

## **AUGMENTED LEADERSHIP: INTEGRATING HUMAN INTUITION AND MACHINE INTELLIGENCE IN POST-DIGITAL ORGANIZATIONS**

*Alecsandra Andreea BURCEA (SCINTEE), Ph.D. candidate  
Bucharest University of Economic Studies*

### **ABSTRACT**

*This paper explores the emerging paradigm of augmented leadership, where human intuition and machine intelligence converge to shape managerial decision-making in post-digital organizations. As artificial intelligence (AI), big data, and predictive analytics become embedded in strategic workflows, leadership roles are redefined beyond traditional competencies. Drawing on current research in digital management and organizational psychology, the study examines how hybrid decision ecosystems balance algorithmic efficiency with human judgment. Using a qualitative, exploratory methodology, it investigates managerial perceptions of AI-assisted leadership in dynamic business contexts. Findings highlight that augmented leadership enhances strategic agility and reduces cognitive bias but raises ethical challenges around transparency and autonomy. The paper proposes a framework in which leaders act as interpreters between data-driven insights and human values, ensuring technology amplifies, rather than replaces, relational and cultural dimensions of management.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Augmented leadership, Human–AI collaboration, Post-digital organizations, Managerial decision-making, Algorithmic management, Strategic agility, Digital ethics*

**J.E.L. Classifications:** M12; M15; O33; D83, L86

### **1. INTRODUCTION**

The post-digital era has redefined the architecture of leadership. Organizations are no longer managed solely through human expertise but increasingly through hybrid ecosystems where AI-driven analytics and human intuition intersect. In this environment, decision-making is shaped not only by experience and context but also by algorithmic predictions and data-driven models (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017). This convergence has given rise to the concept of augmented leadership, emphasizing the complementarity between human judgment and machine intelligence (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

As industries adapt to volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) environments, leaders are expected to leverage technology while preserving the human-centered values essential for organizational cohesion and trust (Wilson & Daugherty, 2018). The challenge lies in balancing efficiency with empathy, automation with creativity, and data with ethics. This paper examines how augmented leadership reshapes managerial practices and proposes strategies for integrating human–AI collaboration into sustainable organizational governance.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. The Concept of Augmented Leadership in Post-Digital Organizations

The rapid diffusion of artificial intelligence (AI) and advanced analytics has transformed leadership paradigms, giving rise to the notion of *augmented leadership*. Unlike traditional models that rely primarily on human intuition or fully automated systems, augmented leadership emphasizes the synergy between human and machine capabilities in complex decision-making processes. According to Raisch and Krakowski (2021), augmented leadership is not a replacement of human agency but a reconfiguration of managerial roles where leaders orchestrate interactions between technological systems and human stakeholders.

Post-digital organizations operate in environments characterized by volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA), making adaptive decision-making critical (Bennett & Lemoine, 2014). In such contexts, leaders cannot rely solely on experiential knowledge; instead, they must integrate real-time data streams, algorithmic predictions, and scenario simulations into their strategic reasoning (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017). This hybrid model requires competencies that extend beyond traditional management, including digital literacy, ethical interpretation of AI outputs, and the ability to mediate between algorithmic recommendations and organizational culture (Wilson & Daugherty, 2018).

Furthermore, augmented leadership redefines power dynamics within organizations. As van Doorn and Aagaard (2021) argue, algorithmic systems introduce new forms of “datafied management” where leadership authority is partially distributed to technological infrastructures. The leader’s role shifts from being the sole decision-maker to acting as a curator and translator of machine-generated insights, ensuring alignment with human values and strategic objectives. This interplay

underscores that in post-digital organizations, leadership is no longer a purely human function but a hybrid, socio-technical construct.

## **2.2. Human–AI Collaboration and Managerial Decision-Making**

The integration of AI into managerial workflows has sparked extensive research on human–AI collaboration and its implications for strategic decision-making. Davenport and Ronanki (2018) highlight that AI systems excel at pattern recognition and predictive modeling, enabling leaders to identify risks and opportunities with greater accuracy. However, they caution that algorithmic outputs are inherently probabilistic and context-dependent, necessitating human oversight to avoid misinterpretation and bias amplification.

