
THE PARADOX OF AI ADOPTION – EMPLOYEE RESISTANCE AS A DRIVER OF ORGANIZATIONAL RESILIENCE

Lili Yordanova, PhD Student

Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Bulgaria

Abstract. As artificial intelligence (AI) gets increasingly integrated into business operations, organizations encounter a critical paradox – AI promises efficiency and innovation, yet often triggers employee resistance, uncertainty, and fear of becoming obsolete. Although traditionally viewed as an obstacle, employee resistance is a valuable indicator of organizational resilience. Thus, the latter is reflective of a company’s adaptability and leadership effectiveness in managing technological disruption.

Based on a comprehensive review of existing literature and relevant case studies, this article examines the relationship between employee resistance, AI adoption and organizational resilience. The findings demonstrate that leaders who effectively manage employee resistance, foster workplace adaptability and support sustainable AI integration. As a result, organizations viewing resistance as a strategic signal, rather than a barrier are more successful in cultivating an AI-ready workforce and sustaining long-term competitive advantage.

This paper proposes the utilization of a paradox-based leadership framework, as a practical strategy for HR professionals and business leaders managing AI-driven transformation. This will transform AI from a tether creating resistance into an anchor stabilizing organizational resilience.

Keywords: artificial intelligence, employee resistance, organizational resilience, paradoxical leadership

JEL: 033, M12

Introduction:

The Artificial Intelligence (AI) promises increased efficiency and better decision making. A survey led by Gartner shows that 79% of the participating consultants view AI as critical for success and 20% are already using AI in their daily work (De Freitas 2023). McKinsey reported that 92% of companies plan to increase their AI investments over the next 3 years, yet only 1% deem their companies “mature” enough to implement AI today (Mayer et al. 2025). This gap underscores a puzzling paradox: leaders champion AI, yet ground-level adoption lags.

A chief cause of this lag is employee resistance: workforce skepticism, pushback and fear often greet new AI systems. A KPMG report (2025) identified employee skepticism (mistrust or job-loss fear) as the single biggest threat to AI adoption. 77% of all employees worry that AI will lead to job

losses within a year, and such anxieties translate into an active resistance (De Freitas 2023). In one poll, conducted in 2024, 31% of employees admitted to sabotaging their company's generative AI efforts (Lebow 2025). Clearly, many employees view AI as a personal or professional threat rather than a helpful tool.

According to research (Smith 2024) 70% of change programs fail due to employee pushback and poor support by management. On the surface, employee resistance is a barrier to AI adoption. Yet, this paper argues a counterintuitive perspective: that resistance, if understood and managed properly, can signal resilience and become a source of strength. Instead of a purely negative force, employee resistance may indicate the employee's deep concern for customer outcomes, ethical AI use, job quality, data security – all of which, when addressed, can improve not only the AI implementation, but strengthen the existing and future organizational processes. This reframing aligns with the paradox theory: embracing the tension between the drive for efficiency and the human fears can yield a more sustainable AI adoption.

As such the paper frames the AI adoption as introducing a paradox – that resistance can drive resilience and if understood as a strategic signal – can strengthen organizations. The article will present a theoretical framework (organizational resilience and paradox-based leadership) and real-world case studies. Ultimately, we offer practical strategies for HR and business leaders to harness employee resistance as feedback, enlightening blind spots and expediting AI integration.

Methodology

The paper adopts a qualitative, dual-method approach combining an integrative literature review with illustrative case study analysis. The literature review synthesized both academic and practitioner sources across three core domains: (1) AI adoption and employee resistance, (2) paradox theory and leadership, and (3) organizational resilience. Peer-reviewed journal articles were accessed via academic databases and supplemented with insights from McKinsey, Harvard Business Review, and other reputable industry publications. The review emphasized literature from the past decade, alongside foundational works in change management and paradox theory.

To illustrate the conceptual framework, three real-world case studies were selected from diverse industries and regions. All cases and review data were drawn from publicly available sources, including academic research, media coverage, and corporate reports.

Theoretical Framework:

Organizational resilience is defined as “the ability of an organization to absorb and adapt in a changing environment to enable it to deliver its objectives and to survive and prosper” (International Organization for Standardization 2017). Resilient organizations can withstand disruptions such

as new technologies and crises, by adjusting their processes and behaviors in a manner that allows them to thrive, and not snap back to status quo.

