

HUMAN-AI COLLABORATION IN MANAGEMENT: DECISION SUPPORT, TRUST AND ORGANIZATIONAL TRANSFORMATION

Aarti Mala* Priyanka Garg** Priya Sharma***

ABSTRACT

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly transforming managerial decision-making by augmenting human capabilities rather than replacing them. Despite rapid advances in AI adoption, empirical evidence regarding users' experiences of Human-AI collaboration remains limited, particularly in higher education environments. This study investigates the impact of human-AI collaboration on decision support, trust in the workforce and development of managerial roles. The methodology applied is quantitative research with structured questionnaire that was given to faculty members and students. Ninety one valid responses were gathered and analyzed. The participants shared their experience with using AI in their tasks by assessing elements like decision quality, efficiency, confidence and trust. According to the findings it has been observed that AI can assist users to make more informed decisions and save time and effort in completing tasks. Overall, participants believed that AI is a valuable tool that can help enhance productivity and decision making. The result also shows that trust in AI is still in early stage. While the majority of participants were interested in the potential of AI in their work, some voiced concerns about the accuracy of AI recommendations and the necessity for transparency in the decision-making process for these references. The research further shows that AI is slowly transforming the way management work is being performed. With the automation of routine and repetitive tasks, humans have more time to think, solve problems and make decisions. The findings contribute to the growing literature on collaborative intelligence and provide practical guidance for organizations seeking to integrate AI responsibly into management practice.

Keywords: AI Adoption, Artificial Intelligence, Collaborative Intelligence, Decision Support Systems, Higher Education, Human-AI Collaboration, Management, Organizational Transformation, Trust in AI, Workforce Trust.

***Aarti Mala** is a Research Scholar at Mangalmai Institute of Management and Technology, Greater Noida, UP, INDIA-201310. Email: aartimala1993@gmail.com

****Priyanka Garg** is a Research Scholar at Mangalmai Institute of Management and Technology, Greater Noida, UP, INDIA-201310. Email: pinkugupta1019@gmail.com

*****Priya Sharma** is a Research Scholar at Mangalmai Institute of Management and Technology, Greater Noida, UP, INDIA-201310. Email: priyasharma830389@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as a transformative force in contemporary management, fundamentally reshaping organizational decision-making, operational efficiency, and workplace practices. Rather than replacing human managers, AI increasingly functions as a decision-support technology that complements human judgement by analysing large volumes of data, identifying patterns, and generating actionable insights. This collaborative model enables managers and employees to devote greater attention to strategic planning, innovation, and complex problem-solving while reducing the burden of routine administrative activities. Consequently, Human–AI collaboration has become an important area of research in management, organizational behaviour, and information systems.

Despite the increasing adoption of AI across organizations, successful implementation depends not only on technological capability but also on users' willingness to trust AI-generated recommendations. Concerns regarding transparency, explainability, accuracy, and accountability continue to influence employees' acceptance of AI-assisted decision-making. As AI becomes more pervasive, so do the roles that people fill. The more AI is being adopted the more job roles are changing. Given the ability of AI to handle numerous repetitive duties, there's a growing trend for employees to take on more creative, critical and strategic roles. While this shift presents new opportunities, it also demands a shift in mindset among individuals to embrace new methods of work and adapt themselves to the use of AI tools. To integrate AI into business management successfully, it is crucial to have an understanding of how individuals go through this change.

Although previous studies have extensively examined the opportunities and challenges associated with Artificial Intelligence, much of the existing literature remains conceptual or technology-oriented. Empirical evidence concerning users' actual experiences of Human–AI collaboration, particularly within higher education environments, remains relatively limited. Furthermore, few studies have simultaneously examined decision support, work efficiency, user trust, confidence, role transformation, psychological safety, and future adoption within a single analytical framework. Addressing these gaps, the present study analyses responses from 91 faculty members and students collected through a structured questionnaire to investigate how AI influences managerial decision-making, workplace efficiency, trust, and behavioural intentions. By integrating these dimensions, the study contributes empirical evidence that can assist organizations in designing more effective, transparent, and human-centred AI adoption strategies.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Researchers have been interested in the interaction between people and AI to better understand how to make it work in organizations as AI becomes more pervasive. Rather than replacing people who run the business, AI systems are primarily recognized today as tools that augment the human decision-making process, making it more efficient, accurate and accessible to information. The latest research indicates that collaboration between humans and AI is the key to achieving the best results.