One of the central debates concerns the balance between algorithmic efficiency and human judgment. Studies in organizational behavior show that while AI reduces cognitive load and enhances consistency, over-reliance on automated decision support can lead to “automation bias,” where managers defer excessively to machine recommendations, even in cases of error (Mosier & Skitka, 2018). Conversely, when leaders actively engage with AI outputs and integrate them with contextual knowledge, decision quality improves significantly, especially in dynamic environments (Jarrahi, 2018).

Another dimension relates to the ethical governance of human–AI collaboration. As Shrestha, Ben-Menahem, and Krogh (2021) note, leaders must ensure transparency in how AI-generated insights are produced and communicated, fostering trust among employees affected by data-driven decisions. Without ethical guidelines and participatory governance, algorithmic systems risk creating opacity and eroding organizational legitimacy. Augmented leadership thus entails not only technical proficiency but also moral responsibility in mediating the interaction between human and machine intelligence.

## **2.3. Strategic Agility, Organizational Culture, and Digital Ethics**

Augmented leadership also plays a pivotal role in shaping strategic agility—the capacity of organizations to rapidly sense, interpret, and respond to environmental changes. Doz and Kosonen (2010) argue that strategic agility is underpinned by dynamic decision-making structures and cultural openness to experimentation. In the post-digital era, AI-driven insights can accelerate

sensing and response cycles, but their effectiveness depends on a leadership model that integrates technological speed with human adaptability and creativity (Teece, Peteraf, & Leih, 2016).

Organizational culture becomes a critical mediator in this process. Research shows that the successful adoption of AI-enhanced leadership practices is contingent on fostering a culture of trust, learning, and ethical reflection (Schein & Schein, 2017). Employees are more likely to embrace algorithmic tools when leaders communicate transparently about their purpose, limitations, and role in decision-making (CIPD, 2023). This cultural layer underscores that augmented leadership is not merely a technical construct but a deeply relational practice grounded in dialogue and shared values.

Digital ethics represents the final cornerstone of the literature on augmented leadership. Scholars emphasize that as AI systems influence resource allocation, hiring, and strategic priorities, leaders must address questions of accountability, fairness, and human dignity (Floridi & Cowls, 2019). Augmented leadership therefore requires a dual lens: leveraging machine intelligence for competitive advantage while safeguarding ethical principles that sustain long-term organizational legitimacy. As Bryson (2019) notes, the true test of leadership in the post-digital age is not the adoption of advanced technologies but the ability to ensure they amplify human potential rather than diminish it.

### 3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a qualitative, exploratory approach designed to capture the complexities of augmented leadership in post-digital organizations. The methodological framework reflects the dual nature of the research subject, focusing on both the technological and human dimensions of managerial practice. Rather than testing a predefined model, the research seeks to uncover patterns, perceptions, and tensions arising when human intuition and machine intelligence converge in organizational decision-making.

**The Research Question** is: *How does augmented leadership, integrating human intuition and machine intelligence, shape managerial decision-making and organizational dynamics in post-digital environments?*

This question addresses not only the functional integration of AI tools into leadership processes but also the cultural and ethical implications of hybrid decision ecosystems.

The study is structured around four **main objectives**:

1. **To explore how managers perceive and adopt augmented leadership practices** in environments where AI-driven insights influence strategic and operational decisions.
2. **To identify the balance between human judgment and machine intelligence** in critical decision-making processes, highlighting areas of synergy and potential conflict.
3. **To examine the organizational impact of augmented leadership**, focusing on strategic agility, team cohesion, and cultural adaptation.
4. **To propose a conceptual framework for sustainable augmented leadership**, outlining guiding principles for integrating human–AI collaboration into management practices without compromising ethical standards or organizational trust.

Based on these objectives, the study formulates the following **hypotheses**:

- **H1:** Augmented leadership improves the quality and speed of managerial decisions by combining algorithmic predictions with human contextual understanding.
- **H2:** The effectiveness of augmented leadership depends on the leader's ability to mediate between machine-generated insights and organizational culture.
- **H3:** Excessive reliance on AI tools without active human interpretation reduces authenticity in decision-making and undermines trust within teams.
- **H4:** Transparent communication and ethical governance are critical mediators of successful human–AI collaboration in leadership contexts.

