SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY PUBLISHING HOUSE

SCIENTIFIC PAPERS OF SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY 2026
ORGANIZATION AND MANAGEMENT SERIES NO. 254

THE LEADER AS A CRITICAL STRATEGIST AND EMPATH: COMPETENCY PROFILE IN HUMAN-AI HYBRID TEAMS FROM THE PERSPECTIVE OF MANAGEMENT PRACTITIONERS

Katarzyna MIKOŁAJCZYK[1*], Anna BIŁYK[2], Rafał ŁABĘDZKI[3]

[1] SGH Warsaw School of Economics, Institute of Human Capital; katarzyna.mikolajczyk@sgh.waw.pl, ORCID: 0000-0003-0630-4382
[2] SGH Warsaw School of Economics, Institute of Human Capital; anna.bilyk@sgh.waw.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-4815-9366
[3] SGH Warsaw School of Economics, Institute of Human Capital; rlabed@sgh.waw.pl, ORCID: 0000-0002-0239-4125
* Correspondence author

Purpose: The article aims to identify and rank key leadership competencies for managing human-AI hybrid teams. It addresses an empirical gap concerning the demands on leaders where AI functions as an integral team member rather than just a tool.
Design/Methodology/Approach: The study utilized a survey-based method with a purposively selected sample of practitioners (N = 79) experienced in leading human-AI teams. A custom questionnaire enabled a quantitative assessment of 24 competencies and a qualitative analysis of managerial challenges and barriers.
Findings: The analysis reveals that practitioners prioritize cognitive and relational competencies over technical ones. Top-rated competencies include critical thinking/data evaluation and emotional intelligence, while AI tool proficiency ranked significantly lower (7th place). The findings suggest the leader's role is evolving toward a critical empath model, combining algorithmic verification with the management of team well-being.
Limitations/Research implications: Generalizability is limited by the exploratory nature of the study, purposive sampling, and the modest sample size. Future research should employ representative samples and conduct cross-sector comparisons.
Practical implications: The results offer guidance for HR in recruitment and development, shifting focus from tool-based training to metacompetencies like digital ethics and psychological resilience. Businesses should cultivate leaders capable of managing technology-related anxiety and building trust.
Originality/Value: The article empirically validates theoretical models within the Polish organizational context. It offers a unique practitioner perspective that challenges technocratic leadership approaches and demonstrates the primacy of soft skills in human-AI collaboration.
Keywords: leadership competencies, artificial intelligence, hybrid teams, human-AI collaboration, critical thinking, emotional intelligence.
Category of the paper: Research paper.

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is driving fundamental changes in organizational leadership models, changes that extend well beyond the scope of traditional managerial competencies. In an era defined by algorithmic decision support, leaders are no longer merely organizational administrators; they are increasingly responsible for shaping the ethical frameworks of AI implementation and managing its organizational consequences. This requires competencies in building trust within human-AI relationships, navigating ethical dilemmas, and accounting for the impact of technology on diverse stakeholder groups (Westover, 2025).

The rapid evolution of technology, particularly the widespread adoption of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI), is compelling a fundamental shift in how AI's role in the workplace is understood. We are witnessing a transition from the model of "AI as a tool" to the concept of "AI as a team member" (*team-centered AI* or *AI as a teammate*). As Seeber et al. (2020) and Schafheitle, Weibel, and Rickert (2021) observe, in this configuration, managers face what might be called "two-leader situations" – circumstances in which managerial authority coexists with algorithmic recommendations that often lack transparency in their decision-making processes. The literature emphasizes that effectiveness in such an environment requires a specific combination of competencies. On the one hand, digital fluency and AI literacy are essential; on the other, as Bock and von der Oelsnitz (2025) and Dedhia (2025) argue, distinctly human competencies become critical: empathy, visionary thinking, and ethical reasoning, none of which technology can replicate. Jarrahi (2018) describes this phenomenon as a symbiosis in which AI assumes analytical tasks while humans retain the advantage in contextual reasoning, strategic planning, and relationship management.

