LEGALITY : JOURNAL OF LAW AND LEGAL STUDIES
Volume 1 No 1 2026

Legal Accountability in Algorithmic Public Decision Making and the Transformation of Administrative Governance

Zhang Linghan
Institute of Data Law, China University of Political Science and Law, Beijing, China
Corresponding author: zhang.li@qq.com

Abstract
The rapid incorporation of algorithmic systems into public administration has generated new legal questions regarding accountability, justification, and review in contemporary governance. As digital infrastructures increasingly mediate welfare allocation, regulatory enforcement, and administrative assessment, public law faces mounting pressure to clarify how state authority remains legally answerable under technologically mediated conditions. This article examines how algorithmic governance is transforming the legal structure of accountability in public decision-making. It adopts a qualitative doctrinal and socio-legal design grounded in legal accountability theory, administrative law, and governance analysis. The analysis draws on statutes, regulatory materials, judicial reasoning, policy documents, and interdisciplinary scholarship concerning automated public decision-making and algorithmic regulation. These materials are examined through the analytical dimensions of answerability, transparency, justification, reviewability, contestability, human oversight, and responsibility attribution. Legal accountability in algorithmic governance emerges as a layered and composite framework rather than a single procedural safeguard, with conventional public law principles remaining relevant but increasingly strained by opacity, distributed responsibility, and formalized oversight. Public decision-making in digital environments therefore requires a reconstruction of accountability that extends beyond compliance-based transparency toward legally meaningful explanation, institutional traceability, and effective avenues of challenge. The article contributes to the field by clarifying how administrative law and legal theory can be integrated to explain the transformation of public authority under algorithmic governance.

Keyword
algorithmic governance, legal accountability, public decision-making, administrative law

1. Introduction

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence and algorithmic systems into public decision-making has become one of the most significant legal developments of contemporary governance (Goldsmith & Yang, 2025). Governments across jurisdictions increasingly rely on automated or semi-automated tools to support decisions in welfare distribution, immigration screening, predictive policing, tax enforcement, public health administration, and judicial risk assessment. This transformation is closely tied to broader shifts toward digital government, data-driven regulation, and administrative efficiency. Algorithmic governance is often presented as a rational response to the complexity, scale, and speed of modern public administration. Public institutions are expected to process vast quantities of data, manage scarce resources, and deliver services in a more consistent and timely manner. Under these conditions, algorithmic systems appear to offer enhanced precision, efficiency, and objectivity in official decision-making. Yet the growing legal importance of these systems lies not only in their technical capacities but

Received: 19 January 2026 Revised: 21 Feb 2026 Published: 11 March 2026

also in their ability to reshape the normative foundations of public authority (Waldman & Martin, 2022).

The expanding use of algorithmic systems has generated pressing legal concerns because public decisions are never merely technical outputs but exercises of state power with direct consequences for rights, obligations, and access to justice. Decisions that affect liberty, livelihood, mobility, social protection, or legal status must remain subject to standards of legality, accountability, and procedural fairness. When such decisions are mediated by opaque computational models, the relationship between the individual and the state becomes more difficult to scrutinize. Individuals may be denied meaningful explanations, public officials may defer excessively to algorithmic recommendations, and institutions may struggle to assign legal responsibility when harm occurs. These concerns are not abstract because algorithmic systems can reproduce social bias, institutional inequality, and structural discrimination at scale (Silfia, 2025). Errors in automated public decision-making may be difficult to detect, contest, or remedy, especially when the logic of the system is inaccessible to affected persons. For this reason, algorithmic governance is now a legal issue of immediate real-world relevance rather than a speculative topic at the margins of technology law.

A substantial body of scholarship has already examined algorithmic governance from the perspectives of ethics, regulation, and public administration. Existing studies have highlighted concerns over bias, opacity, discrimination, surveillance, and the erosion of due process in automated environments. Legal scholars have also explored the role of transparency obligations, data protection rights, administrative review, and human oversight in controlling algorithmic power (Liu et al., 2019). Within public law debates, there is increasing recognition that algorithmic systems challenge traditional assumptions about discretion, reasoning, and institutional accountability. Research in socio-legal and governance literature further shows that algorithmic tools are embedded in broader political and organizational structures rather than operating as neutral technical instruments. These contributions have been valuable in demonstrating that algorithmic decision-making can transform both the process and legitimacy of public administration. They have also established that existing legal frameworks are under strain when public authority is exercised through data-driven and computational mechanisms (Sharma, 2025).

