Advances in Human Resource Development and Management
Vol. 1 (2025), No. 1, pp. 25-35
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55578/hrdm.2507.003

ARTICLE

Artificial Intelligence and Automation in Administrative Practices: A Critical Examination of the Impact on Institutional Memory and Governance Frameworks

Michael Mncedisi Willie[1,*]

[1] *Council for Medical Schemes,Policy Research and Monitoring, Pretoria, South Africa*

[*]Corresponding author. Email: m.willie@medicalschemes.co.za

Received: 06 May 2025, Accepted: 19 June 2025, Published: 25 July 2025

Abstract

Introduction and Context: The integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) into organisational processes — particularly the automation of administrative functions such as minute-taking has transformed traditional workplace practices. While tools like Otter, Zoom, and Microsoft Teams have enhanced operational efficiency, concerns remain regarding their capacity to accurately capture the contextual nuances and subtleties essential for high-quality, comprehensive minutes. The paper explored the implications for governance, institutional memory, and human control by drawing on Socio-Technical Systems Theory.
Objective: The study aimed to examine the impact of AI and automation on administrative tasks, including minute-taking, and its implications for governance, institutional memory, and human oversight. It investigated the balance between technical efficiency and human discretion in organisational situations.
Methods: A narrative literature review was conducted to synthesise research published between 2006 and 2025. Articles on emerging digital technologies, such as AI, minute-taking, and institutional memory, were identified through systematic searches in academic databases. Thematic analysis revealed core themes: the use of automation in minutes, governance deficit, the decline of human judgment and issues about data retention.
Findings and Results: Automated minute-taking effectively increased efficiency, but omitting important context was sometimes linked to governance issues and inaccuracies. Human judgment being treated as a smaller part of the equation meant that it risked missing small signals or indicators that an organisational norm or culture was developing against the interest of the quality of the records or the institution's memory. The study overview highlights the importance of integrating human supervision with AI and the need to establish governance mechanisms and standardised metadata protocols to enhance performance.
Practical Implications: The study recommends integrating AI tools with human oversight to ensure the accuracy and reliability of institutional records. Additionally, it advocates for adopting governance frameworks that address data privacy and regulatory compliance alongside the implementation of standardised metadata practices and robust digital archiving systems to enhance record-keeping and preserve institutional knowledge over time.

Keywords: AI; Automation; Governance; Human Oversight; Institutional Memory; Minute-Taking; Organisational Processes; Socio-Technical Systems

1. INTRODUCTION

In digitalisation, business organisations have increasingly turned to AI-driven platforms, collaborative tools such as Microsoft Teams, and automated software to streamline administrative processes and enhance operational efficiency [1,2]. These technologies have enabled real-time collaboration, reduced redundancies, and improved decision-making through virtual interfaces [3].

However, their growing use has also exposed critical challenges, particularly in minute-taking and institutional memory. While automation offers convenience, it often deprioritises long-term archiving, comprehensive documentation, and knowledge continuity. Issues such as time-bound data storage, inconsistent retrieval mechanisms, and gaps in historical record-keeping raise concerns about the sustainability of organisational memory [4].

Furthermore, administrative records become fragmented without robust archival infrastructure, impeding transparency and institutional governance. The shift to cloud-based and AI-supported platforms also introduces confidentiality, intellectual property, and ethical responsibility risks, particularly when sensitive information is processed through opaque algorithms [5-7]. As AI increasingly informs administrative decisions, the decline of human oversight may further compromise accountability, compliance, and ethical integrity [8,9]. While AI tools like ChatGPT offer pedagogical and administrative advantages, their successful integration depends on clear strategic policies, continuous staff training, and attention to legal and ethical safeguards [10,11]. This article explores these dynamics with a focus on minute-taking and proposes a strategic framework to optimise institutional memory in the age of automation.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

AI Adoption and Workforce Development

The rapid adoption of AI and automation in the workplace demands ongoing skill development, technical proficiency, and strategic workforce education to meet evolving organisational needs [12]. While many studies highlight automation's role in enhancing productivity and communication, they often overlook the complex nature of traditional administrative roles, extending beyond record-keeping to include oversight and custodianship of institutional memory [13]. AI-enabled workflows promise to shift employee focus toward higher-value tasks, boosting efficiency; however, this transition raises significant ethical, workforce, and digital health challenges that organisations must address proactively [14].