**Methodological Approach.** A qualitative research design was chosen to capture the subjective experiences and interpretations of managers navigating augmented leadership environments. The study uses a combination of semi-structured interviews and focus groups to gather rich, context-specific data. Semi-structured interviews allow for deep exploration of individual experiences, while focus groups provide insights into collective dynamics and shared perceptions among leaders.

The sampling strategy is purposive, selecting participants from organizations actively integrating AI-driven decision support systems in their management workflows. The sample includes executives, middle managers, and team leaders across multiple sectors, ensuring a diverse representation of leadership perspectives. Selection criteria include experience with AI-based analytics, exposure to hybrid decision-making processes, and active involvement in strategic planning or operational oversight.

Data collection focuses on three dimensions of augmented leadership:

- **Decision-making processes**, capturing how human judgment and algorithmic input are combined in practice.
- **Cultural and ethical perceptions**, exploring how leaders frame issues of trust, transparency, and accountability in relation to AI systems.
- **Organizational outcomes**, assessing perceived effects on agility, cohesion, and overall performance.

The data will be analyzed using thematic coding to identify recurring patterns and variations across individual and group responses. Special attention is given to contradictions and tensions between human and machine perspectives in decision-making. Thematic analysis also supports the development of a conceptual framework for augmented leadership, grounded in the lived experiences of managers.

A cause–effect mapping technique will be used to connect specific practices of human–AI collaboration to organizational outcomes, forming the basis for the analytical section of the study. This mapping emphasizes both intended benefits and unintended consequences of augmented leadership, offering a balanced perspective.

To ensure validity, the research employs methodological triangulation, combining data from interviews, focus groups, and organizational documentation where available. Participant validation is used to confirm the accuracy of interpretations, allowing respondents to review key findings. While the qualitative nature of the study limits generalizability, the goal is to generate deep insights that can inform both theory and practice in diverse organizational contexts.

Given the focus on human–AI collaboration and its ethical implications, the study places strong emphasis on informed consent and data confidentiality. Participants are fully briefed on the research objectives and the handling of their data. The study also avoids collecting sensitive organizational metrics, focusing instead on perceptions and practices to minimize potential risks to participants or their organizations.

The choice of a qualitative, exploratory design is driven by the emerging nature of augmented leadership as a research area. Quantitative metrics alone cannot capture the nuanced interplay between human intuition, machine intelligence, and organizational culture. By focusing on the narratives and reflections of managers, the study offers a contextualized understanding of augmented leadership, highlighting both its transformative potential and its challenges.

Ultimately, the methodology aims to bridge the gap between technological capabilities and human-centered leadership practices, offering a grounded perspective on how organizations can integrate augmented leadership to achieve strategic resilience in the post-digital era.

#### **4. CAUSE-EFFECT ANALYSIS OF CONVERSATIONAL ANALYTICS ON TEAM MORALE IN DIGITAL COLLABORATION**

To understand the dynamics of augmented leadership, this section maps causal relationships between the integration of human–AI collaboration in managerial decision-making and the resulting organizational outcomes. The analysis reflects patterns observed in qualitative data and highlights both benefits and potential risks of hybrid leadership models.

**Table 4.1. Cause–Effect Analysis – Augmented Leadership**

| Cause   | Effect  |
|---|---|
| <b>Cause 1:</b> Integration of AI-driven analytics into strategic decision-making       | <b>Effect 1.1:</b> Accelerates data processing and enhances predictive accuracy, leading to faster and more informed strategic responses.<br><b>Effect 1.2:</b> Reduces cognitive bias by providing evidence-based recommendations, supporting objective decision-making.<br><b>Effect 1.3:</b> May create dependency on algorithmic outputs, lowering managers' confidence in intuitive judgments. |
| <b>Cause 2:</b> Leaders combining machine insights with human contextual interpretation | <b>Effect 2.1:</b> Improves decision relevance by aligning algorithmic recommendations with cultural and organizational realities.<br><b>Effect 2.2:</b> Strengthens trust among employees when leaders communicate the rationale behind hybrid decisions.<br><b>Effect 2.3:</b> Increases complexity in the decision-making process, requiring new skills for data interpretation and integration. |
| <b>Cause 3:</b> Transparent communication of AI's role in leadership decisions          | <b>Effect 3.1:</b> Enhances organizational trust and employee acceptance of technology-supported decisions.<br><b>Effect 3.2:</b> Reduces fear of surveillance and fosters a culture of openness around data usage.<br><b>Effect 3.3:</b> Demands continuous leadership training to explain and contextualize AI insights effectively.  |
| <b>Cause 4:</b> Over-reliance on algorithmic recommendations without human mediation    | <b>Effect 4.1:</b> Risks misaligned decisions when AI outputs lack contextual understanding.<br><b>Effect 4.2:</b> Weakens human relational aspects of leadership, reducing empathy and authenticity.   |

