguishes them from conventional AI applications. This evolution has catalyzed a transition in the utilization of AI, elevating it from a technical support tool to an active partner in cognitive processes and organizational decision-making within public institutions. (Russell, 2021) From a political science perspective, this shift denotes a fundamental transformation in the nature of political and administrative organization; institutional knowledge is now co-produced through the interplay between human agency and intelligent systems, thereby necessitating a conceptual re-examination of administrative authority, jurisdiction, and accountability.

First: The Conceptual Shift from "Execution Automation" to "Administrative Cognitive Partnership"

Technological transformation within the bureaucratic milieu is no longer a mere process of "hard automation" confined to executing pre-programmed legal rules. Rather, with the advent of generative artificial intelligence, it has transitioned into a phase of "cognitive engineering," wherein these systems have become capable of formulating alternative knowledge and proposing policy options based on deep self-learning. (Schwab, 2020) This qualitative shift has, in turn, fluidized administrative streams within organizational structures. Historically, knowledge and expertise accumulated vertically through the hierarchy of traditional Weberian bureaucracy; however, Large Language Models (LLMs) now collapse this temporal accumulation by synthesizing complex, prospective reports in a matter of seconds. Consequently, this contributes to deconstructing the functions of middle bureaucratic coordination and drives a paradigm shift toward a model of flat digital governance (Patrick Dunleavy, 2026).

Second: Re-engineering Administrative Authority, Jurisdictional Boundaries, and Legitimacy

From a political science perspective, this cognitive interaction between human agency and intelligent systems mandates a radical reconsideration of the concept of "administrative authority" and its legitimacy. While public administration has historically derived its classical legitimacy from legal-rational authority and human merit, generative artificial intelligence is establishing a novel paradigm that may be termed "algorithmic legitimacy." Under this paradigm, decisions and proposals are accepted on the premise of being the output of massive data analytics (Natascha Just, 2017). This involves the latent risk of implicitly transferring "discretionary power" from the administrative leader to the engineers and developers of these systems. Concurrently, this shift aligns with the erosion of the rigid boundaries of both geographic and legal "administrative jurisdiction" in favor of "liquid jurisdiction." Given that these generative networks are Trans boundary and nourished by international data, they dissolve the traditional distinction between local mandates and the major tech conglomerates providing the service. (Mark Bovens, 2002)

Third: The Dilemma of Responsibility and the Problem of Algorithmic Political Bias

The most complex organizational challenges manifest in the impact on the concept of "administrative responsibility and accountability" by the "black box" phenomenon enveloping generative AI. It is inherently difficult to trace the analytical trajectory undertaken by the algorithm to arrive at a specific decision. Consequently, this plunges the administrative structure into the "problem of many hands," fragmenting legal and political accountability among the employee, the institution, and the developing corporation. (Mike Ananny, 2018) Furthermore, these systems do not possess absolute neutrality; rather, they reflect and reinforce the latent political and social biases embedded within their training datasets. Accordingly, the administrative organizations' reliance on them to formulate decisions regarding wealth distribution, subsidies, or public policy-making may lead to institutionalizing and perpetuating "administrative bias and discrimination" albeit this time under a scientific and technological veil that appears ostensibly objective and neutral (O'Neil, 2016).

Section II: Artificial Intelligence and the Restructuring of Political and Administrative Organizations

Modern administrative thought posits that digital transformation is not merely confined to modernizing operational methods; rather, it drives a fundamental reconfiguration of the organizational architecture of public institutions. Within this context, generative artificial intelligence has become a catalyst for re-engineering government processes by flattening administrative tiers, accelerating information workflows, enhancing integration among organizational units, and shifting from hierarchical frameworks to more agile, networked structures (Mintzberg, 1979). Reports by the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) indicate that the deployment of AI in the public sector amplifies productivity, optimizes responsiveness to public services, and strengthens governmental accountability, provided it is coupled with appropriate governance frameworks.