Despite the growing body of theoretical publications, a significant research gap persists regarding empirical verification of these assumptions. Existing competency frameworks tend to be normative in character, grounded in theoretical postulates or literature reviews (Budianto et al., 2025), and rarely incorporate the direct perspective of those managing automation processes within organizations. The scholarly discourse lacks the practitioner's voice: an answer to the question of how leaders themselves, those confronting the daily challenges of human-AI collaboration, define their own needs and the competencies they consider essential.

This article aims to fill that gap by giving voice to practitioners. The study focuses on the subjective assessments of managers actively leading hybrid teams (human-AI collaboration), enabling them to identify and rank the skills required for effective performance independently. It also allows for a response to the central research problem: what competencies do practitioners consider critical for the effective management of such teams? The analysis addresses four specific research questions: (1) which competencies are most important and which are relatively less so; (2) whether differences in perceived priorities exist between leaders with varying levels of AI experience; (3) what practical rationale underlies the selection of these competencies;

and (4) how the identified challenges and barriers translate into developmental needs for leaders. This approach allows theoretical models to be tested against organizational reality. It also helps determine whether practitioners themselves perceive technical proficiency or cognitive and relational competencies as the key to success. The findings carry significant implications both for leadership theory and for the practice of HR departments designing managerial competency development pathways in the AI era.

2. Literature Review

2.1. From e-Leadership to AI-Leadership: A Paradigm Shift

Technology has long shaped leadership models, evolving from the concept of e-Leadership, defined by Avolio and Gardner (2005) as a process of social influence mediated by advanced technologies, toward the more complex construct now referred to as AI-Leadership. Where e-Leadership focused on managing distributed teams through digital media (Van Wart et al., 2019), AI-Leadership introduces a fundamental change: technology is no longer merely a communication medium but becomes an active participant in the decision-making process (Bock, von der Oelsnitz, 2025). This necessitates a redefinition of the manager's role, from direct decision-maker to arbiter and interpreter of AI-generated outputs. As Myszak and Filina-Dawidowicz (2025) emphasize, this requires a departure from traditional hierarchical models toward adaptive and transformational leadership, in which the capacity to build trust, not only with team members but also with technological systems, becomes central (Zhang et al., 2025).

2.2. Human-AI Complementarity as the Foundation of Hybrid Collaboration

The theoretical basis for analyzing competencies in hybrid teams is the concept of human-AI complementarity – *The Missing Middle* – formulated by Daugherty and Wilson (2018). These authors argue that the greatest potential for productivity gains lies not in replacing humans with AI, but in the space of their close collaboration: humans complement AI by training it and explaining its behavior, while AI systems augment human analytical capabilities.

In this context, Trojańczyk (2024) and Budianto, Rahadian, and Yunita (2025) argue that leaders must possess competencies enabling them to manage the human-AI interaction space. The requirement here is not programming ability, but *AI literacy*, an understanding of systems' capabilities and limitations, enabling leaders to avoid cognitive errors arising from excessive algorithmic trust (*automation bias*) or unwarranted scepticism (*algorithm aversion*). Peifer and Terstegen (2023) define these demands as the necessity of combining technical knowledge with a deep understanding of business processes and ethical dimensions. Zhang et al. (2025) find

that only leaders who perceive the strategic value of AI are capable of effectively activating employees' trust in technology and stimulating innovation.

2.3. Competency Models: Technological or Humanistic Orientation?

A review of recent research reveals a clear dichotomy in approaches to leader competencies in the digital environment. On one side, researchers such as Philip, Gilli, and Knappstein (2023) using Delphi methodology identify key competencies associated with digital transformation: data analytics, organizational agility, and innovation management. On the other hand, a growing consensus is emerging around the primacy of human-centric skills.

