

## Artificial Intelligence and Its Impact on Resistance to Change: A Qualitative Study

<sup>1</sup>Ms. Smitha Kothari Badola, <sup>2</sup>Dr. Pradeep Joshi, <sup>3</sup>Dr. Shagun Tyagi

<sup>1</sup>Corresponding Author

Research Scholar, School of Management

Graphic Era Hill University

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, School of Management

Graphic Era Hill University

<sup>3</sup>Assistant Professor, School of Management

Graphic Era Hill University

### Abstract

The transformative effects of artificial intelligence on workforce skills, leadership, organisational practices, and employee attitudes toward change are all examined in this study. It examines AI adoption, ethical issues, algorithmic bias, transparency, and trust as well as human reactions like resistance, anxiety, and adaptability by drawing on interdisciplinary literature. The results emphasise how governance frameworks, organisational culture, and leadership all play a part in facilitating appropriate AI integration. To achieve sustained performance, emphasis is placed on skill transformation, employee well-being, and ethical accountability. The study advances knowledge on how businesses might, during AI-driven change, strike a balance between technical innovation and human-centric values.

**Key words:** Artificial Intelligence, Organizational Change, Employee Resistance to change, AI Ethics, Human Resource Management; Digital Transformation

### 1. Introduction

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has emerged as one of the most influential technologies shaping modern organizations (Murire, 2024). Its rising application across operational, strategic, and human resource domains has deeply altered how work is designed, managed, and evaluated. AI-driven systems such as intelligent mechanization, algorithmic decision-making, and predictive analytics guarantee enhanced efficiency, accuracy, and competitiveness (Zong & Guan, 2024). However, beside these advantages, AI adoption introduces considerable organizational change that somewhere directly affects employees' roles, skills and autonomy trajectories.

Organizational change, particularly when determined by advanced technologies, often forces resistance from employees. Resistance to change represents a natural human reaction to uncertainty and professed threats linked with change initiatives (Erwin & Garman, 2010). In the context of AI, resistance is inherent due to fears of job displacement, skill obsolescence, ethical concerns, and lack of intelligibility in algorithmic systems. Understanding this resistance is very hard, as human acceptance eventually determines the success or failure of AI-enabled transformation.

This qualitative paper seeks to investigate the impact of Artificial Intelligence on resistance to change by studying existing literature, theoretical perspectives, and modern organizational experiences. By understanding an interpretive and exploratory approach, the study aims to provide deeper insights into how AI influences employee perceptions, emotions, and behaviors during change processes (Dipoatmodjo, 2025).

## 2. Overview and Importance of Artificial Intelligence and Resistance to Change

### 2.1 Artificial Intelligence as a Strategic Organizational Imperative

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has evolved from being a accommodating technological enhancement to a strategic organizational essential in an increasingly impulsive, uncertain, complex, and vague (VUCA) business environment (Biloslavo et al., 2025). Organizations across sectors such as banking, healthcare, manufacturing, education, and information technology now nearly depend on AI-enabled systems to improve decision-making speed, accuracy, and consistency. Applications including predictive analytics, machine learning, natural language processing, and robotic process automation allow organizations to process large volumes of data, classify hidden patterns, foresee market trends, and personalize services at scale.

Further than operational efficiency, AI essentially transforms organizational structures, governance mechanisms, and work systems. Traditional hierarchies are slowly giving way to more data-driven and decentralized decision-making models, where algorithmic insights increasingly persuade managerial judgment (Baumann & Wu, 2023). Routine, repetitive, and rule-based tasks are increasingly automated, allowing organizations to change human effort toward analytical, creative, and relational activities. As a result, employees are expected to assume more complex roles requiring problem-solving, critical thinking, and digital literacy. This shift underscores the increasing importance of adaptability, continuous learning, and rescaling as core organizational capabilities.

However, the strategic amalgamation of AI also disrupts existing power structures, professional limitations, and skill configurations. Employees whose proficiency was beforehand central to decision-making may recognize a loss of authority as algorithms presume evaluative or predictive roles. Furthermore, organizations often misjudge the socio-cultural implications of AI adoption, treating it as a technical upgrade rather than a comprehensive organizational transformation (Arriagada-Bruneau et al., 2025). Such an approach overlooks the fact that AI reshapes not only tasks and processes but also values, norms, and identities within the workplace.

From a qualitative point of view, AI adoption represents a socio-technical transformation that requires arrangement between technological systems, human capabilities, and organizational culture (Uren & Edwards, 2023). The strategic importance of AI, as a result, lies not only in its technological potential but also in how effectively organizations deal with the human experience of AI-driven change.

### 2.2 Understanding Resistance to Change in Organizational Contexts

Resistance to change remains one of the most determined challenges in organizational transformation initiatives (Canning & Found, 2015). It refers to employees' conscious or unconscious reactions that go up against or undermine efforts to alter existing structures, processes, or practices. Resistance manifests in multiple forms, including cognitive resistance (negative beliefs, skepticism, or doubt), emotional resistance (fear, anxiety, frustration, or stress), and behavioral resistance (withdrawal, concentrated engagement, passive compliance, or active opposition). These responses are particularly evident during large-scale transformations that threaten established routines and identities.

Traditional change management literature often portrayed resistance as irrational behavior or a barrier to progress (Xue, Nasir, Cheng, Wu, & Cao, 2024). However, existing organizational scholarship adopts a more positive perspective, viewing resistance as a meaningful and often balanced response to perceived threats and uncertainties. Resistance frequently arises from fear of the unknown, perceived loss of control, trouble of familiar work patterns, or distrust in leadership intentions. Employees may resist change when they nearly sure it compromises job security, professional competence within the organization.

Importantly, resistance to change often show case in depth organizational issues rather than individual reluctance. Inadequate communication, lack of employee participation, inconsistent leadership behavior, and inadequate support mechanisms extensively contribute to resistance (Anno, 2025). From a qualitative point of view, resistance represents employees' sense-making efforts as they attempt to interpret how change will affect

their roles, status, and future within the organization. It serves as an phrase of concern, defenselessness, and a desire for stability in uncertain contexts.