In this framework, five primary organizational transformations can be identified: (Farrell, 2023)

- The transition from paper-based administration to intelligent governance.
- Reliance on big data analytics in decision-making processes.
- The emergence of specialized organizational units dedicated to data and artificial intelligence.
- The reduction of red tape through cognitive automation.
- The enhancement of horizontal coordination among government institutions.

First: Re-engineering Organizational Architecture and the Shift toward "Interlocking Networked Democracy"

Generative artificial intelligence and contemporary digital transformation transcend the mere modernization of physical operational tools, driving instead a profound reconfiguration of the structural "archetypes" of public institutions. The adoption of these technologies deconstructs the traditional "machine bureaucracy" paradigm predicated on a rigid division of labor and restrictive vertical hierarchy supplanting it with the model of "adhocracy" or networked structures (Mintzberg, *The Structuring of Organizations: A Synthesis of the Research*, 1979). Generative AI accelerates horizontal information workflows, thereby eliminating the organizational necessity for middle management layers that historically functioned as channels for filtering and transmitting information. Consequently, this leads to the "flattening of organizational structures," (OECD Development, 2024) rendering them highly responsive to shifting political and social dynamics.

Second: Algorithmic Governance and the Transition from Discretionary Administration to "Data-Driven Decision-Making"

The transition from paper-based administration and traditional routine to intelligent governance represents a paradigm shift in the "philosophy of administrative discretion" for public officials. Relying on big data analytics and generative models in decision-making diminishes the margin of conjecture or personal impressions in favor of "augmented mathematical rationality." (Farrell, *Artificial Intelligence for the Public Sector: Deep Learning and Generative Models in Governance*, 2023) This transition alters the very architecture of government process engineering; automation shifts from a mere tool for executing rudimentary transactions into an advisory partner that formulates public policy alternatives. Nevertheless, the success of this transformation is contingent upon the existence of rigorous governance frameworks ensuring that these intelligent systems do not morph into instruments that perpetuate bureaucracy in an opaque, digital guise (Helen Margetts, 2019), but rather enhance transparency and governmental accountability to citizens.

Third: The Structural Transformations and the Institutionalization of Cyber-Data Units

The contours of this restructuring manifest in five interconnected organizational transformations that redraw the state's administrative landscape. This paradigm shift begins with the abandonment of paper-bound repositories in favor of intelligent, digital knowledge environments, managed via newly established, autonomous organizational entities within the governmental hierarchy (such as national data offices and business intelligence units). Rather than operating as isolated islands, these units dismantle "data silos" to enforce horizontal coordination and real-time information sharing across various ministries and sovereign institutions. (Klievink, 2017) This cross-institutional orchestration, coupled with the automation of routine tasks, inevitably minimizes the expenditure of time and human effort, thereby enabling the administrative elite to focus on strategic planning and complex crisis management.

Section Three: The Impact of Generative Artificial Intelligence on Public Decision-Making

Decision-making constitutes the core operation of political and administrative organizations. Within this domain, generative artificial intelligence offers immense potential, characterized by analyzing colossal volumes of data, constructing future scenarios, evaluating alternatives, and drafting policies, thereby enhancing both the velocity and quality of decisions. However, this evolution does not eclipse the human role; rather, it imposes a hybrid model wherein human expertise integrates with algorithmic analysis to safeguard legitimacy and accountability. (Simon, 1997) Consequently, artificial intelligence should not be perceived as a substitute for the decision-maker, but rather as a supportive instrument for political and administrative decision-making.

First: Expanding the Boundaries of "Bounded Rationality" and Transcending the Simonian

Dilemma Public decision-making constitutes the core operation of political and administrative organizations, serving as the primary driver for guiding state public policies. Historically, Herbert Simon argued that the human decision-maker invariably suffers from "bounded rationality," owing to the human mind's incapacity to assimilate all data surrounding a problem, coupled with time constraints and the inability to predict the full future consequences of proposed alternatives (Simon, *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making*, 1997). Herein, generative artificial intelligence represents an epistemological leap; it possesses the capability to process and synthesize vast volumes of unstructured data (reports, legislation, citizen feedback) and construct complex, multidimensional future scenarios within critical timeframes. (Secchi, 2011) Consequently, this contributes to "expanding the boundaries of human rationality" and elevating both the quality and velocity of administrative and political decisions.

