Sociology & Cultural Research Review (SCRR)
Available Online: https://scrrjournal.com
Print ISSN: 3007-3103 Online ISSN: 3007-3111
Platform & Workflow by: Open Journal Systems
https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20647777

Algorithm Governance in Social Welfare: A Narrative Review of Data-Driven Decision-Making in Social Work and Policy

Saad Siddique Khan (Corresponding Author)
Ph.D. Scholar, Department of Social Work | University of the Punjab, Lahore
saadsiddiquekhan123@gmail.com
Dr. Sonia Omer
Associate Professor, Department of Social Work | University of the Punjab, Lahore
Sonia.dsw@pu.edu.pk
Khadija Tariq Khan
Visiting Lecturer, Department of Social Work | University of the Punjab, Lahore
Khadija.dsw@pu.edu.pk

ABSTRACT
This paper discusses the increased use of data analytics and algorithmic decision-support systems in the social sciences, focusing specifically on the implications of such systems to governance of social welfare in Pakistan. It also critically assesses the opportunities, the risk and the policy considerations of the digital transformation of welfare administration. The paper is conducted in the form of a narrative review of interdisciplinary sources on the topics of social policy, algorithmic governance, data ethics, and digital public administration. It summarizes the world evidence and puts the findings into context in the emerging digital welfare environment in Pakistan. Data analytics can provide a substantial opportunity in enhancing precision in targeting, administrative efficiency, and evidence-based policy making in social protection program of Pakistan. Nevertheless, algorithmic bias, data quality constraints, digital exclusion, privacy risks, and lax regulatory oversight risks can cause social inequalities to worsen. Unless there are strong governance systems, automated systems may work to strengthen structural discrimination instead of reducing poverty. The paper suggests reinforcing laws on data protection, providing algorithmic impact testing, investing in institutional capacity, and human intervention in the welfare decision-making process. To protect the equity and the trust of people, participatory and context-sensitive modes of governance are necessary.

Keywords: *AI Governance; Data Analytics; Data Ethics; Social Welfare Policy, Predictive Decision Support System*

1. Introduction

The introduction of the digital revolution in the field of the public administration has transformed the social welfare systems worldwide, introducing the concept of the algorithmic governance, where the computational systems design, inform, or even substitute the human decision-making (Danaher et al., 2017). Algorithms are currently being used in welfare settings to aid risk assessment in child protection, automatize the eligibility of benefits, detect fraud, and track on the delivery of services. These technologies are based on big administrative data, machine learning, and predictive modeling, which can be seen as a transition to evidence-based practice of using big data to predictive governance (Batool et al., 2025; Gambrill, 2019; Keddell, 2019).

This change can be supported by the overall trend toward evidence-based policymaking, which puts more emphasis on measurable results, accountability, and efficiency. Predictive analytics is able to see vulnerability patterns, determine early signs of damage and optimize resource use. Child protection risk modeling systems, as an example, can conceptually warn of high-risk families of maltreatment, and automated types of eligibility systems can decrease delays and bureaucracy, which may minimize human-centric bias (Ayeni et al., 2026; Eubanks, 2018).

Although, there are ethical, social, and political issues brought forth through the algorithmic governance. These systems are not neutral; they incorporate design assumptions and historical biases that are reflected in administrative data that can reproduce or strengthen inequalities. To give an example, AI-supported welfare technologies can group vulnerable communities in the wrong category or strive to care less about people, skewing their service in favor of the marginalized population (Ahmad et al., 2025; Hassen, 2025). The Global South-related research also presents the role of the social hierarchy, the lack of control, and the inadequacy of regulatory frameworks in aggravating algorithmic bias and unfair results (Biju & Gayathri, 2026).

Accountability is also complicated by transparency. A large number of AI systems are black box, where the risk scores or suggestions are yielded without clear explanation. This not to say a word undermines procedural justice among clients, not to mention that social workers are likely to be expected to comply with the output of algorithms that they cannot completely interpret (Aarab et al., 2025; Keddell, 2019). In the less developed countries such difficulties are compounded. The governments are moving fast to implement digital tools of governance including biometric identification systems and centralized welfare databases, often faster than the creation of data protection legislation and institutional protections. Unless they are properly regulated, algorithmic systems may be abused and abused by sensitive information, privacy-violating, and marginalized groups digitally (Ayeni et al., 2026; Nkongolo, 2026).

In theory, algorithmic governance represents larger tendencies of technocratic and managerial government. The use of predictive modeling, the use of performance measurements and reduction of costs coincide with neoliberal logics of efficiency and cost-effectiveness. This framing has the power to depoliticize social issues and make complex structural problems such as poverty and inequality to be technical problems that can be resolved through the optimization of data (Batool et al., 2025; O'Neil, 2017). Critics believe that excessive dependence on algorithms is dangerous as it may lead to a bias in favor of risk management in place of relational, community-oriented, and empowerment-based social work practices (Ayeni et al., 2026; Keddell, 2019).

Although these issues exist, robotized procedures can support human decision-making under ethical constraints. Examples of frameworks which suggest that the final decision is made by human discretion and responsibility include human-in-the-loop applications of AI in decision making in these frameworks, AI outputs are informative, not determinative (Danaher et al., 2017; Kemal, 2026). Equally, global AI governance projects, such as the Framework Convention on Artificial Intelligence (European Commission, 2021), focus on human rights, transparency, and equity in the use of AI in the public sector. All these are meant to make sure that AI does not reinforce social welfare goals without adding to the inequities (Nkongolo, 2026).

In the context of social work, there are both opportunities and normative challenges of the emergence of algorithmic governance. AI has the potential to enhance early intervention, inter-agency coordination and targeting of resources, but only with ethical protections, mitigation plans and participatory controls. The algorithmic implementation should be guided by social work

values, such as social justice, dignity, autonomy, and accountability to avoid the continuation of structural inequalities by digital welfare systems (Eubanks, 2018; Hassen, 2025; Kemal, 2026).

This paper thus discusses the origin and the implications of algorithmic governance in social welfare policy and practice. It identifies the conceptual backgrounds of data analytics and data-driven decision-support systems, summarizes the main applications to the social services domain, and evaluates the opportunities and risks critically. Special focus is placed on the bias, transparency, accountability, and professional autonomy and on the problems in the developing countries where institutional protection can be unequal. The research places algorithmic governance into the ethical context of social work, which also makes it relevant to the discussions of responsible innovation in the area of social policy.

To sum up, the implementation of AI and data analytics in welfare governance creates a serious ethical challenge, namely, what is the way of how such technological applications promote social justice instead of weakening it? To answer this question, interdisciplinary interaction is needed involving public administration, social work, data science, law and policy studies. The governance structures should anticipate transparency, fairness, human control, and community involvement to make algorithmic forms of governance achieve social welfare of humane, fair, and effective delivery.

2. Conceptual and Theoretical Foundations

The conceptual clarity and theoretical background are necessary to understand how the social welfare deals with data analytics and decision-support systems. Algorithmic governance is not just a technological innovation, but it constitutes a shift in the way knowledge is generated, power is managed and responsibility is organized in welfare states. This section clarifies the major concepts and locates them on the context of the appropriate theoretical frameworks, which are technocratic governance, evidence-based policymaking, the digital welfare state theory, and social justice approaches in social work.

2.1 Data Analytics and Decision-Support Systems in Social Welfare

Data analytics can be defined as the systematic computational analysis of massive and multifaceted datasets in order to reveal patterns, relationships, and forecast information to make decisions. In modern public administrative practice, analytics is starting to embrace machine learning methods that have the capacity to identify probable relationships that go beyond the traditional statistical modeling (Al-Inizi, 2025; Kitchin, 2022). Decision-support systems (DSS) are digital applications that are created to support but not eliminate human judgment by organizing data, creating risk analyses, and generating model-based suggestions.