### **2.3 Human and Psychological Dimensions of AI-Driven Change**

AI-driven change introduces distinguishing psychological and emotional challenges that discriminate it from conventional technological transformations (Hidayah et al., 2024). Unlike earlier technologies alleged as tools under human control, AI is often viewed as autonomous, intelligent, and competent of independent decision-making. This perception explains employee uncertainty and understands emotional responses such as anxiety, fear, and insecurity.

A major emotional concern associated with AI adoption is fear of job disarticulation and skill obsolescence. Employees may distinguish AI as a direct threat to their employability, particularly when tasks traditionally requiring human judgment are automated (Morandini et al., 2023b). Such fears are compounded when organizations fail to provide clear communication regarding rescaling opportunities or future career pathways. Additionally, AI-enabled monitoring and examination systems can create feelings of constant evaluation, reducing psychological safety and increasing stress levels.

### **2.4 Organizational and Ethical Implications**

The connection of AI adoption and resistance to change raises significant organizational and ethical concerns. AI-driven decision-making systems often lack transparency, making it difficult for workers to understand how outcomes such as performance evaluations, promotions, or task allocations are established (Tadiwa Walter Muparutsa). This cloudiness can challenge perceptions of fairness and accountability, leading to sharp resistance and mistrust.

Ethical issues related to data privacy, algorithmic bias, and accountability further complicates AI accomplishment (Ranadeep Reddy Palle). Employees may fear mistreatment of personal data or biased outcomes resulting from biased algorithms. When such concerns are not sufficiently addressed, resistance intensifies and managerial legality is threatened. Ethical lapses in AI governance can also harm organizational status and employee morale. Organizations that proactively address ethical considerations through apparent governance frameworks, explainable AI systems, and inclusive decision-making processes are more likely to build trust.

### **2.5 Significance of Addressing Resistance in AI Adoption**

Addressing resistance to change is decisive for the sustainable and ethical implementation of AI. The success of AI initiatives depends not only on technological potential but also on employee willingness, trust, and engagement. Unmanaged resistance can slow implementation, reduce system effectiveness, and ultimately compromise organizational objectives.

At the same time, resistance should be viewed as a valuable analytical signal rather than a problem to be eliminated. It reveals employee concerns, highlights communication gaps, and identifies areas where organizational support is absent (Molino et al.). By attractive with resistance constructively, organizations can design more inclusive, human-centered AI strategies that balance innovation with workforce well-being. Eventually, addressing resistance enables organizations to bring into line the technological advancement with human values, ensuring that AI-driven transformation is both effectual and socially sustainable.

## **3. Literature Review on Artificial Intelligence and Resistance to Change**

### **3.1 Artificial Intelligence in Organizational Contexts**

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is widely recognized in modern literature as a transformative organizational force that extends away from automation to fundamentally reshape learning processes, strategic decision-making, and organizational culture (Murire). Early research sited AI primarily as a productivity-enhancing tool; though,

recent studies give emphasis to its role as a means for organizational redesign and digital transformation. AI systems progressively influence how organizations collect, analyze, and interpret data, thereby reshaping managerial cognition and strategic priorities. This shift has led to greater dependence on algorithmic insights, changing traditional decision hierarchies and reducing reliance on purely human judgment.

The socio-technical viewpoint dominates recent AI literature, emphasizing that technological efficacy depends on alignment between AI systems, human capabilities, and managerial structures (Hutson and Ceballos). AI is not a unbiased artifact; its outcomes are shaped by organizational values, design choices, and cultural contexts. Qualitative studies show that AI execution frequently disrupts established workflows, professional boundaries, and power relations. For example, when algorithmic systems provide recommendations or evaluations, they may challenge managerial authority or professional knowledge, leading to delicate tensions within organizations.

Employees' perceptions of AI are often undecided. On one hand, AI is viewed as an opportunity to lessen workload, enhance decision quality, and support learning (Sofroniew and Vinters). On the other hand, it raises concerns related to surveillance, dehumanization of work, and erosion of professional judgment. This dual perception considerably shapes employees' readiness to accept AI-driven change. Studies propose that when AI is framed as augmenting rather than replacing human work, employees demonstrate more positive attitudes. On the contrary, when AI is imposed without consultation or explanation, skepticism and resistance intensify.

### **3.2 AI, Work Redesign, and Employee Identity**

An emergent body of qualitative research focuses on the impact of AI on work redesign and employee identity. Work is not just a set of tasks but a central constituent of individual identity and social meaning. AI-driven transformation often alters how employees recognize their value, expertise, and role within the organization Roberts and Hipkins (2025). When AI systems encroach upon tasks traditionally connected with human judgment, creativity, or expertise, employees may experience identity threat and loss of professional legitimacy.

Scholars argue that AI adoption can lead to identity pressure, particularly among knowledge workers and professionals whose status is derived from specialized expertise Cox (2022). For example, algorithmic decision-support systems in healthcare, finance, or HR may be perceived as undermining professional prudence. Such perceptions can incite subtle forms of resistance, including reluctance to rely on AI recommendations or deliberate reassertion of human judgment.

From a qualitative point of view, identity-related resistance is often moving and symbolic rather than overt. Employees may obey behaviorally while remaining cognitively or emotionally detached. These identity dynamics highlight the need to understand resistance not just as opposition but as a response to apparent threats to meaning, dignity, and self-worth in AI-enabled workplaces.

### **3.3 Understanding Resistance to Change**

Resistance to change has been widely examined in organizational behavior and change management literature. Traditional perspectives viewed resistance as employee illogicality, inertia, or obstacle that needed to be overcome Xue et al. (2023). Early change models emphasized managerial control and fulfillment, framing resistance as a barrier to efficiency. However, contemporary approaches challenge this narrow view and conceptualize resistance as a multidimensional, socially constructed phenomenon.

Modern scholarship identifies resistance as surrounding cognitive (beliefs and interpretations), emotional (fear, anxiety, anger), and behavioral (withdrawal, delay, non-compliance) responses Loy and Demberg (2023). Qualitative research highlights that resistance emerges from employees' sense-making processes as they appreciate how change affects their identity, competence, relationships, and future security. Resistance is thus tremendously contextual and shaped by organizational history, culture, and power dynamics.

