Journal of Management Dynamics
ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
Edition: Vol 1 No.1 (2026)
https://ij.lafadzpublishing.com/index.php/JMD/

Beyond Efficiency: Governing Human–Generative AI Decision Symbiosis in Global Organizations

Kiki Farida Ferine; Universitas Pembangunan Pancabudi, Indonesia[1]*
Rico Nur Ilham; Universitas Malikussaleh, Indonesia[2]
**Correspondence:* kikifarida@dosen.pancabudi.ac.id

Keywords:
Generative AI governance; human–AI decision symbiosis; organizational decision-making; responsible AI; global organizations.

Article Info.
Received:
17/03/2026
Reviewed:
24/03/2026
Accepted:
1/04/2026
Published:
11/04/2026

ABSTRACT

The rapid advancement of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is reshaping organizational decision-making, moving beyond efficiency-driven automation toward a model of human–AI decision symbiosis. Unlike traditional AI systems, GenAI actively contributes to knowledge generation, problem framing, and strategic reasoning, thereby redefining the boundaries between human judgment and machine intelligence. However, this transformation introduces significant governance challenges related to transparency, trust, accountability, and ethical responsibility. This study aims to explore how global organizations can effectively govern human–GenAI decision symbiosis beyond a narrow focus on efficiency. Using a descriptive qualitative approach based on an integrative literature review, the study synthesizes interdisciplinary insights from information systems, management, and AI ethics. The analysis identifies three core dimensions of decision symbiosis: cognitive augmentation, trust calibration, and distributed accountability. These dimensions highlight the need for balanced interaction between human capabilities and AI-generated outputs. The study proposes a multi-layered governance framework comprising strategic, operational, and technical levels. This framework emphasizes the importance of aligning organizational values with AI deployment, implementing robust oversight mechanisms, and ensuring transparency and fairness in AI systems. The findings also reveal inherent tensions between speed and control, automation and human oversight, and global standardization and local adaptation. This research contributes to the literature by advancing the concept of responsible augmentation, positioning governance as a critical enabler of sustainable human–AI collaboration. It offers practical implications for leaders and policymakers seeking to harness GenAI while mitigating associated risks. Ultimately, effective governance of decision symbiosis is essential for achieving not only efficiency but also accountability and long-term organizational resilience.

SCAN ME

How to cite: Farida Ferine, K., & Nur Ilham, R. Beyond Efficiency: Governing Human–Generative AI Decision Symbiosis in Global Organizations. Journal of Management Dynamics, 1(1), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.47353/jmd.v1i1.374

Introduction

The accelerating development and deployment of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) has fundamentally transformed the landscape of organizational decision-making. Unlike earlier generations of artificial intelligence that were largely confined to predictive analytics and task automation, GenAI systems—particularly those based on large language models—possess the capacity to generate novel content, simulate reasoning processes, and actively participate in knowledge creation (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Kaplan & Haenlein, 2020). This shift marks a transition from automation to augmentation, where human and machine capabilities are increasingly intertwined in what can be described as a form of decision symbiosis (Wilson & Daugherty, 2018). In global organizations, this transformation is especially pronounced, as firms seek to leverage GenAI not only to enhance efficiency but also to improve strategic agility, innovation, and competitive advantage (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017; Wamba et al., 2021).

Traditional models of decision-making, rooted in the work of Herbert Simon, conceptualize decisions as boundedly rational processes shaped by limited information and cognitive constraints (Simon,

1997). Over time, technological advancements have progressively expanded the informational and analytical capacities available to decision-makers. Decision support systems, business intelligence tools, and machine learning algorithms have all contributed to this evolution (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018). However, GenAI introduces a qualitatively distinct paradigm. Rather than merely supporting human decision-makers with data and predictions, GenAI systems can co-create insights, generate alternatives, and even propose courses of action in natural language (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). As a result, decision-making processes are no longer linear or hierarchical but become iterative, dialogic, and co-constructed between humans and machines (Jarrahi, 2018).