In a social welfare system, these technologies are utilized in predictive risk assessment in child protection, automated eligibility verification in social assistance, fraud detection, and AI-enabled case management. In contrast to previous databases that served mainly as a source of information stores, the current systems actively create administrative performance by giving the risk scores or prioritization levels that affect the discretion at the frontline (Keddell, 2023). This trend is part of an overall shift in use of descriptive data to be used to predict and prescriptively govern.

Notably, algorithmic systems are not neutral. They are the socio-technical models that are structured by the choice of data, design of the model, institutional incentives, and political priorities (Beer, 2019; Kitchin, 2017). Normative judgments regarding vulnerability,

deservingness, and resource allocation are thus represented in algorithmic output in welfare governance, which highlights the importance of ethical regulation and accountability.

2.2 Algorithmic Governance

The idea of algorithmic governance is the application of computational systems to organize regulatory and administrative decisions, which are automated (Danaher et al., 2017). These systems in the context of social welfare affect the determination of eligibility, risk levels, fraud detection, and service prioritization. Algorithms systems might change institutional power and make institutions less transparent, although they are justified as efficiency and objectivity tools most of the time. Pasquale (2015) cautions that blackbox algorithms provide less opportunities to comprehend or contest decisions, which is a worry about due process, especially in vulnerable groups that rely on social assistance (Eubanks, 2018).

Algorithms in governance are as well compatible with new public management reforms that focus on quantification and maximisation of performance. Predictive analytics can reduce the complexity of situation-specific problems like poverty and homelessness by converting a complex social problem into easily quantifiable risk variables (O'Neil, 2016; Yeung, 2018).

2.3 Evidence-Based Policymaking and Predictive Rationality

Evidence based policymaking (EBP) is a strategy that intends to improve performance of the government by basing decisions on research and systematic knowledge. Evidence-based practice in social work traditionally combines empirical studies, expertise, and values of the practitioners alongside those of the client (Gambrill, 2019). It has been traditional to invoke evidence as referring mostly to retrospective appraisals, systematic reviews, and practice-based experience.

The growth of predictive analytics represents a transition to what theorists call predictive rationality, where choices are based on predictive forecasts on historical data trends (Kleinberg et al., 2019; Saxena & Guha, 2023). Instead of evaluating what has been working in the past, predictive models determine the probability of future risks. Although such approach can assist in the early intervention, it can also reproduce structural inequalities. In case the administrative data is based on the history of over-surveillance of marginalized communities, predictive systems will tend to label these communities as high-risk (Eubanks, 2018).

This shift in the evaluative to predictive evidence transforms the epistemology of the policymaking. There is a growing data-centricity and algorithmicity of knowledge, which can displace qualitative knowledge, contextual knowledge and relational aspects that define ethical social work practice (Taylor, 2023).

2.4 The Digital Welfare State

The term digital welfare state is used to refer to the reorganization of social assistance in the form of data integration, automation and surveillance technologies (Eubanks, 2018). Governments are investing more in cross-agency databases, computerized eligibility determinations and tracking compliance with digital systems. Although this type of integration has the potential to enhance coordination and decrease the administrative duplication, it also increases the surveillance abilities and can deepen stigmatization or punitive surveillance (Hintz et al., 2019). Also, the digital divides, such as low levels of internet connectivity, digital illiteracy, and infrastructural disparities threaten to marginalize vulnerable groups of people, especially in developed nations, and thus cement current inequalities (Heeks, 2021).

2.5 Social Justice and Rights-Based Perspectives

Social work is based on social justice, human dignity, and human rights. Hence, digital innovation needs to be considered as an equity-related tool, rather than efficiency-related. Algorithms have been shown to recreate racial and socioeconomic bias, and disadvantaged populations are disproportionately adversely affected (Benjamin, 2019; Noble, 2018). New research on algorithmic justice claims that the measures of statistical fairness cannot be considered without social responsibility and structural analysis (Decker et al., 2024). The rights-based methods focus on transparency, explainability, contestability, and meaningful human oversight to automated decision-making (Wachter & Mittelstadt, 2019). These values are very similar to social work ethics that has focused on the empowerment, informed consent, and professional responsibility.

2.6 Professional Autonomy and Human-in-the-Loop Governance

Algorithms governance creates issues that touch on professional discretion in social work, with contextual judgment and relational ethics as the main points. Too much dependence on decision-support systems can limit the autonomy of practitioners or transfer responsibility to technical systems. The human-in-the-loop models aim to maintain professional power by making algorithms informative yet not substituting human judgment (Danaher et al., 2017). Nonetheless, in the absence of institutional protections and training, practitioners can have automation bias, which is excessive confidence in the results of the algorithm (Ruschemeier & Hondrich, 2024). To maintain ethical practice, therefore, needs critical data literacy, organizational responsibility, and explicit professional standards (International Federation of Social Workers [IFSW], 2023).

2.7 Implications for Developing Contexts

Algorithms governance intersects with e-governance and digital welfare reforms in developing countries such as biometric IDs, digital cash transfer systems and centralized registries. These systems would be more targeted, with less leakages, however regulation is usually lagging behind, and digital trust is still not as strong in environments where privacy is undermined and where laws are incomprehensive (Mazhar et al., 2025). With no comprehensive laws on data protection in place, the development of biometric verification in welfare programs has increased ethical and security issues in Pakistan (Akhtar et al., 2025). According to the evidences presented by the global community, without the context-sensitive governance, a digital welfare reform can be excluded and cannot be adjusted to the local social reality (World Bank Group, 2025).

3. Application of Data Analytics in Social Welfare

There is nothing theoretical about the fact that a combination of data analytics and decision-support systems can be applied to the social welfare governance, in fact, it is already working in a variety of social policy sectors. Algorithms are becoming more and more influential in the frontline practice and policy implementation, with predictive risk modeling in child protection giving way to automated eligibility systems and AI-assisted case management. This part is a review of the key applications of data-driven decision-making in social welfare, both in the technical roles as well as the social implications.

3.1 Predictive Risk Modelling in Child Protection

Child protection predictive risk modeling (PRM) applies administrative data to provide an estimate of the risk of maltreatment or re-referral, which aids caseworkers in screening and service placement. Initial usages in the United States and New Zealand purported enhanced uniformity and accuracy in risk evaluation (Vaithianathan et al., 2013). Nevertheless, it is demonstrated that statistically calibrated models can still result in racial or socioeconomic differences (Barocas et al., 2016; Chouldechova, 2017). People claim that these systems lead to

increased surveillance of low-income families whose information are over-represented in welfare databases (Eubanks, 2018). Recent research also shows that there are issues of transparency, accountability, structural biasness embedded in child welfare algorithms (Keddell & Beddoe, 2025). It is true that a predictive tool can minimize the level of inconsistency at the level of the individual (Cuccaro-Alamin et al., 2017), but proper oversight, audit of fairness, and right-based protection are prerequisites.

3.2 Automated Eligibility and Social Assistance Targeting

By combining tax, employment and administrative databases, automated systems of eligibility have become more prevalent in determining the access to cash transfers, food aid and housing benefits. Such systems are advertised as being efficient and effective in fraud reduction, but there is a risk of errors in the wrongful denials in cases of missing or mismatched data (Alston, 2019). Comparative studies indicate that digital welfare reforms have the potential to shift the task of rectifying error to applicants, which increases the level of exclusion among digitally marginalized populations (Busch & Henriksen, 2018). Biometric ID-based social protection has made social protection more targeted in developing countries but has created privacy and surveillance concerns and inaccurate exclusion measures (Gelb & Metz, 2018; World Bank, 2021). Striking the right balance between management and rights protection is one of the key governance issues.

3.3 Fraud Detection and Compliance Monitoring

The welfare systems use fraud detecting algorithms that scan transactional data and indicate abnormal claims or possible non-conformity. Though such systems are justified as the protection of the governmental funds, their establishment can support punitive measures against low-income communities, as they are often over-policed (Eubanks, 2018; O'Neil, 2016). According to the recent literature, probabilistic flagging may result in false investigation or even advantage suspensions, especially where transparency and appeals processes are ineffective (Busuioc, 2021; Citron, 2022). Since algorithmic suspicion is not synonymous with proven wrongdoing, it is important that strong human supervision, explanability of the algorithm, and protocols be in place to preserve a due process and avoid unfair administrative damage.

