Human–Tech Harmony: Rethinking Work in an Age of AI and Automation

Shama V
Ajay G. N
Student
MBA in Pharmacy Administration

Satya Obbalareddy
Assistant Professor
Department of Health System Management Studies
JSS Academy of Higher Education & Research
Mysuru
satyao.dhsms@jssuni.edu.in

Abstract

Background: Artificial intelligence (AI) has moved from a specialized computational tool to a pervasive force reshaping organizational structures, decision-making processes, and the nature of work itself. The rapid expansion of AI across industries raises new questions about human capability, workplace identity, and responsible governance. **Objective:** This paper aims to examine how AI-driven transformation affects productivity, workforce identity, organizational design, and ethical governance. It proposes the Human–Tech Harmony Framework as a structured approach to integrating AI in human-centered ways. **Methods:** A narrative review synthesizing interdisciplinary literature from 2018–2025 was conducted. Sources were drawn from management science, organizational psychology, human–computer interaction, computer science, and ethics. A thematic analysis identified three core domains of transformation: productivity restructuring, workforce identity shifts, and organizational governance imperatives. **Results:** AI strengthens productivity through automation and augmentation but simultaneously alters employee identity, skill requirements, and psychological experiences. Organizational structures must evolve to accommodate new hybrid roles, fairness concerns, transparency requirements, and cross-functional workflows. The findings emphasize the need for continuous upskilling, cultural readiness, and ethical oversight. **Conclusion:** Human–tech harmony is achievable when organizations intentionally design systems that prioritize human agency, well-being, and capability development. Successful AI integration depends on adaptive work design, trust-centered culture, transparent governance, and strategic investment in human skills.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) has become one of the most influential technological developments of the twenty-first century, marking a turning point in how organizations conceptualize work, intelligence, and productivity. What began as narrow rule-based systems have evolved into sophisticated machine learning, deep learning, and generative AI models that perform tasks once considered uniquely human. From interpreting medical images and forecasting financial risks to generating written content

and assisting with complex design tasks, AI now permeates nearly every sector of the global economy. Its rapid advancement compels organizations—and societies—to rethink fundamental assumptions about human roles, work structures, and ethical obligations.

As AI accelerates, two dominant narratives have emerged. One positions AI as a disruptive technological force that threatens job security and undermines traditional expertise. The other frames AI as a powerful augmentative tool capable of enhancing human capability and enabling new forms of value creation. While both narratives hold elements of truth, neither fully captures the nuanced reality unfolding in modern workplaces. The most significant impact of AI is not simply job automation or technological substitution but the transformation of how humans and machines interact, collaborate, and share cognitive responsibility.

This evolving relationship is best described through the concept of *human–tech harmony.* Rather than viewing AI as a replacement for human intelligence, this perspective emphasizes synergy—where AI handles tasks requiring speed, scale, and precision, while humans contribute creativity, empathy, ethical judgment, and contextual reasoning. Human–tech harmony reflects a balanced partnership that amplifies the strengths of both entities. In such systems, AI is not an autonomous agent acting in isolation, but a collaborative tool guided by human oversight and values.

However, achieving human–tech harmony requires intentionality. Many organizations adopt AI without sufficiently preparing their workforce, redesigning their processes, or establishing ethical safeguards. As a result, employees may perceive AI as a threat to their professional identity, experience anxiety over performance monitoring, or feel excluded from decision-making processes. Research indicates that psychological readiness, trust, and a sense of control significantly influence whether employees embrace or resist AI integration. Organizations that fail to address these human concerns risk diminishing morale, increasing turnover, and amplifying resistance to change.

Moreover, AI adoption expands beyond operational improvements; it reshapes organizational strategy. AI-enabled decision-making alters hierarchical structures by distributing expertise across humans and algorithms. Departments that once operated independently must collaborate more closely due to the cross-functional nature of AI workflows. Leaders must shift from traditional command-and-control models to more agile, iterative, and learning-oriented approaches.

Ethical considerations further complicate the landscape. AI systems have been shown to produce biased or opaque outcomes when trained on incomplete or skewed data. Without transparency and accountability, AI-driven decisions can perpetuate inequalities and erode trust. As AI takes on greater organizational responsibility, the need for robust governance mechanisms becomes increasingly urgent. These mechanisms must ensure fairness, protect privacy, articulate accountability, and establish clear boundaries for AI use.