In their structured literature review, Bock and von der Oelsnitz (2025) identified 24 leader competencies for the AI era, grouped into cognitive, functional, social, and personal categories. Their analysis shows that as routine tasks become automated, skills that AI cannot replicate gain in importance: critical thinking, creativity, and emotional intelligence. This is corroborated by Dedhia (2025), whose findings indicate that transformational leadership in the AI era must be grounded in strategic vision and empathy to counter employees' fears of job displacement.

Paradoxically, the greater the technological presence in an organization, the more important purely human competencies become. The works cited suggest that in human-AI hybrid teams, it is interpersonal skills that determine the success of AI adoption.

In Polish academic literature, the topic is present but less frequently examined in the specific context of direct human-AI collaboration. Research by Jagoda-Sobalak and Kaliciak-Gebauer (2025) focuses on the competencies of digital leaders, confirming the complexity of requirements, spanning both technological knowledge and social skills. Nevertheless, empirical studies specifically addressing leaders managing hybrid teams within Polish organizational contexts remain scarce. The existing research gap concerns the question of whether Polish practitioners actually prioritize interpersonal and ethical competencies over technological ones in line with global trends, in their day-to-day work with algorithmic systems.

3. Research Methodology

3.1. Research Strategy

To achieve the research objective, an exploratory-descriptive strategy was employed, drawing on mixed-methods methodology to provide a comprehensive account of the phenomenon under study. The use of methodological triangulation, combining quantitative data (competency rankings) with qualitative data (descriptive justifications and identification of barriers), is particularly warranted in research on emerging technologies, where numerical indicators alone may fail to capture the depth of contextual factors (Creswell, 2013). The main

study was conducted in 2025 using the CAWI (*Computer-Assisted Web Interview*) technique, which ensured respondent anonymity and enabled access to a precisely defined target group.

3.2. Sample Characteristics

The sample was selected purposively. Inclusion criteria required respondents to hold a managerial position (middle or senior level) and to have direct experience managing teams that use artificial intelligence tools, including generative AI, process automation systems, and predictive analytics.

The final sample consisted of N = 79 managers with experience leading hybrid teams, drawn primarily from the IT sector (48%), services (16%), and finance (10%), as well as marketing (8%), industry (8%), trade and distribution (6%), and healthcare (4%). The sample was predominantly male (75%), with the majority of respondents aged 25-44 (64%). By professional profile, the sample consisted of team leaders (41%) and middle managers (32%), with 2-5 years of experience with AI (49%), working in both small firms (32%) and large corporations (22%). Respondents demonstrated high digital maturity: 67% reported deep AI integration into their workflows, and 63% described their personal AI proficiency as high, with GenAI tools dominating (81%). Respondents were divided into novice leaders (AI experience <1 year — 27%) and experienced leaders (>1 year — 73%), enabling an examination of how their competency needs evolve over time.

3.3. Research Instrument and Procedure

A custom-designed questionnaire was used as the research instrument. Its central component was a competency list developed from a review of the literature (Albannai, Raziq, 2025; Aziz et al., 2025; Grenda, 2026; Myszak, Filina-Dawidowicz, 2025; Philip et al., 2023; Tasnim, 2024; World Economic Forum, 2025), with particular reliance on the taxonomy presented by Bock and von der Oelsnitz (2025). They identified a catalogue of 24 key leadership competencies relevant to the AI era, which were adapted for the purposes of the present study.

The research procedure consisted of three stages. In the first step, respondents were asked to select 5 key competencies (from 24 available) that, in their view, are essential for the effective management of a hybrid (human-AI) team. In the second stage, participants ranked their chosen competencies by assigning weights according to their perceived importance. In the third, qualitative stage, respondents were asked to provide a written justification for their top three choices and to identify the main challenges and barriers they face in managing hybrid teams effectively. This multi-stage instrument design enabled not only the construction of a precise importance ranking but also a deeper understanding of the motivations and context underlying managerial decisions.