3.4 AI-Assisted Case Management and Professional Decision Support

Case management systems based on artificial intelligence are progressively generating service propositions, risk notifications, and intervention courses throughout welfare organizations. Although these tools can enhance the coordination and integration of complex data about clients, they also transform the professional knowledge practices. Depending on the algorithmic scores may privilege actuarial logic, which is the center of social work, in favor of relational and contextual judgment (Cheng & Chouldechova, 2022; Keddell, 2019; Saxena & Guha, 2023). Recent research cautions that in the event that institutional cultures place too much value on data-driven measures, automation bias could threaten the discretion of practitioners (Dekker et al., 2022; Goddard et al., 2012). Well-constructed systems though will not substitute professional expertise but will be able to support it with training, transparency and purposeful human supervision.

3.5 Performance Monitoring and Policy Evaluation

Policy monitoring is being facilitated more by data analytics using dashboards, real-time indicators, and cross-sector data integration. Although these systems can improve accountability and strategic planning, they can increase managerial control and highlight the measurable results instead of the relationship elements of care (Busch & Henriksen, 2018; Kitchin, 2022). The opponents believe that the performance indicators might be transformed into the proxies of the

complicated social consequences, which represent the timeless new public management logics (Hood & Dixon, 2015). In addition, the focus of predictive cost-benefit models can be on the immediate economic efficiency at the expense of social investment in the long term, which could be very disadvantageous to marginalized communities (Mazzucato, 2023).

3.6 Cross-cutting Ethical and Institutional Considerations

In the areas of welfare, there are a number of cross-cutting problems. First, the result of algorithms is critically dependent on the data quality, unfair or incomplete administrative documents can replicate a structural disparity (Barocas et al., 2019; Kitchin, 2022). Second, transparency and explainability are also persistent issues, which inhibit practitioners and citizens to question the automated decisions (Pasquale, 2015). Third, governance ability is a question of harm, independent auditing, regulatory capabilities, and participatory design have the ability to reduce harm, and weak institutional structures can increase risk (Busuioc, 2020; World Bank, 2021). Finally, data analytics have little effect per se than on socio-political systems, accountability, and long-term social justice commitments.

4. Opportunities and Benefits

Although the argument on algorithmic governance tends to focus on the negative aspects and ethical issues, it is also crucial to look at the possible advantages of data analytics and decision-support systems in the social welfare domain. Data-driven tools may be efficient, effective and can be used to target and improve interagency coordination, as well as aid evidence-based policymaking when properly designed, regulated, and run in the hands of professional persons. The section discusses the key opportunities related to the incorporation of analytics into the social work and social policy.

4.1 Enhanced Targeting and Early Intervention

Predictive analytics can help to transform welfare systems into preventive rather than reactive intervention. Machine learning based on administrative data may recognize patterns related to child maltreatment, homelessness, and multidimensional vulnerability so that support can be provided beforehand. Empirical studies in the recent past show that predictive modelling is practically applied in child protection systems. Rosholm and colleagues (2024) demonstrate that models based on machine learning on Danish administrative data are capable of ranking children by potential maltreatment and helping in prioritizing preventive interventions in caseworkers. The use of AI in anticipatory governance is also supported by systematic review evidence. Zuiderwijk, and colleagues (2021) find that AI applications in the government contribute to more progressive decision-making and the prevention of risks, especially in the delivery of social services. Predictive analytics could help to minimize long-term fiscal and social expenses, when the identified risks are managed in accordance with preventive welfare measures and professional supervision.

4.2 Improved Efficiency and Resource Allocation

Welfare agencies are often faced by financial limitation and large caseload requirements. Van Noordt and Misuraca (2022) observe that AI platforms implemented in European state-level organizations enhance the efficiency of operations, especially in case prioritization and resource targeting. Their macro mapping research proves that AI implementation is best achieved with the support of governance protection and institutional capacity development. On the same note, Wirtz and colleagues (2020) demonstrate that AI usage in the government has increased the

productivity of the administration and automation of the processes, but regulatory clarity and organizational preparedness are crucial.

Besides, automation and computerized processing may help minimize administrative loads, particularly in the process of repetitive duties like checking eligibility, document processing, and scheduling. It is possible to automatize these routine functions instead of discretionary decision-making, which enables agencies to streamline their work processes, increase accuracy, and enable frontline workers to spend more time on relational and therapeutic work with their clients. This practice is in line with the wider modernization trends in the overall public sector that believe in the use of data-driven dashboards and real-time analytics as means of enhancing transparency, accountability, and operational efficiency without undermining professional judgment (Banerjee, 2025; Matheus et al., 2020).

4.3 Strengthening Evidence-Informed Policymaking

Data-driven governance can facilitate ongoing monitoring and design of policy to make changes on the fly, whereas AI systems can simulate other policy options and predict the impacts that it will have before acting. In a systematic review, Zuiderwijk and colleagues (2021) demonstrate that AI in the public governance allows evidence-based assessment and reinforcing anticipatory capacity that helps to improve strategic planning by finding patterns that inform policy decisions and learning faster across government processes. According to them, predictive analytics may enhance the responsiveness of the policy to be implemented when the approach is supported by the accountability and governance, providing data quality, transparency, and supervision. The policy frameworks established by the OECD (2025) further stress that high-quality AI in delivering services to people should increase transparency, explainability, and people-centred decision-making, as it is imperative that governance frameworks instill human supervision, moral protection, and definite level of accountability in the system.

4.4 Promoting Consistency and Reducing Individual Bias

Human decision-making is susceptible to the inconsistency and cognitive bias especially when there are high workloads. Decision support system (DSS) based on algorithms may encourage the uniform use of the criteria across cases. Responsible AI systems in government management can contribute to more consistent procedures under the conditions of review, transparency, and audit procedures. It is also noted in research, however, that professional judgment augmentation is stressed, as opposed to human decision-maker substitution (Busuioc, 2021). Empirical evidence by Rosholm and colleagues (2024) suggests that predictive models are most efficient as advisory tools to support, as opposed to override, caseworker discretion as well as the fact that human oversight and professional discretion should be preserved in the algorithmically-assisted decision-making procedures.

4.5 Enhancing Interagency Coordination

Lack of fragmentation between social service systems can also be a barrier to providing effective services to clients because clients can be served by a variety of agencies including housing authorities, employment services, and child welfare departments without information being shared between them. Cross-agency data integrated into data analytics platforms can enhance care continuity and coordination through the ability to share information about clients and eliminate duplication of effort (Powell & Casey, 2022). Integrated case management systems can improve coordination in service planning and minimize intersectoral fragmentation in the context of social welfare because practitioners can view a detailed history of clients and service

interactions, which helps them better plan services. Better coordination also favors multidisciplinary strategies like predictive analytics and machine learning models can identify co-occurring risks, such as mental health problems and housing insecurity, and the collaboration of interventions between health and social forces, which is consistent with holistic, person-centered models of social work practice (Kumar & Suthar, 2024).

4.6 Transparency through Data Visualization and Open Data

In combination with the open data projects and the availability of reporting platforms, transparency in delivering the public services may be improved greatly, since public dashboards and performance indicators will provide the citizens with information about the program results, resource allocation, and service performance. The literature on transparency and accountability in AI systems emphasizes open reporting, explainability, and procedural fairness as important tools in achieving that the process of algorithmic decision making is compatible with societal values and safeguards wellbeing (Cheong, 2024). To establish trust with the population in welfare governance, it is possible to implement transparency in reporting the eligibility requirements, performance indicators, and audit outcomes, which will result in the transparency and openness of the decision processes to various groups of people. In addition, comparative legal analyses of AI governance reveal that accountability models and oversight systems in governmental AI applications such as transparency requirements in legislation and comparative regulation strategies are the focal point of protecting democratic checks and balances, defining the legal liability, and fostering fair results (Al Shawabkeh & Al Jasmi, 2025).