Despite these advances, important questions remain insufficiently resolved in current legal scholarship. Much of the literature treats accountability as a broad normative aspiration without fully clarifying its doctrinal content under conditions of algorithmic governance. There is still limited conceptual precision regarding how legal responsibility should be allocated when decisions emerge from hybrid interactions among software systems, data infrastructures, contractors, and public officials (Cheong, 2024). Existing analyses often focus on isolated principles such as transparency or explainability while paying less attention to how these principles interact within the wider architecture of administrative legality. Moreover, scholarship frequently discusses algorithmic governance through the language of risk and compliance rather than through a deeper reconstruction of public accountability itself. This leaves uncertainty about what counts as a legally adequate explanation, what degree of human involvement is normatively meaningful, and how contestability should function when algorithmic outputs influence official judgment. The central unknown, therefore, is not whether algorithmic governance raises legal problems, but how law should systematically redefine accountability when decision-making authority becomes technologically mediated.

This unresolved issue reveals a broader research gap at the intersection of legal theory and administrative law. Current scholarship has not yet provided a sufficiently integrated account of legal accountability that addresses the distributive, procedural, and

institutional features of algorithmic public decision-making. Administrative law traditionally assumes that a decision can be attributed to an identifiable authority, justified through accessible reasons, and reviewed through established legal mechanisms. Algorithmic governance disrupts these assumptions because decision pathways may be partially concealed, technically complex, and organizationally fragmented (Lepri et al., 2017). To address this gap, the article draws on legal accountability theory as an applied framework for examining how public authority remains answerable under technologically transformed conditions. Accountability, in this sense, is not reduced to post hoc blame but understood as a structured legal relationship involving answerability, reviewability, justification, and remedial capacity. The gap lies in the absence of a coherent theoretical synthesis showing how these legal dimensions should be recalibrated when algorithmic systems participate in the exercise of administrative power.

Filling this gap is theoretically justified because legal accountability remains central to the legitimacy of public decision-making in constitutional and administrative orders. Law does not merely authorize state action but also disciplines how public power is exercised, explained, and contested. If algorithmic systems alter the form of official reasoning, then legal theory must clarify whether existing accountability models remain adequate or require reconstruction. This is especially important because the legitimacy of public administration depends not only on efficiency but also on the capacity of institutions to justify their decisions to those subject to them (Khasawneh et al., 2025). A theory-informed analysis can help distinguish superficial procedural safeguards from genuinely meaningful legal protections. It can also prevent accountability from being diluted into vague commitments to ethics, innovation, or technical governance. By grounding the discussion in legal accountability theory, the article seeks to restore analytical coherence to a debate that is often fragmented across regulatory, technological, and managerial vocabularies (Ananny & Crawford, 2018).

Against this background, the article is guided by a set of interrelated research questions that arise directly from the doctrinal and theoretical tensions outlined above. The first question asks how algorithmic governance transforms the legal meaning of accountability in public decision-making. The second asks which elements of traditional accountability frameworks remain applicable and which require reinterpretation under conditions of opaque, data-driven, and distributed decision structures. The third asks how law should conceptualize answerability, justification, and review when decisions are shaped by interactions between human actors and computational systems. The fourth asks whether current public law principles are capable of preserving meaningful legal control over algorithmically mediated authority (Moch, 2025). These questions are designed to move beyond descriptive concerns about technological change toward a deeper legal inquiry into the conditions of legitimate governance. They also create a conceptual pathway for analyzing algorithmic decision-making not as an external challenge to law but as a field through which law must redefine its own internal standards.