Trust is a key element of any Human–AI collaboration. Before they can trust and depend on AI systems, users must first come to trust them, as explained by McGrath *et al.* (2025). The authors noted that collaboration must be built and continued to be nurtured through trust, and that trust must be continuously monitored. Likewise, Sauer and Burggraf (2025) presented the notion of hybrid intelligence, where both humans and AI operate by leveraging the human element's decision-making skills and the AI's analytical power for enhanced decision-making. The study has also delved into the role AI plays in enhancing managerial decision-making. Alam and Khan (2024) discovered that AI can aid managers in making better decisions by processing vast amounts of information and minimizing uncertainty.

The incorporation of AI is not a simple process. Jain *et al.* (2023) stated that for organizations to effectively leverage AI, they have to ensure that the processes they design allow for the human dimension and ensure that it complements human expertise. A balanced distribution of tasks between humans and AI leads to better collaboration and decision quality.

Maintaining trust and user perception is still a significant hurdle in the journey of AI adoption. Tuncer and Ramirez (2022) found that individuals are less inclined to use AI if they are unaware of how the AI is making the recommendations and if they lack transparency of the AI. Similarly Vossing *et al.* (2022) reported that the explainable and transparent AI systems foster users' trust, thus contributing to successful Human–AI co-working.

AI is transforming the way people work too. According to Sowa *et al.* (2021), AI helps to mitigate routine and repetitive work, enabling employees to engage in more creative, analytical and strategic work. This is in line with the findings of Rulandari and Silalahi (2025) which indicate that the integration of Human–AI collaboration can not only boost efficiency, but also enhance job satisfaction, especially in administrative and management tasks. The results indicate that AI is helping to shift the focus of workers from operational work to more value-adding decision-making.

AI has also been associated with organizational long-term growth and sustainability on an organizational level. Based on the above, La Torre *et al.* (2021) suggested structured approaches to creating Human–AI teams to become more adaptable to organizational change. Equally Rachmad (2022) proposed that the application of AI in a management practice contributes to the resilience of an organization by enabling quick and correct decisions based on data in the midst of the changing business world.

While there are many studies that have contributed to our understanding of Human–AI collaboration, there are some gaps in research. Most of the literature is conceptual and theoretical; relatively few studies focus on user experiences of AI in actual decision-making contexts.

Further, few studies explore decision quality and user trust combined with changes in job roles and work efficiency in a unified framework. There are also few empirical comparisons of user performance before and after using AI.

Table 1: Summary of Research Gaps and the Present Study's Contribution

Area of Existing Literature	What Previous Studies Focus On	Identified Research Gap	How This Study Addresses It
Human–AI Collaboration	Theoretical models of collaboration and hybrid intelligence	Limited real-world empirical evidence on actual user experience	Uses survey data from real participants (faculty and students)
Trust in AI Systems	Trust frameworks and explain ability concepts	Lack of measurement of trust in practical management tasks	Examines user trust and confidence using Likert-scale data
Decision-Making with AI	AI improves decision accuracy and its speed	Few studies combine decision support with user behavior outcomes	Links decision support with efficiency, trust and adoption
Work Efficiency	AI improves productivity and reduces workload	Limited understanding of perceived effort reduction in real settings	Measures perceived efficiency from user perspective
Role Transformation	Conceptual discussion on job automation and augmentation	Lack of empirical evidence on shift from routine to strategic roles	Studies perceived role transformation in academic environment
AI Adoption Behavior	Technology acceptance models (TAM/UTAUT) widely used	Limited focus on post-adoption behavior and continuous use intention	Examines future adoption intention directly
Psychological Safety	Very limited research in AI-based decision environments	Psychological comfort in AI-assisted decision-making is underexplored	Includes psychological safety as a key variable
Integrated Analysis	Studies usually focus on single dimensions (trust or efficiency)	Lack of combined framework covering multiple dimensions together	Uses multi-variable integrated framework (trust, efficiency, confidence, et

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES & RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Research Objectives

The primary objective of this study is to examine the influence of Human–AI collaboration on management-related decision-making and organizational work practices. Specifically, the study seeks to:

- Examine the influence of AI-assisted decision support on management decision-making.
- Evaluate the extent to which AI improves work efficiency by reducing the time and effort required to complete managerial tasks.
- Assess users' confidence and trust in AI-assisted decision-making systems.

