Hybrid Human-AI Decision-making Models: A Conceptual Framework for Organizational Integration and Strategic Implementation

Azam Bejou
West Virginia State University, West Virginia, USA

abejou@msn.com

Abstract: This paper synthesizes existing research to establish a comprehensive taxonomy of hybrid models, categorizing them by their reliance on human oversight, algorithmic automation, and collaborative dynamics. By delineating the interplay between machine efficiency and human judgment, this framework provides practitioners with a strategic toolkit to navigate the operational challenges inherent in modern socio-technical systems (Fabri et al., 2023; Rivero, 2025). Furthermore, the taxonomy emphasizes how task complexity and operational risk dictate the optimal alignment between human agency and algorithmic processing (Hillebrand et al., 2025). This synthesis identifies key paradigms, ranging from autonomous execution to collaborative exploration—that define the current landscape of human-AI interaction (Li & Tian, 2025; Sherson et al., 2023). By mapping these dynamics to specific decision typologies, the research offers a structured methodology for leaders to balance algorithmic performance with necessary human accountability (Li & Tian, 2025). Ultimately, these insights enable organizations to move beyond ad-hoc implementations toward a systematic governance approach that optimizes the division of labor between human intuition and computational precision (Fabri et al., 2023).

Keywords: Hybrid intelligence, Algorithmic governance, Human-in-the-loop systems, Decision-making taxonomy, Organizational socio-technical design

1. Introduction

Hybrid Human-AI decision-making - Hybrid human-AI decision-making refers to organizational architectures that synthesize the computational speed and pattern recognition of algorithmic systems with the contextual judgment and ethical discernment of human decision-makers (Hillebrand et al., 2025; Inuwa-Dutse et al., 2023). This integration moves beyond simple task automation by creating dynamic epistemic relationships where neither party acts in isolation (Engin, 2025). Rather, these systems function as integrated workflows where both machine-led data processing and human-led interpretation iteratively refine organizational outputs. This collaborative entanglement allows for the management of complex, ambiguous tasks that require both objective data analysis and nuanced, value-based reasoning (Fabri et al., 2023). In this context, the shift from task-based automation to collaborative hybridity reflects a fundamental transition in organizational design, where the locus of agency is redistributed across socio-technical interfaces (Boos, 2024; Puranam, 2021). This systemic reconfiguration necessitates the formal redesign of decision rights to clarify accountability frameworks, ensuring that roles are explicitly defined rather than implicitly assumed (Westover, 2025). Organizations must move beyond treating this interaction as a peripheral support function, instead embedding it into their operational core to address the persistent tensions between algorithmic scale and human expertise (Cheriyan, 2025; O'Doherty et al., 2025). Transformation of these decision-making structures is particularly critical as organizations grapple with the evolving, dynamic nature of AI systems that increasingly assume greater agency in domains traditionally reserved for human experts (Engin, 2025).

Research questions - This study addresses two primary inquiries: What specific taxonomical types of hybrid human-AI decision-making models can be identified based on their structural interaction, and how do these models diverge in terms of decision-making authority, cognitive load distribution, and operational performance outcomes (Ebel et al., 2021; Sen & Jakkaraju, 2025)? Next, how do they differ in authority, interaction, and outcomes? Finally, the study outlines a series of managerial implications, offering a prescriptive framework to assist leaders in navigating the strategic deployment of these hybrid architectures across diverse institutional contexts (Andrew, 2025; Li & Tian, 2025).

2. Theoretical Foundations

Human decision-making limits (bounded rationality, cognitive load) - Cognitive constraints, such as bounded rationality and the heuristic-driven shortcuts inherent in managerial judgment, frequently lead to suboptimal outcomes in complex, high-velocity environments. These limitations are further compounded by the illusion of explanatory depth, wherein individuals overestimate their comprehension of complex systems while failing to account for the systemic biases inherent in their own mental models (Wang, 2025). Conversely, algorithmic decision-making offers a mechanism to bypass these biological limitations by processing vast datasets without

the fatigue or affective influence that often compromises human-led judgment. However, such systems are constrained by their reliance on historical data patterns, which may fail to capture novel environmental shifts that require the adaptive, context-sensitive reasoning unique to human cognition (Fabri et al., 2023; Hillebrand et al., 2025).

