



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF EDUCATION AND ECONOMIC SCIENCES (IJEES)

DIGITAL SYNERGY IN THE AI ERA: TRANSFORMING ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE THROUGH HUMAN-MACHINE COLLABORATION

Asmirin Noor¹ | Xu Jing²

¹ STIE Mahardika Surabaya, Indonesia | ²Faculty of General Studies and Advanced Education, Universiti Sultan Zainal Abidin, Malaysia
*Corresponding author: asmirin.noor@stiemahardhika.ac.id

Received: 11 November 2025 • Accepted: 03 January 2026 • Published: 31 March 2026

Abstract

This research article examines the transformative impact of artificial intelligence (AI) on organizational culture and explores strategies for achieving digital synergy between human workers and AI systems. Drawing on theoretical foundations from organizational culture studies and emerging research on human-machine collaboration, this paper presents a comprehensive analysis of how AI is reshaping communication, decision-making, and innovation within contemporary organizations. Through empirical case analyses of global enterprises including Microsoft, Siemens, and Singtel, we identify key success factors and challenges in cultural adaptation to AI integration. The study proposes an integrated framework for sustainable cultural transformation that balances technological efficiency with human-centric values. Findings reveal that organizations achieving digital synergy demonstrate strong leadership commitment, ethical AI governance, and continuous learning cultures. This research contributes to both theoretical understanding and practical guidance for organizations navigating the cultural complexities of AI adoption, with significant implications for leadership, change management, and organizational design in the digital era.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Organizational Culture, AI Collaboration, Digital Transformation, Ethical AI Governance

How to cite: Noor, A., Jing, X. (2026). Digital Synergy In The AI Era: Transforming Organizational Culture Through Human-Machine Collaboration. International Journal of Education and Economic Sciences (IJEES), 2(1), 165 - 177.

1 Introduction

The rapid advancement of artificial intelligence (AI) is not only transforming organizational processes but also fundamentally reshaping the cultural foundations upon which organizations operate. Beyond its role in enhancing efficiency and automation, AI increasingly influences how decisions are made, how knowledge is constructed, and how authority is distributed within organizations (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017; Kellogg et al., 2020). As a result, the integration of AI presents a profound cultural challenge, one that extends beyond technology adoption to the reconfiguration of shared values, norms, and assumptions

that guide organizational behavior.

Organizational culture has long been recognized as a critical determinant of organizational effectiveness, adaptability, and long-term sustainability (Denison, 1990; Schein, 2010; Bisri & Xu Jing, 2025). Classical perspectives emphasize that deeply embedded assumptions and values shape how organizations respond to change and uncertainty. In the context of digital transformation, culture can function either as an enabler of innovation or as a source of resistance (Westerman et al., 2016). With the rise of AI, this dual role becomes increasingly complex, as organizations are required to reconcile human-centric values with the growing presence of autonomous and data-driven systems (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018).

Despite the expanding body of research on AI adoption, much of the existing literature remains heavily focused on technological capabilities, performance outcomes, and strategic implementation (Brynjolfsson et al., 2021). While these studies provide important insights, they often treat organizational culture as a peripheral factor rather than a central analytical lens. Similarly, emerging discussions on human–AI collaboration highlight the potential of combining human judgment with machine intelligence (Jarrahi, 2018; Wilson & Daugherty, 2018), yet they tend to underexplore the cultural mechanisms that shape how such collaboration is interpreted, accepted, or resisted within organizations. Furthermore, although frameworks related to AI governance and ethics are increasingly developed (Floridi et al., 2020; Jobin et al., 2019), they are frequently disconnected from organizational culture theories, resulting in fragmented approaches that fail to capture the socio-cultural complexity of AI integration.

