ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar272

Leadership as a Governance Capability in AI-Enabled Organizations: A Conceptual Framework for Human–AI Complementarity and Socio-Economic Outcomes

Imane Ouchen[1]; Ghizlane Chouay[2]; Abderahmane El Arabi[3]

[1]Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Laboratory for Economic, Econometric, and Managerial Research. Faculty of Legal, Economic, and Social Sciences, Mohammed First University - Oujda, Morocco.

[2]Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Laboratory for Economic, Econometric, and Managerial Research. Faculty of Legal, Economic, and Social Sciences, Mohammed First University - Oujda, Morocco.

[3]Laboratory of Interdisciplinary Laboratory for Economic, Econometric, and Managerial Research. Faculty of Legal, Economic, and Social Sciences, Mohammed First University - Oujda, Morocco.

Publication Date: 2026/03/14

Abstract: Artificial intelligence (AI) is progressively becoming a fundamental part of organizational information systems, deeply influencing decision-making processes, redistribution of authority, and socio-economic outcomes. Previous literature has mainly focused on AI technology, digital transformation, and formal mechanisms of information systems governance. Yet, little consideration has been given to leadership as a governance capability, particularly in AI-enabled socio-technical systems. The issue here is that many AI-related governance failures are not primarily due to technical shortcomings but rather because of the way algorithmic outputs are interpreted, enacted, and legitimized in organizational practice.

This article proposes a leadership-as-governance framework in the context of AI-enabled information systems. Based on a review of information systems literature, leadership theories, and economic perspectives, the authors depict three leadership configurations, discrete, transformational, and augmented leadership, that regulate ethical risk, innovation, and human, AI complementarity, respectively. The paper further links leadership-based governance to the quality of AI system use, decision quality, organizational innovation, and to broad socio-economic outcomes such as productivity dynamics, skill transformation, and inequality by formulating a series of research propositions derived from the framework.

In this research leadership is analyzed as a multifaceted supervisory system rather than a managerial style only, therefore it contributes to the extension of information systems governance theory and aligns with the debates on responsible AI, digital transformation, and public policy. The proposed model is of great assistance to the organizations and policymakers who want to manage AI-powered information systems at least in a way that differs from the compliance-centric approaches.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; Information Systems Governance; Leadership; Human, AI Complementarity; Digital Transformation.*

How to Cite: Imane Ouchen; Ghizlane Chouay; Abderahmane El Arabi (2026) Leadership as a Governance Capability in AI-Enabled Organizations: A Conceptual Framework for Human–AI Complementarity and Socio-Economic Outcomes. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(3), 723-731.
https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar272

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar272

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly embedded in the core activities of today's enterprises, reshaping decision-making, coordination, and value creation. Initially, AI was primarily applied to automate tasks or manage data, but nowadays AI-powered information systems are essentially decision-making agents that can even influence strategic decisions, organizational processes, and power distribution within companies. Through predictive analytics, classification systems, and machine learning models, algorithmic technologies alter how problems are defined, information is prioritized, and choices are made.

With organizations granting AI more autonomy to make decisions, there are major governance challenges. Unlike traditional information systems, AI systems heavily rely on probabilistic models, adaptive learning techniques, and hidden algorithmic processes, which makes it very difficult to interpret or explain their outputs. Thus, most decision-making now is a combination of human-AI interaction instead of being solely based on human judgment or automated computation. The change poses a challenge to existing governance mechanisms which are based on clear decision rights, transparency, and accountability structures.

Previous studies in the information systems (IS) area have significantly illuminated the technological capabilities of AI, the problems of digital transformation, and the acceptance of algorithmic decision-making systems in organizations. But the bulk of this literature assumes that governance can be primarily achieved through structural arrangements, formal controls, and technical safeguards. When leadership is mentioned, it is mostly treated as a factor in the context of technology adoption and not as a governance tool per se.