- Investigate the perceived impact of AI on the transformation of routine work into strategic and analytical activities.
- Analyse users' intentions to continue adopting AI technologies in future managerial and organizational decision-making.

Research Questions

The following research questions have been formulated to investigate the role of Human–AI collaboration in management, based on the goals of the study.

RQ1: What is the role of AI support in making effective decisions in management-related tasks?

RQ2: Does the application of AI contribute to the reduction of management tasks time and work?

RQ3: What are the user experiences of trust, confidence and reliability in the use of AI for decision making?

RQ4: How is AI expected to impact the shift from traditional to more analytical and strategic jobs?

RQ5: How ready are the users to use AI tools for future management and decision-making activities?

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The present research is of an empirical nature and aims to investigate the impact of Human – AI collaboration on management related activities. The survey aimed to gather data on usage experiences and opinions of the AI-assisted systems. The research explores the understanding of AI's role in decision-making, enhancing work productivity, nurturing user trust and shaping the transition from ordinary to strategic tasks in actual management contexts.

Table 2: Description of Components

Component	Description
Research Design	Empirical, survey-based quantitative study
Study Area	Higher education environment
Participants	Faculty members and students
Sample Size	91 respondents
Data Collection Tool	Structured Google Form questionnaire
Scale Used	5-point Likert Scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree)
Variables	Decision Support, Efficiency, Confidence, Trust, Role Transformation, Future Adoption, Psychological Safety
Independent Variables	Decision Support, Efficiency
Dependent Variables	Confidence, Trust, Role Transformation, Future Adoption, Psychological Safety
Data Analysis Methods	Descriptive statistics (Mean, percentage distribution), graphical analysis

Participants and Study Context

The study was conducted in a higher education institution, involving both faculty members and students. There were 91 responses to the survey. The diverse backgrounds of the participants brought a range of viewpoints to the table, covering topics such as the use of AI for management-related tasks and its role in analysis. The mix of participants enabled the study to better understand the ways people interact with AI and their perceptions about its role in supporting their work.

Survey Instrument

Table 3: Section-wise Variables

Section	Variable	Sample Statement Items
A	Demographics	Participant type (Faculty / Student)
B1	Decision Support	—AI helps me make better decisions in my tasks.
B2	Efficiency	—AI reduces the time required to complete my work.
B3	Confidence	—I feel confident using AI-generated outputs.
B4	Trust	—I trust the recommendations provided by AI systems.
B5	Role Transformation	—AI allows me to focus more on strategic tasks than routine work.
B6	Future Adoption	—I intend to continue using AI tools in future tasks.
B7	Psychological Safety	—I feel comfortable relying on AI for decision-making.

Data Collection Method

The research method used in the study was quantitative with data collection methods by distributing a structured questionnaire by means of Google Forms. The questionnaire was split into two parts. The initial section collected basic demographic data such as participant's role (faculty or student). The second part assessed participants' experiences and perceptions of using AI by measuring them on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree, 5 = Strongly Agree) with a series of statements.

The questionnaire covered the following aspects related to AI-assisted decision-making and reduction in time and efforts, user confidence, trust in AI recommendations, changes in work roles and participants' willingness to use AI for future management and decision-making tasks.

Response Distribution Summary

Response Level	Average Distribution (%)
Strongly Agree	28%
Agree	42%
Neutral	18%
Disagree	9%
Strongly Disagree	3%

Variables and Measurement

This study explored several of the critical variables to better understand how Human–AI collaboration impacts management. The key variables involved were:

Decision Support – How AI assists in good decision making and information.

Efficiency: How AI can help save time and effort.

Confidence: Users' trust in the correctness and value of outputs created by AI.

Experiencing AI: To what extent to which users are comfortable using AI in their daily tasks.

Usefulness: How useful the AI recommendations are to the user.

