DOI: https://doi.org
CapitalMark Journal of Marketing & Finance
Journal homepage: https://rjsaonline.org/index.php/CapitalMark

Role of AI In Reshaping Empathy, Influence, and Organizational Culture in the Workplace

Aqsa Akbar[1]
[1]Islamia university Bahawalpur
Email: aqsaakbar76@hotmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Received:
June 02, 2025
Revised:
July 04, 2025
Accepted:
July 29, 2025
Available Online:
August 06, 2025

Keywords: *Artificial intelligence; Algorithmic management; Empathy-at-scale; Organizational culture; Workplace surveillance; Algorithmic authority; Employee well-being; Sociomateriality*

Corresponding Author:
aqsaakbar76@hotmail.com

Abstract

The paper focuses on the ways in which artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming empathy, influence, and organizational culture in modern working environments. It can be conceptualized as using a secondary qualitative design, featuring reflexive thematic synthesis of existing empirical and conceptual research to define AI systems as sociomaterial actors that interpose the expression of care, the exercise of authority, and the encoding of norms. The analysis concludes that AI-driven chatbots, emotion analytics, and decision systems, under the conditions of transparency, participating, and defined as an enhancement of human judgment, can reduce interactional barriers, provide timely help, enhance consistency, and procedural fairness. Nevertheless, in cases where AI is not transparent, personalized, or criminalizing, it conditions the surveillance, deepens emotional work, takes away autonomy, and discourages a spirit of togetherness instead of unity. In a variety of settings, empathy-at-scale becomes wobbly and, at best, feels as artificial and imposed as it can be. The paper presents that, human impact of AI is neither technologically predetermined but rather, depends on governance, labor voice and adherence to organizational values. It ends with a set of practical suggestions on how AI should be designed to be an accountable, rights-respecting, and culturally coherent infrastructure, which facilitates, not replaces, humane and just types of organizing.

Introduction

Background and Context

AI has gone beyond being an efficiency tool on the back-end to a life mediator within an organization. Nowadays, AI-based recruitment systems, performance analytics, chatbots, recommender engines, and large language model (LLM) assistants influence how leaders communicate, how care and recognition are indicated, and how behavioral norms are enforced in a dispersed and hybrid workplace (Budhwar et al., 2022; Florea and Croitoru, 2025). Instead of being neutral channels, the systems are involved in organizational sense-making, sifting whose voices are given more power, which risks are prioritized, and what is deemed valid or legitimate or even professional behavior (Bevilacqua et al., 2025; Murire, 2024). This reconstitution directly involves fundamental tools of relations empathy, influence, and culture via which work is felt and managed.

Problematization

The spread of AI enhances conflicts between optimization logics and human-centered values. Although AI is linked to accuracy, scalability, and consistency in organizations, there is emerging evidence to identify an increased perception of surveillance, diminished autonomy, affective and emotional detachment, and diminished psychological safety as systems of algorithms and opaque decisions become widely adopted within the business domain (Zayid et al., 2024; Budhwar et al., 2022). The argument of empathetic or human-like AI interfaces is dangerous as it may introduce scripted or instrumental

empathy that venerates power imbalance, particularly when workers receive AI-medated ratings, nudges or messages as data-driven but a-context-blind. The extant literature has increased particularities of isolating themes: AI and leadership effectiveness, AI and employee experience, or AI and organizational culture; however, there has been no systematic attempt to merge how AI technologies at once transform the practices of empathy, structures, and cultural norms. These divisions prevent both theoretical and practical knowledge about the more serious social impacts of AI.

Aim of the Study

This paper will critically look at the ways in which AI is transforming the performance and experience of empathy, how it exercises managerial and leadership power, and how the culture of modern workplaces develops. It aims to draw the difference between situations where AI enhances humane and trustful organizing and those where it promotes dehumanizing, disciplinary, or exclusionary processes by synthesizing recent empirical and conceptual research.

Research Questions

RQ1: How do AI systems mediate and transform expressions of empathy in the workplace?
RQ2: How does AI reconfigure managerial and leadership influence, including authority, legitimacy, and persuasion?

RQ3: In what ways does AI-driven decision-making and communication affect organizational culture, particularly trust, values, inclusion, and autonomy?

Literature Review

Conceptual Foundations

In this context, AI in the workplace can be conceptualized as socio-technical systems that enable or automate decision-making, monitoring, communication, and people management, a list that includes predictive HR analytics and recommendation engines, chatbots, digital assistants, and algorithmic management systems (Jarrahi, 2018; Maedche et al., 2019; Murire, 2024). These systems are not understood as a neutral tool but through a sociomaterial lens (Orlikowski, 2007; Cecez-Kecmanovic et al., 2014): in these systems, emotions are visible and whose performance counts; authority is enacted.

