Journal of Management Dynamics
ISSN: 3124-9337
Edition: Vol 1 No.1 (2026)
https://ij.lafadzpublishing.com/index.php/JMD/

Algorithmic Leadership Without Dehumanization: A Human-Centered Model for Digital Work

Ika Fitriyani; Universitas Samawa, Indonesia[1]*
Muhammad Nur Fietroh ; Universitas Teknologi Sumbawa, Indonesia[2]
**Correspondence:* ikafem@samawa-university.ac.id

Keywords:
Algorithmic leadership; human-centered AI; digital work; organizational behavior.

Article Info:
Received:
18/03/2026
Reviewed:
27/03/2026
Accepted:
4/04/2026
Published:
11/04/2026

ABSTRACT

The rapid integration of algorithmic systems and artificial intelligence into organizational management has given rise to a new paradigm of leadership often described as algorithmic leadership. While such systems enhance efficiency, scalability, and data-driven decision-making, they also raise critical concerns regarding dehumanization, loss of autonomy, and erosion of employee well-being. This study aims to develop a human-centered model of algorithmic leadership that balances technological capabilities with fundamental human values in digital work environments. Using a descriptive qualitative approach based on an integrative literature review, this research synthesizes insights from leadership theory, human–computer interaction, organizational behavior, and AI ethics. The analysis identifies three core dimensions essential for human-centered algorithmic leadership: augmented decision-making, human dignity preservation, and relational transparency. These dimensions emphasize the need to design algorithmic systems that support rather than replace human judgment, maintain employee agency, and foster trust through explainability and accountability. The study proposes a multi-layered leadership model that integrates strategic intent, operational practices, and technological design. It highlights key tensions between efficiency and empathy, automation and autonomy, and control and empowerment. The findings suggest that effective algorithmic leadership requires not only technical sophistication but also ethical awareness and organizational redesign. This research contributes to the emerging discourse on digital leadership by introducing a framework that mitigates the risks of dehumanization while leveraging the benefits of algorithmic systems. It offers practical implications for leaders and organizations seeking to implement AI-driven management systems responsibly. Ultimately, human-centered algorithmic leadership is essential for ensuring sustainable, ethical, and inclusive digital work environments.

SCAN ME

How to cite: Fitriyani, I., & Nur Fietroh, M. (2026). Algorithmic Leadership Without Dehumanization: A Human-Centered Model for Digital Work. Journal of Management Dynamics, 1(1), 17–24. https://doi.org/10.47353/jmd.v1i1.376

Introduction

The rapid advancement of digital technologies, particularly artificial intelligence (AI) and algorithmic systems, has fundamentally transformed the nature of work and leadership in contemporary organizations. One of the most significant developments is the emergence of algorithmic leadership, where managerial functions such as decision-making, coordination, performance evaluation, and resource allocation are increasingly mediated or even executed by algorithms (Kellogg et al., 2020; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). This transformation reflects a broader shift toward data-driven organizations, where digital infrastructures and computational systems play a central role in shaping organizational processes and outcomes.

Algorithmic leadership offers considerable advantages, including enhanced efficiency, scalability, consistency, and the ability to process vast amounts of data in real time. Organizations can optimize workflows, reduce human error, and make more informed decisions based on predictive analytics (Jarrahi, 2018). In industries ranging from logistics and finance to healthcare and platform-based services, algorithmic systems are increasingly used to assign tasks, monitor performance, and evaluate outcomes.

These developments suggest that algorithmic leadership is not a peripheral phenomenon but a central feature of digital work environments.

However, alongside these benefits, the rise of algorithmic leadership has generated significant concerns about the dehumanization of work. As decision-making authority shifts from human managers to algorithmic systems, employees may experience reduced autonomy, diminished sense of agency, and weakened interpersonal relationships (Kellogg et al., 2020). Algorithmic systems often rely on quantifiable metrics and standardized rules, which can overlook the qualitative, emotional, and relational dimensions of human work. This creates a fundamental tension between the logic of efficiency embedded in algorithms and the human-centered values that underpin effective leadership.