AI in decision support (predictive analytics, optimization, recommendation systems) - AI systems function as sophisticated engines for predictive analytics and optimization, enabling the identification of latent patterns within high-dimensional datasets that exceed human perceptual capacity. These systems transform raw informational inputs into actionable insights, providing real-time recommendations that augment the quality of strategic deliberations. Beyond their predictive utility, these tools act as dual-valence artifacts that simultaneously reduce cognitive load through task automation while escalating new demands for interpretative oversight and algorithmic literacy (Wang & Lin, 2025).

Behavioral decision theory & human-AI collaboration - This interdisciplinary domain examines how the interplay between human and AI shapes organizational search processes (Sen & Jakkaraju, 2025). By integrating these variables into a unified model, firms can better navigate the transition from traditional managerial judgment toward augmented systems that mitigate the pitfalls of bounded rationality (Csaszar et al., 2024; Meyer, 2024). Furthermore, this theoretical synthesis emphasizes that successful collaboration requires intentional design to prevent the "automation bias" that often leads human actors to defer uncritically to machine outputs, even when those outputs conflict with superior situational evidence (Boyacı et al., 2023).

3. Hybrid Human-AI Decision-making Models

Core contribution: describe 12+ hybrid models - these models are categorized based on the degree of human intervention and the specific functional objective within the decision pipeline, ranging from supportive augmentation to autonomous oversight (Gonesh et al., 2023). By systematizing these interactions, organizations can achieve a strategic balance that leverages AI's analytical precision while safeguarding the nuanced judgment and ethical accountability inherent in human leadership (Kuzmanko & Vrbová, 2025; Mohammed et al., 2025). These architectures operationalize decision-making as a collaborative continuum, wherein the distribution of authority is dynamically adjusted based on task complexity, stakeholder impact, and the necessity for explainable outcomes (Mohammed et al., 2025; The Symbiotic Relationship of Humans and AI, 2025). This conceptual taxonomy provides a structured framework for evaluating the fit between specific AI capabilities and the diverse typologies of managerial decisions (Li & Tian, 2025).

Human-in-the-loop Models

- AI recommends, human decides - This model functions by tasking the AI with surfacing actionable insights from large datasets, which the human stakeholder then reviews to finalize the decision based on contextual factors (Frenette, 2024). This workflow allows users to adjust or override system outputs, thereby increasing trust and ensuring that the final choice remains aligned with strategic organizational objectives (FURDUESCU, 2025). This process effectively maintains human accountability for high-stakes outcomes while utilizing machine efficiency to screen vast quantities of information (Haesevoets et al., 2021).
- Human decides, AI validates - In this configuration, the human stakeholder initiates the primary course of action, while the AI performs a real-time audit to identify potential errors, inconsistencies, or alignment gaps with pre-established decision constraints (Nwachukwu et al., 2025). This retrospective verification acts as a fail-safe mechanism, ensuring that subjective judgments do not violate critical operational boundaries or compliance requirements (Saberi, 2022).
- AI decides, human supervises - In this arrangement, the algorithmic agent executes micro-decisions within defined operational parameters, while the human agent maintains high-level oversight to monitor performance trends and intervene only when anomalous outcomes or systemic deviations occur (Kowald et al., 2024). This "human-on-the-loop" approach facilitates high-frequency operations while reserving cognitive bandwidth for strategic adjustments to system objectives or constraints (Gill & Gosine-Boodoo, 2025).

