Beyond Procedural AI Ethics: Islamic Moral Reasoning for Algorithmic Governance

Reza Payandeh (Corresponding Author) , **Seyed Mostafa Jalili**

Email: reza.payandeh@ut.ac.ir

Faculty of Governance, College of Management, University of Tehran, Iran

ORCID: 0000-0002-9515-5587

Email: s.mostafajalili@ut.ac.ir

Faculty of Governance, College of Management, University of Tehran, Iran

ORCID: 0000-0002-3347-7337

Abstract

The expanding reliance on algorithmic systems in public administration has reshaped the foundations of governance by redistributing moral and cognitive authority from human agents to computational procedures. While algorithmic governance enhances efficiency, consistency, and scalability, it simultaneously generates normative tensions concerning justice, dignity, discretion, and accountability. This article argues that addressing these tensions requires not only procedural safeguards but also substantive moral orientation. This article develops an exploratory Islamic ethical framework for algorithmic governance grounded in Islamic moral reasoning. Through qualitative thematic analysis of Qur'anic verses and transmitted traditions, the study identifies nine ethical principles—*al-taṣarruf, al-karāmah, al-adl, al-wafā, al-raḥmah, al-amānah, al-iḥtiyāt, al-ṣidq,* and *al-ḥurmat*—that together form a coherent moral architecture for evaluating algorithmic decision-making. The findings position Islamic moral reasoning as a complementary and context-sensitive evaluative lens for algorithmic governance. Rather than displacing established approaches to fairness, accountability, privacy, or explainability, it connects these concerns to a moral vocabulary of stewardship, dignity, responsible delegation, epistemic caution, and accountability before *Allah*. By integrating these principles into contemporary debates, the study reframes algorithms not as substitutes for moral agency but as instruments whose legitimacy depends on their alignment with enduring ethical commitments.

Key words: Algorithmic governance; AI ethics; Islamic ethics; Human dignity; Algorithmic decision-making.

Introduction

The rise of algorithmic governance has redefined the moral and institutional landscape of public decision-making. Once envisioned as a pathway toward greater efficiency, accuracy, and comprehensibility (Roehl & Crompvoets, 2025), the embedding of algorithms into governance processes now reveals a deeper transformation in authority, legitimacy, and accountability. As Blankenship (2019) observes, algorithmic systems have transitioned from being instruments of administrative rationality to becoming active agents that shape political and moral orders. This transformation signifies not merely a technological shift but a profound reconfiguration of how power is exercised and justified in contemporary governance (Davutoğlu, 2025; Gritsenko & Wood, 2022). Early advocates of digital rationalization emphasized precision, scalability, and predictive capability (Henman, 2020), yet these promises have been overshadowed by mounting evidence of opacity, bias, and erosion of human discretion (Bunnell, 2021). The resulting condition, often described as algocracy (Danaher, 2020), marks a moment in which decision-making authority is increasingly delegated to autonomous systems rather than to accountable human agents.

Algorithmic governance emerges as a novel and distinctive kind of societal steering (König, 2020). Debates on algorithmic governance mainly revolve around governance of algorithms (how algorithms are regulated as socio-technical systems) and governance by algorithms (how they function as tools through which power is exercised) (Musella, 2025; Ebers & Gamito, 2021; Just & Latzer, 2016; Saurwein et al., 2015). When algorithms are conceived as complex computer-based epistemic procedures, algorithmic governance can be understood as **a** mode of social ordering that relies on rule-based coordination among actors and integrates particularly complex computational epistemic procedures (Katzenbach & Ulbricht, 2019). Algorithmic governance offers considerable advantages in enhancing governmental and administrative efficiency. By integrating artificial intelligence and algorithmic decision-making into bureaucratic processes, public institutions can streamline operations, accelerate routine procedures, and reduce the time and resources traditionally required for repetitive tasks. This increased efficiency often leads to cost savings and improved scalability, allowing agencies to manage larger workloads or populations without proportional increases in staffing or expenditures (Bouchetara et al., 2024; Selten & Meijer, 2021). Through leveraging large datasets and predictive analytics, algorithmic governance enables the generation of data-driven insights that inform policy and operational decisions with enhanced accuracy and responsiveness (Vogel, 2025). AI-enabled governance can also foster organizational adaptability and innovation: by automating repetitive tasks and enabling rapid analysis of evolving conditions, institutions become better positioned to respond to emerging societal challenges and shifting citizen needs (Engin et al., 2025). While these benefits underscore

the potential of algorithmic governance to enhance efficiency and responsiveness, it also raises important considerations and challenges, some of which are discussed below.

Algorithmic governance fundamentally creates tensions with—and partially displaces—human discretion and intervention (Issar & Aneesh, 2022). McCann (2023) emphasizes that introducing algorithms into administrative processes reshapes relationships among decision-makers, front-line staff, and affected individuals, often sidelining the human judgment expected by law. Discretion, in his account, involves contextual reasoning, moral sensitivity, and deliberative judgment—capacities algorithms cannot replicate—thus narrowing the discretionary space essential for public law legitimacy. Peeters (2020) further shows that discretion is not eliminated but reconfigured: it may shift upward to the system level, become constrained by the opacity of machine learning, or fragment across organizational networks without harmonized feedback. Together, these insights reveal that algorithmic governance transforms where, how, and by whom judgment is exercised, raising critical questions about accountability, oversight, and the preservation of normative legal principles.

Building on this transformation of administrative judgment, algorithms are also understood as "technologies of power" that "subjectify" the individuals they act upon, shaping their behaviors and roles within social systems (Kasapoglu et al., 2021). This process is often described as "algorithmic subjectification," whereby algorithms can co-produce subjectivities by embedding norms, priorities, and constraints into social and organizational practices (Matzner, 2023; Armano et al., 2022). Rather than merely automating decisions, algorithmic systems can influence how individuals perceive opportunities, structure their actions, and navigate social roles within institutional and everyday contexts. This influence may extend to aspects of subjectivity itself: individuals' choices, self-understanding, and social interactions can be shaped, in context-dependent ways, by data-driven infrastructures that operate alongside existing organizational and social mechanisms. In this sense, algorithmic systems constitute a form of power that is embedded in social and organizational life (Matzner, 2023; Armano et al., 2022).

In addition to shaping subjectivities, algorithms also structure the interpretive frameworks through which individuals and institutions understand social reality. They construct narratives about individuals through processes termed "algorithmic emplotment,"- the narrative structuring of data into coherent life-stories- which organize and present data in coherent ways, influencing how people perceive and interact with the world (Jacobsen, 2022). Moreover, algorithms exercise considerable social power by legitimizing certain representations of the world and creating a necessity for algorithmic visibility, thereby shaping societal norms and behaviors (Lundahl, 2022). This power is not solely inherent to the algorithms themselves but is distributed through networks of people, processes, and resources, becoming particularly evident during moments of breakdown or failure (Neyland & Möllers, 2019). These dynamics are further illustrated in welfare contexts, where algorithmic systems reinforce existing political and economic structures by emphasizing efficiency and standardization, while simultaneously raising ethical challenges (Niklas, 2020). Taken together, algorithms as technologies of power not only shape individual subjectivities but

also reinforce and transform social, political, and economic structures, highlighting the need for a critical examination of their broader implications and ethical considerations.

The ethical paradox at the heart of algorithmic governance lies in its simultaneous claim to neutrality and its capacity to reproduce structural injustices. Studies across diverse political systems indicate that algorithmic decision-making frequently amplifies discrimination, undermines transparency, and weakens social trust (Festic, 2022; Ghose et al., 2025). The problem, as Volkov (2025) and Chomanski (2022) argue, is not only technical but deeply normative; algorithms encode implicit moral assumptions while concealing them under the guise of data-driven objectivity. In other words, ethical considerations are still embedded in algorithms, but they have become largely obscured. Global responses—ranging from algorithmic impact assessments to fairness and explainability frameworks—have strengthened accountability by advancing transparency, non-discrimination, and procedural safeguards. Yet, in some institutional settings, these safeguards can become predominantly compliance-oriented when they are disconnected from wider questions of purpose, responsibility, human worth, and the social meaning of data-driven public decisions. This has given rise to what Innerarity (2024) calls a "legitimacy deficit," in which societies accept algorithmic efficiency at the cost of moral coherence and human dignity.