This fragmentation becomes particularly evident in the growing discourse on *digital synergy*, which refers to the complementary integration of human and artificial intelligence to achieve outcomes superior to either acting alone (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). While the concept is gaining traction, its realization in practice remains limited due to the absence of integrative models that link cultural values, organizational design, and operational processes. Without such integration, AI initiatives risk generating misalignment, employee resistance, and ethical tensions that undermine their long-term effectiveness (Dignum, 2019). In response to these challenges, this study seeks to develop a more holistic understanding of cultural transformation in the AI era by positioning organizational culture as a central driver of successful AI integration. Specifically, this research proposes the Human-Centered AI Synergy Framework (HCASF), an integrative model that connects cultural foundations, strategic alignment, and operational practices in shaping human–AI collaboration. By synthesizing insights from organizational culture theory, human–AI collaboration literature, and empirical illustrations from leading global organizations, this study contributes to both theoretical advancement and practical guidance for navigating the cultural complexities of AI adoption.

2 Theoretical Foundation

Organizational culture has been extensively studied as a fundamental determinant of how organizations interpret and respond to change. Among the most influential frameworks, Schein's model conceptualizes culture as a multi-layered construct consisting of artifacts, espoused values, and underlying assumptions (Schein, 2010). While this model provides a robust foundation for understanding cultural dynamics, its application in the context of artificial intelligence (AI) requires further extension. Specifically, AI integration does not merely introduce new artifacts but has the potential to challenge deeply embedded

assumptions about human expertise, decision authority, and the nature of work itself.

Complementing this perspective, Hofstede's cultural dimensions offer insights into how variations in power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism influence organizational responses to technological change (Hofstede, 2011). However, while Hofstede's framework is useful for understanding cross-cultural differences, it remains limited in explaining intra-organizational dynamics in rapidly evolving digital environments. In AI-integrated contexts, cultural responses are not only shaped by national culture but also by organizational learning processes, technological exposure, and evolving work practices.

The Competing Values Framework (Cameron & Quinn, 2011) further contributes to understanding how different culture types, such as hierarchy, market, clan, and adhocracy, shape organizational readiness for innovation. In particular, adhocracy cultures are often associated with greater flexibility and openness to technological experimentation. Nevertheless, existing applications of this framework tend to treat culture as a relatively stable attribute, whereas AI integration introduces continuous and iterative change that requires a more dynamic conceptualization of culture.

To address these limitations, emerging perspectives such as sociomateriality (Orlikowski, 2007) provide a more suitable lens for analyzing AI's cultural impact. This perspective emphasizes that social and technological elements are inherently intertwined, suggesting that AI systems do not simply operate within organizational culture but actively participate in shaping it. Similarly, the concept of algorithmic management highlights how AI systems increasingly assume roles traditionally associated with human decision-makers, thereby redefining authority structures and accountability within organizations (Kellogg et al., 2020).

Building on these insights, the human–AI collaboration framework (Wilson & Daugherty, 2018) shifts the focus from substitution to complementarity, emphasizing how humans and AI systems can jointly create value. However, while this perspective highlights functional collaboration, it pays relatively limited attention to the cultural conditions that enable such collaboration to emerge and sustain over time.

Taken together, these theoretical perspectives suggest that existing models provide valuable but fragmented insights into cultural dynamics in the AI era. Traditional culture theories offer depth but lack adaptability to technological disruption, while emerging AI-related frameworks emphasize functionality but often overlook deeper cultural mechanisms. This fragmentation highlights the need for an integrative approach that conceptualizes organizational culture not as a static backdrop, but as an evolving and mediating force in human–AI interaction. It is within this theoretical gap that the present study positions its contribution through the development of the Human-Centered AI Synergy Framework.

3 Methodology

This study adopts a qualitative research design using a conceptual and integrative approach to examine the cultural implications of artificial intelligence (AI) integration within organizations. The research is positioned as a conceptual paper supported by illustrative case analysis, aiming to synthesize fragmented insights from organizational culture theory, AI adoption literature, and human, AI collaboration studies

into a coherent analytical framework (Jarrahi, 2018; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Rather than focusing on hypothesis testing, the study emphasizes theory development and conceptual refinement.