AI-Augmented Decision Models

- Scenario simulation + human judgment - This model utilizes predictive algorithms to project multiple potential futures, allowing decision-makers to stress-test their intuition against a range of simulated outcomes (Xu et al., 2025). By evaluating these divergent paths, leaders can stress-test strategic

assumptions against quantified risks, thereby enhancing the robustness of their long-term planning. This synthesis allows managers to navigate uncertainty by visualizing the downstream impact of their strategic choices before finalizing resource commitments (Klöckner & Thoring, 2024).

- Predictive analytics + human interpretation - This model employs advanced data processing to identify underlying trends and statistical correlations, providing a foundation for human stakeholders to provide qualitative context and subjective reasoning (Vudugula et al., 2023). This synthesis ensures that raw algorithmic outputs are translated into actionable, context-aware strategies that reflect organizational values and long-term goals (ARADHYULA, 2024).
- Optimization with human constraints - This model incorporates specific organizational requirements, ethical thresholds, or resource limitations directly into the algorithmic objective function to ensure that generated solutions remain compliant with operational mandates.

Cognitive & Governance Models

- Bias mitigation model - This approach integrates specialized algorithms designed to detect and quantify discriminatory patterns, serving as a secondary layer of scrutiny that alerts human operators to potential fairness violations (Buckley et al., 2025). By leveraging explainability tools, this model empowers human overseers to audit the rationale behind specific recommendations, thereby reinforcing both institutional accountability and ethical alignment.
- Trust calibration model - This model utilizes real-time performance feedback and transparency metrics to adjust the user's level of reliance based on the system's historical reliability and current confidence scores. By dynamically surfacing uncertainty estimates, this framework prevents over-trust in volatile environments while encouraging active engagement when algorithmic confidence is low (Spera & Agrawal, 2025).
- Accountability balancing model - This framework assigns explicit responsibility for specific decision stages to either the human or the AI, ensuring clear attribution for errors or successes within the governance structure (Farayola et al., 2024). By establishing such accountable boundaries, organizations can proactively address the challenges of competing interests and varying risk tolerances among stakeholders (Koripalli, 2025).

4. Comparative Analysis of Hybrid Models

Compare models - The models are compared according to the following 4 factors - Decision authority, speed-to-accuracy trade-offs, cognitive workload intensity, and the distribution of risk and accountability.

- Decision authority - this factor evaluates the degree of autonomy granted to the algorithmic agent versus the human overseer, mapping the shift from human-centric control to autonomous machine execution. This continuum defines the governance hierarchy, determining whether the AI serves as a passive analytical tool or a proactive executor of high-stakes operational choices (Rooy, 2024). This analytical dimension further elucidates how varying levels of machine autonomy necessitate distinct oversight mechanisms to ensure alignment with institutional ethical mandates (Lin, 2024).
- Speed vs accuracy - This dimension assesses the inverse relationship between rapid algorithmic processing and the meticulous refinement required by human intervention. While automation optimizes throughput for high-volume tasks, incorporating human oversight is essential to mitigate contextual insensitivity and algorithmic bias (Selvam & Vallejo, 2025). Optimal hybrid integration strategies often involve a calibration of this trade-off, prioritizing algorithmic speed in routine operations while mandating human deliberation for complex, high-variance scenarios (Agrawal & Cleland-Huang, 2021; Leslie et al., 2024).
- Cognitive load - this metric examines the mental capacity required by human operators to synthesize, interpret, and validate AI-generated outputs within a given decision cycle. High-frequency interactions often necessitate intuitive interfaces to prevent mental fatigue, as excessive monitoring of automated systems can lead to vigilance decrements. Consequently, the design of decision environments must incorporate adaptive load-balancing techniques to preserve human oversight effectiveness during prolonged monitoring tasks (Joshi, 2025).
- Risk and accountability - this factor delineates the distribution of liability for erroneous outcomes, particularly in scenarios where delegated agency complicates traditional legal or operational blame. Establishing clear accountability frameworks requires pre-design analysis to evaluate situational criticality, ensuring that human intervention is mandated when the severity of potential consequences exceeds the operational limits of automated agents (Abbass, 2019; Devitt, 2024).