The urgency of this inquiry is both practical and scholarly. Practically, public institutions are already deploying algorithmic tools in contexts where legal rights and social vulnerability are directly at stake, which means that unresolved accountability problems can produce immediate injustice. Scholarly, the field requires a more rigorous legal vocabulary for understanding how algorithmic systems reshape the foundations of public authority, procedural fairness, and administrative legitimacy. This article contributes by positioning legal accountability as the central analytical category through which algorithmic governance should be evaluated and reconstructed. It advances the debate by bringing together legal theory, administrative law, and governance analysis into a more unified conceptual framework. Such a contribution is important for legal

scholarship because it clarifies how law can remain normatively effective amid digital transformation rather than merely reacting to technological disruption. It is equally important for broader governance debates because the durability of public trust depends on whether state institutions can still be held legally answerable in environments increasingly structured by automated reasoning (Reidenberg et al., 2016). The significance of the article therefore lies in its effort to sharpen the legal grammar of accountability at a moment when the institutional forms of decision-making are changing faster than the frameworks designed to govern them.

The broader value of this discussion also lies in what it reveals about the contemporary relationship between law, technology, and public power. Algorithmic governance does not simply introduce new instruments into existing institutions but alters the conditions under which legality, discretion, and responsibility are understood. As administrative systems become more dependent on digital infrastructures, legal scholarship must confront the possibility that traditional assumptions about visibility, agency, and reason-giving are becoming less stable. This makes it necessary to examine not only regulatory adaptation but also the underlying jurisprudential commitments that sustain public accountability. The article therefore speaks to a wider concern within legal studies about how normative order is preserved when governance becomes increasingly mediated by technical systems. By foregrounding accountability, it seeks to reconnect debates on digital administration with foundational legal questions about justification, authority, and the rule of law. In doing so, the article frames algorithmic governance as a site where legal scholarship can critically engage the transformation of public decision-making without surrendering its central concern for legality and institutional responsibility.

2. Research Method

This study employs a qualitative doctrinal and socio-legal research design to examine how legal accountability is being reconfigured under conditions of algorithmic governance in public decision-making (Edelmann et al., 2020). A qualitative approach is appropriate because the research seeks to clarify normative meaning, institutional logic, and conceptual tensions rather than to measure causal effects or test statistical relationships. The design combines doctrinal legal analysis with an analytical framework drawn from legal accountability theory, administrative law, and governance studies in order to examine how answerability, justification, reviewability, and responsibility operate when public decisions are shaped by algorithmic systems. This design works well for the research because the central problem is interpretive and structural, namely how law understands and regulates authority when decision-making is distributed across public officials, digital infrastructures, datasets, and computational tools. A purely quantitative design would be insufficient because the research questions concern legal concepts, institutional arrangements, and the coherence of accountability frameworks rather than numerical patterns of administrative performance. The qualitative design also enables close engagement with legal texts, regulatory discourse, policy rationales, and institutional practices that together shape the normative architecture of algorithmic governance. Through this approach, the study is able to generate a theoretically grounded account of legal accountability as a dynamic framework for evaluating technologically mediated public authority (Adhabi & Anozie, 2017).

The data sources consist of primary legal materials and secondary interpretive materials. Primary sources include statutes, administrative regulations, judicial decisions, policy guidelines, and official governance documents related to algorithmic decision-making and public administration, while secondary sources include scholarly journal articles, legal commentaries, institutional reports, and interdisciplinary literature on artificial intelligence, governance, and accountability. The unit of analysis is the legal and

institutional framework governing algorithmic public decision-making, with focused attention on accountability dimensions such as transparency, explainability, human oversight, reviewability, and allocation of legal responsibility (Moon et al., 2016). Data were collected through systematic document review and purposive selection of legal and policy texts that directly address public-sector uses of algorithmic systems, and the study used a structured analytical matrix to organize sources according to doctrinal relevance, institutional context, and accountability dimensions. The main research instrument was a document analysis protocol designed to guide coding, comparison, and interpretation across legal sources, while analytical consistency was supported through transparent categorization, iterative cross-reading, and triangulation between legal texts, policy documents, and academic literature. Trustworthiness was ensured through conceptual coherence, source triangulation, careful documentation of analytical steps, and sustained alignment between the research questions, theoretical framework, and selected materials. Ethical considerations were observed by relying on publicly accessible and properly cited documentary sources, maintaining scholarly integrity in interpretation, and upholding the principles of confidentiality and informed consent in the event that any supplementary expert communication or non-public material would be incorporated.