This paper responds to that gap by developing an exploratory Islamic ethical framework for algorithmic governance. It asks: How can the principles of *al-adl*, *al-karāmah*, and *al-amānah* derived from Islamic teachings construct the ethical foundations for algorithmic governance? The study does not claim to offer a comprehensive or legally binding theory of Islamic ethics for artificial intelligence; rather, it draws on selected Qur'anic verses and transmitted traditions relevant to justice, dignity, trust, accountability, privacy, and harm prevention. In addressing this question, the study positions Islamic ethics not as a counterpoint but as a complementary moral paradigm that enriches global debates on algorithmic legitimacy. By aligning the technical architectures of governance with the moral architecture of responsibility, this research proposes a spiritually anchored vision of algorithmic ethics.

The significance of religion, faith, and spirituality for public administration seems to have been overlooked in mainstream research (Ongaro & Tantardini, 2024). And we need to develop a research agenda in this topic (Drechsler et al., 2024). The inquiry into spiritually anchored governance is further supported by the emerging research agenda on Islamic public value, which establishes Islamic public administration as a viable, faith-based alternative to dominant Western models (Drechsler et al., 2025). Recent frameworks emphasize that organizational value creation must integrate financial metrics with social justice and accountability rooted in the *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* (Wahib et al., 2024). Consequently, contemporary Islamic governance models effectively operationalize principles such as *al-adl* (justice) and *al-mas'uliyyah* (accountability) to meet global sustainable development goals and foster institutional integrity (Ahmed, 2025). Accordingly, this article examines Islamic ethical principles as they relate to politics and public administration within the framework of Islamic governance (Alibašić, 2024).

Within this broader Islamic public value perspective, *maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* provides a useful meta-framework for linking textual ethics to public governance. *Maqāṣid al-sharīʿah* refers to the higher objectives of Islamic law, commonly associated with the protection of religion, life, intellect, lineage, and property, and more broadly with the realization of justice and public welfare. In this study, the nine principles identified from Qur'anic verses and transmitted traditions are interpreted in relation to this maqāṣid-oriented horizon, especially in their concern for dignity, justice, trust, harm prevention, privacy, and responsible stewardship.

Ethical Theories and the Genealogy of Critiques of Algorithmic Governance

This section situates contemporary critiques of algorithmic governance within selected ethical traditions, including consequentialist, deontological and contractualist, and virtue-ethical reasoning. The purpose is illustrative rather than exhaustive: these traditions are internally diverse and can support multiple, sometimes conflicting, approaches to fairness, harm, dignity, responsibility, and public legitimacy. The discussion therefore does not seek to establish a single "Western" ethical position, but to identify several influential normative lenses through which the ethical challenges of algorithmic governance have been interpreted.

In consequentialist reasoning—shaped by Bentham's and Mill's formulations of utility—assesses moral practices based on their outcomes (Bentham, 2000; Mill, 1998). Critiques of algorithmic discrimination, unequal error distribution, and the long-term harms of opaque automated systems reflect this evaluative logic. Research demonstrates that algorithmic decision-making can generate disparate impacts, particularly against vulnerable groups (Barocas & Selbst, 2016), and can produce hidden externalities that undermine institutional trust (Mittelstadt et al., 2016). Accordingly, criticisms such as "algorithms amplify inequities," "automated systems impose disproportionate burdens," and "predictive infrastructures create systemic risks" derive from the consequentialist focus on aggregate welfare and distributive effects.

A second cluster of critiques emerges from deontological and contractualist traditions, especially Kantian respect for persons and Rawlsian public justifiability. Kant's principle that individuals must always be treated as ends in themselves (Kant, 1996) underlies concerns about opaque algorithmic decisions that strip individuals of meaningful agency or contestability (Binns, 2018). Contractualist reasoning similarly informs worries about fairness and legitimacy. Rawls (1971) argues that institutions must be acceptable to all under conditions of equality; algorithmic systems that obscure reasoning, prevent appeal, or produce unequal treatment violate this requirement. The disappearance of accountable human judgment and the emergence of "black box bureaucracy" (Citron & Pasquale, 2014) therefore reflect deep deontological anxieties.

A third set of critiques is grounded in virtue ethics, especially Aristotelian notions of character and phronēsis (Crisp, 2014). Scholars argue that algorithmic governance weakens human judgment, fosters overreliance on computational outputs, and cultivates a technocratic ethos that sidelines moral deliberation (Vallor, 2016). From this lens, the issue is not only what algorithms decide but

what kind of moral agents their use produces. Concerns about "moral deskilling," "automation of discretion," and "loss of contextual sensitivity" reflect anxieties that algorithmic systems undermine the cultivation of virtues such as responsibility, prudence, and justice.

Across Western ethical traditions, algorithmic governance can face multidimensional critiques. Consequentialist perspectives emphasize harms, unequal impacts, and systemic risks, highlighting how algorithms can amplify inequities and undermine collective welfare. Deontological and contractualist reasoning focuses on fairness, agency, and accountability, criticizing opaque "black box" systems that violate principles of respect, legitimacy, and public justifiability. Virtue ethics draws attention to the effects on moral character and judgment, warning that overreliance on algorithmic systems fosters moral deskilling and erodes the cultivation of practical wisdom, responsibility, and contextual sensitivity. Collectively, these traditions illuminate the ethical tensions between outcomes, principles, and character in the governance of automated decision-making.

Moral Pluralism and an Islamic Contribution to Algorithmic Governance

Some concerns in contemporary AI ethics extend beyond the dominant procedural emphasis on fairness, transparency, and accountability. These include the marginalization of non-Western moral frameworks, questions of ethical intention, and the place of spiritual or transcendent commitments in public decision-making. Scholars have noted that universal procedural approaches may underrepresent culturally and locally rooted conceptions of justice and responsibility, creating normative gaps in non-Western settings (d'Iribarne, 2009; Fritzen, 2007). This concern is also reflected in postcolonial and decolonial scholarship, which challenges the presumed universality of dominant epistemic and normative frameworks. Mignolo conceptualizes the "coloniality of knowledge" as the ongoing privileging of Western ways of knowing, while de Sousa Santos advances "epistemologies of the South" to foreground plural, context-specific forms of knowledge and justice (Mignolo, 2011; de Sousa Santos, 2014).

Ubuntu-informed AI ethics illustrates both the promise and the difficulty of drawing on culturally situated moral traditions. Ubuntu emphasizes relational personhood, communal responsibility, and social harmony, challenging approaches that privilege abstract individual autonomy. Yet its normative content and institutional application remain contested, and African AI strategies rarely specify how Ubuntu should guide design or governance. This suggests that pluralizing AI ethics requires not only cultural recognition but also clear articulation of ethical content and pathways for implementation (Yilma, 2025).

Buddhist reflections similarly challenge the assumption that humans, AI systems, and their effects exist independently. By emphasizing interdependence and relational agency, they shift attention from technical alignment alone to the broader ways human–AI relations reshape judgment, care, attention, and shared flourishing. Rather than offering a self-contained alternative, Buddhist ethics

calls for an ethical ecosystem in which different traditions contribute their strengths while recognizing their own blind spots (Compson et al., 2025).