4. Research Findings

4.1. Ranking of Leadership Competencies in Hybrid Teams

Analysis of the collected data enabled the construction of an empirical competency profile for a leader managing a human-AI hybrid team. The results reveal a clear hierarchy of needs, dominated by competencies related to the critical evaluation of technology and interpersonal skills. The five most sought-after competencies identified by practitioners are: (1) *Critical thinking and data evaluation* (mean - 0.48 / sum - 38), (2) *Emotional intelligence* (mean - 0.43 / sum - 34), (3) *Empathic communication* (mean - 0.33 / sum - 26), (4) *Change management and adaptability* (mean - 0.27 / sum - 21), and (5) *Building psychological safety* (mean - 0.25 / sum - 20). Table 1 presents a full overview of the competencies and their practitioner-rated scores. The analysis below groups the 24 competencies under study into four key areas (clusters), enabling a deeper interpretation of the competency profile preferred by practitioners.

Table 1.
Detailed competency ranking by category

Category I. Relational Competencies (dominant area at the top of the ranking) - focused on interpersonal relationships, emotions, and communication			
Rank	**competency**	**no. of indications**	**% respondents**
2	Emotional intelligence	34	43.0%
3	Empathic communication	26	32.9%
5	Building psychological safety	20	25.3%
12	Transparent communication	14	17.7%
14	Ensuring effective information flow	12	15.2%
23	Building and sustaining relationships	6	7.6%
24	Managing diversity and inclusion	2	2.5%
TOTAL	**Total number of indications in the category**	**114**	
Category II. Cognitive and Strategic Competencies (key for setting direction and verifying AI output) - related to information processing, decision-making, and ethics			
Rank	**competency**	**no. of indications**	**% respondents**
1	Critical thinking and data evaluation	38	48.1%
8	Strategic thinking and visionary leadership	18	22.8%
10	Ethical and responsible use of AI	16	20.3%
19	Complex problem-solving	8	10.1%
20	Data-driven decision-making	8	10.1%
21	Creativity and fostering innovation	8	10.1%

Cont. table 1.

22	Customer focus	6	7.6%
TOTAL	**Total number of indications in the category**	**102**	
Category III. Adaptive and Developmental Competencies (essential in dynamic environments) - related to change management, learning, and flexibility			
Rank	**competency**	**no. of indications**	**% Respondents**
4	Change management and adaptability	21	26.6%
6	Talent development and coaching	20	25.3%
11	Building a culture of experimentation	14	17.7%
15	Agile Leadership	12	15.2%
18	Performance management	10	12.7%
TOTAL	**Total number of indications in the category**	**77**	
Category IV. Technological and Digital Competencies (technical foundation, but less frequently cited as most critical) - related to operating, understanding, and implementing AI technologies			
Rank	**competency**	**no. of indications**	**% respondents**
7	AI Literacy	19	24.1%
9	Effective task delegation (between humans and AI)	18	22.8%
13	Cybersecurity awareness	13	16.5%
16	Hybrid process management	12	15.2%
17	Driving team improvement through technology	11	13.9%
TOTAL	**Total number of indications in the category**	**73**	

Source: Authors' own research data (multiple-choice; percentages do not sum to 100%).

Leaders prioritize competencies from the relational and cognitive-strategic domains. Strictly technical competencies (e.g., *AI Literacy*) ranked considerably lower (7th place, 24%), suggesting that the leader's role is evolving toward that of a moderator and strategist – a critical strategist and empath – rather than a technical expert.

4.2. Leader Experience and Competency Perceptions: A Comparative Analysis

A comparative analysis by AI experience tenure revealed a strong consensus on the fundamentals: regardless of experience level, critical thinking and emotional intelligence consistently top the ranking (Table 2). This confirms the universality of a leader profile that combines analytical rigor with empathy.

