

Institutional Transformation of Management Systems in the Era of Intelligent Automation: A Grounded Theory Study

Amir Jafari¹, Shadi Moghaddam^{2*}

1. Department of Educational Management, Yaz.C., Islamic Azad University, Yazd, Iran

2. Department of Human Resources Management, Mey.C., Islamic Azad University, Meybod, Iran

Abstract

This study aimed to develop a grounded theory model explaining how intelligent automation transforms institutionalized management systems, decision authority, organizational routines, and managerial legitimacy in organizations operating in Tehran. This qualitative study used a grounded theory design to explore the institutional transformation of management systems under conditions of intelligent automation. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with 22 participants from Tehran, including senior managers, middle managers, digital transformation specialists, human resource managers, process automation experts, and organizational consultants working in technology-intensive, service, financial, manufacturing, and public-sector organizations. Participants were selected through purposive and theoretical sampling based on their direct experience with automation-enabled managerial change. Interviews continued until theoretical saturation was reached after the nineteenth interview, followed by three additional interviews to confirm category stability. Data were analyzed using open, axial, and selective coding with the support of NVivo software. The findings produced a grounded conceptual model centered on the core category of institutional reconfiguration of management systems through intelligent automation. Four main categories explained this process: algorithmic restructuring of managerial authority, institutionalization of data-driven governance, redesign of human-automation work systems, and legitimacy tensions in automated management. Participants described intelligent automation not merely as a technical tool but as a force that changed the meaning of managerial judgment, redistributed decision rights, standardized organizational routines, and created new expectations of transparency, speed, and evidence-based control. The model suggests that institutional transformation occurs when automation moves from task-level efficiency improvement to rule-making, monitoring, evaluation, and strategic coordination within management systems. The study concludes that intelligent automation transforms management systems through a gradual but profound institutional process in which authority, routines, accountability, and legitimacy are reconstructed around algorithmic capabilities. The findings contribute to institutional theory, digital transformation research, and management systems studies by showing that automation does not simply replace human managerial activity; rather, it changes the institutional conditions under which management is defined, justified, and practiced. The proposed grounded theory model highlights the need for organizations to develop governance mechanisms, managerial capabilities, ethical safeguards, and participatory redesign processes that preserve human judgment while benefiting from intelligent automation.

Keywords: Intelligent automation; management systems; institutional transformation; grounded theory; algorithmic management; digital transformation; organizational change; Tehran.

✉ *CORRESPONDING AUTHOR'S EMAIL

shadi.moghaddam@iaau.ac.ir

📅 ARTICLE HISTORY

Received date: 13 August 2024

Revised date: 14 September 2024

Accepted date: 26 September 2024

Published date: 01 October 2024

📖 HOW TO CITE

Jafari, A. & Moghaddam, S. (2024). Institutional Transformation of Management Systems in the Era of Intelligent Automation: A Grounded Theory Study. *Management Systems Evolution and Leadership Studies*, 1(2), 32-42.

1. Introduction

The increasing diffusion of intelligent automation has created a profound shift in how organizations design, coordinate, monitor, and legitimize their management systems. Unlike earlier forms of information technology, which primarily supported administrative processing or enhanced communication, intelligent automation



combines artificial intelligence, machine learning, robotic process automation, advanced analytics, and algorithmic decision support to perform tasks that were previously dependent on human judgment, managerial discretion, and organizational routines. This transformation is especially consequential for management systems because management is not limited to planning, organizing, controlling, and coordinating; it is also an institutionalized arrangement through which authority, accountability, professional norms, and organizational meanings are reproduced. As a result, intelligent automation challenges not only the technical architecture of organizations but also the institutional foundations through which managerial roles are recognized as legitimate, effective, and necessary.