Within this broader pluralist conversation, Islamic moral reasoning offers a further perspective on algorithmic governance. It frames governance as an entrusted responsibility (*al-amānah*) connected to justice (*al-adl*), dignity (*al-karāmah*), and accountability before *Allah*. Rather than replacing established AI ethics approaches, the present study examines how these orientations may enrich reflection on intention, responsibility, justified inference, and the moral purpose of automated public decision-making. Although much existing scholarship has examined the institutional and political implications of algorithmic governance, the moral and spiritual dimensions of this transformation from an Islamic perspective remain underexplored (Calzada, 2018; Grimmelikhuijsen & Meijer, 2022; Mendonça et al., 2024).

Despite the moral richness of Islamic ethical thought, there remains a striking absence of research integrating its principles into the study of algorithmic governance. Existing frameworks seldom address how divine justice could inform automated decision-making or how moral agency might be preserved within computational architectures. The neglect of non-Western ethical systems has produced a normative gap: algorithmic governance is globally pervasive but morally provincial. As a result, the moral imagination guiding AI and governance remains limited to procedural justice, overlooking deeper questions of intention, responsibility, and transcendence (Ghosh et al., 2025; Davutoğlu, 2025).

Methodology

This study adopts an exploratory qualitative approach supported by an archival review of existing texts. The exploratory design allowed the researchers to work through ambiguities in the problem and gradually form a clearer conceptual picture. Since contemporary concepts such as algorithmic governance, automated decision-making, algorithmic profiling, and data-driven public administration do not appear directly in classical Islamic texts, the analysis proceeded through an interpretive bridge. First, the ethical problems of algorithmic governance were decomposed into underlying moral questions, including consent, trust, justice, dignity, confidentiality, verification, non-intrusion, human agency, and harm prevention. Second, Qur'anic verses and transmitted traditions related to these moral questions were identified and coded. Third, the resulting codes were grouped into broader Islamic ethical principles and then translated into implications for algorithmic governance, such as limits on surveillance, requirements for data stewardship, fairness assessment, human oversight, privacy protection, and safeguards against speculative inference.
The archival component involved engaging with authoritative documents and classical Islamic sources, following the logic outlined by Saunders et al. (2023). Data collection took place during 2025–2026 and began with consultations with Islamic scholars familiar with ethical reasoning in the Islamic tradition. These consultations helped refine the scope of inquiry and identify relevant thematic directions within Qur'anic verses and transmitted traditions. To avoid decontextualized readings of the selected Qur'anic passages, the analysis also used tafsīr as an interpretive support,

consulting established exegetical works such as *al-Mīzān, Tafsīr-e Nemūneh, Tafsīr-e Nūr, al-Burhān, and Nūr al-Thaqalayn*. These sources helped clarify the semantic scope and textual context of the verses while guiding, rather than replacing, the thematic coding process. For each selected source, the coding also considered its immediate textual and thematic context, including the surrounding passage for Qur'anic verses and the relevant subject matter of the narration, to avoid isolated readings.

The study does not employ *uṣūl al-fiqh* to derive binding legal rulings or to classify the selected texts as legally enforceable norms. Rather, it treats them as sources of moral orientation, distinguishing textual indications from ethical implications and their contemporary relevance for algorithmic governance.

A concept-led list of keywords was developed to guide searches across hadith collections, Qur'anic sources, and exegetical works. These terms included *amānah* (stewardship), *baḥth* (inquiry), *ghabn* (misrepresentation), *gharār* (uncertainty), *ghashsh* (deception), *ḥaqq* (right/justice), *idhn* (consent), *ikhtiyār* (choice), *istimāʿ* (listening), *istīnās* (seeking assurance), *karam* (nobility), *kitmān* (concealment), *māl* (property), *ṣidq* (truthfulness), *sitr* (protection), *sulṭah* (authority), *tajassus* (intrusion), *ʿawrah* (personal sanctity), *ʿizzah* (dignity), and *ẓann* (assumption). Searches were conducted through the Comprehensive Library of Hadiths Noor and related Qur'anic and exegetical sources. The initial corpus comprised 47 Qur'anic verses and 265 narrations. Using relevance to the ethical questions of algorithmic governance, textual contextualization, and narrational reliability as screening criteria, repetitive, tangential, and weak-chain materials were excluded. For example, texts were excluded when they repeated an ethical indication already represented in the corpus or lacked a direct connection to automated public decision-making, data practices, or algorithmic inference. The final analytical corpus comprised 17 Qur'anic verses and 7 narrations. Given the school-dependent nature of hadith authentication, narrations were treated as supplementary ethical evidence, while the framework was primarily grounded in Qur'anic material.

The thematic analysis followed Braun and Clarke's (2006) six-phase procedure. Both researchers reviewed the screening and coding process, and an external researcher with expertise in Islamic studies examined the final corpus and thematic structure. Any interpretive uncertainties were resolved through discussion and consensus. Coding began without a pre-specified nine-principle framework: textual indications were first coded openly, then compared and clustered into organizing themes and broader ethical categories. The analysis therefore followed a traceable sequence from textual evidence to basic codes, organizing themes, comprehensive ethical categories, and implications for algorithmic governance. Contextual reading of the selected texts and relevant tafsīr sources helped ensure that the resulting categories were grounded in the semantic and thematic setting of the original materials rather than derived from isolated passages.

Findings

After compiling the relevant Qur'anic verses and narrations connected to ethical considerations in algorithmic governance, the material underwent a staged thematic analysis. Each textual unit was examined in its textual and thematic context to identify its underlying ethical indication, which was then expressed as a basic code. In the subsequent phase, the basic codes were clustered into broader organizing themes that reflected recurring ethical functions. These organizing themes were subsequently synthesized into comprehensive ethical orientations that captured the overarching moral structure emerging from the data. Table 1 presents the resulting thematic framework.

Table 1. Ethical themes relevant to algorithmic governance

Comprehensive Themes	Organizing Themes and Illustrative Governance Implications	Basic Themes
al-taṣarruf	Human capacity for choice — *Systems should preserve user agency, avoid coercive nudging, and ensure meaningful consent and explainability.*	Human freedom in belief and action; rejection of coercion; affirmation of moral agency
	Ownership and stewardship of property — *Algorithms must respect data ownership and prevent unauthorized extraction or repurposing.*	Accountable stewardship in managing personal resources
al-karāmah	Acquired dignity — *Systems must avoid discriminatory scoring or embedded value judgments.*	Moral character as a basis for elevated dignity
	Inherent dignity — *Algorithms should preserve human-centered decision rights and avoid dehumanizing classifications.*	Intrinsic honor bestowed upon human beings
	Respect for personal sanctity — *Surveillance, biometric overreach, and exploitative profiling must be restricted.*	Requirement to uphold the personal sanctity of individuals
al-adl	Observing justice — *Fairness audits are needed to prevent bias and discrimination.*	Ensuring fairness and rightful treatment in exchanges
	Considering collective benefit — *Data monopolies should be prevented to ensure equitable digital access.*	Condemnation of monopolizing essential resources

al-wafā	Fulfilling obligations — *Systems should align with declared policies and avoid hidden functionalities.*	Adherence to one's commitments
	Legitimate use of others' property — *Explicit permission and transparency are required in data usage.*	Requirement of permission and ethical acquisition of property
al-raḥmah	Promoting welfare — *Algorithms should prioritize societal well-being and avoid manipulative designs.*	Promotion of kindness and societal welfare
al-amānah	Prohibition of betrayal — *Platforms must maintain integrity in data handling and decisions.*	Rejection of actions that breach entrusted responsibilities
	Confidentiality — *Security-by-design and restricted access are essential for safeguarding information.*	Safeguarding confidential information and refraining from disclosure
al-iḥtiyāt	Preventing harm — *Harm-impact assessments should precede deployment.*	Commitment to preventing harm to others
	Verifying information — *Systems must counter misinformation through reliable verification processes.*	Verification of information through reliable and diverse sources
	Precision in transactions — *High-stakes automation requires accuracy guarantees and oversight.*	Expectation of precision and integrity in transactions
	Avoiding assumptions — *Algorithms should avoid speculative inference or opaque heuristics.*	Avoidance of acting on unverified assumptions
al-ṣidq	Transparency and truthfulness — *Explainability and traceability are necessary for trustworthy systems.*	Practice of truthfulness and openness in exchanges
	Prohibition of fraud — *Algorithms must avoid deceptive or manipulative patterns.*	Prohibition of misleading or fraudulent behavior
al-ḥurmat	Respecting boundaries — *Surveillance and ambient data capture should be minimized.*	Respect for personal boundaries and avoidance of intrusive acts

