Balkans JETSS (2025) 2: 103-113
DOI: https://doi.org/10.31410/Balkans.JETSS.2025.8.2.103-113

Review Article

Partners or Threats? The Hidden Dynamics of AI Adoption in the Workplace

Žikica Milošević[1]
Andrea Ivanišević[2]
Katarina Stojanović[3]

Received: October 23, 2025 / Revised: December 23, 2025 /
Accepted: December 30, 2025 / Published: December 30, 2025

Abstract: *Artificial Intelligence (AI) is rapidly reshaping organisational work, yet its promised benefits often conceal deeper psychological and managerial tensions. This study aims to examine why employees frequently hide their use of AI, how organisational culture shapes these behaviours, and how generational differences influence attitudes toward AI-driven productivity. While companies promote AI as a tool for efficiency and creativity, many workers fear that admitting AI use will lead either to increased workloads or to job displacement. This creates a paradox in which AI is experienced less as a supportive partner and more as a silent competitor or monitoring device. As efficiency gains are reinvested into higher output expectations, anxiety, mistrust, and concealment become common workplace strategies. The paper also analyses how Generation Z responds to this "productivity trap" by simultaneously embracing AI while seeking careers in less automatable fields that promise stability, dignity, and work-life balance. The findings highlight the need for organisations to reframe AI adoption as a collaborative human-machine partnership, supported by transparent communication, ethical management, and redefined performance metrics that protect employee well-being while enabling innovation.*

Keywords: *AI, Workplace, Generation Z, Threats, Partnership, Management*

JEL Classification: J24 · M15 · M54

✉ zikica_m@yahoo.com
[1] Faculty of Technical Sciences Novi Sad, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 6, Novi Sad, Serbia
[2] Faculty of Technical Sciences Novi Sad, Trg Dositeja Obradovića 6, Novi Sad, Serbia
[3] Faculty of Contemporary Arts, Belgrade; Faculty of Economics and Engineering Management, University Business Academy in Novi Sad, Serbia

1. INTRODUCTION

The rapid diffusion of Artificial Intelligence (AI) across workplaces has marked one of the most significant transformations of the 21st century. Once regarded as a futuristic concept, AI has now become a tangible element of everyday professional life - embedded in email filters, predictive analytics, recruitment software, and even creative tools such as text and image generators. This technological shift is often portrayed in corporate narratives as both inevitable and benevolent: a force that promises efficiency, reduces routine work, and liberates human creativity (Davenport & Mittal, 2023; McAfee & Brynjolfsson, 2017). AI, therefore, presents a brand new general-purpose technology with potentially huge impacts on workers and organisations (Farrell et al., 2025). This will be a transformative factor, making nearly every sector of the economy more efficient (Acemoglu, 2025) and less biased (Page & Kallapur, 2025). However, beneath this optimistic discourse lies a growing tension between the promise of AI and the perception of those who must coexist with it. Recent studies reveal that many employees experience AI not as an empowering tool but as a source of anxiety, control, and mistrust (Haenlein et al., 2019; Rahwan et al., 2019). Instead of serving as a neutral assistant, AI systems are often embedded within managerial frameworks that measure performance, predict behaviour, and even inform promotion or termination decisions. This creates a psychological ambivalence: employees are encouraged to "work smarter", yet often feel surveilled, forced to do more for the same period of time, or even replaceable. As Grasiaswaty (2025) notes, the discourse of automation conceals a deeper managerial logic - one that seeks to intensify work through algorithmic monitoring rather than alleviate it. A striking manifestation of this paradox can be seen in what researchers describe as the "AI concealment effect" (Kellogg et al., 2020). Many workers use AI tools privately but hesitate to disclose their reliance on them. The reasons are predominantly organisational rather than technical: fear of job loss, fear of managerial over-expectation, or fear of being perceived as less capable (and thus qualified to become obsolete). In this sense, AI becomes not a symbol of progress, but of precariousness. The workplace turns into a paradoxical arena where employees hide their technological proficiency to safeguard their professional stability. Generational differences further illuminate this phenomenon. Generation Z, entering the workforce during the post-pandemic digital acceleration, approaches AI with both confidence and caution (Deloitte, 2025; Schroth, 2019). Since they are projected to make up 74% of the global workforce by 2030, they are a formidable force (Deloitte, 2025). Digital nativity allows them to use AI creatively and intuitively, yet they are acutely aware of its double-edged nature. Unlike older cohorts, many Gen Z workers reject the glorification of overwork and the "always-on" mentality inherited from the early '00s (Fuchs et al., 2024). Instead, they value psychological safety, work-life balance, and meaningful autonomy - factors that traditional management models often undervalue. Consequently, they gravitate towards roles that cannot be easily automated, such as design, communication, education, and cultural production, viewing them as bastions of human distinctiveness. Some of them even lean towards blue-collar jobs. Namely, 42% of Gen Z adults are currently working in or pursuing a blue-collar or skilled trade job, according to a report from Resume Builder mde in May 2025 (Crist, 2025). Of those, 37% have earned a bachelor's degree, and 25% of them say these jobs are less likely to be replaced by AI (Resume Builder, 2025). As a consequence, qualified workforce from this generational cohort will rather leave the insecure or/and heavily additionally burdened white-collar jobs than comply. This should be a big red flag for HR. However, there are some encouraging data: according to a joint report by MIT Sloan Management Review and the Boston Consulting Group, around 60% of employees perceive artificial intelligence not as a threat to their jobs but as a "co-worker" or collaborator. Moreover, organisations where employees actively derive value from AI are 5.9 times more likely to achieve significant financial benefits than those where employees do not effectively engage with AI tools (Ransbotham et al., 2022). The central problem that this paper addresses is thus twofold. First, it