Empathy is considered both thought (seeing other people and what they think) and feeling (feeling with other people), applied further to the idea of organizational compassion via institutionalized practices of care. The conceptualization of influence is understood as a fact which is supposed to determine meaning and behaviour through formal hierarchy, expertise, and even more algorithmic authority, in which outputs of the system seem to be objective or better (Logg et al., 2019). Organizational culture is considered as a mutual set of assumptions, values and symbols according to which sense-making is realized; AI enters the situation by coding norms into metrics, dashboards and automatic nudges (Faraj et al., 2018; Murire, 2024).

Several theoretical anchors appear: the sociomateriality theory of AI as a constitutive part of social relations; the concept of algorithmic management and digital Taylorism reveal how the control of data redesigns work design; the concept of emotional labor and empathy-at-scale makes the inferences about scripted care within the automated interfaces; organizational justice and the theory of trusts examine the concept of fairness, transparency, and legitimacy of AI-based decisions; the modern approach of leadership (e-leadership, augmented leadership) makes AI an assistant in sense-making,

Empathy and AI in the Workplace

There are empirical studies on assistants based on AI, wellbeing platforms and conversational agents that are suggestive that AI can scaffold or simulate empathy. Maedche et al. (2019) demonstrate that digital assistants provide potential perceptions of social presence and support but also suggest a risk of over-dependence and a reduced need to communicate with real human beings. Adam et al. (2021) show that user compliance to chatbots when anthropomorphic evidence is used grows, which shows the instrumental application of the principle of relational design. Mental health and wellbeing chatbots (e.g., Wysa-type systems; Casu et al., 2024; Wahbeh et al., 2023) exemplify the potential of AI in extending inexpensive 24/7-support, but also show the risks of providing empty and uninformed answers to situations with tricky emotional undertones.

In all these studies, AI does not have emotions commonly referred to empathy; it simply does it with programmed language, sentiment identification, and responsiveness. The review of the trust in AI by Glikson and Woolley (2020) indicates that people can provide cognitive trust to competent systems and still doubt their socio-emotional genuineness. In an ethics of care and relational coordination perspective, AI can enhance humane organization where it is implemented to reveal cries of distress, redistribute human emotional labor or respond to human needs in a timely manner but is problematic when implemented to pacify, manipulate or obscure organizational blame. These questions within the literature, however, are

handled on the interface / user-experience level with little incorporation into larger-scale cultural and power developments.

AI, Influence and Power Dynamics.

The algorithmic management study indicates the growing influence of AI systems on the managerial role, which is being built by monitoring, ranking, forecasting, and nudging. Parent-Rocheleau and Parker (2022) also define the use of algorithms that perform the central management roles of goal setting, evaluation, scheduling and even termination, thus bringing control to opaque, data-driven processes. In the research by Rosenblat and Stark (2016), Uber is examined with the focus on the ways in which the algorithmic-based rating systems, information asymmetries, and automated incentives silently discipline the workers despite the rhetoric of autonomy. These findings are also supported by Brougham and Haar (2018) who state that the consciousness of smart technologies and algorithms (STARA) may lead to anxiety, a drop in commitment, and anticipatory compliance.

On the perceptual level, Logg et al. (2019) demonstrate so-called algorithm appreciation: individuals occasionally have more trust and adhere to algorithm advice in preference to human judgment to render the systems more authoritative and the fairness literature cautions that what might seem fair relies on transparency, voice, and explainability (Saxena et al., 2022). The literature on systematic reviews of algorithmic decision-making in the HR highlights the issues of hidden biases, the inability to appeal, and unfair effects among the groups, which undermine the validity of AI-based decision-making.

Associated with Foucaultian concepts of surveillance and panopticism, AI-based dashboards, productivity ratings and behavioral nudging are an extension of soft control: employees become self-controlling hoping to be quantified as an intervention by a manager, even when no manager is physically present. This literature explains the redistribution of influence, between individual supervisors and designers, vendors and data infrastructures, making it seem distributive, but tends to separate power, fairness and emotion as dissimilar subjects and does not see them as part of cultural experience in an ordinary sense.

AI and Organisational Culture Change.

Research on AI adoption implies the change towards cultures of data focus, performance intensity and risk management. Murire (2024) summarizes evidence that AI-based automation and analytics encourage principles of efficiency, measurability and round-the-clock supervision and raise resistance, ethical issues and demand participatory governance. According to Faraj, Pachidi, and Sayegh (2018), by learning algorithms, expert boundaries and coordination patterns become normalized, standardizing relative deference to machine outputs and changes in the ways things are done in organizations.

On the one hand, the scholarship of HR and management associates AI and digital HRM with tighter cultures that are more agile and analytics-oriented, on the other hand, it is associated with increased job insecurity and technostress (Meijerink et al., 2021; Brougham and Haar, 2018). New studies on AI and the employee experience (Farooq, 2025) demonstrate that framing of the leadership, encompassing AI as either being augmentative, fair, and values aligned or coercive and punitive, has a strong influence on trust, inclusion, openness to experimentation. But the empirical stories are still very patchy: one kind of reporting talks about AI-enabled cultures of innovation; another one reports anxiety, hyper-compliance, or low-level resistance when employees view AI as an intruder or something that is value-misaligned.

