

‘Taming’ Generative AI at Work: Balancing Technological Promise with Professional Values

MARTINA SKRUBBELTRANG MAHNKE

University of Roskilde, Denmark

ABSTRACT

Drawing on domestication theory, the overall aim of this study is to examine how users ‘tame’ generative AI (GenAI) in professional contexts. Domestication theory perceives ‘new’ technologies, such as GenAI, as comparatively wild, unpredictable, perplexing, or somewhat troublesome. Consequently, it is not just a matter of how these technologies are employed in the most effective way but, more importantly, how users tame them for their specific needs and purposes. The analysis focuses specifically on the ambiguities, negotiations, and contradictions that shape the multifaceted processes of adopting GenAI in professional contexts. The empirical material, consisting of a survey, qualitative interviews, and notes from on-site visits, was gathered in Southeast Asia in close collaboration with a non-profit organization operating in the Mekong Delta. The thematic analysis illustrates how employees carefully balance technological promise with professional values when ‘taming’ GenAI for professional purposes. In essence, the study discusses the potential implications of GenAI for organizations and advocates for the development of employee-centered guidelines that align with the organization’s mission and accommodate diverse user practices.

Keywords: domestication theory, generative AI, intelligent technologies, professional contexts, technology adoption, thematic analysis

INTRODUCTION

Generative AI (GenAI) is growing in popularity, and professionals have started to 'tame' this 'wild' technology for professional purposes. At its core, GenAI combines models of machine learning, natural language processing, and artificial intelligence, offering users an intelligent platform that can facilitate human-like communication processes. Allowing users to communicate *with* the platform is what distinguishes GenAI from other digital applications. 'Taming GenAI' then refers to a multifaceted process shaped by this user-GenAI communication, where users need to navigate the GenAI's intricate socio-technical complexities and entanglements. Examining GenAI through the lens of domestication theory allows for an exploration of the ambiguous, often contradicting dynamics and dilemmas that affect the adoption and utilization of GenAI in professional workflows and practices.

The development of intelligent chatbots, such as ChatGPT, has started to challenge the dominant anthropocentric paradigm within communication studies and has prompted a variety of theoretical, conceptual, and philosophical discussions (Guzman & Lewis 2020; Bailey and Barley 2020; Lindgren 2023). Central to these discussions are explorations of the blurring boundaries between humans and machines (Gill 2016; Gunkel 2017; Dignum 2022) as well as their ethical and societal implications (Ananny 2016; Hagerty & Rubinov 2019; Campolo & Crawford 2020; Hagendorff 2020; Crawford 2021). In organizational contexts, empirical studies have started to examine the role of AI in relation to arising strategic opportunities and challenges (Zerfass et al. 2020; Sestino & De Mauro 2022) as well as AI's impact on business communication (Getchell et al. 2022). Scholarly discussions surrounding AI in general and GenAI more specifically are primarily theoretical in nature, and little attention has been paid to communication and AI practices in organizational contexts (Gulbrandsen & Just 2023).

The aim of this study is, therefore, to contribute to the academic discourse on the topic at hand with a nuanced empirical examination of the following research question: *How do employees adopt GenAI for professional purposes?* The process of data collection took place in a non-profit organization (NGO) operating in a Southeast Asian context, more specifically in the city of Chiang Mai (the second largest city in Thailand), and the Mekong Delta. The region's distinct blend of traditions and languages, combined with an easily accessible digital infrastructure, creates a socio-economically attractive environment for organizations and thus makes it a valuable research environment. Overall, the study aims to make research-based recommendations to organizational management on how to integrate GenAI tools meaningfully in a professional context. In conclusion, the study advocates for the development of employee-centered guidelines that align with the organization's mission and accommodate diverse user practices.

FROM ELIZA TO CHATGPT: AI RESEARCH AND PRACTICE

In recent years, AI applications have become ubiquitous, and lately, a variety of GenAI applications have started to penetrate the market. To systematize the field, AI applications have been defined along the lines of narrow or weak, generative, and general AI (ISO, n.d.). In contrast to previous AI applications, generative AI focuses on the generation of new content rather than solely evaluating existing data. The currently most well-known GenAI application is ChatGPT; however, others are

equally used, e.g., Gemini (Google), Copilot (Microsoft), Grammarly, and Quillbot. One of the earliest applications to be able to 'communicate' was ELIZA, a natural language processing computer program that was designed to respond like a Rogerian psychotherapist. Computer scientist Joseph Weizenbaum developed the application at MIT in the late 1960s, and it marked a significant step towards creating programs that allowed for conversations between humans and machines (Weizenbaum 1966). Prior to ELIZA, Alan Turing's famous imitation game, also known as the Turing test, laid the theoretical groundwork for human-machine communication (Turing 1950). His thought experiment led to a shift of focus from the question "*can machines think?*" towards the conditions under which machines are able to exhibit intelligent behavior in the form of communicating with humans.