explores the contradiction between the corporate rhetoric of AI as a productivity enhancer and the lived reality of employees who often perceive it as a source of surveillance or pressure. Second, it examines how generational shifts - especially the values and strategies of Generation Z - might catalyse a more human-centred redefinition of AI integration in organisational life. In doing so, the research seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How does organisational culture influence employees' willingness to openly use and discuss AI tools?
2. What psychological and managerial mechanisms contribute to the concealment of AI use in the workplace?
3. How does Generation Z challenge or reshape traditional managerial expectations in the context of AI adoption?

By framing AI not merely as a technological innovation but as a socio-economic and cultural phenomenon, this study contributes to the growing discourse on human-machine collaboration, digital trust, and ethical management. It argues that the future of AI in the workplace will depend less on its computational capabilities and more on how organisations choose to reimagine relationships of trust, transparency, and shared value (Chung & Schiff, 2025; Susskind & Susskind, 2015). Unless AI is redefined as a partner rather than a threat, it risks deepening the managerial paradox of modern capitalism - where progress in technology coincides with regression in human well-being. It is worth noticing that this is a conceptual paper, i.e. a literature review with no primary data, since the future research will dig more deeply into the subject.

2. FROM AUTOMATION TO ALGORITHMIC MANAGEMENT – THE RISE OF "TECHNOLOGICAL TAYLORISM"

The emergence of AI-driven technologies has reshaped the fundamental architecture of organisational management. What was once a hierarchy governed by human supervisors is increasingly mediated by algorithmic systems that track, predict, and evaluate performance. This shift has given rise to what Kellogg et al. (2020) call the "new contested terrain of control", in which algorithms act simultaneously as instruments of coordination and surveillance. The early promise of automation - reducing routine labour to allow for creative and strategic engagement - has gradually evolved into a more complex managerial apparatus, often described as algorithmic management (Mateescu & Nguyen, 2019). Algorithmic management refers to the delegation of supervisory tasks - monitoring, scheduling, and evaluating - to software systems rather than human managers (Möhlmann & Zalmanson, 2017). While efficiency gains are substantial, scholars have noted that such systems may also erode autonomy and increase psychological strain (Lee et al., 2015). In many workplaces, AI acts as both a "digital boss" and a "data-driven mirror," reflecting employees' performance back to them with unprecedented precision. Yet this precision often comes at the cost of trust. Grasiaswaty (2025) argues that the rhetoric of efficiency conceals a deeper managerial intention: AI is used not only to streamline work but to intensify it by quantifying every moment of labour. A parallel body of literature suggests that this trend represents a new stage of so-called "technological Taylorism", where algorithmic systems extend the logic of early industrial management into the cognitive and emotional domains of work (Kellogg et al., 2020; Rosenblat, 2018). As a result, AI becomes less a tool of assistance and more an agent of standardisation. Even in creative and knowledge-based industries, where individuality and improvisation are vital, employees increasingly encounter digital metrics of "engagement" or "creativity" imposed by management dashboards.