Platforms such as Microsoft Teams exemplify AI's potential to transform collaboration, especially in hybrid and remote work contexts [15]. Despite productivity gains, these tools complicate traditional administrative practices, requiring employees to adapt to new skill sets and workflows that blend AI capabilities with human judgment.

Governance Gaps in AI-Driven Administrative Systems

The literature reveals persistent governance gaps despite rapid AI adoption. Existing technology-neutral regulations often fail to manage generative AI complexities effectively, as evidenced by Italy's ChatGPT regulatory challenges [16]. Researchers warn of biases, cybersecurity risks, and ethical dilemmas in AI deployment that demand robust governance frameworks [17]. Modiba [18] highlights how AI can improve records management but emphasises the need for strategic institutional policies, resources, and clear accountability mechanisms, which are elements often lacking in practice.

Microsoft 365's 'in place' records strategy exemplifies these tensions, complicating compliance efforts and underscoring the necessity for coordinated policies that align technological capabilities with legal and ethical standards [15]. Moreover, ambiguity around data ownership, accountability, and bias exacerbates governance challenges, raising concerns about AI's ethical use in administrative contexts [13].

The rise of AI-powered cybercrime, including deepfakes, phishing, and voice cloning, adds another layer of risk, eroding trust in digital infrastructures [19]. Current legal structures lag behind these technological advances, especially regarding AI-driven content and copyright issues [20]. Scholars emphasise the importance of a multidisciplinary, human-centred approach to AI governance that balances innovation with ethical safeguards [21,22].

To mitigate these risks, the literature advocates for cybersecurity best practices such as encryption, identity management, role-based access control, and human-AI collaboration, which collectively protect privacy and preserve organisational knowledge integrity [23-25]. This calls for human resource development initiatives that embed governance awareness and ethical AI use into employee training and policy compliance programs, ensuring workforce capabilities evolve alongside technology.

Human Judgment and the Limits of AI Automation

Despite AI's ability to streamline administrative functions, its limitations in interpreting context, tone, and emotional nuance pose significant risks to the quality and completeness of organisational records [26]. Unlike human recorders, AI transcription and documentation tools frequently omit subtle communicative cues, diminishing records' richness and reliability, especially in sensitive domains such as governance, academia, and legal administration.

This critical gap supports longstanding arguments by Clegg [27] and Mumford [28] that automation should augment rather than replace human input. Effective AI integration thus requires hybrid workflows that preserve human oversight and interpretive analysis, safeguarding the institutional memory that underpins organisational knowledge.

Human resource functions must, therefore, evolve to design training programs that enhance employees' ability to assess AI-generated outputs and intervene critically when necessary. Cultivating this human-AI partnership is essential for maintaining documentation accuracy, contextual grounding, and ethical accountability within AI-driven administrative systems.

Data Retention, Compliance, and Institutional Memory

Adapting retention policies and compliance protocols is paramount in environments that must preserve legal, fiscal, or historically significant records. While platforms like Microsoft Teams have shown promise in fostering collaborative knowledge creation in educational and professional contexts [29], their integration with AI-driven processes complicates traditional record-keeping.

AI-assisted transcription and automated archiving often fail to capture the layered context that institutional memory requires, risking the loss of critical historical and operational insights [26]. Cloud migration further exacerbates these issues by eroding internal IT expertise and creating dependencies on external vendors, which introduces operational and security vulnerabilities [30].

Pillen and Eckard [31] emphasise that inconsistent metadata standards in cloud environments threaten the long-term accessibility and preservation of digital archives. Addressing these challenges requires standardised metadata protocols and AI-augmented archival systems, enhancing data discoverability and ensuring knowledge continuity [23].

From a workforce perspective, HR must lead initiatives to upskill employees on compliance, data governance, and the strategic use of AI for records management. This includes fostering collaboration between IT, legal, and administrative units to institutionalise practices that preserve organisational memory while adapting to evolving technological landscapes.

3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

This study was underpinned by the Socio-Technical Systems (STS) Theory, which posited that optimal organisational performance arose from the balanced interaction of people, technology, and social structures [32,33]. The theory was particularly relevant in illustrating that technological interventions, when not aligned with human processes and governance mechanisms, often resulted in operational dysfunctions, especially within administrative contexts [34]. STS emphasised the need for congruence between technical tools and social systems, advocating that automation should enhance rather than replace essential human functions [27,28].