- Trade-offs and insights - Effective hybrid integration requires organizations to recognize that no universal distribution of tasks exists; instead, optimal interaction modes must be calibrated based on specific situational demands and the varying capabilities of human and automated agents (Leyli-Abadi et al., 2025). Successful implementation depends upon aligning the chosen model with the organization's specific tolerance for risk and its existing regulatory requirements regarding human-in-the-loop mandates (Faas et al., 2025). Moreover, leadership must cultivate a culture of continuous assessment, where the performance of hybrid systems is systematically audited to refine the balance between automation and human judgment.

5. Managerial Implications

Guidance for choosing appropriate hybrid models - Managers should initiate selection by mapping the specific decision-making task against the required levels of ethical oversight, regulatory compliance, and cognitive complexity. This diagnostic process ensures that the selected framework aligns with institutional risk tolerance while mitigating the systemic biases inherent in autonomous processes (Yuanjun et al., 2025). Furthermore, leaders must establish robust transparency architectures that connect automated processing with clear accountability protocols, ensuring that hybrid outcomes remain verifiable in high-stakes environments (Torres et al., 2025). Additionally, organizational leaders must assess the long-term impact of algorithmic interaction on human expertise, ensuring that reliance on automated decision-support systems does not atrophy critical analytical skills within the workforce. Additionally, firms must navigate the complex delegation of liability, as the collaborative nature of these systems often obscures the locus of responsibility when errors occur (Huang et al., 2025). Finally, managers should adopt a structured, scalable approach to implementation that prioritizes human-AI collaboration as a means of improving operational outcomes rather than mere automation (Sauer & Burggräf, 2024).

Training, governance, and organizational preparation - Organizations must implement targeted training programs that calibrate human knowledge thresholds, ensuring employees possess the domain expertise required to validate and correct algorithmic outputs effectively (He et al., 2024). Moreover, organizations should foster trust by implementing explainable AI interfaces that clarify the logic behind machine-generated suggestions, thereby enhancing the precision of human-AI interaction (Wen et al., 2025). Furthermore, firms should proactively establish multidisciplinary ethical review boards to evaluate these automated systems, ensuring that governance frameworks evolve in tandem with technological advancements (Patel, 2025). Additionally, managers should focus on optimizing the complementarity potential of these teams by aligning task requirements with the unique strengths of both human judgment and machine precision (Глухов & Синогина, 2025).

Ethical and accountability considerations - Leaders must establish explicit liability frameworks that define agency in hybrid systems, particularly when automated outputs influence high-stakes organizational outcomes (Ramli, 2025; Wilson et al., 2025). This involves instituting rigorous audit trails and explainability protocols to ensure that every algorithmic contribution remains subject to human oversight, thereby aligning technological efficiency with institutional values and regulatory compliance (Frimpong, 2025). Ultimately, the long-term success of these hybrid configurations depends on fostering a symbiotic environment where technology augments rather than replaces human expertise, ensuring that automated systems remain tools for empowerment (Sarioguz & Miser, 2024). Furthermore, sustained competitive advantage relies on executive commitment to integrating these digital capabilities into the core corporate strategy, ensuring that innovation is incentivized rather than stifled by the fear of obsolescence (Tasheva & Karpovich, 2024). To achieve this, firms should prioritize incremental implementation through pilot projects, allowing for iterative refinement and the minimization of operational risks before full-scale deployment (Bruno, 2024).

6. Challenges and Risks

Algorithmic bias - automated systems often reflect and amplify historical prejudices present in training datasets, potentially leading to discriminatory outcomes in recruitment, credit allocation, or resource distribution. Mitigating this risk necessitates the implementation of robust data curation processes and periodic auditing to identify and neutralize embedded biases (Farach et al., 2025; Szajczyk, 2025). - Transparency and explainability gaps - The "black-box" nature of advanced algorithms often obscures the underlying logic behind automated decisions, which can foster mistrust and inhibit effective collaboration between human operators and AI systems (Simón et al., 2024). Consequently, managers must prioritize the adoption of interpretable machine learning

techniques that provide actionable insights, thereby bridging the divide between automated complexity and human understanding (Fisher & Fleming, 2025; Hemmer et al., 2024).