Differences reflect the stage of technology adoption. Novice leaders focus on the operational management of change and communication transparency (both at 33%), aiming to reduce uncertainty within their teams. Experienced leaders, by contrast, prioritize talent development (29%) and *AI Literacy* (28%), indicating a shift in role from facilitating change to strategically optimizing the potential of human-AI collaboration.

Table 2.
Comparison of Top 5 competencies by AI experience group

Group	Competency (Top 5)	Indications	% Group
Experienced (>1 year) (N=58)	1. Critical thinking and data analysis	28	48.3%
	2. Emotional intelligence	25	43.1%
	3. Empathic communication	19	32.8%
	4. Talent development and coaching	17	29.3%
	5. AI Literacy	16	27.6%
Novice (<1 year) (N=21)	1. Critical thinking and data analysis	10	47.6%
	2. Emotional intelligence	9	42.9%
	3. Change management and adaptability	7	33.3%
	4. Empathic communication	7	33.3%
	5. Transparent communication	7	33.3%

Source: Authors' own research data.

4.3. Rationale for Competency Choices, Barriers, and Developmental Gaps

The quantitative analysis is complemented by an interpretation of the qualitative data gathered in the course of the study. A thematic analysis of responses to open-ended questions identified the practical rationale behind competency selections, key barriers in managing hybrid teams, and resulting developmental needs of leaders. In justifying their prioritization of critical thinking and data evaluation, respondents stressed the need for rigorous scrutiny of AI-generated suggestions – outputs that, though produced rapidly, are not always data-grounded, optimal, or contextually appropriate. Soft competencies, in turn, are perceived as the foundation of leadership, particularly as technology becomes increasingly pervasive. Respondents emphasized that these competencies help not only to "effectively leverage and complement the hard competencies that AI reinforces" (ID 76), but also to "maintain a balance between efficiency and a human approach to work" (ID 44). From the managers' perspective, soft competencies combined with critical thinking enhance effectiveness in change management and adaptability. In the short term, they enable flexible responses to current challenges; over time, they help "lead teams effectively through processes of technological change" (ID 9), changes that generate concern among many employees.

Respondents also identified numerous challenges across three domains: individual, organizational, and technological. These point to a need to develop competencies that enable leaders to guide teams through new forms of AI-integrated work. First, at the interpersonal level, strengthening communication and change management skills is essential, encompassing the ability to address employees' concerns about job loss or transformation, overcome resistance to new tools, and educate teams in the responsible use of AI. Second, at the organizational level, the ability to thoughtfully design task allocation, select appropriate

AI tools, and establish clear principles for human-AI collaboration is critical. Third, at the technological level, leaders need to deepen their understanding of AI systems' capabilities and limitations and develop competencies in systems evaluation and data governance.

5. Discussion

The research findings support a multidimensional interpretation of the evolution of leadership in the context of AI implementation. They confirm the theoretical construct of human-AI complementarity (*The Missing Middle*) formulated by Daugherty and Wilson (2018), while shifting the emphasis significantly, away from technical complementarity and toward the cognitive-emotional dimension. Although hybrid collaboration rests on a technological infrastructure, its effectiveness is determined by the quality of human-AI interaction in terms of interpretation and process management.

Analysis of the competency hierarchy leads to three key conclusions that define the profile of the contemporary leader of hybrid teams. First, despite the intensive use of AI, strictly technical competencies (Category IV) are treated as foundational rather than differentiating factors for leadership effectiveness. An effective leader is not perceived as an AI technical expert, but as a facilitator of collaboration and a strategist capable of harnessing the analytical capabilities of algorithmic systems in pursuit of business objectives.