Data for this study are derived from two primary sources. First, a structured review of academic literature was conducted, focusing on peer-reviewed journal articles, books, and reports related to organizational culture, digital transformation, and AI integration. Sources were primarily drawn from reputable academic databases and publications between 2010 and 2024 to ensure relevance and currency. Second, illustrative case evidence was obtained from publicly available secondary data, including corporate reports and prior empirical studies on organizations such as Microsoft, Siemens, and Singtel, which are widely recognized for their engagement in AI-driven transformation.

The analysis employs a qualitative thematic synthesis approach. Relevant materials were systematically reviewed and coded to identify recurring patterns related to cultural transformation, including communication practices, decision-making processes, leadership approaches, innovation dynamics, and ethical considerations. The analytical process involved identifying key concepts, grouping them into broader thematic categories, and integrating these themes into a unified conceptual structure that informs the development of the proposed Human-Centered AI Synergy Framework (HCASF).

4 Results & Discussion

4.1 Cultural Mechanisms in AI-Driven Transformation

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into organizational environments fundamentally reshapes core cultural dimensions, particularly communication patterns, decision-making processes, and innovation practices. Rather than functioning as neutral tools, AI systems actively reconfigure how organizational members interact, interpret information, and exercise authority (Kellogg et al., 2020; Leonardi et al., 2021).

In terms of communication, AI-mediated platforms enable more decentralized and data-driven information flows, reducing reliance on traditional hierarchical channels. While such transformation enhances efficiency and responsiveness, it also challenges established norms of authority and control (Mazzei & Noble, 2021). From a sociomaterial perspective, communication becomes an emergent outcome of human–technology interaction rather than a purely social process (Orlikowski, 2007). Consequently, organizations must renegotiate communication norms to maintain alignment between algorithmic outputs and human expectations.

Similarly, AI significantly alters decision-making structures by introducing algorithmic recommendations into domains historically dominated by human judgment. This shift redefines the basis of decision legitimacy, moving from experience-based authority toward data-driven rationality (Brynjolfsson et al., 2021). However, as Jarrahi (2018) argues, effective decision-making in AI contexts relies on hybrid models that combine human intuition with machine intelligence. Cultural acceptance of such models depends on how organizations reconcile tensions between trust in algorithms and the preservation of human agency.

In the context of innovation, AI expands organizational capabilities through predictive analytics and

generative technologies. While this enhances the speed and scope of innovation, it also challenges traditional notions of creativity and authorship (Amabile et al., 2022). Organizations that frame AI as a collaborative partner tend to cultivate more adaptive innovation cultures, whereas those that position AI as a replacement for human creativity often encounter resistance and reduced engagement (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

4.2 Strategies for Digital Synergy

Achieving digital synergy requires organizations to move beyond technological adoption toward aligning AI implementation with human-centered cultural values. This alignment represents a critical balancing act between efficiency and human well-being, as AI systems often introduce tensions between performance optimization and ethical considerations (Ransbotham et al., 2017; Dignum, 2019). A key strategy involves embedding human-centric principles into AI governance and decision-making processes. Organizations that establish clear ethical guidelines, conduct human impact assessments, and implement oversight structures, such as AI ethics committees, are better positioned to ensure that technological advancements remain aligned with organizational values (Floridi et al., 2020; Jobin et al., 2019). These mechanisms not only mitigate risks such as bias and unfairness but also strengthen trust in AI systems.

Leadership also plays a pivotal role in enabling digital synergy. Adaptive and ethical leadership approaches help organizations navigate the uncertainty and complexity associated with AI integration (Heifetz et al., 2009; Treviño et al., 2006). Leaders who adopt a socio-technical perspective are more capable of managing the interdependence between human and technological systems, fostering a culture that supports collaboration rather than resistance (Sarker et al., 2019; Daugherty & Wilson, 2018).

In addition, organizational design must evolve to support dynamic human–AI interaction. Flexible structures, cross-functional teams, and continuous learning infrastructures enable organizations to adapt to rapidly changing technological environments (Garvin et al., 2008; McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2017). Such designs facilitate the development of AI literacy and promote experimentation, both of which are essential for sustaining innovation. Effective change management strategies are crucial for cultural adaptation. Evolutionary approaches that emphasize continuous learning, employee involvement, and transparent communication are more effective than top-down implementations (Kotter, 2012; Becker, 2020). Practices such as co-creation, cultural translation, and the use of change champions help build organizational ownership and reduce resistance to AI-driven transformation.