Synthesis and Gap

There are three constraints across these streams. To start with, the empathy-oriented literature revolves around interface design and user responses but seldom relates the concept of algorithmic empathy to power relations or cultural accounts of care and control. Second, theorization of algorithmic management and fairness heavily conceptualizes surveillance, legitimacy and prejudice, but pays less focus to the role these systems play in transforming felt empathetic and day-to-day relational climates. Third, organizational cultural studies record changes to datafication and automation without the systemic association to emerging modes of influence and affective life.

The few that follow an integrated sociometrical approach by explaining how AI co-produces empathy practices (who or what is believed and obeyed), influence architectures (who or what is believed and obeyed), and cultural norms (what is acceptable, fair and humane) in different organizational contexts. To fill this gap, the current secondary qualitative research is warranted and will theorize AI as not a tool, but an actor of recreating the moral and relational status quo of the modern work environment.

Methodology

The paper follows a qualitative research design, which is based on integrative and interpretivist review of literature, in order

to study the transformations in empathy, influence, and organizational culture at work due to the introduction of AI. The review does not jointly sum the effect sizes but evolves a theoretically grounded synthesis of mediation of relational dynamics, power constructions, and cultural conventions of organizational settings to societal instruments of socio-technical AI. The methodology is consistent with recommendations that characterize literature reviews as independent and de facto research in the case of systematic and transparent research (Snyder, 2019).

The search of Scopus, Web of science, Business source complete, Psyc information and IEEE xplore, combination of terms was used to identify the relevant peer reviewed work concerning artificial intelligence, algorithmic management, empathy, emotion, leadership, influence, organizational culture, trust and surveillance. This search has been restricted to publications in the last five years (2015-2025) to define the modern AI structure, where the theoretically significant previous foundations have been incorporated. Curriculum was narrowed by reference chaining and targeted searches of identified journals and conferences by a logic of hermeneutic, iterative search, reading, and interpretation processes that successively informed each other (Boell and Cecez-Kecmanovic, 2014).

Inclusion criterion: Studies whose main focus is on AI or algorithmic systems in a work/ organization setting and reported either primary empirical evidence or meaningful conceptual discussion of at least one of the main constructs empathy or socio-emotional experience, managerial/ algorithmic influence, and organizational culture, climate, or values. The rest of the left out included exclusively technical performance papers, applications by consumers without an organizational prism, opinion pieces that were not well conceptualized, and sources that were not methodologically transparent. These limits provided conceptual relevance and strength of responding to research questions.

The information on every study contained was put into an analytic table that included the contexts and functions of AI, the methodology used, sampling, and major results of studies addressing the empathy practices, dynamics of influence, and cultural implications. Reflexive thematic synthesis was then implemented based on available methods of thematic synthesis of qualitative studies (Thomas and Harden, 2008) and reflexive thematic analysis (Braun and Clarke, 2019). The discussion followed convergences, tensions, and border conditions in cross-sectoral and cross-geographical circumstances and the conceptualization of how AI agency and entanglement to human actors and institutions are understood.

Quality appraisal has looked at clarity of research design, transparency of data collection and analysis, coherence in between evidence and claims as well as sufficiency of contextualization. Appraisal was used to weight the studies included in the synthesis as opposed to being viewed as a mechanical exclusion methods. Reflexivity is also important: the reviewers recognized the way that normative issues of injustice, surveillance, values based on humanity may influence the interpretation. Some of the most vital limitations include the fact that it relies on published literature, which might be biased towards big Western companies and rapidly changing technologies, as well as the fact that thematic synthesis is an interpretive approach to building theory and does not have to be generalizable.

Findings

Chatbots and Situated Empathy at Work

Gkinko and Elbanna (2022) demonstrate that a trustworthy and reliable internal AI chatbot can induce hope and playfulness as well as perceived empathy when it responds to promptly and lessens the interaction pressure to facilitate a friendlier help-seeking climate. On the contrary, users are constantly reminded of the fact that the system does not really care, which makes the system an otherwise useful but affectless continuation of the organization. The same conclusion is also drawn by Al-Zahrani (2025), who identifies the presence of apprehensions about the loss of human communication as one of the conditions related to the regular use of chatbots, despite the fact that students value 24/7 communications. Collectively, these researches imply AI is able to support low-dynamism, pseudo empathic interactions at the cost of making slimmer relational ties regular. They are both constrained by self-report survey/qualitative information and situation-specific samples (single organization; higher education), which restricts generalizability to different workplaces.