Second: The Emergence of the "Hybrid Model" and the Problematic of Cognitive Role Allocation

This qualitative evolution in the capabilities of intelligent systems by no means implies the exclusion of the human actor or the erosion of their sovereign role. Rather, it necessitates a transition toward a "hybrid decision-making model," wherein human ethical and political expertise integrates with the analytical efficiency of algorithms. While generative artificial intelligence excels in the "intelligence and design phases" (Kirby, 2016) (comprising research, analysis, and drafting alternative scenarios), the human element remains the custodian of the "choice phase." This final stage demands a value-based, ethical assessment and the political reconciliation of conflicting interests within society. Such an equilibrium is indispensable for safeguarding "political legitimacy" and accountability, thereby ensuring that artificial intelligence does not morph into a substitute for the decision-maker, but rather remains a strategic support instrument subject to the oversight of human agency. (Crawford, 2018)

Third: The Risks of "Automation Bias" and the Vulnerability of Political Decisions

Despite the strategic advantages that generative intelligence offers in accelerating the engineering of public policies, its adoption as an advisory instrument entails severe political and administrative risks, most notably the phenomenon of "automation bias." This refers to the propensity of human decision-makers to over-rely on machine outputs and recommendations without critical examination, assuming their absolute objectivity (Manzey, 2010). This bias, coupled with the generative models' capability to formulate highly persuasive justifications and reports, which may nevertheless be anchored in technical "hallucinations" or pre-biased data can culminate in flawed sovereign or administrative decisions (O'Neil, *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*, 2016) that deepen social disparities and erode public trust in governmental institutions.

Section Four: Opportunities Provided by Artificial Intelligence for Political and Administrative Organizations

These opportunities can be classified into four distinct levels:

First: Administrative Efficiency

- Minimizing time expenditure.
- Mitigating operational costs.
- Optimizing public service delivery.

Second: Enhancing the Quality of Public Policies

- Forecasting emerging problems.
- Analyzing public opinion trends.
- Bolstering strategic planning.

Third: Transparency

- Combating systemic corruption.
- Tracking administrative procedures.
- Deploying intelligent oversight.

Fourth: Enhancing Engagement

- Analyzing citizen proposals.
- Advancing digital services.
- Improving governmental communication.

Furthermore, the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) indicates that artificial intelligence can contribute to enhancing productivity, responsiveness, transparency, and accountability within the public sector, provided that governance mechanisms and trust are firmly established.

First: Operational Efficiency and Enhancing the Quality of Public Policy Engineering

The opportunities offered by generative artificial intelligence at the levels of administrative efficiency and public policy transcend the traditional notion of temporal and material reduction, extending to the reformulation of state outputs. Integrating these systems into the bureaucratic environment contributes to maximizing "optimum productivity" by dismantling bureaucratic waste and mitigating the costs of public service delivery, thereby redirecting human resources toward higher-value tasks (OECD, 2024). This positive impact extends deep into the "public policy-making" process; wherein generative models and predictive analytics afford the capacity for "early crisis forecasting prior to occurrence" and deconstructing complex public opinion trends through the real-time analysis of digital posts and commentaries. (Wollmann, 2019) Consequently, this endows the state's strategic planning with a proactive agility that dismantles reactive bureaucracy, replacing it with an agile, anticipatory governance model.

Second: Structural Transparency and Anti-Corruption via "Intelligent Oversight"

The level of transparency constitutes the fundamental leverage for restoring political trust in public institutions; herein, artificial intelligence provides unprecedented capabilities in engineering "intelligent oversight systems and structural transparency." By tracking administrative procedures with algorithmic precision and monitoring any anomalies or atypical patterns in financial transactions or governmental procurement, the fight against administrative and financial corruption shifts from a "post-facto" detection traditionally conducted by conventional oversight bodies after the damage has occurred to a real-time, "ex-ante" prevention (Kuhlmann, 2019). This paradigm of intelligent oversight minimizes discretionary human intervention, which typically represents a breeding ground for bribery and nepotism, thereby consolidating the principles of institutional integrity and bolstering the state's mechanisms of political and administrative accountability (Margetts, 2011).