This alignment was considered vital in administrative settings, where institutional memory, ethical oversight, and human discretion remained crucial. Figure 1 illustrates the interrelationship between AI integration, administrative efficiency, and governance challenges. While AI technologies significantly improved procedural efficiency through automation, they often created contextual blind spots, enabling errors and inconsistencies to emerge. These unintended consequences alongside the erosion of human judgment, governance gaps, and fragmented metadata underscored the importance of hybrid AI-human systems and robust governance frameworks in mitigating risks and upholding the quality and integrity of administrative functions. The figure visually encapsulated the delicate balance between technological efficiency and human oversight, highlighting the inherent trade-offs in efforts to streamline organisational processes.

Figure 1: The Impact of AI Integration on Administrative Efficiency and Governance Challenges in Minute-Taking.

4. METHODOLOGY

This study used a narrative literature review to examine the impact of AI and automation on traditional administrative tasks, especially minute-taking. This method was chosen for its ability to integrate interdisciplinary sources and provide thematic insights into evolving digital processes [35,36]. A systematic search of databases like Scopus, Web of Science, and Google Scholar was conducted using keywords such as "artificial intelligence," "automation," "administrative functions," and "minute-taking," focusing on publications from 2006 to 2025 to capture recent AI advancements, which consisted of a total of 45 studies.

The narrative approach allowed synthesis across varied studies to identify key themes and research gaps. Emerging themes from the reviewed literature include the automation of meeting documentation, the erosion of human judgment in record-keeping, governance and policy gaps, and concerns over data retention and accuracy. Herdiyanti [26] underscored the ethical and methodological dilemmas posed by AI-driven transcription tools such as Otter.ai, particularly in qualitative research contexts. These concerns encompass data ownership, intellectual property rights, implicit bias in speech recognition, and the accountability of decisions based on AI-generated records. Herdiyanti [26] further emphasised the need for discipline-specific guidelines, especially within Library and Information Science (LIS), to govern the ethical deployment of such technologies in virtual research settings.

In parallel, the rise of virtual meetings accelerated by the COVID-19 pandemic has significantly transformed organisational decision-making processes. As Boma-Siaminabo [37] notes, adopting digital platforms such as Zoom and Microsoft Teams ensured operational continuity and cross-border collaboration and contributed to increased productivity, cost reduction, and the promotion of innovation within modern office environments. However, despite their benefits in facilitating timely decisions, these platforms also present persistent challenges related to communication quality, productivity, and the integrity of decision-making outcomes. Together, these insights reveal a complex landscape in

which AI and digital meeting tools enhance administrative efficiency while necessitating robust frameworks to mitigate emerging risks.

While preparing this manuscript, the author utilised Grammarly and QuillBot for language editing, polishing, and plagiarism detection [38-40]. All outputs generated by these tools were critically reviewed and edited by the author, who takes full responsibility for the final content presented in this publication.

4.1. Balancing Efficiency and Accountability: A Socio-Technical Perspective on AI Integration in Administrative Functions

Automation of Meeting Records and Transcription Tools

The inclusion of AI-driven transcription services, such as Otter. AI has created efficiencies in how meetings are recorded, with automated taking of notes and better ways of getting at the information. These programs offer benefits, including live transcription and easy meeting record storage and retrieval, which facilitate administrative processes. However, they cannot understand context, tone, and subtle nuances, which causes poor and incomplete documentation, thereby lowering the quality of institutional documentation [26]. In addition to this, systems such as Microsoft Teams and Zoom, the latter full of opportunities to improve on the (impersonal) quality of meetings held in the traditions of meetings in the workplace, harnessing communication in the hybrid work settings, such as hybrid work makes the organisations rethink about the new ways of effectively managing records [15]. These advances underscore the need for AI-enhanced, integrated system capabilities that combine automation and human review to ensure the accuracy and fidelity of administrative records.

Governance Gaps and Policy Misalignment

Despite rapid AI adoption, significant governance gaps and policy misalignments hinder effective oversight. Cordella and Gualdi [16] show that technology-neutral regulations fall short in managing generative AI, as seen in Italy's ChatGPT intervention. Vatamanu and Tofan [17] highlight AI's benefits for public administration but warn of challenges like bias, cybersecurity, and ethical issues requiring strong governance. Modiba [18] emphasises AI's potential to improve records management but stresses the need for strategic frameworks and resources, which many organisations lack. For example, Microsoft 365's 'in place' records strategy complicates compliance, revealing regulatory gaps. Overall, coordinated policies that align technology with legal and ethical standards are urgently needed to ensure responsible AI use in administration.