Role Transformation: The degree to which AI can transform an individual's role from mundane to more strategic and analytical.

Future Adoption: Users' intent to pursue the use of AI tools in the future for work and decision-making.

Psychological Safety: Users' feeling of comfort and security in relying on AI systems in decision-making processes.

The variables identified in this study that is expected to influence the dependent variables – namely decision support and efficiency were chosen as the independent variables as these are the main advantages that AI brings. The dependent variables were confidence, trust, role transformation, future adoption and psychological safety all of which stem from users' response and experience with AI-supported work.

All variables were scored on a five-point Likert scale (1 = Strongly Disagree and 5 = Strongly Agree).

Table 4: Descriptive Statistical Results

Variable	Mean Score (out of 5)	Interpretation
Decision Support	4.21	High agreement – AI strongly supports decisions
Efficiency	4.35	Very high – significant reduction in time/effort
Confidence	3.62	Moderate – users somewhat confident
Trust	3.48	Moderate – trust is developing but not strong
Role Transformation	4.10	High – shift toward strategic tasks observed
Future Adoption	4.28	High willingness to continue using AI
Psychological Safety	3.55	Moderate comfort level with AI reliance

Data Analysis Approach

Descriptive statistical techniques were used for the analysis of the collected data. The mean score was calculated for each variable to better provide overall trends and to understand the reaction of the participants. Besides the numerical analysis, the distribution of responses

was also presented graphically using pie charts to present the data in a simple and visual way that helps in understanding the data patterns.

Reliability and Validity

A structured questionnaire ensured consistency of response from all participants. The Likert scale approach enabled the opinions to be transformed into measurable data and thus increased the reliability of the results. In addition, including multiple variables allowed for a more complete and well-rounded understanding of Human–AI collaboration and its impact on users’ experiences.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 5: Theme-wise Scores

Theme	Key Finding	Interpretation
Decision Support	High mean score (4.21)	AI is widely perceived as useful in improving decision quality
Efficiency	Highest score (4.35)	Strong evidence that AI reduces workload and saves time
Trust & Confidence	Moderate scores (3.48–3.62)	Users are still developing trust in AI systems
Role Transformation	High score (4.10)	AI is shifting users from routine to strategic thinking
Psychological Safety	Moderate score (3.55)	Users feel cautious but generally comfortable
Future Adoption	High score (4.28)	Strong intention to continue using AI tools

Participant Distribution

The research involved 91 participants in all, comprising both faculty and students. Most of the respondents were students (73.6%), while the faculty members accounted for 26.4% of the total number. This distribution presents diverse perspectives on Human –Artificial Intelligence partnership, from diverse user groups.

AI Support in Decision Making

Results of the feedback revealed most participants felt that AI could be useful in improving decision making. Many of the individuals expressed more agreement, suggesting that AI is beneficial in enhancing decision quality while reducing uncertainty.

AI's Role in saving effort and time

The efficiency was given a strong positive comment. The majority of participants concurred that AI lessens both the effort and time needed to finish tasks. This underscores AI's contribution in enhancing efficiency and streamlining task performance.

Confidence in AI:

According to the findings, the participants have a level of confidence that ranges from moderate to high when it comes to using AI. Although a large number of users are confident in

their ability to relay on suggestions mode by AI, there are still some respondents who exhibit reluctance, which indicates that there is room for improvement in terms of user familiarity and dependability of the system.

Psychological Safety

The results show a low level of trust in AI among participants. Users understand the benefits of using AI but there are some accuracy and reliability concerns. Although users are cautious to rely solely on AI systems, there is a need for more user knowledge and transparency as evidenced by psychological safety scores.

Table 6:Domain-wise Conclusion

Domain	Conclusion
Overall Impact	Positive impact of AI on management tasks
Human Factor	Trust remains the weakest dimension
Work Nature	Clear shift toward strategic work roles
Adoption Trend	High willingness for continued AI use
Organizational Implication	Need for transparency and trust-building mechanisms

The overall experience of using AI tools to support participants' tasks was good. AI was perceived as useful, easy to use and assisting people to get jobs done faster. This means that AI is gaining traction as a collaborative tool instead of AI as a replacement.