3. THE PSYCHOLOGICAL LANDSCAPE: TRUST, FEAR, AND CONCEALMENT

While corporate narratives celebrate AI as a "neutral partner in progress", psychological and sociological research paints a more ambivalent picture. Rahwan et al. (2019) describe this as a "machine behaviour paradox"- humans design algorithms but then must adapt to their logic. This adaptation often triggers anxiety, not because of technical difficulty or the error made by the machine (AI outputs), but because of uncertainty about how AI outputs are interpreted by managers. The opacity of algorithmic decision-making further deepens this anxiety (Burrell, 2016; Haenlein et al., 2019). Recent workplace studies reveal that employees frequently conceal their use of AI tools, fearing that transparency could backfire. This "AI concealment effect" demonstrates a misalignment between technological innovation and organisational culture. When employees believe that admitting AI reliance could either signal redundancy or justify increased workloads, the supposed benefits of automation become self-defeating. Instead of enhancing productivity, fear of exposure generates inefficiency through emotional self-censorship and reduced openness. Scholars in organisational psychology have linked this dynamic to the broader theory of psychological safety - a condition where individuals feel free to express ideas or admit mistakes without fear of punishment (Edmondson, 2018). In AI-mediated workplaces, psychological safety depends less on technology itself and more on managerial framing. If AI is positioned as a monitoring device rather than a collaborator, employees internalise a sense of surveillance and control (Huang & Rust, 2018). Conversely, when AI is introduced with transparent communication, ethical guidelines, and participatory training, trust tends to increase (Haenlein et al., 2019). Moreover, the literature suggests that the fear of AI replacement is not only an economic concern but also an existential one. Susskind and Susskind (2015) argue that AI challenges professional identity by questioning what constitutes "uniquely human" labour. For many, the notion of being outperformed by a machine undermines personal dignity and the meaning of work. This explains why concealment may coexist with heavy AI usage: workers rely on AI pragmatically but deny it symbolically to preserve self-worth and their status in the eyes of managers.

4. GENERATIONAL AND CULTURAL DIMENSIONS: GENERATIONS Y AND Z AND THE SEARCH FOR MEANING

The literature on generational behaviour provides important insights into how digital-native cohorts navigate the new AI workplace. Generation Z, born between the mid-1990s and early 2010s, represents the first generation to enter the workforce with full digital fluency and algorithmic literacy (Schroth, 2019). Unlike Millennials (Generation Y), whose early careers were marked by technological adaptation, Gen Z workers have grown up within ecosystems of predictive algorithms, social media analytics, and recommendation systems. This familiarity, however, does not necessarily translate into unconditional acceptance. Deloitte's 2025 Gen Z and Millennial Survey found that among those who already use GenAI at work, Gen Zs and millennials are broadly optimistic about its impact. They believe it has improved the quality of their work (78% of Gen Zs and 82% of millennials), and that it has helped to free up their time and improved their work/life balance (77% of Gen Zs and 79% of millennials). When asked about the top impacts of GenAI on their careers so far, roughly a quarter (28%) of both generations say that GenAI has simplified routine tasks and increased efficiency, improved overall productivity (25% of Gen Zs and 26% of millennials), and enhanced creativity and innovation (25% of Gen Zs and 24% of millennials). Twenty percent of Gen Zs and millennials say that GenAI has freed them up to focus on more strategic work. But they do have some significant concerns. They worry GenAI will eliminate jobs (63% of Gen Zs and 65% of millennials) and make it harder for younger generations to enter the workforce as it automates tasks typically performed by entry-level