With the emergence of GenAI, questions regarding machine intelligence have gained new relevance, especially in the social sciences and humanities, where societal and ethical implications are critically scrutinized (Gill 2016). Almost three decades of critical research on discriminatory and unintended outcomes have led social scientists and humanities scholars to reject the idea of technology as being neutral. Instead, focus is put on the inherent biases, assumptions, and values that are embedded in technology (Friedman & Nissenbaum 1996; Nissenbaum 2001; boyd & Crawford 2012; Crawford & Calo 2016; Crawford 2021; Lindgren 2023) as well as questions of infrastructural power (Van Dijck et al. 2018).

Following the extensive research on the structural properties of intelligent communication technologies, empirical research has started to focus on the substantial role and agency of the user (Mathieu & Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt; 2020 Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt and zu Hörste 2020). Especially research in the field of audience and user studies has started to examine the multiple forms of user agency with regards to how users decode (Swart 2021), make sense of (Bucher & Helmond 2018), and avoid and/or resist algorithms and AI-driven platforms (Bonini and Treré 2024). These studies have brought attention to the user's active role in adopting intelligent technologies. Further, they have shown how users' reflective engagement with technology shapes and reshapes technological structure(s) as well as professional practices (Mathieu et al. 2022). AI is thus not only shaped by its underlying models and technical infrastructure but also by the interpretations and practices of its users.

GENAI AS A "COMMUNICATIVE OTHER"

The young research field of human-machine communication (HMC) has argued that the human-centric communication paradigm is being challenged by the widespread adoption of intelligent technologies (Guzman 2018). Already a decade ago, Gunkel (2012) put forward the notion of an intelligent machine as a "communicative other" (22). This notion moves away from the traditional understanding of communication technologies as means of transmitting or mediating information and moves towards the idea of intelligent technology as an interlocutor that is designed to participate in human communication. Following this, GenAI, in the scope of this study, is conceptualized as a communicative agent, taking part in shaping and redefining communicative processes. In the process of human-GenAI communication, users are generally viewed as agentic, that is, capable of refining and customizing outcomes to align with their specific needs. Analyzing

GenAI as a communicative other from a user's perspective provides insights into the evolving socio-technical dynamics emerging and thus shaping organizational contexts.

DOMESTICATING GENAI AT WORK

Domestication theory provides a valuable theoretical lens through which to examine GenAI in professional contexts, as it allows for a focus on the user while simultaneously highlighting socio-technical and contextual factors. In the social studies of technology, the theory of domestication holds significant importance, even though its application and interpretations differ. The starting point for domestication theory is the exploration of processes regarding the 'taming' of new technologies, which are often perceived as wild, unpredictable, perplexing, or somewhat troublesome. New technology is, hence, not solely a tool to be used efficiently but something that needs to be actively appropriated by the user. In other words, users need to adopt the technology and, furthermore, integrate it into their daily routines, which is a complex process. Today, for example, we might perceive the electrical toothbrush as normal and common. However, when it first was introduced, this very technology needed to be tamed by its users in order to become an accepted and integrated part of daily oral hygiene routines (Carter, Green, & Thorogood 2013).

Domestication theory's central concepts of appropriation, objectification, incorporation, and conversion were originally formulated in a household context (Silverstone & Hirsch 1992); since then, however, they have been used and transformed in a variety of ways (Haddon 2006). The concept of appropriation refers to the process where a technology is selected and starts to be incorporated into everyday practices. This involves making choices about how to use the technology, for what purpose, and how to tweak and tune it for personal needs. In the objectification stage, the technology is being integrated and normalized through habitual use. This is followed by an incorporation phase, where the technology becomes embedded in the cultural and social context. The final stage of conversion refers to the overall transformational impact of the specific technology in a broader societal context. It is important to note that technology appropriation is not a linear but a complex and intertwined process (Silverstone et al. 1992).

