



POSTHUMAN HUMAN RESOURCE MANAGEMENT IN ORGANIZATIONS USING GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Didit Darmawan

Universitas Sunan Giri Surabaya, Indonesia
correspondence: dr.diditdarmawan@gmail.com

Abstract

This article develops a normative account of posthuman human resource management under generative artificial intelligence. It argues that when generative systems participate in drafting, ideation, and decision preparation, human competence shifts from production toward curation, verification, and accountable judgment. The discussion clarifies how ethical work norms must be redesigned around disclosure of system use, privacy protection, and disciplined checking of machine generated outputs. It also examines changes in the psychological relationship between workers and organizations, including altered recognition, perceived replaceability, and professional identity tension when outputs are co authored with non human agents. The paper emphasizes governance arrangements that preserve human agency by treating generative outputs as hypotheses rather than authoritative conclusions. It proposes principles for recruitment, development, and performance evaluation that reward reasoning quality and responsibility rather than volume and speed. The central claim is that organizations can sustain trust and dignity in human machine collaboration only when accountability remains human, recognition is fair, and learning practices cultivate critical inquiry and shared sense making.

Keywords: posthuman HRM, generative AI, human competence, work ethics, psychological contract, accountability, governance.

Introduction

The transformation of work in this century is increasingly defined by the presence of intelligent systems capable of generating text, images, code, and decision designs rapidly. In many organizations, knowledge work once defined as the ability to draft reports, prepare presentations, write letters, summarize documents, or design strategic messages now faces a non-human partner that can perform most of these activities in seconds. The use of digital technology in human resource management has now become commonplace, particularly to support remote work systems to remain effective (Mardikaningsih & Darmawan, 2022). This change shifts the workers' experience regarding their self-worth in the workplace, as the measure of contribution no longer rests on visible output, but rather on the quality of judgment, clarity of purpose, and the courage to take responsibility for decisions. In daily life, workers are beginning to reassess what it means to be competent when generative systems can offer answers that appear convincing. Organizations are also reassessing the meaning of performance when work becomes a result of human-machine collaboration that is difficult to separate. This shift demands a reading of human resources that transcends classical frameworks, as labor relations are no longer merely interpersonal, but relations where non-human agents are present as parties that help shape the rhythm, standards, and language of work (Shen, 2019).

In the realm of human resource management, technology has long been understood as a tool to accelerate administrative processes, expand recruitment reach, or support learning. Furthermore, the way we communicate digitally, such as through electronic mail, remains an important part of organizational relationship strategies today (Sinambela & Darmawan, 2021). Generative artificial intelligence introduces a conceptual leap because it does not stop at automation; instead, it participates in proposing ideas, suggesting steps, and shaping word choices that influence meaning (Garbuio & Lin, 2021). When generative systems are integrated into the work process, the boundary between creator and editor becomes blurred. Workers using these systems may feel productive, yet simultaneously doubt the authenticity of their contributions. Managers may feel assisted, yet simultaneously wonder who should be held accountable when the output turns out to be erroneous or misleading. At

this point, human resources face a new problem regarding the definition of human capacity. Competence is no longer sufficiently understood as knowledge and skills, but rather as the ability to direct, test, and evaluate machine output in accordance with organizational goals. Therefore, the discussion of posthuman resource management becomes relevant as a way of viewing organizations inhabited by human subjects and computational agents within a single work ecology.

The entry of generative artificial intelligence into organizations also changes work ethics in a subtle yet powerful way. Traditional work ethics often emphasize diligence, discipline, and adherence to procedures. Now, questions arise regarding epistemic honesty namely, to what extent workers are obligated to declare the use of generative systems in their work. We must ensure that every technology built and used continues to prioritize the principle of justice for all parties (Radjawane & Mardikaningsih, 2022). Questions also emerge regarding the ownership of ideas, as output generated through brief commands can appear like the result of mature writing or thinking abilities (Gladden, 2016). Furthermore, work ethics are related to loyalty toward organizational values. If a generative system suggests a sentence that is effective but masks a moral risk, the worker must choose between efficiency and caution. Such decisions cannot be delegated to the machine, as they involve judgment and responsibility. In the work experience, workers may be driven to pursue speed because the system offers shortcuts. However, speed can weaken the verification and dialogue processes that have served as the pillars of high-quality decisions. Thus, the integration of generative artificial intelligence creates a new ethical field that demands firm norms regarding transparency, accountability, and the boundaries that may be crossed for the sake of productivity.

The psychological relationship between workers and organizations is also changing as machines are treated as work partners. Traditionally, many organizational psychology concepts have rested on trust, justice, and the psychological contract between individuals and institutions (Cherrstrom & Boden, 2020). Another challenge is ensuring that everyone has equal opportunities and skills in using these technology-based services (Ramle & Mardikaningsih, 2022). The presence of generative systems adds a layer of relationship, as workers interact intensely with agents that possess no intent, yet generate responses that resemble dialogue. This interaction

can provide a sense of companionship, while simultaneously triggering social isolation if the organization reduces the space for human-to-human discussion. Workers may feel that their contributions are more easily replaced, thereby weakening job security. At the same time, workers can experience a new sense of competence because they are able to direct the system to produce high-quality output. This ambivalence affects organizational engagement. If the organization evaluates workers solely based on output, workers may feel like operators rather than professionals. If the organization values the ability to judge and take responsibility, workers may feel their self-worth increase. Therefore, posthuman resource management needs to unravel how organizations shape the experience of work meaning when machines participate in mediating communication, assessment, and learning.

The shift in the definition of human competence has become a focal point that converges on human resource practices. Competencies once used to screen applicants, assess performance, and design training are now confronted by machine capabilities that can mimic professional language outputs (Al-Amoudi & Lazega, 2019). Consequently, organizations need to distinguish between output competence and judgment competence. To that end, a competency-based performance appraisal system is essential so that employee evaluations become more accurate and effective (Putra, 2021). Output competence refers to the ability to generate documents or ideas. Judgment competence refers to the ability to examine assumptions, test relevance, and assess moral and legal implications. Generative artificial intelligence shifts the value of output competence toward a commodity, while judgment competence becomes the determinant of work quality. However, judgment competence does not emerge automatically. It requires a culture of dialogue, room for questioning, and the courage to acknowledge uncertainty. This is where human resources must rethink recruitment, training, and promotion. If organizations continue to measure competence by the skill of composing words, they may be deceived by neat but fragile output. If organizations measure competence by the quality of questions and the firmness of accountability, they build human capacity that complements the machine rather than imitating it.

