Research article

MechEcology 2025;4(1):e7
https://doi.org/10.23104/ME.e7

MechEcology

eISSN 2799-9297

The Role of Artificial Intelligence in Backing Up Human Insight: A Powerful Partnership

Hyunghun Kim[1,*], Hye sun Lee[2]

[1]*MechEcology Research Center, Seoul, Korea*
[2]*College of Medicine, Korea University, Seoul, Korea*

Published: June 30, 2025

***Corresponding author**
Hyunghun Kim
MechEcology Research Center, 150, Mokdongdong-ro, Yangcheon-gu, Seoul 08014, Korea
Tel: +82-2-2643-2323
E-mail: relyonlord@gmail.com

Copyright © 2025 MechEcology Research Center. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) which permits unrestricted non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

ORCID
Hyunghun Kim
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3013-075X
Hye sun Lee
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2790-2448

Competing interests
No potential conflict of interest relevant to this article was reported.

Funding sources
Not applicable.

Acknowledgements
This manuscript was edited for language and style using ChatGPT, a large language model developed by OpenAI.

Availability of data and material
Upon reasonable request, the datasets of this study can be available from the corresponding author.

Authors' contributions
Hyunghun Kim: He served as both the first and corresponding author, drafted the preliminary version of the essay, and oversaw all stages of the manuscript's development and finalization.

Abstract

The evolving relationship between artificial intelligence (AI) data backup and human insight in decision-making reveals a powerful synergy. Human insight is shaped by qualities such as parallel thinking, analytical depth, and conceptual blending, while AI is capable of enhancing human insight through rigorous data dissection, pattern discovery, and improved analysis. This integration contributes to an advancement in the quality and depth of decision-making. Nevertheless, challenges such as automation bias and anchoring bias continue to impede seamless collaboration between humans and AI. In response, strategies involving the promotion of critical thinking, improvement of AI transparency, balanced training, incorporation of diverse perspectives, a human-centered approach, and continuous evaluation are recommended. When these elements are integrated effectively, the collaboration between AI and human insight can drive robust and nuanced decision-making across multiple disciplines, demonstrating the transformative potential of their combined strengths.

Keywords: artificial intelligence; human collaboration; insight; intuition; data analysis

INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence (AI) is rapidly reshaping contemporary society by transforming data processing, decision-making, and operational efficiency in various domains. Fundamentally, AI excels in processing large datasets and recognizing complex patterns with high speed and precision. Such computational strength enables AI to execute complex calculations and manage repetitive tasks without fatigue, in contrast to human capabilities. As a result, AI enhances productivity by detecting subtle patterns that may escape human observation; thereby it supports more informed and data-driven decision-making, a critical asset in fields demanding efficiency and precision (Boden, 2016).

Notwithstanding these analytical strengths, AI remains deficient in several critical respects. AI systems are inherently dependent on the data used for training, which limits their ability to adapt to environments that deviate substantially from historical norms. In novel or unforeseen scenarios, these systems generally require extensive retraining with new datasets. As De Freitas (2024) indicates, the absence of a self-orienting capability, a capacity intrinsic to humans for continuously assessing one's position and adapting to new contexts, limits the flexibility and reliability of AI in dynamic, high-stakes applications such as autonomous vehicles (AVs).

Hye sun Lee: She critically reviewed the manuscript, offered constructive feedback to enhance its clarity and coherence, and verified the references accordingly.

Ethics approval
Not applicable.

Moreover, AI's capacity for creative problem-solving is constrained. Although AI can generate a range of ideas based on data pattern recognition, its outputs tend to be derivative and confined within the boundaries of its training material. Consequently, the generated ideas often lack the emotional depth, contextual sensitivity, and originality inherent in human thought (Gaffar & Albarashdi, 2024). Without the ability to integrate personal experience or emotional nuance, AI encounters difficulties in navigating complex ethical dilemmas or making judgments that extend beyond algorithmic calculations (Dreyfus & Dreyfus, 1986; Narimisaei et al., 2024; Wallach & Allen, 2009).

By comprehensively understanding both the strengths and limitations of AI, one may better appreciate its role as an invaluable partner to human insight. This paper aims to elucidate the complementary roles of AI and human cognition and emphasizes the importance of leveraging each for their unique contributions in decision-making and problem-solving.

THE UNIQUE STRENGTHS OF HUMAN INSIGHT

Building on the interplay between analytical precision and creative adaptability, human insight emerges as a critical component in tackling complex challenges. Human insight, a key element of creative thinking, is formed through a complex process of parallel thinking, analysis, and recombination of ideas (Kounios & Beeman, 2014). Such cognitive processes enable individuals to approach problems from various perspectives simultaneously, fostering novel solutions and a deeper understanding.

The human brain's capability for parallel processing facilitates the simultaneous consideration of multiple aspects of an issue, thereby promoting the emergence of creative insights (Jung-Beeman et al., 2004). In conjunction with robust analytical skills, humans can deconstruct complex problems into manageable parts, an essential step in identifying the intricacies of challenging situations (Gilhooly & Murphy, 2005).

Perhaps the most distinctive aspect of human cognition is the ability to recombine these analyzed elements in original and unexpected ways; a process known as "conceptual blending". This recombination allows for the creation of novel ideas and solutions that may not be immediately apparent through linear thinking alone (Fauconnier & Turner, 2002). Such intuitive leaps, which generate innovative solutions to complex problems, remain a unique strength of human insight, a capability that current AI systems struggle to replicate fully (Boden, 2004).

THE COMPLEMENTARY NATURE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND HUMAN INSIGHT

By recognizing and leveraging the characteristics of human cognition, parallel thinking, analytical assessment, and idea recombination, it becomes evident how human insight and AI complement one another in decision-making processes. AI excels in discerning complex patterns and subtle correlations that may be overlooked by humans (Chen et al., 2012).

In rapidly evolving environments characterized by rapid shifts in technology, market conditions, or societal norms, AI's predictive analytics assist decision-makers in forecasting trends and adapting strategies. Agrawal et al. (2018) emphasize the utility of predictive modeling based on historical data, enabling businesses to anticipate market changes, identify emerging opportunities, and mitigate risks. When decisions must be made in real-time, AI serves as an invaluable ally, offering immediate analysis of fast-changing data streams. Brynjolfsson & McAfee (2017) illustrate how AI can update insights instantaneously, empowering humans to make informed decisions under tight

time constraints.