In this study, the focus lies especially on the initial stage of appropriation, that is, how users 'tame' the 'wild' technology of GenAI for professional purposes. A specific interest lies in empirically carving out the ambiguities and contradictions users need to negotiate when aiming to adopt the technology. GenAI can be described as 'wild' because of its unique capacity to generate human-like communication, thus challenging communication processes in professional workflows and organizational routines. Even though the study takes place in a professional environment, it is important to acknowledge that professional and personal contexts are inextricably linked (Haddon 2006). Adopting a domestication perspective allows, hence, a nuanced understanding of the processes by which GenAI is appropriated from an employee's point of view.

To summarize, the notion of taming GenAI refers to a multifaceted socio-technical process shaped by human-machine communication. Users may exert control and mastery over the technology, thus shaping, tweaking, and tuning GenAI to fit their specific needs and preferences. This may involve customizing prompts or adapting workflows to optimize GenAI utilization in a specific context. Additionally, GenAI adoption processes are likely to be influenced by users' prior

experiences, expectations, and cultural norms surrounding artificial intelligence and automation in the workplace (Ashri 2019).

METHODS

The empirical analysis is based on data collected in spring and summer 2023, including a survey, fourteen semi-structured interviews, and notes from informal on- and off-site meetings. The analysis draws on data collected as part of a broader research project on the use of generative AI in a professional context. Portions of the data material, including selected quotes and examples, are also analyzed in Mahnke and Bagger (2024). The data was collected in close collaboration with a non-profit organization headquartered in Chiang Mai, Thailand. The organization works primarily in the Mekong Delta. They chose to build their main offices in Chiang Mai because of its centrality and reputation as a digital hub in the ASEAN region. Thailand is known for its robust digital infrastructure combined with relatively low living costs, which creates an attractive environment for a diverse range of international organizations. The organization was chosen as a research site because of its diverse international setting, reflected in the workforce of more than seventy individuals representing various cultural backgrounds and a variety of projects based in Southeast Asia, while also maintaining strong connections to Europe.

The different methods for data collection were chosen to allow for a comprehensive understanding of GenAI taming processes. At first, a survey with twelve questions asking for overall user practices and experiences was distributed amongst the seventy professionals working in the organization. Sixty employees returned the completed survey, yielding an 86 percent response rate. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the closed questions, and the open-ended questions were analyzed thematically. The survey results were then used to sample interview participants. The sampling procedure followed a deliberate sampling strategy, as described by Cresswell and Poth (2017). The following factors were used to choose interview participants: 1) work tasks; 2) seniority; and 3) experience with GenAI. The criterion "experience" was divided into five categories, ranging from "extremely familiar" to "not familiar at all". "Seniority" comprised shorter work contracts (less than a year), middle-range work contracts (between one and three years), and long-term work contracts (more than five years of employment). The "work tasks" criterion concentrated on the daily work tasks. Aside from the survey and interviews, informal on- and off-site meetings were carried out. The primary purpose of those meetings was to talk informally, build closer relationships, and create a better understanding of the context and everyday work conditions.

A total of fourteen qualitative interviews were conducted. The semi-structured interview guidelines included a range of topics, from daily user practices to the implications for professional tasks. Domestication theory views non-use as a deliberate decision, and therefore, two interviews with non-users were conducted as well. These allowed insights into the reasons why GenAI was either rejected or not used. The duration of the interviews ranged from twenty minutes to one hour. All of them were recorded, made anonymous, transcribed, and edited for readability. Each interview was coded thematically (Brinkmann & Kvale 2014) in several iterative steps until data saturation was archived (Alvesson & Kärreman 2007; Brinkmann 2014).

Because GenAI is at the core of this study, an experiment with ChatGPT for interview coding was conducted in addition to the manual (human) coding. Following the instructions from a YouTube tutorial (Kriukow, 2023), different prompts were developed for ChatGPT-4 to provide codes and theme suggestions for parts of the interview material. The interview material that was used in ChatGPT-4 was carefully selected to ensure compliance with ethical research standards and to avoid compromising interview participant data. At the end of the experiment, it was concluded that the output was too generic and unsuitable for the analysis. Therefore, no AI-generated codes were included in the analysis. Nevertheless, the experiment contributed to a deeper and more nuanced understanding of the material because it allowed for comparing and questioning ChatGPT's output and the human analysis.

EMPIRICAL ANALYSIS: TECHNOLOGICAL PROMISE AND PROFESSIONAL VALUES

The following analysis delves deeper into professionals' adoption processes of GenAI for professional purposes. The thematic analysis focuses specifically on the ambiguities, contradictions, and negotiation processes that occur in relation to the adoption process. As a conclusion to the analysis, it can be stated that professionals need to carefully balance technological promise with professional values. In the organizational context, GenAI applications were generally welcomed and approached optimistically. However, sooner than later professionals find themselves in a conundrum where it becomes their task to tame GenAI, that is, to balance the potential offered by the technology with their professional values and beliefs. Especially in an organizational context where guidelines and regulations are yet to be implemented, a heightened sense of responsibility is put on the individual employee, calling for careful strategies and appropriate responses.