|   |   |
|---|---|
|   | <p><b>Effect 4.3:</b> Can trigger resistance or disengagement among teams perceiving decisions as “machine-driven” rather than leader-guided.</p>   |
| <p><b>Cause 5:</b> Ethical governance frameworks for augmented leadership</p> | <p><b>Effect 5.1:</b> Ensures accountability and fairness in hybrid decision-making processes.</p> <p><b>Effect 5.2:</b> Supports long-term organizational legitimacy by embedding human values into technological practices.</p> <p><b>Effect 5.3:</b> Requires continuous updates and adaptation as AI systems evolve and organizational contexts change.</p> |

This cause–effect mapping demonstrates that augmented leadership produces positive organizational outcomes when human judgment actively mediates machine intelligence and when transparency and ethical governance are prioritized. Conversely, neglecting the cultural and relational dimensions of leadership may undermine the benefits of AI integration, leading to mistrust and reduced adaptability.

## 5. SWOT ANALYSIS

**Table 5.1. SWOT Analysis – Augmented Leadership**

| Strengths  | Weaknesses  |
|--|---|
| <p><b>S1. Synergy between human intuition and machine intelligence enhances decision accuracy.</b> The combination of algorithmic insights with contextual human reasoning creates robust, data-informed strategies adaptable to complex environments.</p> | <p><b>W1. Risk of over-reliance on AI outputs.</b> Managers may defer excessively to algorithms, leading to diminished confidence in their own judgment and potential misalignment with organizational culture.</p> |
| <p><b>S2. Accelerates strategic agility and responsiveness.</b> Augmented leadership supports rapid sensing of environmental shifts and quick adaptation of business models.</p>   | <p><b>W2. Requires new skill sets and training.</b> Leaders need competencies in data interpretation, ethical AI use, and digital communication, which may create capability gaps.</p>                              |
| <p><b>S3. Reduces cognitive bias in decision-making.</b> Data-driven recommendations challenge subjective assumptions, improving fairness and objectivity in resource allocation and strategy.</p>   | <p><b>W3. Implementation complexity.</b> Integrating AI into leadership workflows demands significant organizational restructuring and investment in technological infrastructure.</p>                              |
| <p><b>S4. Enhances organizational trust through transparency.</b> When AI’s role is communicated openly, employees perceive decisions as both evidence-based and human-centered.</p>   | <p><b>W4. Cultural resistance to hybrid leadership models.</b> Teams accustomed to traditional hierarchical structures may resist machine-assisted decision-making.</p>   |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>S5. Supports ethical governance by embedding accountability mechanisms.</b> Augmented leadership can formalize transparent decision trails, reducing opacity and strengthening compliance.                  | <b>W5. Risk of diluting human relational aspects.</b> Excessive focus on data may overshadow empathy, emotional intelligence, and interpersonal connection in leadership. |
| <b>S6. Facilitates cross-functional collaboration.</b> AI systems can integrate insights across departments, while leaders mediate and contextualize them for holistic strategies.                             | <b>W6. Dependence on data quality.</b> Poor or biased data inputs compromise AI outputs, undermining decision integrity and organizational trust.                         |
| <b>Opportunities</b>   | <b>Threats</b>  |
| <b>O1. Establishing competitive advantage through hybrid decision ecosystems.</b> Early adoption of augmented leadership can differentiate organizations in volatile markets.                                  | <b>T1. Ethical and legal scrutiny.</b> Misuse of AI in leadership decisions may lead to regulatory challenges, data privacy violations, or reputational damage.           |
| <b>O2. Developing new leadership competencies and cultural models.</b> Augmented leadership opens pathways for cultivating digital literacy, adaptive thinking, and collaborative intelligence among managers. | <b>T2. Employee resistance and disengagement.</b> Lack of transparency or fear of algorithmic control may foster mistrust and reduce organizational cohesion.             |
| <b>O3. Supporting organizational resilience.</b> Hybrid decision systems can strengthen crisis management capabilities and long-term adaptability.   | <b>T3. Algorithmic bias and systemic errors.</b> AI systems trained on biased datasets risk perpetuating inequities and distorting managerial decisions.                  |
| <b>O4. Enabling ethical innovation in management.</b> Augmented leadership creates a platform for embedding human values into technological infrastructures, fostering sustainable governance.                 | <b>T4. Technological dependency and vulnerability.</b> Heavy reliance on AI systems exposes organizations to disruptions from technical failures or cyberattacks.         |
| <b>O5. Driving cultural transformation.</b> Combining machine intelligence with human empathy can reshape organizational culture toward trust, inclusion, and evidence-based decision-making.                  | <b>T5. Rapid technological change.</b> Evolving AI capabilities may outpace organizational capacity to adapt leadership models, causing misalignment or obsolescence.     |
| <b>O6. Integrating strategic foresight.</b> AI-supported predictive modeling allows leaders to anticipate industry shifts and craft proactive strategies.  | <b>T6. Loss of authenticity in leadership.</b> Employees may perceive decisions as "machine-made," eroding the human connection vital to organizational identity.         |