The primary issue arises from the ambiguity of responsibility boundaries when work is performed through collaboration between

humans and generative artificial intelligence (Benbya et al., 2020). In daily work processes, many decisions are made through a series of small activities, such as summarizing, drafting options, writing recommendations, and proposing steps. If some of these activities are assisted by machines, the organization needs to determine who holds the final authority over truth, justice, and the feasibility of actions. In such situations, the role of leaders capable of driving change is highly needed to maintain values within the organization (Rojak et al., 2022). Unclear boundaries of responsibility can give rise to a blame-shifting pattern, where humans blame the machine for erroneous output, while the organization blames the worker for failing to verify. This pattern erodes trust and weakens the psychological contract. Additionally, the lack of clarity regarding responsibility boundaries affects performance appraisal. Workers may receive high ratings for being productive, yet that productivity stems from the use of generative systems that are not discussed openly. When transparency is absent, it is difficult for organizations to build fair standards. At this point, HR faces normative issues regarding accountability namely, how to draft regulations that respect professional dignity, protect the organization, and still acknowledge that the machine has become part of the work process.

Another problem lies in the formation of work ethics norms when machines are capable of generating outputs that appear original but cannot always be held accountable for their sources (Anderson & Anderson, 2007). Generative artificial intelligence can produce statements that sound valid, yet the basis of its reasoning cannot always be traced by the user. This creates an epistemic risk within the organization, where decisions are made based on materials that look convincing but are actually fragile. Epistemic risk affects fairness, especially if generative systems participate in shaping policy texts, internal communications, or assessment materials. In the realm of labor relations, workers may experience pressure to use the system for the sake of speed, even when they realize that such use requires time-consuming verification. It is crucial for us to continue learning and adapting so that this technology truly provides broad benefits (Ramle & Mardikaningsih, 2022). The pressure for speed can normalize negligence. Furthermore, work ethics also relate to privacy and confidentiality. If workers input sensitive data into a generative system, the boundaries of

organizational confidentiality are tested. When these boundaries are repeatedly tested, a worker's psychological safety can be disrupted because they feel constantly at risk of making an accidental mistake. Thus, posthuman resource management needs to unravel how ethical norms are constructed when the machine is no longer a passive tool, but an agent that participates in shaping the content of communications and decisions.

This writing is conducted to formulate a conceptual framework capable of explaining the fundamental shifts in human management within organizations when generative artificial intelligence is present as a work partner. Without a clear framework, organizations can easily fall into two extremes: worshipping machine productivity while ignoring human dignity, or rejecting machine use and losing learning opportunities. A normative description is required to assess changes in the definition of competence, changes in work ethics, and changes in the psychological relationship between workers and the organization, so that the discussion does not stop at the issues of tools and efficiency. HR needs a conceptual language to explain accountability, transparency in system use, privacy protection, and the fairness of performance appraisal in a collaborative human-machine work environment. Additionally, this framework is important so that organizations can understand the epistemic and relational risks arising from the use of generative systems, as these risks can affect decision quality, trust, and worker engagement. This writing positions these changes as matters of values and governance, rather than merely technical issues. Thus, answers will be sought on how posthuman resource management explains changes in the definition of human competence, work ethics, and the psychological relationship of workers with the organization when generative artificial intelligence is present as a work partner in the process of knowledge production and decision-making. This question directs the discussion toward the mechanism of forming new standards, including how organizations assess relevant competencies, how ethical norms are validated in practice, and how psychological contracts change due to shifts in accountability and recognition. This focus demands a conceptual explanation of how HR designs fair performance appraisals, how HR builds a culture of verification, and how HR maintains worker dignity when work output is the result of collaboration with non-human agents. With one sharp

question, the discussion can organize the relationship between generative technology, assessment structures, and the psychological experience of workers into a single consistent line of argument.

The purpose of this writing is to develop a conceptual framework for posthuman resource management that explains changes in human competence, work ethics, and psychological relations in organizations that use generative artificial intelligence as a work partner. This writing affirms competency criteria that emphasize judgment, verification, and accountability, while simultaneously organizing ethical principles regarding transparency of system use, confidentiality, and the fairness of performance appraisal. This writing also formulates an understanding of changes in the psychological contract, particularly concerning the sense of security, the sense of being recognized, and the meaning of work when human and machine contributions are intertwined. Theoretically, this writing enriches HR with categories that go beyond automation. Practically, this writing provides direction for designing responsible collaborative human-machine work governance.

Method

This study uses a qualitative literature study to synthesize knowledge regarding posthuman resource management in organizations that utilize generative artificial intelligence. The synthesis work is carried out by organizing core concepts, namely changes in the definition of competence, the formation of work ethics, and shifts in the psychological relationship between workers and the organization when computational agents participate in producing work outputs. Snyder (2019) asserts that literature study as a methodology demands clear procedures, from the formulation of questions to the organization of themes and the construction of arguments, so that the results take the form of a coherent conceptual synthesis. Barry et al. (2022) offer a state-of-the-art review approach that emphasizes systematic steps to map the development of ideas and distinguish established concepts from those that are still growing. In this writing, sources were selected based on the clarity of definitions, the strength of normative reasoning, and relevance to the mechanisms of work change involving collaboration between humans

and generative systems, ensuring that the description does not lapse into a mere descriptive summary.

The processing of materials is conducted through a thematic synthesis that binds the themes of competence, ethics, and psychological relations into a single line of argument. May and Perry (2022) emphasize that social research demands clarity in interpretative decisions and consistency in reasoning, especially when the author constructs normative claims from diverse texts. Gupta and Gupta (2022) stress the importance of methodology to maintain the traceability of steps, the precision of categories, and discipline in formulating conclusions so as not to exceed the available conceptual basis. The validity of the synthesis is maintained through the consistent use of terms, cross-checking ideas that appear aligned or contradictory, and the formulation of propositions that can be argumentatively tested. Since this study does not collect field data, the primary weight lies in the clarity of concepts, the firmness of relations between concepts, and the precision in formulating human resource governance principles within the work relationship between humans and generative machines.