One perspective to look at resilience is as a paradox management exercise (Tekletsion et al. 2024), where organizations must balance stability (preserving what works) and flexibility (embracing change) to move forward. This inherently creates tensions: e.g. the need for efficiency vs. the need for slack resources, or AI vs. human skills. For instance, Tekletsion et al. (2024) identify multiple contradictory demands that companies must juggle before, during and after crises, as they pursue resilience. Thus, effective resilience isn't about eliminating the tensions, but about navigating them with mastery.

When AI is introduced employees' resistant behaviors (raising concerns, pointing out flaws, demanding clarity, refusal to use the new tools) can be seen as the organization's "immune response". Rather than dismissing those behaviors, resilient organizations shall use them as feedback to adjust AI implementation. In other words, resistance can highlight operational weaknesses or ethical pitfalls of the AI, allowing the organization to address issues and emerge stronger. This aligns closely with Nassim Nicholas Taleb's concept of "antifragility" (2014) where stressors (in our case employee resistance) can improve the system, if properly handled. A workforce that voices dissent can ultimately help an organization avoid blind AI adoption and unintended consequences, thus bolstering long-term stability.

The Paradox theory in management recognizes that organizations often face conflicting yet interdependent goals or "dualities" that persists over time. Rather than solve or eliminate such tensions, successful leaders embrace "both/and" solutions and accept the coexistence of paradox (Smith et al 2016). Smith and Lewis (2011) define organizational paradox as "contradictory, yet unrelated elements that exist simultaneously and persist over time" and propose a dynamic equilibrium model for managing them. This means continuously oscillating or balancing between opposing demands (e.g. exploration vs. exploitation, global consistency vs. local adaptation) to achieve long-run sustainability.

The AI adoption represents a classic paradox: the push for technological efficiency vs. the pull of human concerns and values. The paradox perspective suggests that organizations should not choose either to force AI through or to halt innovation due to employee fear but rather pursue both objectives simultaneously (efficiency and employee wellbeing). Embracing that AI is both transformative and disruptive encourages proactive strategies to ensure transformation is inclusive and mindful of human impact.

An interesting viewpoint on paradox research (Chen & Yang 2023) proposes that accepting contradictions can spur innovation and prevent stagnation. When applying this in the AI adoption context, we can assume that employee resistance can spark meaningful dialogues that lead to a more

thoughtful AI integration. Over time this may cultivate a culture, where efficiency improvements and employee values co-evolve. In a nutshell, organizational change efforts should accommodate conflicting viewpoints, as the paradoxical approach can increase creative problem-solving and resilience.

The paradox-based leadership (also known as paradoxical leadership) refers to leadership behaviors that embrace and leverage contradictory demands simultaneously. Instead of favoring one pole of a tension (e.g. enforcing strict control versus granting autonomy), paradoxical leaders do both – they provide structure and flexibility, they uphold accountability and show empathy. Chen and Yang (2023) describe paradoxical leadership as a style where leaders “adopt contradictory but interconnected behaviors to satisfy competing demands,” seeking “unity in contradiction”. This leadership mindset moves beyond “either/or” thinking, focusing on synergistic “both/and” solutions to resolve frictions.

Further studies indicate that paradoxical leadership can foster employee resilience and positive attitudes. In a public sector study, Franken et al. (2019) found that paradoxical leadership (balancing various demands over time) predicted higher employee resilience, and part of this effect was due to employees’ perceptions of organizational support. In practice, leaders who openly address both sides of a tension (e.g. acknowledging employees’ job-security concerns and advocating for innovation) build trust and psychological safety. Employees are then more likely to “continuously adapt and flourish, even in the face of challenge”, which is the essence of resilience (Franken et al. 2019).

A paradox-based leadership approach to AI adoption would involve leaders validating employees’ concerns about AI (showing understanding of fears about job displacement, fairness, etc.) while also inspiring optimism and championing the technology’s benefits. This might include transparent communication about AI’s intended role, inviting employee input on implementation, and simultaneously setting a vision for how AI can elevate everyone’s work. By doing so, leaders send the message that efficiency and human dignity are both non-negotiable goals. Such leaders effectively turn resistance into a form of engagement – employees feel heard and are more likely to support the AI initiative. Over time, this paradoxical leadership can create a culture of “engaged skepticism” where employees neither passively resist nor uncritically adopt new technology but actively collaborate to make the innovation work better.