Loss of Human Judgment in Documentation

Automating administrative tasks boosts efficiency but often overlooks vital human judgment, crucial for capturing context, intent, and emotional elements. AI transcription frequently misses raising concerns about record accuracy in sensitive fields [26]. AI adoption risks weakening institutional memory's depth and quality without proper oversight. Additionally, many organisations lack robust governance for AI tools, leading to inconsistent practices and accountability gaps. Microsoft 365's records management challenges traditional compliance, highlighting the need for updated policies. Taeihagh [41] argues that while AI boosts efficiency and quality of life, its rapid growth creates complex risks requiring comprehensive governance. Policy gaps undermine trust and emphasise the need for coherent, ethical, and legal frameworks for responsible AI use.

Data Retention and Institutional Memory

AI and digital platforms have improved administrative data management and challenged institutional memory. Modiba [18] notes that despite AI's efficiency benefits, organisations like the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research lack the systems and strategies for effective adoption. Molas and Nowak [42] highlight how emerging memory technologies combined with AI shift memory from mere storage to integrated computing, meeting rising energy and performance demands. Canning and Jaillant [43] show AI's role in managing vast UK government digital archives by identifying important records and enhancing accessibility. However, unlike structured analogue systems, cloud-based platforms often lack consistent metadata, creating complex "shadow archives" that risk record

integrity and access. This underscores the urgent need for holistic AI-driven digital archiving strategies to preserve institutional memory and compliance.

Ethical and Confidentiality Concerns

The deployment of AI in administrative settings raises substantial ethical concerns, particularly regarding data confidentiality, informed consent, and accountability in decision-making. AI tools collect and process vast amounts of sensitive data, often without clear guidelines on ownership, usage rights, or consent protocols [13,26]. Inadequate safeguards can lead to confidentiality breaches, information misuse, and biased outcomes, especially in diverse and multilingual environments where AI systems may falter. A multidisciplinary, human-centred approach to AI governance, emphasising transparency, inclusivity, and accountability, is essential to mitigate these ethical risks [21,22].

Fragmentation of Digital Archives and Metadata Inconsistencies

As institutions adopt AI-supported platforms like Microsoft Teams, metadata tagging and document classification inconsistencies have become common, challenging digital record-keeping. Oyighan et al. [44] note that while AI improves metadata management by automating creation and enhancing discoverability, issues with data quality, ethics, and technical limitations persist, requiring ongoing human oversight, staff training, and updated policies. The lack of standardised archiving protocols leads to fragmented records, hindering retrieval, authentication, and knowledge sharing across departments and generations [45]. Addressing these problems demands investment in automated metadata tools and institution-specific taxonomies to preserve information integrity and accessibility [4], ensuring a balance between technological advancement and organisational continuity.

Legal Compliance and Data Sovereignty in Cloud Environments

Utilising cloud-based AI systems for administrative functions raises complex legal issues regarding jurisdiction, data sovereignty, and intellectual property. Data stored on international servers may be subject to foreign laws, which can complicate compliance with national privacy regulations and expose institutions to legal vulnerabilities [20]. Moreover, the legal frameworks governing AI-generated content, such as authorship rights and accountability for errors, remain underdeveloped. The literature calls for updated legislative instruments and cross-border agreements to safeguard data sovereignty while enabling innovation [19,23]. Strengthening legal literacy and compliance mechanisms will ensure that AI deployment aligns with institutional responsibilities and public trust.

4.2. Interventions to Circumvent Challenges

Integrating AI and automation into administrative functions has significantly transformed operational efficiency; however, it also introduces substantial challenges that require strategic intervention, as outlined in Table 1. AI and automation in administration have enhanced efficiency but also introduced difficulties, including loss of context in transcription, record inaccuracies, and governance gaps [26]. Reliance on AI diminishes human judgment in record-keeping, while fragmented archives and inconsistent metadata hinder data retrieval; literature suggests hybrid AI-human review systems, governance frameworks, and standardised metadata practices address these issues [26,23,25].