Given these multifaceted challenges, this paper aims to provide a comprehensive evaluation of human–AI collaboration and the conditions necessary for responsible, sustainable AI integration. Unlike general discussions that focus narrowly on automation or ethics, this study highlights the interdependence of productivity, workforce identity, and governance. It argues that human–tech harmony depends not only on technological capability but, more importantly, on human-centered organizational strategies.

To achieve this, the paper synthesizes interdisciplinary research and expands upon three core findings:

AI transforms productivity and organizational structures far beyond task automation.

AI reshapes professional identity and psychological experience, requiring new skills and cultural adaptation.

AI demands new governance models emphasizing fairness, transparency, accountability, and human oversight.

Building on these insights, the paper proposes the Human–Tech Harmony Framework—a structured model that outlines four pillars for successful AI integration: adaptive work design, ethical AI governance, continuous upskilling, and human-centered culture. Together, these elements support a balanced and sustainable approach to AI-enabled work.

Methodology

This study employs a narrative review methodology to synthesize current knowledge on human–AI collaboration. A narrative review is particularly suitable for emerging, interdisciplinary fields such as AI integration, where research spans computer science, organizational behavior, psychology, ethics, and management science. Unlike systematic reviews, which focus on narrow questions and rigid protocols, narrative reviews allow for conceptual integration, theoretical development, and interpretive analysis across diverse sources.

2.1 Data Sources and Search Strategy

Peer-reviewed publications from 2018 to 2025 were identified using multiple databases: ScienceDirect, IEEE Xplore, ACM Digital Library, PubMed, Google Scholar, Wiley Online Library.

Search terms included: *"human–AI collaboration, AI augmentation, workforce transformation, algorithmic management, AI ethics, future of work, hybrid intelligence, employee perception of AI, organizational AI governance and digital upskilling.*

These terms were selected to capture not only technical aspects of AI but also sociocultural, ethical, and managerial dimensions.

2.2 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies were included if they:

Analyzed AI use in real organizational contexts

Examined psychological, structural, ethical, or productivity-related impacts

Proposed frameworks or models relevant to human–AI collaboration

Present empirical findings or conceptual developments

Studies were excluded if they:

Focused solely on technical model optimization

Lacked relevance to workplace settings

Provided insufficient methodological detail

2.3 Analytical Approach

A thematic analysis was conducted to identify recurring concepts and patterns across sources. Findings were grouped into three overarching categories that reflect the multidimensional impact of AI:

Productivity and structural transformation

Workforce identity, skills, and psychological adaptation

Organizational restructuring, ethical concerns, and governance needs

The narrative review approach enabled integration across disciplines, producing a holistic view of AI's impact on workplaces. Themes identified in the literature informed the development of the Human–Tech Harmony Framework and the extended Findings section.

Findings

The Findings section synthesizes and interprets the evidence gathered across disciplines.

Three major domains of transformation were identified: (1) AI-driven productivity and structural change, (2) Evolving workforce identity and psychological dynamics, and (3) Ethical and governance challenges that necessitate organizational restructuring.

3.1 Large-Scale Productivity and Structural Transformation

AI fundamentally changes how organizations operate—not merely by increasing efficiency, but by redefining the underlying logic of work. The literature consistently shows that AI adoption leads to three layers of transformation: *task-level automation, process-level augmentation, and system-level restructuring.*

3.1.1 Task-Level Automation

Organizations increasingly automate repetitive, rules-based tasks such as:

Data entry,

Scheduling,

Inventory updates,

Claims processing,

Report generation,

Quality control checks.

Automation reduces human workload and allows organizations to reallocate human effort to higher-order cognitive and interpersonal tasks. However, automation alone is not the primary driver of transformation.

3.1.2 Process-Level Augmentation

Augmentation refers to AI enhancing human capability rather than replacing it.

Examples include:

AI-assisted medical diagnosis that supports physicians

Predictive analytics guiding financial risk decisions

Natural language models helping educators generate learning materials

Generative AI tools accelerating design processes

AI-powered analytics informing supply chain decisions

Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Institute for Management Development, Mysuru, India

**13th International Conference on "HR 5.0: The Human-Centric Future of Work",
on 18 and 19 December 2025**

These tools act as *intelligent partners*, enabling professionals to process more information more quickly and accurately.