	Avoiding harm — *Profiling and targeting of vulnerable groups should be restricted.*	Refraining from actions that inflict material or personal harm
	Avoiding intrusion into private matters — *Systems must refrain from predicting sensitive traits or conducting hidden profiling.*	Avoidance of unnecessary inquiry into private matters

Taken together, the analysis identified 34 basic themes, 22 organizing themes, and 9 comprehensive themes. These themes outline an ethical architecture grounded in Islamic teachings—including *al-taṣarruf, al-karāmah, al-adl, al-wafā, al-raḥmah, al-amānah, al-iḥtiyāt, al-ṣidq, al-ḥurmat* —that can inform evaluations of contemporary algorithmic governance practices.

To make explicit how the extracted Islamic ethical principles were connected to contemporary algorithmic governance, Table 2 presents the interpretive bridge between textual indications, underlying ethical questions, comprehensive principles, and governance implications.

Table 2. Interpretive bridge from Islamic ethical principles to algorithmic governance implications

Islamic textual indication	Basic ethical question	Islamic principle	Algorithmic governance implication
Prohibition of spying and suspicion	How should hidden inference and surveillance be limited?	*al-ḥurmat / al-iḥtiyāṭ*	Restrict covert surveillance, hidden profiling, and speculative inference
Obligation to verify reports	How should systems prevent harm from unreliable information?	*al-iḥtiyāṭ / al-ṣidq*	Require data validation, model verification, and impact assessment
Human dignity	How should persons be treated in automated decisions?	*al-karāmah*	Avoid dehumanizing classification and preserve human review
Trust and non-betrayal	Who remains responsible for automated decisions?	*al-amānah*	Assign responsibility to human and institutional actors
Consent and legitimate use of property	When is data use legitimate?	*al-taṣarruf / al-adl*	Require consent, lawful data use, and limits on unjust extraction

Table 3 clarifies how the framework relates to familiar AI ethics safeguards. Its contribution is not to replace these safeguards, but to identify additional evaluative questions and conditions of legitimacy that arise when algorithmic governance is interpreted through Islamic moral reasoning.

Table 3. Shared AI ethics safeguards and distinctive evaluative questions in Islamic moral reasoning

Islamic moral orientation	Shared concern in mainstream AI ethics	Distinctive evaluative question	Governance consequence
Stewardship (*al-amānah*)	Accountability, traceability, and human oversight	Who bears non-transferable responsibility when authority is delegated to an algorithmic system?	Identify named institutional duty-bearers, preserve human responsibility, and establish mechanisms of justification and remedy.
Personal sanctity (*al-ḥurmat*)	Privacy, data minimization, and protection of sensitive information	Is the collection, inference, or use of personal data necessary and morally permissible, even where it may be legally available?	Apply stricter necessity and proportionality tests to surveillance, biometric systems, and sensitive profiling.
Moral caution (*al-iḥtiyāt*)	Risk assessment, robustness, and harm prevention	What level of uncertainty is morally tolerable before automated decisions affect people's rights or welfare?	Require heightened verification, conservative deployment thresholds, and human review in high-stakes contexts.
Human dignity (*al-karāmah*)	Non-discrimination, human rights, and contestability	Does the system reduce persons to predictive categories in ways that undermine their moral standing?	Restrict dehumanizing classifications and ensure meaningful opportunities for explanation, appeal, and human reconsideration.
Responsible agency and fulfilment of commitments (*al-taṣarruf and al-wafā*)	Consent, autonomy, and purpose limitation	Is consent meaningful under conditions of informational asymmetry, and is data use consistent with its declared purpose?	Limit coercive nudging, hidden secondary uses, and deviations from publicly stated data practices.
Justice and mercy (*al-adl and al-raḥmah*)	Fairness, equity, and social welfare	Who bears the residual costs, errors, and exclusions created by automated allocation or prediction?	Assess distributive effects, protect vulnerable groups, and prevent efficiency goals from displacing social welfare.

Discussion

The findings of this study suggest that Islamic ethics offers a coherent and substantive moral framework capable of addressing the legitimacy challenges that have emerged with the rise of algorithmic governance. While contemporary scholarship has traced how administrative systems increasingly shift from human discretion to automated decision-making—often in the name of efficiency, scalability, and predictive accuracy (Blankenship, 2019; Davutoğlu, 2025)—research consistently shows that these developments also generate deeper tensions around justice, accountability, and transparency (Festic, 2022; Grimmelikhuijsen & Meijer, 2022). As illustrated in Figure 1, the nine Islamic ethical orientations operate not as isolated principles but as an interconnected moral architecture for assessing the legitimacy of algorithmic systems. By grounding governance in entrusted responsibility, justice, dignity, epistemic caution, and accountability before Allah, Islamic moral reasoning complements established AI ethics concerns while broadening reflection on intention, justified inference, and the moral purpose of automated public decision-making.

Figure 1: Interrelated Islamic Ethical Orientations for the Legitimate Governance of Algorithmic Systems

The analysis conducted in this study demonstrates that existing critiques of algorithmic governance—whether consequentialist, deontological, contractualist, or virtue-based—remain rooted in a secular, human-centered moral framework. Consequentialist arguments highlight the risks of discriminatory outcomes, unequal error distribution, and long-term harms produced by opaque computational systems (Barocas & Selbst, 2016; Mittelstadt et al., 2016). Deontological and contractualist perspectives raise concerns about diminished agency, opacity, and the weakening of due process in algorithmically mediated decisions (Binns, 2018; Citron & Pasquale, 2014; Rawls, 1971). Virtue-ethical accounts warn that heavy reliance on automated systems can undermine practical judgment, promote moral deskilling, and marginalize forms of reasoning that

depend on context and lived experience (Crisp, 2014; Vallor, 2016). Meanwhile, scholarship on the governance capacities of algorithms has emphasized how computational infrastructures reshape power relations, redistribute discretion, and deepen dependencies on socio-technical arrangements (Danaher, 2020; Gritsenko & Wood, 2022; Issar & Aneesh, 2022).

The Islamic ethical architecture that emerged from this study responds to these concerns but does so by invoking a different moral ontology. Principles such as *al-taṣarruf*, *al-karāmah*, *al-adl*, *al-wafā*, *al-raḥmah*, *al-amānah*, *al-iḥtiyāt*, *al-ṣidq*, and *al-ḥurmat* do not view ethics as merely a matter of balancing utilities, respecting procedural rights, or cultivating individual virtues. Instead, they frame governance—human or algorithmic—as an exercise of stewardship (*al-amānah*) that is accountable before *Allah*. In this view, algorithmic systems are not neutral instruments to be judged solely by their outputs but must themselves align with substantive moral expectations: they must uphold justice, protect human dignity, avoid harm, exhibit truthfulness, and preserve the sanctity of personal and sensitive information. These principles expand the normative vocabulary of algorithmic ethics by grounding evaluation not only in institutional or procedural criteria but in an overarching moral purpose.