Table 1. Interventions for AI and Automation Challenges in Administration

Challenge	Key Intervention	Description of the key intervention
Automation without Contextual Understanding	Hybrid AI-Human Review Systems	Combine AI transcription with human oversight to capture nuance, tone, and intent accurately.
Governance Gaps and Policy Misalignment	Development of AI Governance Frameworks	Establish institution-wide policies that guide the ethical use of AI, retention schedules, and accountability roles.

Loss of Human Judgment in Documentation	Embedding Discretionary Human Roles in Automation Workflows	Assign personnel to review AI-generated content and contextualise critical records.
Data Retention & Institutional Memory Risks	AI-Integrated Archival Systems with Standardised Metadata	Adopt platforms with structured metadata protocols and digital archiving strategies for continuity.
Ethical and Confidentiality Issues	Ethical AI Guidelines & Consent Frameworks	Enforce transparent data collection practices, consent protocols, and bias mitigation strategies.
Fragmented Digital Archives	Institution-Specific Taxonomies and Metadata Automation Tools	Implement AI tools for metadata tagging and develop standardised taxonomies for information organisation.
Legal Compliance & Data Sovereignty Issues	Localised Cloud Solutions & Updated Regulatory Frameworks	Utilise region-compliant cloud providers and advocate for legal reforms related to AI and data governance.
Platform-Specific Records Management Gaps (e.g., MS Teams)	Custom Retention Policies & Integrated Records Management Plugins	Design custom retention and compliance tools tailored to collaborative platforms like Microsoft Teams.
AI Bias and Misinformation	Bias Audits and Multilingual AI Training	Regularly audit AI tools for bias and train them on diverse, inclusive data sets to improve fairness.
Security and Cybercrime Vulnerabilities	Multi-layered Cybersecurity Strategies (e.g., encryption, role-based access, anomaly detection)	Implement robust digital security protocols to prevent breaches and unauthorised access.
Cross-disciplinary Incompatibilities	Creation of Discipline-Specific AI Deployment Guidelines	Develop sector-specific ethical and operational guidelines for AI in settings like education and research.

5. DISCUSSION

Integrating AI and automation into administrative functions offers notable gains in operational efficiency but simultaneously raises critical challenges that necessitate thoughtful human resource development and workforce training strategies. While AI-driven tools like Otter accelerate meeting transcription, Herdiyanti [26] underscores their inherent limitations in capturing contextual nuances, emotional tone, and privacy considerations essential for maintaining organisational records' integrity and completeness. This underscores the vital role of HR in designing hybrid workflows where AI's scalability is complemented by human oversight, ensuring that employee training programs equip staff to engage with AI outputs and exercise interpretive judgment critically.

The broader literature [23,25] reinforces that technological innovation must be embedded within human-centred frameworks. Consequently, HR functions must evolve beyond traditional administrative support to become strategic partners in managing AI-driven systems, including policy development, ethical governance, and continuous workforce capability building. The governance gaps identified here, mirroring prior research, highlight the pressing need for robust institutional policies that address ethical AI use, data privacy, and compliance, especially as platforms like Microsoft Teams transform record-keeping practices and complicate accountability.

Moreover, AI's shortcomings in interpreting subtle communicative cues pose risks to records' reliability and institutional value, particularly in sensitive domains like governance and academia. This aligns with the insights of Clegg [27] and Mumford [28], who argue that automation should enhance rather than replace human input, reinforcing HR's need to foster a culture of vigilant human oversight within AI-augmented administrative workflows. Additionally, the shift toward cloud-based enterprise systems, while offering agility and cost benefits, has contributed to the erosion of internal IT expertise

[30], increasing dependence on external vendors and exposing organisations to operational and security vulnerabilities. Pillen and Eckard [31] highlight that inconsistent metadata standards in cloud environments further jeopardise digital record-keeping, threatening long-term organisational memory.

To mitigate these risks, HR must champion and comprehensively train initiatives that upskill employees in AI literacy and promote cross-functional collaboration between IT, legal, and administrative units to establish standardised metadata protocols and governance frameworks. Integrating AI into archival and record management systems, supported by such standards, can enhance data discoverability and safeguard institutional knowledge continuity [23]. In sum, the effective management of AI-driven administrative systems requires a holistic approach where human resource development, governance, and technology coalesce to balance innovation with ethical, contextual, and operational integrity.