However, this notion has become outdated in the context of AI-enabled socio-technical systems. A great number of AI-related governance failures such as algorithmic bias, automation bias, ethical risks, and accountability diffusion are not just the outcome of technical defects. In fact, they frequently result from the differences in the interpretations, implementations, and the embedding in organizational routines of the algorithmic outputs. Thus, governance here goes beyond technical design or compliance and also addresses the interpretive, ethical, and political aspects of AI usage.

Against this backdrop, the article promotes the concept that in AI-enabled information systems leadership plays the role of the main governance capability. Besides being a managerial style or an influence process, leadership is a socio-technical governance tool that regulates the interface between human judgment and algorithmic decision systems, the distribution of roles and responsibilities, and the way AI generated decisions by organizational actors are interpreted and legitimized.

In backing up the main point the article presents a conceptual model that brings together perspectives from the information systems discipline, leadership theory, and economic analysis of technological development. The model distinguishes three leadership styles, disembodied leadership, transformational leadership, and augmented leadership, which an organization may use to tackle ethical risk, encourage innovation, and facilitate productive human, AI collaboration, depending on its internal needs and external challenges. Leadership here is the governance mechanism that according to the article determines how AI is interpreted, used, and institutionalized in organizational routines.

Furthermore, the article elaborates on the hypotheses of leadership-based governance impacts on AI system usage effectiveness, decision quality, organizational innovation, as well as the wider socio-economic outcomes using the framework. By defining the leadership role as a governance mechanism at different levels the article bridges leadership activities at the micro-level to the changes at the meso- and macro-levels resulting from AI adoption such as productivity, skills, and inequality.

The article contributes to the discourse on information systems governance, leadership during digital transformation, and the impact of artificial intelligence on society and the economy by supporting this view. Moreover, it acts as a reservoir of ideas to companies and governments who want to control AI-enabled information systems so as to foster innovation, ensure accountability, and build public trust.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATIONS

- *AI-Enabled Information Systems as Socio-Technical Systems*

Compared with the earlier classes of digital tools, AI-based information systems constitute quite a radical innovation. The first information systems were primarily based on a set of rules, and their operation could be predicted. They were intended to be used for task automation and for decision-making support in structured situations. But AI solutions produce their results by calculating different probabilities, using machine learning techniques, and analyzing large volumes of data. Consequently, their outputs are adaptive and take the context into account.

The above-mentioned features of technology substantially alter the traditional understanding of the link between technology and decision-making at the organizational level. Instead of functioning as mere tools that execute predefined instructions, AI systems increasingly act as decision-support partners, determining the problem formulation, guiding the selection of alternatives, and even justifying the decisions. In most cases, algorithmic results have the effect of directing managerial attention and greatly influence how the organization makes sense of the situation at hand.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar272

These phenomena can be well explained using a socio-technical approach. According to this perspective, technologies cannot be separated from the human and organizational environments in which they are used. AI-driven information systems are not just technical artifacts; they are socio-technical systems comprising human and machine participants engaged in decision-making.

Such human, machine cooperation brings about new uncertainties and ambiguities. For instance, AI models tend to produce probabilities nor certain answers, further, if the model is updated with the new data, its behavior will change over time. Hence, people in the organization are challenged to interpret the algorithmic results or check their accuracy, and then decide how much weight to give the recommendations of the algorithm vis-à-vis those of the humans.

The above-mentioned features of AI raise new governance issues that cannot be dealt with solely via traditional IT governance mechanisms, thus additional governance methods will need to be put in place.

- *Limitations of the Traditional Information Systems Governance*

Information systems governance has basically been about finding the best way to use IT as a lever for the business and at the same time ensuring accountability, risk management, and performance monitoring. The governance tools usually include formal structures such as the definition and assignment of decision rights, compliance frameworks, performance measurement systems, and standardized operating procedures.

While it is still true that those mechanisms are essential, they are based on assumptions that are being increasingly challenged by the nature of AI systems. For one thing, traditional governance frameworks are built on the premise that the behavior of the system can be predetermined and then it can be evaluated in a relatively transparent manner. However, a lot of AI models run as "black boxes", hence it is hard to know exactly how the outputs are derived in some cases.