workers (61% of Gen Zs and millennials). The prevalence of GenAI is also causing many (66% of Gen Zs and 68% of millennials) to say they will look for job opportunities that they perceive as being safe from GenAI-driven disruption, such as manual labour or skilled trades. This is up from last year, when less than six in 10 Gen Zs (59%) and just over half of millennials (52%) said the same (Deloitte, 2025). This ambivalence reflects what is described as the "productivity trap" - the perception that technology designed to save time ultimately increases pressure to do more. Gen Z's response to this dilemma is both strategic and philosophical. On the one hand, they adopt AI to reduce cognitive load and streamline routine tasks – they want AI to be their "copilot" or an autopilot, not a threat, a competitor, or a servant. On the other hand, they actively seek roles that preserve the human factor: creativity, empathy, and social connection, relegating laborious and dull tasks to their AI partner. This search for meaningful work aligns with broader sociological shifts towards post-material values and human sustainability (Kraus et al., 2019). Gen Z workers, more than any previous generation, frame success not in terms of income or status but in terms of balance, autonomy, and authenticity. Their resistance to the "grind culture" challenges management to redefine performance metrics that value human judgment and ethical reflection. Their tendency for well-being is opposed by the old-school billionaires and company owners like Jeff Bezos, Elon Musk and Reid Hoffman, since Bezos considers any "balance" to be a "tradeoff" (Burleigh, 2025), and the opposing forces will continue to clash in the future. As Chung and Schiff (2025) argue, sustainable AI integration requires a "social contract for automation" that redistributes efficiency gains in ways that protect psychological health and civic dignity. Across these strands of research, one theme is consistent: the social meaning of AI depends not on its algorithms but on the contexts in which they operate. When embedded within exploitative or opaque managerial cultures, AI reinforces asymmetries of power and weakens employee trust. Yet, when aligned with participatory ethics, transparent governance, and human-centred design, AI can genuinely augment rather than replace human capacities. The challenge for organisations, therefore, is not merely technological adoption but cultural translation - reframing AI as a cooperative partner rather than a disciplinary instrument.

5. ORGANISATIONAL CULTURE AND THE OPENNESS TO USE AI TOOLS

The organisational culture in which employees operate has become a crucial determinant of how artificial intelligence (AI) is adopted and discussed within the workplace. AI integration is not solely a technological or managerial issue but a cultural one. As Schein and Schein (2017) argue, culture shapes "the way things are done" in an organisation - what is rewarded, tolerated, or silenced. When applied to AI, this means that trust, transparency, and psychological safety define whether employees will use AI tools openly or conceal their reliance on them. Empirical studies show that innovative and learning-oriented cultures tend to facilitate openness toward AI. For example, Huang and Rust (2021) found that employees in organisations with a culture of experimentation were 37% more likely to engage with AI-driven analytics tools proactively. Similarly, a 2023 McKinsey survey reported that firms promoting "digital curiosity" saw significantly higher self-reported willingness to test generative AI models than those with more rigid, hierarchical norms (Chui et al., 2023).

Conversely, control-oriented or risk-averse cultures often suppress open discussion about AI. Workers in such settings fear being judged as "lazy" or "replaceable" if they admit to using automation tools (Fountaine et al., 2019). This echoes the early days of computerisation, when employees concealed spreadsheet automation to preserve perceived expertise. The current "AI stigma" mirrors that same defensive behaviour, especially in traditional industries where managerial cultures prioritise control over innovation. An equally significant factor is psychological safety

- the collective belief that one can voice ideas or admit mistakes without fear of reprisal (Edmondson, 2018). In cultures where psychological safety is low, employees hesitate to discuss AI usage, particularly in knowledge-intensive sectors where professional identity is tied to intellectual performance. On the other hand, organisations that normalise experimentation and treat AI as an augmenting rather than replacing technology report greater cross-departmental collaboration (McKinsey & Company, 2022). Practical case studies from large consulting and technology firms (e.g., PwC; IBM) demonstrate that framing AI as a human-centred, augmentative capability - emphasising collaboration (e.g., "human-AI collaboration" or "AI as a talent multiplier") - helps increase voluntary adoption and trust among employees. Empirical reports and practitioner playbooks from these organisations recommend messaging, governance and skills programmes that position AI as an enabler of better decisions rather than a replacement for human judgement (PwC, 2025). This cultural signalling reassures employees that AI use is a mark of competence rather than a confession of inadequacy. Furthermore, transparent communication about data governance and ethical safeguards fosters a climate of trust, making employees more inclined to share AI-based insights with peers (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). In summary, organisational culture functions as both the accelerator and the brake of AI adoption. Cultures that reward learning, collaboration, and openness create a fertile ground for AI-driven transformation. Those anchored in rigid hierarchies and implicit fear of replacement, however, generate "digital silence," where AI tools are used secretly, without shared learning. There is a sizable minority of workers in every generational cohort who are afraid of technology even without understanding it, so-called "technophobes", and it is a recursive category, since such workers appear with every technological advancement, but this time it seems to be more serious than when the computerisation was implemented (McClure, 2017). Therefore, cultivating a psychologically safe, trust-based, and learning-oriented culture is not merely an HR recommendation - it is the precondition for responsible and innovative AI integration.