However, in flexible and volatile environments, where conditions are not just fast-moving but can also change unpredictably, AI's dependence on historical datasets reveals its limitations. While the AI system processes new data to uncover evolving patterns, humans draw on intuition and situational awareness to devise creative solutions that may not emerge from algorithmic predictions alone. In this way, AI's analytical inputs refine and strengthen final strategies, but human judgment remains essential for navigating the unforeseeable twists of truly volatile scenarios.

AI also plays a significant role in enhancing human creativity. Zhou & Lee (2024) proposed that AI can stimulate and expand human creative thought by mimicking divergent thinking and presenting multiple possibilities. By learning from existing datasets to generate new combinations or variations, AI presents new possibilities and unexpected connections. AI can inspire human creativity and lead to breakthrough innovations, particularly in fields like marketing and product development. Humans, however, hold the essential responsibility of selecting among these diverse options, determining which choices are ethically sound and emotionally suitable, and assessing their broader socio-cultural implications.

In summary, the synergy between AI and human cognition provides a powerful framework for decision-making and creative innovation. While AI excels in rapid data processing and pattern recognition, human insight brings the crucial elements of creativity, contextual understanding, and ethical reasoning to the table (Korteling et al., 2021). Although AI adeptly analyzes historical data and identifies intricate patterns, its effectiveness diminishes in flexible and volatile environments where fresh data is scarce. In contrast, human intuition, marked by flexibility, innovation, and ethical foresight, addresses these gaps and drives adaptive problem-solving. This collaborative dynamic not only enhances strategic decision-making but also fuels breakthrough innovations across various fields.

CASE STUDIES OF HUMAN-ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE COLLABORATION

Healthcare

In healthcare, AI algorithms now analyze medical images with impressive accuracy, often even surpassing human experts in detecting certain conditions, as demonstrated by several studies (Liu et al., 2019). However, the final diagnosis and treatment decisions still rely heavily on the insight and experience of human doctors. A study published in Nature in 2020 demonstrated the effectiveness of an AI system in breast cancer detection UK (McKinney et al., 2020). The AI system, developed by researchers from Google Health, DeepMind, and several medical institutions, showed remarkable performance in analyzing mammograms for breast cancer screening. In this study, the AI model was able to reduce both false positives and false negatives compared to human radiologists. Specifically, the AI system reduced false positives by 5.7% in the U.S. and 1.2% in the UK, and false negatives by 9.4% in the U.S. and 2.7% in the UK (McKinney et al., 2020). Despite these impressive results, the researchers emphasized that the AI system is not meant to replace radiologists but to serve as a supportive tool. Human radiologists still play a vital role in interpreting the AI's findings, considering patient history, and making final diagnostic decisions. The integration of AI in mammography screening has the potential to enhance the accuracy and efficiency of breast cancer detection, but it requires a collaborative approach between AI and human expertise.

AI has indeed shown significant potential in augmenting radiology practices; however, its limitations become evident when broader clinical contexts and ethical considerations come into play. AI systems, while effective at processing vast amounts of data, lack the nuanced judgment and

contextual awareness necessary for complex medical scenarios. This underscores the critical need for continuous oversight by radiologists, who must evaluate the quality of training data and validate AI outputs to counter biases such as anchoring and automation bias (Geis et al., 2019). Radiologists are essential in interpreting AI-generated results within a comprehensive clinical framework, taking into account individual patient variations, edge cases, and the broader health implications that extend beyond algorithmic predictions.

Together, these insights highlight the importance of a collaborative approach in which AI serves as a powerful supportive tool while human expertise ensures ethical, contextually rich, and accurate clinical decision-making.

Finance

In the financial sector, AI-driven algorithms have transformed trading strategies and risk assessment. However, the 2010 Flash Crash demonstrated the potential risks of over-reliance on AI in financial markets (Kirilenko et al., 2017), highlighting the importance of human oversight and insight in interpreting market trends and making strategic decisions. The Flash Crash of 2010 was a significant event in the U.S. financial markets that occurred on May 6, 2010. Within a span of about 36 minutes, starting at 2:32 p.m. Eastern Daylight Time (EDT), the Dow Jones Industrial Average plummeted nearly 1,000 points (about 9%) before rapidly recovering most of its losses (Kirilenko et al., 2017). This sudden drop and recovery affected various financial instruments, including stocks, futures, options, and exchange-traded funds (ETFs), temporarily erasing about $1.35 trillion in market value (Kirilenko et al., 2017). The crash was attributed to a combination of factors, including a large sell order from a mutual fund, the reaction of high-frequency trading algorithms, alleged market manipulation through "spoofing," and the cascading effect of automated trading systems (U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission, 2010). This event highlighted the potential risks and vulnerabilities in modern financial markets heavily reliant on algorithmic and AI-driven trading systems, prompting discussions about market stability, regulation, and the need for human oversight in increasingly automated financial environments (Easley et al., 2011).

Creative Industry

The creative industries have indeed seen significant AI inroads, with AI-generated art gaining recognition (Cohn, 2018). The true value of AI in creative fields lies in its ability to inspire and augment human creativity rather than replace it. In visual art, AI tools such as DALL-E and Artbreeder enable artists to generate unique visual pieces based on text prompts (Restack, 2023). For instance, Sofia Crespo's "Neural Zoo" series employs AI algorithms to create intricate images of imaginary creatures, thereby inspiring new forms of artistic expression that blend biological and technological elements. In music, AI has been used to compose melodies and harmonies as well as to serve as a creative collaborator for musicians. David Cope's "Experiments in Musical Intelligence" program has produced compositions in the style of classical composers, thereby providing fresh inspiration for human musicians (NYU SPS, 2023). In literature, AI language models such as GPT-3 have been utilized to generate story ideas and to overcome writer's block. Robin Sloan, for example, used AI to help generate ideas for his science fiction novel "Mr. Penumbra's 24-Hour Bookstore" (BuildPrompt, 2023). In the field of design, AI algorithms are employed to create multiple design options based on specific input criteria. Nutella used AI to design 7 million unique jar labels for a limited edition release, which demonstrates AI's potential to enhance product design at scale (BuildPrompt, 2023).

These examples demonstrate that, although AI is capable of producing impressive outputs, its most significant contribution lies in augmenting and inspiring human creativity rather than

replacing it. Research indicates that AI-assisted artists who successfully explore novel ideas may produce artworks that are evaluated more favorably by their peers (Zhou & Lee, 2024). Furthermore, the framework proposed by Shneiderman et al. (2007) in their study on Creativity Support Tools underscores that the effective support of human creativity depends on tools that facilitate exploration, idea variation, and collaborative refinement. This perspective reinforces the view that AI is best utilized as an augmentative tool that enhances human capacity for creative insight.