4.3 Empirical Insights & Case Analyses

Empirical insights from leading organizations demonstrate that successful AI integration is fundamentally driven by cultural transformation rather than technological capability alone. Across different industry contexts, companies such as Microsoft, Siemens, and Singtel illustrate how digital synergy emerges through the alignment of organizational values, leadership approaches, and workforce development strategies.

Microsoft's transformation highlights the importance of shifting organizational mindset toward a human-centered approach to AI. By redefining AI as a tool for augmenting human capabilities and embedding

ethical principles into its operations, Microsoft successfully fostered employee trust and engagement (Smith, 2020; Microsoft, 2021). This case underscores the role of leadership in shaping cultural narratives that influence how AI is perceived and adopted within organizations.

In contrast, Siemens demonstrates how cultural adaptation in traditional industries requires tangible value demonstration and employee involvement. By engaging engineers in AI development through co-creation initiatives and aligning AI implementation with existing professional identities, Siemens was able to reduce resistance and build cultural ownership (Müller et al., 2021). This suggests that digital synergy is more likely to be achieved when AI is positioned as an extension of existing expertise rather than a disruption.

Singtel provides further evidence of the importance of workforce transformation and ethical governance. Through structured reskilling programs and the establishment of AI ethics frameworks, Singtel maintained employee confidence while enhancing customer experience (Lim et al., 2021; Singtel, 2020). This case illustrates that balancing efficiency with human-centric considerations is critical for sustaining both internal engagement and external trust.

Taken together, these cases reveal several common patterns: the centrality of human-centered values, the importance of leadership in guiding cultural change, the role of continuous learning in enabling adaptation, and the necessity of governance mechanisms to ensure ethical alignment. At the same time, they highlight that effective strategies must be tailored to organizational context, as cultural transformation is shaped by industry characteristics, historical identity, and strategic priorities. These insights reinforce the argument that digital synergy is not a universal formula, but a context-dependent process grounded in cultural alignment.

Table 1. Comparative Analysis of AI-Driven Cultural Transformation

Organization	Industry Context	Cultural Focus	Key Strategies	Cultural Mechanism	Outcomes
Microsoft	Technology	Mindset transformation toward human-centered AI	AI principles, leadership-driven culture shift, AI literacy programs	Reframing AI as human augmentation; embedding ethical values into culture	Increased employee trust, higher adoption, innovation enhancement
Siemens	Industrial Manufacturing	Identity evolution of engineering culture	Value demonstration, co-creation with engineers, innovation labs	Aligning AI with professional identity; reducing resistance through participation	Cultural acceptance, operational efficiency, competitive advantage
Singtel	Telecommunication	Workforce	Reskilling	Balancing	Stable

ns	transformation and service alignment	programs, ethical governance, hybrid customer service model	automation with human interaction; reinforcing trust and capability	employee engagement, improved service quality, reputational gain
----	--------------------------------------	---	---	--

4.4 Challenges and Ethical Considerations

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) introduces significant cultural and ethical challenges that may hinder the achievement of digital synergy. One of the most critical issues is algorithmic bias, as AI systems trained on historical data can reproduce and amplify existing inequalities related to gender, race, and other social factors (Buolamwini & Gebru, 2018). Such biases undermine organizational values of fairness and meritocracy, reduce trust in AI systems, and may trigger resistance among employees (Dastin, 2018; Lee, 2018). Addressing this issue requires not only technical solutions, such as bias detection and diverse datasets, but also cultural mechanisms, including ethical governance, bias awareness, and transparency in decision-making (Dignum, 2019; Jobin et al., 2019).