This emerging paradigm raises critical questions about governance. Much of the existing discourse on artificial intelligence in organizations has focused on efficiency gains, cost reduction, and performance optimization (McAfee et al., 2020). While these dimensions remain important, they provide an incomplete picture of the implications of GenAI. Efficiency-centric approaches often overlook the socio-technical complexities inherent in human–AI collaboration, including issues of trust, accountability, transparency, and ethical responsibility (Floridi et al., 2018; Thiebes et al., 2021). As organizations increasingly rely on GenAI to inform high-stakes decisions, the need for robust governance frameworks becomes paramount (West et al., 2019).

One of the central challenges in governing human–GenAI decision symbiosis lies in the opacity of generative models. Many GenAI systems operate as "black boxes," producing outputs that are difficult to interpret or explain (Miller, 2019). This lack of transparency complicates the ability of decision-makers to evaluate the reliability and validity of AI-generated insights. Moreover, the probabilistic nature of generative outputs means that these systems can produce plausible but inaccurate or misleading information, often referred to as "hallucinations" (Bender et al., 2021). In organizational contexts, such errors can have significant consequences, particularly when decisions involve financial investments, regulatory compliance, or public safety.

Another critical issue is the calibration of trust between humans and AI systems. Trust plays a pivotal role in determining how decision-makers interact with technology. Over-reliance on AI, driven by excessive trust, can lead to automation bias, where individuals accept AI recommendations without sufficient scrutiny (Shrestha et al., 2019). Conversely, under-reliance, driven by skepticism or lack of understanding, can result in missed opportunities to leverage AI capabilities (Keding, 2021). Achieving an optimal level of trust—often referred to as trust calibration—requires not only technical solutions, such as explainable AI, but also organizational interventions, including training, guidelines, and cultural change (Liao et al., 2020).

The question of accountability further complicates the governance of human–GenAI decision-making. In traditional organizational settings, accountability is typically assigned to individuals or clearly defined roles (Mintzberg, 1978). However, when decisions are co-produced by humans and AI systems, the attribution of responsibility becomes ambiguous (Markus & Rowe, 2018). For instance, if an AI-generated recommendation leads to a negative outcome, it is unclear whether responsibility lies with the human decision-maker who accepted the recommendation, the developers who designed the system, or the organization that deployed it (Varshney, 2019). This ambiguity poses significant challenges for legal, ethical, and managerial frameworks, particularly in highly regulated industries.

Global organizations face additional layers of complexity due to the diversity of regulatory environments, cultural norms, and institutional contexts in which they operate. Different regions have adopted varying approaches to AI governance, ranging from the risk-based regulatory framework of the European Union to more market-driven approaches in other parts of the world (OECD, 2021; Jobin et al., 2019). These differences create challenges for multinational organizations seeking to implement consistent governance practices across jurisdictions. At the same time, cultural factors influence how individuals perceive and interact with AI systems, affecting levels of trust, acceptance, and reliance (Venkatesh et al., 2022).

The integration of GenAI into organizational decision-making also has profound implications for roles, skills, and organizational structures. Decision-makers are no longer required solely to analyze data and make judgments; they must also be capable of interacting effectively with AI systems, interpreting their outputs, and integrating them into broader decision contexts (Susskind & Susskind, 2015). This necessitates the development of new competencies, including AI literacy, critical thinking, and ethical reasoning (Russell & Norvig, 2021). Furthermore, organizations must reconsider the distribution of decision rights, as AI

systems increasingly participate in processes that were traditionally reserved for human actors (Kellogg et al., 2020).