However, autonomous AI art creation is accompanied by legal and ethical challenges. Copyright issues are particularly significant because AI models often require substantive datasets of existing artworks. This reliance on large datasets raises critical questions regarding fair use, authorship, and the potential infringement of artists' intellectual property rights (Gaffar & Albarashdi, 2024). In addition, AI-generated art may inadvertently perpetuate biases or reinforce prejudices that are embedded in its training data, potentially leading to limited representation or stereotyping of certain groups (Tiku, 2023). Moreover, the limitations of AI in creative domains extend beyond legal and ethical concerns. AI systems lack the nuanced moral reasoning, emotional intelligence, and cultural sensitivity that characterize human judgment.

It is important to note that human creativity is not solely a matter of generating new content; rather, it often originates from the profound ability to reinterpret and reframe known phenomena. In particular, the reconfiguration of perspectives, achieved by changing one's viewpoint or by leveraging social and cultural contexts, collaboration, and feedback, plays a critical role. This "restructuring of the worldview" is a core aspect of what Shneiderman et al. (2007) refer to as a situationalist approach. Such reconfiguration entails a deliberate change in the problem structure or the framework of meaning, which is intrinsically linked to processes of social and political validation. This reconfiguration emphasizes the indispensable role of human insight in high-level creative endeavors. As AI continues to evolve within the creative sphere, it remains essential to appreciate that the capacity to reanalyze and reinterpret existing phenomena from novel perspectives forms a foundational pillar of authentic creativity. This human trait is critical to ensuring that technology serves as an augmentative tool that enhances creative judgment rather than as a substitute for the nuanced evaluative processes that define genuine artistic innovation.

These considerations provide a basis for examining how emerging technologies can be effectively integrated into creative workflows without undermining the essential human contribution to artistic innovation.

Transportation

Transportation is a key area of AI application where the development of AVs demonstrates both enormous potential and significant ethical challenges. For instance, although AVs are designed to improve roadway safety and efficiency, they continue to struggle with ethical decision-making in potential accident scenarios, which underscores the need for human insight and moral reasoning in system design and oversight (Rhim et al., 2021). One of the most prominently discussed dilemmas in this context is a variation of the classic trolley problem. When an AV must decide whether to hit a group of pedestrians or swerve to potentially endanger its passenger, the situation exemplifies the complex moral calculus inherent in programming ethical responses (Luccio, 2024).

In addition to these moral considerations, research has shown that bias can infiltrate AV decision-making algorithms. Studies indicate that AV systems may be less likely to recognize pedestrians with darker skin tones, leading to unequal safety outcomes and emphasizing the importance of diverse representation in AI development teams as well as rigorous testing for bias (Li et al., 2023). Moreover, the challenge of transparency further complicates the ethical landscape.

Many AV systems are based on complex machine learning models that operate as "black boxes," making it difficult even for developers to interpret their decisions in the event of an accident; such opacity raises serious concerns regarding accountability and trust (IEEE SA, 2023).

Balancing safety with efficiency is another critical issue, as AVs must navigate the tension between ensuring maximum safety and maintaining optimal traffic flow. An overly cautious AV may slow traffic considerably, thereby introducing new safety or economic issues, which necessitates a careful consideration of both ethical and practical factors (Weinberger, 2023). Finally, the ethical implications of the extensive data collection required for AV operation cannot be overlooked, as these systems often record vast amounts of sensitive information about individuals and locations, raising important privacy concerns (Indika, 2024).

Collectively, these examples illustrate the complex ethical landscape that AV developers, policymakers, and ethicists must navigate. They highlight the need for ongoing dialogue between technologists, ethicists, and the public to ensure that AVs are developed and deployed in a manner that aligns with societal values and ethical principles (Lim & Taeihagh, 2018).

Education

In education, AI powered adaptive learning systems have shown promise in personalizing education to individual student needs (Pane et al., 2014). However, these systems cannot replace the empathy, motivation, and complex social interactions that human teachers provide. One prominent case involves the use of AI in detecting and addressing learning gaps. For instance, Realizeit, an AI powered adaptive learning platform implemented at the University of North Carolina at Charlotte, analyzes students' responses to provide immediate feedback and create personalized learning paths (Letslivealife, 2023). Although Realizeit has demonstrated positive effects on student retention and achievement in gateway courses, it faces challenges in ensuring the quality and reliability of its AI algorithms, protecting learner privacy and data security, and balancing human intervention with automation during the learning process (Letslivealife, 2023).

Another example is Carnegie Learning's Cognitive Tutor, which uses AI to adapt its teaching approach based on individual student performance in K-12 mathematics education (Itransition, 2023). This software provides personalized instructions along with a dynamic feedback loop that allows teachers to monitor student progress effectively. However, as Liew Xiu Jie & Aisyah Kamrozzaman (2024) note, the use of AI programs in the learning process is correlated with reduced student motivation, decreased critical thinking skills, over reliance on AI, and reduced engagement in the learning process.

The limitations of AI in education are further highlighted by the case of Duolingo, a popular language learning application that uses AI to personalize learning experiences (Zaghool & Khasawneh, 2025). While Duolingo's AI driven approach adjusts lesson difficulty based on user performance, it lacks the ability to engage in nuanced cultural discussions or to provide context specific language usage guidance that human language teachers can offer.

These examples underscore that while AI can enhance personalized learning and provide valuable data driven insights, it cannot fully replace the role of human teachers. AI systems struggle with ethical decision making and lack the ability to provide the empathetic understanding that is crucial in educational settings. As Selwyn (2024) points out, these limitations are further compounded by the inability of AI technologies to fully grasp the complexities of educational contexts, which often require nuanced human interaction and cultural awareness. The human element remains essential in interpreting complex student needs, providing emotional support, and fostering critical thinking skills that extend beyond the mere acquisition of knowledge.

In conclusion, while AI powered adaptive learning systems offer significant benefits in

personalizing education, they should be viewed as tools to augment human teaching rather than as replacements for human educators. The ideal approach involves a balanced integration of AI technologies with human expertise to create a more effective and holistic learning environment.