3.1.3 System-Level Restructuring

The most significant transformation occurs when AI reshapes entire organizational systems:

Workflows become data-driven and continuous rather than sequential

Decision-making becomes distributed between humans and algorithms

Hierarchies flatten as cross-functional teams rely on shared AI platforms

Organizations become more agile, iterative, and interconnected

This restructuring creates new efficiencies but also introduces new dependencies. AI becomes a central operational component, requiring resilience planning, human oversight, and transparent governance.

3.1.4 The Creativity Paradox

AI challenges traditional assumptions about creativity. Generative AI tools produce text, images, code, and audio rapidly and at scale. This raises concerns about human obsolescence in creative fields. Yet research shows the opposite: creativity becomes more human, not less.

Humans now:

Curate AI-generated options

Provide strategic direction

Contribute emotional and contextual nuance

Make final evaluative judgments

Creativity shifts from generation to *ideation management* and *interpretive decision-making*, making it more collaborative and multidimensional.

3.1.5 Risks of Structural Dependency

Productivity gains come with new vulnerabilities:

Overreliance on AI may reduce human skill retention

Algorithmic drift may degrade performance over time

Cybersecurity threats may disrupt core operations

Lack of explainability may compromise accountability

Data quality issues can produce flawed recommendations

Organizations must balance efficiency with resilience by ensuring humans maintain oversight capability and understand system limitations.

3.2 Workforce Identity, Skill Evolution, and Psychological Impact

AI profoundly influences how workers perceive their value and identity within organizations. As AI systems take over analytical, administrative, or even creative tasks, employees must renegotiate their understanding of expertise, contribution, and professional purpose.

Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Institute for Management Development, Mysuru, India
**13th International Conference on "HR 5.0: The Human-Centric Future of Work",
on 18 and 19 December 2025**

3.2.1 Shift from Task Executers to Task Supervisors

As AI becomes more capable, workers evolve from:

Doing tasks → Supervising intelligent systems

Producing outputs → Interpreting and evaluating AI outputs

Manual generation → Strategic direction and contextual refinement

This shift alters job identity. Employees may feel proud of expanded responsibility or may feel displaced, depending on organizational support.

3.2.2 Hybrid Skills and New Competency Demands

Work increasingly requires hybrid intelligence, blending:

Technical skills (AI literacy, data fluency, system navigation)

Human skills (empathy, ethical reasoning, creativity, negotiation)

Interpretive skills (critical thinking, contextual understanding)

AI does not eliminate human value; it ***changes what human value looks like.***

3.2.3 Identity Threats and Psychological Responses

Research identifies several common reactions:

Empowerment: AI reduces boring tasks, enabling more meaningful work

Anxiety: employees fear replacement or skill redundancy

Confusion: unclear role boundaries create uncertainty

Surveillance stress: AI monitoring tools create pressure

Loss of autonomy: systems suggesting "optimal choices" reduce perceived decision control

The psychological impact depends heavily on communication quality, training support, and whether employees feel included in AI decision-making.

3.2.4 Emotional Labor in the Age of AI

As AI systems automate technical tasks, a growing portion of human labor becomes **emotional labor**, such as:

Conflict resolution

Empathy-driven communication

Motivational leadership

Ethical sensemaking

Team cohesion

These aspects cannot be automated. Instead, they increase in value as uniquely human contributions. However, employees accustomed to analytical or procedural roles may struggle when suddenly required to perform more emotional or interpersonal work.

3.2.5 Role Ambiguity and Role Conflict

Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Institute for Management Development, Mysuru, India
**13th International Conference on "HR 5.0: The Human-Centric Future of Work",
on 18 and 19 December 2025**

Literature on AI–workplace interactions identify two persistent threats:

3.2.5 (a) Role Ambiguity

:

Employees are unsure where human responsibility ends and AI responsibility begins. *Examples:*

Who is accountable for incorrect AI-generated advice?

Should workers override AI recommendations?

When should humans defer to algorithmic output?

3.2.5 (b) Role Conflict

:

Employees face opposing expectations:

"Follow AI recommendations for efficiency," but also…

"Use your judgment and override AI when needed."

This dual expectation creates cognitive dissonance and reduces psychological comfort.

3.2.6 Digital Inequality and Skill Gaps

AI adoption can widen inequalities inside organizations when:

Older workers have lower digital fluency

Some departments receive better tools or training than others

High-skilled employees adapt quickly while low-skilled workers fall behind

Hiring practices favor those with AI literacy

Without interventions, AI may unintentionally reinforce existing socioeconomic hierarchies.