6. PSYCHOLOGICAL AND MANAGERIAL MECHANISMS BEHIND THE CONCEALMENT OF AI USE

The concealment of AI use in contemporary workplaces has become a subtle yet widespread phenomenon. Employees increasingly rely on generative and analytical AI systems, but often hide this reliance from supervisors or peers. The roots of such behaviour are both psychological and managerial, stemming from deep-seated cultural norms and structural incentives within organisations. From a psychological standpoint, the first mechanism is impression management - the human tendency to control how one is perceived by others. When workers start to believe that their AI usage signals laziness or incompetence, they downplay or hide their interaction with these tools (Huang & Rust, 2018). This tendency is especially strong in knowledge-intensive sectors, where professional identity is tied to intellectual effort rather than digital facilitation. Employees thus fear that revealing AI assistance could devalue their expertise or originality (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). The discrepancy between the admitted use and the real use of AI is quite visible: 66% of individuals report that they do not use AI or use it only minimally when they are asked generally, but 43% of these respondents acknowledge that they regularly or sometimes use business products with AI if the question is more specific about the tasks (Ransbotham et al., 2022). The second psychological mechanism is AI anxiety, a composite of fear of replacement and loss of autonomy (Fountaine et al., 2019). Even when employees recognise AI's utility, they may experience "technological shame" - a reluctance to admit reliance on algorithms perceived as competitors rather than collaborators. Such anxiety suppresses open dialogue and creates a paradoxical situation where AI is both ubiquitous and invisible in everyday workflows (McKinsey & Company, 2022). Managerial mechanisms reinforce this silence.

Traditional performance appraisal systems tend to reward visible individual effort rather than outcome efficiency (Edmondson, 2018). As a result, workers are disincentivised from admitting that AI contributed to their productivity. Moreover, a lack of formal policies on acceptable AI use leaves employees uncertain about managerial attitudes. Several surveys indicate that a significant share of employees are using generative AI tools without informing their managers, often due to uncertainty about company policies or fear of disciplinary action. This ambiguity creates what Edmondson (2018) terms a "psychologically unsafe climate," where silence is perceived as the safer route. Furthermore, managerial opacity - the absence of transparent communication about AI's strategic role - deepens mistrust. When leaders fail to articulate whether AI is intended to augment or replace human labour, employees interpret every automation tool as a potential threat. In such contexts, concealment becomes a defensive survival strategy, protecting both job security and self-image (Chui et al., 2023). Ultimately, the concealment of AI use illustrates a broader organisational paradox: firms invest heavily in digital transformation yet maintain managerial cultures that penalise openness about it. Overcoming this requires reconfiguring both managerial systems and collective mindsets to treat AI as a legitimate extension of human capability rather than a sign of weakness or redundancy.

7. HOW GENERATION Z CHALLENGES AND RESHAPES TRADITIONAL MANAGERIAL EXPECTATIONS IN THE CONTEXT OF AI ADOPTION

Generation Z, born roughly between 1997 and 2012, is the first truly "AI-native" workforce cohort - raised alongside algorithms, recommendation engines, and machine learning interfaces. Their entry into the labour market has disrupted long-held managerial expectations about hierarchy, communication, and technological adaptation. Unlike previous generations that learnt to trust technology, Gen Z workers expect seamless integration of digital tools, including AI, as a normal part of everyday work (Francis & Hoefel, 2018). This generational disposition challenges traditional management in three key ways. First, Gen Z demands participatory decision-making and horizontal collaboration, rather than top-down control. Research by Deloitte (2025) indicates that Gen Z employees prefer managers who act as "mentors" rather than "supervisors." In the context of AI, this means they expect transparency and co-creation when new tools are introduced, not unilateral mandates. When leaders fail to include them in AI discussions, young employees often respond with disengagement or silent resistance (Chui et al., 2023). Their expectations are the following: when a human works together with AI, the human will be less constrained computationally, and the human-machine teams should make better decisions than humans alone (Page & Kallapur, 2025), not meaning less dull work and no additional tasks.