Overreliance on AI - this phenomenon, often characterized as automation bias, involves a decline in human vigilance where decision-makers become passive observers, ultimately weakening the organization's ability to identify systemic errors when algorithmic performance degrades (Walther, 2025). To counter this, organizations should promote a data-driven mindset that encourages employees to actively exercise their domain expertise and critical judgment when reviewing algorithmic insights (Huynh, 2025). Moreover, integrating digital labor into the enterprise requires a fundamental restructuring of workflows and roles to ensure that human-AI collaboration is supported by clear performance metrics (Farach et al., 2025). Furthermore, successful long-term adoption hinges on cultural readiness, necessitating a shift toward organizational designs that value continuous learning and adaptive, innovation-oriented mindsets (Nikzat, 2025).

Human resistance - employees often exhibit techno-skepticism and apprehension regarding job displacement, which can lead to the "not-invented-here" syndrome or active avoidance of algorithmic tools (Ștefan et al., 2024). To mitigate these cultural barriers, organizations must communicate the augmentation value of AI by emphasizing how such tools alleviate cognitive burdens rather than diminishing professional agency (Ng et al., 2021; الحدراوي et al., 2025). Addressing these concerns requires transparent change management strategies that actively involve staff in the design of workflows, thereby transforming potential resistance into a shared commitment to digital transformation (Rahman, 2024). Finally, by linking the integration of these systems to clear professional upskilling pathways, leadership can reinforce the perception that AI is an asset for career growth rather than a replacement for human talent (Grant & Levasseur, 2025; Jadad-Garcia & Jadad, 2024).

7. Future Research Directions

Empirical testing of hybrid models - researchers must shift toward longitudinal case studies that analyze the long-term impact of specific model configurations on organizational performance and employee decision-making autonomy (Ali et al., 2024). Additionally, future inquiries should investigate the cross-cultural variability in trust calibration mechanisms to determine how diverse workforce demographics perceive and engage with AI agents in high-stakes environments (Li et al., 2025). Moreover, there is a critical need to develop standardized audit protocols for assigning accountability in instances where human-AI partnerships yield suboptimal outcomes (Miedema et al., 2025). - Advancing hybrid intelligence frameworks - scholars should explore the design of AI systems capable of supporting nuanced human capabilities such as creativity and emotional intelligence, which remain critical for complex, non-routine decision tasks (Akinnagbe, 2024). Furthermore, future research should investigate how these advancements influence organizational power dynamics and the evolving role of managerial authority in an era of distributed cognitive labor (“International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation,” 2021).

Industry-specific adaptation - investigating how hybrid models function across distinct sectors, such as healthcare, finance, and manufacturing, is essential to determine whether decision-making frameworks require tailored configurations to address unique regulatory and operational constraints (Lin & Chen, 2025; Shukla, 2024). Additionally, future studies should examine the evolution of professional roles and requisite skill sets as AI augmentation fundamentally reshapes the distribution of responsibilities within these specialized domains (Petrescu & Krishen, 2023). Finally, establishing robust ethical frameworks and data governance protocols will be paramount to ensuring these human-AI systems align with organizational values and mitigate risks related to algorithmic bias and privacy (Balbaa & Abdurashidova, 2024).

Human-AI interaction under uncertainty - investigating how decision-makers maintain performance when AI predictive reliability fluctuates is vital for developing resilient collaboration protocols (Söllner et al., 2025). Furthermore, research should explore the role of team-level dynamics and co-learning mechanisms, as these factors significantly influence how collective cognition adapts to the integration of autonomous agents (Li & Tian, 2025). Additionally, scholars should examine the design of effective incentive structures and governance mechanisms to ensure that expert contributions remain aligned with the evolving requirements of hybrid systems (Dellermann et al., 2019).