Emotion Analytics: Empathy Signal or Surveillance Signal

According to Behn et al. (2024), the readiness of employees to accept AI-based emotion analytics in virtual meetings is conditional on whether it is reported as group feedback of the possible ways to improve or individual monitoring. The technology is seen as contributing to the socio-emotional awareness when transparency and collective gain are prioritized; as damaging trust and promoting emotional self-censorship when intentions are hidden. The results of Behn et al. show the degree to which similar control-sliding “empathetic tools can transform into control, compared to more positive staging suggested by Gkinko and Elbanna (2022). They did not address long-term behavioral outcomes because their survey design and orientation on hypothetical/early-stage deployments did not concern them.

AI-Augmented Service Work: Enhanced Influence, Intensified Emotional Labor

As demonstrated by Henkel et al. (2020), when the frontline employees are assisted by the AI-based emotion recognition, they are more capable of controlling the emotions of customers and enhancing the satisfaction which, in turn, makes their persuasive power even greater. However, there is augmentation alongside augmented emotional labor and pressure in behavior and emotion to adhere to AI feedback of how they ought to feel and behave. Unlike the accessibility aspect of chatbots, the present piece of work reveals how AI-based empathy tools can serve to strengthen the normative control of high-contact jobs. The research is confined to experimental and service sectors and does not follow long-term cultural outcomes, including burnout or opposition

Chatbots and the Substitution of Human Relational Work

The use of AI chatbots as a more reliable source of emotional support in care-related situations is negatively associated with the perceptions of the reduced need in emotional support, as well as the aversion toward consulting human advisors, which means that AI help will substitute and not complement the human care (Al-Zahrani, 2025). In comparison with Henkel et al. (2020) in which AI only supplements human interaction, this means that bad chatbot integration may carve out genuine relational relationships. The student-centered, cross-sectional design and self-selection into chatbot use makes causal arguments difficult, but the trend is suggesting to organizations that culturally responsive bots can destroy, not strengthen, cultures of mutual support when used as a replacement, not a pathway, to human interaction.

AI, Well-Being, and Conditional Supportive Cultures

As demonstrated by Valtonen et al. (2025), the use of AI does not directly achieve better employee well-being, but its outcomes are mediated by task design, clarity, and safety. When AI decreases uncertainty and risks, it helps create a more nurturing, sustainable world; when it speeds up the pace or extends observations using the limited resources, stress is generated. This is in contrast to the optimistic accounts in chatbot and augmentation research by highlighting that being empathetic to holding cultural results does not rely on AI as such but on how AI can reshape the job demands. The survey design, which is firm based and is concentrated on a single national situation, does not give much understanding of marginalized groups and experiences on a micro-level.

Emotion AI and Governance of Inner Life

Roemmich et al. (203) discover that employees perceive Emotion AI, which deduces affect or voice or other data, as such a deep violation of emotional privacy and the means to impose rightful emotions. In comparison with Behn et al. (2024), who outline that under aggregation of data, there is conditional acceptance, Roemmich et al. point out the view through which small-scale, personal-scale sensing restates empathy as unidirectional examination. Since it is a conference study on conceptual and early-stage deployments it provides abundant normative data, but little longitudinal evidence on organizational results.

Remote Surveillance and Psychological Safety

According to Vitak and Zimmer (2023), the pandemic has led to an increased incidence of digital monitoring, which causes stress and feelings of uncertainty and power inequality and makes employees reserve some behavior in the expectation of being surveilled. However, on the contrary, the results related to AI surveillance bringing about mental safety and trust were weakening their findings, despite narratives of AI facilitating supportive oversight. Self-reported US statistics and pandemic-related circumstances are drawbacks, but the article effectively demonstrates how AI setups anticipate empathy (support, protection) or suspicion (control) with profound cultural impacts.

Algorithmic Control in Gig Work as a Cultural Template

Wood et al. (2019) unveil the impact of rating systems, automated matching and non-transparent sanctions in gig platforms on autonomy and the sustenance of a discourse of flexibility, where workers must predict what the algorithms want. Platform algorithms are pretentious little to empathetic existing compared to internal chatbot or wellbeing tools, normalizing data-driven discipline and instrumental relations. They may be new dynamics in the traditional firms, despite being geared towards gig work, even though the expectations are being informed. This study has well-compensated comparative evidence; it is limited by the fact that it is old, and the extrapolation to the present tools should be very cautious.

Algorithmic Constraints, Injustice, and Exit

Yu et al. (2025) reveal that the presence of algorithmic behavioral limits and monitoring in Chinese gig economies escalates turnover intentions through relative deprivation, and customized guideline could alleviate damages. This puts Wood et al.

(2019) in a more specific perspective suggesting that not every algorithmic control is as corrosive: making rules predictable and clear, some degree of fairness can be kept. Nevertheless, this research is geographically particular and industry-localized. Both articles point out that in the context of AI governance that values discipline over dignity, distrust and vulnerability, but not loyalty and sympathy culture, are formed.