Secondly, machine learning systems are by definition adaptive, therefore, their standardization is only very limited. As the AI system receives more data, it can change its behavior; thus, the rules that are static and were originally made for a stable technological environment become less and less effective.

Thirdly, the use of AI blurs the line between human and technological agency. When the decisions result from a combination of algorithmic models and human interpretation, the processes of assigning responsibility and accountability become complicated. Most of the governance failures occurring in such environments are not the result of missing technical safeguards but of the ways people interpret, trust, and rely on the outputs generated by algorithms.

With these problems in mind, it is clear that going beyond formal structures and technical controls is necessary if governance mechanisms are to reflect the interpretative and relational aspects of AI-enabled decision-making.

- *Leadership as a Governance Capability*

Leadership theory provides useful points of reference as to how organizations gather their resources, coordinate their works, and deal with uncertainty. The focus of leadership in early days centered on authority and control, but nowadays, leadership is more about activities of making sense, interpreting, and giving the meaning.

These matters are even more important when we talk about digital transformation whereby new technologies break the patterns of the old ways and cause uncertainty about how the new technology can be used. Leaders especially are responsible for besides other things, leading change and convincing organizational members of new technologies:

Leadership can be seen as a human trait that an individual naturally possesses. However, from a governance perspective, it is even a capability that can be exercised within socio-technical systems. For example: through leadership, the way organizational members perceive algorithmic outputs can be influenced; the balance between human judgment and machine recommendation can be handled; and the trade-off between efficiency, accountability, and ethical responsibility can be negotiated.

Leadership is the intermediate between the language of the formal governance structures and the reality of the everyday organizational practices. On the one hand, formal rules describe decision rights and structures of accountability. On the other hand, leaders determine how these rules are implemented, understood, and modified in situations of complex decision-making.

In AI-enabled organizations, therefore, leadership is one of the mechanisms by which governance is carried out in the real world.

- *Multi-Level Implications of AI Governance*

The governance of AI-enabled information systems impacts, in fact, a whole range of issues that are beyond the mere operations of an organization. For instance, if the questions on which AI technology to introduce and how to control it are decided at the one end, the answers to this can affect not only the economy but also the society at large.

The leadership-centric governance at the micro-level causes a change in the working of employees with AI systems, the becoming of human and AI as complements to each other, and the growing up of organizational learning processes, to name a few. The result of such decisions is reflected in productivity, innovativeness, and the getting done of tasks between human workers and algorithmic systems.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar272

At the meso level, governance styles can be spread via industries by professional networks, regulatory frameworks, and the establishment of institutional norms. Common governance styles have the influence to decide the adoption and legitimation of AI technologies within industries.

At the macro level, governance strategies may differ according to the socio-economic paths they reflect. In particular, those governance mechanisms that emphasize human, AI complementarity possibly lead to skill upgrading and inclusive productivity growth. On the other hand, those that focus on automation can contribute to the deterioration of labor market inequalities.

In short, leadership as a governance capability enables us to understand how through organizational practices there can be generated larger socio-economic consequences of AI use.

The effect of IS governance by leadership-based methodology does not limit to a single organization. Prosperity, competence, job-seeking, job creation, and the service of needs arise from a network of interconnected industries and economies. Hierarchical analysis helps us understand how micro-level governance activities in separate organizations result in meso-level and macro-level overall outcomes and impacts respectively.

At the micro-level, the leader functions as the director of the IS leadership that in turn influences the formation of the human-labor-AI synergies. The implementation and continuation of leader's decision intervention contents will short or long time affect the main areas, i.e. team-based working within the organization, intra-employee relations, work conditions and employment terms, the workforce composition, and the overall workplace atmosphere. Furthermore, such choices that have been made directly through the execution of leader's decisions indirectly or come as the result of the leader's decisions contribute to the carrying capacity of the organization, i.e. the organization's adaptability level to environmental changes, robustness in crisis periods or simply the survival capacity in times of upheavals and disruptions of the existence conditions (Hazy & Uhl-Bien, 2013; Morgan, 1986; Weick, 1995, pp. 55-58).