8. Conclusion

Key takeaways - hybrid decision-making models transcend mere technological integration, functioning instead as foundational shifts in organizational design that necessitate a synergy between algorithmic precision and human judgment. By systematically codifying decision rights and fostering collaborative trust, organizations can

effectively mitigate the risks of deskilling while capitalizing on the unique, complementary strengths of both agents (Natali et al., 2025; Westover, 2025). This evolution requires organizations to treat decision-making architectures as dynamic systems that balance technical sophistication with the nuanced requirements of human authority (Westover, 2025). Ultimately, successful implementation hinges on moving beyond binary views of automation to embrace frameworks that operationalize collective morality and accountability (Kiškis, 2026).

Contribution to theory and practice - this work advances organizational design by mapping the combinatorial space of human-machine interaction, providing practitioners with a taxonomy for reconfiguring decision rights in agentic AI environments (Andrew, 2025). By synthesizing these diverse interaction patterns, the proposed framework serves as a roadmap for leaders navigating the automation-augmentation paradox to cultivate sustainable, high-performing decision ecosystems (O'Doherty et al., 2025; Puranam, 2021). Future scholarship must now bridge the gap between these conceptual archetypes and the real-world complexities of organizational culture, where power asymmetries and human agency are continuously renegotiated (Hillebrand et al., 2025; O'Doherty et al., 2025). Integrating these socio-technical dimensions will prove essential for moving from theoretical taxonomy toward prescriptive guidance in high-stakes organizational contexts (Axelsen et al., 2025; Puranam, 2020). Ultimately, this research underscores that the most resilient organizational architectures are those that treat human-AI collaboration not as a static arrangement, but as a deliberate design problem (Puranam, 2020, 2021). By systematically aligning technical capabilities with organizational decision rights, firms can evolve beyond passive implementation toward a more intentional, symbiotic architecture that empowers human judgment while leveraging the scalability of autonomous systems (Andrew, 2025; Shrestha et al., 2019). In this pursuit, the longitudinal study of these collaborative dynamics remains the next frontier for both management science and organizational engineering (Puranam, 2021; Wang, 2025).

Ethics Declaration: I did not need ethical clearance for the research referred to in this paper

AI Declaration: I did not use any AI tool in the development of this paper.

References

Abedin, B., Meske, C., Junglas, I., Rabhi, F., & Motahari-Nezhad, H. R. (2022). Designing and Managing Human-AI Interactions. *Information Systems Frontiers*, *24*(3), 691. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10313-1

Alves, M. M., Seringa, J., Silvestre, T., & Magalhães, T. (2024). Use of Artificial Intelligence tools in supporting decision-making in hospital management. *Research Square (Research Square)*. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4491119/v1

Bevilacqua, S., Ferraris, A., Matzler, K., & Kuděj, M. (2025). Strategic leadership at high altitude: Investigating how AI affects the required skills of top managers. *Journal of Business Research*, *205*, 115878. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115878

Buschmeyer, K., Hatfield, S., & Zenner, J. (2023). Psychological assessment of AI-based decision support systems: tool development and expected benefits. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, *6*. https://doi.org/10.3389/frai.2023.1249322

Cahyani, R. R., & Musslifah, A. R. (2025). Balancing bytes and biases: A case study of AI adoption in academic human resource management. *Journal of Educational Management and Instruction (JEMIN)*, *5*(2), 437. https://doi.org/10.22515/jemin.v5i2.11679

Doh, W. (2025). Systematically Predicting and Preventing Overreliance Through the Human-AI-System Concordance (HASC) Matrix and Cognitive Interventions. *Deep Blue (University of Michigan)*. https://doi.org/10.7302/25824

Fenwick, A., Molnár, G., & Frangos, P. (2024). The critical role of HRM in AI-driven digital transformation: a paradigm shift to enable firms to move from AI implementation to human-centric adoption. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-024-00125-4

Gans, J. (2025). AI as Strategist. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5195933