4.7 Supporting Innovation and Policy Experimentation

Adaptive and experimental policymaking can be assisted by data analytics, which increases the accuracy of evaluations and permits fundamental changes in interventions by the government. By using machine learning techniques, one can operate data with high dimensions and discover intricate relationships and enhance impact estimation, as opposed to traditional methods (Ballestar et al., 2019). Moreover, Bayesian trials and other adaptive designs offer a systematic structure to continuous learning, whereas policymakers use adaptive designs as new evidence is applied to update and optimize interventions (Cripps et al., 2025). Such methods of analysis help to conduct evidence-based experimentation, enhance the targeting of services, and dynamically respond to the complex problems of society.

4.8 Potential for Empowerment through Participatory Data Practices

New studies indicate that participatory data governance in which communities assist in defining data collection, sharing, and decision-making can transform analytics out of surveillance and into creating leverage. Analytics can also promote community-wide advocacy, problem-solving, and activism based on evidence instead of a one-way top-down grip by institutions when individuals are engaged collaborators in the development of data systems and results interpretation (Rempel et al., 2025; Sharp et al., 2022). Co-designing methodologies, in which service users are engaged in the development of data generation and usage patterns, make the so-called digital governance processes more relevant, owning, and trusted. These participatory efforts, although still in formative stages, support the social work principle of inclusion and empowerment by making technological advances to be responsive to experiences and priorities of the community.

4.9 Balancing Opportunity with Responsibility

When properly managed, social welfare data analytics can be used to promote preventative services, impose transparency, and advance evidence-based policy instead of promoting bias and

surveillance. According to recent scholarship, the systems of governance should encourage equity, participation, and accountability to make algorithms systems consistent with human rights and social values (Taylor et al., 2025). Engaging the stakeholders in the design and management of AI makes participatory approaches better than top-down approaches to AI in public administration, enhancing fairness and trust and reducing harm to vulnerable populations (Allen et al., 2025). The absence of such governance can recreate the institutional inequalities on the digital tools. To enable AI to promote justice and inclusion, social work and policy researchers need to actively influence the governance of AI by involving everyone in the creation and applying ethical principles in the development of the innovative product.

5. Ethical, Legal and Social Challenges

Although the use of algorithmic governance in the social welfare may have a positive effect, its growth poses serious ethical, legal, and social issues. Due to the fact that welfare systems exist on both the border of state power and individual susceptibility, data analytics implementation in this area has increased normative implications. Of special relevance are matters of algorithmic bias, algorithmic opaqueness, accountability, privacy, surveillance, and professional autonomy. This part is a critical analysis of these issues and puts them into context of the general discussion on justice, governance and human rights.

5.1 Algorithmic Bias and Structural Inequality

There has been a lot of criticism on the basis of social bias being reproduced in algorithmic decision-making. Patterns of disparate policing, access to services, and structural disadvantage can be coded into systems that have been conditioned on past administrative data. The work by Barocas and Selbst (2016) demonstrates that discrimination may manifest itself even without a clear intention since datasets are the reflection of the existing inequalities. Marginalized groups in the welfare systems are usually overrepresented as they face more state scrutiny, making them more prone to being suspected by predictive algorithms as high-risk groups. Benjamin (2019) labels this dynamism the New Jim Code, pointing to the reinvention of hierarchy by seemingly neutral technologies. More contemporary research also emphasizes that the metrics of fairness cannot address inherent normative trade-offs (Raji et al., 2022). In the case of social work, based on anti-oppressive ethics, algorithmic bias is not only technical but also a loss to distributive justice and professional ethics.

5.2 Opacity, Explainability and Due Process

One of the issues regarding governance is algorithmic opacity. Burrell (2016) outlines three types of the sources of opacity, namely, secrecy at the corporate level, technical complexity, and the unintelligibility of certain machine-learning models themselves. Obscurity of systems in welfare administration prevents procedural fairness when citizens are unable to comprehend or appeal automatic decision-making. Citron (2008) cautions that when the contestation mechanisms are restrained, the weakened nature of due process is realized. The explainability is not a technical but a socio-technical (Wachter et al., 2017) phenomenon. In the case of social workers, the lack of transparency spreads responsibility between humans and machines.

5.3 Privacy, Surveillance and Data Protection

Digital welfare systems increase the scope of surveillance of the state because they combine data in the fields of health, education, housing, and justice. Zuboff (2019) presents such massive extraction of data as a component of the so-called surveillance capitalism, which can be applied to the modern governance. Data sharing is not meaningfully refusable by welfare recipients,

which concerns the issue of consent and power. Breach of data and profiling of groups also increases risks. Wachter and Mittelstadt (2019) believe that data protection is required to consider collective harms, rather than individual privacy. Well-developed control, cybersecurity protection, and legal frameworks should be enforced, especially in the developing environment.

5.4 Accountability and Governance Gaps

Algorithmic governance entails networks of government and commercial suppliers, usually pushing the responsibility out. According to Bovens (2007), accountability is an act to clarify and defend actions to an audience with a punishing authority, however, in automated systems, the developers, policymakers, or practitioners may not be held accountable. Some of the tools used to explain responsibility include algorithmic impact assessment. Reisman and colleagues (2018) support harm evaluations before deployment whereas Raji and colleagues (2020) emphasize the necessity of producing audit, which is obligatory. Absence of good supervision, welfare algorithms are likely to run out of control in terms of real democracy.

5.5 Impact on Professional Autonomy and Ethical Practice

Professional discretion in social work can be reformed by the use of algorithmic decision-support tools. Eubanks (2018) says that automated welfare systems can also lead to the de-skilling of frontline workers since automated systems standardize judgments. Automation bias also promotes excessive dependence on the results of algorithms, particularly when the institutional cultures favor data-based measures (Green & Chen, 2019). Research put an emphasis on the role of such systems in shaping professional choices, instead of just supporting them (Elish, 2019). To protect autonomy, override mechanisms, vital digital literacy, and training on ethics must be a part of social work education.

5.6 Democratic Legitimacy and Public Trust

The issue of algorithmic governance concerns the matter of democratic legitimacy in the welfare policy. When distributive decisions are devolved to platforms based on data, normative judgment is transferred between a public deliberation and a technical design. Yeung (2018) cautions that algorithmic regulation can produce the behaviour in certain ways that circumvent any meaningful debate. Scholarship during the last decade believes that the presence of AI in the public sector should incorporate democratic principles of participation and contestability (Dencik et al., 2019). Institutional trust can decrease in the event that welfare recipients feel that systems are not transparent or fair. Enhancing legitimacy thus needs transparency, joint design processes, and available systems of appeal.

5.7 Global Inequalities and Digital Colonialism

In the developing world, algorithmic governance can cause the asymmetries of world power, because tools created in the Global North are exported without much control on the ground. According to Milan and Treré (2019), this is associated with data colonialism. Recent research also demonstrates that AI infrastructures may make dependency and marginalization permanent (Couldry & Mejias, 2020). Mismatched thresholds and poor participation lead to disproportionate harms, that is why locally controlled and context-sensitive design is important.

Algorithms in social welfare governance are interconnected in ethical, legal, and social concerns such as bias, lack of transparency, surveillance, accountability, and democratic threats. These systems entrench normative decisions regarding justice and responsibility. With social work and policy, the effort is to regulate data analytics in accordance with the human rights and equity by

engaging in interdisciplinary efforts, robust regulation, involvement, and long-term ethical supervision.

6. Implications for Developing Countries: Digital Welfare Governance in Global South: Special Focus on Pakistan

Algorithms and governance of social welfare systems present new opportunities and issues for the developing world. Many resources have focused on the North American and European context, but digitalisation is taking place in the Global South as well. Governments are adopting the use of biometric identification, unified beneficiary registers, predictive analytics and digital cash transfer systems as part of their digital transformation and e-governance programs. However, in developing countries, institutional and regulatory factors, and structural inequalities influence the use of these technologies. This section examines the implications of data-based welfare governance in the developing world in Pakistan.