Another major challenge concerns workforce transformation and job displacement. While AI can enhance productivity and create new roles, it also generates uncertainty and anxiety among employees regarding job security (Frey & Osborne, 2017). This tension affects organizational trust and identity, particularly when AI is perceived as a replacement rather than an augmentation of human capabilities (Ford, 2015). Organizations that adopt human-centered strategies, such as reskilling programs, transparent communication, and employee involvement, are more successful in mitigating resistance and fostering cultural adaptation (Daugherty & Wilson, 2018; Westerman et al., 2020).

Transparency and trust in algorithmic systems also represent fundamental challenges. The “black-box” nature of many AI systems limits understanding of how decisions are made, which can undermine accountability and legitimacy (Burrell, 2016). Without adequate transparency, organizations risk generating suspicion and reducing employee engagement. To address this, practices such as explainable AI, algorithmic literacy, and human oversight mechanisms are essential for building trust and ensuring responsible use of AI (Adadi & Berrada, 2018; Davenport & Ronanki, 2018).

Finally, the broader implementation of ethical frameworks is crucial for guiding AI integration. Effective frameworks incorporate principles such as fairness, accountability, transparency, and human autonomy, supported by governance structures, ethical impact assessments, and continuous training (Floridi et al., 2020; Treviño et al., 2006). These approaches ensure that AI systems are not only technically effective but also culturally and socially aligned with organizational and societal expectations.

4.5 Proposed Framework: Human-Centered AI Synergy Framework (HCASF)

This study proposes the Human-Centered AI Synergy Framework (HCASF) as an integrative model for guiding cultural transformation in AI-enabled organizations. The framework emphasizes that successful AI integration is not solely determined by technological capability, but by the alignment between cultural

values, strategic direction, and organizational practices.

The HCASF consists of four interconnected components: (1) Cultural Foundation, (2) Strategic Integration, (3) Operational Implementation, and (4) Continuous Evolution. These components operate as a dynamic and iterative system, where each element influences and reinforces the others. At the core, the Cultural Foundation defines how AI is perceived within the organization, including human-centered values, growth mindset, and AI literacy. This foundation shapes organizational attitudes toward trust, collaboration, and technological change. Building on this, Strategic Integration ensures that AI initiatives align with organizational goals and ethical principles through value-driven strategies, human–AI collaboration design, and governance mechanisms.

The Operational Implementation component translates strategy into practice, focusing on change management, bias mitigation, and transparency mechanisms to ensure responsible and effective AI use. Finally, Continuous Evolution highlights that AI-driven cultural transformation is an ongoing process supported by learning infrastructures, feedback systems, and performance evaluation, enabling organizations to adapt to emerging challenges and opportunities.



Picture 1. Visual Representation of HCASF

This cyclical structure indicates that cultural transformation is not linear but iterative, where insights from implementation continuously reshape organizational values and strategies.

Expected Outcomes

The implementation of HCASF generates three key outcomes. First, operational benefits, including improved performance and decision quality through effective human–AI collaboration. Second, cultural benefits, such as increased trust, reduced resistance, and stronger organizational identity. Third, strategic benefits, including enhanced innovation capacity, competitive advantage, and organizational legitimacy. Empirical evidence from organizations such as Microsoft, Siemens, and Singtel supports these outcomes, demonstrating that human-centered approaches to AI integration lead to higher employee acceptance, improved efficiency, and sustainable transformation.

5 Conclusion

This study demonstrates that the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) within organizations is fundamentally a cultural transformation rather than a purely technological process. The findings highlight that the success of AI adoption depends on the alignment between technological capabilities and human-centered values, particularly in shaping communication, decision-making, and innovation practices. The study contributes by proposing the Human-Centered AI Synergy Framework (HCASF), which positions organizational culture as a central mechanism in enabling effective human–AI collaboration. The framework emphasizes that digital synergy emerges through the interaction of cultural, strategic, and operational dimensions supported by continuous adaptation.

Practically, organizations are encouraged to approach AI adoption through cultural alignment, ethical governance, leadership development, and workforce capability building. While this study is conceptual in nature, it provides a foundation for future empirical research to further validate and refine the proposed framework. In conclusion, achieving sustainable digital synergy requires organizations to integrate technological advancement with deliberate cultural transformation.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank the STIE Mahardika Surabaya, Indonesia, for supporting this research.