In response to these challenges, the concept of human–AI symbiosis has gained prominence as a framework for understanding and managing the interaction between humans and intelligent systems. Symbiosis implies a mutually beneficial relationship in which each party contributes unique strengths. Humans provide contextual understanding, moral judgment, and experiential knowledge, while AI systems offer computational efficiency, scalability, and pattern recognition (Haenlein & Kaplan, 2019). However, achieving effective symbiosis is not automatic; it requires deliberate design and governance. Without appropriate mechanisms, the relationship can become imbalanced, leading either to over-dependence on AI or to resistance and under-utilization (Newell & Marabelli, 2015).

Existing literature on AI governance has begun to address some of these issues, emphasizing principles such as fairness, accountability, transparency, and ethics (Floridi et al., 2018; Thiebes et al., 2021). However, much of this work has focused on traditional AI applications, such as predictive models and classification systems. GenAI introduces new challenges that extend beyond these frameworks, including the dynamic and interactive nature of human–AI collaboration, the generative capacity of models, and the difficulty of tracing decision pathways (Dwivedi et al., 2023). Consequently, there is a need to rethink governance approaches to account for the unique characteristics of GenAI.

This study seeks to contribute to this emerging field by exploring how global organizations can govern human–GenAI decision symbiosis in a manner that goes beyond efficiency considerations. Specifically, the study aims to develop a conceptual framework that integrates key dimensions of decision symbiosis with multi-layered governance mechanisms. By doing so, it addresses a critical gap in the literature and provides practical guidance for organizations navigating the complexities of GenAI adoption.

The significance of this research lies in its focus on governance as a central enabler of responsible and effective AI use. While technological capabilities continue to advance at a rapid pace, the ability of organizations to harness these capabilities depends on their capacity to manage the associated risks and challenges (Teece, 2018). Governance frameworks play a crucial role in shaping how AI systems are designed, deployed, and used, influencing outcomes at both the organizational and societal levels (Zuboff, 2019).

The rise of generative artificial intelligence represents a paradigm shift in organizational decision-making, characterized by the emergence of human–AI symbiosis. This shift presents both opportunities and challenges, requiring organizations to move beyond efficiency-driven approaches toward more holistic governance models. By examining the dimensions and implications of decision symbiosis, this study aims to provide a foundation for understanding and managing the evolving relationship between humans and AI in global organizational contexts.

Method

This study adopts a descriptive qualitative approach aimed at developing a conceptual understanding of human–generative AI (GenAI) decision symbiosis and its governance in global organizations. A qualitative design is appropriate given the exploratory nature of the research problem, which focuses on emerging phenomena that are not yet fully theorized or empirically stabilized in the literature (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Rather than testing hypotheses, this study seeks to synthesize existing knowledge and derive a governance framework grounded in interdisciplinary insights.

The primary method employed is an integrative literature review, which allows for the consolidation of findings from diverse academic domains, including information systems, strategic management, organizational theory, and AI ethics (Torraco, 2016). This approach is particularly relevant for examining complex socio-technical systems such as human–AI collaboration, where insights are dispersed across multiple fields (Jarrahi, 2018). The literature selection process focused on peer-reviewed journal articles, conference proceedings, and authoritative institutional reports published between 2018 and 2025, reflecting the rapid evolution of generative AI technologies (Dwivedi et al., 2023).

Sources were identified using purposive sampling based on their relevance to key themes, including human–AI interaction, algorithmic governance, decision-making augmentation, and AI ethics frameworks (Floridi et al., 2018; Thiebes et al., 2021). Priority was given to widely cited and high-impact studies to ensure theoretical robustness and conceptual depth. In addition, selected industry reports were included to

capture emerging practices in global organizations, complementing academic perspectives (McAfee et al., 2020).

The analytical procedure consisted of three stages. First, thematic coding was conducted to extract recurring concepts related to human–GenAI decision symbiosis, such as trust calibration, cognitive augmentation, and accountability structures (Liao et al., 2020). Second, these codes were grouped into broader analytical categories representing key dimensions of governance and decision-making processes (Markus & Rowe, 2018). Third, an interpretive synthesis was performed to integrate these categories into a multi-layered governance framework that reflects both theoretical insights and practical implications (Teece, 2018).