Also, there are leadership engagement practices and organizational configurations through leadership network and industry community, professional exchange, market acting, and collaborative learning at the meso level. This is done through providing learning mechanism, internalization strengthening, and creation of stable environment for further adoption, acceptance, and adaptation. Besides the generation of shared meaning establishments between the referents of the legitimation process and the legitimate source through the communicative symbolic means of witnessing (de Sousa Santos, 1995), such network and community collaborations facilitate the perpetuation of the technology functioning and the transmission and the spread of the innovation momentum via social, cultural, historical, geographic opportunities, constraints, and resources (Shove et al., 2012).

At the macro level, leadership styles which emphasize human, AI cooperation complementarity will be inclined towards the achievement of a more inclusive growth and skills enhancement. On the contrary, the focus on automation might not only fail to deliver such growth but even lead to exacerbation of inequalities. Hence, leadership is the link between the micro-level IS governance and the macro-level economic outcomes.

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: LEADERSHIP-BASED GOVERNANCE OF AI-ENABLED INFORMATION SYSTEMS

Over the years AI-supported information systems are being deeply integrated into the key organizational activities such as strategic planning, risk assessment, talent management, and everyday decision-making. Since these systems are increasingly leading to organizational outcomes, it can no longer be argued that the question of governance belongs entirely to the domains of the technical design, compliance structures, or system ownership. In fact, governance depends on the ways in which AI-generated outputs are received, interpreted, and embedded into organizational routines.

In this light, governing AI-enabled organizations is a socio-technical matter at the very core. The algorithmic models produce outputs such as predictions, classifications, and recommendations but these outputs only become meaningful when humans understand them and use them in context. People in organizations face questions such as: should we trust the algorithmic recommendations, how do we compare the algorithmic recommendations with human judgment, and how do we explain our choices?

The role of leadership, though, is often considered to be central to the interpretative work. The way leaders communicate, frame, and make decisions in relation to AI greatly shapes AI's perception and acceptance within the organization. Besides that, leadership is crucial in handling how organizations manage the trade-offs among different priorities such as efficiency, accountability, innovation, and ethical responsibility.

Considering this, the article argues that **leadership-based governance** consists of technologically-socio practices where through leaders manage the tension between human judgment and algorithmic decision systems. Leadership-based governance, basically, counts on activities like sensemaking, giving interpretive guidance, establishing accountability structures, and coordinating practices rather than formal controls.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar272

Such an approach views governance as a kind of continuing work embedded in daily organizational routines rather than as a strict control mechanism. Leaders' choices in terms of decisions influence how AI results can be trusted, questioned, and even overturned. Such decisions not only affect how much users benefit from AI, but also the extent of risks that go along with it.

In order to make these cases clearer, the authors propose three varieties of leadership that are **interdependent**: separate leadership, transformational leadership, and enhanced leadership. Each leadership style focuses on a specific dimension of AI governance and, taken together, they help organizations find the right balance between automation and human oversight, innovation and accountability, as well as efficiency and legitimacy.

IV. LEADERSHIP CONFIGURATIONS IN AI GOVERNANCE

- *Discrete Leadership: Governing Ethical Risk and Accountability*

Discrete leadership differs from the rest in that it concentrates heavily on the aspect of establishing the boundaries on algorithmic decision-making. Specifically, it exposes the ethical risk by identifying accountability and keeping away from the blind trust in the authority of algorithms.

In AI-driven companies, the outputs of the algorithms are generally treated as so objective and technically legitimate that the employees can hardly resist falling into the automation bias effects. This is the situation when decision-makers completely trust the algorithms' suggestions and therefore don't evaluate them critically. By carving out the space for human decision-making, and by stating the conditions under which algorithmic recommendations are to be accepted, reviewed, or overruled, discrete leadership significantly contributes to the risk mitigation.