Leadership behavior plays a critical role in shaping resistance. Employees are more likely to resist change when leaders fail to converse clearly, demonstrate empathy, or involve employees in decision-making. Organizational culture and trust also considerably influence resistance (Doeze Jager-van Vliet, Born, & van der Molen, 2024).

In high-trust environments, employees may articulate concerns openly, allowing resistance to be addressed fruitfully. In low-trust contexts, resistance may become underground and more difficult to manage.

### **3.4 Psychological and Emotional Foundations of Resistance**

Resistance to change is deeply rooted in psychological and emotional processes. Change initiatives barge in established routines and create uncertainty, triggering emotional responses such as fear, anxiety, and stress. These reactions are intensified when change threatens job security, competence, or social status. Qualitative research emphasizes that employees' emotional experiences during change are often unnoticed in favor of rational planning models( Doeze Jager-van Vliet, Born, and van der Molen (2024). Vagueness is a central driver of resistance. When employees lack clarity about how change will affect their roles, performance assessment, or career scenario, they are more likely to resist. Emotional resistance may obvious as disengagement, cynicism, or passive fulfillment. These responses are particularly marked in technology-driven change, where results are perceived as unpredictable and uncontrollable.

Understanding resistance from an emotional perspective underscores the importance of psychological safety, empathy, and support systems. Change initiatives that acknowledge emotional results and provide space for dialogue are more likely to succeed Moen and Federici (2013). This impending is particularly relevant in the context of AI-driven change, which often evokes strong emotional reactions due to its apparent autonomy and intelligence.

### **3.5 AI-Driven Change and Employee Resistance**

The literature on AI-driven change proposed that resistance associated with AI differs in intensity and nature from resistance to traditional organizational change. AI introduces indecision not only about processes but also about the prospect of work itself. Employees normally express anxiety connected to job displacement, loss of autonomy, deskilling, and dependence on dense algorithms( Lichtenstein et al. 2021).

Qualitative confirmation suggests that resistance is sensitive when AI systems are apparent as biased, unexplainable, or imposed without employee consultation. Algorithmic dullness undermines trust, as employees struggle to appreciate how decisions are made and how they can influence outcomes( Becker 2025). In HR contexts, AI-driven recruitment or performance assessment systems often suggest concerns about fairness and discrimination, intensifying resistance.

Trust emerges as a central subject in AI-related resistance literature. Trust in AI systems, leadership intentions, and organizational values significantly shape employee responses. Clear communication, ethical safeguards, and understandable AI practices can moderate resistance by reducing uncertainty and development confidence. Conversely, lack of clarity regarding AI objectives and penalty amplifies skepticism and emotional resistance (Kuzmanov (2025).

### **3.6 Ethical Concerns and Resistance to AI**

Ethical considerations dwell in a prominent place in recent AI literature. Employees express concerns regarding data privacy, surveillance, accountability, and algorithmic bias. These concerns are not just abstract but directly influence resistance behaviors. When employees recognize AI systems as violating ethical norms or organizational values, resistance becomes morally beached and more persistent.

Qualitative studies reveal that ethical resistance often takes the form of surprised legitimacy rather than absolute opposition (McMillan and Perron (2021). Employees may meet the terms with AI systems while simultaneously challenging their fairness or suitability. This form of resistance reflects deeper value-based conflicts between technological efficiency and human dignity. Organizations that neglect ethical size risk eroding trust and legitimacy. On the other hand, ethical AI governance, transparency, and participative decision-making can decrease resistance and enhance recognition. Ethics thus functions as a critical bridge between AI adoption and employee trust.

### 3.7 Integrative Perspectives and Limitations of Existing Literature

In spite of growing scholarly interest, the literature on AI and resistance to change remains fragment. Many studies focus either on technological aspect of AI or on general theories of resistance without integrating both perspectives. Quantitative studies govern empirical research, often overlooking the nuanced emotional, ethical, and identity-related dimensions captured through qualitative inquiry.

There is a prominent lack of integrative qualitative frameworks that scrutinize how technological characteristics of AI interact with psychological, social, and organizational factors to shape resistance. Existing research also tends to highlight outcomes of resistance rather than resistance as an ongoing process of sense-making and edition. This disintegration highlights the need for holistic, qualitative approaches that imprison employees' lived experiences of AI-driven change. Such approaches can endow with deeper insights into how resistance evolves, how it is negotiated in everyday practices, and how organizations can retort fruitfully.

## 4. Research Gaps

Despite the mounting body of research on artificial intelligence and organizational change, several significant gaps remain that warrant systematic scholarly attention. First, much of the existing literature on AI adoption remains mainly **technology-centric**, focusing on system capabilities, efficiency gains, and performance outcomes (Haryanto et al. (2025)). While such studies provide important insights into the functional aspects of AI, they offer restricted understanding of **employees' lived experiences**, subjective interpretations, and emotional responses to AI-driven change. As a result, the human and social dimensions of AI accomplishment remain under explored, particularly from an interpretive and qualitative point of view.

Second, research on **resistance to change** has largely evolved separately of specific technological contexts. Traditional resistance frameworks often provide comprehensive explanations entrenched in cognitive or behavioral reactions without sufficiently accounting for the distinguishing characteristics of AI, such as algorithmic opacity, perceived autonomy, and data-driven decision-making de Bruijn, Warnier, and Janssen (2021). This division has resulted in conceptual models that may not fully imprison the **unique dynamics of resistance emerging in AI-enabled environments**, where technology is professed not merely as a tool but as an vigorous organizational actor.

Third, there is a distinguished **lack of integrative qualitative studies** that holistically examine how manifold factors such as ethical concerns, trust in algorithms and management, professional identity, and perceptions of skill relevance interrelate to shape employee resistance to AI. Existing studies tend to look at these variables in isolation, restraining the ability to understand resistance as a complex, interrelated phenomenon. The deficiency of such holistic perspectives constrains the development of all-inclusive frameworks that reflect the reality of AI-driven organizational change.