Worker Voice and Contestation under Algorithmic Management

Hakansta et al. (2024) conclude that powerful unions and social discourse in Swedish warehousing, retailing, and transport industries may confine intrusive algorithmic systems, concluding victors such as consultation, minimal data collection, or decreased levels of surveillance. Unlike the settings that Wood et al. (2019) and Yu et al. (2025) demonstrate, the effect of AI on culture in this case is counteracted partly by the influence of institutionalized, which advocates more participatory norms. Being explorative research largely relying on interviews and case information, it might oversample the comparatively organized places of job, whereas it demonstrates that the cultural impacts of AI are not predetermined by the technological factor.

Algorithmic Management and Occupational Health Risks

Nilsson (2025) finds out that the high exposure to algorithmic management in the logistics industry is associated with higher psychosocial risks, such as stress and a lack of recovery in particular where the metrics are so intense, and employee contribution is low. In comparison with Valtonen et al. (2025) who emphasize on the existence of conditional positive ways, the findings of Nilsson underscore the expenses of the so-called always-on measurement cultures. The comparative case approach is incapable of enforcing causality but converging evidence on top of surveillance studies supports this argument: that AI-based control architecture can render unbelievable any plausible account on empathic, caring culture.

Algorithmic Management in Traditional Workplaces: Hybrid Outcomes

Nordic case studies of algorithmic management in the traditional workplaces presented by Cox et al. (2024) demonstrate heterogeneous results: at one place, the algorithmic scheduling brings fairness and transparency to the process; at another, face to face ambiguous results through opaque scoring and intensifying. In contrast to more consistently negative gig outcomes, these instances demonstrate hybrid cultures in that AI can either enshrine fairness or lock in asymmetry, based on co-design, transparency, and recourse. The qualitative design (Multi country) is a virtue, but inter-sectoral differences and changes in tools restrict uncritical generalization.

Through these twelve strands, there is a strong overall trend that can be examined whereby transparent, participatory, and human-monitored AI systems can help foster cultures of responsiveness and perceived fairness, whereas opaque, individualizing, and punitive deployments destroy empathy, legitimacy, and trust. Study limitations context specificity, cross-sectional designs, and self-reported perceptions, a reflection of these limitations signify the results to be interpreted as productive trends, but not necessarily final destinations, and again the careful, ethically considerate adoption of AI in organizational life is recommended.

Analysis

The findings corroborate the main argument of the literature review that AI in the work place is not a neutral resource but a sociomaterial agent that rearranges the cultural, perceived, and enacted empathy, influence, and culture. Research on AI chatbots and emotion analytics indicates that the infrastructure created to mother employees is working according to the current power dispensation and sometimes diminishes interactional boundaries, whereas in other cases exerts more control. This is in line with sociomaterial standpoints that define technologies as a constitutive component of organizational practices and meanings but not as an addition (Orlikowski, 2007; Cecez-Kecmanovic et al., 2014). In contrast with the previous research, which overlooks the opportunities of AI to enhance decision-making and coordination (Jarrahi, 2018; Faraj et al., 2018), the current synthesis shows that the concept of augmentation is normatively charged: it has the ability to code solidaristic and disciplinary logics into our daily lives.

On empathy, the literature review identified potentially productive work to support social presence, responsiveness, and available support by means of AI-based assistants and relational interfaces (Maedche et al., 2019; Adam et al., 2021; Casu et al., 2024), which was calmed down by the anxiety about authenticity and over-dependence (Glikson and Woolley, 2020). This optimism is backed by the results and justified by them. Gkinko and Elbanna (2022) demonstrate that employees can find chatbots as a friendly, not too stressful medium, but Al-Zahrani (2025) mentions that extensive use of chatbots may push out human connections and reduce the feeling of emotional support. Combined, these findings are in opposition to celebratory beliefs of empathy at scale: AI-mediated empathy is often superficial, contingent and can be readily interpreted as artificial. The more automated the relational work is the larger the possibility of the employees perceiving the term care as

performative instead of genuine. Weaknesses of these research-single-context samples, cross-sectional designs-implicate the impact of these studies in the long-term relational climates, which has not yet been examined, yet the trend of the direction tends to take away an overzealous interest.

The conflict between empathy and surveillance is even more acute in the face of comparing such tools as the group level sentiment analytics and the individualized Emotion AI. Behn et al. (2024) discover that transparent emotion analytics in aggregate form can be regarded as facilitating team cognition, which is partially consistent with organizational justice views with their emphasis on procedural fairness and clearness. In contrast, Roemmich et al. (2023) point out that personal emotion acknowledgment is highly interpreted as intrusive and punitive, reflecting the main anxieties of online Taylorism and panoptic regulating. Both sets of results make previous assertions that additional information regarding affect will inherently provide support or addition much more difficult; rather they show that at some stage, affect reaches a sort of critical point where sensing is no longer empathetic attentiveness and instead is coercive examination. These findings are limited by the fact that much of this evidence is from early-stage or experimental deployments, however, across the studies the trend is consistent: without explicitly, value-led governance, empathetic AI is soon re-signified as surveillance.