CRITICAL CHALLENGES OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE AND HUMAN COLLABORATION

The collaboration between AI and human insight offers significant potential benefits, but it also presents challenges that must be addressed for effective partnership. As repeatedly mentioned earlier, AI has inherent limitations, making it essential for human users to understand these constraints thoroughly when collaborating with AI. Users must recognize AI's limitations and use AI tools effectively. Common pitfalls for users include uncritically accepting AI outputs, over-reliance, or failing to trust AI sufficiently, leading to excessive verification and inefficient decision-making.

Two major challenges associated with over-reliance are automation bias and anchoring bias, both significantly impacting decision-making processes.

Automation bias refers to the human tendency to excessively depend on automated systems, even in the presence of contradictory information (Goddard et al., 2012). This bias typically manifests in two forms: errors of commission and errors of omission. For instance, in medical contexts, a doctor might follow an AI system's incorrect diagnosis (an error of commission) despite contradictory symptoms, or fail to conduct additional tests not suggested by the AI (an error of omission). Similarly, in finance, a trader might blindly follow AI recommendations without considering recent market news, potentially resulting in substantial financial losses.

Anchoring bias occurs when individuals overly rely on the initial piece of information they receive when making decisions (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). In human-AI collaboration, this could result in undue emphasis being placed on initial AI recommendations, even when presented with new or contradictory information. For example, in hiring processes, if an AI system initially ranks a candidate highly, hiring managers might struggle to objectively evaluate subsequent candidates, potentially overlooking better-qualified applicants. Similarly, in urban planning, if AI suggests a particular location for development, planners might fixate on this initial recommendation, neglecting viable alternatives introduced later.

The interplay between automation bias and anchoring bias can create a dangerous feedback loop in decision-making processes. Users might overly trust AI systems due to automation bias while simultaneously struggling to adjust their thinking when new information becomes available due to anchoring bias. This combined effect can reinforce incorrect decisions, making it difficult for users to recognize and correct errors. For instance, in AV systems, consistent AI suggestions for a particular route might cause human operators to continue following these suggestions even when real-time traffic data indicates severe congestion or safety risks. In high-stakes environments such as healthcare, finance, or autonomous systems, this compounded bias effect could lead to critical mistakes that might have been avoided with a more balanced approach.

Users of AI must, therefore, remain aware of these biases, critically assessing AI outputs to selectively adopt recommendations appropriately. Conversely, excessive skepticism or overly critical verification of AI outputs can diminish the social and economic effectiveness of AI-human collaboration, reducing decision-making efficiency. This lack of trust can be exacerbated by AI's black-box nature, making it challenging to understand AI decision-making processes. In fields like healthcare and finance, where responsibilities are high, insufficient trust can delay adopting and advancing new technologies. Consequently, enhancing AI trustworthiness at the design stage is essential, an approach central to Human-Centered AI strategies discussed later.

By addressing these challenges through enhanced training, innovative system design, and refined decision-making protocols, the full potential of human-AI collaboration can be realized; furthermore, considering these pitfalls, the following strategies can assist organizations in striking the appropriate balance between AI's analytical capabilities and human intuitive judgment.

STRATEGIES TO OVERCOME CHALLENGES

The collaboration between AI and human insight offers immense potential for enhancing decision-making processes across various fields. However, this partnership is not without its challenges. This section explores strategies to overcome these challenges, mainly focused on anchoring and automation bias, and foster more effective collaboration between AI systems and human experts.

Before delving into specific sections, it is essential to first discuss the critical types of intuition humans must employ when evaluating AI outputs critically and efficiently executing tasks. Following this, the distinct characteristics and strengths of human experts will be described to avoid bias. Finally, based on this understanding of intuitions in human-AI interaction and the expertise of human professionals, concrete solutions to address challenges in AI-human collaboration will be proposed.

Understanding the Types of Intuition in Human-Artificial Intelligence Interaction

Chen et al. (2023) propose three types of intuition that play substantial roles in human-AI decision-making processes, shedding light on the complex interplay between human expertise and AI capabilities. These intuitions about task outcomes, relevant features, and AI limitations not only form the foundation of effective human-AI collaboration but also enable humans to critically evaluate and appropriately accept AI-generated conclusions, leading to more efficient and well-informed decision-making.

The first type, intuition about the task outcome, refers to a decision maker's initial judgment based on experience and understanding, independent of AI input, providing a critical reference point that prevents them from over-relying on the AI's initial assessment, anchoring bias. For instance, an experienced physician might intuitively diagnose asthma after observing a patient's symptoms, even before consulting an AI diagnostic system. This intuition is a valuable counterpoint to AI-generated insights, potentially highlighting discrepancies that warrant further investigation.

The second type, intuition about features, encompasses the decision-maker's understanding of which factors are most relevant to the task, thereby avoiding blind acceptance of automated suggestions, automation bias. This is exemplified by a seasoned financial analyst who instinctively recognizes the significance of specific economic indicators in stock market analysis before employing AI tools. Such intuition can guide the selection and interpretation of AI-processed data, ensuring that critical factors are not overlooked.

Lastly, intuition about AI limitations plays a vital role in maintaining appropriate trust levels, as recognizing where and why AI might fail or produce unreliable results encourages experts to apply heightened scrutiny in those scenarios. This awareness not only safeguards against errors but also fosters a balanced perspective that values the AI's strengths without discarding the indispensable human element in judgment and oversight. An AV engineer, for example, might anticipate the need for increased scrutiny of AI judgments in challenging weather conditions, recognizing potential situations where human intervention becomes necessary. This awareness is crucial for maintaining safety and effectiveness in AI-assisted operations.

This awareness not only safeguards against errors but also fosters a balanced perspective that values the AI's strengths without discarding the indispensable human element in judgment and oversight.

Engaging Expert Intuition

To prevent automation bias and anchoring bias, integrating expert intuition with AI analysis is essential. Expert intuition, honed through years of practical experience and deep domain knowledge, provides the critical contextual and ethical insights that AI alone cannot offer. This balanced approach not only mitigates the risks of relying too heavily on automated outputs but also helps address the underlying distrust issues that can arise when professionals question whether technology fully captures the complexities of nuanced decision-making.

One of the primary differences lies in contextual understanding. Experts develop a nuanced ability to interpret complex situational contexts through years of experience. For instance, a skilled physician can holistically interpret a patient's facial expressions, tone of voice, and non-verbal cues to inform their diagnosis. AI systems, while proficient in data analysis, often struggle to fully comprehend and integrate such intricate contextual information. This human capacity for contextual understanding allows experts to make more nuanced and situationally appropriate decisions.