This ontological shift significantly affects how algorithmic systems are assessed. In Western frameworks, algorithmic decision-making is often considered ethically problematic when it demonstrably produces discriminatory outcomes or undermines opportunities for contestation. The Islamic perspective elevates the threshold: systems that infer sensitive characteristics without necessity, that rely on unverifiable assumptions, or that normalize intrusive data practices may be morally unacceptable even if they satisfy formal criteria of fairness. Principles such as *al-iḥtiyāt* and *al-ṣidq* require epistemic caution, rigorous verification, and avoidance of speculative inference. As a result, models and data practices that are deemed "acceptable" in risk-based administrative systems (Henman, 2020; Monteiro, 2025) may still fail Islamic tests of moral responsibility.

The findings also deepen existing debates on the reconfiguration of administrative discretion. While Western scholars have shown that algorithms shift discretion rather than eliminate it—relocating judgment to system-designers or fragmenting it across technical infrastructures (McCann, 2023; Peeters, 2020)—the Islamic concepts of *al-taṣarruf* and *al-karāmah* highlight that preserving meaningful agency is not only instrumentally useful but intrinsically required by the recognition of human beings as honoured moral actors. Reducing individuals to data points or narrowing the scope for conscientious judgment is therefore normatively troubling not simply because it may result in errors, but because it violates the moral status accorded to human beings.

Furthermore, the notion of *al-amānah* offers a clearer resolution to the widespread problem of diminishing accountability in automated governance. Western scholarship often struggles to determine responsibility when authorial and operational control is distributed across designers, bureaucrats, and machine-learning systems (Henman, 2020; Innerarity, 2024; Volkov, 2025). The Islamic framework does not allow responsibility to be shifted onto machines. Instead, it places

moral and institutional responsibility squarely on the human and organizational actors who design, authorize, and deploy algorithmic systems. Delegation to automated systems therefore increases, rather than decreases, the obligation to safeguard confidentiality, prevent harm, and uphold justice—particularly for vulnerable groups.

Finally, this study shows that the legitimacy crisis of algorithmic governance cannot be resolved through procedural reforms alone. While transparency requirements, fairness audits, and impact assessments are important contributions (Ghosh et al., 2025; Monteiro, 2025; Sharma et al., 2020), they do not address the deeper moral deficit that arises when governance is detached from the ethical imperatives of justice, mercy, and human dignity. The Islamic framework reframes algorithms not as replacements for moral agency but as sites in which moral responsibility must be consciously enacted. By bringing principles of *al-adl*, *al-karāmah*, and *al-amānah* into the analysis, it moves beyond the assumption that technical refinement is sufficient to restore legitimacy. Instead, it calls for a more fundamental ethical orientation—one in which efficiency and innovation are continually evaluated in light of enduring moral commitments that shape a just and dignified social order.

Operationalizing the Framework: An Illustrative Welfare Eligibility Use Case

This study remains conceptual and does not claim to empirically evaluate a live algorithmic system. The following illustration is intended to demonstrate the practical relevance of the framework rather than to report findings from an empirical case study. The framework may be applied illustratively to an automated eligibility system used by a public agency to screen applications for housing assistance or social welfare benefits. Such a system may draw on income, household composition, employment status, geographic location, and prior benefit records to prioritize applicants or identify cases for further review.

The framework does not replace existing legal, technical, or rights-based safeguards. Rather, it provides an additional evaluative layer across the life cycle of the system. At the procurement stage, public authorities should define the legitimate public purpose of automation, identify decisions that cannot be delegated without meaningful human review, and require vendors to disclose data sources, model limitations, and procedures for material system changes. At the data and model-design stage, data scientists and data stewards should assess whether each category of data and inference is necessary, proportionate, and adequately supported by evidence, particularly where sensitive characteristics or proxy variables may be involved.

Before deployment, the responsible agency should examine model performance, uncertainty, error distribution, and foreseeable effects on vulnerable applicants. Systems with high uncertainty, weak evidence, or substantial risks of exclusion should not make final eligibility decisions without human reconsideration. During deployment, affected individuals should receive understandable reasons for adverse outcomes, have access to a timely appeal process, and be able to request human

review and correction of inaccurate data. After deployment, agencies should monitor complaints, exclusionary effects, and the distribution of errors across relevant groups, with authority to suspend, revise, or withdraw the system where harms cannot be adequately remedied.

In this illustrative application, operational responsibility is distributed across several actors. Policymakers and procurement officials define the legitimate public purpose of automation and identify decisions that should not be delegated without meaningful human judgment. Data scientists and data stewards are responsible for documenting data provenance, feature selection, model limitations, and sources of uncertainty. Regulators, internal auditors, and oversight bodies should review evidence of risk, monitor compliance with institutional safeguards, and establish conditions for escalation, suspension, or system revision. Front-line administrators, meanwhile, retain responsibility for communicating decisions, handling appeals, initiating human reconsideration, and ensuring that affected individuals can correct inaccurate information.

In this context, the proposed Islamic Algorithmic Impact Assessment (IAIA) is an initial conceptual template derived from the study's interpretive synthesis rather than a validated operational instrument. It functions as a structured decision gate within existing governance processes rather than as a parallel legal regime. It asks whether the proposed use of automation serves a legitimate public purpose; whether data practices and predictive inferences are necessary and proportionate; whether responsibility remains clearly assigned to human and institutional actors; whether the available evidence is sufficiently reliable for the stakes involved; and whether errors, burdens, and remedies are distributed fairly. Existing instruments—such as fairness audits, privacy safeguards, impact assessments, explainability tools, procurement requirements, and appeal mechanisms—can then serve as operational means for answering these questions.

Conclusion

This study argues that algorithmic governance cannot be legitimized through technical performance, procedural compliance, or administrative efficiency alone. Although automated systems may improve scalability, consistency, and predictive capacity, such benefits do not resolve the ethical questions surrounding responsibility, moral agency, justified inference, and the treatment of individuals within data-driven administrative architectures. Drawing on Islamic moral reasoning, this study develops a complementary and context-sensitive evaluative lens for algorithmic governance. Concepts such as *al-adl* (justice), *al-amānah* (entrusted responsibility), *al-karāmah* (dignity), *al-ṣidq* (truthfulness), and *al-iḥtiyāt* (moral caution) provide a moral vocabulary through which algorithmic systems may be assessed not only in terms of their outputs, but also in terms of the purposes, responsibilities, and forms of delegated authority that they embody.

The contribution of this framework is not to present Islamic ethics as a homogeneous or superior alternative to established approaches in AI ethics. Rather, it situates familiar concerns—including fairness, privacy, explainability, accountability, consent, and harm prevention—within an

interconnected account of entrusted authority, dignity, moral restraint, and responsibility. In this respect, Islamic moral reasoning can add interpretive depth to the assessment of data practices, speculative inference, intrusive profiling, and the social consequences of automated decision-making. It also responds to wider calls for context-sensitive and pluralistic approaches to AI governance by showing how religious and moral traditions may enrich, rather than displace, existing legal, technical, and rights-based safeguards (Astuti et al., 2025; Davutoğlu, 2025).

The framework's practical relevance was illustrated through the case of an automated welfare-eligibility system. Such a system may satisfy conventional requirements of transparency or statistical fairness while continuing to raise questions about the necessity of data collection, the legitimacy of sensitive inference, the treatment of uncertain cases, and the distribution of errors among vulnerable applicants. The proposed Islamic Algorithmic Impact Assessment (IAIA) should therefore be understood as an initial conceptual template that can operate within existing impact-assessment, procurement, auditing, and oversight processes. Rather than creating a parallel legal regime, it directs attention to whether automation serves a legitimate public purpose, whether data practices and predictive inferences are necessary and proportionate, whether consequential responsibility remains assigned to human and institutional actors, whether available evidence is reliable enough for the stakes involved, and whether errors, burdens, and remedies are distributed fairly.