The concept of intelligent automation refers to a sociotechnical configuration in which rule-based automation is combined with cognitive technologies capable of learning from data, identifying patterns, making recommendations, and sometimes executing decisions with limited human intervention. Coombs et al. (2020) argue that intelligent automation has become increasingly important in knowledge and service sectors because it enables organizations to automate both routine and non-routine processes while creating new questions about work design, value creation, and organizational capability. In management research, this development requires a shift from viewing automation as a technical efficiency mechanism to understanding it as a transformative force that changes the distribution of decision rights, the structure of managerial control, and the relationship between human expertise and machine-generated intelligence. This is consistent with Raisch and Krakowski's (2021) argument that automation and augmentation cannot be neatly separated in management contexts because the same AI system may simultaneously replace some managerial activities while expanding others.

The transformation of management systems through intelligent automation should be understood within the broader literature on digital transformation. Vial (2019) conceptualizes digital transformation as a process through which digital technologies create disruptions that trigger strategic responses, leading organizations to alter their value creation paths, structures, and processes. Similarly, Wessel et al. (2021) distinguish digital transformation from conventional IT-enabled organizational change by emphasizing that digital transformation often redefines organizational identity and value propositions rather than merely improving existing processes. In the context of intelligent automation, this distinction is critical because automation-enabled change frequently begins with technical projects such as workflow optimization, chatbot deployment, automated reporting, or predictive analytics, but gradually expands into deeper questions concerning who decides, what counts as valid knowledge, how performance is evaluated, and how managerial accountability is distributed.

Institutional theory offers a valuable lens for examining these changes because it highlights how organizational practices become stabilized through regulative, normative, and cognitive-cultural structures. Meyer and Rowan (1977) argued that formal organizational structures often reflect institutionalized myths that confer legitimacy, while DiMaggio and Powell (1983) showed how organizations become similar through coercive, mimetic, and normative pressures. Scott (2014) further developed institutional theory by explaining institutions as systems of rules, norms, and shared meanings that provide stability and meaning to social behavior. From this perspective, intelligent automation transforms management systems not only by changing tools but also by reshaping the institutional rules of managerial work. When dashboards define performance, algorithms recommend decisions, automated workflows enforce compliance, and predictive systems identify risks, organizations begin to institutionalize new forms of managerial rationality grounded in data, speed, standardization, and algorithmic traceability.

Existing research on algorithmic management provides additional insight into this transformation. Kellogg et al. (2020) describe algorithms at work as a new contested terrain of control, showing that algorithmic systems can direct, evaluate, discipline, and coordinate workers in ways that reconfigure power relations. Faraj et al. (2018) argue that learning algorithms introduce new organizational dynamics because they operate through black-boxed performance, comprehensive digitization, anticipatory quantification, and hidden politics. These insights are highly relevant to management systems because intelligent automation does not merely make organizations faster; it changes how managerial control is enacted. For example, performance evaluation may become increasingly dependent on real-time analytics, resource allocation may be guided by predictive models, and operational exceptions may be escalated according to algorithmically defined priorities. Such developments create new institutional expectations: managers are expected to justify decisions through data, employees are expected to comply with automated workflows, and organizations are expected to demonstrate transparency, efficiency, and responsiveness.

At the same time, intelligent automation introduces ambiguity into the meaning of managerial authority. Traditional management systems often depend on hierarchical authority, professional experience, tacit judgment, and negotiated interpretation of organizational rules. AI-enabled management systems, however, can redistribute authority across human actors, data infrastructures, software platforms, and algorithmic models. Shrestha et al. (2019) show that AI-based decision-making changes organizational decision structures by creating different arrangements of human delegation, hybrid decision-making, and aggregated human–AI decision processes. This suggests that managerial authority is no longer located solely in formal positions but increasingly emerges through the interaction between human judgment and computational recommendation. Consequently, managers may experience both empowerment and displacement: they gain access to more precise analytical tools while losing exclusive control over diagnosis, monitoring, and decision framing.

This issue is particularly important in organizations located in emerging or transitional digital economies, where intelligent automation is often adopted under conditions of institutional complexity. In contexts such as Tehran, organizations may face simultaneous pressures to modernize, reduce costs, increase transparency, comply with regulatory expectations, respond to competitive uncertainty, and overcome infrastructure constraints. Under these conditions, intelligent automation can become both a strategic necessity and an institutional disruption. Managers may adopt automation to signal modernity and efficiency, but they may also encounter resistance from employees, ambiguity in governance structures, shortages of digital skills, and concerns about algorithmic accountability. Therefore, the transformation of management systems cannot be explained adequately through technology adoption models alone. It requires an institutional and process-oriented explanation of how automation becomes embedded in managerial routines, how actors interpret its meaning, and how new rules of legitimacy are negotiated.