Ethical Considerations

Not Applicable

Conflict of Interest

The Authors declare there is no conflict of interest.

Funding

This research did not receive any financial support.

REFERENCES

- Adobe. (2020). Adobe's ethical AI principles. *Adobe Ethics & Design*. <https://www.adobe.com/ethics.html>
- Amazon. (2019). Amazon to invest over \$700M to provide upscale training for 100,000 U.S. employees by 2025. *Amazon Newsroom*. <https://press.aboutamazon.com/news-releases/news-release-details/amazon-invest-over-700m-provide-upskill-training-100000-us>
- Amabile, T. M., Fisher, C. M., & Pillemer, J. (2022). Algorithmic aids to idea evaluation: A double-edged sword for creativity? *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 42, 100108. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2022.100108>
- Becker, J. (2020). *Cultural evolution in the digital age*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262043831.001.0001>
- Bisri, M. H., & Xu Jing. (2025). Workplaces Digital Distraction: Psychological Drivers Of Excessive Scrolling At Sino Unram International Centre. *International Journal of Education and Economic Sciences*, 1(4), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.64451/ijeess.v1i4.1.20>
- Boden, M. A. (2016). *AI: Its nature and future*. Oxford University Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1093/actrade/9780198604869.001.0001>

- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature.2014.434>
- Brynjolfsson, E., Rock, D., & Syverson, C. (2021). The contribution of artificial intelligence to economic growth. NBER Working Paper No. 28921. <https://doi.org/10.3386/w28921>
- Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). Gender shades: Intersectional accuracy disparities in commercial gender classification. Proceedings of the 1st Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency, 81, 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3287560>
- Burrell, J. (2016). How the machine ‘thinks’: Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. Big Data & Society, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512>
- Cameron, K., & Quinn, R. (2011). Diagnosing and changing organizational culture: Based on the competing values framework (3rd ed.). Jossey-Bass. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119219254>
- Castells, M. (2000). The rise of the network society (2nd ed.). Blackwell Publishers. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470713359>
- Chen, Y., Wang, Y., & Nevo, D. (2020). The impact of AI on organizational culture: Evidence from Microsoft. Journal of Organizational Computing and Electronic Commerce, 30(3), 195-214. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10919392.2020.1802431>
- Chesbrough, H. (2020). Open innovation results: Going beyond the hype. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198850094.001.0001>
- Danaher, J. (2016). The threat of algorithmic authority. Philosophical Disquisitions. <https://philosophicaldisquisitions.blogspot.com/2016/10/the-threat-of-algorithmic-authority.html>
- Dastin, J. (2018, October 10). Amazon scraps secret AI recruiting tool that showed bias against women. Reuters. <https://www.reuters.com/article/us-amazon-com-jobs-automation-insight/amazon-scraps-secret-ai-recruiting-tool-that-showed-bias-against-women-idUSKCN1MK08G>
- Daugherty, P. R., & Wilson, H. J. (2018). Human + machine: Reimagining work in the age of AI. Harvard Business Review Press. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.21287>
- Davenport, T. H., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. Harvard Business Review, 96(1), 108-116. <https://hbr.org/2018/01/artificial-intelligence-for-the-real-world>
- Denison, D. R. (1990). Corporate culture and organizational effectiveness. John Wiley & Sons. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470676415>
- Dignum, V. (2019). Responsible artificial intelligence: How to develop and use AI in a responsible way. Springer Nature. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30373-1>
- Dweck, C. (2016). Mindset: The new psychology of success. Random House. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-0-399-18447-9>
- Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., Chatila, R., Chazerand, P., Dignum, V., ... & Vayena, E. (2020). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society: Opportunities, risks, principles, and recommendations. Minds and Machines, 28(4), 689-707. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5>
- Ford, M. (2015). Rise of the robots: Technology and the threat of a jobless future. Basic Books. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-0-465-09753-0>
- Frey, C. B., & Osborne, M. A. (2017). The future of employment: How susceptible are jobs to computerisation? Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 114, 254-280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2016.08.019>