Another crucial aspect is tacit knowledge, a form of implicit understanding that is difficult to articulate or codify explicitly. A prime example is a seasoned wine connoisseur who can detect subtle quality differences in wines that are challenging to describe verbally. This type of knowledge, deeply ingrained through experience, is not easily programmable or learnable by AI systems. The intuitive application of tacit knowledge often leads to insights and decisions that may seem inexplicable but are rooted in deep expertise.

Human intuition also plays a pivotal role in ethical judgment. Confronted with complex moral dilemmas, experts can weigh various factors, such as societal norms, professional obligations, and individual rights, to make balanced decisions. While AI can process large data sets rapidly, it faces inherent challenges in capturing the full breadth of human values and moral nuances, making human oversight indispensable for ethical deliberations.

In novel or unprecedented situations, experts demonstrate remarkable adaptive reasoning, drawing on diverse experiences to form creative solutions. AI, in contrast, often remains tethered to its training data and algorithms, struggling to generalize effectively when confronted with data or conditions outside its learned parameters. Expert adaptability thus becomes invaluable when dealing with emergent, rapidly changing environments by harnessing their intuition and insight.

The emotional and interpersonal dimensions of decision-making are another domain where human intuition excels. Experts can detect and interpret subtle emotional cues, which proves essential in fields such as leadership, counseling, or negotiation. Although AI can be trained to recognize basic emotional signals, it lacks the depth and sensitivity required for complex human interactions, where empathy and rapport can significantly influence outcomes.

Finally, unconscious processes, formed over years of practice, are imperative in guiding expert intuition (Dane & Pratt, 2007). Experts often rely on immediate, automatic judgments that are shaped by deep familiarity with their field. These instinctive reactions act as a safety net against uncritical acceptance of AI outputs, offering a means to cross-verify or question algorithmic recommendations when something "feels off."

Balancing Artificial Intelligence Analysis and Expert Intuition

The process of integrating AI analysis with expert intuition involves a delicate balance. Experts must critically evaluate AI outputs, leveraging their intuitive understanding to identify

potential biases, contextual misalignments, or oversights in the AI's analysis (Dwivedi et al., 2021). Simultaneously, they must remain open to new insights provided by AI that may challenge their preconceived notions or reveal previously unnoticed patterns.

This collaborative approach, where AI augments rather than replaces human expertise, allows for more robust decision-making (Dwivedi et al., 2021). It enables organizations to harness the strengths of both AI's data processing capabilities and human intuition's contextual understanding and creative problem-solving skills (Vaccaro et al., 2024). By ensuring that expert insight and experience remain central to the decision-making loop, organizations can mitigate biases, address distrust, and fully capitalize on AI's transformative potential.

Pillars for Effective Collaboration

To address the challenges of human-AI collaboration and foster more effective partnerships, several key components for solid collaboration can be implemented: enhancing critical thinking to rigorously assess AI outputs; balancing expertise with targeted training; adopting a human-centric approach that integrates intuitive judgment; improving transparency in AI decision-making; leveraging diverse perspectives to counter bias; and continuously evaluating collaboration performance.

Enhancing Critical Thinking

Encouraging high-level executives to rigorously scrutinize AI outputs while maintaining a deliberate skepticism serves as a vital countermeasure against automation and anchoring biases (Goddard et al., 2012). This critical approach is particularly essential in high-stakes decision-making processes, such as mergers and acquisitions (M&A), where objective evaluation can substantially enhance the integrity and effectiveness of strategic outcomes. For instance, when a CEO is considering a major acquisition of a tech startup based on an AI system's analysis suggesting high profitability, they should critically evaluate this recommendation by considering factors that AI might not fully capture, such as cultural fit, potential regulatory challenges, long-term strategic alignment, and stakeholder reactions. The CEO should also cross-reference the AI's suggestion with insights from industry experts, consultants, the board of directors, key leadership team members, and detailed due diligence reports. This approach ensures that while leveraging advanced AI for M&A analysis, the executive maintains a critical understanding of the technology's limitations and the irreplaceable value of human insight in high-stakes decision-making, ultimately leading to a more informed and balanced decision that considers both quantitative and qualitative factors crucial for the company's long-term success.

Balancing Expertise Through Training

Educating users on both the capabilities and limitations of AI systems fosters realistic expectations and appropriate reliance (Korteling et al., 2021). For instance, hospitals introducing AI systems for medical image analysis could offer in-depth training programs for their radiologists. These programs would demonstrate the AI's ability to quickly detect certain abnormalities in X-rays or MRIs, such as identifying potential lung nodules or brain tumors with high accuracy and speed. However, the training would also emphasize scenarios where the AI might miss subtle signs that an experienced radiologist would catch, such as early-stage cancers with atypical presentations or rare conditions that the AI hasn't been extensively trained on.

This balanced approach would help radiologists leverage AI to enhance their diagnostic capabilities while maintaining their critical role in patient care and final decision-making. For example, radiologists might learn to use AI as a "second reader" to flag potential issues for closer

examination, but would also understand the importance of conducting their own thorough analysis. The training could include case studies where AI and human interpretations differed, encouraging radiologists to think critically about when to trust or question AI outputs.

By providing this comprehensive education, hospitals can ensure that their radiologists use AI as a powerful tool to improve efficiency and accuracy, while still relying on their expertise and judgment for complex cases and final diagnoses. This approach not only improves patient care but also helps radiologists adapt to and thrive in an AI-enhanced medical environment.

Human-Centric Approach

Developing AI systems that complement human strengths rather than attempting to replace human judgment entirely is critical (Tsiakas & Murray-Rust, 2022). This approach involves designing AI interfaces that augment human decision-making, incorporating human feedback loops into AI systems, and prioritizing user experience and cognitive ergonomics in AI tool development (Xu, 2019). The ultimate goal is to create a balanced partnership where human intuition and AI's analytical capabilities work in harmony, avoiding extreme outcomes and producing well-rounded results (Islam et al., 2023).

An example could be an AI-assisted customer service platform designed to augment human agents rather than replace them. The interface might present AI-generated suggestions for resolving customer queries, but allow agents to easily modify or override these suggestions. The system could learn from agent interactions, improving its recommendations over time. The interface would be designed with the agents' workflow in mind, presenting information in a way that reduces cognitive load and allows for quick decision-making during customer calls.