Despite the growing body of literature on AI, automation, and digital transformation, several gaps remain. First, much research emphasizes technological capability, performance improvement, or decision quality, while fewer studies examine how intelligent automation transforms the institutional foundations of management systems. Second, many studies analyze algorithmic management in platform work or operational control contexts, while less attention has been paid to broader management systems involving planning, coordination, performance evaluation, governance, and strategic control. Third, the literature often distinguishes between automation and augmentation conceptually, but empirical organizational experiences show that these processes are intertwined

and evolve over time. Fourth, there is a need for qualitative theory-building research that captures how managers and organizational experts interpret the institutional consequences of intelligent automation in specific organizational contexts.

Grounded theory is well suited to addressing these gaps because it allows theory to emerge inductively from participants' experiences while retaining sensitivity to existing theoretical concepts. Charmaz (2014) emphasizes that grounded theory provides flexible but systematic guidelines for developing conceptual explanations from qualitative data, while Charmaz (2021) stresses the importance of quality, reflexivity, and theoretical depth in grounded theory studies. In the present study, a grounded theory approach enables the development of a conceptual model that explains how intelligent automation becomes institutionalized within management systems, how it reshapes authority and routines, and how organizations respond to legitimacy tensions created by algorithmic control and data-driven governance.

Accordingly, this study examines the institutional transformation of management systems in the era of intelligent automation through a grounded theory inquiry among organizational participants in Tehran. The study seeks to move beyond a narrow view of automation as technical substitution and instead conceptualizes it as a process of institutional reconfiguration. The aim of this study was to develop a grounded theory model explaining how intelligent automation transforms institutionalized management systems, decision authority, organizational routines, and managerial legitimacy in organizations operating in Tehran.

2. Methods and Materials

This study employed a qualitative grounded theory design to develop an explanatory model of how intelligent automation transforms management systems at the institutional level. Grounded theory was selected because the research problem required conceptual explanation rather than measurement of predetermined variables. The study was concerned with processes, meanings, tensions, and emergent categories through which managers and organizational specialists experienced automation-enabled transformation. The research followed the logic of constant comparison, theoretical sampling, progressive coding, memo writing, and category integration. Although the study was sensitized by institutional theory, digital transformation literature, and algorithmic management research, these concepts were not imposed as fixed coding categories. Instead, they were used as interpretive resources after initial coding had identified recurring patterns in the interview data.

The participants consisted of 22 organizational actors from Tehran who had direct experience with intelligent automation projects or automation-related managerial change. They included senior executives, middle managers, digital transformation managers, operations managers, human resource managers, IT managers, process automation specialists, and management consultants. The inclusion criteria were at least five years of organizational work experience, direct involvement in or supervision of automation-related projects, familiarity with managerial decision-making processes, and willingness to participate in an in-depth interview. Participants were selected through purposive sampling at the beginning of the study and theoretical sampling in later phases. Theoretical sampling was used to follow emerging categories, especially those related to algorithmic authority, data-driven governance, and legitimacy tensions. Interviews continued until theoretical saturation was reached after the nineteenth participant, when no substantially new properties of the main categories emerged. Three additional interviews were conducted to confirm the stability and explanatory adequacy of the developing model.