Second, Gen Z redefines what counts as professional competence. For them, using AI is not a shortcut but a demonstration of digital fluency and critical thinking. PwC's "Global Workforce Hopes & Fears 2024" states that among employees who use generative-AI daily, 82% expect it to make their work more efficient. While no exact generational ratio is publicly confirmed, large-scale surveys from PwC indicate younger workers (such as Gen Z) are significantly more likely to engage with generative AI tools than older cohorts, especially Baby Boomers (PwC, 2024). This contrasts with older managerial norms that equate visible effort with value. Consequently, friction arises when supervisors interpret AI reliance as a lack of diligence rather than as an intelligent optimisation strategy (Fountaine et al., 2019). Third, Gen Z's value system is closely tied to authenticity, ethics, and purpose, extending into their perception of AI. They are more likely to question opaque data practices, algorithmic bias, and the social impact of automation (Deloitte, 2025). Traditional managers, accustomed to technocratic adoption, are often unprepared for such ethical scrutiny from subordinates. This shift compels leaders to become educators and ethical

stewards, not just implementers of efficiency. Practically, this generational tension has prompted some companies to establish "reverse mentoring" programmes, where Gen Z employees advise senior managers on AI usage and digital trends (McKinsey & Company, 2022). These initiatives symbolise a cultural inversion of expertise - authority no longer flows strictly from experience but also from digital intuition. As Raisch and Krakowski (2021) note, successful AI transformation requires precisely this type of reciprocal learning, where managers unlearn outdated notions of control and embrace distributed intelligence. In sum, Generation Z is not merely adapting to AI-driven change - they are redefining its cultural logic. Their expectations for openness, ethics, and collaboration are forcing organisations to evolve from hierarchical command structures into networked, learning ecosystems. The question is no longer whether Gen Z will adapt to managerial norms, but whether management itself can adapt to them. If the management fails now, it would be even harder with Gen Alpha, which is said to be even less flexible and more demanding than the previous generation (Crumley, 2025).

8. FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

While no primary data (such as surveys or interviews) was collected in this phase, future research may include quantitative methods to test the hypotheses and themes presented here.

9. CONCLUSION

The convergence of technological, psychological, and generational forces ("the perfect storm" in HR management in the last decade) has created a profound shift in how organisations approach AI adoption. The studies reviewed here suggest that the success or failure of AI integration depends less on the technology itself and more on the human environment surrounding it. Organisational culture, psychological safety, and generational expectations jointly define whether AI becomes a shared instrument of progress or a hidden, mistrusted companion. A culture that values transparency, learning, and experimentation encourages employees to use and discuss AI tools openly, transforming the technology into a collaborative asset rather than a secret advantage. Conversely, when fear, hierarchy, or managerial opacity dominates, employees resort to concealment - protecting their self-image and job security instead of collective innovation. This concealment phenomenon underscores the persistence of industrial-era control logics within post-digital organisations. At the same time, Generation Z's arrival is accelerating this cultural reckoning. Their comfort with AI, demand for authenticity, and ethical sensitivity directly challenge managerial traditions built on surveillance and procedural authority. Gen Z expects a workplace where AI enhances human creativity, not one where it replaces or monitors it. Their influence is pushing organisations toward horizontal learning models, where expertise flows both upward and downward across generations. The implication is clear: sustainable AI transformation requires a human-centric recalibration of management itself. In its efforts to avoid the perception of AI adoption as a mutation of "working smarter, not harder" mutates into an implicit expectation of "working faster, for longer", managers must change their own managerial approaches in order to assure the frankness of their employees and their trust concerning the real AI usage. As we know from history, great painters never worked all alone on all their masterpieces - they usually made sketches, and their pupils finished the paintings with the master's colours and mannerism - it did not make the paintings less valuable or "less theirs". In the aviation industry, pilots did not become obsolete with the arrival of automatic pilots, nor did their salaries suffer a downgrade. The same should apply in the other areas of business. Efficiency gains thus should be redistributed to benefit employees, and not reinvested into more demanding output targets, as we mentioned in the beginning. Finally, the answer to the question "Should AI be an autopilot, a copilot, a servant, a competitor, or