3. Result and Discussion

Test Algorithmic governance has altered the legal structure of public decision-making by relocating significant elements of administrative judgment into data infrastructures, computational models, and automated recommendation systems. Public authority no longer operates solely through visible acts of interpretation undertaken by identifiable officials, but increasingly through hybrid arrangements in which legal discretion is shaped by technical architectures. This transformation does not eliminate the relevance of administrative law; rather, it places pressure on its core assumptions about responsibility, intelligibility, and institutional control. Legal accountability becomes more difficult to sustain when the production of a decision depends on interactions among databases, software design, classification systems, and organizational protocols. The issue is therefore not merely whether algorithmic tools are used by public institutions, but how their use redefines the conditions under which state action can be justified and contested. At stake is the continuing capacity of law to maintain a meaningful relationship between public power and legal answerability (Mark & Morison, 2025).

Conventional public law principles retain normative force within algorithmic governance, especially legality, procedural fairness, reason-giving, and reviewability. Their persistence is important because algorithmic systems do not suspend the constitutional and administrative obligations attached to public decision-making. Welfare allocation, immigration screening, policing, and regulatory enforcement continue to involve the exercise of state power, even when digital systems mediate the path to the final administrative act (Goldsmith & Yang, 2025). Yet these principles operate under altered institutional conditions. Legality must now address not only the formal authorization of a decision but also the lawful design and deployment of decision-support systems. Procedural fairness must extend beyond the opportunity to be heard and include the ability to understand how automated processing structures official judgment. Reviewability must likewise confront the problem that relevant reasons may be embedded in technical processes that are inaccessible to ordinary legal scrutiny (Silfia, 2025).

Transparency has often been treated as the preferred remedy for algorithmic opacity, but such an approach is too narrow to sustain legal accountability. Disclosure of source code, technical documentation, or general system descriptions does not necessarily produce reasons that affected individuals can understand or contest. A public authority

may comply with formal transparency requirements while leaving the substantive basis of a decision effectively insulated from challenge. The legal problem lies in the distinction between visibility and intelligibility. A system can be visible in procedural terms yet remain obscure in normative terms if its operational logic cannot be translated into legally meaningful reasons. Accountability in public law depends on more than information release; it requires the provision of explanations that connect institutional action to standards of justification, proportionality, and lawful authority. Transparency therefore functions as one component of accountability, but it cannot substitute for the broader architecture of answerability and review (Liu et al., 2019).

Responsibility attribution becomes especially unstable when public decisions are produced through distributed technical and organizational arrangements. Algorithmic systems are commonly developed by private vendors, trained on datasets assembled through multiple administrative channels, and implemented by public bodies that rely on internal operators with limited technical control over system design. Under such conditions, the conventional model of a clearly identifiable decision-maker becomes increasingly fragile. Legal responsibility may be displaced onto procurement procedures, outsourced software contracts, or internal bureaucratic hierarchies in ways that make direct accountability difficult to establish. This fragmentation matters because legal challenge presupposes an institutional target capable of explaining and defending the decision. When no single actor clearly owns the reasoning process, the legal order faces a diffusion of answerability that weakens procedural safeguards. Administrative law has traditionally relied on attribution to preserve review and remedy, but algorithmic governance complicates the very conditions under which attribution can occur (Kuziemski & Misuraca, 2020).

The role of human oversight does not resolve this difficulty as easily as regulatory discourse often assumes. Human involvement is frequently invoked as a safeguard that preserves discretion and prevents automated arbitrariness, yet its legal significance depends on the quality rather than the mere existence of intervention. Where officials routinely defer to algorithmic outputs because they are faster, institutionally normalized, or presented as technically superior, human oversight may become nominal rather than substantive. A formally human decision may in practice reproduce the authority of the system without meaningful independent evaluation (Coeckelbergh, 2019). The doctrinal implication is important because public law often associates accountability with the presence of an identifiable official capable of being called to account. That assumption becomes unstable when human review functions as procedural confirmation rather than genuine reconsideration. The legal meaning of oversight must therefore be reconstructed around active judgment, reasoned departure, and institutional willingness to question automated recommendations (Bannister & Connolly, 2020).