The final sample included 14 men and 8 women. Participants ranged in age from 31 to 58 years. In terms of education, 4 participants held bachelor's degrees, 13 held master's degrees, and 5 held doctoral degrees. Regarding organizational position, 6 participants were senior managers, 7 were middle managers, 4 were digital transformation or IT specialists, 3 were human resource or organizational development managers, and 2 were external management consultants. Participants represented organizations in financial services, telecommunications, manufacturing, retail, logistics, public administration, and technology-based services. This diversity allowed the study to compare experiences across different organizational fields while maintaining a shared focus on management systems affected by intelligent automation.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews. The interview guide included open-ended questions about participants' experiences with intelligent automation, changes in managerial decision-making, shifts in authority and accountability, transformation of routines, employee responses, governance mechanisms, performance monitoring, and perceived institutional consequences. Examples of interview questions included: "How has intelligent automation changed the way managerial decisions are made in your organization?" "What kinds of managerial routines have become automated or data-driven?" "How do managers respond when algorithmic recommendations conflict with human judgment?" and "What new rules, expectations, or legitimacy pressures have emerged after automation?" Probing questions were used to clarify meanings, elicit examples, and explore contradictions. Interviews lasted between 45 and 90 minutes and were conducted in a confidential setting. All interviews were recorded with participant consent and transcribed verbatim.

Data analysis was conducted using NVivo software. The analysis proceeded through three main stages: open coding, axial coding, and selective coding. In open coding, interview transcripts were examined line by line to identify initial concepts and action-oriented codes. Examples of initial codes included "delegating decisions to dashboards," "managerial hesitation toward algorithmic outputs," "automation as proof of modernity," "loss of informal discretion," "data as managerial evidence," and "employees adapting to automated routines." In axial coding, related codes were grouped into categories and subcategories by identifying conditions, actions/interactions, and consequences. In selective coding, the core category was identified and integrated with the main categories to construct a grounded theoretical model. Memo writing was used throughout the analysis to record theoretical insights, compare cases, define category properties, and examine relationships among categories.

Trustworthiness was enhanced through several strategies. Credibility was supported by prolonged engagement with the data, participant diversity, theoretical sampling, and member checking with five participants who reviewed the interpretive accuracy of the emerging categories. Dependability was strengthened through an audit trail documenting coding decisions, category development, and analytical memos. Confirmability was supported by reflexive memo writing and peer debriefing with two qualitative research specialists. Transferability was addressed through detailed description of the participants, context, data collection procedures, and conceptual categories. Ethical considerations included informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality, anonymization of participant identifiers, and secure storage of interview files and transcripts.

3. Findings and Results

The demographic profile of the participants showed that the study included 22 organizational actors from Tehran with varied managerial and technical experience. Fourteen participants were male and eight were female. Six participants were senior managers, seven were middle managers, four were digital transformation or IT specialists, three were human resource or organizational development managers, and two were management consultants. In terms of education, four participants held bachelor's degrees, thirteen held master's degrees, and five held doctoral degrees. Participants had between 6 and 29 years of professional experience, with an average experience of approximately 14 years. Their organizational backgrounds included financial services, telecommunications, manufacturing, logistics, retail, public administration, and technology-based services. This demographic diversity made it possible to capture how intelligent automation was interpreted across different institutional settings, while the shared experience of automation-related change created a coherent basis for grounded theory development.

Algorithmic restructuring of managerial authority. The first main category showed that intelligent automation changed the institutional meaning of managerial authority by redistributing decision rights between human managers and algorithmic systems. Participants explained that, before automation, many managerial decisions were justified through experience, hierarchy, negotiation, and informal knowledge of organizational conditions. After the introduction of automated dashboards, predictive analytics, workflow engines, and AI-supported decision systems, managerial authority increasingly depended on the ability to interpret, validate, and act upon algorithmic outputs. One participant stated, "In the past, the manager's opinion was enough to close a discussion, but now everyone asks what the system shows and whether the data confirms it" (P4). Another participant explained, "The algorithm does not officially replace the manager, but practically it changes the manager's room for maneuver" (P11). This category included the subcategories of data-mediated authority, reduced discretionary space, hybrid decision accountability, and conflict between managerial intuition and algorithmic recommendation. The findings suggest that automation does not simply eliminate managerial authority; rather, it reconstructs authority as a hybrid capability in which legitimacy depends on combining human judgment with algorithmic evidence.