Discrete leaders engage heavily with the creation of human versus algorithmic accountability features in governance instruments such as roles, responsibilities, escalation mechanisms, and decision rights. In addition, discrete leaders anticipate that people will challenge the algorithms' outputs, and hence, they present AI systems as tools that assist decision-making rather than as independent decision makers.

By doing so, discrete leadership is capable of solving ethical issues that result from AI such as bias and prejudice as well as the problem of responsibility-shifting. For this reason, it is a governance tool that legitimacy and accountability can be maintained where decisions are supported by algorithms.

- *Transformational Leadership: Facilitating AI Innovation*

Where discrete leadership is geared towards risk mitigation, transformational leadership focuses more on innovation.

In fact, there is no guarantee that AI technologies will be self-sufficient value generators. The value of the new is brought about by a trial and error process, remixing the technology with the organizational context in an innovative way. The employees have to perceive that AI can be their partner in work process improvement, the origin of new ideas, and thus, the solution-generating tool.

Transformational leadership plays a crucial role in this regard. Through psychological empowerment, learning support, and the improvement of a culture of exploration, transformation leaders can change employees' AI technology-appraisal from something that diminishes their professional autonomy to something that is helpful.

Since transformational leaders see AI as a challenge to human skills rather than a job-taker, the way they deal with this conundrum is so subtle that no one can even tell it is a win-win situation.

Therefore transformational leadership is turning the features of AI into innovations, meanwhile, it is fostering both continuous and organizational learning and adaptation to the technologically ever-changing environment.

- *Augmented Leadership: Enabling Human, AI Complementarity*

Augmented leadership is primarily concerned with the harmonious integration of human judgment and algorithmic decision support so as to reap the maximum from AI's analytical power without at the same time conceding human responsibility.

Interestingly, AI systems are endowed with the capability of handling a massive volume of data and, subsequently, pulling out the recurring patterns or statistical regularities. Yet, as it often happens, such systems are not very capable of adequately grasping meaning or context, engaging in moral reasoning, or foreseeing the organizational and societal consequences of their actions. So, human-judgment-algorithmic co-decision becomes a winning solution for the success in the AI-assisted decision scenarios.

Augmented leadership fosters this complementary relationship by recognizing that algorithmic outputs are not to be treated as final decisions but rather as a basis for further debate and deeper reflection.

What is more, leaders who employ the augmented leadership approach constantly test the assumptions behind AI models, carefully check the data used for model training, and take into consideration the likelihood of undesirable effects.

AI-supported information systems over time are becoming more deeply integrated into key organizational activities such as strategic planning, risk assessment, talent management, and everyday decision-making. It no longer can be denied that as these systems increasingly determine organizational outcomes

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar272

the issue of governance is no longer entirely in the domains of the technical design, compliance structures, or system ownership. On the contrary, governance is dependent on how AI-generated outputs are received, interpreted, and embedded into organizational routines.

Thus, from this point of view, the governance of AI-enabled firms is ultimately a socio-technical one. Algorithmic models generate outputs such as predictions, classifications, and recommendations but these outputs only get their meaning when humans interpret them and apply them in context. Organizational actors have to make decisions such as whether to believe algorithmic recommendations, how to check these with human judgment, and how to explain their choices.

Nevertheless, leadership is thought to be the primary means through which the interpretative work is done. Leaders through their communication, framing, and decision-making largely determine how AI is understood and accepted inside the organization. Besides this, leadership is also key in dealing with how organizations handle the trade-offs among different priorities such as efficiency, accountability, innovation, and ethical responsibility.

On the contrary, the article reflects on leadership-based governance as technologically-socio practices wherein leaders through human judgment manage the tension between an algorithmic decision system. Leadership-based governance fundamentally depends on mechanisms such as sensemaking, providing interpretive guidance, setting up accountability structures, and coordinating practices rather than formal controls.