Crucially, the final responsibility for decisions remains with the human agents. This human-in-the-loop approach ensures that the intuitive understanding and emotional intelligence of human agents can temper the sometimes overly logical or data-driven suggestions of AI systems (Jarrahi, 2018). By combining AI's ability to process vast amounts of data and identify patterns with human intuition's capacity for nuanced understanding and contextual interpretation, the system can produce more balanced and appropriate outcomes for customers (Dellermann et al., 2019).

This synergy between human intuition and AI analysis is particularly valuable in complex or sensitive situations where purely algorithmic decisions might miss important nuances or lead to unintended consequences. The human agent's ability to consider factors that may not be captured in the AI's dataset, such as cultural sensitivities, emotional cues, or unusual circumstances, allows for more holistic and empathetic problem-solving (Picca, 2024).

Improving Artificial Intelligence Transparency

Developing AI systems that provide clear explanations for their decisions allows users to better understand and evaluate the AI's reasoning (Chen et al., 2023). This can be achieved through implementing explainable AI (XAI) techniques, creating user-friendly interfaces that visualize AI reasoning, and providing confidence levels or uncertainty metrics alongside AI recommendations (Arrieta et al., 2020). For instance, in a credit scoring system used by banks, the AI could provide not only a credit score but also a clear breakdown of the factors influencing the score. It might explain that a low score is due to a combination of recent missed payments, high credit utilization, and a short credit history. The system could also provide confidence levels for its assessment, indicating when there might be insufficient data for a reliable score.

Leveraging Diverse Perspectives

AI has the potential to learn and amplify the implicit biases embedded in its training data. For

example, Amazon's hiring algorithm, which was trained on historical hiring data, systematically favored male candidates over female ones due to the male dominance in the tech industry reflected in the data. Resumes containing terms such as "women" were penalized, leading Amazon to discontinue the tool after recognizing its inherent bias (BBC News, 2018). Similarly, the COMPAS algorithm, widely used in the U.S. criminal justice system to predict recidivism, was found to disproportionately label Black defendants as high risk for re-offending at nearly twice the rate of White defendants. This disparity arose from systemic racial inequities embedded in historical crime data. ProPublica's analysis revealed that Black defendants who did not re-offend were misclassified as high-risk at a false positive rate of 44.9%, compared to 23.5% for White defendants (Dressel & Farid, 2017; Larson et al., 2016). Therefore, it is essential for experts from diverse fields to rigorously review both AI-generated outputs and training data to ensure that they are free from bias and uphold fairness.

Forming cross-functional teams for AI-assisted projects, implementing structured debate or devil's advocate roles in decision-making processes, and seeking input from stakeholders with diverse backgrounds can lead to more robust and well-rounded decisions (Chiang et al., 2024; Meta, 2023). For instance, in an AI-driven urban planning project, the process might begin with the first AI analyzing data to select the most optimal location for a new public facility based on criteria such as population density and transportation routes. To ensure that this initial recommendation is critically evaluated, a second AI then assumes the role of a devil's advocate, challenging the proposed site by raising alternative considerations and questioning potential oversights. Based on these two contrasting AI perspectives, a cross-functional team, comprising urban planners, environmental scientists, sociologists, and community representatives, engages in structured debates. Community representatives might highlight the cultural significance of specific areas, while environmental scientists could flag concerns like wildlife corridors that the initial data might have neglected. This method, leveraging both the optimality assessment and the critical counterarguments from the dual AI system, fosters a richer discussion and ultimately leads to more robust, balanced decision-making.

Continuous Evaluation

Regularly assessing the performance of human-AI collaborations and adjusting strategies as needed is crucial for optimizing outcomes in complex operational environments. According to Fragiadakis et al. (2025) a structured evaluation framework can guide this process by focusing on three primary factors: Goals, Interaction, and Task Allocation. Organizations must first establish clear and measurable individual as well as collective objectives such as improving process efficiency and enhancing decision accuracy. Strong interaction mechanisms through regular feedback loops, adaptability assessments, and trust evaluations ensure that AI outputs and human insights remain consistently aligned. Task allocation is also essential; it requires leveraging AI's analytical strengths to handle large data sets and generate predictive insights while relying on human expertise for contextual judgment and complex decision-making.

For example, consider a large e-commerce company that has implemented an AI-powered inventory management system to work alongside human warehouse managers (Yaroson et al., 2025). In this scenario, key performance indicators such as inventory accuracy, order fulfillment speed, and the frequency of overstocking or understocking are continuously monitored. After critical sales events like Black Friday, the company conducts in-depth reviews to evaluate the effectiveness of the human-AI partnership. Should the analysis reveal that the AI system performs well with standard products but struggles with new or trending items, human managers are able to provide essential market feedback to refine the predictive algorithms.

By systematically integrating quantitative metrics with qualitative insights from user feedback organizations can iteratively adjust their strategies. This ongoing evaluation and realignment process ensures that human-AI collaborations not only remain effective but also adapt to evolving business needs, ultimately leading to more efficient operations and improved business outcomes.

CONCLUSION

AI offers powerful pattern recognition and predictive capabilities grounded in historical data, yet this strength reflects its inherent focus on "predictability" rather than adaptability to new contexts. In contrast, human insight, rooted in flexible reasoning, cumulative experience, and nuanced ethical or emotional judgment, can offset many of AI's inherent blind spots. Notably, anchoring bias and automation bias can be mitigated when humans critically assess AI recommendations using their own intuition and domain expertise.

To achieve more effective AI-human collaboration, organizations benefit from fostering high-level critical thinking so that users rigorously evaluate AI-generated outcomes. Equally important is balancing expertise with targeted training, ensuring professionals fully grasp both the potential and limitations of AI tools. Adopting a human-centric approach allows designers to integrate intuitive judgment directly into AI systems while improving transparency in AI decision-making through XAIs and intuitive interfaces, encouraging greater trust. Finally, leveraging diverse perspectives remains essential for offsetting algorithmic or data-driven biases, as teams with varied backgrounds contribute greater depth and robustness to AI-assisted decision-making.

By synthesizing AI's data-driven strengths with the rich contextual awareness and innovative thinking unique to humans, more multidimensional and creative solutions emerge. This synergy not only enhances decision accuracy but also drives forward-looking innovation, even not only in rapidly evolving environments but also in volatile environments. In the long run, refining past data predictions through expert intuition paves the way for a dynamic co-evolution of AI and human cognition, expanding the boundaries of human insight and charting a path toward more informed, ethical, and transformative outcomes. However, ongoing challenges, including XAI, thorough bias audits, user-centered interface design, and refined protocols for ethical decision-making, must be addressed to unlock the full potential of this partnership. Ultimately, the synergy between powerful predictive analytics and expert human judgment promises to be a driving force for meaningful progress across industries and disciplines.