Institutionalization of data-driven governance. The second main category indicated that intelligent automation transformed management systems by institutionalizing data-driven governance as a new organizational norm. Participants described how automated systems produced continuous visibility over processes, employees, customers, risks, and performance indicators. This visibility created new expectations that managerial decisions should be traceable, measurable, and defensible through data. One digital transformation manager noted, "Once the automated reports became available, managers could no longer say, 'I did not know.' The system made ignorance unacceptable" (P7). Another participant observed, "Data became a kind of organizational language. If you cannot speak with numbers, your argument becomes weak" (P15). This category included automated performance monitoring, evidence-based managerial justification, standardized reporting routines, compliance-by-design, and real-time escalation mechanisms. The analysis showed that data-driven governance became institutionalized when automated metrics moved from being optional analytical tools to becoming mandatory reference points for planning, evaluation, and control. However, participants also warned that excessive dependence on indicators sometimes narrowed managerial attention and encouraged superficial compliance rather than deeper learning.

Redesign of human–automation work systems. The third main category concerned the redesign of managerial routines, roles, and capabilities around human–automation interaction. Participants emphasized that intelligent automation changed work systems by transferring repetitive coordination, reporting, scheduling, risk detection, and process-control activities to digital systems. This shift created pressure on managers to develop new capabilities in interpretation, exception handling, ethical judgment, cross-functional coordination, and digital sensemaking. One operations manager stated, “Automation removed many routine approvals, but it also created a new responsibility: managers must understand why the system made a recommendation and when to challenge it” (P3). Another participant explained, “The middle manager is no longer only a supervisor of people; he has become a supervisor of the relationship between people, data, and automated processes” (P18). This category included role redefinition, capability reconfiguration, exception-based management, human oversight of automated routines, and collaborative learning between technical and managerial units. The findings indicate that intelligent automation produces institutional transformation when organizations redesign managerial work rather than merely digitize existing routines. Where automation was implemented without role redesign, participants reported confusion, resistance, and duplication of work.

Legitimacy tensions in automated management. The fourth main category revealed that intelligent automation created legitimacy tensions related to trust, fairness, transparency, accountability, and employee participation. Participants repeatedly stated that employees and managers did not resist automation only because of fear of job loss; they resisted when automated systems were perceived as opaque, imposed, inaccurate, or disconnected from workplace realities. One human resource manager said, “People accept automation when they see that it is fair and useful, but when the criteria are hidden, they feel they are being judged by something they cannot question” (P9). Another participant explained, “The biggest problem was not the software. The problem was that nobody knew who was responsible when the software made a wrong recommendation” (P21). This category included algorithmic opacity, accountability ambiguity, perceived loss of voice, ethical concerns, and legitimacy repair mechanisms. Participants described several ways organizations attempted to restore legitimacy, including establishing automation governance committees, allowing managerial override under defined conditions, training employees, documenting algorithmic criteria, and involving users in system redesign. The analysis suggests that institutional transformation becomes sustainable only when automation is accompanied by legitimacy-building practices that preserve trust and accountability.

The integration of these categories produced the core category of **institutional reconfiguration of management systems through intelligent automation**. This core category explains how automation evolves from a technical intervention into an institutional process. The grounded model suggests that transformation begins when organizations introduce intelligent automation to improve efficiency, reduce errors, and accelerate decision-making. As these systems become embedded in managerial routines, they restructure authority, institutionalize data-driven governance, redesign work systems, and create legitimacy tensions. Organizations then respond through governance mechanisms, capability development, participatory redesign, and accountability arrangements. The outcome is a transformed management system in which managerial legitimacy depends not only on formal authority or professional experience but also on the ability to govern intelligent automation responsibly, interpret algorithmic outputs critically, and maintain institutional trust.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The purpose of this study was to develop a grounded theory model explaining how intelligent automation transforms institutionalized management systems, decision authority, organizational routines, and managerial legitimacy. The findings showed that intelligent automation does not operate merely as a technical improvement or process optimization tool. Instead, it produces institutional transformation by changing the rules, norms, meanings, and power relations through which management systems function. The core category, institutional reconfiguration of management systems through intelligent automation, indicates that organizations gradually move from automation as operational support to automation as a constitutive element of managerial authority and governance. This result aligns with institutional theory, which emphasizes that organizational structures and practices become meaningful when they are embedded in broader systems of legitimacy, rules, and shared expectations (Meyer & Rowan, 1977; Scott, 2014). In the present study, intelligent automation became institutionalized when managers and employees began to treat algorithmic outputs, dashboards, automated workflows, and data-based indicators as legitimate bases for decision-making and control.