5.1. Limitations

This study highlights AI and automation's transformative impact on administrative work but has limitations. It relies on available literature, which may be biased due to underrepresented non-English and unpublished sources. The focus on AI in administrative tasks like automated meeting minutes may limit applicability across all industries and roles. Rapid technological changes could also render some references outdated. Importantly, the study lacks empirical evidence for the proposed interventions, emphasising the need for future research to test their practical implementation and effectiveness.

5.2. Recommendations

In light of the challenges identified in this study, several recommendations are proposed to strengthen the integration of AI and automation into administrative processes. In hybrid AI-human systems, a lack of familiarity with AI-driven tools should not be conflated with a broader lack of competence in AI; rather, these systems should leverage AI's operational efficiency alongside the critical thinking and contextual judgment of human reviewers to produce more accurate and robust documentation. Additionally, organisations should develop a comprehensive AI governance framework that delineates permissible uses, outlines ethical considerations, establishes data retention policies, and defines accountability structures. Such a framework would address existing governance gaps and ensure alignment with legal and professional standards. Implementing standardised metadata protocols and integrating AI into archival systems can enhance digital records' accuracy, reliability, and evidentiary value, thereby supporting institutional memory and long-term information security. Ethical concerns surrounding AI deployment can also be mitigated through transparent data collection practices, informed consent models, and bias reduction strategies, safeguarding sensitive data, promoting equity, and ensuring compliance with data protection regulations. Future research should include empirical investigations, such as case studies, to validate these recommendations and assess the practical effectiveness of AI applications within various administrative contexts.

5.3. Recommendations for Future Research and Organisational Interventions

To advance the insights of this study, future research should incorporate empirical data, such as case studies or interviews, to explore the practical implementation of AI and automation in administrative functions across diverse sectors. A longitudinal research design would be particularly valuable in evaluating the sustained impact of these technologies on organisational memory, governance structures, and ethical considerations. Furthermore, examining the efficacy of various governance frameworks in mitigating identified risks would offer critical guidance for institutions aiming to adopt AI responsibly. It is also imperative for organisations to invest in comprehensive training programs that equip employees with the necessary competencies to engage with AI-driven administrative systems while ensuring continued human oversight. In parallel, establishing robust data governance policies, including clearly defined data retention schedules and access control mechanisms, will be essential to upholding legal and ethical standards. Lastly, prioritising investment in secure, scalable systems for the long-term storage and management of digital records, such as archived meeting minutes, is vital to preserving institutional memory and ensuring operational continuity.

6. CONCLUSION

While AI, Microsoft Teams, and other automated tools substantially benefit contemporary organisations, their uncritical adoption has also introduced notable administrative challenges. Concerns about time-bound archiving, confidentiality, intellectual property rights, and governance demand urgent attention. Organisations must reassert human oversight, establish robust governance frameworks, and prioritise sustainable information management strategies to mitigate these risks. Ensuring these technologies support rather than undermine administrative integrity requires a deliberate balance between automation and accountability, which is essential for maintaining the institutional foundation in an increasingly digital environment.

Acknowledgements: While preparing this manuscript, the author utilised Grammarly and QuillBot for language editing, polishing, and plagiarism detection. All outputs generated by these tools were critically reviewed and edited by the author, who takes full responsibility for the final content presented in this publication.

Funding Statement: No external funding was received for this research's conduct or the manuscript's preparation.

Contribution: The author contributed to the research and writing of this article and has read/agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: The data used in this study were derived from secondary sources compiled through a comprehensive literature review. All data are publicly available and have been appropriately cited in the manuscript.

Conflict of Interest Statement: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

1. Bughin, J., Seong, J., Manyika, J., *et al.* (2018, September). *Notes from the AI frontier: Modeling the impact of AI on the world economy*. McKinsey Global Institute. https://www.mckinsey.com/featured-insights/artificial-intelligence/notes-from-the-ai-frontier-modeling-the-impact-of-ai-on-the-world-economy
2. Nawaz, N., Hemalatha, A., Pathi, B. K., *et al.* (2024). The adoption of artificial intelligence in human resources management practices. *International Journal of Information Management Data Insights, 4*(1), 100208. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jjimei.2023.100208
3. Davenport, T. H., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harvard Business Review, 96*(1), 108–116
4. Duranti, L., Rogers, C., McLeod, J., *et al.* (2019, September). *Trusting records and data in the cloud: The creation, management, and preservation of trustworthy digital content*. Victoria Lemieux's Lab. https://doi.org/10.29085/9781783304042
5. Enemosah, A., & Ifeanyi, O. G. (2025). Cloud security frameworks for protecting IoT devices and SCADA systems in automated environments. *World Journal of Advanced Research and Reviews, 22*(3), 2232–2252. https://doi.org/10.30574/wjarr.2024.22.3.1485
6. Richards, N. M., & King, J. H. (2014). Big data ethics. *Wake Forest Law Review, 49*(2), 393–432.
7. Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information.* Harvard University Press.
8. Sellen, A. J., & Whittaker, S. (2010). Beyond total capture: A constructive critique of lifelogging. *Communications of the ACM, 53*(5), 70–77. https://doi.org/10.1145/1735223.1735243
9. Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 149–159). Organiser: Association for Computing Machinery (ACM). Location: New York, NY, USA. Country: United States.