In the following section, the empirical analysis is presented, starting with a description of the survey results. They serve as a backdrop for the subsequent thematic analysis, which delves deeper into the interview data by outlining the three major themes that arose during the coding process.

Opportunities and challenges

The use of GenAI is widespread in the examined organization; almost all employees (90%) have interacted with GenAI to at least some degree. Eleven percent of the respondents stated that they were very familiar with GenAI, 25% said that they were somewhat familiar, 28.3% said they had played around with it, and 35% said that they had heard about it. 35% of the respondents said they have tried GenAI but found its use of no particular value. When considering specific tools, Grammarly and ChatGPT are the most popular ones, followed by Quillbot and Google's Bard (now Gemini). When asked about the effectiveness of these tools, 51.7% stated that they enhance their work to a certain degree. Most employees are generally optimistic about the impact GenAI can have on the organization. Several employees stated that GenAI could serve as an asset in enhancing translations and report writing. However, there was also a clear consensus amongst the employees that GenAI requires clear guidelines. Despite the evident enthusiasm, some respondents expressed feelings of resistance, pressure, or even fear. One stated, "I think we should be careful with blindly using AI tools (...) would be a pity if we lost the skills writing our own reports". Another concern is

the authenticity and reliability of the information. While most respondents see GenAI as a valuable tool for suggestions and ideas, it is acknowledged that “not all the AI suggestions will be relevant”. In conclusion, the results of the survey show that GenAI is widely used within the organization and, further, that employees are aware of its opportunities and challenges. Against this backdrop, the qualitative thematic analysis is presented below, starting with the first identified theme, which is termed *finding comfort and professional confidence*.

Finding comfort and professional confidence

As the survey data shows, GenAI is adopted for various purposes, and the following qualitative analysis will nuance and detail the results further. Some of the most prevalent applications are the use of GenAI as a language assistant, a content producer, and an idea generator. Current research has also outlined this as the main benefits of GenAI (Farrokhnia et al. 2024). Most of the informants use GenAI to refine their English, from simple text corrections to the creation of more sophisticated texts and reports. There was a consensus amongst the respondents that GenAI helps to produce texts and often serves as a good starting point, especially when tasks are repetitive. For example, when forms need to be filled out or standard reports need to be written.

One of the informants, June, a young woman overseeing different projects, uses GenAI primarily for writing emails, informal or formal ones, and as an assistant for creating texts for different purposes. She is especially excited about how promptly she receives answers and feels that GenAI makes written communication much easier and faster. Throughout the interview material, the use of GenAI as a language assistant is dominant. This may be less surprising, because English is the organization’s corporate language but not the native language of many of the employees. What is perhaps more surprising is the level of comfort and self-assurance that some employees gain from using GenAI. Several informants mentioned that using GenAI increases their professional confidence significantly. June, the young woman mentioned above, states:

I am not fully confident after I write something. And when I want to have a sentence like for example, that is what I try to, I copy and paste into AI and ask them, ask AI to write in the most like formal way or familiar way and things like that. And the I see and compare with my original writing and their [AIs] writing and then, yeah, and then I finalize things. (June)

For many of the interviewees, it is very important to portray English at a high level, and GenAI appears to be the ideal tool for achieving this. Differences in language proficiency are inevitable due to the organization’s international and culturally diverse background. Especially employees with lower English proficiency reported using GenAI as a professional translation and text creation tool. In relation to this, it is important to mention that AI-generated text is rarely copied and pasted the way it is. Typically, it is tweaked and tuned several times.

When asked about the difference GenAI makes when used for communication purposes, most interviewees reported that they felt that using GenAI led to a better understanding between the different partners involved in the communication processes. Another young female employee,

Flora, talks about her lack of educational background in English as a second language and how she has been using GenAI to train her English skills. She uses her technical background to get useful results from GenAI, constantly crosschecking, tweaking, and revising her prompts to receive the best possible output.