6.1 Digital Transformation and Social Protection in Developing Contexts

Poverty, informal sector, administrative weaknesses, and budget deficits are major recurring issues in many developing countries. With the exception of access to services in these contexts, digital technologies are frequently described as 'leapfrogging' technologies that can overcome institutional weaknesses, enhance the delivery of public services, prevent corruption, and finally improve access to services (Heeks, 2017; Aarab et al., 2025). The benefits of digital identification, mobile payments and social registries are also highlighted as ways to improve targeting and reduce leakages of social protection programs (Aarab et al., 2025; Kemal, 2026).

Emerging evidence shows the increasing use of digital platforms to enhance responsiveness in social protection, especially during crises, such as the COVID-19 pandemic. Digital cash transfer programmes have assisted governments in numerous LMICs to deliver cash transfers rapidly at scale, even lacking efficient or integrated administrative systems. This evidence demonstrates the ability of digital systems to enhance speed, coordination and reach in complex environments (Kemal, 2026).

But the embracing of algorithmic and data-driven systems in developing countries needs to be seen in the context of prevailing socio-political circumstances. Structural inequalities based on class, gender, ethnicity and rural-urban differences are reproduced in digital inclusion and exclusion (Eder & Sjøvaag, 2024; Siad & Sagar, 2025). If not implemented with a concerted approach towards equity and accountability, digitization could further reinforce inequity and even exacerbate it (Hakimi et al., 2025; Kemal, 2026).

6.2 Institutional Capacity and Governance Constraints

Lack of institutional and technical capacity in developing countries to aid data-driven governance is one of the main issues. However, in such environments, strong data governance structures, cybersecurity systems, competent workforce, and independent monitoring are often lacking, making the implementation of data analytics challenging (Amin et al., 2024; Mazhar et al., 2025). Poor institutional alignment, and a lack of technical skills among frontline staff, can impede the use of digital systems, especially if the frontline staff do not have the capacity to understand and critically evaluate algorithmic outputs.

Moreover, there are gaps in, and weak enforcement of, data protection and algorithmic accountability laws. This heightens the chances of sensitive personal data being misused and the possibility of public distrust of digital governance systems. Recent research has emphasised that in developing countries, citizens are vulnerable to breaches of privacy, surveillance, and

discrimination, particularly with welfare programs that depend heavily on demographic and socioeconomic data (Bhattacharjee, 2024; Malik et al., 2025).

6.3 Digital Exclusion and the Risk of Inequity

Digital welfare systems require identification documents and internet access and the skills to use them. Marginalised groups, including rural areas, women, persons with disabilities and informal workers, still have access problems on digital platforms in many developing countries. Research indicates that digital ID systems can enhance service delivery, but can also contribute to exclusion if they are not formally documented or have limited or poor access to digital infrastructure (Gelb & Clark, 2013). Requiring digital verification as a condition of welfare access can exclude people from crucial services if they lack the technological means to access it.

The inequalities in digital access continue to exist in Pakistan between provinces and within the provinces between urban and rural areas. While mobile penetration has improved considerably, and there are still large digital literacy and reliable internet connectivity gaps. Research on digital governance and the adoption of e-government in Pakistan indicates that disparities in access to digital resources persist and digital trust is low, thereby hindering inclusive participation (Amin et al., 2024; Mazhar et al., 2025). This implies that algorithmic welfare systems that assume digital universality could inadvertently disadvantage already marginalised populations and exacerbate inequalities.

6.4 Pakistan's Digital Welfare Landscape

In the last 20 years, Pakistan has implemented major reforms in the area of social protection through the medium of digital systems. With the introduction of National Database and Registration Authority (NADRA), a full-fledged biometric identification system was established for a significant section of the population. NADRA's unified database facilitates integration across various public service systems, such as electoral processes, taxation, and welfare, which enhances administrative coordination and services (Amin et al., 2024).

The Benazir Income Support Programme (BISP) was launched as a significant social safety net scheme for poor people, building on this infrastructure. BISP uses Proxy Means Test (PMT) to determine the eligibility of the household on the basis of socioeconomic indicators. Data-driven targeting mechanisms have demonstrated to enhance transparency and minimize political manipulation in the delivery of benefits (Cheema et al., 2014; Mazhar et al., 2025).

Recent years have seen digital payment systems being used to transfer cash directly to beneficiaries via biometric identification and mobile banking which enables mobile money payments. In the era of COVID-19, the Government of Pakistan started the Ehsaas Emergency Cash Program which is provided through the existing digital setup to reach the beneficiaries swiftly. There is evidence that these digital interventions have improved administrative efficiency and facilitated timely responses to crisis, especially in large-scale emergencies (UNDP, 2022; World Bank, 2021).

But, having a central database and automated eligibility procedures bring significant concerns. Exclusion errors can result from data entry mistakes, outdated household data and the Proxy Means Test. There can be barriers to the appeals and grievance processes, including for people with low literacy or limited mobility. Moreover, the use of biometric information increases privacy, data security and surveillance issues, particularly where the institutions lack robust data protection regulations (Bhattacharjee, 2024; Malik et al., 2025).

6.5 Data Protection and Legal Frameworks in Pakistan

In recent times, Pakistan has begun to take steps to enhance digital privacy and data governance by introducing the Personal Data Protection Bill 2023, which seeks to define and govern the collection, processing, and storage of personal data, and to create an oversight body for data protection (Senate of Pakistan, 2023). But Pakistan is still lacking a comprehensive and fully-fledged law on algorithmic systems and automated decision-making in the field of welfare.

This lack of clarity in digital welfare governance about the use of algorithms, automated profiling and data retention and the possible use of data for secondary purposes leaves citizens with uncertainty about their rights and means of accountability. Most of the legislation that exists looks at cybercrime and doesn't specifically focus on the ethical debate of welfare algorithms and AI. Wachter and Mittelstadt (2019) state that contemporary data protection schemes need to take into consideration both collective harms from profiling and predictive analytics, as well as individual privacy.

Algorithmic profiling in Pakistan could have a disproportionate impact on vulnerable groups, such as impoverished people, women and rural communities. Meanwhile, civil society groups have voiced apprehensions about inadequate oversight and sweeping powers for the state in the proposed bill (Haq, 2024). If audit systems are not transparent, and there are no independent regulatory bodies, discriminatory outcomes and privacy violations can be ignored.

6.6 Political Economy and Power Dynamics

Digital welfare governance in developing countries is constrained by political economy, as external stakeholders such as technology companies, development banks and international donors shape and influence the design of digital systems and their implementation. These actors offer technical and financial assistance, but can also influence priorities and system design according to external interests (Taylor & Broeders, 2015).

Evidence indicates that without the effective involvement of local stakeholders in the design of digital infrastructure, global power imbalances can be exacerbated and accountability to the local population in welfare systems can suffer (Eubanks, 2018; Milan & Treré, 2019). Meanwhile, centralized data systems increase the capacity of governments to monitor, sparking worries about how data can be misused and the impact on civil rights. Transparency and rights protection, along with efficiency, are important governance issues in digital welfare systems (Kitchin, 2021; Taylor & Broeders, 2015).

6.7 Opportunities for Responsible Innovation

However, the developing countries such as Pakistan have particular opportunities to shape their digital welfare systems around the core of social justice. Since digital infrastructures are still quite new, it is possible to embed ethical protections in the design and development process, before damage has been done.

Key strategies include:

- Proactively institutionalizing the assessment of the impact of algorithms before deployment.
- Provision of human-in-the-loop decision making for high-stakes decisions. Setting up independent institutions that can review predictive systems.
- Increasing beneficiaries' and social workers' digital literacy.
- Involving civil society and community members in system design.