Gladden, M. E., Fortuna, P., & Modliński, A. (2022). The Empowerment of Artificial Intelligence in Post-Digital Organizations: Exploring Human Interactions with Supervisory AI. *Human Technology*, *18*(2), 98. https://doi.org/10.14254/1795-6889.2022.18-2.2

Gölgeci, İ., Ritala, P., Arslan, A., McKenna, B., & Ali, I. (2024). Confronting and alleviating AI resistance in the workplace: An integrative review and a process framework [Review of *Confronting and alleviating AI resistance in the workplace: An integrative review and a process framework*]. *Human Resource Management Review*, *35*(2), 101075. Elsevier BV. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2024.101075

Hao, X., Demir, E., & Eyers, D. (2024). Exploring collaborative decision-making: A quasi-experimental study of human and Generative AI interaction. *Technology in Society*, *78*, 102662. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2024.102662

Hao, X., Demir, E., & Eyers, D. (2025). Beyond human-in-the-loop: Sensemaking between artificial intelligence and human intelligence collaboration. *Sustainable Futures*, *10*, 101152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.101152

International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation. (2021). *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation*. https://doi.org/10.54660/anfo

KAÇMAZ, G. (2021). Araştırma Makalesi. *MAS Journal of Applied Sciences*, *7*(7). https://doi.org/10.52520/masjaps.90

Kolbjørnsrud, V. (2023). Designing the Intelligent Organization: Six Principles for Human-AI Collaboration. *California Management Review*, *66*(2), 44. https://doi.org/10.1177/00081256231211020

Lin, H. (2024). Ethical and Scalable Automation: A Governance and Compliance Framework for Business Applications. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2409.16872

Nair, M., Svedberg, P., Larsson, I., & Nygren, J. (2024). A comprehensive overview of barriers and strategies for AI implementation in healthcare: Mixed-method design [Review of *A comprehensive overview of barriers and strategies for AI implementation in healthcare: Mixed-method design*]. *PLoS ONE*, *19*(8). Public Library of Science. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0305949

Review and Research Agenda for Healthcare and Beyond [Review of *AI-induced Deskilling in Medicine: A Mixed-Method Review and Research Agenda for Healthcare and Beyond*]. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, *58*(11). Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-025-11352-1

Navarro-Meneses, F. J., & Pablo-Martí, F. (2025). Reimagining human agency in ai-driven futures: a co-evolutionary scenario framework from aviation. *European Journal of Futures Research*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-025-00260-w

Nguyen, K. M., Bui, T.-T., Pham, H. T., Nguyen, L., Pham, H. T., Gia, L. L., & Nguyen, N. T. (2025). Fostering employees' AI adoption in strategic marketing planning and decision making: a mixed-method study in Vietnam. *Cognition Technology & Work*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10111-025-00838-1

Page, S. E., & Kallapur, A. (2025). Replace, augment, disrupt: AI & organizational decision-making. *Journal of Organization Design*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-025-00194-4

Proceedings of the 20th Conference on Computer Science and Intelligence Systems (FedCSIS). (2025). *Annals of Computer Science and Information Systems*, *43*. https://doi.org/10.15439/978-83-973291-6-4

Rainy, T. A., Goswami, D., Rabbi, M. M. K., & Maruf, A. A. (2023). *A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF AI-ENHANCED DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS: STRATEGIC APPLICATIONS IN SERVICE-ORIENTED ENTERPRISES AND ENTERPRISE PLANNING* [Review of *A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF AI-ENHANCED DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS: STRATEGIC APPLICATIONS IN SERVICE-ORIENTED ENTERPRISES AND ENTERPRISE PLANNING*]. *2*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.63125/73djw422

Raisch, S., & Fomina, K. (2024). Combining Human and Artificial Intelligence: Hybrid Problem-Solving in Organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *50*(2), 441. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2021.0421

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation–Augmentation Paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, *46*(1), 192. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

Ramli, M. (2025). Intelligent Automation for FDI Facilitation: Optimizing Tariff Exemption Processes with OCR And Large Language Models. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2506.12093