More than just a tool

The second theme becoming evident in the analysis is termed *more than just a tool*. It relates primarily to employees' sense-making processes and conceptualizations of GenAI. Even though employees may start by utilizing GenAI as a tool for simpler text tasks, the analysis shows that, over time, GenAI becomes more than just a tool. Many describe GenAI as "simple" in the sense that it is a simple tool to use. Furthermore, it is "helpful" and "for free", meaning the employees do not have to pay for using it. Interviewees also describe GenAI in more metaphorical and philosophical terms, such as "magic", "amazing", and "a conversation partner". June, introduced above, values the fact that GenAI offers suggestions, encouragement, and positive energy. While she also likes to talk to her friends and colleagues, she describes the advantage of GenAI as "I can use it when I want to use it."

Another informant, Peter, who is primarily working at the intersection of finance and communication, describes GenAI as a "knowable assistant". Peter's tasks include answering all financial supporters and donors with a personal letter. While he generally enjoys this task, he also felt like he was reaching personal limits. Sometimes he felt his writing lacked empathy, and other times he felt like it was too repetitive, especially when he was communicating with the same donor over longer periods of time. After hearing about the new technology from a colleague, he tried it for himself:

After trying it out, I realized it's particularly useful for our emails to donors. It provides good input, offers inspiration, and serves as a template for what to write. Eventually, I run out of ideas too. I tend to get stuck in my patterns of speech and thought, often writing the same things or variations of them. Especially when communicating frequently with donors, it's been a great option. (Peter)

In the beginning, he used GenAI primarily for translations, and later, he started to use it for creating text templates, which also shows the progression in the 'taming' process. In general, he feels a certain relief from getting new and diverse inputs from GenAI as a creator and idea-giver. Peter's description of GenAI mirrors several other employees' experiences with the technology. Many of them talk about how they turn to GenAI when they want to improve their work but cannot find the capacity within the organization.

Negotiating uncertainty and risks

The third theme, which is termed *negotiating uncertainty and risks*, points to the intricate dilemmas, concerns, and challenges arising through GenAI use in professional contexts. All employees acknowledged inherent risks and tried to find ways of negotiating them in order to generate the

best possible outcomes. Some spent time cross-checking and tweaking the outcome; others, like Flora, whom we introduced above, point towards the significance of precise and detailed input. Due to her technical background, she is aware of the risk that imprecise prompts may potentially lead to ambiguous outputs with low quality:

And you would say that maybe there is some of the risk that the input isn't precise enough, isn't good enough in a way, ok? But it is the input that is not clear. The command of the things that you want to do is not clear. Also the output cannot be, I mean, it can be a risk to just like copy and paste and then I send it. Is this the real meaning? Like is this the real message that I want to get or maybe I want to change some words because I have the output. And then I say ok, this makes sense. So maybe I will use another word. It's not only like copy and paste. In each stage at each step, you need to be very critical to reduce this kind of risks. (Flora)

During the interviews, employees often go back and forth between the machine's output and their own (human) interpretations. At the receiving end, some interviewees have thus begun to question whether certain pieces of communication were generated by GenAI or not. Another employee states critically: "People use it [GenAI] too much. I think we don't use our own idea and our own thoughts and our, we couldn't afford our, how should I say ... just like we use everything from AI and ChatGPT" (Chang).

During the analysis, a nuanced interplay between cultural backgrounds and the adoption of GenAI emerged. While all participants had engaged with GenAI in one way or another, their experiences and openness varied significantly. While some employees refused to use GenAI because they anticipated a high risk of compromising personal data, others were extremely enthusiastic about the technology. They were quick to integrate the technology into their everyday work. This shows not only the intricate negotiations that organizational employees engage in while integrating GenAI into their work practices, but it also reflects the cultural and personal nuances that influence these negotiations.

DISCUSSION: GENAI AND HUMAN AGENCY

The analysis shows how GenAI is being adopted for contemporary work routines and practices. As mentioned in the theoretical section, adoption processes are complex, prompting employees to tame GenAI—that is, making the technology work for their needs and purposes. The analysis shows that GenAI has been adopted in various ways, ranging from using it as a basic text tool to a conversation partner. The wide-ranging adoption of GenAI in professional contexts raises questions of human and technological agency as well as how organizational contexts are shaped and reshaped through employees' adoption of GenAI.

Human agency refers to the capacity of individuals to act and reflect upon their use (de Certeau 1984; Giddens 1984). The adoption of GenAI is challenging users' prior conceptualizations of what technology is capable of and useful for. Employees using GenAI to produce texts might start relying on it to an extent where they feel like losing their own voice. Particularly in the context of this study

in Southeast Asia, the correlation between limited English proficiency and increased reliance on these tools has become evident. This highlights a critical tension: while GenAI enhances employees' work, it also impacts their sense of ownership regarding the very same work. The integration of GenAI tools into everyday work processes thus calls for a deeper evaluation of the organizational contexts and frameworks in which these tools are adopted. This further underscores the importance of considering the broader socio-cultural context in which GenAI adoption occurs, as well as the ethical questions involved. Issues such as transparency, accountability, and the potential for bias in AI-generated content become increasingly relevant as GenAI becomes more deeply embedded in daily work practices. Organizations need to openly address these challenges to ensure that the adoption of GenAI technologies does not diminish human communication processes and, thus, human agency.