Finally, empirical research on AI and resistance remains **methodologically distorted toward quantitative approaches**, which, while useful for identifying patterns and relationships, often fail to imprison the depth, ambiguity, and contextual wealth of employee experiences (Christou (2023)). There is a very important need for qualitative methodologies such as interviews, narratives, and case-based approaches that can illuminate how employees construct meaning around AI, eloquent concerns, and navigate indecision during AI-driven change. Addressing these gaps is necessary for developing **nuanced, human-centered, and ethically grounded perspectives** on AI-enabled organizational change. Such insights can contribute not only to theory building but also to more comprehensive and sustainable AI implementation practices within organizations.

## 5. Role of Artificial Intelligence in Shaping Resistance to Change

Artificial Intelligence plays a multifaceted and multidimensional role in determining resistance to change within organizations. Unlike conventional technologies, AI is often perceived as autonomous, intelligent, and

competent of replacing or outperforming human judgment. As a result, AI-driven change does not merely alter processes or tools; it essentially reshapes how employees perceive work, authority, competence, and organizational control. Resistance emerging in response to AI is therefore deeply tangled with psychological, social, and ethical dimensions of organizational life.

### **5.1 AI as a Disruptor of Power, Control, and Decision-Making**

One of the most important ways AI shapes resistance to change is through its impact on power structures and decision-making ability within organizations. Traditionally, decision-making has been rooted in hierarchical roles, professional expertise, and managerial prudence. AI systems, particularly those based on advanced analytics and machine learning, increasingly inform or even mechanize decisions related to hiring, performance evaluation, scheduling, and resource allocation Sharma et al. (2024).

Employees may resist AI when they recognize that decision-making authority is changing away from human actors toward solid algorithms. This apparent loss of control can generate skepticism, defensiveness, and distrust, particularly among middle managers and professionals whose roles have historically relied on empirical judgment and tacit knowledge (Nayak, Hicks, and Morris (2020). Qualitative studies propose that resistance in such contexts often manifests as questioning data validity, bypassing AI recommendations, or delicately undermining system use rather than overt opposition.

Moreover, AI-driven consistency of decisions may be interpreted as a threat to related judgment and discretion. Employees may feel that algorithmic logic fails to capture the difficulty of human work, leading to a sense of depression. Resistance, in this sense, becomes a instrument through which employees attempt to protect autonomy, influence, and professional relevance within AI-enabled organizations.

### **5.2 AI and Threats to Professional Identity and Expertise**

AI strongly influences resistance to change by demanding employees' professional identities. specialized identity is closely connected to individuals' sense of competence, expertise, and contribution to the organization. When AI systems perform tasks that were beforehand considered core to a professional role such as analysis, diagnosis, or evaluation employees may experience identity commotion (Selenko, Bankins, Shoss, Warburton, and Restubog (2022).

This form of confrontation is often emotional and representative rather than behavioral. Employees may not openly refuse AI but may knowledge anxiety, loss of confidence, or diminished self-worth. For information workers, resistance may stem from the fear that years of education and experience are being rendered obsolete by automatic systems. For operational employees, resistance may be driven by concerns that AI will reduce their roles to monitoring or compliance functions.

Qualitative evidence highlights that such identity-based resistance is particularly intense when AI implementation is framed as a replacement rather than an augmentation of human capabilities Zittis et al. (2022). In contrast, when organizations position AI as a harmonizing tool that enhances human judgment, employees are more likely to reinterpret AI as a source rather than a threat. Thus, resistance is formed not only by what AI does, but by how its role is socially analysed and communicated within the organization.

### **5.3 Psychological Responses to AI-Induced Uncertainty and Risk**

AI-driven change brings heightened levels of vagueness, which plays a vital role in shaping resistance. Unlike traditional change initiatives with comparatively expected outcomes, AI systems often develop continuously through learning algorithms, making their future impact difficult to predict. This uncertainty can produce fear related to job security, skill relevance and performance evaluation.

Moreover, AI-related ambiguity can undermine psychological safety, particularly when employees fear being continuously monitored or evaluated by algorithmic systems. When mistakes are supposed as being enduringly recorded or judged without human understanding, resistance may emerge as a protective response. Addressing

these psychological proportions requires organizations to prioritize lucidity, dialogue, and emotional support next to technical training (Shaik (2025)).

#### **5.4 Ethical Concerns, Trust, and Moral Resistance**

Ethical considerations play a innermost role in determining resistance to AI-driven change. Employees gradually question the fairness, accountability, and transparency of AI systems more, particularly when these systems manipulate decisions affecting careers, compensation, or job continuity. Resistance may arise when employees identify AI as biased, discriminatory, or uneven with organizational values (Dwivedi (2023)).

This structure of resistance can be very well described as moral or value-based resistance. Employees may contest AI not because it threatens their role straight, but because it conflicts with their sense of fair dealing or ethical responsibility (Christodoulou, Bächtold, and Kalypso Iordanou (2024)).

#### **5.5 AI as an Enabler of Change Acceptance and Reduced Resistance**

While AI can strengthen resistance, it also has the possible to reduce resistance when implemented considerately. AI-supported training systems, tailored learning platforms, and decision-support tools can give power to employees by enhancing competence and confidence (Bagai & Mane, 2023). When employees experience AI as a helpful partner rather than a controlling device, resistance tends to weaken. AI can also lessen resistance by humanizing communication and participation.

Leadership plays a essential role in shaping this positive course. When leaders frame AI as a tool for intensification rather than substitution, lay emphasis on re skilling and career development, and vigorously listen to employee concerns, resistance is more likely to evolve into acceptance or observant optimism (Doharey (2025)).

#### **5.6 Leadership and Sense-Making in AI-Driven Change**

Leadership is essential in shaping how employees understand AI-driven change. Leaders manipulate resistance by creating AI narratives, modeling technology use, and creating spaces for conversation and sense-making (Deb Biswas and Sengupta (2025)). In the dearth of clear leadership communication, employees are more likely to depend upon on rumors, assumptions, and worst-case scenario, rising resistance.

Qualitative research determines that leaders who connect employees in conversations about AI, admit uncertainties, and authenticate emotional responses are more effective in managing resistance. Thus, the role of AI in determining resistance is indivisible from leadership behavior. Resistance is not just a reaction to technology, but a reply to how meaning, power, and values are negotiated throughout AI-driven change.