- Garvin, D. A., Edmondson, A. C., & Gino, F. (2008). Is yours a learning organization? *Harvard Business Review*, 86(3), 109-116. <https://hbr.org/2008/03/is-yours-a-learning-organization>
- Google. (2020). Google AI principles. <https://ai.google/principles/>
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-0-8091-3740-9>
- Heifetz, R. A., Grashow, A., & Linsky, M. (2009). *The practice of adaptive leadership: Powerful tools for changing a complex world*. Harvard Business Press. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-1-4221-8579-1>
- Hofman, J., Rai, V., & Hui, S. K. (2020). Power distance and acceptance of algorithmic advice. *Journal of Marketing*, 84(5), 85-102. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022242920924407>
- Hofstede, G. (2011). Dimensionalizing cultures: The Hofstede model in context. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Holstein, K., Wortman Vaughan, J., Daumé III, H., Dudik, M., & Wallach, H. (2019). Improving fairness in machine learning systems: What do industry practitioners need? *Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300799>
- Horvitz, E. (2019). Reflections on the past, present, and future of AI at Microsoft. *Microsoft Research Blog*. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/blog/reflections-on-the-past-present-and-future-of-ai-at-microsoft/>
- Hsieh, T. (2020). Delivering happiness: A path to profits, passion, and purpose. *Business Plus*. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-0-446-58420-7>
- IBM. (2021). *New Collar: A new approach to workforce development*. IBM. <https://www.ibm.com/employment/new-collar/>
- Iansiti, M., & Lakhani, K. R. (2020). Competing in the age of AI: Strategy and reality when humans and machines think together. *Harvard Business Review Press*. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-1-63369-672-8>
- 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.2018.03.005>
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389-399. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2>
- JPMorgan Chase. (2020). *Responsible AI at JPMorgan Chase*. <https://www.jpmorganchase.com/corporate/about/corporate-responsibility/ai-responsibility>
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms and management: The case of algorithmic management in the workplace. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 202-239. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0159>
- Kniberg, H. (2017). Spotify engineering culture. *Spotify Engineering Blog*. <https://engineering.atspotify.com/2014/03/spotify-engineering-culture-part-1/>
- Kodiyan, D., & Abraham, A. (2021). Algorithmic literacy: A prerequisite for understanding AI in everyday life. *AI & Society*, 36(3), 867-878. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01184-9>
- Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading change*. Harvard Business Review Press. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-1-4221-2186-3>
- Lee, M. K. (2018). Understanding perception of algorithmic decisions: Fairness, trust, and emotion in response to algorithmic management. *Big Data & Society*, 5(1).