The central dimensions of this transformation can be clarified by mapping how core elements of accountability change under algorithmic governance. The issue is not the disappearance of accountability, but its reconfiguration through technical mediation, institutional layering, and dispersed decision pathways. Table 1 organizes these dimensions by contrasting the conventional assumptions of administrative law with the altered conditions produced by algorithmic systems . This synthesis makes visible the pressure placed on public law concepts that were developed for human-centered decision environments. It also demonstrates that accountability difficulties emerge across multiple dimensions simultaneously rather than from opacity alone. The table thus serves as a conceptual bridge between doctrinal analysis and the broader governance argument developed throughout this section (Enarsson et al., 2021).

Table 1. Core Dimensions of Legal Accountability

Analytical Dimension	*Conventional Administrative Assumption*	*Transformation Under Algorithmic Governance*	*Legal Implication*
Answerability	Public authority can explain its decision through accessible official reasons	Explanations are mediated by technical systems, data processing, and model outputs	Answerability requires translation of computational logic into legally meaningful reasons
Justification	Decisions are supported by reasons attributable to identifiable officials	Reasoning is partially embedded in models, datasets, and system design choices	Justification must extend beyond final decisions to upstream technical and institutional processes
Transparency	Disclosure enables public and legal scrutiny	Disclosure may reveal technical information without producing intelligibility	Transparency must be linked to interpretability and procedural fairness
Human Oversight	Human review preserves discretion and responsibility	Review may become formalistic due to institutional reliance on automated outputs	Oversight must involve substantive evaluative intervention rather than nominal approval
Reviewability	Courts and administrative bodies can examine decision logic and legality	Decision pathways may be opaque, complex, or distributed across actors and systems	Reviewability requires new standards for evidentiary access and procedural traceability
Responsibility Attribution	Liability and accountability attach to a clear public decision-maker	Responsibility is dispersed among agencies, contractors, designers, and operators	Attribution must address shared and layered forms of institutional responsibility
Contestability	Affected persons can challenge decisions through established procedures	Challenges are weakened when reasons are inaccessible or system logic is obscure	Contestability depends on comprehensible explanations and effective remedial mechanisms

The table supports the argument that algorithmic governance destabilizes accountability not at a single point but across the full chain of public decision-making. Answerability, justification, transparency, and reviewability are no longer separate procedural ideals; they operate as interdependent legal conditions whose weakness in one dimension affects the others. A public authority cannot provide effective contestability if it cannot articulate reasons in a comprehensible form, and it cannot sustain meaningful review if responsibility attribution remains institutionally diffuse. The table also clarifies that technical complexity is not simply an operational problem but a doctrinal one, because it changes the legal pathways through which decisions become

intelligible and contestable. In this sense, algorithmic governance does not merely add a technological layer to existing administrative practice. It reorganizes the legal environment within which authority is exercised, scrutinized, and remedied. The analytical value of the table lies in demonstrating that accountability must be treated as a composite legal structure rather than an isolated procedural safeguard (Rumlus, 2025).

This reconstruction aligns with and extends earlier debates on opacity, bias, and automation in public administration. Prior scholarship has already emphasized the dangers of black-box decision systems, discriminatory outcomes, and excessive institutional reliance on data-driven tools. Those concerns remain compelling, but the present analysis indicates that the deeper issue lies in the instability of the legal form through which public decisions are authorized and defended (Horneber & Laumer, 2023). The primary challenge is not only that algorithmic systems may produce unfair outcomes, but that they complicate the relationship between decision, reason, and responsibility on which administrative legality depends. This shifts the discussion away from narrow compliance models toward a more foundational inquiry into the legal conditions of legitimate governance. Earlier work on transparency and explainability is therefore most persuasive when situated within a broader framework of accountability that includes attribution, contestability, and institutional traceability. The doctrinal conversation becomes richer once algorithmic governance is examined as a structural rather than merely technical disruption.