## **6. Challenges Associated with Artificial Intelligence and Resistance to Change**

The execution of Artificial Intelligence in organizations introduces a multifaceted set of challenges that considerably shape employee resistance to change. These challenges make bigger far beyond technical readiness and include cognitive, emotional, cultural, ethical, and structural proportions. Managing resistance in AI-driven change consequently requires organizations to deal with multiple, interrelated obstacles that influence how employees perceive, interpret, and respond to AI initiatives Ivchyk (2024).

### **6.1 Lack of AI Literacy and Understanding**

One of the most basic challenges associated with AI implementation is the extensive lack of AI literacy amongst employees. AI systems are often complex to understand, particularly for non-technical staff. When employees lack basic understanding about how AI systems function, what data they use, and how the decisions are examined, ambiguity and mistrust increase significantly.

Qualitative studies indicate that low AI literacy contributes to overstated fears related to job loss, observation, and loss of control. Employees may point unrealistic capabilities or hateful intent to AI systems, leading to resistance beached in misunderstanding rather than direct experience (Smith et al. (2019). This challenge is seen when organizations presume that employees will naturally adapt to AI without planned education or conversation.

Furthermore, AI literacy gaps create power asymmetries connecting technical experts and other employees, reinforcing perceptions of keeping out and marginalization. Resistance in such situations may evident as disconnection, escaping of AI tools, or reliance on informal workarounds (Shirish & Batuekueno, 2021). Addressing and understanding AI literacy is therefore not merely a training issue but a introductory requirement for reducing resistance and nurturing informed participation in AI-driven change.

### **6.2 Inadequate Reskilling and Fear of Skill Obsolescence**

A major driver of resistance to AI adoption is the professed threat to employees' skills and long-term employability. AI-driven mechanization and increase often alter job roles, reduce demand for certain competencies, and elevate the significance of digital and analytical skills (Abayomi, Sharma, Adekunle, Ogeawuchi, and Omoniyi Onifade (2023). When organizations fail to provide clear re-skilling pathways, employees may understand AI as a signal of joblessness rather than opportunity.

Qualitative confirmation suggests that resistance intensifies when re-skilling initiatives are reactive, inadequately communicated, or unequally distributed across employee groups. Employees may feel deserted or unfairly treated mainly older workers or those in routine-intensive roles (Russo et al. (2025). Fear of skill obsolescence is not limited to forefront employees; professionals and managers may also oppose AI when it encroaches upon tasks central to their know-how.

### **6.3 Ethical, Legal, and Algorithmic Bias Concerns**

Ethical and legal concerns symbolize a significant challenge in managing resistance to AI-driven change. AI systems progressively influence decisions connected to hiring, promotion, performance evaluation, and extinction. Employees may oppose AI acceptance when they perceive these systems as prejudiced, opaque, or lacking accountability (Lancaster, Schulenberg, Flathmann, McNeese, and Freeman (2023).

Algorithmic unfairness whether real or perceived can harshly undermine trust. Qualitative research reveals that employees often raise question whether AI systems reflect organizational principles or reinforce existing inequalities (Kordzadeh and Ghasemaghaei (2021). When organizations fail to explain how justice, transparency, and answerability are ensured, resistance may take the form of moral conflict rather than self-interest.

### **6.4 Insufficient Employee Involvement and Participation**

Another critical confront in managing resistance to AI is the partial involvement of employees in AI-related decision-making (Madanchian & Taherdoost, 2025). Many AI mechanism and initiatives are designed and implemented in a top-down way, with negligible consultation or participation from those most pretentious. Qualitative studies without fail demonstrate that employees are more likely to refuse to accept change when they feel that AI is being "done to them" rather than "developed with them." Lack of contribution reduces ownership and increases incredulity regarding organizational intentions (Hofid and Andri (2025). Employees may obey apparently while resisting in subtle ways, such as not trusting and ignoring AI recommendations or reverting to traditional practices.

Participation also plays a fundamental role in sense-making. Without any idea or opportunities to ask questions, share concerns, and influence implementation, employees generally faces or struggle to appreciate the underlying principle and implications of AI adoption. This sense-making gap ensures amplifies uncertainty and emotional resistance. Effective management of resistance consequently requires participatory change processes that extravagance employees as stakeholders to a certain extent than passive recipients of technology.

### 6.5 Cultural Resistance and Organizational Inertia

Organizational culture considerably shapes confrontation to AI-driven change. In traditionally structured organizations characterized by hierarchical control, unbending routines, and risk dislike, AI adoption often encounters strong cultural resistance (Vishwakarma and Bhardwaj (2025)). Such cultures may view AI as troublemaker to established norms, authority structures, and ways of functioning.

Cultural resistance manifests in united narratives that depict AI as mismatched with organizational identity or values. Organizational apathy further compounds this challenge. Existing systems, processes, and power relations may resist reassurance and reconfiguration, particularly when AI threatens well-established interests (Zuo & Li, 2019). Resistance in such contexts is not just individual but entrenched in organizational routines and informal practices. Acknowledging cultural resistance requires long-term educational change efforts rather than remote AI projects.

### 6.6 Managing Emotional Responses and Psychological Safety

One of the most compound challenges associated with AI and resistance to change is supervising and managing employees' emotional responses. AI-driven change often occur and evokes fear, anxiety, stress, and doubt, which cannot be determined through technical explanations alone Nasaj, Sulafa Badi, Murtagh, and Ding (2025).

Qualitative research highlights that AI can demoralize psychological safety when employees fear being continuously evaluated or replaced by algorithms. This apprehension may lead to silence, abridged experimentation, and risk-averse performance, ultimately restraining the efficiency of AI initiatives. Employees may refuse to accept not because they oppose AI, but because they fear the consequences of disappointment in an AI-monitored environment.

### 6.7 Integrating Technological, Human, and Ethical Dimensions

A concluding and overarching challenge lies in integrating technological, human, and ethical dimensions of AI-driven change. Many organizations move toward AI implementation as a technical project, underestimating and not analyzing the complexity of human and ethical implications. This uneven approach leads to misalignment between system design, organizational culture, and employee outlook.

Resistance takes place when employees experience AI as technically competent but socially insensate or ethically ambiguous. Holistic and profound change management strategies that align AI capabilities with human values, managerial purpose, and ethical ideology are essential. Such addition requires cross-functional collaboration, unremitting dialogue, and adaptive governance mechanisms.