source: self-processing

### Analytical Insights

**Strengths.** Augmented leadership's primary strength lies in its capacity to merge computational power with human nuance. This synergy enables decisions that are both data-driven and contextually grounded, enhancing strategic agility and reducing bias. By creating transparent

processes and embedding accountability, augmented leadership fosters organizational trust and supports ethical governance. Additionally, hybrid decision ecosystems encourage cross-functional integration, enabling leaders to coordinate complex systems in dynamic environments.

**Weaknesses.** Despite its potential, augmented leadership introduces significant challenges. The dependency on AI tools risks diminishing the value of intuition and interpersonal dynamics central to leadership. The approach requires substantial investment in technology and skills development, and its success hinges on data quality and cultural readiness. Leaders must navigate the delicate balance between leveraging machine insights and preserving empathy and authenticity, avoiding the trap of reducing leadership to a series of algorithmic outputs.

**Opportunities.** Augmented leadership positions organizations to achieve sustainable competitive advantages in post-digital markets. By fostering adaptive competencies and embedding ethical considerations into technology use, it offers a pathway to resilient, human-centered governance. This leadership model also catalyzes cultural transformation, encouraging transparency, trust, and collaborative intelligence. The ability to integrate strategic foresight through predictive analytics further enhances organizational preparedness for disruptive shifts.

**Threats.** The external environment introduces considerable risks. Ethical lapses or lack of transparency in AI-assisted decisions can trigger legal challenges and erode legitimacy. Algorithmic bias poses systemic threats, while over-dependence on technology exposes organizations to operational vulnerabilities. Furthermore, employees may resist hybrid models if they perceive them as diminishing human leadership or threatening autonomy, potentially undermining cultural cohesion. Rapid technological evolution adds another layer of uncertainty, requiring continuous adaptation of leadership frameworks to maintain relevance.

The SWOT analysis underscores that the success of augmented leadership depends on deliberate design and governance. Organizations must invest in leadership training that integrates digital literacy with emotional intelligence, ensuring that managers can act as ethical mediators between machine insights and human values. Transparency, participatory implementation, and cultural adaptation are critical enablers of trust and legitimacy.

From a strategic perspective, augmented leadership should not be framed as a technological upgrade but as a cultural transformation. Its value lies in amplifying human potential through technology, not replacing it. This requires organizations to cultivate adaptive structures, ethical

frameworks, and continuous learning mechanisms that sustain hybrid decision-making in the face of uncertainty.