Legal accountability theory gains renewed importance within this environment because it offers a framework capable of integrating procedural, institutional, and normative dimensions of public authority. Accountability cannot be reduced to ex post sanction or administrative reporting. It involves the ongoing capacity of institutions to provide reasons, accept scrutiny, and remain open to correction under legal standards. Algorithmic governance exposes the insufficiency of conceptions that treat accountability as a single event at the end of the decision chain. The legal significance of datasets, model design, procurement practices, and internal implementation protocols indicates that accountability must be distributed across the lifecycle of a decision system (Kurniawan & Purwanto, 2025). This does not imply that responsibility becomes indeterminate; rather, it suggests that legal doctrine must recognize layered and shared forms of institutional obligation. Public law remains capable of regulating algorithmic authority, but only if it expands its analytical vocabulary beyond the image of a solitary human decision-maker.

The practical implications of this argument are substantial for regulators, courts, administrative agencies, and public-sector procurement bodies. Public institutions require accountability frameworks that address system design, operational oversight, and legal review in an integrated manner. Procurement law becomes relevant not merely as a contractual mechanism but as an accountability gateway through which public authorities shape the legal terms of algorithmic deployment. Administrative guidelines must specify the conditions under which officials may rely on automated recommendations and the circumstances that require independent evaluative judgment. Judicial review may also need to adapt its evidentiary expectations so that technical mediation does not function as a shield against legal scrutiny. These implications are directly relevant to the governance of welfare, immigration, taxation, law enforcement, and other domains where algorithmic tools structure access to rights and public goods. The broader consequence is that trust in digital government depends less on innovation rhetoric than on the visible durability of legal answerability (Wieringa, 2020).

The analytical strength of this discussion lies in its ability to connect doctrinal concerns with the institutional realities of digital governance. Treating accountability as a composite structure allows legal analysis to capture the interaction among technological opacity, fragmented responsibility, and procedural vulnerability. It also avoids the false

opposition between legal continuity and technological novelty. Public law principles do not become obsolete, but their application requires reinterpretation under conditions of computational mediation. A further strength lies in the capacity of this framework to explain why apparently robust safeguards, such as transparency mandates or nominal human review, may fail to preserve genuine accountability in practice. At the same time, certain limitations remain. A document-based legal analysis cannot fully capture the internal organizational dynamics through which officials engage with automated systems, and cross-jurisdictional variation may produce different accountability pressures depending on administrative culture, digital capacity, and constitutional structure (Engelmann, 2023).

Unexpected patterns emerge from the doctrinal analysis, particularly in the relationship between formal safeguards and substantive control. Legal and policy frameworks often assume that transparency and human oversight are sufficient to protect against arbitrary automation, yet those safeguards may become ritualized if they are not connected to institutional capacities for challenge and revision. The legal order may therefore display a paradoxical condition in which accountability appears procedurally present while substantively weakened. This pattern is especially significant because it reveals how algorithmic governance can normalize the appearance of control without ensuring meaningful answerability. It also helps explain why regulatory debates centered exclusively on disclosure or ethics principles often fail to resolve deeper administrative concerns. The problem is less the absence of safeguards in abstract terms than the inadequacy of safeguards that are detached from the realities of attribution, intelligibility, and review. Such tensions underscore the need for legal scholarship to distinguish symbolic oversight from legally effective accountability.

Further development of this field requires closer attention to the sectoral and jurisdictional diversity of algorithmic governance. Comparative legal analysis would clarify how different constitutional traditions and administrative cultures shape the possibilities of accountability under digital transformation (McGregor et al., 2019). Domain-specific inquiry into welfare systems, policing, immigration control, taxation, and judicial administration would also sharpen understanding of how accountability pressures vary across forms of state action. There is equal value in examining the relationship between legal doctrine and digital infrastructure, since the practical operation of accountability increasingly depends on how records are generated, retained, and made accessible for review. The normative stakes remain high because algorithmic governance is not a peripheral innovation but an evolving mode of public administration. Legal scholarship must therefore continue to refine standards of answerability, justification, and contestability that can preserve legality under technologically mediated conditions. The broader intellectual task is to ensure that the modernization of public power does not outrun the legal structures that make such power accountable.