## 7. Future Scope of the Study

The swift diffusion of Artificial Intelligence across organizational structure and functions presents vast opportunities for future research, mainly in understanding its complex relationship with resistance to change (Benbya, Davenport, and Pachidi (2020)). While obtainable studies have begun to document employee reactions to AI adoption, much of the current information remains fragment, cross-sectional, and outcome-oriented. Future research must consequently adopt deeper, more nuanced, and context-sensitive methodology and approaches to imprison the evolving human dimensions of AI-driven change.

One important opportunity for future research lies in the use of **in-depth qualitative methodologies and systems** such as semi-structured interviews, focus group discussions and ethnographic studies. These approaches can expose employees' lived experiences, emotions, and sense-making processes as they interrelate with AI systems in their daily work (Engström, Mohlin, Mirzaei, Pittino, and Johansson (2022)). Qualitative narratives can show how employees interpret AI not only as a technological instrument but as a representative representation of organizational intent, power, and future direction. Such important insights are difficult to

imprison through survey-based methods alone and are necessary for developing grounded theories of resistance in AI-enabled environments.

Another perspective shows potential direction involves **cross-cultural and cross-national studies**. Cultural values related to ambiguity avoidance, power distance, collectivism, and attitudes toward technology can strongly persuade employee responses to AI (Cannavale, Claudio, & Koroleva, 2025). Resistance that appears as individual fretfulness in one cultural context may be obvious as collective opposition or silent compliance in another. Qualitative cross-cultural research can add to culturally sensitive frameworks for managing AI-induced resistance and avoid overly universalized assumptions.

Longitudinal qualitative research show case a particularly decisive future direction. Resistance to AI is not a static incident; it evolves as employees gain experience to, interact with, and adapt to AI systems over time. Longitudinal studies can draw how initial fear, uncertainty, or opposition may transform into acceptance, provisional trust, or even advocacy (Cappuccio, Galliot, Eyssel, and Lanteri (2023). Such research can also imprison moments of re-emerging resistance when AI systems are updated and upgraded, expanded, or repurposed. Understanding these chronological dynamics is essential for mounting sustainable AI implementation strategies.

Future research should also put together **ethical, emotional, and identity-based perspectives** more openly. While ethical AI is conventionally growing attention, few studies examine and explore at how ethical concerns are experienced emotionally by employees or how they meet with professional identity and moral values. Resistance beached in ethical discomfort or identity threat may continue even when technical performance is high. Additionally, future studies can explore the **role of leadership and organizational narratives** in shaping resistance over time. Leaders play a crucial role in framing AI, legitimizing concerns, and guiding sense-making processes. Examining leadership discourse, storytelling, and everyday communication practices can reveal how resistance is amplified, silenced, or transformed within organizations.

Finally, future research can move in the direction of **integrative frameworks** that connect micro-level employee experiences with micro-level organizational practices and macro-level institutional forces such as directive, labor markets, and societal attitudes toward AI. Such multi-level qualitative models can add considerably to theory building and inform more ethical, comprehensive, and human-centered approaches to AI-driven organizational change.

## 8. Conclusion

Artificial Intelligence has now emerged as one of the most influential drivers of modern organizational change, deeply reshaping work practices, decision-making processes, and employee experiences. While AI offers considerable potential for efficiency, innovation, and strategic advantage, its execution is unavoidably accompanied by resistance to change.

The conclusion synthesized in this study highlight that confrontation to AI is multidimensional and socially accepted and constructed. Employees resist or oppose not only because they fear job loss or skill obsolescence, but also because AI somehow challenges long-standing perception and assumptions about expertise, fairness, and human value in organizations. Prominently, this study emphasizes that resistance should not be seen as an obstruction to be eliminated or concealed. As a substitute, resistance serves as a meaningful gesture of employee concerns, managerial misalignments, and ethical tensions. From a qualitative view point/perspective, resistance just represents an active sense-making and adaptive procedure through which workers attempt to appreciate, negotiate, and influence AI-driven change. The study also highlights the significant role of leadership, communication, and participation in determining how resistance unfolds. When AI is studied and framed as a substitute mechanism enforced without consultation, resistance intensify. On the other hand, when organizations accept transparent and human-centered approaches by emphasizing extension, re-skilling, ethical governance, and psychological safety confrontation can be transformed into careful acceptance or positive engagement.

In conclusion to the above study, achieving sustainable and ethical AI implementation requires organizations to move beyond a merely technical mindset and engage intensely with the human side of transformation. Understanding resistance to AI as a compound interplay of cognitive, ethical, and identity-related factors enables more accountable and effective change management. By listening to employee insight, addressing fundamental concerns, and aligning AI initiatives with human values, organizations can cultivate trust, resilience, and long-term success in a gradually more AI-driven world.