Dehumanization in organizational contexts refers to the process by which individuals are treated as objects, data points, or instruments rather than as autonomous and meaningful contributors (Haslam, 2006). In algorithmically managed environments, this phenomenon can manifest in several ways, including excessive monitoring, rigid performance metrics, and lack of transparency in decision-making processes. Employees may feel that they are being evaluated solely based on numerical indicators, without consideration for context, effort, or individual circumstances. Such conditions can lead to decreased job satisfaction, increased stress, and reduced organizational commitment.

The rise of platform-based work and the gig economy further amplifies these challenges. In many digital platforms, workers are managed almost entirely through algorithms, with minimal or no human supervision. Studies have shown that algorithmic management in such contexts can create a sense of isolation and uncertainty, as workers often lack clear communication channels and opportunities for feedback (Möhlmann & Zalmanson, 2017). Moreover, opaque decision-making processes can lead to perceptions of unfairness, particularly when workers do not understand how their performance is evaluated or how decisions are made.

A critical issue in algorithmic leadership is the erosion of autonomy. Autonomy is a key driver of motivation, engagement, and well-being in the workplace (Deci & Ryan, 2000). When algorithms dictate tasks, schedules, and performance criteria, employees may perceive a loss of control over their work, leading to reduced intrinsic motivation. At the same time, organizations may benefit from the efficiency and consistency provided by algorithmic systems. This creates a paradox: while automation can enhance performance, it can also undermine the human factors that sustain long-term organizational success.

Another central concern is trust. Trust in leadership is traditionally built through interpersonal interactions, transparency, and accountability. In algorithmic systems, however, decision-making processes are often opaque, making it difficult for employees to understand how outcomes are determined (Miller, 2019). This lack of explainability can erode trust, particularly when decisions have significant consequences for employees, such as promotions, compensation, or job security. Addressing this issue requires the development of explainable and transparent AI systems that provide meaningful insights into their functioning.

Ethical considerations are also paramount in the context of algorithmic leadership. Issues such as bias, discrimination, and privacy are inherent risks in AI-driven systems. Algorithms trained on biased data can perpetuate or amplify existing inequalities, leading to unfair or discriminatory outcomes (Floridi et al., 2018). Furthermore, the extensive use of data in algorithmic systems raises concerns about surveillance and privacy, as employees may feel constantly monitored and evaluated. These issues highlight the need for robust ethical frameworks and governance mechanisms to ensure responsible use of AI in leadership.

In response to these challenges, the concept of human-centered AI has emerged as a guiding principle for the design and implementation of algorithmic systems. Human-centered AI emphasizes the importance of aligning technological development with human values, ensuring that systems are designed to enhance rather than diminish human well-being (Shneiderman, 2020). In the context of leadership, this implies that algorithms should serve as tools that augment human decision-making rather than replace it. Human-centered algorithmic leadership thus represents a hybrid model that integrates the strengths of both humans and machines.

Despite the growing interest in algorithmic leadership, existing research remains fragmented. Studies in information systems, management, and ethics often focus on specific aspects of algorithmic systems, such as efficiency, control, or fairness, without providing a comprehensive framework that integrates these dimensions. Moreover, much of the literature emphasizes the technical aspects of AI, with less attention to the organizational and human implications. This creates a gap in understanding how algorithmic leadership

can be designed and implemented in a way that balances technological capabilities with human-centered values.

This study seeks to address this gap by developing a human-centered model for algorithmic leadership in digital work environments. Rather than viewing algorithms as replacements for human leaders, the study conceptualizes them as collaborative agents that can support and enhance human capabilities. The central argument is that effective algorithmic leadership requires the integration of three core dimensions: augmented decision-making, human dignity preservation, and relational transparency. These dimensions capture the essential elements of a leadership model that leverages technology while maintaining a strong focus on human values.