a surveillance tool?“ should therefore be „a copilot“, and there is no wonder that one of the most advanced AI tools bears that very name. Therefore, leaders must evolve from supervisors into facilitators, HR must become the guardian of psychological safety, and employees - especially younger ones - must be empowered as co-creators in the digital ecosystem with no fear that they would be fired or burdened with more tasks. When these elements align, AI adoption ceases to be a threat to human value and becomes, instead, a reflection of it. The “perfect HRM storm” thus becomes an opportunity: a chance to rebuild organisational life on trust, openness, and shared intelligence rather than fear and control. It is therefore useful to promote the perception of AI tools as a “copilot” that allows the worker to focus on the creative and strategic components of the job, while routine or data-intensive tasks are taken over by the AI, alleviating the fear of being redundant and expelled from the workplace.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful for the support within the project of the Department for General Disciplines in Technology, Faculty of Technical Sciences Novi Sad entitled “Socio-technological aspects of improving the teaching process in the English language in fundamental disciplines”.

References

Acemoglu, D. (2025). The simple macroeconomics of AI, *Economic Policy*, *40*(121), 13–58, https://doi.org/10.1093/epolic/eiae042

Burleigh, E. (2025). *Billionaire bosses like Jeff Bezos and Reid Hoffman denounce work-life balance—and some think working nonstop is key to success*, https://fortune.com/2025/10/15/billionaire-ceo-jeff-bezos-reid-hoffman-work-life-balance-careers-business-boundaries-success-entrepreneurs-38-hour-workweek/

Burrell, J. (2016). How the machine ‘thinks’: Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data & Society*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951715622512

Chui, M., Hazan, E., Roberts, R., Singla, A., Smaje, K., Sukharevsky, A., Yee, L., & Zemmel, R. (2023). *The Economic Potential of Generative AI: The Next Productivity Frontier*, McKinsey & Company.

Chung, C. H., & Schiff, D. S. (2025). AI and the Social Contract. *Proceedings of the AAAI/ACM Conference on AI, Ethics, and Society*, *8*(1), 615-627. https://doi.org/10.1609/aies.v8i1.36575

Crist, C. (2025). 42% of Gen Z workers say they’re turning to blue-collar roles for security, HR Dive, www.hrdive.com/news/gen-z-workers-say-theyre-turning-to-blue-collar-roles-for-security/749115

Crumley, B. (2025). Generation Alpha May Find the Workplace Even Tougher Than Gen-Z Does, Inc.com, *www.inc.com/bruce-crumley/generation-alpha-may-find-the-workplace-even-tougher-than-gen-z-does/91248959*

Davenport, T. H., & Mittal, N. (2023). *All-in on AI: How smart companies win big with artificial intelligence.* Harvard Business Review Press.

Deloitte. (2025). *2025 Gen Z and Millennial Survey: Growth and the pursuit of money, meaning, and well-being*

Edmondson, A. (2018). *The Fearless Organisation: Creating Psychological Safety in the Workplace for Learning, Innovation, and Growth*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Farrell, H., Gopnik, A., Shalizi, C., & Evans, J. (2025). Large AI models are cultural and social technologies. *Science, 387*(6739), 1153-1156. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adt9819

Fountaine, T., McCarthy, B., & Saleh, T. (2019). Building the AI-powered organisation. *Harvard Business Review, 97*(4), 62–73.

Francis, T., & Hoefel, F. (2018). True Gen: Generation Z and its implications for companies. *McKinsey & Company.*

Fuchs, O., Lorenz, E., & Fuchs, L. (2024). Generational differences in attitudes towards work and career: A systematic literature review on the preferences of generations X, Y, and Z. *International Journal of Innovative Research and Advanced Studies*, *11*(7), 54-71.