Result and Discussion

Posthuman resource management begins its reading from the assumption that organizations are now inhabited by agencies that are not entirely human within the work production process. This agency is present when generative systems participate in drafting texts, suggesting decisions, and shaping how people understand problems. In this type of work structure, the definition of human competence changes from the ability to produce output to the ability to direct production and assess feasibility. Competence becomes closer to responsible judgment rather than just the dexterity of composing sentences or summarizing information. This change demands that HR redesign job competency maps, as tasks that appear identical on the surface may have different qualities depending on the quality of questions, the quality of verification, and the quality of the final decision. We need to realize that this change is part of human resource management innovation aimed at increasing organizational competitiveness amidst increasingly fierce global competition (Abdulah et al., 2021). At the ethical level, the presence of generative systems gives rise

to new obligations regarding transparency of use, as visible skills may stem from collaboration with machines. At the psychological level, workers may experience ambivalence between feeling assisted and feeling replaced. This ambivalence is not merely an emotional detail, but a determinant of engagement and trust. Therefore, posthuman HR focuses its attention on the design of norms, recognition, and accountability capable of maintaining worker dignity while utilizing the capacity of generative machines (Al-Amoudi & Lazega, 2019).

The change in the definition of competence can be formulated through a shift from production competence to curation competence (Cherrstrom & Boden, 2020). Production competence prioritizes the ability to generate documents, ideas, or answers. Curation competence prioritizes the ability to select, examine, and frame outputs to align with organizational goals, values, and boundaries. In work assisted by generative systems, the quality of curation becomes the primary determinant, because machines are capable of generating many options but do not understand the organizational moral mandate. This demonstrates how important it is to master digital skills and technology access so that every individual has the same opportunity in a constantly evolving world of work (Arifin & Darmawan, 2021). Competent workers in this era are those capable of drafting clear commands, examining assumptions, testing references, and rejecting outputs that conflict with policy or ethics. Here, a new and often overlooked competence emerges: the ability to maintain accuracy under the pressure of speed. Organizations that worship speed can erode curation competence, as workers are pushed to accept rapid output as practical truth. Posthuman HR assesses that human competence should be defined as the capacity to resist such temptation. This capacity to resist emerges from reasoning training, a culture of dialogue, and the courage to take responsibility for decisions. Thus, human competence becomes cognitive leadership competence specifically, leading the flow of work thinking rather than merely executing tasks.

If competence shifts, then recruitment and selection must also change. Selection focusing on writing portfolios or quick answers will find it increasingly difficult to distinguish human ability from machine ability (Korteling et al., 2021). This is not merely an issue of cheating, but an issue of assessment design. Posthuman HR encourages a selection logic that

evaluates the process, not just the result. The process can be seen from how candidates formulate problems, how they structure assumptions, how they test consistency, and how they acknowledge the limits of knowledge. The application of this advanced technology has actually begun to be seen in various sectors, including how digital transformation helps optimize supply chains in the manufacturing industry (Putra & Arifin, 2021). Good selection also evaluates a candidate's ability to work with generative systems without surrendering authority. This means candidates are assessed on their capacity to use the machine as a source of options and then transform those options into responsible decisions. Within this framework, digital competence does not stop at the ability to use tools, but at the ability to maintain the integrity of reasoning when tools offer convenience. Organizations also need to assess whether candidates understand privacy risks and bias risks, as these risks can damage organizational trust. Consequently, recruitment in this era is no longer just about finding fast people, but about finding people capable of withstanding uncertainty, maintaining accuracy, and formulating decisions that can be held accountable before the public and internal stakeholders.

Training and development must also move from mastering tools toward strengthening judgment capacity. Many organizations are tempted to provide technical training on how to give commands and how to arrange templates. Such training is useful, but it is not enough. Posthuman HR emphasizes that the primary training involves verification training, epistemic literacy training, and ethical training for using generative systems. Through an adaptive learning process, it is expected that everyone can continue to improve their abilities independently as well as together within a team (Kurniawan & Darmawan, 2021). Verification means building the habit of checking facts, checking consistency, and checking for potential harms. Epistemic literacy means understanding that generative output is the result of language modeling, not a guarantee of truth (Floridi & Cowls, 2019). Ethics of use means understanding when the use of the system must be declared, what data must not be entered, and how to avoid reproducing stereotypes or injustice. Training also needs to strengthen human collaboration skills, because when generative systems facilitate document preparation, the value of meetings and dialogue shifts toward substantive

assessment. Organizations that do not train for dialogue risk having many documents but being poor in mutual understanding. Thus, posthuman HR training is training that fosters the sharpness of questions, the firmness of boundaries, and the ability to build consensus, so that machines do not take over the collective thinking space.

Performance appraisal is under great pressure because work output is increasingly difficult to trace to its source. If an organization evaluates performance based on the number of documents, the number of ideas, or response speed, then the workers who most aggressively use generative systems will appear superior. This situation creates injustice, as workers who are cautious and check for risks may appear slow. Posthuman HR asserts the need for performance measures that evaluate the quality of decisions, the accuracy of verification, and the normative impact on stakeholders. Such measures demand that organizations change evaluation habits, from quantity-based evaluations to accountability-based evaluations (Vrontis et al., 2022). In addition to work results, organizations must also continue to pay attention to the health and well-being of their workers, especially those who are seniors, so that they remain productive in the future (Darmawan, 2020). Accountability here means the ability to explain why a choice was made, what the risks are, and how those risks are mitigated. Performance also needs to evaluate a worker's ability to build shared knowledge, for example, by documenting lessons learned and drafting guidelines for the use of generative systems. Thus, workers who maintain integrity must receive equal recognition. If recognition is not given, the organization encourages a fast but fragile work culture, and damage will emerge as a crisis of trust when generative output causes serious errors. Posthuman HR views performance appraisal as a moral tool, not just an administrative one.

Work ethics in the era of generative artificial intelligence contain questions about honesty and transparency. Workers can use generative systems to draft outlines, improve language, or design options. Ethical questions arise when such use is hidden so that supervisors or clients believe the output is entirely the result of individual capability. Transparency is not just an abstract moral demand, but the foundation of organizational trust. Responsibility and morality in every decision taken by leaders are crucial to ensuring that this technology brings about good

(Gani & Darmawan, 2022). When transparency is lost, the organization loses the ability to assess competence fairly and loses the ability to design appropriate training. However, transparency must also be designed wisely so as not to turn into a shaming surveillance tool. Posthuman HR asserts the need for clear norms regarding when the use of the system must be disclosed, to whom, and in what format (Al-Amoudi & Lazega, 2019). We can see real examples of how this smart technology has brought about major changes, for example, in the increasingly modern world of health (Khayru, 2022). However, all this progress must still be based on clear legal rules so that everyone's rights remain protected (Priyatama et al., 2022). These norms must protect the dignity of workers, as the use of generative systems can become part of a new work standard. Work ethics also concern creative boundaries. If a machine drafts a substantial part, the worker needs to ensure that they understand and agree with the content, rather than merely attaching their name. Here, accountability becomes the core of ethics. Machines can help, but humans must be responsible for decisions that affect others.