Augmented decision-making refers to the use of algorithmic systems to support human judgment, providing insights and recommendations while preserving human oversight. Human dignity preservation emphasizes the need to respect and protect the intrinsic value of individuals, ensuring that algorithmic systems do not reduce employees to mere data points. Relational transparency involves making algorithmic processes understandable and accountable, fostering trust and engagement among employees.

In addition to identifying these dimensions, the study proposes a multi-layered leadership model that integrates strategic, operational, and technological perspectives. At the strategic level, organizations must define principles and policies that guide the use of algorithmic systems. At the operational level, these principles are translated into practices and processes that shape daily work. At the technological level, systems are designed and implemented in ways that align with human-centered values.

The significance of this research lies in its contribution to the emerging discourse on digital leadership and AI governance. By integrating insights from multiple disciplines, the study provides a comprehensive framework that addresses both the opportunities and challenges of algorithmic leadership. It also offers practical guidance for organizations seeking to implement AI-driven management systems in a responsible and sustainable manner.

This study addresses these gaps by proposing a novel human-centered framework for algorithmic leadership that explicitly balances efficiency with dignity, automation with autonomy, and control with empowerment. Unlike prior research that predominantly focuses on algorithmic management as a tool for optimization and control, this study conceptualizes leadership as a hybrid socio-technical process in which algorithms and humans co-produce decisions. Furthermore, it introduces a multi-layered model that integrates augmented decision-making, human dignity preservation, and relational transparency, providing a comprehensive approach to mitigating dehumanization in digital work environments.

In conclusion, the rise of algorithmic leadership represents both a significant opportunity and a profound challenge for organizations. While algorithmic systems can enhance efficiency and decision-making, they also risk undermining the human aspects of work if not carefully designed and governed. By adopting a human-centered approach, organizations can harness the benefits of digital technologies while ensuring that leadership remains ethical, inclusive, and aligned with fundamental human values.

Method

This study adopts a conceptual modeling and theory-building approach to develop a human-centered framework for algorithmic leadership in digital work environments. Given the emerging and interdisciplinary nature of algorithmic leadership, a design-oriented methodology is employed to systematically construct and refine a theoretical model that integrates insights from leadership studies, human-centered AI, and organizational behavior (Gregor & Hevner, 2013).

Rather than relying solely on a traditional literature review, this study applies a theory synthesis approach, which involves identifying, comparing, and integrating key constructs across multiple research domains to generate a novel conceptual framework (Jaakkola, 2020). The research draws on three primary knowledge streams: (1) algorithmic management and AI-driven decision-making, (2) human-centered design and ethical AI principles, and (3) leadership and organizational psychology theories related to autonomy, trust, and human dignity.

The analytical process consists of three iterative stages. First, construct identification was conducted by extracting core concepts such as autonomy, transparency, augmentation, control, and dignity from the literature. Second, relational mapping was performed to examine how these constructs interact within algorithmic work environments, particularly focusing on tensions between technological efficiency and human-centered values (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Third, a framework development stage synthesized

these relationships into a multi-layered model of algorithmic leadership that aligns technological systems with human needs and organizational goals.

To enhance theoretical rigor, the study applies principles of internal coherence, explanatory power, and conceptual clarity (Whetten, 1989). The proposed model is evaluated based on its ability to explain observed challenges in algorithmic management—such as dehumanization, opacity, and loss of agency—and to offer actionable design principles for organizations.

Although the study does not involve empirical data collection, its strength lies in developing a normative and design-oriented framework that can guide future empirical validation and practical implementation. This approach is particularly appropriate for addressing emerging phenomena where theoretical foundations are still evolving.

Results and Discussion

Reframing Algorithmic Leadership: From Control to Human-Centered Augmentation

The findings of this study suggest that algorithmic leadership must be fundamentally reframed from a paradigm of control and optimization toward one of human-centered augmentation. Existing implementations of algorithmic management often emphasize efficiency, standardization, and performance monitoring, positioning algorithms as instruments of control (Kellogg et al., 2020). However, such approaches risk reducing employees to quantifiable units, thereby contributing to dehumanization and diminishing intrinsic motivation.