### References

- [1] Abayomi, A. A., Sharma, A., Adekunle, B. I., Ogeawuchi, J. C., & Omoniyi Onifade. (2023). Integrating Machine Learning Algorithms in Financial Modeling: Evaluating Accuracy and Market Impact. *International Journal of Management and Organizational Research*, 2(2), 183–189. <https://doi.org/10.54660/ijmor.2023.2.2.183-189>
- [2] Babashahi, L., Barbosa, C. E., Lima, Y., Lyra, A., Salazar, H., Argôlo, M., ... Souza, J. M. de. (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>
- [3] Bagai, R., & Mane, V. (2023). Designing an AI-Powered Mentorship Platform for Professional Development: Opportunities and Challenges. *International Journal of Computer Trends and Technology*, 71(4), 108–114. <https://doi.org/10.14445/22312803/ijctt-v71i4p114>
- [4] Barkat, B., & Noureen, G. (2023). Understanding the Influence of Trust as Knowledge Management Enabler on Organizational Effectiveness Through Organizational Culture: A Mediation Analysis. *Journal of Policy Research*, 9(4), 224–231. <https://doi.org/10.61506/02.00144>
- [5] Becker, L. (2025). How Transparency and Value Affect Platform Workers' Workaround Use and Continuance Intention. *Proceedings of the ... Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences/Proceedings of the Annual Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.24251/hicss.2025.471>
- [6] Benbya, H., Davenport, T. H., & Pachidi, S. (2020). Artificial Intelligence in Organizations: Current State and Future Opportunities. *SSRN Electronic Journal*, 19(4). <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3741983>
- [7] Cannavale, C., Claudio, L., & Koroleva, D. (2025). Digitalisation and artificial intelligence development. A cross-country analysis. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 28(11), 112–130. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ejim-07-2024-0828>
- [8] Cappuccio, M. L., Galliot, J. C., Eyssel, F., & Lanteri, A. (2023). Correction to: Autonomous Systems and Technology Resistance: New Tools for Monitoring Acceptance, Trust, and Tolerance. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 16(4), 827–827. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-023-01081-2>
- [9] Christodoulou, V., Bächtold, M., & Kalypso Iordanou. (2024). Can a values and video-based activity increase knowledge or pro-environmental attitudes and behaviour? *E3S Web of Conferences*, 585, 10001–10001. <https://doi.org/10.1051/e3sconf/202458510001>
- [10] Christou, P. (2023). How to Use Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a Resource, Methodological and Analysis Tool in Qualitative Research? *The Qualitative Report*, 28(7), 1968–1980. <https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2023.6406>
- [11] Cox, A. (2022). How artificial intelligence might change academic library work: Applying the competencies literature and the theory of the professions. *Journal of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 74(3). <https://doi.org/10.1002/asi.24635>
- [12] de Bruijn, H., Warnier, M., & Janssen, M. (2021). The perils and pitfalls of explainable AI: Strategies for explaining algorithmic decision-making. *Government Information Quarterly*, 39(2), 101666. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2021.101666>

- [13] Deb Biswas, D., & Sengupta, R. (2025). Reimagining leadership for the AI era: a grounded theory of adaptive, ethical and contextually situated practices in workplaces. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/10.1108/lodj-06-2025-0488>
- [14] Doeze Jager-van Vliet, S., Born, M., & van der Molen, H. (2024). De relatie tussen behoeften en wendbaarheid van medewerkers en de mediërende rol van de attitude ten aanzien van verandering. *Gedrag & Organisatie*, 37(1), 78–112. <https://doi.org/10.5117/go2024.1.005.doez>
- [15] Doharey, P. K. (2025). Role of Artificial Intelligence in Healthcare Services. *Era's Journal of Medical Research*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.24041/ejmr.2025.24>
- [16] Dwivedi, Y. K. (2023). “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(0268-4012), 102642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642>
- [17] Engström, A., Mohlin, A., Mirzaei, N. E., Pittino, D., & Johansson, A. (2022). Understanding Organizational Tensions During Artificial Intelligence Transformation. *Academy of Management Proceedings*, 2022(1). <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2022.12745abstract>
- [18] Haryanto, B., Kristiani, N., Setiawan, A. I., Dewi, A. S., Khoiriyah, S., & Haryanto, H. (2025). Analyzing the Effect of Celebrity Endorsement on Purchase Intention: The Role of Attitude toward the Brand and Brand Congruity. *Journal of Management and Entrepreneurship Research*, 6(4), 396–412. <https://doi.org/10.34001/jmer.2025.12.06.4-82>
- [19] Hofid, A., & Andri, S. (2025). Pengaruh Iklim Organisasi dan Komitmen Afektif Terhadap Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Pada Perawat. *RIGGS: Journal of Artificial Intelligence and Digital Business*, 4(2), 2944–2956. <https://doi.org/10.31004/riggs.v4i2.962>
- [20] Hosseini, A., & Ayaz, Ö. (2025). AI ethics in action: a circular model for transparency, accountability and inclusivity. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jmp-03-2024-0177>
- [21] Hu, Y., Li, Y., Cui, B., Su, H., & Zhu, P. (2025). Internet of things enabled deep learning monitoring system for realtime performance metrics and athlete feedback in college sports. *Scientific Reports*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-025-13949-6>
- [22] Hutson, J., & Ceballos, J. (2023). Rethinking Education in the Age of AI: The Importance of Developing Durable Skills in the Industry 4.0. *Journal of Information Economics*, 1(2), 26–35. <https://doi.org/10.58567/jie01020002>
- [23] Ivchik, V. (2024). OVERCOMING BARRIERS TO ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE ADOPTION. *Three Seas Economic Journal*, 5(4), 14–20. <https://doi.org/10.30525/2661-5150/2024-4-3>
- [24] Johansson, A., & Vinthagen, S. (2014). Dimensions of Everyday Resistance: An Analytical Framework. *Critical Sociology*, 42(3), 417–435. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0896920514524604>
- [25] Kordzadeh, N., & Ghasemaghaei, M. (2021). Algorithmic bias: review, synthesis, and Future Research Directions. *European Journal of Information Systems*, 31(3), 388–409. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085X.2021.1927212>
- [26] Kuzmanov, I. (2025). Cognitive Inertia and Status Quo Bias: Understanding Resistance to Change from Mind to Society. *JOURNAL of NOVEL RESEARCH and INNOVATIVE DEVELOPMENT*, 3(4). <https://doi.org/10.56975/jnrid.v3i4.701293>
- [27] Lancaster, C., Schulenberg, K., Flathmann, C., McNeese, N. J., & Freeman, G. (2023). “It’s Everybody’s Role to Speak Up... But Not Everyone Will”: Understanding AI Professionals’ Perceptions of Accountability for AI Bias Mitigation. *ACM Journal on Responsible Computing*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3632121>