Another ethical issue relates to confidentiality and privacy. Many generative systems work by processing inputs that may contain sensitive data, whether customer data, employee data, or business plans. In practice, workers may be tempted to input fragments of information to obtain more relevant answers. Posthuman HR views this temptation as something that must be addressed through the design of rules that are easy to understand and easy to follow. Complex and abstract rules often fail because they are not connected to work routines (Belk, 2022). HR needs to transform privacy ethics from compliance documents into work habits. Work habits are built through leadership examples, system reminders, and fair consequences. Privacy ethics also concern the boundaries of organizational monitoring of workers. If an organization installs generative systems that record worker interactions for model training, workers may feel subtly surveilled. This sense of being watched affects psychological safety and can decrease creativity. Thus, posthuman HR positions privacy as an element of the psychological contract. Workers need to know what is being recorded, for what purpose, and how their rights are protected. Without clarity, working alongside machines becomes work under the shadows, and that damages the employment relationship.

The psychological relationship between the worker and the organization changes as the source of recognition shifts. In many organizations, recognition is given to those capable of producing neat documents quickly. When machines can help everyone produce neat documents, the value of recognition moves toward the ability to think, the ability to judge, and the ability to lead collaboration. However, this shift is not automatic. If the organization continues to give recognition to fast output, workers will feel their competition has turned into a competition of tool usage. Such competition can erode solidarity and drive anxiety. Workers may feel constantly left behind if they do not follow the rhythm of generative system usage. This anxiety can reduce work quality, as attention is split between completing tasks and maintaining a competent image (Brougham & Haar, 2018). Posthuman HR assesses that organizations need to build a new narrative of recognition. This narrative emphasizes accuracy, responsibility, and the ability to uphold organizational values in decisions. A clear narrative helps workers find a meaning of work that does not depend on speed alone. The meaning of work is a vital psychological element because it maintains engagement. When meaning is lost, an organization may remain productive on the surface but become fragile from within.

The psychological contract is also influenced by the sense of security regarding career sustainability. Generative artificial intelligence can create the perception that certain jobs are easily replaced. This perception can trigger existential anxiety namely, the fear of losing one's self-worth. Within an organization, this kind of anxiety can elicit two responses: quiet resistance or excessive acceptance. Quiet resistance appears as a reluctance to learn and a reluctance to share. Excessive acceptance appears as a dependence on the machine and a reduction in investment in human skills. Both are detrimental to the organization. Posthuman HR assesses that security needs to be built through clear development paths specifically, how workers can grow to become curators, evaluators, and quality guardians (Hmoud & Laszlo, 2019). Clarity in development paths provides realistic hope rather than empty promises. Furthermore, security is built through fairness namely, appraisal rules that do not punish those who are cautious. If an organization punishes caution, workers learn that job security is obtained by taking epistemic risks. That is a dangerous lesson.

Thus, psychological relations require governance that restores security through clarity, fairness, and recognition.

The change in the relationship between humans and machines also affects professional identity. Many professions are built on recognized claims of expertise, such as the ability to write, the ability to formulate arguments, or the ability to draft recommendations. When machines can mimic the form of output, professional identity can be shaken. This disruption can be an opportunity to purify professional identity toward truly human elements, such as practical wisdom, moral judgment, and relational understanding. However, the disruption can also turn into an identity crisis if the organization simplifies work into mere prompt-filling and option-selection (Pettersen, 2019). Posthuman HR assesses that organizations must maintain space for healthy professional pride. Healthy professional pride is not pride in speed, but pride in responsibility and quality. Quality here means the quality of decisions and the quality of treatment toward people. If professional identity is reorganized in this way, machines can be understood as partners that expand capacity, not competitors that erase dignity. However, reorganizing identity requires honest organizational communication, a resetting of standards, and leadership by example. Workers judge an organization by its practices, not its slogans. When leaders demonstrate caution and transparency, workers find it easier to accept identity changes. Thus, posthuman HR connects professional identity with the design of norms and recognition.

The issue of justice arises when generative artificial intelligence is used in HR processes, for instance, to draft job descriptions, screen candidates, or design performance appraisals. When generative systems participate in drafting the language of criteria, they can reinforce existing biases within the organization. Bias can appear as a preference for certain communication styles, assumptions about ideal career paths, or stereotypes about competence. Within the posthuman HR framework, justice is not merely about reducing technical bias, but about testing whether the definition of competence used by the organization aligns with the value of equality (Tambe et al., 2019). If the definition of competence overemphasizes a specific linguistic style, then workers from certain backgrounds will be disadvantaged. Generative artificial

intelligence can refine language to make it appear neutral, yet it may still carry latent preferences. Therefore, HR needs to evaluate criteria as a moral text. A moral text means it shapes who is considered worthy and who is not. If moral texts are shaped by machines without testing, the organization delegates normative decisions to non-human agents. This contradicts the principle of accountability. Consequently, posthuman HR demands a normative audit mechanism for HR language, including the language of job advertisements, appraisal language, and policy language. A normative audit is a human task, as it requires judgments about fairness, not just accuracy.

Generative artificial intelligence also changes the structure of organizational learning. When systems can answer technical questions quickly, workers can learn independently without depending on mentors. This can expand access to learning. However, independent learning can reduce the quality of social learning namely, learning through dialogue, learning through feedback, and learning through the formation of practical wisdom. Practical wisdom is usually born from conversations about cases, value conflicts, and difficult decisions. Machines can help draft options, but they do not experience social consequences. Therefore, posthuman HR emphasizes the need to maintain social learning as the core (De Bruyn et al., 2020). Organizations can use generative systems to accelerate preparation, but human discussion remains necessary to evaluate implications. Learning also needs to emphasize the ability to explain decisions, because in collaborative work, workers need to explain why they chose one option among many. The ability to explain is the ability to build accountability. If learning shifts toward the consumption of answers, the ability to explain will decline. Thus, posthuman HR views learning as the formation of professional character, not just the mastery of information. The formation of professional character involves honesty, caution, and the courage to reject improper output, even if that output is efficient.