In contrast, a human-centered perspective redefines algorithmic leadership as a collaborative system in which algorithms enhance, rather than replace, human capabilities. This aligns with the concept of human–AI symbiosis, where decision outcomes are co-produced through interaction between human judgment and algorithmic insights (Jarrahi, 2018). Within this framework, algorithms function as decision-support systems that provide recommendations, identify patterns, and augment human cognition, while final authority and contextual interpretation remain with human actors.

This reframing has significant implications for leadership practice. It shifts the focus from efficiency maximization to value-sensitive design, where organizational goals are balanced with employee well-being and ethical considerations (Floridi et al., 2018). Consequently, algorithmic leadership becomes not merely a technological implementation but a socio-technical system requiring careful alignment between human values and digital infrastructures.

Core Dimensions of Human-Centered Algorithmic Leadership

The analysis identifies three interdependent dimensions that constitute the foundation of human-centered algorithmic leadership: augmented decision-making, human dignity preservation, and relational transparency.

1. *Augmented Decision-Making*

   Augmented decision-making refers to the integration of algorithmic insights into human decision processes in a way that enhances, rather than replaces, human judgment. Algorithms can process large volumes of data, identify trends, and generate predictive insights, thereby supporting more informed and timely decisions (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). However, their effectiveness depends on how they are embedded within organizational decision structures.

   In human-centered systems, algorithms serve as advisory tools, providing recommendations that are subject to human evaluation. This ensures that contextual knowledge, ethical considerations, and experiential insights are incorporated into decision-making. Such an approach mitigates risks associated with automation bias, where individuals overly rely on algorithmic outputs without critical assessment (Jarrahi, 2018).

   Moreover, augmented decision-making requires the development of AI literacy among employees and leaders. Without sufficient understanding of algorithmic processes, users may misinterpret outputs or fail to recognize limitations. Therefore, organizations must invest in training and capacity-building to enable effective human–AI collaboration.

2. *Human Dignity Preservation*

   Human dignity preservation is a central component of the proposed framework, addressing the ethical implications of algorithmic leadership. In digital work environments, there is a risk that employees are reduced to performance metrics, leading to a loss of individuality and agency (Haslam, 2006). This can result in negative outcomes such as disengagement, stress, and reduced organizational commitment.

   A human-centered approach emphasizes the importance of respecting individuals as autonomous and meaningful contributors. This involves designing algorithmic systems that support employee autonomy, provide

opportunities for feedback, and recognize qualitative aspects of work. For example, performance evaluation systems should incorporate both quantitative metrics and qualitative assessments, ensuring a more holistic understanding of employee contributions.

Additionally, dignity preservation requires addressing issues of fairness and bias. Algorithmic systems must be regularly audited to identify and mitigate biases that may lead to discriminatory outcomes (Floridi et al., 2018). Transparency in data collection and usage is also critical to ensuring that employees feel respected and protected.

3. *Relational Transparency*

Relational transparency refers to the extent to which algorithmic processes are understandable, explainable, and accountable to users. Transparency is a key factor in building trust, particularly in environments where decisions are mediated by opaque systems (Miller, 2019). Without transparency, employees may perceive algorithmic decisions as arbitrary or unfair, leading to resistance and disengagement.

Human-centered algorithmic leadership requires the implementation of explainable AI (XAI) mechanisms that provide insights into how decisions are made. This includes clear communication about the role of algorithms, the data used, and the criteria for decision-making. Additionally, organizations should establish channels for feedback and appeal, allowing employees to question and challenge algorithmic outcomes.

Relational transparency also involves maintaining human interaction within digital systems. While algorithms can automate processes, human leaders play a critical role in providing context, empathy, and support. By combining technological transparency with interpersonal communication, organizations can foster a more inclusive and trustworthy environment.