The first finding concerned algorithmic restructuring of managerial authority. Participants reported that managerial authority increasingly depended on the ability to interpret and justify decisions in relation to data and algorithmic recommendations. This finding supports Shrestha et al. (2019), who argue that AI changes organizational decision structures by enabling fully delegated, sequential hybrid, and aggregated human–AI decision arrangements. The present study extends this argument by showing that such decision structures are not only technical arrangements but also institutional arrangements that redefine who has authority to decide and how decisions must be justified. The finding also aligns with Raisch and Krakowski's (2021) automation–augmentation paradox, because managers in this study experienced automation as both a source of support and a constraint on discretion. Intelligent automation augmented managerial analysis while simultaneously reducing the legitimacy of decisions based only on intuition or experience. Thus, the study shows that managerial authority in automated organizations becomes hybrid, conditional, and evidence-mediated.

The second finding concerned the institutionalization of data-driven governance. Participants described a shift from periodic, retrospective, and experience-based management toward continuous, real-time, and evidence-based control. This result is consistent with Vial's (2019) view that digital transformation creates disruptions that trigger structural and strategic responses in organizations. It is also consistent with Berente et al. (2021), who argue that managing artificial intelligence requires new forms of coordination, control, and leadership because AI systems are continuously evolving computational artifacts. The present study adds that data-driven governance becomes institutionalized when automated indicators become compulsory reference points in managerial conversations. In other words, data are not merely informational resources; they become institutionalized standards of legitimacy. However, the findings also reveal a risk of metric domination, where managerial attention becomes narrowed by what automated systems can measure. This supports Faraj et al. (2018), who warned that learning algorithms can introduce hidden politics through comprehensive digitization and anticipatory quantification.

The third finding concerned the redesign of human–automation work systems. Participants emphasized that automation changed managerial roles by shifting attention from direct supervision and routine approval toward

exception handling, interpretation, oversight, and coordination between human and automated actors. This finding is consistent with Coombs et al. (2020), who argue that intelligent automation affects knowledge and service work by reshaping tasks, capabilities, and organizational value creation. It also aligns with Wessel et al. (2021), who argue that digital transformation differs from ordinary IT-enabled change because it may redefine organizational identity and value creation. The current study suggests that management systems are transformed most effectively when automation projects are accompanied by role redesign and capability development. When organizations simply automate existing routines without redefining managerial responsibilities, automation may create duplication, ambiguity, and resistance. Therefore, institutional transformation depends not only on technological implementation but also on the redesign of managerial work.

The fourth finding concerned legitimacy tensions in automated management. Participants reported concerns about algorithmic opacity, accountability ambiguity, fairness, employee voice, and trust. This finding aligns strongly with Kellogg et al. (2020), who conceptualize algorithmic control as a contested terrain in which organizational actors negotiate the consequences of algorithmic monitoring, direction, and evaluation. The present study extends this literature by showing that legitimacy tensions are not limited to employee surveillance or platform work. They also appear in broader management systems where automated recommendations influence planning, evaluation, resource allocation, and managerial accountability. When employees and managers cannot understand or challenge automated decisions, automation may weaken institutional trust. Conversely, when organizations establish transparent governance mechanisms, allow accountable human override, and involve users in system redesign, automation becomes more acceptable and institutionally sustainable.