To enhance rigor and credibility, the study applied principles of transparency, triangulation, and conceptual consistency. Findings were cross-validated across multiple sources to identify converging evidence and minimize bias (Varshney, 2019). Although the study does not involve primary empirical data, its contribution lies in offering a structured and theoretically grounded framework that can guide future empirical investigations and organizational applications.

Results and Discussion

Dimensions of Human–Generative AI Decision Symbiosis

The analysis reveals that human–GenAI decision symbiosis is structured around three interrelated dimensions: cognitive augmentation, trust calibration, and distributed accountability. These dimensions collectively define how humans and AI systems co-produce decisions in organizational contexts.

Cognitive augmentation refers to the ability of GenAI to extend human cognitive capabilities by generating insights, summarizing complex information, and proposing alternative solutions. Unlike traditional decision support systems, GenAI operates in a more interactive and generative manner, enabling iterative dialogue between human users and AI systems (Dwivedi et al., 2023). This aligns with the concept of "collaborative intelligence," where humans and AI complement each other's strengths (Wilson & Daugherty, 2018). However, the effectiveness of augmentation depends heavily on the user's ability to critically interpret outputs. Without sufficient AI literacy, decision-makers may misinterpret or overvalue AI-generated content (Jarrahi, 2018).

Trust calibration emerges as a critical factor influencing the quality of human–AI collaboration. Trust must be aligned with the actual capabilities and limitations of GenAI systems. Excessive trust can result in automation bias, where users accept AI outputs without adequate scrutiny (Shrestha et al., 2019). Conversely, insufficient trust may lead to underutilization of AI capabilities (Keding, 2021). Mechanisms such as explainable AI, transparency tools, and user feedback loops are essential for achieving appropriate trust levels (Liao et al., 2020; Miller, 2019). These mechanisms enable users to understand the reasoning behind AI outputs, thereby supporting informed decision-making.

Distributed accountability reflects the shift from individual to shared responsibility in decision-making processes. In traditional settings, accountability is clearly assigned to human decision-makers (Mintzberg, 1978). However, in human–GenAI symbiosis, responsibility is distributed across multiple actors, including system developers, organizational leaders, and end users (Markus & Rowe, 2018). This creates ambiguity in cases of decision failure or unintended outcomes, necessitating new governance models that explicitly define roles and responsibilities (Varshney, 2019).

Key Governance Challenges in GenAI-Enabled Decision-Making

The integration of GenAI into organizational decision processes introduces several governance challenges that extend beyond traditional AI concerns.

Opacity and explainability remain central issues. Many GenAI models function as complex neural architectures with limited interpretability, making it difficult to trace how specific outputs are generated (Miller, 2019). This lack of transparency undermines trust and complicates auditing processes. Furthermore, generative models are prone to producing "hallucinations," or outputs that appear plausible but are factually incorrect (Bender et al., 2021). In high-stakes decision contexts, such inaccuracies can lead to significant organizational risks.

Bias and fairness are also critical concerns. GenAI systems are trained on large datasets that may contain historical biases, which can be reproduced or amplified in outputs (Floridi et al., 2018). Without proper governance, these biases can lead to discriminatory outcomes, particularly in areas such as recruitment, lending, and customer segmentation (Thiebes et al., 2021). Addressing bias requires continuous monitoring, auditing, and the implementation of fairness-aware algorithms.

Regulatory fragmentation poses additional challenges for global organizations. Different jurisdictions have adopted varying approaches to AI governance, resulting in a fragmented regulatory landscape (OECD, 2021; Jobin et al., 2019). Organizations operating across borders must navigate these differences while maintaining consistent internal governance standards. This often requires the development of flexible frameworks that can be adapted to local regulatory requirements.