Correlation Analysis

After this, a correlation analysis was carried out to further examine the relations between the variables

Table 7: Correlation between Key Variables

Variables	Decision Support	Efficiency	Confidence	Trust	Role Transformation	Future Adoption	Psychological Safety
Decision Support	1.00	0.74	0.56	0.49	0.56	0.69	0.32
Efficiency	0.74	1.00	0.59	0.51	0.49	0.71	0.36
Confidence	0.56	0.59	1.00	0.73	0.53	0.64	0.55
Trust	0.49	0.51	0.73	1.00	0.56	0.55	0.55
Role Transformation	0.56	0.49	0.53	0.56	1.00	0.59	0.53
Future Adoption	0.69	0.71	0.64	0.55	0.59	1.00	0.43
Psychological Safety	0.32	0.36	0.55	0.55	0.53	0.43	1.00

The correlation results indicate that all of the variables are correlated positively. Decision support and efficiency (i.e. better performance of the AI) have a strong correlation with future adoption, suggesting that improved AI performance drives increased user acceptance. The positive correlation between confidence and trust is also significant $r=0.73$, highlighting the importance of trust in human-AI collaboration. Decision assistance and psychological safety have a rather weak association, suggesting that consumers are still hesitant to rely on AI. Overall, the results show the user perception and behavioral intention are positively impacted by AI- driven performance gains.

Regression Analysis

To gain deeper insights into the impact of AI-related parameters on the future adoption a regression analysis was performed as shown in table 3.

The regression results indicate that both decision support and efficiency have a positive and significant impact on future AI adoption. However, efficiency ($\beta = 0.44$) is slightly more influential than decision support ($\beta = 0.38$), indicating that users are more likely to embrace AI when it saves them effort and time. The results indicate that performance-related gains are vital to affecting user acceptance of AI systems.

Correlation and regression analysis were also used, in addition to descriptive analysis, to determine the relationships between the variables.

Table 8: Regression Results

Variable	Coefficient (β)	Significance
Decision Support	0.38	Significant
Efficiency	0.44	Significant
Constant	0.82	—

Discussion

This study's results are unmistakable and show that using AI can make a major difference in making decision-making processes more efficient and supported. The positive responses for the reduction in effort and future adoption emphasize the practical advantages of AI in management settings. The moderate levels of trust and psychological comfort, however, imply that users still need more transparency and trust in AI outputs.

The findings are consistent with previous studies that highlight the significance of trust and Human-AI partnership. It also emphasizes that although AI is helping to redefine roles; the transition to the shift of strategic work is an ongoing process and relies on user adaptation. Overall, the results indicate that AI needs to be used as a tool to assist and build user confidence and engagement.

LIMITATIONS, FUTURE SCOPE AND CONCLUSION

Limitations

- This study has some limitations that should be kept in mind while interpreting the results. One limitation of the study was the small number of participants (91). This may not be

representative of the views of a larger population. The results of this study might not be directly applicable to other sectors, including industry or government organizations, because it was conducted in a higher education environment.

- Second, it was a self-reported questionnaire that was used to collect data. This implies that the answers may be subjective or biased towards participants' opinions and perceptions.
- Third, the study was conducted cross-sectional (i.e. at one time). As a result it is not feasible to track the changes in trust, confidence or use of AI by participants over time.
- Fourth, the study was primarily descriptive in nature, and therefore it was not able to explore the cause-and-effect relationship between variables in detail.
- Lastly, the study only examined certain variables including decision support, efficiency and trust and role transformation. Other factors such as organizational culture, technical skills or ethical considerations were not considered which can have an impact on Human–AI collaboration as well.
- In general, the study offers valuable insights but these limitations warrant consideration for caution when interpreting the results and for future studies to allow for more generalizations.
- The study took place in an academic setting (faculty/student) and may not be representative of corporate settings.
- The analysis is based on the responses that have been self-reported, and these may contain subjective bias.
- The study reflects short term perceptions and not long term impact.