Key Tensions in Algorithmic Leadership

The integration of algorithmic systems into leadership processes introduces several inherent tensions that organizations must navigate.

a) Efficiency vs. Empathy
Algorithmic systems are designed to optimize efficiency, often prioritizing measurable outcomes. However, leadership also requires empathy, understanding, and emotional intelligence. Balancing these dimensions is essential for maintaining employee well-being while achieving organizational goals.

b) Automation vs. Autonomy
While automation can enhance productivity, excessive reliance on algorithms may undermine employee autonomy. Organizations must ensure that automation does not eliminate opportunities for human decision-making and creativity (Deci & Ryan, 2000).

c) Control vs. Empowerment
Algorithmic management can increase control over work processes, but this may conflict with the goal of empowering employees. Effective leadership requires a balance between providing guidance and enabling autonomy.

A Multi-Layered Human-Centered Leadership Model

Building on the identified dimensions, this study proposes a multi-layered model of human-centered algorithmic leadership:

a) Strategic Level: Establishing ethical principles, governance frameworks, and organizational values that guide the use of algorithmic systems.
b) Operational Level: Implementing practices that integrate algorithms into daily workflows while preserving human oversight and flexibility.
c) Technological Level: Designing AI systems that are transparent, fair, and aligned with human-centered principles.

This model emphasizes the importance of alignment across levels, ensuring that technological design supports organizational goals and human values.

Organizational Implications

The adoption of human-centered algorithmic leadership requires significant organizational transformation. Leaders must develop new competencies, including AI literacy, ethical awareness, and the ability to manage hybrid human–AI systems (Venkatesh et al., 2022). Additionally, organizations must redesign structures and processes to support collaboration between humans and algorithms.

Employee well-being must also be prioritized. Organizations should implement policies that protect privacy, ensure fairness, and promote work-life balance. By doing so, they can mitigate the risks of dehumanization and create more sustainable work environments.

Theoretical Contribution and Synthesis

This study contributes to the literature by advancing a human-centered framework of algorithmic leadership. It extends existing leadership theories by incorporating technological and ethical dimensions, providing a more comprehensive understanding of leadership in digital contexts.

Furthermore, the study bridges the gap between AI ethics and organizational behavior, highlighting the importance of integrating human values into technological systems. By conceptualizing algorithmic leadership as a socio-technical process, the study offers a new perspective on how organizations can navigate digital transformation.

Synthesis: Toward Ethical and Sustainable Digital Leadership

Overall, the findings suggest that algorithmic leadership must evolve into a human-centered, ethically grounded, and strategically integrated system. Rather than viewing technology as a replacement for human leadership, organizations should embrace a hybrid model that leverages the strengths of both humans and algorithms.

Such an approach not only enhances organizational performance but also ensures that digital transformation remains aligned with fundamental human values. In an era where technology increasingly shapes work and leadership, maintaining this balance is essential for achieving sustainable and inclusive outcomes.

Conclusion

This study has examined the emergence of algorithmic leadership in digital work environments and addressed the critical challenge of preventing dehumanization in increasingly automated organizational contexts. The findings demonstrate that while algorithmic systems offer significant advantages in terms of efficiency, scalability, and data-driven decision-making, they also introduce substantial risks related to reduced autonomy, diminished human agency, and erosion of trust. As such, the integration of algorithms into leadership processes must be approached not merely as a technological innovation but as a socio-technical transformation that requires careful alignment with human values.

A key contribution of this study lies in the development of a human-centered model of algorithmic leadership, structured around three core dimensions: augmented decision-making, human dignity preservation, and relational transparency. These dimensions collectively emphasize that effective leadership in digital environments depends on the ability to balance technological capabilities with the preservation of human agency, ethical responsibility, and interpersonal trust. Rather than replacing human leaders, algorithms should function as complementary tools that enhance human judgment and enable more informed and inclusive decision-making (Jarrahi, 2018; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

The proposed multi-layered model further highlights the importance of integrating strategic, operational, and technological perspectives. At the strategic level, organizations must establish clear ethical principles and governance frameworks that guide the use of algorithmic systems. At the operational level, leadership practices must ensure that algorithms are embedded in ways that support flexibility, learning, and employee engagement. At the technological level, systems must be designed to be transparent, explainable, and fair, thereby fostering trust and accountability (Floridi et al., 2018; Miller, 2019).