Governance over the use of generative systems has become a central focus, as it determines whether an organization gains benefits without eroding trust (Felzmann et al., 2019). Governance encompasses usage policies, verification procedures, data restrictions, and error-reporting mechanisms. However, governance also includes culture. Culture

determines whether a policy lives or dies. A healthy culture encourages people to admit mistakes and correct them, rather than covering them up to save face. In working alongside machines, errors can occur because outputs are convincing yet incorrect. If the culture punishes admission, workers will hide their use of the system and conceal their doubts. This amplifies organizational risk. Posthuman HR assesses that governance must invite transparency rather than trigger fear. Transparency can be built through clear rules and by protecting workers who report issues. Furthermore, governance needs to clarify the principle of final accountability, which is that humans remain responsible for decisions. This principle protects the organization from the illusion that machines can replace judgment. However, this principle also demands that the organization provide time and resources for verification. If an organization demands accountability without granting time for verification, it produces injustice. Thus, posthuman HR governance must balance productivity demands with accountability demands.

The psychological relationship of workers is also influenced by how the organization manages surveillance. Generative systems can be positioned as freely used aids or as systems integrated with intense monitoring. Intense monitoring can be conducted through activity logs, productivity measurements, or automated quality assessments. Intense monitoring may increase compliance, but it can damage the sense of autonomy. The sense of autonomy is a vital element of professional work motivation. If workers feel that every step they take is measured, they tend to choose safe decisions and avoid experimentation. Yet, the use of generative systems often requires experimentation to find the right way of working (Kellogg et al., 2020). Posthuman HR assesses that organizations need to distinguish between protective surveillance and controlling surveillance. Protective surveillance focuses on data protection, safety protection, and quality protection. Controlling surveillance focuses on micro-behavioral control. In collaborative human-machine work, micro-control can create dependency and reduce the sense of responsibility. Workers might do something because the system dictates it, not because they understand it. This is a long-term loss. Thus, posthuman HR positions surveillance as a moral design that affects organizational character, not just a technical feature.

Changes in work ethics also touch upon the issues of copyright and internal knowledge ownership. When workers use generative systems to draft documents, questions arise regarding who owns the resulting formulation. The organization may claim the document as organizational property, yet the worker may feel their contribution is diluted because the machine participated in the drafting. On the other hand, the organization may feel vulnerable if workers take prompts, templates, or process knowledge outside. Posthuman HR assesses that this issue is not merely legal, but a matter of the justice of recognition (Schmitt, 2021). Recognition needs to be given to the work of curation the work of selecting, examining, and framing. If the organization only recognizes the final result, the worker feels replaceable. If the organization recognizes the judgment process, the worker feels valued as a professional. Thus, HR needs to formulate a language of recognition that positions humans as the holders of responsibility and the owners of judgment competence. At the same time, the organization needs to safeguard strategic knowledge. This balance requires clear rules and respectful communication. If rules are made unilaterally, the psychological contract is disrupted. Consequently, knowledge ownership in the generative era is a relational issue that determines loyalty, rather than just a matter of legal documents.

Posthuman HR also needs to unravel changes in team structure. Generative systems can reduce the need for some administrative roles, yet increase the need for bridging roles such as quality facilitators, ethics guardians, and knowledge managers. Team structures become more fluid because team members can access the same machine support. In a fluid structure, the boundaries of individual contribution are more blurred. This blurring can reduce ownership conflicts, but it can also reduce accountability if not intentionally designed. Posthuman HR emphasizes the need for a division of responsibility that remains clear, especially regarding high-risk decisions (Baptista et al., 2020; Gladden, 2016). Clarity of responsibility also protects workers, as they do not want to bear systemic errors alone. Furthermore, teamwork in this era requires agreements on prompt-sharing practices, template-sharing practices, and change-logging practices. These practices build organizational memory. Without memory, the organization will repeat mistakes. Thus, a healthy team structure

requires consistent "micro-rules." These micro-rules establish fair work habits, including the habit of mentioning the use of system assistance when relevant and the habit of collectively reviewing sensitive outputs. Posthuman HR views these small habits as ethical infrastructure.

Leadership competence is also changing. A good leader in the generative era is not judged by the ability to write the fastest, but by the ability to establish shared standards of thinking. A leader must be able to determine what can be delegated to the machine and what must be decided by humans. They must also be able to protect the team's time for verification and reflection. Without time protection, the team will fall into a fragile mode of rapid production. Leaders also need to be capable of managing collective emotions, especially anxiety about replacement and confusion regarding new standards. Within the posthuman HR framework, the leader is the guardian of the organization's moral boundaries (Schwarz Müller et al., 2018). They affirm that the use of machines does not diminish human responsibility. However, the leader must also avoid a morality that punishes the use of machines, as machine use can be part of professional work. The key is to make machine use a transparent and verified practice. Additionally, leaders must develop fairness in recognition. They must ensure that workers who maintain quality are not sidelined by workers who pursue quantity. Thus, leadership in posthuman HR constitutes ethical leadership and epistemic leadership leading the way the organization knows and decides.

The psychological relationship of workers with the organization is also influenced by the experience of control over tools. Generative systems can feel like tools that can be directed, but sometimes they feel like an authority that dictates. When workers accept machine suggestions without reflection, they lose a sense of agency. The loss of agency can weaken job satisfaction and professional pride. Posthuman HR emphasizes the need for a culture that teaches workers to treat machine output as a hypothesis, not a conclusion. This culture helps workers maintain their sense of agency (Cherrstrom & Boden, 2020). The sense of agency is reinforced through space for questioning and space for expressing doubt. If the organization interprets doubt as weakness, workers will suppress their concerns and follow the machine. This is dangerous because machines can generate errors that are difficult to see

at first glance. Consequently, HR needs to organize communication norms that value questions. A question is a competence. A question is a sign of responsibility. Furthermore, HR needs to organize recognition for "rejection work" the act of choosing not to use machine output when it is unsuitable. Rejection work is often invisible, yet it protects the organization. If rejection work is recognized, workers will feel that the organization values judgment, not just production.

Changes in work ethics also touch upon the issue of distributive justice namely, who benefits from machine productivity. If an organization raises targets because machines accelerate work, workers may feel that the machines are being used to exploit rather than to liberate. This feeling erodes engagement and fosters cynicism. Posthuman HR evaluates that productivity must be read alongside the quality of work life. If machines speed things up, the organization can use the available time for verification, learning, innovation, or recovery, rather than merely increasing the workload. This choice is an organizational moral choice (Aitken et al., 2020). If the organization chooses to increase the burden, it sends a message that humans are resources to be exploited. This message reinforces psychological vulnerability. Conversely, if the organization chooses to use machine capacity to improve quality and reduce pressure, it builds trust. Trust is the foundation of collaborative work. Within the posthuman HR framework, trust is formed from the consistency between stated values and target practices. Thus, the distribution of productivity benefits is a concrete ethical element. It determines whether the machine becomes a partner that enriches or a partner that diminishes dignity.