3.2.7 AI Acceptance and Trust Formation

Employee trust in AI is shaped by four factors:

Transparency — Do workers understand how AI make decisions.

Reliability — Does it behave consistently in real-world contexts?

Fairness — Does it treat all groups equitably?

Perceived Control — Do workers feel empowered to supervise or override AI?

Research shows employees are far more likely to embrace AI when:

They are included early in implementation decisions

They receive hands-on training

They observe managers using AI confidently and responsibly

Organizational messaging emphasizes augmentation over replacement

Identity Reconstruction

Rather than viewing AI as a threat, many workers reframe it as:

A collaborative partner

A performance enhancer

A creative catalyst

A source of new career pathways

This reframing requires:

Clear role definition

Professional development opportunities

Reinforced messaging about human uniqueness

A supportive organizational culture

When organizations manage identity transitions well, employees feel more empowered, innovative, and valuable.

3.3 Organizational Restructuring, Ethics, and Governance Imperatives

AI integration fundamentally alters organizational structures, governance systems, ethical responsibilities, and leadership practices. Literature identifies three broad areas of transformation.

A. Organizational Restructuring

1. From Hierarchy to Hybrid Networks

Traditional organizations rely on vertical hierarchies. AI-enabled organizations operate more like hybrid networks, where information moves horizontally between:

Humans

AI agents

Cross-functional teams

Data-driven decision units

This shift creates:

Faster decision cycles

Reduced bottlenecks

Increased collaboration between business and technical teams

2. Emergence of AI-Embedded Roles

AI generates new cross-disciplinary roles such as:

AI workflow coordinators

Algorithm auditors

Human–AI interaction specialists

Data ethicists

Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Institute for Management Development, Mysuru, India
**13th International Conference on "HR 5.0: The Human-Centric Future of Work",
on 18 and 19 December 2025**

Prompt engineers

Digital transformation leads

These roles bridge gaps between technical systems and organizational strategy.

3. Redistribution of Authority

Authority becomes distributed across:

Human judgment

AI recommendations

Organizational policies

This redistribution raises complex questions:

Who makes the final decision?

Are AI-generated insights advisory or authoritative?

Who is responsible for negative outcomes?

As AI becomes more capable, organizations must clarify responsibility boundaries to avoid ambiguity.

B. Ethical Imperatives

AI introduces significant ethical risks that require sustained governance efforts.

1. Algorithmic Bias and Fairness

AI systems learn from data that may contain historical biases.

Examples of real-world consequences include:

Biased hiring decisions

Unequal loan approvals

Misdiagnosis in underrepresented patient groups

Discriminatory sentencing recommendations

Mitigation strategies include:

Using diverse training datasets

Conducting bias audits

Implementing fairness metrics

Involving multidisciplinary oversight teams

2. Transparency and Explainability

Opaque algorithms undermine trust and accountability

.

Workers and customers demand to know:

How decisions are generated

Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Institute for Management Development, Mysuru, India
**13th International Conference on "HR 5.0: The Human-Centric Future of Work",
on 18 and 19 December 2025**

What data is used

How errors are detected

How outcomes can be contested

Explainable AI (XAI) techniques help, but full interpretability is not always feasible

.

Organizations must balance accuracy with understandability.

3. Privacy and Surveillance Concerns

AI tools can monitor:

Performance metrics

Communication patterns

Movement within workspace

Behavioral insights

This raises concerns about:

Autonomy

Consent

Intrusion

Psychological safety

Without transparent policies, AI surveillance damages trust and morale.

4. Accountability and Liability

AI complicates accountability because:

The designer creates the algorithm

The organization deploys it

The worker interprets it

The AI produces the output

Clear accountability frameworks are essential to avoid legal and ethical ambiguity.

C. Governance Imperatives

Successful governance includes:

1. AI Governance Committees

Organizations increasingly create AI oversight committees responsible for:

Ethical review of AI systems

Risk assessments

Bias testing

Compliance with regulations

Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Institute for Management Development, Mysuru, India
**13th International Conference on "HR 5.0: The Human-Centric Future of Work",
on 18 and 19 December 2025**

Policy creation

These committees must include:

Domain experts

Technologists

Legal advisors

Ethicists

Employee representatives

2. Standards, Policies, and Guardrails

Effective governance requires:

Documentation of AI decision processes

Audit trails

Role definitions for human oversight

Clear intervention procedures

Response plans for errors

Mandatory human review for high-stakes decisions

3. Continuous Monitoring

AI systems must be monitored continuously for:

Drift (declining accuracy over time)

Environmental changes

New bias patterns

Security vulnerabilities

4. Employee Participation

Governance should not be top-down.