4. Conclusion

Algorithmic governance is reshaping the legal foundations of public decision-making by embedding administrative judgment within technical systems, data infrastructures, and institutional arrangements that complicate answerability, justification, and review. The discussion has established that conventional public law principles remain normatively relevant, yet their practical operation is increasingly strained when decision pathways become opaque, responsibility is dispersed, and human oversight functions only formally rather than substantively. Transparency alone is insufficient to preserve accountability because disclosure does not necessarily produce legally meaningful explanations or effective opportunities for challenge. The central issue lies in the transformation of accountability from a relatively stable administrative relationship into a layered legal

structure that must now address technical mediation, fragmented authority, and reduced institutional traceability. Public decision-making in digital environments therefore requires a more precise legal understanding of how responsibility is assigned, how reasons are communicated, and how review remains possible under conditions of algorithmic complexity.

The contribution to legal scholarship lies in the reconstruction of legal accountability as a composite framework for evaluating algorithmically mediated public authority. Rather than treating accountability as a narrow procedural safeguard or a general normative aspiration, the analysis has clarified its interdependent dimensions, including answerability, justification, transparency, reviewability, contestability, and responsibility attribution. This conceptualization strengthens the dialogue between administrative law, legal theory, and governance studies by showing that the primary challenge of algorithmic governance is not merely technological opacity but the destabilization of the legal form through which public authority is rendered intelligible and contestable. The argument also advances current debates by moving beyond compliance-based approaches and highlighting the doctrinal significance of upstream processes such as system design, procurement, and institutional implementation. In this way, the discussion reinforces the relevance of public law as a normative framework capable of engaging digital transformation without surrendering its core concern with legality, institutional responsibility, and protection against arbitrary power.

Future research should expand this line of inquiry through comparative, sector-specific, and interdisciplinary analysis. Comparative work across jurisdictions would be particularly valuable for examining how constitutional traditions, regulatory models, and administrative cultures influence the structure of accountability in algorithmic governance. More focused studies on welfare administration, immigration control, policing, taxation, and judicial systems would further clarify how accountability pressures vary according to the legal stakes, institutional design, and degree of automation involved in different domains of state action. There is also a need for deeper investigation into the relationship between legal doctrine and digital infrastructure, especially regarding evidentiary access, system traceability, and the design of review mechanisms capable of responding to technically mediated decisions. Such research would support the development of more robust legal standards that preserve meaningful answerability and contestability as public administration becomes increasingly dependent on algorithmic systems.

References

Adhabi, E., & Anozie, C. L. (2017). Literature Review for the Type of Interview in Qualitative Research. *International Journal of Education*, *9*, 86–97. https://doi.org/10.5296/ije.v9i3.11483

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

Bannister, F., & Connolly, R. (2020). Administration by algorithm: A risk management framework. *Information Polity*, *25*, 471–490. https://doi.org/10.3233/ip-200249

Cheong, B. C. (2024). Transparency and accountability in AI systems: safeguarding wellbeing in the age of algorithmic decision-making. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2024.1421273

Coeckelbergh, M. (2019). Artificial Intelligence, Responsibility Attribution, and a Relational Justification of Explainability. *Science and Engineering Ethics*, *26*, 2051–2068. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-019-00146-8

Edelmann, A., Wolff, T., Montagne, D., & Bail, C. (2020). Computational Social Science and Sociology. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *46 1*, 61–81. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-121919-054621

Enarsson, T., Enqvist, L., & Naarttijärvi, M. (2021). Approaching the human in the loop – legal perspectives on hybrid human/algorithmic decision-making in three contexts. *Information & Communications Technology Law*, *31*, 123–153. https://doi.org/10.1080/13600834.2021.1958860