"We hold that human insight is the flame, and artificial intelligence the lens that magnifies it—together they illuminate the uncharted future with clarity and resolve."

REFERENCES

Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). *Prediction machines: The simple economics of artificial intelligence*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Arrieta, A. B., Díaz-Rodríguez, N., Del Ser, ., Bennetot, A., Tabik, S., Barbado, A., Garcia, S., Gil-Lopez, S., Molina, D., Benjamins, R., Chatila, R., & Herrera, F. (2020). Explainable artificial intelligence (XAI): Concepts, taxonomies, opportunities and challenges toward responsible AI. *Information Fusion*, 58, 82-115.

BBC News. (2018). *Amazon scrapped 'sexist AI' tool*. BBC News. https://www.bbc.com/news/technology-45809919

Boden, M. A. (2004). *The creative mind: Myths and mechanisms* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Boden, M. A. (2016). AI: Its nature and future. Oxford University Press.

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). The business of artificial intelligence. *Harvard Business Review*, 95(4), 3-11.

BuildPrompt. (2023). *AI prompts in creative industries: Impact on art, writing, and design*. BuildPrompt.ai. https://buildprompt.ai/blog/ai-prompts-in-creative-industries-impact-on-art-writing-and-design/

Chen, H., Chiang, R. H. L., & Storey, V. C. (2012). Business intelligence and analytics: From big data to big impact. *MIS Quarterly*, *36*(4), 1165-1188.

Chen, V., Vera Liao, Q., Wortman Vaughan, J., & Bansal, G. (2023). Understanding the role of human intuition on reliance in human-AI decision-making with explanations. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, *7*(CSCW1), 1-32.

Chiang, C. W., Lu, Z., Li, Z., & Yin, M. (2024). Enhancing AI-assisted group decision making through LLM-powered devil's advocate. In: *IUI '24: Proceedings of the 29th International Conference on Intelligent User Interfaces*. Greenville, SC.

Cohn, G. (2018). *AI art at Christie's sells for $432,500*. The New York Times.

Dane, E., & Pratt, M. G. (2007). Exploring intuition and its role in managerial decision making. *Academy of Management Review*, *32*(1), 33-54.

De Freitas, J. (2024). *How humans outshine AI in adapting to change*. Baker Library. https://www.library.hbs.edu/working-knowledge/how-humans-outshine-ai-in-adapting-to-change

Dellermann, D., Ebel, P., Söllner, M., & Leimeister, J. M. (2019). Hybrid intelligence. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*, *61*(5), 637-643.

Dressel, J. J., & Farid, H. (2017). *Accuracy and racial biases of recidivism prediction instruments*. Berkeley Publications.

Dreyfus, H. L., & Dreyfus, S. E. (1986). *Mind over machine: The power of human intuition and expertise in the era of the computer*. Free Press.

Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., Duan, Y., Dwivedi, R., Edwards, J., Eirug, A., Galanos, V., Vigneswara Ilavarasan, P., Janssen, M., Jones, P., Kar, A. K., Kizgin, H., Kronemann, B., Lal, B., Lucini, B., … Williams, M. D. (2021). Artificial intelligence (AI): Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, *57*, 101994.

Easley, D., López de Prado, M. M., & O'Hara, M. (2011). The microstructure of the "flash crash": Flow toxicity, liquidity crashes, and the probability of informed trading. *The Journal of Portfolio Management*, *37*(2), 118-128.

Fauconnier, G., & Turner, M. (2002). *The way we think: Conceptual blending and the mind's hidden complexities*. Basic Books.

Fragiadakis, G., Diou, C., Kousiouris, G., & Nikolaidou, M. (2025). Evaluating human-AI collaboration: A review and methodological framework. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.19098*.

Gaffar, H., & Albarashdi, S. (2024). Copyright protection for AI-generated works: Exploring originality and ownership in a digital landscape. *Asian Journal of International Law*, *15*(1), 23-46.

Geis, J. R., Brady, A. P., Wu, C. C., Spencer, J., Ranschaert, E., Jaremko, J. L., Langer, S. G., Borondy Kitts, A., Birch, J., Shields, W. F., van den Hoven van Genderen, R., Kotter, E., Wawira Gichoya, J., Cook, T. S., Morgan, M. B., Tang, A., Safdar, N. M., & Kohli, M. (2019). Ethics of artificial intelligence in radiology: Summary of the joint European and North American multisociety statement. *Radiology*, *293*(2), 436-440.

Gilhooly, K. J., & Murphy, P. (2005). Differentiating insight from non-insight problems. *Thinking & Reasoning*, *11*(3), 279-302.

Goddard, K., Roudsari, A., & Wyatt, J. C. (2012). Automation bias: A systematic review of frequency, effect mediators, and mitigators. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, *19*(1), 121-127.

IEEE SA. (2023). *How to make autonomous systems more transparent and trustworthy*. IEEE SA beyond standards (blog). https://standards.ieee.org/beyond-standards/how-to-make-autonomous-systems-more-transparent-and-trustworthy/

Indika AI. (2024). *Ethical challenges in autonomous vehicles*. Indika AI (blog). https://www.indikaai.com/blog/understanding-ethics-of-autonomous-vehicle-development

Islam, M. S., Das, S., Gottipati, S. K., Duguay, W., Mars, C., Arabneydi, J., Fagette, A., Guzdial, M., & Taylor, M. E. (2023). Human-AI collaboration in real-world complex environment with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.15160*.

Itransition. (2023). *AI in education: Top applications, real-life examples, and adoption tips*. https://www.itransition.com/ai/education

Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. *Business Horizons*, *61*(4), 577-586.

Jung-Beeman, M., Bowden, E. M., Haberman, J., Frymiare, J. L., Arambel-Liu, S., Greenblatt, R., Reber, P. J., & Kounios, J. (2004). Neural activity when people solve verbal problems with insight. *PLOS Biology*, *2*(4), e97.

Kirilenko, A., Kyle, A. S., Samadi, M., & Tuzun, T. (2017). The flash crash: High-frequency trading in an electronic market. *The Journal of Finance*, *72*(3), 967-998.