The inclusion of ethical governance mechanisms at an early stage will help developing countries prevent some of the problems faced by more advanced digital welfare systems.

6.8 The Role of Social Work in Pakistan

Digital welfare reforms offer opportunities and responsibilities for social work in Pakistan. Social workers need to be digitally literate to critically use data-driven systems and to defend the rights of their clients. Algorithmic bias, data ethics and digital governance must be part of professional education courses.

Furthermore, social workers can act as a liaison between the beneficiary and the digital systems, helping clients in appeals processes and disputing misclassification. The profession can help drive the process of digital transformation forward, but not at the expense of social justice goals, by continuing to follow this rights-based and participative approach.

7. Towards Responsible Algorithmic Governance: Policy and Practice Recommendations

Good algorithmic governance of social welfare requires a multidimensional framework that is innovative, accountable, equitable, and human rights friendly. Strong data protection regimes, mandate algorithmic impact assessment, and provide a right to explanation and meaningful human review in automated decisions should be part of the governments (Cheong, 2024; European Union, 2024). These protections are essential when the welfare decisions play a direct role in influence on housing, income support, and healthcare.

Auditability and transparency are also necessary. Although there might be proprietary restrictions that prevent an agency to give out source code, it is worthwhile that clear documentation of system objectives and data sources, methods of validation, and fairness evaluations be released. Causal and independent audits, fairness testing may contribute to identifying the discriminatory results and changing risks (Alon-Barkat et al., 2025; Fang et al., 2024). Constant surveillance is required to deal with the model drift and changing social realities.

Centrality should be human-based. The results of the algorithms must complement but not override professional judgment, and the frontline officials should receive digital literacy education (Batool et al., 2025). Technical measures of fairness should be used in conjunction with participatory governance and community inclusion to increase the fate and trust of the masses (Ayeni et al., 2026; Thakur, 2025). Responsible digital welfare reform is further enhanced by democratic control via open reporting and legislative scrutiny.

8. Future Research Directions

Although there is an increasing literature on algorithmic governance, gaps still exist. There are a limited number of longitudinal studies that quantify the impact of predictive analytics in welfare and public services on inequality, service quality, and public trust and how these impacts will be sustained in the long run, thus the long-term harms or benefits remain unknown (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, 2025).

Little comparative studies are performed in various political and socio-economic environments, especially those with restricted resources, and necessitate contextually focused research in the area of infrastructure, data quality as well as regulatory capacity (Idil & Alimuddin, 2024).

To assess technical fairness, metrics and tests are still being developed, but most of them are unable to measure the social and institutional trade-offs of the algorithmic systems, therefore there is a necessity to combine normative and empirical inquiry (Rulandari et al., 2025). Algorithms also transform power relations and organizational work in the field of public service provision, yet the outcomes of this transformation remain unclear (Mahroof et al., 2025).

Research in the future must be participatory, mixed-method designs that take into consideration the views of the stakeholders to shape adaptive governance frameworks that ensure equity, accountability and democratic legitimacy.

9. Conclusion

This article examined the growing role of data analytics and algorithmic decision-support systems in social sciences, with particular focus on social welfare governance in Pakistan. While digital tools enhance targeting efficiency, transparency, and evidence-based policymaking, they also introduce risks related to algorithmic bias, privacy, opacity, and exclusion. In resource-constrained settings, these risks can disproportionately affect already marginalized populations. The review demonstrates that technology itself is neither inherently beneficial nor harmful, its impact depends on governance frameworks, regulatory safeguards, and institutional capacity.

9.1 *Balancing Innovation with Social Justice*

In the case of Pakistan and other developing settings, the key dilemma here is the ability to balance digital innovation and equity and accountability. The protection of efficiency should not come at the expense of fairness, procedural justice and privacy. Responsible implementation demands data protection legislation, algorithmic regulation, human evaluation procedures, and participatory regulation. The unintentional harms that may emerge in digital reform processes can be avoided by embedding some ethical protection at the initial stages, and this approach can enhance the confidence of the population.

9.2 Reaffirming Core Social Work Values in Digital Age

With the growing data-driven nature of welfare systems, human dignity, social justice, integrity, and respect of persons should be on the forefront of core social work. Professional judgment and relational practice should not be substituted by algorithms. With the help of matching technological innovation to ethical standards, policymakers and practitioners can make sure that digital transformation can promote fair and inclusive social progress but not support structural inequality.

References

Aarab, A., El Marzouki, A., Boubker, O., & El Moutaqi, B. (2025). Integrating AI in public governance: A systematic review. *Digital, 5*(4), 59. https://doi.org/10.3390/digital5040059

Ahmad, A., Vallès, Y., & Idaghdour, Y. (2025). Bias in AI systems: Integrating formal and socio-technical approaches. *Frontiers in Big Data, 8*, 1686452. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdata.2025.1686452

Akhtar, N., Chaudhary, H. K., & Abidi, S. a. A. (2025, August 10). Privacy laws in the era of biometric data: ethical and legal challenges in Pakistan. *Review Journal of Social Psychology and Social Works, 3*(3), 772-782. https://socialworksreview.com/index.php/Journal/article/view/359

Allen, D., Hubbard, S., Lim, W., Stanger, A., Wagman, S., Zalesne, K., & Omoakhalen, O. (2025). A roadmap for governing AI: technology governance and power-sharing liberalism. *AI and Ethics, 5*(3), 3355-3377. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00635-y

Alon-Barkat, S., Busuioc, M., Schwoerer, K., & Weißmüller, K. S. (2025). Algorithmic discrimination in public service provision: Understanding citizens' attribution of responsibility for human versus algorithmic discriminatory outcomes. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 35*(4), 469-488. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muaf024

Al-Shawabkeh, F. A. H., & Al-Jasmi, K. (2025). Artificial intelligence and transparency management in the public sector: A comparative legal study on accountability and oversight in European and

American laws. *Journal of Posthumanism, 5*(5), 2326-2340. https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i5.1619

Alston, P. (2019). Report of the Special Rapporteur on extreme poverty and human rights: Digital welfare states and human rights. *United Nations Human Rights Council*. https://digitallibrary.un.org/record/3834146?ln=en&v=pdf

Al-Inizi, M. S. M. (2025). Enhancing Governmental Decision-Making through Predictive Analytics with Machine Learning-Based Data-Driven Framework. *Babylonian Journal of Machine Learning, 2025*, 86–96. https://doi.org/10.58496/bjml/2025/007

Amin, S., Ali, H., & Zafar, M. R. (2024). Digital Governance in Pakistan: Trends, Challenges, and Sectorial Implementation Endeavors. *Journal of Humanities, Health and Social Sciences, 2*(1), 56-73. https://www.jhhss.com/index.php/jhhss/article/view/21

Ayeni, O. B., Musinguzi-Karamukyo, I., Onibalusi, O. T., & Omigbodun, O. M. (2026). AI in Everyday Life: How Algorithmic Systems Shape Social Relations, Opportunity, and Public Trust. *Societies, 16*(2), 59. **https://doi.org/10.3390/soc16020059**

Ballestar, M. T., Doncel, L. M., Sainz, J., & Ortigosa-Blanch, A. (2019). A novel machine learning approach for evaluation of public policies: An application in relation to the performance of university researchers. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 149*, 119756. DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2019.119756

Banerjee, S., Fullerton, C. E., Gaharwar, S. S., & Jaselskis, E. J. (2025). Strategic Web-Based Data Dashboards as Monitoring Tools for Promoting Organizational Innovation. *Buildings, 15*(13), 2204. **https://doi.org/10.3390/buildings15132204**

Barocas, S., Hardt, M., & Narayanan, A. (2019). *Fairness and machine learning*. https://www.fairmlbook.org/

Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big Data's Disparate Impact. *California Law Review, 104*, 671-732. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2477899

Batool, A., Zowghi, D., & Bano, M. (2025). AI governance: a systematic literature review. *AI and Ethics, 5*(3), 3265-3279. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00653-w

Beer, D. (2019). *The social power of algorithms*. In The social power of algorithms (pp. 1-13). Routledge.