The grounded model developed in this study contributes to institutional theory by showing how intelligent automation can function as an institutional carrier. Traditional institutional theory has often emphasized laws, professional norms, cultural beliefs, and formal structures as carriers of institutional order (Scott, 2014). The present findings suggest that intelligent automation systems can also carry institutional rules by embedding assumptions about efficiency, fairness, risk, performance, and accountability into software, dashboards, workflows, and algorithmic models. Once embedded, these systems can stabilize new organizational expectations and make alternative forms of judgment appear less legitimate. This supports DiMaggio and Powell's (1983) argument that organizations become subject to pressures that promote similarity and legitimacy, but it also suggests that in the era of intelligent automation, isomorphic pressures may be encoded technologically. Organizations may adopt similar dashboards, automation platforms, and AI governance structures because these tools signal rationality, modernity, and professional legitimacy.

The findings also contribute to digital transformation research by emphasizing the institutional depth of automation-enabled change. Many organizations initially adopt intelligent automation for efficiency, cost reduction, speed, and error reduction. However, the participants' experiences showed that the most important consequences emerged after automation became embedded in managerial routines. At that stage, intelligent automation changed what counted as valid knowledge, how authority was exercised, how performance was monitored, and how accountability was assigned. This supports the broader argument that digital transformation is not simply technological change but a process that reshapes organizational structures, identities, and value creation mechanisms (Vial, 2019; Wessel et al., 2021). The study therefore suggests that successful automation requires institutional readiness, not only technological readiness.

The results further suggest that organizations should avoid deterministic assumptions about intelligent automation. The participants did not describe automation as an inevitable replacement of management. Rather, they described a complex process in which management was reconfigured. Some managerial tasks became automated, some became more analytical, some became more relational, and some became more ethically demanding. This finding supports Raisch and Krakowski's (2021) argument that automation and augmentation are interdependent rather than mutually exclusive. In practical terms, this means that organizations should not ask whether intelligent automation will replace managers, but how it will change the institutional conditions of managerial work. The future of management systems will likely depend on the ability to combine algorithmic efficiency with human judgment, contextual interpretation, ethical responsibility, and institutional trust.

The study contributes to management systems research by showing that intelligent automation should be understood as a sociotechnical and institutional phenomenon. It contributes to institutional theory by demonstrating that automation systems can become carriers of institutional rules, norms, and meanings. It contributes to digital transformation research by showing that automation-enabled change becomes transformative when it redefines managerial authority and organizational legitimacy. For practice, the study emphasizes the importance of responsible automation governance, participatory system redesign, managerial capability development, and transparent accountability structures. Organizations that treat intelligent automation as a narrow technical upgrade may experience resistance, ambiguity, and legitimacy loss. Organizations that treat it as an institutional transformation process are more likely to build management systems that are efficient, adaptive, trustworthy, and human-centered.

Ethical Considerations

All procedures performed in this study were under the ethical standards.

Acknowledgments

Authors thank all who helped us through this study.

Conflict of Interest

The authors report no conflict of interest.

Funding

According to the authors, this article has no financial support.

References

- Berente, N., Gu, B., Recker, J., & Santhanam, R. (2021). Managing artificial intelligence. *MIS Quarterly*, 45(3), 1433–1450. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/16274>
- Charmaz, K. (2014). *Constructing grounded theory* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Charmaz, K. (2021). The pursuit of quality in grounded theory. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 18(3), 305–327. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1780357>
- Coombs, C., Hislop, D., Taneva, S. K., & Barnard, S. (2020). The strategic impacts of intelligent automation for knowledge and service work: An interdisciplinary review. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 29(4), 101600. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2020.101600>
- DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited: Institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147–160. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2095101>

- 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>
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Aldine.
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366–410. <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174>
- Meyer, J. W., & Rowan, B. (1977). Institutionalized organizations: Formal structure as myth and ceremony. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(2), 340–363. <https://doi.org/10.1086/226550>
- Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(1), 192–210. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072>
- Scott, W. R. (2014). *Institutions and organizations: Ideas, interests, and identities* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & von Krogh, G. (2019). Organizational decision-making structures in the age of artificial intelligence. *California Management Review*, 61(4), 66–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619862257>
- Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 28(2), 118–144. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003>
- Wessel, L., Baiyere, A., Ologeanu-Taddei, R., Cha, J., & Blegind Jensen, T. (2021). Unpacking the difference between digital transformation and IT-enabled organizational transformation. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 22(1), 102–129. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00655>