For public administrations in Muslim-majority settings, including the United Arab Emirates, Saudi Arabia, and Malaysia, the framework may offer one means of connecting established AI governance mechanisms with locally meaningful moral vocabularies and expectations of responsible authority. Its purpose is not to displace legal compliance, technical standards, or rights-based protections, but to enrich institutional deliberation regarding the purpose, necessity, limits, and accountability of algorithmic decision-making. Algorithmic systems should remain subordinate to ethically justified public purposes rather than being treated merely as instruments of administrative expediency.

This study has several limitations. First, the analysis is conceptual and text-based, focusing on the interpretation of Islamic ethical sources rather than empirical testing in real-world algorithmic systems. The proposed ethical architecture should therefore be regarded as an initial interpretive contribution, not as a fully validated implementation model. Future research could examine how dignity, entrusted responsibility, justified inference, and moral caution may be operationalized within machine-learning pipelines, decision-support tools, and public-sector algorithmic assessment processes (Henman, 2020; Chenou & Valenzuela, 2021).

Second, the study does not resolve juristic disagreements across Islamic schools or encompass the full diversity of ethical reasoning across Muslim societies. Although the framework identifies broadly shared moral orientations, their legal specification, institutional interpretation, and policy application may vary across Sunni and Shiʿi traditions, cultural contexts, and governance systems. Future comparative and participatory research involving Islamic scholars, technologists, public

administrators, regulators, and affected communities could clarify how these orientations may be translated into contextually appropriate AI governance guidelines (Kariotis & Mir, 2020; Webb et al., 2018).

The study also does not fully address the institutional challenges that may arise in liberal-secular states or Muslim-minority contexts where Islamic law is not the formal legal foundation. In such settings, Islamic moral reasoning cannot substitute for democratic legitimacy, constitutional commitments, legal accountability, or pluralistic public deliberation. Future research should therefore investigate how the framework might contribute to diverse legal and political environments while remaining compatible with public reason, human rights, and the ethical diversity of affected communities.

Overall, this study underscores that algorithmic governance must be not only accurate, transparent, and legally compliant, but also morally intelligible. Systems that obscure responsibility, normalize unjustified inference, or weaken the ethical standing of affected persons risk undermining the legitimacy they are intended to enhance. By bringing Islamic moral reasoning into dialogue with contemporary debates on AI and governance, this study contributes to a more pluralistic and morally attentive understanding of the digital public sphere—one in which justice, human dignity, justified authority, and responsible stewardship remain central as societies navigate the expanding authority of algorithms.

References

Ahmed, S. S. (2025). The evolving role of sustainable development in shaping political progress: A contemporary Islamic perspective on human rights and civil institution. *Metro Islamic Law Review*, *4*(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.32332/milrev.v4i1.10128

Alibašić, H. (2024). Exploring the influence of Islamic governance and religious regimes on sustainability and resilience planning: a study of public administration in Muslim-majority countries. *Public policy and administration*, *39*(4), 556-587. https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767231223282

Armano, E., Briziarelli, M., & Risi, E. (Eds.). (2022). *Digital platforms and algorithmic subjectivities* (Vol. 24). University of Westminster Press

Astuti, Y., Ahmad, J., & Adnan, A. A. (2025). Artificial intelligence research trends in e-governance: A bibliometric analysis of decision making. In Public Governance Practices in the Age of AI. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-9286-7.ch006

Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104(3), 671–732. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2477899

Bentham, J. (2000). An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation, Kitchener. *Batoche Books*, *10*, 236

Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. In *Conference on fairness, accountability and transparency* , 149-159.

Blankenship, J. (2019). Algorithmic governance. In *International Encyclopedia of Human Geography* (2nd) .https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-102295-5.10509-8

Bouchetara, M., Zerouti, M., & Zouambi, A. R. (2024). Leveraging artificial intelligence (AI) in public sector financial risk management: Innovations, challenges, and future directions. *EDPACS*, *69*(9), 124-144. https://doi.org/10.1080/07366981.2024.2377351

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, *3*(2), 77-101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bunnell, N. (2021). Remedying public-sector algorithmic harms: The case for local and state regulation via independent agency. *Columbia Journal of Law and Social Problems*. https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85130470109

Calzada, I. (2018). Algorithmic nations: Seeing like a city-regional and techno-political conceptual assemblage. *Regional Studies, Regional Science*. https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85063477806

Chenou, J. M., & Rodríguez Valenzuela, L. E. (2021). Habeas Data, Habemus Algorithms: Algorithmic Intervention in Public Interest Decision-Making in Colombia. *Law, State & Telecommunications Review/Revista de Direito, Estado e Telecomunicações*, *13*(2). https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85115769070

Chomanski, B. (2022). Legitimacy and automated decisions: The moral limits of algocracy. *Ethics and Information Technology*. https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85135695259

Citron, D. K., & Pasquale, F. (2014). The scored society: Due process for automated predictions. *Washington Law Review*, 89(1), 1–33. DOI:10.1080/13600869.2017.1298547

Compson, J., Graves, M., Hershock, P. D., & Mirghafori, N. (2025). A middle path for AI ethics? Some Buddhist reflections. *Theology and Science, 23*(1), 1–5. https://doi.org/10.1080/14746700.2024.2436776

Crisp, R. (Ed.). (2014). *Aristotle: nicomachean ethics*. Cambridge University Press

Danaher, J. (2020). Freedom in an age of algocracy. In *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Technology*. https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/85138097704

Davutoğlu, E. (2025). Algorithmic governance and its transformative role in decision-making. In *AI driven tools for sustainable public administration*. 277-290. IGI Global Scientific Publishing. https://www.scopus.com/pages/publications/86000202956

de Sousa Santos, B. (2014). *Epistemologies of the South: Justice against epistemicide*. Routledge.

d'Iribarne, P. (2009). National cultures and organisations in search of a theory: an interpretative approach. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management*, *9*(3), 309-321. https://doi.org/10.1177/1470595809346601

Drechsler, W., Chafik, S., & Kattel, R. (Eds.). (2025). *Islamic public value: Theory, practice, and administration of indigenous cooperative institutions*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Drechsler, W., Kattel, R., & Chafik, S. (2024). Islamic public administration and Islamic public value: Towards a research agenda. *Public Policy and Administration*, *39*(4), 608-624. https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767231201799

Ebers, M., & Gamito, M. C. (2021). *Algorithmic Governance and Governance of Algorithms*. New York: Springer.

Engin, Z., Crowcroft, J., Hand, D., & Treleaven, P. (2025). The Algorithmic State Architecture (ASA): An Integrated Framework for AI-Enabled Government. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.08725.* https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2503.08725

Festic, N. (2022). Same, same, but different! Qualitative evidence on how algorithmic selection applications govern different life domains. *Regulation and Governance*. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12333

Fritzen, S. A. (2007). Linking context and strategy in donor support for decentralisation: A diagnostic framework. *Public Administration and Development*. https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.440

Gal, U., Hansen, S., & Lee, A. S. (2022). Research perspectives: Toward theoretical rigor in ethical analysis: The case of algorithmic decision-making systems. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*. DOI: 10.17705/1jais.00784

Ghose, A., Pallav, P., & Ali, S. M. A. (2025). AI and political polarization: Analyzing the impact of algorithmic bias on governance in diverse political systems. In *Economic and Political Consequences of AI: Managing Creative Destruction*. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5222523

Ghosh, A., Saini, A., & Barad, H. (2025). Artificial intelligence in governance: Recent trends, risks, challenges, innovative frameworks and future directions. AI and Society, 1-23. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02312-y

Ghosh, P. S. (2003). Challenge of governance and globalisation: Case study of India's north east. *Ethnic Studies Report*. 21 (2), 149-178

Grimmelikhuijsen, S., & Meijer, A. (2022). Legitimacy of algorithmic decision-making: Six threats and the need for a calibrated institutional response. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, *5*(3), 232-242. https://doi.org/10.1093/ppmgov/gvac008

Gritsenko, D., & Wood, M. (2022). Algorithmic governance: A modes of governance approach. *Regulation & Governance*, *16*(1), 45-62. https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12367

Henman, P. (2020). Improving public services using artificial intelligence: Possibilities, pitfalls, governance. *Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration*. https://doi.org/10.1080/23276665.2020.1816188

https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.12955

Innerarity, D. (2024). Defence and criticism of algorithmic governance. *Revista CIDOB d'Afers Internacionals*, *138*, 11-25. DOI: 10.24241/rcai.2024.138.3.11

Issar, S., & Aneesh, A. (2022). What is algorithmic governance? *Sociology Compass*.