Human–AI role ambiguity further complicates governance. The integration of GenAI blurs the boundaries between human and machine decision-making, making it difficult to determine who is responsible for specific actions (Kellogg et al., 2020). This ambiguity can lead to inefficiencies, conflicts, and increased risk exposure if not properly managed.

A Multi-Layered Governance Framework

Based on the synthesis of the literature, this study proposes a multi-layered governance framework consisting of three interconnected levels: strategic, operational, and technical governance.

Strategic governance focuses on the establishment of overarching principles, policies, and ethical guidelines for AI use. This includes defining organizational values related to fairness, transparency, and accountability (Floridi et al., 2018). At this level, leadership plays a critical role in setting the tone for responsible AI adoption and ensuring alignment with long-term organizational objectives (Teece, 2018). Governance bodies, such as AI ethics committees, can provide oversight and guidance on high-level decisions.

Operational governance translates strategic principles into actionable processes and practices. This includes model validation, performance monitoring, and risk management procedures (McAfee et al., 2020). Human oversight mechanisms are essential at this level, ensuring that AI-generated outputs are reviewed and contextualized before being used in decision-making (Shrestha et al., 2019). Additionally, organizations should implement feedback systems that allow users to report errors and improve system performance over time.

Technical governance involves the implementation of tools and methods that ensure the reliability and transparency of AI systems. This includes explainability techniques, bias detection algorithms, and model documentation practices such as model cards (Mitchell et al., 2019). Technical safeguards are critical for maintaining system integrity and supporting accountability across the decision-making process.

Organizational Implications and Transformation

The adoption of GenAI-driven decision symbiosis requires significant organizational transformation. One key implication is the need for new skill sets. Employees must develop competencies in AI literacy, critical thinking, and ethical reasoning to effectively collaborate with AI systems (Russell & Norvig, 2021). Training programs and continuous learning initiatives are therefore essential.

Another implication is the reconfiguration of decision-making structures. Traditional hierarchical models may be insufficient in environments where decisions are co-produced by humans and AI systems. Organizations must adopt more flexible and adaptive structures that facilitate collaboration and knowledge sharing (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

Leadership also plays a crucial role in managing this transformation. Leaders must balance the pursuit of innovation with the need for control and accountability. This involves fostering a culture that encourages experimentation while maintaining ethical standards and risk awareness (Haenlein & Kaplan, 2019).

Global and Cross-Cultural Considerations

For global organizations, the governance of human–GenAI decision symbiosis is further complicated by cross-cultural differences and diverse institutional environments. Cultural factors influence how individuals perceive and interact with AI systems, affecting levels of trust and acceptance (Venkatesh et al., 2022). For example, societies with high uncertainty avoidance may exhibit lower trust in AI, requiring additional transparency and assurance mechanisms.

Regulatory diversity also necessitates a glocal approach to governance—combining global consistency with local adaptability. Organizations must establish core governance principles while allowing for contextual adjustments based on regional requirements (OECD, 2021). This approach enables organizations to maintain compliance while leveraging the benefits of GenAI across different markets.

Synthesis and Theoretical Contribution

The findings of this study contribute to the literature by integrating the concepts of human–AI collaboration, AI governance, and organizational decision-making into a unified framework. The proposed model extends existing theories by emphasizing the dynamic and interactive nature of decision symbiosis, as well as the need for multi-level governance mechanisms.

Importantly, the study shifts the focus from efficiency to responsible augmentation, highlighting that the value of GenAI lies not only in improving performance but also in enhancing the quality, inclusiveness, and accountability of decisions. This perspective aligns with emerging calls for trustworthy and human-centered AI (Thiebes et al., 2021; Varshney, 2019).

Overall, the results demonstrate that effective governance of human–GenAI decision symbiosis requires a holistic approach that integrates technical, organizational, and institutional dimensions. By addressing these interconnected aspects, organizations can harness the full potential of GenAI while mitigating associated risks.