Rather than perceiving resistance as defiance, paradox-aware leaders interpret it as valuable input. For example, an employee’s refusal to use a flawed AI tool could alert leadership to issues of accuracy or ethics, prompting improvements. Such a leader simultaneously enforces the strategic

direction (AI adoption) and adapts that direction in response to feedback, exemplifying paradoxical behavior. This approach contrasts with a traditional view where leaders might solely push the change and suppress dissent. Paradox-based leadership theory thus provides a blueprint for turning resistance into a driver of learning and adaptation – key elements of resilience.

Case studies

KPMG Australia adopted a transparent communication as a resilience strategy, when deploying AI tools (Agentspace and agentOS). Their paradox was that aiming to enhance productivity, they triggered initial employee resistance due to concerns about job security and unclear role definitions. The leadership team responded with a strategic communication campaign emphasizing transparency, inclusive AI training programs, and direct engagement with employees to co-create the adoption process. This multidimensional approach transformed uncertainty into trust and built a foundation for resilient, adaptive behavior across the workforce. KPMG's case highlights how open dialogue and collaborative implementation can neutralize resistance and foster long-term acceptance of AI in professional environments. According to KPMG (2025), involving employees in the AI journey and addressing their concerns through communication and empowerment played a pivotal role in driving adoption.

A case study examined AI implementation in five family-owned businesses (Worek & Aaltonen 2024). There the employee resistance stemmed from deeply ingrained values, generational work habits, and fear of replacement. However, the companies that aligned AI deployment with organizational culture and involved employees in framing its benefits reported smoother transitions. Key resilience mechanisms included leadership transparency, the use of shared language that emphasized augmentation over automation, and leveraging existing trust-based relationships. As Worek and Aaltonen (2024) explain, addressing resistance in value-driven environments requires framing AI in alignment with employee identity and long-term mission.

Colgate-Palmolive took a bottom-up approach by creating an internal AI Hub, enabling employees to build tailored AI assistants for their specific workflows without coding experience. Initially, the organization encountered resistance, particularly from mid-level employees concerned about relevance and automation replacing human judgment. Instead of pushing through resistance, Colgate's leadership reframed AI as a tool for empowerment. According to Business Insider (Kapadia 2025), the shift toward empowerment, experimentation, and internal capability-building helped Colgate turn employee skepticism into creative AI engagement.

Strategies for HR and Business Leaders

Building on the theoretical framework and case studies above, there are some practical strategies for leaders and HR professionals to leverage paradox-based leadership in AI implementation. The focus is on turning employee resistance into a constructive force – enhancing organizational resilience and ensuring AI initiatives succeed. Each strategy acknowledges the dual demands (innovation and employee well-being) and provides actionable guidance.

Fostering a high-trust, inclusive culture by “involving everyone in the AI journey” is a key predictor of successful digital transformation (KPMG 2025). Employees need to feel that AI is being introduced with them, not to them. They should be engaged early and often and their input solicited before and during AI rollouts through surveys, workshops, and pilot programs. Making AI implementation a collaborative project across departments (IT, HR, operations) will turn it into a team effort and a common goal, not “an edict from above”. This inclusion reduces fear of the unknown and gives employees ownership. For example, high-trust organizations like KPMG saw better AI uptake when they clearly explained benefits and included employees in discussions, leading to stronger buy-in. When people understand the “why” and have a voice, they are more likely to embrace change. Leaders should also be transparent about AI decisions, addressing questions like data privacy, purpose of the AI, and its limits. Trust is built through honesty and two-way communication. In practice, an HR team might set up an “AI council” with employee representatives to guide implementation policies – signaling that employee perspectives matter.

Communicating the paradox and embracing both sides is a key step towards successful AI implementation through the prism of paradoxical leadership. Leaders should explicitly communicate a “both/and” vision: e.g., “We aim to leverage AI for efficiency and we are committed to our employees’ growth and security.” By articulating this dual commitment, leaders validate employee concerns while also expressing confidence in the technology. This approach can diffuse polarization. One HBR article notes that great leaders often “unleash the power of paradox” by being consistent in purpose but flexible in execution (Smith et al. 2016). A practical advice on the above is crafting messaging that acknowledges the tension - an internal memo showing empathy (reducing defensive resistance) and optimism (encouraging openness). Research on change management suggests that when leaders frame change as an opportunity and address the losses people fear, resistance can shift to commitment (Alhezzani 2022). Leaders can even share examples or stories: e.g., how a competitor used AI successfully with employee support, reinforcing the feasibility of the paradoxical outcome.