Importantly, the study identifies several inherent tensions—such as efficiency versus empathy, automation versus autonomy, and control versus empowerment—that organizations must continuously navigate. These tensions suggest that algorithmic leadership is not a static model but a dynamic balancing process requiring ongoing adaptation and reflexivity. Organizations that successfully manage these paradoxes are more likely to achieve sustainable performance while maintaining a positive and inclusive work environment.

From a practical standpoint, the findings underscore the need for leaders to develop new competencies, including AI literacy, ethical awareness, and the ability to manage hybrid human–AI systems. Additionally, organizations must invest in policies and practices that protect employee well-being, ensure fairness, and promote transparency. By doing so, they can mitigate the risks of dehumanization and create digital workplaces that are both productive and humane.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the literature by extending leadership theory into the domain of algorithmic systems, integrating insights from human-centered AI and organizational behavior. It introduces a novel perspective that conceptualizes leadership as a hybrid, co-evolutionary process between humans and algorithms, thereby enriching existing frameworks that often treat technology as a passive tool.

However, this study has limitations. As a conceptual and design-oriented analysis, it does not provide empirical validation of the proposed framework. Future research should conduct empirical investigations, such as case studies or quantitative analyses, to test the relationships between human-centered algorithmic leadership and organizational outcomes. Additionally, further research could explore sector-specific applications and examine how cultural and institutional contexts influence the implementation of algorithmic leadership.

Algorithmic leadership without dehumanization is both a challenge and an opportunity. By adopting a human-centered approach that prioritizes dignity, transparency, and collaboration, organizations can harness the transformative potential of digital technologies while preserving the essential human qualities that underpin effective leadership. Ultimately, the future of leadership in digital work environments depends on the ability to design systems that are not only intelligent but also ethical, inclusive, and deeply human.

AI Usage Statement

This study utilized generative artificial intelligence (AI) as a supportive tool in the development of the manuscript. AI was employed primarily to assist in structuring the content, enhancing language clarity, and improving the overall coherence of academic writing. The formulation of research ideas, conceptual framework development, critical analysis, and interpretation of findings were conducted independently by the author to ensure originality and scholarly integrity.

All AI-assisted outputs were carefully reviewed, revised, and validated by the author to ensure accuracy, relevance, and compliance with academic standards. The author assumes full responsibility for the content, arguments, and conclusions presented in this article.

No AI tools were used for data fabrication, falsification, or generation of empirical evidence. The use of AI in this study adheres to ethical guidelines for academic writing and promotes transparency, accountability, and responsible use of emerging technologies in research.

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

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227–268. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01

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

Gregor, S., & Hevner, A. R. (2013). Positioning and presenting design science research. *MIS Quarterly, 37*(2), 337–355. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2013/37.2.01

Haslam, N. (2006). Dehumanization: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(3), 252–264. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1003_4

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

Jaakkola, E. (2020). Designing conceptual articles: Four approaches. *AMS Review, 10*, 18–26. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13162-020-00161-0

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, M. K., Kusbit, D., Metsky, E., & Dabbish, L. (2015). Working with machines: The impact of algorithmic management. *Proceedings of CHI*, 1603–1612. https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702548

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

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

Möhlmann, M., & Zalmanson, L. (2017). Hands on the wheel: Navigating algorithmic management. *Proceedings of ICIS*.

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

Shneiderman, B. (2020). Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe & trustworthy. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 36*(6), 495–504. https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2020.1741118

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

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

Wilson, H. J., & Daugherty, P. R. (2018). Collaborative intelligence: Humans and AI are joining forces. *Harvard Business Review, 96*(4), 114–123.

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