Conclusion

This study has examined the transformation of organizational decision-making in the era of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), emphasizing the shift from efficiency-oriented automation toward human–AI decision symbiosis. The findings demonstrate that GenAI is not merely a tool for improving operational performance but a collaborative agent that reshapes how decisions are generated, evaluated, and implemented within global organizations (Dwivedi et al., 2023; Wilson & Daugherty, 2018). As such, the integration of GenAI necessitates a fundamental rethinking of governance frameworks to address the complex interplay between human judgment and algorithmic outputs.

A central contribution of this study lies in identifying three key dimensions of decision symbiosis—cognitive augmentation, trust calibration, and distributed accountability. These dimensions highlight that effective human–AI collaboration depends not only on technological capabilities but also on the ability of organizations to manage human cognition, perceptions, and responsibilities (Jarrahi, 2018; Shrestha et al., 2019). Cognitive augmentation enables enhanced decision quality, but only when users possess sufficient critical and analytical skills. Trust calibration ensures that AI systems are neither over-relied upon nor underutilized, while distributed accountability underscores the need for new mechanisms to assign responsibility in hybrid decision environments (Markus & Rowe, 2018; Varshney, 2019).

The study further proposes a multi-layered governance framework encompassing strategic, operational, and technical levels. At the strategic level, organizations must define ethical principles and align AI initiatives with long-term objectives (Floridi et al., 2018). At the operational level, governance is enacted through processes such as monitoring, validation, and human oversight (McAfee et al., 2020). At the technical level, mechanisms such as explainability tools and bias detection systems ensure the reliability and transparency of AI outputs (Mitchell et al., 2019). Together, these layers provide a comprehensive approach to managing the risks and opportunities associated with GenAI.

Importantly, the findings reveal that governance of human–GenAI symbiosis is not solely a technical challenge but a socio-organizational transformation. Organizations must invest in developing new competencies, including AI literacy, ethical reasoning, and interdisciplinary collaboration (Russell & Norvig, 2021). Leadership plays a critical role in fostering a culture that balances innovation with responsibility, ensuring that AI adoption aligns with organizational values and societal expectations (Teece, 2018). Moreover, global organizations must adopt flexible governance models that accommodate diverse regulatory environments and cultural perspectives (OECD, 2021; Jobin et al., 2019).

This study also contributes theoretically by extending existing literature on AI governance and organizational decision-making. While prior research has largely focused on efficiency and performance outcomes, this study introduces the concept of responsible augmentation, emphasizing that the true value of GenAI lies in enhancing the quality, inclusiveness, and accountability of decisions (Thiebes et al., 2021). By integrating insights from multiple disciplines, the proposed framework offers a holistic perspective on managing human–AI collaboration.

Despite its contributions, this study has limitations. As a conceptual and descriptive analysis, it does not provide empirical validation of the proposed framework. Future research should conduct empirical studies, such as case studies or quantitative analyses, to test the relationships between governance mechanisms and decision outcomes. Additionally, sector-specific investigations could provide deeper

insights into how governance requirements vary across industries such as healthcare, finance, and public administration.

In conclusion, moving beyond efficiency requires organizations to embrace a governance paradigm that recognizes the interdependence of human and AI capabilities. Human–GenAI decision symbiosis represents both an opportunity and a responsibility: an opportunity to enhance decision-making in unprecedented ways, and a responsibility to ensure that such enhancements are ethical, transparent, and accountable. By adopting comprehensive governance frameworks, global organizations can harness the transformative potential of GenAI while safeguarding against its risks, ultimately achieving sustainable and responsible innovation.

AI Usage Statement

This study utilized generative artificial intelligence (AI) as a supportive tool during the research and writing process. AI was employed primarily to assist in language refinement, structuring of academic arguments, and improving clarity and coherence of the manuscript. The conceptual development, critical analysis, and synthesis of ideas were conducted independently by the author to ensure originality and intellectual integrity.