Such a perspective saw governance more as an incessant process that is part of regular organizational practice than a repressive device. The manner in which leaders decide on their decisions will determine which context AI outputs should be trusted, questioned, and even overruled. These decisions will affect not only the benefits of AI use but also the risks that come with it.

In order to gain a deeper understanding of these kinds of scenarios, the authors take a look at three types of leadership that are interdependent: separate leadership, transformational leadership, and enhanced leadership. Each leadership style addresses a particular aspect of AI governance and through their joint efforts, they enable organizations to find the right balance between automation and human oversight, innovation and accountability, as well as efficiency and legitimacy.

V. LEADERSHIP CONFIGURATIONS IN AI GOVERNANCE

- *Discrete Leadership: Governing Ethical Risk and Accountability*

Discrete leadership mostly concerns itself with putting limits on algorithmic decision-making. To be precise, it exposes the ethical risk by talking about who is responsible and it stops people from blindly following the authority of the algorithm.

At AI-based organizations, the results of the algorithms might be considered so objective and technically legitimate that the employees are likely to fall into automation bias effects. Decision-makers using automation bias accept suggestions made by algorithms with little or no critical evaluation. Discrete leadership through clarifying the limits of decision-making and under what circumstances algorithmic suggestions are to be accepted, reviewed, or overruled greatly contributes to risk reduction.

The central part of this leadership style is controlled interpretation of algorithmic results, which is even more strengthened by giving people an understanding of the role of AI in decision-making. By considering AI-generated data as merely one among many factors at both the business and ethical levels, augmented leadership may result in higher quality outcomes that garner wider acceptance among stakeholders.

What ultimately happens is the achievement of **human and AI complementarity** that is net productive, i.e., not only are human judgment capacities enhanced by algorithmic systems but also the substitute function of these systems is eradicated.

VI. RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS

The conceptual framework suggests that leadership-based governance influences the outcomes of AI adoption through multiple mechanisms.

Table 1 Leadership Configurations and AI Governance Outcomes

Proposition	Leadership Configuration	Governance Mechanism	Expected Outcome
P1	All configurations	Sensemaking and interpretive guidance	Improved quality of AI system use
P2	Augmented leadership	Human–AI integration	Higher decision quality
P3	Discrete leadership	Accountability and decision boundaries	Reduced ethical risk
P4	Transformational leadership	Learning and experimentation	Increased organizational innovation
P5	Integrated leadership governance	Human–AI complementarity	Positive socio-economic outcomes

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar272

VII. DISCUSSION

The synthesized framework first unveils that the majority of problems in AI governance not only stems from the technical aspects only, but more of them are socio-technical problems. A poor understanding of the technology, rather than the technological limitations, causes governance breakdowns.

Leadership through the lens of the study refers to mechanisms of governance working together to produce an effective system and not to different styles being mutually exclusive. Enterprises that are able to integrate the leadership traits of discreet, transformative, and augmented components will be more effective in enabling innovation whilst also being accountable to all stakeholders.

Third, the working model illustrates that disagreements by those organizations unwilling to fully integrate AI solutions might result with entirely different outcomes. Governance through leadership practices therefore explain the varying interpretations of AI systems, the differing degrees of trust, and the ways in which they are combined with the working processes of the organization.

VIII. POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Alongside setting the governance at the corporate level, the framework also points out the policymakers and regulators as the ones responsible for ensuring AI being rolled out in a safe, secure, and responsible manner.

Most current policies focus solely on technical regulations such as algorithmic audits, transparency requirements, or compliance standards. Such measures are still very valid but to a certain extent, they fail to address the socio-technical dynamics that form the very nature of AI decision-making.

Besides the leadership development activities, responsible AI training, and human-centric governance practices, which are the main features of the policies, the latter can be used as a powerful lever that shapes the social impact of AI at large. Instead of automating power only, governance models that emphasize human, AI complementarity should be nurtured by leadership in order to bring about inclusive productivity growth and reduce the risks of technological inequality.