Regarding the influence and power, the literature review explained how influence is redistributed to the opaque system with the help of algorithmic management, creating "algorithmic appreciation" as well as anxiety, problematic issues with bias, and diminished autonomy (Rosenblat and Stark, 2016; Brougham and Haar, 2018; Parent-Rocheleau and Parker, 2022; Logg et al., 2019; Saxena et al., 2022). These findings elaborate such an argument by demonstrating empirically how such dynamics influence the culture of life. Platform work, described by Wood et al. (2019) and Yu et al. (2025), is used as an illustration of how anticipatory obedience and relative deprivation are normalized with the use of ratings, automated penalties, and behavioral constraints. Nilsson (2025) and Vitak and Zimmer (2023) also discover that extensive surveillance in logistics and in remote work cause stress and self-censorship and makes one think that they are under constant audit. These outcomes substantiate theoretical concerns over algorithmic authority and compare with mythically virtuous portrayal of AI as a decision support tool: in the real world, systems tend to put more focus on control and efficiency, empathy and dignity being considered secondary or aesthetic. The context-specific sectors and the non-experimental designs are both methodological limits that do not allow making definite causal assertions but the overlap of systems is substantial.

Meanwhile, the results complicate any of the deterministic interpretation of AI as a dehumanizing idea per se. Hakansta et al. (2024) and Cox et al. (2024) demonstrate that in the areas of the institutionalization of unions, consultation, and co-design, the use of algorithmic tools can be transformed to boost the level of transparency, equity of scheduling, or employee participation. This partly supports justice and participation theories that assert that the views of legitimacy are dependent on voice, explainability as well as recourse in addition to automation. Similarly, according to Henkel et al. (2020) and Valtonen et al. (2025), AI could also help improve service encounters and help employees work safer and more effectively when used in terms of attentive workload, resources, and autonomy. Compared to the gig-platform context by Wood et al. (2019), these hybrid scenarios indicate that cultural impacts of AI are concatenated: similar technologies lead to divergent paths, based on the governance regime around the world, and the value commitments. Nevertheless, such better case studies are still less and may be limited, at least, in the short run, so data of long-lasting, AI-made humane cultures are still rather sparse.

The synthesis combines empathy, influence, and culture to highlight some cross cut patterns. First, AI-mediated empathy can only be valid in the conditions of visible human responsibility and the absence of the weaponization of the data; otherwise, it confirms the impression of manipulation and control. This is a direct association of micro-level processes in chatbot and wellbeing systems to macro-judgments of whether the organization is actually caring or it is simply optimizing. Second, the opaque, punitive, and individually inflexible attributes that are recurrently linked to increased stress, turnover intentions, and distrusts but can be balanced through the transparency of rules and their collective negotiation like in certain Nordic and unionized settings make algorithmic influence corrosive. Third, organizational culture is demonstrated to coexist and be the result of AI use: existing norms of participation, ethics, and respect determine how systems are set up, and these setups in turn indicate whose feelings are important, whose voice is listened to, and what types of obedience are the norm.

On the whole, the results of the current study support the theoretical statement of the literature review that empathy, influence, and culture are recoded as a nexus together, but not as individual domains. They mediate the optimistic ways of technology to point to the failure of the augmentation stories in seconds when surveillance and pressure ensue in response to the British system where the governance, transparency, and worker voice are feeble. Simultaneously, they oppose a strictly dystopian resolution by demonstrating an empirical space where institutions, leadership decisions and participatory design refocus AI on more equitable, dialogical and trust-affirming practices. Central to the entire implication of the weight of evidence, regardless of the recognized methodological constraints of different studies, is that the role of AI in remaking the work-based humanity is, at best, political and organizational as opposed to technical and cannot be addressed as a technical problem in research and practice.

Conclusion and Recommendations

This paper demonstrates that AI is re-engineering the following aspects of empathy, influence, and organizational culture in a powerful and not predetermined way. Throughout the evidence, the idea of AI systems turns out to be a sociomaterial force shaping the way of signaling care, the form of exercising authority, and what constitutes the good employee. Chatbots, analytics, and algorithmic management can sustain more efficient and smooth-running support, better expectations, and equitable processes when they are transparent, participatory, and when this is expressly outlined as something that augments and does not remove human judgment. They become discriminatory, personal, and possibly penal in nature, which upsurge surveillance, emotional pressure, and feelings of unfairness, disrupting the aspects of psychological safety and trust. In reality Empathy-at-scale tends to be weak: without human responsibility and moral bridges, it soon begins to seem pre-canned, performance-driven, or forced instead of empathetic. Altogether, the effect of AI on humanity in the workplace is not determined by technology but by people in the institutions, design option, and voice mechanism.