All content generated or assisted by AI was carefully reviewed, revised, and validated by the author to ensure accuracy, relevance, and alignment with academic standards. The author takes full responsibility for the content, interpretations, and conclusions presented in this article.

No AI tools were used for data fabrication, falsification, or generation of empirical results. The use of AI complies with ethical guidelines for academic writing and publication, ensuring transparency and accountability in the research process.

References

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *Machine, platform, crowd: Harnessing our digital future*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Davenport, T. H., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harvard Business Review, 96*(1), 108–116.

Dwivedi, Y. K., et al. (2023). So what if ChatGPT wrote it? Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges, and implications of generative conversational AI. *International Journal of Information Management, 71*, 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., et al. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines, 28*, 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5

Gilson, L. L., Maynard, M. T., Young, N. C., et al. (2015). Virtual teams research: 10 years, 10 themes, and 10 opportunities. *Journal of Management, 41*(5), 1313–1337. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314559946

Haenlein, M., & Kaplan, A. (2019). A brief history of artificial intelligence: On the past, present, and future of AI. *California Management Review, 61*(4), 5–14. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619864925

Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. *Business Horizons, 61*(4), 577–586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*, 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2

Kaplan, A., & Haenlein, M. (2020). Siri, Siri in my hand: Who's the fairest in the land? On the interpretations of AI. *Business Horizons, 63*(1), 15–25. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2019.08.004

Keding, C. (2021). Understanding the interplay of artificial intelligence and strategic management. *California Management Review, 63*(4), 95–125. https://doi.org/10.1177/00081256211008583

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, K. F. (2018). *AI superpowers: China, Silicon Valley, and the new world order*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt.

Liao, Q. V., Gruen, D., & Miller, S. (2020). Questioning the AI: Informing design practices for explainable AI. *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376590

Markus, M. L., & Rowe, F. (2018). Is IT changing decision making? *MIS Quarterly, 42*(4), 1251–1280. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2018/14188

McAfee, A., Brynjolfsson, E., Davenport, T. H., et al. (2020). How AI will change work. *MIT Sloan Management Review, 61*(4), 1–9.

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

Mintzberg, H. (1978). Patterns in strategy formation. *Management Science, 24*(9), 934–948. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.24.9.934

Mitchell, M., Wu, S., Zaldivar, A., et al. (2019). Model cards for model reporting. *Proceedings of FAT*, 220–229. https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560.3287596

Newell, S., & Marabelli, M. (2015). Strategic opportunities (and challenges) of algorithmic decision-making. *MIS Quarterly Executive, 14*(4), 155–169.

OECD. (2021). *OECD principles on artificial intelligence*. https://doi.org/10.1787/ead7c7d9-en

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.

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

Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior* (4th ed.). Free Press.

Susskind, R., & Susskind, D. (2015). *The future of the professions*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198713395.001.0001

Teece, D. J. (2018). Business models and dynamic capabilities. *Long Range Planning, 51*(1), 40–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2017.06.007

Thiebes, S., Lins, S., & Sunyaev, A. (2021). Trustworthy artificial intelligence. *Electronic Markets, 31*, 447–464. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-020-00441-4

Varshney, K. R. (2019). Trustworthy machine learning and AI. *XRDS, 25*(3), 26–29. https://doi.org/10.1145/3331041

Venkatesh, V., Bala, H., & Sykes, T. A. (2022). Impacts of AI on organizations. *Journal of Information Technology, 37*(3), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962211063359

Wamba, S. F., Queiroz, M. M., Trinchera, L., & Handfield, R. (2021). AI adoption and firm performance. *International Journal of Production Economics, 232*, 107962. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2020.107962

West, D. M., Whittaker, M., & Crawford, K. (2019). Discriminating systems: Gender, race, and power in AI. *AI Now Institute Report*.

Wilson, H. J., & Daugherty, P. R. (2018). Collaborative intelligence. *Harvard Business Review, 96*(4), 114–123.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism*. PublicAffairs.