A major cause of resistance is feeling unprepared or helpless in the face of new tech, what Golgeci et al. (2025) termed “inefficacy” in AI resistance. To counter this an investment in capability and confidence building is crucial. Those may include providing comprehensive training programs and upskilling opportunities around the AI tools and making these programs accessible and on-going (not one-offs). Also, encouraging a sandbox mentality – allowing employees to experiment with AI in a low-risk setting. For example, one strategy is establishing a “center of excellence” or labs where volunteers can pilot the AI, discover bugs, and suggest improvements. KPMG’s approach of creating a safe space for hands-on experimentation (KymChat) generated enthusiasm and nearly full participation (KPMG 2025). When employees feel competent and involved in shaping how AI is used, their fear diminishes. Additionally, empowering employees to make decisions by giving teams discretion on how to integrate AI into their workflow rather than imposing rigid rules fosters respect for their professional expertise and turns resistance into problem-solving. Overall, investing in people’s skills and agency sends the message that the organization is as committed to its people as it is to technology, a balance which encourages adaptive rather than obstructive behaviors.

People are more likely to support change when they see tangible benefits for them. At the same time, leaders must mitigate perceived threats. Actively seeking and publicizing quick wins where AI has helped employees or made work better will build positive momentum. For instance, if the new AI system helped reduce a routine task from 3 hours to 3 minutes, a story shared in an internal newsletters will shed light as well as credit the employees involved for leveraging the tool. On the flip side, identifying what employees feel they are losing because of AI and compensating for those losses is crucial. If an AI scheduling tool removes some human interaction of shift planning, perhaps introducing daily team huddles to maintain camaraderie will help out. If AI threatens certain job roles, outlining pathways for those roles to evolve or for affected staff to move into new roles (with training provided) will foster the feeling of security. A McKinsey report suggests “large reskilling efforts” should accompany AI adoption as roles shift (Mayer et al. 2025) In practice, HR might implement a career development program that shows employees how their roles can transition in an AI-enabled environment, thus turning fear into excitement for new opportunities. By balancing wins and loss-mitigation, leaders uphold the paradoxical promise that AI can benefit the organization and its people.

To truly turn resistance into a driver of resilience, employees must feel safe to speak up about problems and ideas related to AI. Creating a climate of psychological safety – where raising concerns or admitting difficulties is welcomed, not punished – is crucial. Leaders and managers should actively

solicit feedback and reward honesty. When employees do voice concerns, responding with gratitude and transparency will foster psychological safety. Research by Edmondson (2019) on psychological safety finds that teams with a safe climate innovate better and adapt faster – exactly the resilience traits we seek. Also, involving employee representatives in governance of AI formalizes their voice in policy. The benefit of high employee voice is two-fold: it identifies issues early (enhancing resilience), and it converts would-be resistors into partners in implementation. Instead of quietly undermining the AI or grumbling, employees become part of the solution, which is the goal of reframing resistance. Essentially, making it safe to resist turns resistance into feedback, which becomes improvement.

HR can coach and support leaders to cultivate a paradox mindset in daily leadership. This might involve training managers on how to handle conflicting goals and emotional reactions during change. Encouraging leaders to practice both empathy and assertiveness is a good strategy. For instance, in meetings about AI changes, a paradoxical leader might say, “I understand these changes are tough and I want to hear all your concerns” (empathy), followed by “We also have a target to meet, so let’s brainstorm how we can address these concerns while moving forward” (assertiveness in goal orientation). Leaders should also be present on the ground – e.g., “manage by walking around” during initial AI rollout days to observe and help employees, showing they care about the human side. At the same time, they should keep the team focused on the big-picture benefits, reframing obstacles as problems to solve together rather than reasons to abandon the effort. HR can facilitate workshops where leadership teams role-play scenarios of employee pushback and practice responding in integrative ways. Moreover, aligning incentives and evaluation for leaders to balance results and people metrics will reinforce paradoxical behavior. For example, making successful adoption (measured by both performance improvement and employee engagement scores) a criterion in management bonuses. This ensures leaders don’t just push for usage stats at the cost of morale – they have to achieve both. Over time, these practices will develop leadership resilience: leaders become comfortable managing uncertainty and dissent, which in turn nurtures organizational resilience.