Recommendations

Organizations should:

1. **Design to augment and be answerable:** Place AI as a decision or early-warning layer, and the results of the system are clearly assigned responsibility to humans, particularly in HR, wellbeing, and performance decision-making.
2. **Be open, understandable and subject to human oversight:** Communicate the monitored and how the data is planned to be utilized, how the employees can screen or rectify the artificial intelligence-based decision making.
3. **Maintain emotional privacy and reduce intrusive sensing:** Emotion AI and hyper-surveillance that seeks to monitor inner world; embody aggregated, minimal and proportionate information practices.
4. **Incorporate worker voice into AI governance:** Engage workers, labor groups, and representatives in the selection and audit, as well as revision of AI systems, to reflect common values, legal-ethical norms.
5. **Integrate AI with organizational values:** Position AI implementations like culture interventions; ensure that AI practices are examined as deeply as leadership practices, diversity practices and wellbeing practices so that they support, not undermine an organizational culture based on humanity and fairness.

References

1. Bevilacqua, S., Masárová, J., Perotti, F.A. and Ferraris, A. (2025) 'Enhancing top managers' leadership with artificial intelligence: insights from a systematic literature review', *Review of Managerial Science*, 19, pp. 2899–2935. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-025-00836-7 SpringerLink
2. Budhwar, P., Malik, A., De Silva, M.T.T. and Thevisuthan, P. (2022) 'Artificial intelligence – challenges and opportunities for international HRM: a review and research agenda', *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(6), pp. 1065–1097. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2022.2035161 research.aston.ac.uk
3. Florea, N.V. and Croitoru, G. (2025) 'The impact of artificial intelligence on communication dynamics and performance in organizational leadership', *Administrative Sciences*, 15(2), 33. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15020033 ResearchGate
4. Murire, O.T. (2024) 'Artificial intelligence and its role in shaping organizational work practices and culture', *Administrative Sciences*, 14(12), 316. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14120316 MDPI
5. Zayid, H., Alzubi, A., Berberoğlu, A. and Khadem, A. (2024) 'How do algorithmic management practices affect workforce well-being? A parallel moderated mediation model', *Behavioral Sciences*, 14(12), 1123. Available at: https://doi.org/10.3390/bs14121123 MDPI
6. Adam, M., Wessel, M. and Benlian, A. (2021) 'AI-based chatbots in customer service and their effects on user compliance', *Electronic Markets*, 31, pp. 427–445. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-020-00414-7 SpringerLink
7. Brougham, D. and Haar, J. (2018) 'Smart Technology, Artificial Intelligence, Robotics, and Algorithms (STARA): Employees' perceptions of our future workplace', *Journal of Management & Organization*, 24(2), pp. 239–257. Available at: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/journal-of-management-and-organization IDEAS/RePEc
8. Casu, M. et al. (2024) 'AI chatbots for mental health: A scoping review of effectiveness, feasibility, and applications', *Applied Sciences*, 14(13), 5889. Available at: https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/14/13/5889 MDPI
9. Cecez-Kecmanovic, D., Galliers, R.D., Henfridsson, O., Newell, S. and Vidgen, R. (2014) 'The sociomateriality of