Future Scope

- There are a number of ways to further extend this study in future research. First, it would be helpful to have more and varied participants from various industries, like healthcare, banking, IT and manufacturing. This would facilitate understanding of working environments where Human–AI collaboration takes place.
- Secondly, future research could be carried out for a longer duration of time. This would enable researchers to observe the evolution of trust, confidence and acceptance of AI with increasing usage.
- Third, more sophisticated methods of analysis, including regression or structural equations can be employed to gain a better understanding of the relationships among factors such as trust, efficiency and decision support.
- Fourth, a mixture between the survey and the interview or a case study could provide additional insights into actual users' experiences. Some of this would be why there are people who still don't know or are only somewhat confident in AI systems.
- Finally, future research can include enhancing the transparency and explainability of AI systems. If one can understand how AI is making decisions and make it clear which can boost trust and make collaboration more effective in the future.

CONCLUSION

This study explored the impact of Human–AI collaboration on various aspects of management related work, including decision-making, efficiency, trust and role change. The analysis of the received answers from 91 respondents suggests that AI can be a helpful and positive tool for enhancing task performance and user experience. AI was found to assist in decision-making and to save a lot of effort and time in tasks. Experiences with AI were generally positive, with many users saying that they were willing to use AI in their future activities. The results indicate that AI is increasingly being adopted as a helpful tool for management purposes.

Meanwhile, the study identified certain issues. The level of trust in AI and psychological comfort were also identified to be moderate, meaning users are still cautious but fully trust in the output generated by AI. Adopting AI is a trend that's on the rise but there's a need for greater transparency, reliability and user understanding of the system. The study also notes that the transition from routine work to more strategic and analytical jobs occurred progressively. This is in accordance with the changing nature of work, as AI helps people to shift their focus from repetitive tasks to more value-adding work. Overall, the results indicate that AI can be a valuable tool for improving management practices as long as it is used in a way that builds trust, does not alienate users and enables Human–AI collaboration.

REFERENCES

1. Alam, S., & Khan, M. F. (2024). *Enhancing AI-human collaborative decision-making*. *IEEE Access*.
2. Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency*, pp. 149–159.
3. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
4. Dwivedi, Y. K., et al. (2021). Artificial intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges. *International Journal of Information Management*, **57**, 101994.
5. Hinsberg, K. et al. (2024). Risk governance and trust perception in digital systems. *Sustainability*, **16**(13).
6. Jain, R. et al. (2023). Effective human–AI work design. *Kybernetes*, **52**(11):5017–5040.
7. La Torre, D. et al. (2021). Team formation for human–AI collaboration. *IEEE Transactions on Engineering Management*, **70**(5):1966–1976.
8. Liao, Q. V. et al. (2020). Questioning the AI: Informing design practices for explainable AI. In *Proceedings of the CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*.
9. Łabędzki, R. et al. (2025). Understanding human-AI collaboration: A systematic review. In *Proceedings of the HCI Conference*, pp. 332–348. Springer.

10. McGrath, M. J. *et al.* (2025). Collaborative human-AI trust (CHAI-T): A process framework for active management of trust in human-AI collaboration. *Computers in Human Behavior: Artificial Humans*.
11. Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, **46**(1): 192–210.
12. Rulandari, N., & Silalahi, A. D. K. (2025). Human-AI collaboration for efficiency and job satisfaction. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy*, **19**(2):264–287.
13. Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.
14. Sauer, C. R., & Burggräf, P. (2025). Hybrid intelligence: A systematic approach to determine the level of human-AI collaboration. *Production Engineering*, **19**(3):525–541.
15. Shneiderman, B. (2022). Human-centered AI: Reliable, safe, and trustworthy systems. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction*, **38**(6):495–504.
16. Sowa, K. *et al.* (2021). Cobots in knowledge work: Human–AI collaboration. *Journal of Business Research*, **125**, 135–142.
17. Tuncer, S., & Ramirez, A. (2022). Exploring trust in human-AI collaboration. In *Proceedings of the HCI Conference*, pp. 541–557. Springer.
18. Vössing, M., *et al.* (2022). Designing transparency for human-AI collaboration. *Information Systems Frontiers*, **24**(3): 877–895.
19. Wamba, S. F. *et al.* (2020). How AI impacts organizational decision-making. *Journal of Business Research*, **118**, 220–231.
20. Zhang, D. *et al.* (2022). Human-centered AI: Trust, transparency, and explainability. *AI & Society*, **37**(4):1647–1660.