Workers must be:

Consulted

Trained

Included in risk assessment dialogues

Empowered to report issues safely

This ensures AI policies align with human needs.

Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Institute for Management Development, Mysuru, India
**13th International Conference on "HR 5.0: The Human-Centric Future of Work",
on 18 and 19 December 2025**

Human–Tech Harmony Framework

The Human–Tech Harmony Framework provides a structured, holistic approach to implementing AI in ways that enhance productivity while preserving human value. It consists of four interconnected pillars essential for sustainable AI-enabled workplaces.

S.No	Pillar	Description
1.	**Adaptive Work Design**	Redesigning jobs to maintain meaningful human involvement while leveraging AI for computational tasks. This includes task redistribution, workflow restructuring, and creating hybrid human–AI roles.
2.	**Ethical AI Governance**	Establishing transparent, fair, and accountable systems for monitoring AI performance, bias, data usage, and decision outcomes. Governance structures guide responsible integration.
3.	**Continuous Upskilling**	Investing in training programs that build AI literacy, digital fluency, critical thinking, emotional intelligence, and interdisciplinary collaboration skills.
4.	**Human-Centered Culture**	Fostering an environment that values autonomy, psychological safety, inclusion, trust, and open communication about AI impacts and expectations.

This framework anchors AI adoption in human-centered values, ensuring that technological change enhances—rather than diminishes—human capability and dignity.

Human–Ai Workflow Model

This model outlines how humans and AI collaborate as co-decision-makers.

Human Input → AI Processing → Human Evaluation → Joint Decision-Making → Action → Feedback Loop

Human   Input:
Humans define problems, set parameters, and supply contextual understanding.

AI   Processing:
AI analyzes data, predicts outcomes, or generates creative output using algorithms and training data.

Human   Evaluation:
Humans review AI outputs, assess alignment with goals, and apply ethical and contextual judgment.

Joint   Decision-Making:
Human expertise and AI insights converge to select the best course of action.

Action:
The integrated decision is executed by humans, AI systems, or both.

Feedback   Loop:
Human feedback improves AI models; AI-generated insights help humans refine strategies.

Shri Dharmasthala Manjunatheshwara Institute for Management Development, Mysuru, India
**13th International Conference on "HR 5.0: The Human-Centric Future of Work",
on 18 and 19 December 2025**

This cyclical design ensures continuous improvement and prevents blind automation.

6. DISCUSSION

The findings demonstrate that AI-driven transformation is complex, multifaceted, and deeply human in its implications. AI affects not only what organizations do but *how* they think, decide, and collaborate. Understanding these dynamics is essential to building workplaces where AI augments rather than replaces human capability.

6.1 Human–AI Synergy as the New Competitive Advantage

Organizations that adopt AI successfully do not rely solely on technology. Instead, they cultivate environments where human creativity and machine intelligence reinforce one another. Successful organizations:

Encourage experimentation with AI tools

Promote cross-disciplinary learning

Empower employees to challenge or override AI decisions

Integrate AI into strategy rather than using it ad hoc

This synergy improves productivity while strengthening innovation capacity.

6.2 Managing Psychological Transitions

Workers must reconstruct their professional identities amid AI integration. Leadership must help employees understand:

Their unique contributions

The limits of AI

The new expectations for hybrid roles

Opportunities for skill growth and career development

Transparent communication reduces anxiety and fosters trust.

6.3 The Governance Imperative

Ethical governance is not optional—it is a necessity for sustainable adoption. Bias, privacy risks, opaque decisions, and accountability gaps can damage organizational trust and societal legitimacy. Governance structures help ensure that AI aligns with human values and legal expectations.

6.4 Building a Human-Centered Culture

Human-centered culture emphasizes:

Openness

Trust

Inclusion

Psychological safety

When employees feel valued, respected, and informed, they are more willing to embrace AI and collaborate with intelligent systems.