Conclusion and Recommendations

In navigating the paradox of AI adoption, this paper has argued that what appears to be an obstacle – employee resistance – can in fact be a valuable driver of improvement and resilience. AI implementations often trigger legitimate employee concerns (about job security, fairness, efficacy), which, if ignored, can derail even the most well-intentioned projects. However, when organizations acknowledge these concerns and treat resistance as insight, they can adjust their strategies to better integrate AI in a

human-compatible way. This reframing transforms resistance into a form of engagement: employees become active participants in shaping the change, and the organization becomes more robust against future challenges. The theoretical framework of paradox and resilience explains why this works – balancing tensions leads to more sustainable outcomes than one-sided pushes.

The key takeaway for leaders is to not simply attempt to eliminate resistance but rather, channel it. A certain amount of skepticism and pushback from employees can be healthy. It signals that employees care about the work and see potential issues. Wise leaders, therefore, listen before reacting. By applying paradox-based leadership, they can uphold the importance of innovation while directly addressing the frictions it creates. Leaders should create forums for dialogue, be transparent about the purpose and impact of AI, provide support and training, and demonstrate through actions that they value their people as much as the technology. The case studies illustrated that when these principles are followed outcomes are far more positive than when they are not.

Future research directions:

While this paper offered a conceptual and case-based exploration, more research is needed to generalize findings. One avenue is to study, through longitudinal surveys or interviews, organizations that have explicitly adopted paradoxical strategies in AI adoption – do they indeed achieve better performance and morale outcomes than those who take a traditional approach?

Another important area is quantifying the “tipping point” of resistance: How much resistance (in forms like negative comments, slower adoption rates, etc.) is beneficial (stimulating improvements) versus harmful? Understanding this could help managers know when to encourage debate and when to intervene more directly. Moreover, sector-specific studies could be valuable: the dynamics of AI resistance in a hospital (with life-and-death stakes and professional autonomy concerns) differs from those in a bank or factory.

There is also a need for more study on paradoxical leadership in times of technological change, as well as empirical validation of the concept that resistance can lead to positive organizational adaptation.

Final thoughts:

AI will undoubtedly continue to spread in organizations, and with it will come uncertainty and resistance. Rather than viewing resistance as a deadweight, organizations should see it as the rudder – it can provide direction and stability amid rough seas, preventing the ship from capsizing in a storm of unchecked change. By embracing the paradox that an efficient organization is one where people feel safe to slow down, question, and challenge, leaders

can steer their companies through the AI revolution with both high performance and a loyal, engaged workforce.

In short, resistance – when heard – becomes resilience. And AI, when embraced wisely, shifts from a tether of fear to an anchor of hope.

REFERENCES

ALHEZZANI, Y. 2022. When resistance to change is an enabler to change. Online. *Chief Talent Officer*. Available from: <https://www.chieftalentofficer.co/2022/11/29/when-resistance-to-change-is-an-enabler-to-change/>. [viewed 2025-04-21].

ALLGANIZE 2023. Resistance to AI: Governance and Cultural Challenges. Online. *Allganize Blog*. Available from: <https://www.allganize.ai/en/blog/resistance-to-ai-governance-and-cultural-challenges>. [viewed 2025-04-21].

BARHITE, B. 2024. AI Anxiety? 6 Ways to Manage Employee Concerns. Online. *Reworked*. Available from: <https://www.reworked.co/employee-experience/ai-anxiety-6-ways-to-manage-employee-concerns/>. [viewed 2025-04-21].

CHEN, X. AND YANG, B. 2023. A review of paradoxical leadership research. Online. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 11, 871-886. Available from: <https://www.scirp.org/journal/paperinformation?paperid=130032>. [viewed 2025-04-21].

DEAN, J. 2024. More complaints, worse performance when AI monitors work. Online. *Cornell Chronicle*. Available from: <https://news.cornell.edu/stories/2024/07/more-complaints-worse-performance-when-ai-monitors-work>. [viewed 2025-04-21].