Third: Enhancing Democratic Participation and Advancing Interactive Governmental Communication

At the fourth level, generative artificial intelligence unlocks new horizons for advancing "digital and participatory democracy" by re-engineering governmental communication channels. These models possess the capability to sort, summarize, and analyze thousands of proposals, petitions, and complaints submitted by citizens via digital platforms, transforming them into structured inputs for decision-makers (OECD, Governing with Artificial Intelligence: Are Governments Ready, 2024). This ensures that the voices of marginalized groups are heard and broadens the base of political participation. This transition shifts governmental communication from its traditional, unidirectional paradigm (propaganda and mass broadcasting) into an "ongoing, networked, and interactive" model. Within this framework, intelligent and personalized digital services efficiently meet individual citizen needs, ultimately culminating in the construction of "trust-based governance." (Leighninger, 2015)

Section V: Organizational and Legal Challenges

Notwithstanding the advantages, the integration of generative artificial intelligence raises fundamental challenges, most notably:

- Algorithmic bias. The ambiguity of legal liability.
- The protection of personal data. Cyber security threats.
- The deficit of transparency in certain models.
- The potential erosion of human oversight over decision-making.

Reports from the OECD and UNESCO underscore that the responsible deployment of artificial intelligence mandates clear governance frameworks, robust data architecture, capacity-building for human resources, and mechanisms for accountability and oversight.

First: The Epistemological and Ethical Crisis: Algorithmic Bias and the Erosion of Human Sovereignty

The integration of generative artificial intelligence into the public organizational environment confronts a structural challenge rooted in "algorithmic bias." Because these models are trained on historical datasets that may harbor underlying political, racial, or social prejudices, they inevitably reproduce and institutionalize these biases under the guise of the machine's "false objectivity" (O'Neil, *Weapons of Math Destruction: How Big Data Increases Inequality and Threatens Democracy*, 2016). This peril is exacerbated by the structural "deficit of transparency" in complex models; the black box dilemma thereby portending the "erosion of human oversight and sovereignty" over public decision-making. Administrative decision-makers gradually tend to delegate their discretionary authority to intelligent systems, acquiescing to their recommendations without critical review (Pasquale, 2015). Such a trajectory fundamentally threatens the essence of democratic legitimacy, which is predicated on accountable, human choice that is publicly justified.

Second: The Legal and Security Vacuum: Ambiguity of Responsibility and the Breach of Cyberspace

Generative artificial intelligence imposes unprecedented legal and security challenges that disrupt the traditional equilibrium of administrative organization. On one hand, the system provokes an "ambiguity in legal liability" when errors or flawed decisions occur (such as the phenomenon of technical hallucinations in models), thereby creating the "problem of many hands" and fragmenting accountability among the employee, the institution, and the technology companies developing the system (Crawford, *Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability*, 2018). On the other hand, heavy reliance on these models multiplies threats to the state's "cybersecurity," leaving critical informatics and infrastructures vulnerable to breaches. This is compounded by severe risks regarding the "violation of personal data protection" for citizens (Zuboff, 2019) when these generative models are fed their data in the absence of rigorous legislative frameworks protecting the right to privacy.

Third: Requirements for Good Governance and Building Cyber-Institutional Capabilities

In light of these interconnected risks, international reports issued by transnational organizations consensus that the responsible and ethical utilization of artificial intelligence within the public sector cannot succeed as an isolated technological endeavor. Rather, it necessitates the engineering of "clear and comprehensive governance frameworks" that guarantee transparency, accountability, and continuous human oversight (Human-in-the-loop). (OECD, *Governing with Artificial Intelligence: Are Governments Ready?*, 2024) This strategic transition entails constructing a "robust and secure data architecture," in tandem with the "rehabilitation of human capital" and human resources within public institutions. This rehabilitation must be not merely technical, but legal and ethical, thereby empowering the administrative elite to govern these systems and critically examine their outputs rather than being led by them (UNESCO, 2022), which ultimately ensures the preservation of the public good and democratic principles.