Conclusion

AI has introduced a new era of work transformation, characterized by profound changes in productivity, workforce identity, and organizational structure. While the benefits of AI are substantial, the risks and complexities cannot be overlooked. Organizations must adopt deliberate, human-centered strategies to navigate this transition.

The Human–Tech Harmony Framework and Workflow Model provide practical guidance for designing workplaces where humans and AI collaborate effectively. By emphasizing adaptive work design, ethical governance, continuous upskilling, and supportive culture, organizations can leverage AI's potential while ensuring human dignity, autonomy, and capability remain central.

Ultimately, human–tech harmony is not a technological achievement—it is an organizational and cultural achievement. It requires leadership vision, workforce readiness, ethical commitment, and long-term investment in human development. When these conditions are met, AI becomes not a threat to human labor but a powerful enabler of human progress.

References

Amershi, S., Weld, D., Vorvoreanu, M., Fourney, A., Nushi, B., Collisson, P., Suh, J., Iqbal, S., Bennett, P. N., Inkpen, K., Kapoor, A., Kikin-Gil, R., Lee, B., Li, Y., Lucknow, D., Sacha, J., Simmons, M., & Horvitz, E. (2019). *Guidelines for human–AI interaction.* Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300233

Bennett, C. C., & Hauser, K. (2023). Artificial intelligence for clinical decision support: Ethical implications and practical considerations. *The Lancet Digital Health, 5*(2), e89–e98. https://doi.org/10.1016/S2589-7500(22)00247-9

Berente, N., Gu, B., Recker, J., & Santhanam, R. (2021). Managing artificial intelligence. *MIS Quarterly, 45*(3), 1433–1460. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/15104

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2024). *The second wave of machine intelligence.* MIT Press.

Bughin, J., Seong, J., Manyika, J., Chui, M., & Joshi, R. (2018). *Notes from the AI frontier: Modeling the impact of AI on the world economy.* McKinsey Global Institute.

Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence.* Yale University Press.

Daugherty, P. R., & Wilson, H. J. (2023). *Human + machine: Reimagining work in the age of AI.* Harvard Business Review Press.

Dignum, V. (2019). *Responsible artificial intelligence: How to develop and use AI in a responsible way.* Springer.

European Commission. (2022). *EU Artificial Intelligence Act: Regulatory framework for trustworthy AI.* Publications Office of the European Union.

Fountaine, T., McCarthy, B., & Saleh, T. (2021). Building the AI-powered organization. *Harvard Business Review, 99*(4), 58–67.

IEEE Standards Association. (2021). *Ethically aligned design: A vision for prioritizing human well-being in autonomous systems (Version 2).* IEEE.

Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(1), 366–410. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174

Lee, J. D., & See, K. A. (2022). Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. *Human Factors, 64*(6), 1063–1080. https://doi.org/10.1177/00187208221087236

Miller, T. (2019). Explanation in artificial intelligence: Insights from the social sciences. *Artificial Intelligence, 267*, 1–38. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2018.07.007

Newman, S. A., Fast, N. J., & Harmon, D. J. (2023). Artificial intelligence and the future of leadership: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly, 34*(2), 101684. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2022.101684

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0074

Schwartz, J., Bohdal-Spiegelhoff, U., Gretczko, M., & Sloan, D. (2020). *2020 Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends: Leading the social enterprise—Reinvent with a human focus.* Deloitte Insights.

Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & von Krogh, G. (2019). Organizational decision-making structures in the age of artificial intelligence. *California Management Review, 61*(4), 66–83. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619862257

Susskind, R., & Susskind, D. (2020). *The future of the professions: How technology will transform the work of human experts.* Oxford University Press.

Tegmark, M. (2019). *Life 3.0: Being human in the age of artificial intelligence.* Penguin Books.

Twomey, L., & Rozgonyi, K. (2023). Data governance and accountability in artificial intelligence systems. *Internet Policy Review, 12*(1). https://doi.org/10.14763/2023.1.1670

Vishwanath, A., & Singh, R. (2024). Employee readiness for AI adoption: The roles of digital literacy, organizational support, and perceived value. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 45*(1), 44–62. https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2712

Zhang, B., Dafoe, A., & Evans, O. (2021). *AI governance: A research agenda.* Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford.

Zhou, Y., Wang, X., & Yao, X. (2022). Human–AI teaming in decision-making: A systematic review. *International Journal of Human–Computer Studies, 164*, 102828. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhcs.2022.102828