Benjamin, R. (2019). *Race after Technology: Abolitionist tools for the new JiM Code*. Polity USA.

Bhattacharjee, R. (2024). Data protection for democratic e-governance in India. *Indian Journal of Public Administration, 70*(3), 631-637. https://doi.org/10.1177/00195561241257461

Biju, P. R., & Gayathri, O. (2026). Structural oppression and AI: A systematic review of data policy frameworks in India. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 223*, 124415. DOI: 10.1016/j.techfore.2025.124415

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework. *European Law Journal, 13*, 447-468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x

Busch, P. A., & Henriksen, H. Z. (2018). Digital discretion: A systematic literature review of ICT and street-level discretion. *Information Polity, 23*(1), 3–28. https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-170050

Burrell, J. (2016). How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data & Society, 3*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512

Busuioc, M. (2021). Accountable Artificial intelligence: Holding algorithms to account. *Public Administration Review, 81*(5), 825–836. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.13293

Cheema, I., Farhat, M., Hunt, S., Javeed, S., Pellerano, L., & O'Leary, S. (2014). Benazir income support programme. *Oxford Policy Management*. https://www.opml.co.uk/files/Publications/7328-

evaluating-pakistans-flagship-social-protection-programme-bisp/bisp-final-impact-evaluation-report.pdf

Cheng, L., & Chouldechova, A. (2022, April 12). Heterogeneity in Algorithm-Assisted Decision-Making: A case study in child abuse hotline screening. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, *6*(CSCW2), 1-33. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2204.05478

Cheong, B. C. (2024). Transparency and accountability in AI systems: safeguarding wellbeing in the age of algorithmic decision-making. *Frontiers in Human Dynamics, 6*, 1421273. https://doi.org/10.3389/fhumd.2024.1421273

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

Citron, D. K. (2008). *Technological due process*. Washington University School of Law.

Citron, D. K. (2022). *The fight for privacy: Protecting dignity, identity, and love in the digital age.* W. W. Norton & Company.

Couldry, N., & Mejias, U. A. (2019). The Costs of Connection How Data Is Colonizing Human Life and Appropriating it for Capitalism. *Stanford University Press.* https://doi.org/10.1515/9781503609754

Cripps, S., Lopatnikovaz, A., Afshar, H. M., Gales, B., Marchant, R., Francis, G., ... & Fischer, A. (2025). Bayesian adaptive trials for social policy. *Data & Policy, 7*, e27. https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2024.97

Cuccaro-Alamin, S., Foust, R., Vaithianathan, R., & Putnam-Hornstein, E. (2017). Risk assessment and decision making in child protective services. *Social Service Review, 91*(4), 679–706. DOI: 10.1016/J.CHILDYOUTH.2017.06.027

Danaher, J., Hogan, M. J., Noone, C., Kennedy, R., Behan, A., De Paor, A., Felzmann, H., Haklay, M., Khoo, S., Morison, J., Murphy, M. H., O'Brolchain, N., Schafer, B., & Shankar, K. (2017). Algorithmic governance: Developing a research agenda through the power of collective intelligence. *Big Data & Society, 4*(2), 205395171772655. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717726554

Decker, M. C., Wegner, L., & Leicht-Scholten, C. (2024). Procedural fairness in algorithmic decision-making: the role of public engagement. *Ethics and Information Technology, 27*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-024-09811-4

Dekker, R., Koot, P., Birbil, S. I., & van Embden Andres, M. (2022). Co-designing algorithms for governance: Ensuring responsible and accountable algorithmic management of refugee camp supplies. *Big Data & Society, 9*(1), 20539517221087855. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951722108785

Dencik, L., Hintz, A., Redden, J., & Treré, E. (2019). Exploring Data Justice: Conceptions, applications and directions. *Information Communication & Society, 22*(7), 873–881. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2019.1606268

Eder, M., & Sjøvaag, H. (2024). Artificial intelligence and the dawn of an algorithmic divide. *Frontiers in Communication, 9*, 1453251. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2024.1453251

Elish, M. C. (2019). Moral crumple zones: Cautionary tales in human-robot interaction. *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society, 5*, 40–60. https://doi.org/10.17351/ests2019.260

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

European Commission. (2021). *Proposal for a Regulation laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act*). https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=CELEX:52021PC0206

Fang, S., Chen, Z., & Ansell, J. (2024). Peer-induced Fairness: A Causal Approach for Algorithmic Fairness Auditing. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2408.02558

Gambrill, E. (2018). *Critical thinking and the process of evidence-based practice*. Oxford University Press.

Gelb, A., & Clark, J. (2013). Identification for development: The biometrics revolution (CGD Working Paper No. 315). *Center for Global Development.* https://www.cgdev.org/publication/identification-development-biometrics-revolution-working-paper-315

Gelb, A., Metz, A. D., & Center for Global Development. (2018). Identification Revolution: Can Digital ID be harnessed for development? *In CGD Brief.* https://www.cgdev.org/sites/default/files/identification-revolution-can-digital-id-be-harnessed-development-brief.pdf

Goddard, K., Roudsari, A., & Wyatt, J. C. (2012). Automation bias: a systematic review of frequency, effect mediators, and mitigators. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association, 19*(1), 121-127. https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000089

Green, B., & Chen, Y. (2019). Disparate Interactions. *Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency (FAccT '19)*, 90–99. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287563

Hakimi, M., Zarinkhail, S., & Sahnosh, F. A. (2025). Artificial intelligence and legal reform in developing countries: Advancing ethical, rights-based, and accountable digital governance. *Jurnal Ilmiah Telsinas Elektro, Sipil dan Teknik Informasi, 8*(2), 127-144. https://doi.org/10.38043/telsinas.v8i2.6934

Haq, A. H. U. (2024). The right to privacy & Personal data protection: An analysis of Pakistan's proposed personal data protection Bill. *UCP Journal of Law and Legal Education 2*(2). https://doi.org/10.24312/ucp-jlle.02.02.122

Hassen, M. Z. (2025). Ethical Considerations in AI-powered Social Innovation: Balancing Progress with Responsibility. *Research and Innovation, 2*(1). 42-50. DOI: 10.11648/j.ri.20260201.15

Heeks, R. (2021, August 22). From Digital Divide to Digital Justice in the Global South: Conceptualising adverse Digital Incorporation. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2108.09783

Hintz, A., Dencik, L., & Wahl-Jorgensen, K. (2018). *Digital citizenship in a datafied society*. John Wiley & Sons. https://research.gold.ac.uk/id/eprint/37289/

Hood, C., & Dixon, R. (2015). A government that worked better and cost less? Evaluating three decades of reform and change in UK central government. *Oxford University Press*. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199687022.001.0001

Idil, A., & Alimuddin, H. (2024). AI-Based Public Service Transformation: An Analysis of Algorithmic Bias Risks and Digital Government Accountability in ASEAN. *Asian Digital Governance Problems, 1*(2), 78-87. https://doi.org/10.71435/685956

International Federation of Social Workers. (2023). The second issue of the International Journal of Social Work Values and Ethics for 2023 has just been published. *International Federation of*

Social Workers. https://www.ifsw.org/the-second-issue-of-the-international-journal-of-social-work-values-and-ethics-for-2023-has-just-been-published/

Keddell, E. (2019). Algorithmic justice in child protection: Statistical fairness, social justice and the implications for practice. *Social Sciences*, *8*(10), 281. **https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci8100281**

Keddell, E. (2023). On decision variability in child protection: Respect, interactive universalism and ethics of care. *Ethics and social welfare, 17*(1), 4-19. https://doi.org/10.1080/17496535.2022.2073381

Keddell, E., & Beddoe, L. (2025). Resisting the new conservatism: Social work and the social justice imperative. *Aotearoa New Zealand social work, 37*(3), 1-8. https://doi.org/10.11157/anzswj-vol37iss3id1312

Kemal, A. A. (2026). Data, algorithmic targeting, and artificial intelligence (AI) technologies in adaptive social cash systems: towards an AI governance framework. *Data & Policy, 8*, e12. https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2026.10057

Kitchin, R. (2022). *The Data Revolution: A Critical Analysis of Big Data, Open Data and Data Infrastructures* (2nd ed.). Sage Publications.