While the agency of GenAI is not to be equated with that of human actors, it becomes clear that the sophisticated output generated through GenAI compels, or, as Gunkel (2012) puts it, "calls upon" employees and "requires an appropriate response" (21). Employees are called upon to adopt GenAI in ways that go beyond traditional technology-as-a-tool conceptualizations, and by doing so, professional practices and routines gradually change. New norms are introduced incrementally through the employee's mundane, everyday use. A way to study this further is, as Lomborg, Kaun, and Scott Hansen (2023) suggest, to "highlight ground up experiences and practices relating to technologies while taking into account the specific context within which they emerge" (12). This is especially valuable as GenAI is not exclusively used for professional purposes but also spans across the personal sphere. The examination of employees' ground-up experiences can contribute towards a better understanding of the nuanced ways in which GenAI influences both work and personal life. Furthermore, it allows us to study the subtle shift in norms and practices that occur as employees not only start to adopt GenAI but appropriate them over time.

CONCLUSION

This study examined professionals' taming processes of GenAI. It focused especially on contradictions, ambiguities, and negotiating processes. A significant empirical observation is that GenAI has become an integral part of professionals' everyday work routines and practices. However, the empirical analysis also showed that the adoption of GenAI is still in a trial-and-error phase: employees are currently exploring opportunities and potential challenges. The ubiquitous use of GenAI in organizational contexts signifies a transformational phase in organizational processes. Based on the theoretical discussion and empirical analysis, it can be concluded that GenAI influences and modifies the work practices of employees incrementally and, consequently, has an impact on the organizational context as well as the organization itself. The long-term impact of GenAI adoption on organizations remains to be seen and needs further research.

At present, it is recommendable for organizations to formulate explicit, transparent, and meaningful guidelines regarding the use of GenAI to preserve the organization's mission. Meaningful policies will allow employees to use GenAI with ease, which, in turn, will improve trust, productivity, and legal compliance. According to the study's findings, most employees see GenAI as having the potential to enhance productivity, which is one of the primary reasons they began to

adopt it. Understanding the strategies used can provide organizations with a strategic advantage, as employees' firsthand experiences can illuminate benefits and challenges.

Taking this a step further, this study advocates that organizations start to generate user-centered guidelines. That is, guidelines that prioritize the needs and experiences of the employees, ensuring that the utilization of GenAI aligns closely with the organization's mission and serves employees' expectations and requirements. By embracing a user-centric approach, organizations can provide a framework that empowers employees, enabling them to use GenAI meaningfully and to the advantage of the organization.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author would like to express gratitude to the employees of the NGO for their openness and responsiveness. A sincere appreciation goes further to the NGO's management team for their willingness to participate in this study.

FUNDING

This study was funded by THE VELUX FOUNDATION, Grant No. 38916.

REFERENCES

- Alvesson, Mats, and Dan Kärreman. 2007. "Constructing Mystery: Empirical Matters in Theory Development." *Academy of Management Review* 32, no. 4: 1265–1281.
<https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.26586822>.
- Ananny, Mike. 2016. "Toward an Ethics of Algorithms: Convening, Observation, Probability, and Timeliness." *Science, Technology & Human Values* 41, no. 1: 93–117.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243915606523>.
- Ashri, Ronald. 2019. *The AI-Powered Workplace: How Artificial Intelligence, Data, and Messaging Platforms Are Defining the Future of Work*. Apress.
- Bailey, Diane E., and Stephen R. Barley. 2020. "Beyond Design and Use: How Scholars Should Study Intelligent Technologies." *Information and Organization* 30, no. 2: 100286.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2019.100286>.
- Bonini, Tiziano, and Emiliano Treré. 2024. *Algorithms of Resistance*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
<https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262547420/algorithms-of-resistance/>.
- boyd, danah, and Kate Crawford. 2012. "Critical Questions for Big Data: Provocations for a Cultural, Technological, and Scholarly Phenomenon." *Information, Communication & Society* 15, no. 5: 662–79. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2012.678878>.
- Brinkmann, Sven, and Steinar Kvale. 2014. *InterViews. Learning the Craft of Qualitative Research Interviewing*. 3rd ed. SAGE Publications. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/interviews/book239402>.
- Brinkmann, Svend. 2014. "Doing Without Data." *Qualitative Inquiry* 20, no. 6: 720–725.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1077800414530254>.