Iunes Monteiro, J. (2025). The need for responsible use of AI by public administration: Algorithmic Impact Assessments (AIAs) as instruments for accountability and social control. In *Public Governance and Emerging Technologies: Values, Trust, and Regulatory Compliance*. 179-216. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-84748-6_9

Jacobsen, B. N. (2022). Algorithms and the narration of past selves. *Information, Communication & Society*, *25*(8), 1082-1097. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1834603

Just, N., & Latzer, M. (2016). Governance by algorithms: reality construction by algorithmic selection on the Internet. *Media, Culture & Society*, *39*(2), 238-258. https://doi.org/10.1177/0163443716643157

Kant, I. (1996). *Groundwork of the metaphysics of morals* (M. Gregor, Trans.). Cambridge University Press. (Original work published 1785)

Kariotis, T., & Mir, D. J. (2020). Fighting back algocracy: The need for new participatory approaches to technology assessment. In *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series*. https://doi.org/10.1145/3384772.3385151

Kasapoglu, T., Masso, A., & Calzati, S. (2021). Unpacking algorithms as technologies of power: Syrian refugees and data experts on algorithmic governance. *Digital Geography and Society*, *2*, 100016, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.diggeo.2021.100016

Katzenbach, C., & Ulbricht, L. (2019). Algorithmic governance. *Internet Policy Review*. https://doi.org/10.14763/2019.4.1424

König, P.D (2020). Dissecting the Algorithmic Leviathan: On the Socio-Political Anatomy of Algorithmic Governance. *Philos. Technol.* **33**, 467–485. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-019-00363-w

Lundahl, O. (2022). Algorithmic meta-capital: Bourdieusian analysis of social power through algorithms in media consumption. *Information, Communication & Society*, *25*(10), 1440-1455. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2020.1864006

Matzner, T. (2023). *Algorithms: Technology, culture, politics*. Routledge

McCann, S. (2023). Discretion in the automated administrative state. *Canadian Journal of Law & Jurisprudence*, *36*(1), 171-194. doi:10.1017/cjlj.2022.25

Mendonça, R. F., Almeida, V., & Filgueiras, F. (2024). *Algorithmic Institutionalism: the changing rules of social and political life*. Oxford University Press

Mignolo, W. D. (2011). *The darker side of Western modernity: Global futures, decolonial options*. Duke University Press.

Mill, J. S. (1998). *Utilitarianism*. Oxford University Press. (Original work published 1861)

Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679

Musella, F. (2025). Algorithmic Governance. In *Public Administration in Italy: The Science and the Profession.* 203-218. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-94878-7_10

Neyland, D., & Möllers, N. (2019). Algorithmic IF… THEN rules and the conditions and consequences of power. In *The social power of algorithms.* 45-62. Routledge

Niklas J. (2020) Human Rights-Based Approach to AI and Algorithms: Concerning Welfare Technologies. In: Barfield W, ed. *The Cambridge Handbook of the Law of Algorithms*. Cambridge Law Handbooks. Cambridge University Press: 517-542.

Ongaro, E., & Tantardini, M. (2024). Religion, spirituality, faith and public administration: A literature review and outlook. *Public Policy and Administration*, *39*(4), 531-555. https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767221146866

Peeters, R. (2020). The agency of algorithms: Understanding human-algorithm interaction in administrative decision-making. *Information Polity*, *25*(4), 507-522. https://doi.org/10.3233/IP-200253

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Roehl, U., & Crompvoets, J. (2025). Inside algorithmic bureaucracy: Disentangling automated decision-making and good administration. *Public Policy and Administration*, *40*(2), 322-350. https://doi.org/10.1177/09520767231197801

Saunders, M. N. K., Lewis, P., & Thornhill, A. (2023). *Research methods for business students* (9th ed.). Pearson

Saurwein F, Just N, Latzer M (2015), Governance of algorithms: options and limitations. *Info*, 17 (6). 35–49. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1108/info-05-2015-0025

Selten, F., & Meijer, A. (2021). Managing algorithms for public value. *International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age (IJPADA)*, *8*(1), 1-16. DOI: 10.4018/IJPADA.20210101.oa9

Sharma, G. D., Yadav, A., & Chopra, R. (2020). Artificial intelligence and effective governance: A review, critique and research agenda. *Sustainable Futures*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2019.100004

Vallor, S. (2016). *Technology and the virtues: A philosophical guide to a future worth wanting*. Oxford University Press.

Vogel M (2025). AI Integration in Public Administration: Enhancing Transparency and Efficiency. Review Pub Administration Manag.13: 474. DOI: 10.35248/2315-7844.25.13.474

Volkov, M. (2025). The root of algocratic illegitimacy. *Philosophy & technology*, *38*(2), 48 https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-025-00879-4

Wahib, N., Rosle, N. A., Malik, H. K. A., Nadzri, F. A. A., & Yusuf, S. N. S. (2024). A Shari'ah-compliant framework for value creation: A case study of the State Islamic Religious Council. *Asia-Pacific Management Accounting Journal*, *19*(2), 269–292. DOI: 10.24191/APMAJ.V19i2-14

Webb, H., Koene, A., Patel, M., & Vallejos, E. P. (2018). Multi-stakeholder dialogue for policy recommendations on algorithmic fairness. In ACM International Conference Proceeding Series. https://doi.org/10.1145/3217804.3217952

Yilma, K. (2025). Ethics of AI in Africa: Interrogating the role of Ubuntu and AI governance initiatives. *Ethics and Information Technology, 27,* Article 24. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10676-025-09834-5

Appendix A. Final Analytical Corpus of Qur'anic Verses and Transmitted Traditions

This appendix lists the 17 Qur'anic verses and 7 transmitted traditions retained in the final analytical corpus. The Arabic passages reproduce the excerpts used in the coding process. English translations are authors' renderings provided for analytical accessibility.

Table A1. Selected Qur'anic Verses

No.	Source	Arabic excerpt used in coding	Authors' English rendering	Indicative coding focus
1	Qur'an 24:27	يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَدْخُلُوا بُيُوتًا غَيْرَ بُيُوتِكُمْ حَتَّىٰ تَسْتَأْنِسُوا وَتُسَلِّمُوا عَلَىٰ أَهْلِهَا	O you who believe, do not enter houses other than your own until you seek permission and greet their inhabitants.	Consent, personal boundaries, and non-intrusion; al-taṣarruf / al-ḥurmat
2	Qur'an 24:28	فَإِن لَّمْ تَجِدُوا فِيهَا أَحَدًا فَلَا تَدْخُلُوهَا حَتَّىٰ يُؤْذَنَ لَكُمْ ۖ وَإِن قِيلَ لَكُمُ ارْجِعُوا فَارْجِعُوا	If you find no one therein, do not enter until permission is granted to you; and if you are told to return, then return.	Respect for refusal, consent, and limits on access; al-taṣarruf / al-ḥurmat
3	Qur'an 24:58	يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لِيَسْتَأْذِنكُمُ الَّذِينَ مَلَكَتْ أَيْمَانُكُمْ وَالَّذِينَ لَمْ يَبْلُغُوا الْحُلُمَ مِنكُمْ ثَلَاثَ مَرَّاتٍ	O you who believe, let those under your authority and those among you who have not reached puberty ask permission of you at three times.	Protection of private space and context-sensitive permission; al-ḥurmat
4	Qur'an 49:12	يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اجْتَنِبُوا كَثِيرًا مِّنَ الظَّنِّ إِنَّ بَعْضَ الظَّنِّ إِثْمٌ ۖ وَلَا تَجَسَّسُوا	O you who believe, avoid much suspicion; indeed, some suspicion is sinful. And do not spy.	Restricting speculation, surveillance, and covert profiling; al-iḥtiyāt / al-ḥurmat
5	Qur'an 8:27	يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَخُونُوا اللَّهَ وَالرَّسُولَ وَتَخُونُوا أَمَانَاتِكُمْ وَأَنتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ	O you who believe, do not betray Allah and the Messenger, nor knowingly betray your trusts.	Entrusted responsibility and prohibition of betrayal; al-amānah
6	Qur'an 70:32	وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ لِأَمَانَاتِهِمْ وَعَهْدِهِمْ رَاعُونَ	And those who faithfully observe their trusts and commitments.	Stewardship and fulfilment of commitments; al-amānah / al-wafā