The issue of competence is also related to tacit knowledge knowledge formed from experience that is difficult to write down. Many jobs require reading the situation, reading relationships, and reading long-term consequences. Generative systems can help draft options, but they do not undergo the social experience of those choices. Posthuman HR assesses that tacit knowledge is a source of human advantage. However, tacit knowledge can be eroded if the organization encourages excessive delegation to generative systems (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 2021). Workers who always use machines to compose answers may lose their thinking exercise. This loss of thinking exercise will become apparent when workers

face new situations that do not fit the machine's patterns. In this state, the organization experiences a decline in adaptive capacity. Therefore, HR needs to design work practices that maintain thinking exercises. These practices can take the form of reflection sessions, assignments that demand reasoning, and case-based learning. The goal is to maintain the "muscle" of human judgment. Thus, human competence in the generative era is not just the ability to use the system, but the ability to maintain internal capacity so it does not grow blunt. This is an ethic toward the professional self. A healthy organization encourages this ethic through learning time and recognition of the quality of reasoning.

Posthuman HR also perceives that organizational language is changing because generative systems produce uniform language. Uniformity of language can increase professionalism, but it can reduce the diversity of voices. Diversity of voices is important for creativity and for justice, as different experiences provide different perspectives. If all communication is structured by similar language patterns, the organization may lose warning signals that usually emerge from differences in expression. Furthermore, uniform language can mask value conflicts. Value conflicts are often visible in the words chosen and in the way people express disagreement. If disagreement is written in the polished language suggested by the machine, the organization may appear harmonious but is actually fragile (Vrontis et al., 2022). Posthuman HR assesses that organizations need to maintain space for authentic human expression, especially in ethical discussions, policy discussions, and feedback. This is not romanticization, but a functional necessity. Clarity of conflict helps the organization improve. If conflict is masked, bad decisions can proceed without correction. Thus, HR needs to regulate when generative language is appropriate to use and when human dialogue must be the centerpiece. This determination is part of communication governance.

In the realm of psychological relations, there also exists the possibility of anthropomorphism the tendency to treat generative systems like a colleague who understands. Anthropomorphism can help workers feel supported, but it can cause misunderstandings about machine capacity (Troshani et al., 2021). Workers may assume the system understands organizational values, whereas the system is merely modeling language

patterns. This misunderstanding can lead to misplaced trust. Posthuman HR assesses that literacy regarding machine limits is an aspect of work well-being. If a worker understands the limits, they will not feel betrayed when the machine is wrong. They will also not surrender moral decisions to the machine. Additionally, anthropomorphism can reduce social interaction in the workplace. Workers may choose to dialogue with the machine rather than with colleagues because machine dialogue feels fast and non-judgmental. However, coworkers are the source of learning organizational values. If social interaction declines, the culture weakens. A weakening culture makes it difficult for the organization to maintain ethical norms. Thus, posthuman HR views the design of machine use as something that must maintain human relationships, not replace them. Machines can accelerate, but human relationships safeguard meaning and accountability.

Generative artificial intelligence also influences the processes of discipline and compliance. Organizations can use generative systems to draft policies and procedures, making compliance documents faster to create. However, rapidly created documents do not guarantee meaningful compliance. Meaningful compliance means workers understand the moral reasoning behind the rules. If rules are structured as generic text, workers may comply formally but fail to internalize them. Posthuman HR assesses that compliance in this era must emphasize reasoning namely, the ability to connect rules with risks and values. Furthermore, generative systems can be used to monitor communication and detect violations. Such monitoring can enhance prevention but may reduce the sense of being trusted. If the sense of trust declines, workers may seek ways to circumvent rules, and the employment relationship becomes antagonistic. Thus, posthuman HR encourages a balance between prevention and trust (Gladden, 2016). Prevention must be directed toward protection, not total control. Trust is built through dialogue and through procedural justice. If workers know the enforcement process is fair, they are more accepting of the rules. In the generative era, this acceptance is vital because many compliance decisions involve rapid judgments regarding the use of systems and data.

When machines produce drafts, workers may feel their work has become a compilation rather than a creation. The sense of ownership is related to intrinsic motivation. If the sense of ownership declines, the

quality of attention declines. Posthuman HR assesses that ownership can be restored by focusing work on decisions, not on drafts. A draft is a material; a decision is a creation. If an organization positions the draft as a starting point and evaluates workers based on the quality of their decisions, workers can rediscover ownership. Additionally, HR can encourage the practice of reasoning documentation noting why certain options were chosen and why others were rejected. Reasoning documentation highlights human contributions that cannot be replaced by machines (Amabile & Pratt, 2016). Documentation also helps the organization learn. Thus, the sense of ownership is strengthened through the recognition of reasoning and accountability. This also serves an ethical function, as documentation facilitates audits and corrections. In organizations using generative systems, a healthy audit is one that examines the thinking process, not just the final result. In this way, posthuman HR connects motivation, ethics, and governance into a single chain.

Fairness in compensation and career development also needs to be reinterpreted. If machines increase productivity, organizations may assume that the value of the worker decreases because the work has become easier. This view risks ignoring that the work has become different, not light. Workers bear a greater burden of judgment and accountability. This burden constitutes mental and moral labor. Posthuman HR assesses that compensation must reflect this burden. If compensation does not reflect it, the organization sends a signal that judgment work is valueless. This signal pushes workers back toward chasing quantity. Beyond compensation, career development must recognize new skills, such as the ability to design verification procedures, the ability to train teams in machine literacy, and the ability to manage privacy risks (Huang & Rust, 2018). These skills are institutional skills. Organizations that ignore them will be fragile, as generative work can produce a reputation crisis if misused. Thus, posthuman HR views the career structure as a tool for building organizational ethical capacity. If ethical capacity is not given a career path, that capacity will be weak. Workers who care about ethics will feel unappreciated and choose to remain silent or leave. That is both a strategic and a moral loss.

Psychological relations also relate to the experience of interactional justice—how workers are treated when an error involving a machine occurs.