- Bucher, Taina, and Anne Helmond. 2018. "The Affordances of Social Media Platforms." In *The SAGE Handbook of Social Media*, edited by Jean Burgess, A. Marwick, and T. Poell, 233–253. SAGE Publications. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781473984066>.
- Campolo, Alexander, and Kate Crawford. 2020. "Enchanted Determinism: Power without Responsibility in Artificial Intelligence." *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society* 6 (January): 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.17351/ests2020.277>.
- Carter, Simon, Judith Green, and Nicki Thorogood. 2013. "The Domestication of an Everyday Health Technology: A Case Study of Electric Toothbrushes." *Social Theory & Health: STH* 11 (November): 344–67. <https://doi.org/10.1057/sth.2013.15>.
- Crawford, Kate. 2021. *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Crawford, Kate, and Ryan Calo. 2016. "There Is a Blind Spot in AI Research." *Nature* 538 (7625): 311–13. <https://doi.org/10.1038/538311a>.
- Cresswell, J. W., and Cheryl N. Poth. 2017. *Qualitative Inquiry and Research Design. Choosing Among Five Approaches*. 4th ed. SAGE Publications. <https://us.sagepub.com/en-us/nam/qualitative-inquiry-and-research-design/book246896>.
- de Certeau, Michel. 1984. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Dignum, Virginia. 2022. "Relational Artificial Intelligence." arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2202.07446>.
- Farrokhnia, Mohammadreza, Seyyed Kazem Banihashem, Omid Noroozi, and Arjen Wals. 2024. "A SWOT Analysis of ChatGPT: Implications for Educational Practice and Research." *Innovations in Education and Teaching International* 61, no. 3: 460–474. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14703297.2023.2195846>.
- Flensburg, S., and Lomborg, S. (2023). Datafication research: Mapping the field for a future agenda. *New Media & Society*, 25 (6), 1451–1469. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14614448211046616>.
- Friedman, Batya, and Helen Nissenbaum. 1996. "Bias in Computer Systems." *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)* 14, no. 3: 330–347.
- Getchell, Kristen M., Stephen Carradini, Peter W. Cardon, Carolin Fleischmann, Haibing Ma, Jolanta Aritz, and James Stapp. 2022. "Artificial Intelligence in Business Communication: The Changing Landscape of Research and Teaching." *Business and Professional Communication Quarterly* 85, no. 1: 7–33. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23294906221074311>.
- Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Cambridge [Cambridgeshire]: Polity Press.
- Gill, Karamjit S. 2016. "Artificial Super Intelligence: Beyond Rhetoric." *AI & SOCIETY* 31, no. 2: 137–143. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-016-0651-x>.
- Gulbrandsen, Ib T, and Sine N. Just. 2023. "Artificial Intelligence in Organizational Communication: Challenges, Opportunities, and Implications." In *Organizational Communication in the Digital Era*, edited by Martin N. Ndlela, 51–78. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Gunkel, David J. 2012. "Communication and Artificial Intelligence: Opportunities and Challenges for the 21st Century." <https://doi.org/10.7275/R5QJ7F7R>.