7	Qur'an 10:36	إِنَّ الظَّنَّ لَا يُغْنِي مِنَ الْحَقِّ شَيْئًا	Indeed, conjecture avails nothing against truth.	Avoidance of speculative inference; al-iḥtiyāt
8	Qur'an 27:27	قَالَ سَنَنظُرُ أَصَدَقْتَ أَمْ كُنتَ مِنَ الْكَاذِبِينَ	He said: We shall see whether you have spoken truthfully or whether you are among the liars.	Verification of information and truthfulness; al-ṣidq / al-iḥtiyāt
9	Qur'an 49:6	يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِن جَاءَكُمْ فَاسِقٌ بِنَبَإٍ فَتَبَيَّنُوا أَن تُصِيبُوا قَوْمًا بِجَهَالَةٍ	O you who believe, if a morally unreliable person brings you news, verify it, lest you harm people in ignorance.	Data validation and prevention of harm caused by unreliable information; al-iḥtiyāt / al-ṣidq
10	Qur'an 4:83	وَإِذَا جَاءَهُمْ أَمْرٌ مِّنَ الْأَمْنِ أَوِ الْخَوْفِ أَذَاعُوا بِهِ ۖ وَلَوْ رَدُّوهُ إِلَى الرَّسُولِ وَإِلَىٰ أُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْهُمْ	When news of security or fear reaches them, they spread it; had they referred it to the Messenger and to those in authority among them, those able to draw conclusions would have known it.	Responsible handling of sensitive information and institutional referral; al-amānah / al-ḥurmat
11	Qur'an 18:29	وَقُلِ الْحَقُّ مِن رَّبِّكُمْ ۖ فَمَن شَاءَ فَلْيُؤْمِن وَمَن شَاءَ فَلْيَكْفُرْ	Say: The truth is from your Lord; let whoever wills believe, and let whoever wills disbelieve.	Recognition of moral agency and choice; al-taṣarruf
12	Qur'an 88:22	لَّسْتَ عَلَيْهِم بِمُصَيْطِرٍ	You are not a controller over them.	Limits on coercion and excessive control; al-taṣarruf
13	Qur'an 17:70	وَلَقَدْ كَرَّمْنَا بَنِي آدَمَ	We have certainly honoured the children of Adam.	Inherent human dignity; al-karāmah
14	Qur'an 49:13	إِنَّ أَكْرَمَكُمْ عِندَ اللَّهِ أَتْقَاكُمْ	Indeed, the most honoured of you in the sight of Allah is the most righteous of you.	Non-arbitrary moral worth and equal human standing; al-karāmah / al-adl
15	Qur'an 57:7	وَأَنفِقُوا مِمَّا جَعَلَكُم مُّسْتَخْلَفِينَ فِيهِ	Spend from that over which He has made you successors or stewards.	Stewardship over entrusted resources; al-amānah / al-taṣarruf
16	Qur'an 2:188	وَلَا تَأْكُلُوا أَمْوَالَكُم بَيْنَكُم بِالْبَاطِلِ	Do not consume one another's wealth unjustly.	Lawful use of resources and prohibition of unjust extraction; al-adl

17	Qur'an 4:29	يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَأْكُلُوا أَمْوَالَكُم بَيْنَكُم بِالْبَاطِلِ إِلَّا أَن تَكُونَ تِجَارَةً عَن تَرَاضٍ مِّنكُمْ	O you who believe, do not consume one another's wealth unjustly, except through trade by mutual consent.	Legitimate use, consent, and protection against unjust appropriation; al-taṣarruf / al-adl / al-wafā

Table A2. Selected Transmitted Traditions

No.	Source reference	Arabic excerpt used in coding	Authors' English rendering	Indicative coding focus
1	al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-Anwār*, vol. 77, p. 89	الْمَجَالِسُ بِالْأَمَانَةِ، وَإِفْشَاءُ سِرِّ أَخِيكَ خِيَانَةٌ، فَاجْتَنِبْ ذَلِكَ	Gatherings are held in trust, and disclosing your brother's secret is betrayal; therefore, avoid it.	Confidentiality and entrusted communication; al-amānah / al-ḥurmat
2	al-Ḥuwayzī, *Tafsīr Nūr al-Thaqalayn*, vol. 5, p. 93	مَنْ اسْتَمَعَ إِلَى حَدِيثِ قَوْمٍ وَهُمْ لَهُ كَارِهُونَ صُبَّ فِي أُذُنَيْهِ الْآنُكُ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ	Whoever listens to the conversation of people while they dislike such listening will have molten lead poured into his ears on the Day of Resurrection.	Prohibition of eavesdropping and unauthorized listening; al-ḥurmat
3	al-Ṣadūq, *al-Khiṣāl*, vol. 1, p. 27	حُرْمَةُ الْمُؤْمِنِ أَعْظَمُ مِنْ حُرْمَةِ الْكَعْبَةِ	The sanctity of a believer is greater than the sanctity of the Ka'bah.	Personal sanctity and moral status; al-karāmah / al-ḥurmat
4	al-Ṭabrisī, *Mishkāt al-Anwār*, vol. 1, p. 78; al-Majlisī, *Biḥār al-Anwār*, vol. 64, p. 71	إِنَّ اللَّهَ حَرَّمَ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِ دَمَهُ وَمَالَهُ وَأَنْ يُظَنَّ بِهِ ظَنَّ السُّوءِ	Allah has made inviolable the believer's blood, property, and the harbouring of bad suspicion about him.	Protection against unjust suspicion, harm, and appropriation; al-ḥurmat / al-iḥtiyāt / al-karāmah
5	al-Kulaynī, *al-Kāfī*, vol. 2, p. 164	عَلَيْكَ أَنْ تَكُونَ لِلَّهِ فِي خَلْقِهِ نَاصِحًا، فَإِنَّهُ لَا تَلْقَاهُ بِعَمَلٍ أَفْضَلَ مِنْهُ	You should be sincerely benevolent toward God's creation, for you will not meet Him with a better deed than this.	Benevolence and public welfare; al-raḥmah

6	al-Quḍāʿī, *Shihāb al-Akhbār*, vol. 1, p. 61	الْمُسْلِمُ مَنْ سَلِمَ النَّاسُ مِنْ لِسَانِهِ وَيَدِهِ	A Muslim is one from whose tongue and hand people are safe.	Non-maleficence and protection from harm; al-raḥmah / al-ḥurmat
7	al-Ṣadūq, *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh*, vol. 3, p. 273	مَنْ غَشَّ الْمُسْلِمِينَ حُشِرَ مَعَ الْيَهُودِ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ، لِأَنَّهُمْ أَغَشُّ النَّاسِ لِلْمُسْلِمِينَ.	Whoever deceives Muslims …	Prohibition of deception and exploitative conduct; al-ṣidq / al-adl