Korteling, J. E., van de Boer-Visschedijk, G. C., Blankendaal, R. A. M., Boonekamp, R. C., & Eikelboom, A. R. (2021). Human-versus artificial intelligence. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, *4*, 622364.

Kounios, J., & Beeman, M. (2014). The cognitive neuroscience of insight. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *65*, 71-93.

Larson, J., Mattu, S., Kirchner, L., & Julia, A. (2016). *How we analyzed the COMPAS recidivism algorithm*. ProPublica. https://www.propublica.org/article/how-we-analyzed-the-compas-recidivism-algorithm

Letslivealife. (2023). *Examples of AI-powered adaptive learning in education*. https://www.letslivealife.com/post/examples-of-ai-powered-adaptive-learning-in-education

Liew Xiu Jie, A., & Aisyah Kamrozzaman, N. (2024). The challenges of higher education students face in using artificial intelligence (AI) against their learning experiences. *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, *12*(10), 362-387.

Lim, H. S. M., & Taeihagh, A. (2018). Autonomous vehicles for smart and sustainable cities: An in-depth exploration of privacy and cybersecurity implications. *Energies*, *11*(5), 1062.

Liu, X., Faes, L., Kale, A. U., Wagner, S. K., Fu, D. J., Bruynseels, A., Mahendiran, T., Moraes, G., Shamdas, M., Kern, C., Ledsam, J. R., Schmid, M. K., Balaskas, K., Topol, E. J., Bachmann, L. M., Keane, P. A., & Denniston, A. K. (2019). A comparison of deep learning performance against health-care professionals in detecting diseases from medical imaging: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *The Lancet Digital Health*, *1*(6), e271-e297.

Li, X., Chen, Z., Zhang, J. M., Sarro, F., Zhang, Y., & Liu, X. (2023). Dark-skin individuals are at more risk on the street: Unmasking fairness issues of autonomous driving systems. *arXiv preprint arXiv.2308.02935*.

Luccio, M. (2024). *The trolley problem: What would a self-driving car do*? GPS World. https://www.gpsworld.com/what-would-a-self-driving-car-do/

Meta. (2023). *Stakeholder engagement for responsible AI*. Open Loop India Program. https://openloop.org/reports/2024/09/india-report-stakeholder-engagement-for-responsible-ai.pdf

McKinney, S. M., Sieniek, M., Godbole, V., Godwin, J., Antropova, N., Ashrafian, H., Back, T., Chesus, M., Corrado, G. S., Darzi, A., Etemadi, M., Garcia-Vicente, F., Gilbert, F. J., Halling-Brown, M., Hassabis, D., Jansen, S., Karthikesalingam, A., Kelly, C. J., King, D., … Shetty, S. (2020). International evaluation of an AI system for breast cancer screening. *Nature*, *577*(7788), 89-94.

Narimisaei, J., Naeim, M., Imannezhad, S., Samian, P., & Sobhani, M. (2024). Exploring emotional intelligence in artificial intelligence systems: A comprehensive analysis of emotion recognition and response mechanisms. *Annals of Medicine & Surgery*, *86*(8), 4657-4663.

NYU SPS. (2023). *Embracing creativity: How AI can enhance the creative process*. NYU School of Professional Studies. https://www.sps.nyu.edu/homepage/emerging-technologies-collaborative/blog/2023/embracing-creativity-how-ai-can-enhance-the-creative-process.html

Pane, J. F., Griffin, B. A., McCaffrey, D. F., & Karam, R. (2014). Effectiveness of cognitive tutor algebra I at scale. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis*, *36*(2), 127-144.

Picca, D. (2024). Emotional hermeneutics: Exploring the limits of artificial intelligence from a Diltheyan perspective. In *HT '24: Proceedings of the 35th ACM Conference on Hypertext and Social Media*. Poznan, Poland.

Restack. (2023). *AI art examples of generated artwork*. Restack.io. https://www.restack.io/p/ai-art-answer-examples-of-ai-generated-artwork-cat-ai

Rhim, J., Lee, J. H., Chen, M., & Lim, A. (2021). A deeper look at autonomous vehicle ethics: An integrative ethical decision-making framework to explain moral pluralism. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, *8*, 632394.

Selwyn, N. (2024). On the limits of artificial intelligence (AI) in education. *Nordisk Tidsskrift for Pedagogikk og Kritikk*, *10*(1), 3-14.

Shneiderman, B. (2007). Creativity support tools: Accelerating discovery and innovation. *Communications of the ACM*, *50*(12), 20-32.

Tiku. (2023). *AI generated images are biased, showing the world through stereotypes*. https://www.washingtonpost.com/technology/interactive/2023/ai-generated-images-bias-racism-sexism-stereotypes/

Tsiakas, K., & Murray-Rust, D. (2022). Using human-in-the-loop and explainable AI to envisage new future work practices. In *PETRA '22: Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on PErvasive Technologies Related to Assistive Environments ACM International Conference Proceeding Series* (pp. 588-594). Corfu, Greece.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, *185*(4157), 1124-1131.

U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission and U.S. Commodity Futures Trading Commission. (2010). *Findings Regarding the Market Events of May 6, 2010*. CFTC and SEC. https://www.sec.gov/news/studies/2010/marketevents-report.pdf

Vaccaro, M., Almaatouq, A., & Malone, T. (2024). When combinations of humans and AI are useful: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nature Human Behaviour*, *8*(1), 2293-2303.

Wallach, W., & Allen, C. (2009). *Moral machines: Teaching robots right from wrong*. Oxford University Press.

Weinberger, J. (2023). *The efficacy and ethics of AI must move beyond the performative to the operational*. Palantir Blog. https://blog.palantir.com/the-efficacy-and-ethics-of-ai-must-move-beyond-the-performative-to-the-operational-1792e933b34

Xu, W. (2019). Toward human-centered AI: A perspective from human-computer interaction. *Interactions*, *26*(4), 42-46.

Yaroson, E. V., Abadie, A., & Roux, M. (2025). Human-artificial intelligence collaboration in

supply chain outcomes: The mediating role of responsible artificial intelligence. *Annals of Operations Research*, 1-35.

Zaghlool, Z. D., & Khasawneh, M. A. S. (2025). Incorporating the impacts and limitations of AI-driven feedback, evaluation, and real-time conversation tools in foreign language learning. *Migration Letters*, *20*(7), 1071-1083.

Zhou, E., & Lee, D. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence, human creativity, and art. *PNAS Nexus*, 3(3), pgae052.