<https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951718756684>

- Leonardi, P. M., Neeley, T. B., & Gerber, E. M. (2021). How hybrid work will change organizational communication and collaboration. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 62(3), 28-35. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/how-hybrid-work-will-change-organizational-communication-and-collaboration/>
- Lim, T. K., Tan, B., & Lee, O. (2021). Cultural transformation for AI integration: A case study of Singtel. *International Journal of Information Management*, 57, 101958. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.101958>
- Marler, J. H., & Boudreau, J. W. (2017). An evidence-based review of HR Analytics. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 28(1), 3-26. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1244699>
- Mazzei, A., & Noble, C. H. (2021). The role of AI in organizational communication: A review and research agenda. *Journal of Communication Management*, 25(1), 3-20. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-10-2020-0124>
- McAfee, A., & Brynjolfsson, E. (2017). *Machine, platform, crowd: Harnessing our digital future*. W. W. Norton & Company. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-0-393-60477-1>
- McKinney, S. M., Sieniek, M., Godbole, V., Godwin, J., Antropova, N., Ashrafian, H., ... & Shotton, J. (2020). International evaluation of an AI system for breast cancer screening. *Nature*, 577(7788), 89-94. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1799-6>
- Mehrabi, N., Morstatter, F., Saxena, N., Lerman, K., & Galstyan, A. (2021). A survey on bias and fairness in machine learning. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 54(6), 1-35. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3457607>
- Microsoft. (2021). Responsible AI principles from Microsoft. <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/ai/responsible-ai>
- Müller, V., Bostrom, N., & Yampolskiy, R. (2021). Siemens' approach to cultural transformation for AI integration. *Journal of Business Research*, 132, 521-532. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.033>
- Nadella, S. (2017). Hit refresh: The quest to rediscover Microsoft's soul and imagine a better future for everyone. *HarperBusiness*. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-0-06-265252-1>
- Nambisan, S., Wright, M., & Feldman, M. (2019). The digital transformation of innovation and entrepreneurship: Progress, challenges and key themes. *Research Policy*, 48(8), 103773. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.respol.2019.03.018>
- Newell, S., & Marabelli, M. (2020). Strategic opportunities (and challenges) of algorithmic decision-making: A socio-technical perspective. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 29(1), 101617. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.101617>
- O'Reilly, C. A., & Tushman, M. L. (2008). Ambidexterity as a dynamic capability: Resolving the innovator's dilemma. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 28, 185-206. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.riob.2008.06.002>
- Orlikowski, W. J. (2007). Sociomaterial practices: Exploring technology at work. *Organization Studies*, 28(9), 1435-1448. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840607081138>
- Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation-augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(1), 192-217. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072>
- Ransbotham, S., Kiron, D., & Gerbert, P. (2017). Reshaping business with artificial intelligence. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 59(1), 1-12. <https://sloanreview.mit.edu/article/reshaping-business->

with-artificial-intelligence/

- Rossman, J. (2016). *The retail revolution: How agile teams and customer networks are creating the next generation of Amazon.com*. McGraw-Hill Education. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-0-07-184950-4>
- Salesforce. (2021). *Responsible AI: The Salesforce approach*. <https://www.salesforce.com/products/einstein/responsible-ai/>
- Sarker, S., Sarker, S., & Sidorova, A. (2019). Understanding the socio-technical dynamics of enterprise systems implementation: A sociomaterial perspective. *Information Systems Journal*, 29(2), 327-356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12215>
- Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (5th ed.). Jossey-Bass. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781119219254>
- Seaver, N. (2017). Algorithms as culture: Some tactics for the ethnography of algorithmic systems. *Big Data & Society*, 4(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717738104>
- Shankar, A., Davenport, T., & O’Riordan, F. (2022). Building trust in AI: The role of explainability in organizational contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 178(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-021-04906-3>
- Siemens. (2020). *Digital transformation at Siemens: Our approach to AI*. Siemens AG. <https://www.siemens.com/global/en/home/company/topic-areas/digitalization.html>
- Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organizations* (4th ed.). Free Press. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-0-684-83584-7>
- Singtel. (2020). *Annual report 2020: Transforming for growth*. Singapore Telecommunications Limited. <https://www.singtel.com/about-singtel/investor-relations/financial-reports/annual-reports>
- Smith, W. (2020). *Microsoft’s culture journey: From know-it-all to learn-it-all*. Harvard Business School Case Study. <https://www.hbs.edu/faculty/Pages/item.aspx?num=56817>
- Tadelis, S. (2019). *Market design: A linear programming approach to auctions and matching*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108636777>
- Treviño, L. K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L. P. (2006). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations*, 56(1), 5-37. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726703056001628>
- Von Hippel, E. (2016). *Free innovation*. MIT Press. <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262034329.001.0001>
- Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2016). *Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation*. Harvard Business Review Press. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-1-63369-062-7>
- Westerman, G., McAfee, A., & Bonnet, D. (2020). *Leading digital transformation: A playbook for the digital age*. Harvard Business Review Press. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-1-63369-063-4>
- Wilson, H. J., & Daugherty, P. R. (2018). Collaborative intelligence: Humans and AI are joining forces. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(4), 114-123. <https://hbr.org/2018/07/collaborative-intelligence-humans-and-ai-are-joining-forces>
- Zuboff, S. (1988). *In the age of the smart machine: The future of work and power*. Basic Books. <https://doi.org/10.7242/978-0-465-04819-2>