Kleinberg, J., Ludwig, J., Mullainathan, S., & Sunstein, C. R. (2018). Discrimination in the Age of Algorithms. *Journal of legal analysis*, *10*, 113-174. https://doi.org/10.1093/jla/laz001

Kumar, D., & Suthar, N. (2024). Predictive analytics and early intervention in healthcare social work: a scoping review. *Social work in health care, 63*(4-5), 208-229. https://doi.org/10.1080/00981389.2024.2316700

Mahroof, K., Weerakkody, V., Hussain, Z., & Sivarajah, U. (2025). Navigating power dynamics in the public sector through AI-driven algorithmic decision-making. *Government Information Quarterly*, 42(3), 102053. 10.1016/j.giq.2025.102053

Malik, W., Gul, S., & Qureshi, G. M. (2025). Regulating Artificial Intelligence: Challenges for Data Protection and Privacy in Developing Nations. *Journal of Social Signs Review, 3*(05), 95-108. https://www.socialsignsreivew.com/index.php/12/article/view/249

Matheus, R., Janssen, M., & Maheshwari, D. (2020). Data science empowering the public: Data-driven dashboards for transparent and accountable decision-making in smart cities. *Government Information Quarterly, 37*(3), 101284. 10.1016/j.giq.2018.01.006

Mazhar, A., Iradat, F., Taşkın, N., & Metin, B. (2025). Digital trust and the adoption of e-government services in Pakistan: a systematic literature review. *Security Journal, 38*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41284-025-00506-z

Mazzucato, M. (2023). Mission economy: A moonshot guide to changing capitalism. Harper Business.

Milan, S., & Treré, E. (2019). Big Data from the South(s): Beyond Data Universalism. *Television & New Media, 20*(4), 319–335. https://doi.org/10.1177/1527476419837739

Nkongolo, M. W. (2026). Pluralism in AI Governance: Toward Sociotechnical Alignment and Normative Coherence. arXiv preprint arXiv:2602.15881. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2602.15881

Noble, S. U. (2018). *Algorithms of oppression: How search engines reinforce racism*. NYU Press.

O'neil, C. (2017). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2025). Governing with artificial intelligence: Enablers, guardrails and engagement for unlocking trustworthy AI in government. OECD Publishing. https://www.oecd.org/en/publications/governing-with-artificial-intelligence_398fa287.htm

Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society*. Harvard University Press.

Powell, M. B., & Casey, S. (2022). Professionals' perceptions of a multi-agency computerised data sharing system. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law, 29*(6), 889-899. https://doi.org/10.1080/13218719.2021.1995520

Raji, I. D., Smart, A., White, R. N., Mitchell, M., Gebru, T., Hutchinson, B., Smith-Loud, J., Theron, D., & Barnes, P. (2020, January 3). Closing the AI accountability gap: Defining an End-to-End Framework for internal Algorithmic auditing. arXiv.org. https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.00973

Reisman, D., Schultz, J., Crawford, K., & Whittaker, M. (2018). Algorithmic Impact Assessments A Practical Framework for Public Agency Accountability. AI Now. - References - Scientific Research Publishing. (n.d.). https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3337648

Rempel, E. S., Polizzi, G., & Yates, S. (2025). Exploring the benefits of participatory action research to a participatory data stewardship community project: the Round 'Ere case study on data and well-being. *Frontiers in digital health*, 7, 1520825. https://doi.org/10.3389/fdgth.2025.1520825

Rosholm, M., Bodilsen, S. T., Michel, B., & Nielsen, A. S. (2024). Predictive risk modeling for child maltreatment detection and enhanced decision-making: Evidence from Danish administrative data. *PLoS one*, 19(7), e0305974. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0305974

Rulandari, N., Silalahi, A. D. K., Phuong, D. T. T., & Eunike, I. J. (2025). Decoding effectiveness and efficiency in AI-enabled public services: a configurational pathway to citizen and employee satisfaction. *Frontiers in Political Science, 7*, 1560180. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2025.1560180

Ruschemeier, H., & Hondrich, L. J. (2024). Automation bias in public administration: An interdisciplinary perspective from law and psychology. *Government Information Quarterly, 41*(3), 101953. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2024.101953

Saxena, D., & Guha, S. (2024). Algorithmic harms in child welfare: Uncertainties in practice, organization, and street-level decision-making. *ACM Journal on Responsible Computing*, *1*(1), 1-32. https://doi.org/10.1145/361647

Senate of Pakistan. (2023). *The Personal Data Protection Bill, 2023*. http://senate.gov.pk/en/billsummary.php?bid=1182

Sharp, D., Anwar, M., Goodwin, S., Raven, R., Bartram, L., & Kamruzzaman, L. (2022). A participatory approach for empowering community engagement in data governance: The Monash Net Zero Precinct. *Data & Policy, 4*, e5. https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2021.33

Siad, R., & Sagar, A. (2025). AI-powered digital identity systems and the new digital divide: The case of world. *Emerging Media, 3*(3), 391-400. https://doi.org/10.1177/27523543251340713

Taylor, L. (2023). Data Justice, Computational Social Science and Policy. *In Hand Book of Computational Social Science and Policy* (pp. 41–56). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-16624-2_3

Taylor, L., & Broeders, D. (2015). In the name of development: Power, profit and the datafication of the global south. *Geoforum, 64*, 229-237. 10.1016/j.geoforum.2015.07.002

Taylor, R. R., Murphy, J. W., Hoston, W. T., & Senkaiahliyan, S. (2025). Democratizing AI in public administration: improving equity through maximum feasible participation. *AI & society, 40*(5), 3653-3662. https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007/s00146-024-02120-w

Thakur, P. (2025). Algorithmic accountability: Ensuring transparency and fairness in automated systems. *Global Media Journal, 23*(78), Article 521. 10.36648/1550-7521.22.70.521

UNDP. (2022). *Pakistan national human development report 2020/2021: The three Ps of inequality—Power, people, and policy*. Islamabad: United Nations Development Programme.

https://www.undp.org/pakistan/publications/pakistan-national-human-development-report-inequality

Vaithianathan, R., Maloney, T., Putnam-Hornstein, E., & Jiang, N. (2013). Children in the public benefit system at risk of maltreatment: Identification via predictive modeling. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 45*(3), 354–359. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2013.04.022

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

Wachter, S., & Mittelstadt, B. (2019). A right to reasonable inferences. *Columbia Business Law Review, 2019*(2), 494–620. https://doi.org/10.7916/cblr.v2019i2.3424

Wachter, S., & Mittelstadt, B. (2019). A right to reasonable inferences. Wachter, S., Mittelstadt, B. and Russell, C. (2017) Counterfactual Explanations without Opening the Black Box Automated Decisions and the GDPR. Harvard Journal of Law & Technology, 31, 842-887. https://doi.org/10.7916/cblr.v2019i2.3424

Wirtz, B. W., Weyerer, J. C., & Sturm, B. J. (2020). The dark sides of artificial intelligence: An integrated AI governance framework for public administration. *International Journal of Public Administration, 43*(9), 818-829. https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2020.1749851

World Bank. (2021). *World development report 2021: Data for better lives.* Washington, DC:

World Bank. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-1-4648-1600-0

World Bank. (2025). Digital delivery systems for social protection. *In World Bank*. https://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/socialprotection/brief/digital-delivery-systems

Yeung, K. (2018). Algorithmic regulation: A critical interrogation. *Regulation & Governance, 12*(4), 505–523. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12158

Zuboff, S. (2019) *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power.* New York: Public Affairs.

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