Second, AI implementation intensifies the need to manage emotional responses within teams. The dominance of critical thinking in the ranking corresponds to the challenges posed by the limited transparency of algorithmic processes (*the black box phenomenon*) described by Schafheitle et al. (2021). Leaders in the study clearly indicate that their role extends beyond operating systems to encompass the verification and contextualization of AI-generated results. A discernible pattern emerges here: as the sophistication of the AI tools being implemented increases, so does the importance attributed by leaders to emotional intelligence (ranked second). This is confirmed by Dedhia's (2025) argument that AI anxiety must be actively managed through empathy and the cultivation of psychological safety within teams. The leader's role is evolving toward a model that combines the verification of algorithmic outputs with the management of team members' psychological well-being.

Third, the comparative analysis reveals a process of competency priority development as leaders gain experience working with AI systems. Priorities shift from the operational management of the change process (adaptation phase) toward the strategic development of employee competencies and coaching (optimization phase). This suggests that the initial resistance and uncertainty surrounding technology gradually give way to the need for systematic development of the team's competencies within the new hybrid work environment.

At the theoretical level, the study supports the model of human-centered leadership described, among others, by Morris and Morris (2024). In the context of automated decision-making processes, the leader serves as an interpreter of meaning and a guardian of organizational values, a function of fundamental importance for the design of future managerial development models.

6. Conclusions

The study found that practitioners perceive an effective leader of hybrid teams as someone who combines strong analytical capabilities with high emotional intelligence. Cognitive and relational competencies form the core of modern leadership, outranking technological proficiency in perceived importance.

The findings carry significant practical implications for human resource management and business strategy. In the area of managerial recruitment and selection, there is a need to reorient selection criteria away from technical proficiency toward metacognitive abilities, including the capacity to synthesize information from diverse sources and critically evaluate algorithmic outputs, as well as emotional maturity. In the domain of competency development, investment should shift from tool-based training (such as prompt engineering) toward programs cultivating digital ethics, change process management, and the building of psychological safety within teams. At the organizational culture level, it is important to support an environment conducive to continuous learning – one in which relational competencies are developed as a collective organizational resource, not merely as an individual managerial attribute.

6.1. Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The primary limitation of the study lies in its purposive sampling design and relatively modest sample size, giving the work an exploratory character. The overrepresentation of the technology sector in the sample may account for the relatively high level of comfort with AI systems reported by respondents.

Future research directions should focus on three key areas. First, longitudinal analyses are warranted to track how the competency hierarchy shifts as autonomous AI agents become more prevalent. Second, incorporating the employee perspective would be valuable, specifically comparing leaders' self-assessments with subordinates' expectations regarding relational competencies in an automated work environment. Third, examining sector-specific variation appears important, particularly investigating whether the identified leadership profiles hold in sectors with lower technological density, such as traditional manufacturing.

References

1. Albannai, N.A.A., Raziq, M.M. (2025). Navigating ethical, human-centric leadership in AI-driven organizations: a thematic literature review. *The Service Industries Journal*, 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1080/02642069.2025.2534360
2. Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(3), 315-338. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.03.001
3. Aziz, M.F., Rajesh, J.I., Jahan, F., McMurray, A., Ahmed, N., Narendran, R., Harrison, C. (2025). AI-powered leadership: a systematic literature review. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *40*(5), 604-630. https://doi.org/10.1108/JMP-05-2024-0389
4. Bock, T., von der Oelsnitz, D. (2025). Leadership-Competences in the Era of Artificial Intelligence – a Structured Review. *Strategy & Leadership*, *53*(3), 235-255. https://doi.org/10.1108/SL-09-2024-0100
5. Budianto, S., Rahadian, D., Yunita, I. (2025). The Emerging Landscape of AI-Powered Leadership: Transforming Roles and Organizations. *Journal of Lifestyle and SDGs Review*, *5*(2), e04139. https://doi.org/10.47172/2965-730X.SDGsReview.v5.n02.pe04139
6. Creswell, J.W. (2013). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications.
7. Daugherty, P.R., Wilson, H.J. (2018). Human + Machine: Reimagining Work in the Age of AI. *Harvard Business Review Press*. Boston.
8. Dedhia, P. (2025). Transformational Leadership in the Age of AI-Driven Tech: Inspiring with Vision in No Code Generation. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Engineering and Management*, *9*(6), 1-9. https://doi.org/10.55041/IJSREM50924
9. Grenda, D. (2026). Technological knowledge, soft skills and management & leadership skills: three pillars for the digitally competent manager. *Journal of Business Economics*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11573-025-01250-x
10. Jagoda-Sobalak, D., Kaliciak-Gebauer, M. (2025). Rozwój kompetencji lidera w erze cyfrowej na podstawie badań i doświadczeń menedżerów [Leadership competency development in the digital era: research findings and managerial perspectives]. *Zeszyty Naukowe Politechniki Częstochowskiej. Zarządzanie*, *57*, 68-82. https://doi.org/10.17512/znpcz.2025.1.05
11. Jarrahi, M.H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. *Business Horizons*, *61*(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007
12. Morris, M.L., Morris, J. (2024). Human-centered leadership. In: T.S. Rocco, M.L. Morris, R.F. Poell (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of human resource development* (pp. 347-362). SAGE Publications Ltd.