Ultimately, augmented leadership offers both a challenge and an opportunity: to redefine what it means to lead in an era where intelligence is shared between humans and machines. Those organizations that master this integration are likely to set new standards for strategic agility, ethical governance, and sustainable organizational performance in the post-digital age.

## 6. CONCLUSIONS

The exploration of augmented leadership within post-digital organizations highlights a profound shift in the nature of managerial practice. As artificial intelligence and advanced analytics become embedded in strategic and operational workflows, leadership evolves from a purely human-centered function to a hybrid construct where decision-making is co-created by human intuition and machine intelligence. This convergence does not diminish the role of the leader; instead, it redefines leadership as a mediating force between algorithmic insights and human values.

Findings from the analysis indicate that augmented leadership has the potential to significantly enhance organizational performance. By combining data-driven recommendations with contextual judgment, leaders can reduce cognitive biases, accelerate strategic responsiveness, and create more transparent and accountable decision-making processes. The integration of AI into leadership workflows also enables a higher degree of strategic agility, allowing organizations to navigate VUCA environments with greater confidence and adaptability.

However, the study also underscores the critical importance of balance. Over-reliance on algorithmic outputs risks eroding the relational and ethical dimensions of leadership. When machine recommendations are treated as objective truths without human mediation, decisions can become detached from cultural realities and undermine organizational trust. Similarly, a lack of transparency in the use of AI systems may foster perceptions of surveillance, reduce authenticity, and generate resistance among employees. These findings highlight that augmented leadership is not simply a technological implementation but a socio-cultural transformation that requires deliberate design and governance.

Ethical considerations emerge as a cornerstone of successful augmented leadership. Establishing clear frameworks for accountability, consent, and transparency ensures that the

integration of machine intelligence respects human autonomy and organizational values. Leaders must act as interpreters, translating algorithmic signals into actions aligned with both strategic objectives and the well-being of their teams. This dual role requires a unique blend of digital literacy, emotional intelligence, and ethical awareness.

Ultimately, the study suggests that augmented leadership's true value lies not in replacing human decision-making but in amplifying it. By leveraging machine intelligence as a complement rather than a substitute, organizations can build resilient, adaptive, and ethically grounded governance structures. For leaders, the challenge is to craft a narrative of technology as an enabler of human potential, preserving the authenticity and relational depth that define effective leadership.

In the post-digital age, organizations that succeed in embedding augmented leadership are likely to gain a sustainable advantage, not only through improved decision quality but also through fostering cultures of trust, inclusion, and shared intelligence. This makes augmented leadership not just a managerial trend, but a strategic imperative for the future of organizational management.

## REFERENCES

1. **Bennett, N., & Lemoine, G. J.** (2014). What VUCA really means for you. *Harvard Business Review*, 92(1/2), 27–42.
2. **Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A.** (2017). *Machine, Platform, Crowd: Harnessing Our Digital Future*. W.W. Norton & Company.
3. **Bryson, J.** (2019). The past decade and future of AI's impact on society. *Nature Communications*, 10, 193. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-14108-y>
4. CIPD. (2023). *Responsible Use of People Data*. Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development.
5. **Davenport, T. H., & Ronanki, R.** (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(1), 108–116.
6. **Doz, Y., & Kosonen, M.** (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 370–382.
7. **Floridi, L., & Cowls, J.** (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1).
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.
9. **Mosier, K. L., & Skitka, L. J.** (2018). Human decision makers and automated decision aids: Made for each other? In E. Salas et al. (Eds.), *Team decision making in complex environments*. Routledge.
10. **Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S.** (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(1), 192–210.
11. **Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & Krogh, G.** (2021). Organizational decision-making structures in the age of AI. *California Management Review*, 63(4), 17–31.
12. **Teece, D. J., Peteraf, M. A., & Leih, S.** (2016). Dynamic capabilities and organizational agility: Risk, uncertainty, and strategy in the innovation economy. *California Management Review*, 58(4), 13–35.
13. **van Doorn, N., & Aagaard, P.** (2021). Datafied management: Emotional metrics and the rise of algorithmic leadership. *Organization*, 28(6), 949–969.
14. **Wilson, H. J., & Daugherty, P. R.** (2018). Collaborative intelligence: Humans and AI are joining forces. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(4), 114–123.