Grasiaswaty, N. (2025). Algorithmic human resource management: A brief introduction and managerial toolkit. *EWOP in Practice*. *19*(1), 61–76. https://doi.org/10.21825/ewopinpractice.94698.

Haenlein, M., Kaplan, A., Tan, C. W., & Zhang, P. (2019). Artificial intelligence (AI) and management analytics. *Journal of Management Analytics*, *6*(4), 341–343. https://doi.org/10.1080/23270012.2019.1699876

Huang, M.-H., & Rust, R. T. (2018). Artificial Intelligence in Service. *Journal of Service Research*, *21*(2), 155-172. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670517752459

Huang, M.-H., & Rust, R. T. (2021). Engaged to a robot? The role of AI in service. *Journal of Service Research, 24*(1), 30–41. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670520902266

Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(1), 366–410. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174

Kraus, S., Palmer, C., Kailer, N., Kallinger, F. L., & Spitzer, J. (2019). Digital entrepreneurship: A research agenda on new business models for the twenty-first century. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behavior & Research*, 25(2), 353–375. https://doi.org/10.1108/ijebr-06-2018-0425

Lee, M. K., Kusbit, D., Metsky, E., & Dabbish, L. (2015). Working with machines: The impact of algorithmic and data-driven management on human workers. *Proceedings of the 33rd ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computer* Systems (CHI '15), Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1603 – 1612, https://doi.org/10.1145/2702123.2702548

Mateescu, A., & Nguyen, A. (2019). *Explainer: Algorithmic management in the workplace.* Data & Society Research Institute.

McAfee, A., & Brynjolfsson, E. (2017). *Machine, platform, crowd: Harnessing our digital future.* WW Norton & Company.

McClure, P. K. (2017). "You're Fired," Says the Robot: The Rise of Automation in the Workplace, Technophobes, and Fears of Unemployment. *Social Science Computer Review*, *36*(2), 139-156. https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439317698637

McKinsey & Company. (2022). *The State of AI in 2022.* https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai-in-2022-and-a-half-decade-in-review

Möhlmann, M., & Zalmanson, L. (2017). Hands on the wheel: Navigating algorithmic management and Uber drivers' autonomy. 38th International Conference on Information Systems (ICIS 2017)

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

PwC. (2024). PwC 2024 Global Workforce Hopes & Fears Survey: Workers embrace AI and prioritise skills growth amid rising workloads and an accelerating pace of change. PricewaterhouseCoopers Global Report.

PwC. (2025). *SXSW 2025 key insights.* PricewaterhouseCoopers.

Rahwan, I., Cebrian, M., Obradovich, N., Bongard, J., Bonnefon, J. F., Breazeal, C., Crandall, J. W., Christakis, N. A., Couzin, I. D., Jackson, M. O., Jennings, N. R., Kamar, E., Kloumann, I. M., Larochelle, H., Lazer, D., McElreath, R., Mislove, A., Parkes, D. C., Pentland, A. S., 1, Roberts, M. E., Shariff, A., Tenenbaum, J. B., & Wellman, M. (2019). Machine behaviour. *Nature, 568*, 477–486. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1138-y

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

Ransbotham, S., Kiron, D., Candelon, F., Khodabandeh, S., & Chu, M. (2022). Achieving Individual — and Organisational — Value With AI, MIT Sloan Management Review, https://sloanreview.mit.edu/projects/achieving-individual-and-organizational-value-with-ai/

Resume Builder. (2025). *4 in 10 Gen Z College Grads Are Turning To Blue-Collar Work for Job Security*, www.resumebuilder.com/4-in-10-gen-z-college-grads-are-turning-to-blue-collar-work-for-job-security

Rosenblat, A. (2018). *Uberland: How algorithms are rewriting the rules of work.* University of California Press. https://doi.org/10.1525/9780520970632

Schein, E. H., & Schein, P. A. (2017). *Organisational Culture and Leadership, 5th edition*. John Wiley & Sons.

Schroth, H. (2019). Are you ready for Gen Z in the workplace? *California Management Review, 61*(3), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619841006

Susskind, R., & Susskind, D. (2015). The Future of the Professions: How Technology Will Transform the Work of Human Experts. Oxford University Press, https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198713395.001.0001