13. Myszak, J.M., Filina-Dawidowicz, L. (2025). Leaders' Competencies and Skills in the Era of Artificial Intelligence: A Scoping Review. *Applied Sciences*, *15*(18), 10271. https://doi.org/10.3390/app151810271
14. Peifer, Y., Terstegen, S. (2023). *Artificial Intelligence – Qualification and Competence Development Requirements for Executives*. IEEE International Symposium on Multimedia.
15. Philip, J., Gilli, K., Knappstein, M. (2023). Identifying key leadership competencies for digital transformation: evidence from a cross-sectoral Delphi study of global managers. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *44*(3), 392-406. https://doi.org/10.1108/LODJ-02-2022-0063
16. Schafheitle, S., Weibel, A., Rickert, A. (2021). *The Bermuda Triangle of Leadership in the AI Era? Emerging Trust Implications from "Two-Leader-Situations" in the Eyes of Employees.* Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences.
17. Seeber, I., Bittner, E., Briggs, R.O., de Vreede, T., de Vreede, G.J., Elkins, A., Maier, R., Merz, A.B., Opie-Epstein, S., Schwabe, G., Söllner, M. (2020). Machines as teammates: A research agenda on AI in team collaboration. *Information & Management*, *57*.
18. Tasnim, M. (2024). Leadership competencies for the age of artificial intelligence. In: *Utilizing AI and Smart Technology to Improve Sustainability in Entrepreneurship*. Hershey: IGI Global. https://doi.org/10.4018/979-8-3693-1842-3.ch002
19. Trojańczyk, A. (2024). *Przywództwo w czasach AI. Minipodręcznik dla liderów o zarządzaniu kryzysem w epoce maszyn generatywnych [Leadership in the AI Era: A Mini-Guide for Leaders on Crisis Management in the Age of Generative Machines]* (1st ed.). Łódź.
20. Van Wart, M., Roman, A., Wang, X., Liu, C. (2019). Operationalizing the definition of e-leadership: identifying the elements of e-leadership. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *85*(1), 80-97. https://doi.org/10.1177/0020852316681446
21. Westover, J.H. (2025). How to Become an Effective AI-Augmented Leader. *Human Capital Leadership Review*.
22. World Economic Forum (2025). *The Future of Jobs Report 2025*. Retrieved from: https://reports.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Future_of_Jobs_Report_2025.pdf
23. Zhang, Q., Wang, F., Liao, G., Li, M. (2025). How Does AI Trust Foster Innovative Performance Under Paternalistic Leadership? The Roles of AI Crafting and Leader's AI Opportunity Perception. *Behavioral Sciences*, *15*(8), 1064. https://doi.org/10.3390/bs15081064