DE FREITAS, J. 2025. Why People Resist Embracing AI. Online. *Harvard Business Review*. Available from: <https://hbr.org/2025/01/why-people-resist-embracing-ai>. [viewed 2025-04-21].

DURTH, S., HANCOCK, B., MAOR, D. AND SUKHAREVSKY, A. 2023. The organization of the future: Enabled by gen AI, driven by people. Online. *McKinsey & Company*. Available from: <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/the-organization-of-the-future-enabled-by-gen-ai-driven-by-people>. [viewed 2025-04-10].

EDMONDSON, A.C. 2019. *The Fearless Organization: Creating Psychological Safety in the Workplace for Learning, Innovation, and Growth*. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

FRANKEN, E., PLIMMER, G. AND MALINEN, S. 2019. Paradoxical leadership in public sector organisations: Its role in fostering employee resilience. Online. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, 79(1). Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/335282524_Paradoxical_leadership_in_public_sector_organisations_Its_role_in_fostering_employee_resilience. [viewed 2025-04-21].

GOLGECI, I., RITALA, P., ARSLAN, A., MCKENNA, B., AND ALI, I. 2025 Confronting and alleviating AI resistance in the workplace: An integrative review and a process framework. Online. *Human Resource Management Review*, **35**(2). Available from: <https://ueaeprints.uea.ac.uk/id/eprint/98064/>. [viewed 2025-04-21].

INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION FOR STANDARDIZATION. 2017. ISO 22316:2017 Security and resilience – Organizational resilience – Principles and attributes. Online. Available from: <https://www.iso.org/obp/ui/#iso:std:iso:22316:ed-1:v1:en>. [viewed 2025-01-05].

KAPADIA, S. 2025. Companies' biggest barrier to AI isn't tech — it's employee pushback. Here's how to overcome it. Online. *Business Insider*. Available from: <https://www.businessinsider.com/how-to-prevent-employee-skepticism-push-back-gen-ai-2025-3>. [viewed 2025-04-10].

KPMG. 2025. AI adoption in the workplace: success insights and stories. Online. *KPMG Insights*. Available from: <https://kpmg.com/au/en/home/insights/2025/01/workplace-ai-adoption-success-insights-stories.html>. [viewed 2025-04-10].

LEBOW, S. 2025. AI at work: Navigating employee backlash and implementation challenges. Online. *Insider Intelligence (eMarketer)*. Available from: <https://www.emarketer.com/content/ai-work-navigating-employee-backlash-implementation-challenges>. [viewed 2025-05-01].

MAYER, H., YEE, L., CHUI, M. & ROBERTS, R. 2025. Superagency in the workplace: Empowering people to unlock AI's full potential. Online. *McKinsey & Company*. Available from: <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/superagency-in-the-workplace-empowering-people-to-unlock-ais-full-potential-at-work>. [viewed 2025-04-10].

SMITH, K. 2024. 6 reasons why change management fails and how to avoid them. Online. *Prosci*. Available from: <https://www.prosci.com/blog/why-change-management-fails>. [viewed 2025-05-01].

SMITH, W.K., LEWIS, M. 2011. Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. Online. *Academy of Management Review* **36**(2), 381-403. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/274709284_Toward_A_Theory_of_Paradox_A_Dynamic_Equilibrium_Model_of_Organizing. [viewed 2025-04-21].

SMITH, W.K., LEWIS, M.W. AND TUSHMAN, M.L. 2016. Both/And Leadership. Online. *Harvard Business Review*. Available from: <https://hbr.org/2016/05/both-and-leadership>. [viewed 2025-04-21].

TALEB, N. N. 2012. *Antifragile: Things that gain from disorder* Penguin Books.

TEKLETSION, B.F., GOMES, J.F. AND TEFERA, B. 2024. Organizational resilience as paradox management: A systematic review of the literature. Online. *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*, **32**(1), e12495. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5973.12495>. [paywall] [viewed 2025-05-01].

WOREK, M., AALTONEN, P. 2024 AI Adoption Challenges in Family-Owned Firms: A Case Study. Online. *Contemporary Issues in Industry 5.0*. Available from: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-74779-3_9. [viewed 2025-05-01].

Lili Yordanova, PhD Student
ORCID ID: 0009-0001-9471-5204
Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”
E-mail: yordanova.l.hr@gmail.com