- Gunkel, David J. 2012. *The Machine Question. Critical Perspectives on AI, Robots, and Ethics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press. <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9780262534635/the-machine-question/>.
- Guzman, Andrea L. (ed.). 2018. *Human-Machine Communication: Rethinking Communication, Technology and Ourselves*. Digital Formations. New York: Peter Lang.
- Guzman, Andrea L, and Seth C Lewis. 2020. "Artificial Intelligence and Communication: A Human–Machine Communication Research Agenda." *New Media & Society* 22, no. 1: 70–86. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444819858691>.
- Haddon, Leslie. 2006. "The Contribution of Domestication Research to In-Home Computing and Media Consumption." *The Information Society* 22, no. 4: 195–203. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01972240600791325>.
- Hagendorff, Thilo. 2020. "The Ethics of AI Ethics: An Evaluation of Guidelines." *Minds and Machines* 30, no. 1: 99–120. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-020-09517-8>.
- Hagerty, Alexa, and Igor Rubinov. 2019. "Global AI Ethics: A Review of the Social Impacts and Ethical Implications of Artificial Intelligence." arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1907.07892>.
- ISO. n.d. "What Is Artificial Intelligence (AI)?" ISO. Accessed July 5, 2024. <https://www.iso.org/cms/render/live/en/sites/isoorg/contents/news/insights/AI/what-is-ai-all-you-need-to-know.evergreen.html>.
- Lindgren, Simon. 2023. "Introducing Critical Studies of Artificial Intelligence." In *Handbook of Critical Studies of Artificial Intelligence*, edited by Simon Lindgren, 1–19. Edward Elgar Publishing. <https://www.e-elgar.com/shop/gbp/handbook-of-critical-studies-of-artificial-intelligence-9781803928555.html>.
- Lomborg, Stine, Anne Kaun, and Sne Scott Hansen. 2023. "Automated Decision-Making: Toward a People-Centred Approach." *Sociology Compass* 17, no. 8: e13097, 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/soc4.13097>.
- Mahnke, M. S., & Bagger, C. (2024). Navigating platformized generative AI: Examining early adopters' experiences through the lens of data reflectivity. *Convergence*, (online first). <https://doi.org/10.1177/13548565241300857>.
- Mathieu, David, Niklas Alexander Chimirri, Jelena Kleut, and Pille Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt. 2022. "Questioning the Business-Humanities Divide in Media Studies: A Reformulation of the Administrative-Critical Distinction in Stakeholder Collaboration." In *Business Meets the Humanities*. Routledge.
- Mathieu, David, and Pille Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt. 2020. "The Data Loop of Media and Audience: How Audiences and Media Actors Make Datafication Work." *Mediekultur: Journal of Media and Communication Research* 36, no. 69: 116–138. <https://doi.org/10.7146/mediekultur.v36i69.121178>.
- Nissenbaum, Helen. 2001. "How Computer Systems Embody Values." *Computer* 34, no. 3: 65–67 something wrong with the page numbers.
- Pruulmann-Vengerfeldt, Pille, and Hanna Meyer zu Hörste. 2020. "Reimagining Audiences in the Age of Datafication." In *Reimagining Communication: Experience*, 179–94. London: Routledge.

- <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781351015356-11/reimagining-audiences-age-datafication-pille-pruulmann-vengerfeldt-hanna-meyer-zu-h%C3%B6rste>.
- Sestino, Andrea, and Andrea De Mauro. 2022. "Leveraging Artificial Intelligence in Business: Implications, Applications and Methods." *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* 34, no. 1: 16–29. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09537325.2021.1883583>.
- Silverstone, Roger, and Eric Hirsch (eds.). 1992. *Consuming Technologies: Media and Information in Domestic Spaces*. London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203401491>.
- Silverstone, Roger, Eric Hirsch, and David Morley. 1992. "Information and Communication Technologies and the Moral Economy of the Household." In *Consuming Technologies*, 15–31. London: Routledge.
- Swart, Joëlle. 2021. "Experiencing Algorithms: How Young People Understand, Feel About, and Engage With Algorithmic News Selection on Social Media." *Social Media + Society* 7, no. 2: 1. 205630512110088. <https://doi.org/10.1177/20563051211008828>.
- Turing, Alan Mathison. 1950. "I.—Computing Machinery and Intelligence." *Mind* 59, no. 236: 433–460. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/LIX.236.433>.
- Van Dijck, José, Thomas Poell, and Martijn de Waal. 2018. *The Platform Society: Public Values in a Connective World*. Oxford University Press.
- Weizenbaum, Joseph. 1966. "ELIZA—a Computer Program for the Study of Natural Language Communication between Man and Machine." *Communications of the ACM* 9, no. 1: 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.1145/365153.365168>.
- Zerfass, Ansgar, Jens Hagelstein, and Ralph Tench. 2020. "Artificial Intelligence in Communication Management: A Cross-National Study on Adoption and Knowledge, Impact, Challenges and Risks." *Journal of Communication Management* ahead-of-print (ahead-of-print). <https://doi.org/10.1108/JCOM-10-2019-0137>.

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

MARTINA SKRUBBELTRANG MAHNKE serves as an Associate Professor at the Faculty of Communication and Arts at Roskilde University, Denmark, and as a visiting associate professor at the School of Public Policy, Chiang Mai University, Thailand (2023–2024). Her research focuses on how developers and users (co-)create intelligent technologies and the implications for contemporary societies and the planet. Adopting a communication perspective, she has primarily written about the multifaceted socio-technical relationships on social media and eHealth platforms, and more recently, about the utilization of generative AI in a Southeast Asian context.

Email: mahnke@ruc.dk