10. Ali, O., Murray, P. A., Momin, M., *et al.* (2024). The effects of artificial intelligence applications in educational settings: Challenges and strategies. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 199*, 123076. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.123076
11. Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., *et al.* (2023). Opinion paper: "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management, 71*, 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642
12. Babashahi, L., Barbosa, C. E., Lima, *et al.* (2024). AI in the Workplace : A Systematic Review of Skill Transformation in the Industry. Administrative Sciences, 14(6), 127. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14060127
13. Susskind, R., & Susskind, D. (2020). *The future of the professions: How technology will transform the work of human experts* (Oxford, 2015; online edn, Oxford Academic, 12 Nov. 2020). https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780198713395.001.0001
14. Babu, N. S., Marda, K., Mishra, A., *et al.* (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence in the workplace and its effect on the digital wellbeing of employees. *Journal for Studies in Management and Planning, 10*(4), 1–32. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10936348
15. Abazi Chaushi, B., Nastovska, M., & Veseli-Kurtishi, T. (2024, September). *MS Teams for virtual collaboration – An overview*. 4th International Conference on Educational Technology and Online Learning, Anadolu University, Eskişehir, Türkiye.
16. Cordella, A., & Gualdi, F. (2024). Regulating generative AI: The limits of technology-neutral regulatory frameworks. Insights from Italy's intervention on ChatGPT. Government Information Quarterly, 41(4), 101982. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2024.101982
17. Vatamanu, A. F., & Tofan, M. (2025). Integrating Artificial Intelligence into Public Administration: Challenges and Vulnerabilities. Administrative Sciences, 15(4), 149. https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci15040149
18. Modiba, M. T. (2021). Utilising artificial intelligence technology for the management of records at the Council for Scientific and Industrial Research in South Africa (Doctoral dissertation, University of South Africa). https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.11451.49443
19. Alugoju, N. R. (2024). The dark side of AI: A growing global threat in cybersecurity. *International Journal of Computer Engineering & Technology, 9*(2), 579–587. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14405057
20. Nyaboke, Y. (2024). Intellectual property rights in the era of artificial intelligence. *Journal of Modern Law and Policy, 4*(2), 57–72. https://doi.org/10.47941/jmlp.2162
21. Al-kfairy, M., Mustafa, D., Kshetri, N., *et al.* (2024). Ethical challenges and solutions of generative AI: An interdisciplinary perspective. *Informatics, 11*(3), 58. https://doi.org/10.3390/informatics11030058
22. Osasona, F., Amoo, O. O., Atadoga, A., *et al.* (2024). Reviewing the ethical implications of AI in decision-making processes. *International Journal of Management & Entrepreneurship Research, 6*(2), 322–335. https://doi.org/10.51594/ijmer.v6i2.773
23. Akinade, A. O., Ige, A. B., & Pub, A. (2024). Cloud security challenges and solutions: A review of current best practices. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation, 6*(1), 26–35. https://doi.org/10.54660/IJMRGE.2025.6.1.26-35
24. Zhang, Q., Cheng, L., & Boutaba, R. (2010). Cloud computing: State-of-the-art and research challenges. *Journal of Internet Services and Applications, 1*, 7–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13174-010-0007-6
25. Parycek, P., Schmid, V., & Novak, A.-S. (2023). Artificial intelligence (AI) and automation in administrative procedures: Potentials, limitations, and framework conditions. *Journal of the Knowledge Economy, 15*, 8390–8415. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13132-023-00808-4
26. Herdiyanti, A. (2024). *The use of automatic AI-based notes and transcription services in qualitative research: Ethical and methodological concerns*. In Proceedings of the ALISE Annual Conference. Association for Library and Information Science Education (ALISE), Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, United States. https://doi.org/10.21900/j.alise.2024.1717
27. Clegg, C. W. (2000). Socio-technical principles for system design. *Applied Ergonomics, 31*(5), 463–477. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0003-6870(00)00009-0
28. Mumford, E. (2006). The story of socio-technical design: Reflections on its successes, failures and potential. *Information Systems Journal, 16*(4), 317–342. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2575.2006.00221.x