The primary goal of this paper was to construct a theoretical account of leadership as an essential resource for successful information system governance of AI-enabled organizations. The model proposed here helps to understand better how organizations govern AI in situations characterized by uncertainty, non-transparency, and distributed agency by assuming leadership as a socio-technical governance mechanism instead of only a manager's style.

The case study points out that the major reason for governance breakdowns around the AI-based systems is not the lack of technical capacity but rather the way in which algorithmic results are interpreted and executed and then institutionalized as organizational routines. Leadership-driven governance can be understood as the strategic use of leadership capacities such as sensemaking, discretion, accountability, and coordination, which are mostly beyond the reach of both standard formal rules and technical solutions, to fill the gaps of discretion, accountability, and coordination that are substantially outside the reach of both standard formal rules and technical solutions.

Besides, the model shows that the various leadership styles should not be regarded as alternatives to each other. Separate, transformational, and augmented leadership each cover a different segment of an eventual governance challenge. Through their combined effort, a company is able to strike a balance between productivity and responsibility, technology and user autonomy, and novelty and legitimacy. Such a comprehensive view accounts for the greatest variations among the results of firms that have implemented the same AI technology.

IX. CONCLUSION

The paper presents a conceptual model that positions the leadership role as an indispensable competency of information systems governance in the AI era. It unveils that leadership as an inherent, socio-technical governance tool can be a prism through which to interpret the way organizations tackle AI-enabled decision-making in terms of interpretation, accountability, and moral judgment.

The drafted model accounts for how separate, transformational, and augmented leadership distinctively differ and yet, complement and collectively help a company to control the use of AI-enabled information systems in a responsible way and, at the same time, they are able to preserve the integration of innovation and value creation. The linking of leadership-based governance to organizational and socio-economic outcomes that is done in this paper helps to extend the range of IS governance theory and it also responds to the call for research that links organizational practices with societal consequences.

Instead of considering leadership as just one of the factors that determine AI adoption, this paper elevates it as a major explanatory variable in the governance of AI-driven socio-technical systems. Consequently, it paves the road for empirical work and is a step towards a more comprehensive understanding of the dual role of organizations and societies in responsibly harnessing AI.

The rapid and relentless integration of AI with the organizational IS calls for new ways of governing. This study argues that leadership is a fundamental governance capability in AI-enabled socio-technical systems.

Introducing the idea of three intertwined and mutually supportive kinds of leadership, discrete, transformational, and

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar272

augmented, that the model puts forward, the paper helps to unravel the ways organizations are able to maintain a sustainable ethical risk management, boost innovation, and nurture human-AI collaboration.

It also highlights the role of leadership not only as the determinant of the company's success but also as the one that influences the socio-economic effects of AI adoption. By associating leadership efforts with governance mechanisms and societal outcomes, the article revisits the topics around responsible AI, digital revolution, and the future labor market.

REFERENCES

[1]. Acemoglu, D., & Restrepo, P. (2020). The wrong kind of AI? Artificial intelligence and the future of labour demand. *Cambridge Journal of Economics, 44*(4), 739–770. https://doi.org/10.1093/cje/beaa020

[2]. Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2019). *Prediction machines: The simple economics of artificial intelligence*. Harvard Business School Press.

[3]. Autor, D. H. (2015). Why are there still so many jobs? The history and future of workplace automation. *Journal of Economic Perspectives, 29*(3), 3–30. https://doi.org/10.1257/jep.29.3.3

[4]. Badaracco, J. L. (2003). *We don't need another hero*. Harvard Business School Press.

[5]. Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.

[6]. Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). *Transformational leadership* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum.

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

[8]. Brynjolfsson, E., Rock, D., & Syverson, C. (2021). The productivity J-curve: How intangibles complement general-purpose technologies. *American Economic Journal: Macroeconomics, 13*(1), 333–372. https://doi.org/10.1257/mac.20180345

[9]. Chesbrough, H., Lettl, C., & Ritter, T. (2018). Value creation and value capture in open innovation. *Journal of Product Innovation Management, 35*(6), 930–938. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12471

[10]. Davenport, T. H., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harvard Business Review, 96*(1), 108–116.