In an organization, mistakes will happen. What determines the quality of the relationship is how the organization responds. If the organization shames a worker when a machine output is erroneous, the worker will hide their use of the machine. If the organization turns a blind eye to errors because it is chasing productivity, the quality of decisions drops. Posthuman HR assesses that a fair response is one that distinguishes between an honest mistake and negligence. An honest mistake occurs when the worker has performed reasonable checks, yet the system still produces something incorrect. Negligence occurs when a worker surrenders the decision to the machine without reasonable verification. This distinction requires clear verification standards (Bies, 2015). If standards are clear, workers know what is expected. Furthermore, the organization needs to treat mistakes as material for collective learning, not as a basis for individual blaming. Collective learning strengthens organizational memory and improves procedures. Thus, posthuman HR positions error management as a part of work ethics and a part of psychological well-being. Well-being does not mean freedom from demands, but rather demands that are fair and understandable.

Changes in the definition of competence also demand a discussion about creativity. Many assume that generative systems replace creativity. Within the posthuman HR framework, creativity shifts from generating new sentences to designing problems and designing boundaries. Designing problems means determining what truly needs to be solved. Designing boundaries means determining what must not be done for the sake of values and security. Generative systems can produce variations, but they do not determine which variation is appropriate in a specific moral situation. Human creativity becomes curatorial creativity and moral creativity (Runco & Jaeger, 2012). Curatorial creativity means choosing the right combination of options. Moral creativity means finding a path that fulfills goals without violating dignity. HR needs to recognize this type of creativity in performance appraisals. If creativity is judged by the number of ideas, machines will dominate. If creativity is judged by the precision of decisions and the wisdom of boundaries, the human element will be visible. Thus, posthuman HR asserts that human creativity is not lost, but rather moves into the realm that requires responsibility. This shift is essential to maintain a sense of work meaning. Workers who see their

creativity valued will be more open to learning how to use generative systems ethically. Conversely, workers who feel their creativity is trivialized will build distance and cynicism.

Changes in competence, ethics, and psychological relations are bound together in a single mechanism of recognition and accountability. The definition of human competence shifts toward the ability to direct, examine, and take responsibility for work output produced alongside generative systems. Work ethics shift toward transparency of use, verification discipline, privacy protection, and the rejection of delegating moral decisions to non-human agents. Psychological relations shift because the source of recognition changes, career security is tested, and professional identity needs to be reorganized. All of these shifts depend on how the organization designs governance, designs appraisal standards, and builds a culture of dialogue (Colquitt et al., 2013). When governance demands accountability but does not provide time for verification, the organization creates injustice. When governance worships quantity, the organization erodes curation competence. When governance values reasoning, the organization builds a responsible partnership between humans and machines. Thus, posthuman HR is not merely an updated term, but a normative framework to ensure that organizations using generative artificial intelligence continue to uphold human dignity, maintain justice, and safeguard the quality of decisions.

Conclusion

Posthuman resource management views generative artificial intelligence as a work agent that transforms the assessment structures, value systems, and psychological experiences of workers within organizations. The definition of human competence shifts from production competence toward curation competence the ability to formulate problems, direct systems, verify outputs, and take responsibility for decisions. Work ethics shift toward demands for transparency in system use, verification discipline, privacy protection, and the assertion that moral judgment remains with humans. The psychological relationship between the worker and the organization changes as the sources of recognition and achievement standards shift, requiring a fair reorganization of job security, recognition, and professional identity. This framework

emphasizes that the benefits of generative systems can only be sustained if the organization builds clear governance, a culture of dialogue that values questioning, and performance appraisals that emphasize accountability rather than the quantity of output. Thus, posthuman HR explains that human and machine work must be understood as a normative relationship requiring the design of rules, recognition, and accountability that safeguard worker dignity while maintaining the quality of organizational decisions.

Implications and suggestions emphasize that organizations need to redesign HR practices to align with the collaborative work of humans and generative systems. Recruitment and selection need to assess the thinking process and verification capabilities, rather than just the easily polished final results. Training needs to center on epistemic literacy, ethics of use, and the habit of documenting reasoning, so that workers retain their agency and do not surrender judgment to the machine. Performance appraisal needs to position decision quality, verification accuracy, and the courage to maintain boundaries as primary indicators, ensuring that cautious workers are not outperformed by those merely chasing quantity. Organizations also need to develop privacy rules that are easy to follow and avoid surveillance that undermines professional autonomy. A conceptual suggestion for further writing is to clarify the categories of curation competence, justice of recognition, and error governance in generative work, so that the posthuman HR framework can guide organizations in building human-machine partnerships that are fair, trustworthy, and sustainable.

References

- Abdulah, M. H. A. B., Gardi, B., & Darmawan, D. 2021. Innovation in Human Resource Management to enhance Organizational Competitiveness in the Era of Globalization. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 51-58.
- Aitken, M., Toreini, E., Carmichael, P., Coopamootoo, K., Elliott, K., & van Moorsel, A. (2020). Establishing a social licence for Financial Technology: Reflections on the role of the private sector in pursuing ethical AI. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 167(1), 1-17.
- Al-Amoudi, I., & Lazega, E. (Eds.). 2019. *Post-human institutions and organizations: Confronting the matrix*. Routledge.

- Amabile, T. M., & Pratt, M. G. 2016. The dynamic componential model of creativity and innovation in organizations: Making progress, making meaning. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 36, 157-183.
- Anderson, M., & Anderson, S. L. 2007. Machine ethics: Creating an ethical intelligent agent. *AI magazine*, 28(4), 15-15.
- Arifin, S., & Darmawan, D. 2021. Technology Access and Digital Skills: Bridging the Gaps in Education and Employment Opportunities in the Age of Technology 4.0. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 163-168.
- Baptista, J., Stein, M. K., Klein, S., Watson-Manheim, M. B., & Japaassu, J. 2020. Digital work and intermediate objects: how generative AI and algorithms change the nature of professional work. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 29(1), 101616.
- Barry, E. S., J. Merkebu., & L. Varpio. 2022. State of the Art Literature Review Methodology: A Six Step Approach for Knowledge Synthesis. *Perspectives on Medical Education*, 11(5), 281-288.
- Belk, R. 2022. Ethical issues in service robotics and artificial intelligence. *Service Industries Journal*, 42(11-12), 889-901.
- Benbya, H., Davenport, T. H., & Pachidi, S. 2020. Artificial intelligence in organizations: Current state and future opportunities. *MIS Quarterly Executive*, 19(4).
- Bies, R. J. 2015. Interactional justice: Looking backward, looking forward. *Oxford Handbook of Justice in the Workplace*, 89-108.
- Brougham, D., & Haar, J. 2018. Smart Technology, Artificial Intelligence, Robotics, and Algorithms (STARA): Employees' perceptions and wellbeing. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(15), 2242-2262.
- Cherrstrom, C. A., & Boden, C. J. 2020. Expanding Role and Potential of Curation in Education: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *The Reference Librarian*, 61(2), 113-132. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02763877.2020.1776191>
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., Rodell, J. B., Long, D. M., Zapata, C. P., Conlon, D. E., & Wesson, M. J. 2013. Justice at the millennium, a decade later: A meta-analytic test of social exchange and affect-based perspectives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(2), 199-236.
- Darmawan, D. 2020. Health, Well-Being, and Productivity of Senior Employees in the Era of Artificial Intelligence. *Journal of Science, Technology and Society (SICO)*, 1(2), 43-50.
- De Bruyn, A., Viswanathan, V., Beh, Y. S., Brock, J. K. U., & Von Wangenheim, F. 2020. Artificial intelligence and marketing: Pitfalls and opportunities. *Journal of Interactive Marketing*, 51(1), 91-105.
- Felzmann, H., Villaronga, E. F., Lutz, C., & Tamò-Larrieux, A. 2019. Transparency you can trust: Transparency requirements for artificial intelligence between legal norms and contextual concerns. *Big Data & Society*, 6(1), 2053951719860542.

- Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. 2019. A Unified Framework of Five Principles for AI in Society. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 1(1).
- Gani, A., & Darmawan, D. 2022. Ethics and Accountability in Artificial Intelligence-Based Managerial Decision Making. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 147-152.
- Garbuio, M., & Lin, N. 2021. Innovative idea generation in problem finding: Abductive reasoning, cognitive impediments, and the promise of artificial intelligence. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, 38(6), 701-725.
- Gladden, M. E. 2016. *Posthuman management: Creating effective organizations in an age of social robotics, ubiquitous AI, human augmentation, and virtual worlds*. Defragmenter Media.
- Gupta, A., & N. Gupta. 2022. *Research Methodology*. SBPD Publications, Agra.
- Hmoud, H., & Laszlo, V. 2019. Will Artificial Intelligence Take Over Human Resources Management? Exploratory Study of AI-Driven Recruitment. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Sciences*, 4(1), 1-13.
- Huang, M. H., & Rust, R. T. 2018. Artificial intelligence in service. *Journal of Service Research*, 21(2), 155-172.
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. 2020. Algorithms at work: The new directorship of managerial control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366-410.
- Khayru, R. K. 2022. Transforming healthcare: the power of artificial intelligence. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 1(3), 15-19.
- Korteling, J. E., van de Boer-Visschedijk, G. C., Blankendaal, R. A., Boonekamp, R. C., & Eikelboom, A. R. 2021. Human-versus artificial intelligence. *Frontiers in artificial intelligence*, 4, 622364.
- Kurniawan, Y., & Darmawan, D. 2021. The Adaptive Learning Effect on Individual and Collective Learning. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 93-98.
- Mardikaningsih, R. & D. Darmawan. 2022. Digital Human Resource Practices in Remote Work Systems, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 357-388.
- May, T., & B. Perry. 2022. *Social Research: Issues, Methods and Process*. McGraw Hill Education UK, London.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (2021). The wise-humanizing leadership: Creating shared value through tacitness. *Management and Organization Review*, 17(5), 1011-1025.
- Pettersen, L. 2019. Why artificial intelligence will not outsmart human intelligence. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 5(1), 1-9.
- Priyatama, S., Aliyah, N. D., Mardikaningsih, R., Safira, M. E., & Issalillah, F. (2022). Juridical Analysis of the Implementation of Artificial Insemination in Indonesia: Legal Status and Children's Rights in a Positive Legal Perspective. *Bulletin of Science, Technology and Society*, 1(2), 27-32.
- Putra, A. R. 2021. Implementation of Competency-Based Performance Appraisal System to Ensure Accuracy and Effectiveness of Employee Evaluation. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(1), 59-66.

- Putra, A. R., & Arifin, S. (2021). Supply Chain Management Optimization in the Manufacturing Industry through Digital Transformation: The Role of Big Data, Artificial Intelligence, and the Internet of Things. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 1(2), 161-166.
- Radjawane, L. E., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2022. Building Ethical and Fair Technology: Approaches to Responsible Technology Development and Application. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(1), 189-194.
- Ramle, N. L. B., & Mardikaningsih, R. 2022. Inclusivity in Technology-Based Services: Access and Skills Challenges. *Journal of Social Science Studies*, 2(2), 225-230.
- Rojak, J. A., D. Darmawan, & R. K. Khayru. 2022. Transformational Leadership as an Agent of Social Change in Organizational Value Systems, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 2(1), 191-212.
- Runco, M. A., & Jaeger, G. J. 2012. The standard definition of creativity. *Creativity Research Journal*, 24(1), 92-96.
- Schmitt, U. 2021. Scalability of generative knowledge management systems: designing for individuals' and institutions' mutual benefit. *Kybernetes*, 50(10), 2701-2725.
- Schwarz Müller, T., Brosi, P., Duman, D., & Welp, I. M. (2018) Leadership capabilities in a digitized world: A review and proposition of a digital leadership framework. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33(4), 455-486.
- Shen, W. 2019. *Multi-agent systems for concurrent intelligent design and manufacturing*. CRC press.
- Sinambela, E. A. & D. Darmawan. 2021. Relevance of Email Marketing in the Contemporary Digital Marketing Communication Mix, *Studi Ilmu Sosial Indonesia*, 1(2), 301-324.
- Snyder, H. 2019. Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, 104, 333-339.
- Tambe, P., Cappelli, P., & Yakubovich, V. 2019. Artificial intelligence in human resources management: Challenges and a path forward. *California Management Review*, 61(4), 15-42.
- Troshani, I., Rao Hill, S., Sherman, C., & Arthur, D. 2021. Do we trust in AI? Role of anthropomorphism and intelligence. *Journal of Computer Information Systems*, 61(5), 481-491.
- Vrontis, D., Christofi, M., Pereira, V., Tarba, S., Makrides, A., & Trichina, E. 2022. Artificial intelligence, robotics, advanced technologies and human resource management: a systematic review. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(6), 1237-1266.
- Vrontis, D., Christofi, M., Pereira, V., Tarba, S., Makrides, A., & Trichina, E. (2022). Artificial intelligence, robotics, advanced technologies and human resource management: a systematic review. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(6), 1237-1266.