29. Buchal, R., & Songsore, E. (2019). Using Microsoft Teams to support collaborative knowledge building in the context of sustainability assessment. *Proceedings of the Canadian Engineering Education Association (CEEA)*. https://doi.org/10.24908/pceea.vi0.13806
30. George, A. S. (2024). Consequences of enterprise cloud migration on institutional information technology knowledge. *Partners Universal Innovative Research Publication (PUIRP)*, *2*(2), 38–55. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10938874
31. Pillen, D., & Eckard, M. (2023). The impact of the shift to cloud computing on digital record-keeping practices at the University of Michigan Bentley Historical Library. *Archival Science, 23*(1), 65–80. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10502-022-09391-9
32. Trist, E. L., & Bamforth, K. W. (1951). Some social and psychological consequences of the longwall method of coal-getting. *Human Relations, 4*(1), 3–38. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872675100400101
33. Emery, F. E., & Trist, E. L. (1960). Socio-technical systems. In C. W. Churchman & M. Verhulst (Eds.), *Management science models and techniques* (Vol. 2, pp. 83–97). Pergamon.
34. Pasmore, W. A. (1988). *Designing effective organisations: The socio-technical systems perspective.* John Wiley & Sons.
35. Gregory, A. T., & Denniss, A. R. (2018). An introduction to writing narrative and systematic reviews—Tasks, tips and traps for aspiring authors. *Heart, Lung and Circulation, 27*(7), 893–898. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hlc.2018.03.027
36. Sukhera, J. (2022). Narrative reviews: Flexible, rigorous, and practical. *Journal of Graduate Medical Education, 14*(4), 414. https://doi.org/10.4300/JGME-D-22-00480.1
37. Boma-Siaminabo, H. (2022). Office virtualisation, virtual meeting, office of today and the future. *Journal of International Research in Accounting and Management, 10*(3), 78–88.
38. Kurniati, E. Y., & Fithriani, R. (2022). Post-graduate students' perceptions of QuillBot Utilization in English academic writing class. Journal of English Language Teaching and Linguistics, 7(3), 437–451. https://doi.org/10.21462/jeltl.v7i3.852
39. Xuyen, N. T. (2023). Using the online paraphrasing tool Quillbot to assist students in paraphrasing the source information: English-majored students' perceptions. In T. T. Nghi (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 5th Conference on Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 21–27). AIJR. Conference organised by AIJR Publisher, Vietnam, held in Hanoi. https://doi.org/10.21467/proceedings.150.3
40. Fitria, T. N. (2025). *QuillBot grammar checker: The ability to evaluate students' writing errors of English essay*. *International Journal of Computer and Information System (IJCIS)*, *6*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.29040/ijcis.v6i1.201
41. Taeihagh, A. (2021). Governance of artificial intelligence. Policy and Society, 40(2), 137–157. https://doi.org/10.1080/14494035.2021.1928377
42. Molas, G., & Nowak, E. (2020). Advances in Emerging Memory Technologies: From Data Storage to Artificial Intelligence. Applied Sciences, 11(23), 11254. https://doi.org/10.3390/app112311254
43. Canning, D., & Jaillant, L. (2025). AI to review government records: New work to unlock historically significant digital records. *AI & Society*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-025-02221-0
44. Oyighan, D., Ukubeyinje, E. S., David-West, *et al.* (2024). The role of AI in transforming metadata management: Insights on challenges, opportunities, and emerging trends. *Asian Journal of Information Science and Technology, 14*(2), 20–26. https://doi.org/10.70112/ajist-2024.14.2.4277
45. Yeo, G. (2007). Concepts of record (1): Evidence, information, and persistent representations. *The American Archivist, 70*(2), 315–343. https://doi.org/10.17723/aarc.70.2.u327764v1036756q