Rooy, D. V., & Vaes, K. (2024). Harmonizing human-AI synergy: behavioral science in AI-integrated design. *Proceedings of the Design Society*, *4*, 2287. https://doi.org/10.1017/pds.2024.231

Sarioguz, O., & Miser, E. (2024). ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND PARTICIPATORY LEADERSHIP: THE ROLE OF TECHNOLOGICAL TRANSFORMATION IN BUSINESS MANAGEMENT AND ITS IMPACT ON EMPLOYEE PARTICIPATION. *International Research Journal of Modernization in Engineering Technology and Science*. https://doi.org/10.56726/irjmets49539

Schmitt, M. (2024a). Strategic Integration of Artificial Intelligence in the C-Suite: The Role of the Chief AI Officer. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4812654

Schmitt, M. (2024b). Strategic Integration of Artificial Intelligence in the C-Suite: The Role of the Chief AI Officer. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2407.10247

Sellen, A., & Horvitz, E. (2024). The Rise of the AI Co-Pilot: Lessons for Design from Aviation and Beyond. *Communications of the ACM*, *67*(7), 18. https://doi.org/10.1145/3637865

Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & Krogh, G. von. (2019). Organizational Decision-Making Structures in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. *California Management Review*, *61*(4), 66. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619862257

Ştefan, S. C., Olariu, A. A., & Popa, Ştefan C. (2024). Implications of Artificial Intelligence on Organizational Agility: A PLS-SEM and PLS-POS Approach. *Amfiteatru Economic*, *26*(66), 403. https://doi.org/10.24818/ea/2024/66/403

Sudeeptha, I., Mueller, W., Leyer, M., Richter, A., & Nolte, F. (2024). Use Cases for Prospective Sensemaking of Human-AI-Collaboration. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2408.10812

Tallam, K. (2025). From Autonomous Agents to Integrated Systems, A New Paradigm: Orchestrated Distributed Intelligence. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2503.13754

Tasleem, N., Raghav, R. S., Ansari, M., & Sharma, A. (2024). A Decision Intelligence Framework: Integrating Human Intuition with Ai Models. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence General Science (JAIGS) ISSN 3006-4023*, *7*(1), 304. https://doi.org/10.60087/jaigs.v7i01.361

Tjondronegoro, D. (2025). TOAST Framework: A Multidimensional Approach to Ethical and Sustainable AI Integration in Organizations. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2502.00011

Trunk, A., Birkel, H., & Hartmann, E. (2020). On the current state of combining human and artificial intelligence for strategic organizational decision making. *BuR - Business Research*, *13*(3), 875. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-020-00133-x

Übellacker, T. (2025). Making Sense of AI Limitations: How Individual Perceptions Shape Organizational Readiness for AI Adoption. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2502.15870

Vincent, V. (2021). Integrating intuition and artificial intelligence in organizational decision-making. *Business Horizons*, *64*(4), 425. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2021.02.008

Westover, J. (2025). AI-Augmented Decision Rights: Redesigning Authority in Human-Machine Organizations. *Human Capital Leadership.*, *27*(1). https://doi.org/10.70175/hclreview.2020.27.1.7

Wilson, K., Sim, M., Gueorguieva, A.-M., & Caliskan, A. (2025). *No Thoughts Just AI: Biased LLM Hiring Recommendations Alter Human Decision Making and Limit Human Autonomy*. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2509.04404

Woolley, A. W. (2025). Generative AI and collaboration: opportunities for cultivating collective intelligence. *Journal of Organization Design*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-025-00199-z

Wulf, J., Meierhofer, J., & Hannich, F. (2025). Architecting Human-AI Cocreation for Technical Services -- Interaction Modes and Contingency Factors. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2507.14034

Xu, G., Murthy, S. V., & Jia, B. (2025). Enhancing Intuitive Decision-Making and Reliance Through Human–AI Collaboration: A Review. *Informatics*, *12*(4), 135. https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics12040135