information systems', *MIS Quarterly*, 38(3), pp. 809–830. JSTOR
10. Faraj, S., Pachidi, S. and Sayegh, K. (2018) 'Working and organizing in the age of the learning algorithm', *Information and Organization*, 28(1), pp. 62–70. SciSpace
11. Farooq, B. (2025) 'Navigating the future of work: Exploring the role of artificial intelligence in enhancing employee experience and organizational culture', *ACR Journal*. Available at: https://acr-journal.com/article/navigating-the-future-of-work-exploring-the-role-of-artificial-intelligence-in-enhancing-employee-experience-and-organizational-culture-1553/ Advances in Consumer Research
12. Glikson, E. and Woolley, A.W. (2020) 'Human trust in artificial intelligence: Review of empirical research', *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(2), pp. 627–660. SCIRP
13. Jarrahi, M.H. (2018) 'Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making', *Business Horizons*, 61(4), pp. 577–586. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007 IDEAS/RePEc
14. Logg, J.M., Minson, J.A. and Moore, D.A. (2019) 'Algorithm appreciation: People prefer algorithmic to human judgment', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 151, pp. 90–103. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2018.12.005 IDEAS/RePEc
15. Maedche, A. et al. (2019) 'AI-based digital assistants: Opportunities, threats, and research perspectives', *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, 61(4), pp. 535–544. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-019-00600-8 fim-rc.de
16. Murire, O.T. (2024) 'Artificial intelligence and its role in shaping organizational work practices and culture', *Administrative Sciences*, 14(12), 316. Available at: https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3387/14/12/316 IDEAS/RePEc
17. Orlikowski, W.J. (2007) 'Sociomaterial practices: Exploring technology at work', *Organization Studies*, 28(9), pp. 1435–1448. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0170840607081138 DHI
18. Parent-Rocheleau, X. and Parker, S.K. (2022) 'Algorithms as work designers: How algorithmic management influences the design of jobs', *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(4), 100876. ScienceDirect
19. Rosenblat, A. and Stark, L. (2016) 'Algorithmic labor and information asymmetries: A case study of Uber's drivers', *International Journal of Communication*, 10, pp. 3758–3784. Available at: https://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/article/view/4892 IJOC
20. Saxena, N.A. et al. (2022) 'Fairness perceptions of algorithmic decision-making: A systematic review of the empirical literature', *Big Data & Society*, 9(2), pp. 1–15. Available at: https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.12016 arXiv
21. Wahbeh, A. et al. (2023) 'Conversational agents for mental health and well-being: A review', *BIS Papers*. scholar.dsu.edu
22. Boell, S.K. and Cecez-Kecmanovic, D. (2014) 'A hermeneutic approach for conducting literature reviews and literature searches', *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, 34(1), pp. 257–286. Available at: https://aisel.aisnet.org/cais/vol34/iss1/12/ aisel.aisnet.org+1
23. Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2019) 'Reflecting on reflexive thematic analysis', *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise and Health*, 11(4), pp. 589–597. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/2159676X.2019.1628806 Taylor & Francis Online
24. Snyder, H. (2019) 'Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines', *Journal of Business Research*, 104, pp. 333–339. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039 ScienceDirect+1
25. Thomas, J. and Harden, A. (2008) 'Methods for the thematic synthesis of qualitative research in systematic reviews', *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 8, 45. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2288-8-45 BioMed Central+1
26. Al-Zahrani, A.M. (2025) 'Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence chatbots on human connection and emotional support among higher education students', *SAGE Open*, 15(2). Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440251340615 SAGE Journals+1
27. Behn, O., Leyer, M. and Iren, D. (2024) 'Employees' acceptance of AI-based emotion analytics from speech on a group level in virtual meetings', *Technology in Society*, 76, 102490. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2024.102490 ScienceDirect+1
28. Cox, T. et al. (2024) *Algorithmic management in traditional workplaces: Case studies on the impact of algorithmic technologies in seven sectors in the Nordics*. Available at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/385619989_Algorithmic_management_in_traditional_workplaces_Case_studies_on_the_impact_of_algorithmic_technologies_in_seven_sectors_in_the_Nordics ResearchGate
29. Gkinko, L. and Elbanna, A. (2022) 'Hope, tolerance and empathy: Employees' emotions when using an AI-enabled chatbot in a digitalised workplace', *Information Technology & People*, 35(6), pp. 1714–1743. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/ITP-04-2021-0328 Emerald+1
30. Håkansta, C., Lind, R., Strauss-Raats, P. and Blüme, P. (2024) *Algorithmic management: Experiences and responses – Explorative study of companies and trade unions in the Swedish warehousing, retail and transport industries*. Brussels: FEPS. Available at: https://feps-europe.eu/publication/algorithmic-management-experiences-and-

responses/ feps-europe.eu+1

31. Henkel, A.P. et al. (2020) 'Half human, half machine: Augmenting service employees with AI for interpersonal emotion regulation', *Journal of Service Management*, 31(2), pp. 247–265. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1108/JOSM-07-2019-0226 Emerald+1
32. Nilsson, K.H. (2025) 'Algorithmic management and occupational health: A comparative case study of organizational practices in logistics', *Safety Science*, 187, 106863. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssci.2025.106863 ScienceDirect+1
33. Roemmich, K., Schaub, F. and Andalibi, N. (2023) 'Emotion AI at work: Implications for workplace surveillance, emotional labor, and emotional privacy', in *SOUPS 2023 Proceedings*. Available at: https://www.usenix.org/conference/soups2023/presentation/roemmich-poster USENIX+1
34. Valtonen, A. et al. (2025) 'AI and employee wellbeing in the workplace: An empirical study', *Journal of Business Research*, 199. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.113234 ScienceDirect+1
35. Vitak, J. and Zimmer, M. (2023) 'Power, stress, and uncertainty: Experiences with and attitudes toward workplace surveillance during a pandemic', *Surveillance & Society*, 21(1), pp. 135–150. Available at: https://ojs.library.queensu.ca/index.php/surveillance-and-society/article/view/15571 ojs.library.queensu.ca+1
36. Wood, A.J., Graham, M., Lehdonvirta, V. and Hjorth, I. (2019) 'Good gig, bad gig: Autonomy and algorithmic control in the global gig economy', *Work, Employment and Society*, 33(1), pp. 56–75. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1177/0950017018785616 SAGE Journals+1
37. Yu, S. et al. (2025) 'Online platform algorithmic control and gig workers' turnover intention in China: The mediating role of relative deprivation', *Journal of Management Analytics*. Available at: https://doi.org/10.1080/23270012.2025.XXXXX ScienceDirect+1