Funding: no

Conflict of interest: no

Conclusion

Building upon the aforementioned analysis, it can be argued that embedding generative artificial intelligence within the state's organizational and political architecture does not merely constitute a new phase of technological modernization. Rather, it represents an epistemological paradigm shift that re-engineers the classical concepts of public administration. This study demonstrates that transitioning from the "automation of execution" to a "partnership of cognition" has imposed a novel organizational reality; one in which the rigid boundaries of administrative jurisdiction dissolve, giving rise to fluid, networked structures that transcend traditional Weberian hierarchy.

Nevertheless, this transformation confronts the state with a profound structural dilemma. While generative intelligence unlocks unprecedented horizons for maximizing operational efficiency, expanding the boundaries of bounded rationality in decision-making, and consolidating structural transparency, it simultaneously harbors grave sovereign and legal perils. These risks manifest in the crisis of algorithmic legitimacy, the accountability deficit engendered by the "black box" phenomenon, the institutionalization of statistical bias, and the erosion of human agency in the face of automation bias. Consequently, the definitive conclusion yielded by this research is that generative artificial intelligence can never serve as a surrogate for the human actor; rather, it must remain an advisory instrument subordinated to a "hybrid model" that meticulously calibrates algorithmic efficiency against human sovereignty.

Bibliography

- Crawford, M. A. (2018). Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability. *New Media & Society*, 20(03), 973 - 989.
- Farrell, E. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence for the Public Sector*. European Commission, Joint Research Centre.
- Farrell, E. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence for the Public Sector: Deep Learning and Generative Models in Governance*. Publications Office of the European Union.
- Helen Margetts, C. D. (2019). Rethink public administration for the Government as a Platform. *Policy & Internet*, 274 - 288.
- Kirby, T. H. (2016). *Only Humans Need Apply: Winners and Losers in the Age of Smart Machines*. Harper Business.
- Klievink, B. (2017). Big data in the public sector: Uncertainties and readiness. *Information Policy*, 22(02).
- Kuhlmann, S. &. (2019). *Introduction to comparative public administration: Administrative systems and reforms*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Leighninger, T. N. (2015). *Public Participation for 21st Century Democracy*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Manzey, R. P. (2010). Complacency and Bias in Human Use of Automation. *Human Factors*, 381 - 410.
- Margetts, H. (2011). The internet and public policy: Using the internet to improve regulatory performance. *Policy & Internet*, 3(3).
- Mark Bovens, S. Z. (2002). From bureaucratic to cybercratic governance: Towards management by algorithm in public administration. *Public Administration Review (PAR)*, 62(02), 174-184.
- Mike Ananny, K. C. (2018). Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability. *New Media & Society*, 973-989.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979). *The Structuring of Organizations: A Synthesis of the Research*. Prentice-Hall.
- Natascha Just, M. L. (2017). Governance by algorithms: A conceptual framework. *Media, Culture & Society*, 39(2), 238-258.
- OECD. (2024). *Governing with Artificial Intelligence: Are Governments Ready?* Paris: OECD Publishing.
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of Math Destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishing Group Penguin Random House.
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms That Control Money and Information*. Harvard University Press.
- Patrick Dunleavy, H. M. (2026). *Digital Era Governance: IT Corporations, the State, and e-Government*. Oxford University Press.
- Russell, S. &. (2021). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*. Pearson.
- Schwab, K. &. (2020). (2020). *COVID-19: The Great Reset*. Forum Publishing.
- Secchi, D. (2011). *Extendable Rationality: Understanding Decision Making in Organizations*. Springer (Specifically published within the "Organizational Change and Innovation" book series).
- Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making*. The Free Press.
- Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. New York: The Free Press (A division of Simon & Schuster, New York).
- UNESCO. (2022). *Recommendation on the Ethics of Artificial Intelligence*. UNESCO Digital Library.

- Wollmann, S. K. (2019). *Introduction to Comparative Public Administration: Administrative Systems and Reforms*. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. PublicAffairs Hachette Book Group.