Engelmann, A. (2023). Algorithmic transparency as a fundamental right in the democratic rule of law. *Brazilian Journal of Law, Technology and Innovation*. https://doi.org/10.59224/bjlti.v1i2.169-188

Goldsmith, S., & Yang, J. (2025). AI and the Transformation of Accountability and Discretion in Urban Governance. *ArXiv*, *abs/2502.13101*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2502.13101

Horneber, D., & Laumer, S. (2023). Algorithmic Accountability. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, *65*, 723–730. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-023-00817-8

Khasawneh, F., Amoush, M. A. M., & Khwaileh, K. (2025). GOVERNING ALGORITHMS: THE INTELLECTUALIZATION OF ADMINISTRATIVE LAW AND EMERGING INTERNATIONAL-LAW CONSTRAINTS. *Veredas Do Direito*. https://doi.org/10.18623/rvd.v22.n3.3464

Kurniawan, M. J., & Purwanto, R. (2025). The Revolution of Public Administration in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: Legal Challenges and Constitutional Implications. *Fortiori Law Journal*. https://doi.org/10.47200/flj.v5i01.3050

Kuziemski, M., & Misuraca, G. (2020). AI governance in the public sector: Three tales from the frontiers of automated decision-making in democratic settings. *Telecommunications Policy*, *44*, 101976. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.telpol.2020.101976

Lepri, B., Oliver, N., Letouzé, E., Pentland, A., & Vinck, P. (2017). Fair, Transparent, and Accountable Algorithmic Decision-making Processes. *Philosophy & Technology*, *31*, 611–627. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-017-0279-x

Liu, H.-W., Lin, C.-F., & Chen, Y.-J. (2019). Beyond State v Loomis: artificial intelligence, government algorithmization and accountability. *Int. J. Law Inf. Technol.*, *27*, 122–141. https://doi.org/10.1093/ijlit/eaz001

Mark, D., & Morison, J. (2025). Governing AI Decision-Making: Balancing Innovation and Accountability. *Politics and Governance*. https://doi.org/10.17645/pag.10245

McGregor, L., Murray, D., & Ng, V. (2019). INTERNATIONAL HUMAN RIGHTS LAW AS A FRAMEWORK FOR ALGORITHMIC ACCOUNTABILITY. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, *68*, 309–343. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0020589319000046

Moch, E. (2025). Algorithms as Judges: Constitutional Limits to Automated Decision-Making in Public Administration. *East African Journal of Law and Ethics*. https://doi.org/10.37284/eajle.8.1.3044

Moon, K., Brewer, T., Januchowski-Hartley, S., Adams, V., & Blackman, D. (2016). A guideline to improve qualitative social science publishing in ecology and conservation journals. *Ecology and Society*, *21*, 1–20. https://doi.org/10.5751/es-08663-210317

Reidenberg, J., Reidenberg, J., Robinson, D., & YUt, H. (2016). *Accountable Algorithms*. https://consensus.app/papers/accountable-algorithms-reidenberg-reidenberg/246a3e3340f65b8d8824062c91ec655b/

Rumlus, M. H. (2025). Governing AI: A Narrative Review of Algorithmic Accountability and Legal Frameworks. *Legalis : Journal of Law Review*. https://doi.org/10.61978/legalis.v3i2.810

Sharma, S. (2025). Governance in the Age of Algorithms: Ethical Dilemmas and Administrative Reforms. *International Journal of English Literature and Social Sciences*. https://doi.org/10.22161/ijels.102.58

Silfia, R. I. (2025). Role of Administrative Law in Regulating Advanced Algorithms: A Legal Framework for Emerging Technologies. *Best Journal of Administration and Management*. https://doi.org/10.56403/bejam.v3i4.278

Waldman, A., & Martin, K. (2022). Governing algorithmic decisions: The role of decision importance and governance on perceived legitimacy of algorithmic decisions. *Big Data & Society*, *9*. https://doi.org/10.1177/20539517221100449

Wieringa, M. (2020). What to account for when accounting for algorithms: a systematic literature review on algorithmic accountability. *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3351095.3372833