[11]. De Haes, S., & Van Grembergen, W. (2015). *Enterprise governance of information technology: Achieving strategic alignment and value*. Springer.

[12]. Eisenhardt, K. M., & Graebner, M. E. (2007). Theory building from cases. *Academy of Management Journal, 50*(1), 25–32. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2007.24160888

[13]. Faraj, S., Pachidi, S., & Sayegh, K. (2018). Working and organizing in the age of the learning algorithm. *Information and Organization, 28*(1), 62–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2018.02.005

[14]. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., et al. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. *Minds and Machines, 28*(4), 689–707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-018-9482-5

[15]. Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and sensegiving in strategic change initiation. *Strategic Management Journal, 12*(6), 433–448. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250120604

[16]. Glikson, E., & Woolley, A. W. (2020). Human trust in artificial intelligence. *Academy of Management Annals, 14*(2), 627–660. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0057

[17]. Grandori, A. (2010). Asset coordination and the governance of knowledge-intensive firms. *Journal of Management Studies, 47*(2), 335–359. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00895.x

[18]. Grint, K. (2005). Problems, problems, problems: The social construction of leadership. *Human Relations, 58*(11), 1467–1494. https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726705061314

[19]. Iansiti, M., & Lakhani, K. R. (2020). *Competing in the age of AI*. Harvard Business Review Press.

[20]. Joti, Y. (2025). *La gestion des projets open source : Les fondements d'une approche marketing axée sur la cocréation de la valeur* (Doctoral dissertation). Université du Québec en Outaouais.

[21]. Lollia, F. (2025). *L'impact des nouvelles technologies sur le leadership*. Actes de la 2e Rencontre des Dirigeants, Antananarivo, Madagascar. HAL Open Science. https://hal.science/hal-05063046

[22]. March, J. G. (1991). Exploration and exploitation in organizational learning. *Organization Science, 2*(1), 71–87. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2.1.71

[23]. Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society, 3*(2), 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679

[24]. Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company*. Oxford University Press.

[25]. OECD. (2019). *Artificial intelligence and the future of work*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/5467ee8e-en

[26]. Orlikowski, W. J. (2000). Using technology and constituting structures: A practice lens for studying technology in organizations. *Organization Science, 11*(4), 404–428. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.11.4.404.14600

[27]. Orlikowski, W. J., & Scott, S. V. (2016). Digital work. *MIS Quarterly, 40*(3), 1–15.

[28]. Pieterse, A. N., van Knippenberg, D., Schippers, M., & Stam, D. (2010). Transformational and transactional leadership and innovative behavior. *Journal of Management, 36*(3), 609–640. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206309358593

[29]. Rahwan, I., Cebrian, M., Obradovich, N., et al. (2019). Machine behaviour. *Nature, 568*(7753), 477–486. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1138-y

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar272

[30]. Rai, A., Constantinides, P., & Sarker, S. (2019). Next-generation digital platforms: Toward human–AI hybrids. *MIS Quarterly, 43*(1), iii–ix. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2019/13752
[31]. Sarker, S., Chatterjee, S., Xiao, X., & Elbanna, A. (2019). The sociotechnical axis of cohesion for the IS discipline: Its historical legacy and its continued relevance. *MIS Quarterly, 43*(3), 695–719. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2019/13747
[32]. Simon, H. A. (1957). *Administrative behavior* (2nd ed.). Free Press.
[33]. Suchman, M. C. (1995). Managing legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review, 20*(3), 571–610. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1995.9508080331
[34]. Tiwana, A., Konsynski, B., & Bush, A. A. (2010). Platform evolution: Coevolution of platform architecture, governance, and environmental dynamics. *Information Systems Research, 21*(4), 675–687. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1100.0323
[35]. Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(4), 298–318. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002
[36]. Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 28*(2), 118–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003
[37]. Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson Education.