- [28] Lichtenstein, A. H., Appel, L. J., Vadiveloo, M., Hu, F. B., Kris-Etherton, P. M., Rebholz, C. M., ... Wylie-Rosett, J. (2021). 2021 Dietary Guidance to Improve Cardiovascular Health: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association. *Circulation*, *144*(23), 472–487. <https://doi.org/10.1161/cir.0000000000001031>
- [29] Lo, F.-Y., Rey-Martí, A., & Botella-Carrubi, D. (2020). Research Methods in business: Quantitative and Qualitative Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, *115*(1), 221–224. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.05.003>
- [30] Loy, J. E., & Demberg, V. (2023). Perspective Taking Reflects Beliefs About Partner Sophistication: Modern Computer Partners Versus Basic Computer and Human Partners. *Cognitive Science*, *47*(12). <https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.13385>
- [31] Madanchian, M., & Taherdoost, H. (2025). Barriers and Enablers of AI Adoption in Human Resource Management: A Critical Analysis of Organizational and Technological Factors. *Information*, *16*(1), 51–51. <https://doi.org/10.3390/info16010051>
- [32] McMillan, K., & Perron, A. (2021). Change Resistance as Practicing Moral Authenticity: A Qualitative Study. *Research and Theory for Nursing Practice*, *35*(2), RTNP-D-20-00078. <https://doi.org/10.1891/rtnp-d-20-00078>
- [33] Moen, F., & Federici, R. A. (2013). Coaches' Coaching Competence in Relation to Athletes' Perceived Progress in Elite Sport. *Journal of Education and Learning*, *2*(1). <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v2n1p240>
- [34] Molino, M., Ingusci, E., Signore, F., Manuti, A., Giancaspro, M. L., Russo, V., ... Cortese, C. G. (2020). Wellbeing Costs of Technology Use during Covid-19 Remote Working: An Investigation Using the Italian Translation of the Technostress Creators Scale. *Sustainability*, *12*(15), 5911. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155911>
- [35] Murire, O. T. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and Its Role in Shaping Organizational Work Practices and Culture. *Administrative Sciences*, *14*(12), 316. <https://doi.org/10.3390/admsci14120316>
- [36] Nasaj, M., Sulafa Badi, Murtagh, N., & Ding, L. (2025). Collective AI anxiety and team innovative behaviour: the role of coping strategies. *Construction Innovation*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ci-08-2024-0222>
- [37] Nayak, A., Hicks, A. J., & Morris, A. A. (2020). Understanding the Complexity of Heart Failure Risk and Treatment in Black Patients. *Circulation: Heart Failure*, *13*(8). <https://doi.org/10.1161/circheartfailure.120.007264>
- [38] Ranadeep Reddy Palle. (2023). Investigate Ethical Challenges and Considerations in the Collection, Analysis, and Use of Data for IT Analytics, Addressing Issues Related to Privacy, Bias, and Responsible AI. *International Journal of Science and Research*, *12*(1), 1246–1252. <https://doi.org/10.21275/es24101103401>
- [39] Rasheed, A., San, O., & Kvamsdal, T. (2020). Digital Twin: Values, Challenges and Enablers From a Modeling Perspective. *IEEE Access*, *8*(1), 21980–22012. <https://doi.org/10.1109/access.2020.2970143>
- [40] Roberts, J., & Hipkins, R. (2025). Rich mathematical tasks. *Set: Research Information for Teachers*, 1–3. <https://doi.org/10.18296/set.1578>
- [41] Ruiz-Palomino, P., Yáñez-Araque, B., Gutiérrez-Broncano, S., & Jiménez Estévez, P. (2025). Unlocking organizational change: servant leadership, change resistance and the mediating role of emotional intelligence. *Management Decision*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/md-04-2024-0874>
- [42] Russo, C., Romano, L., Clemente, D., Iacovone, L., Gladwin, T. E., & Panno, A. (2025). Gender differences in artificial intelligence: the role of artificial intelligence anxiety. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *16*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2025.1559457>
- [43] Selenko, E., Bankins, S., Shoss, M., Warburton, J., & Restubog, S. L. D. (2022). Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Work: A Functional-Identity Perspective. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *31*(3), 272–279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214221091823>

- [44] Shaik, F. F. (2025). TRACES of trust: A framework for leading amid digital oversight. *Organizational Dynamics*, 101204. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.orgdyn.2025.101204>
- [45] Sharma, A. S., Kalia, A., Sharma, A., Sidhu, M. S., Sanghera, G. S., Chhabra, G., ... Sandhu, J. S. (2024). Expression of *Trichoderma* spp. endochitinase gene improves red rot disease resistance in transgenic sugarcane. *PLoS ONE*, 19(9), e0310306–e0310306. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0310306>
- [46] Shirish, A., & Batuekueno, L. (2021). Technology renewal, user resistance, user adoption: status quo bias theory revisited. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, ahead-of-print*(ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/jocm-10-2020-0332>
- [47] Smith, H., Miller, K., Barnett, N., Oboh, L., Jones, E., Darcy, C., ... Crawford, P. (2019). Person-Centred Care Including Deprescribing for Older People. *Pharmacy*, 7(3), 101. <https://doi.org/10.3390/pharmacy7030101>
- [48] Sofroniew, M. V., & Vinters, H. V. (2009). Astrocytes: biology and pathology. *Acta Neuropathologica*, 119(1), 7–35. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00401-009-0619-8>
- [49] Tadiwa Walter Muparutsa. (2024). Demystifying Machine Learning: Applications in African Environmental Science and Engineering. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 2(3), 688–705. [https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2024.2\(3\).53](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2024.2(3).53)
- [50] Vishwakarma, S., & Bhardwaj, P. (2025). Ionospheric TEC Variations Across Latitudes During the May 2024 Geomagnetic Superstorm. *International Journal of Science and Research (IJSR)*, 462–467. <https://doi.org/10.21275/sr25910135544>
- [51] Xue, L. C., Noor, A. M., Zakaria, Z., Nasir, N. F. M., Norali, A. N., & Khiruddin, K. D. N. (2023). Neurorehabilitation Robot-Assisted for Stroke Recovery: Hybrid Exoskeleton Assistive Limb (HEAL). *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Informatics (IJEI)*, 11(4), 1143–1154. <https://doi.org/10.52549/ijeei.v11i4.5166>
- [52] Zittis, G., Almazroui, M., Alpert, P., Ciais, P., Cramer, W., Dahdal, Y., ... Xoplaki, E. (2022). Climate change and weather extremes in the Eastern Mediterranean and Middle East. *Reviews of Geophysics*, 60(3). <https://doi.org/10.1029/2021rg000762>
- [53] Zuo, Z., & Li, Y. (2019). Emerging Electrochemical Energy Applications of Graphdiyne. *Joule*, 3(4), 899–903. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joule.2019.01.016>