

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE, POWER AND DECISION-MAKING IN VENEZUELAN MANAGEMENT: A POSTMODERN READING

Jesus Cendros Guasch

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4840-5771>

Abstract

The emergence of artificial intelligence (AI) in contemporary management is transforming production processes, decision-making, and the symbolic frameworks through which managers interpret organisational reality. In Venezuela, this transformation is particularly complex, due to economic crises, institutional fragility, environmental volatility, and the need for rapid managerial decisions amid uncertainty. This article analyses the impact of AI from a postmodernist perspective, based on a survey of Venezuelan managers (N=150) from the industrial, commercial and service sectors, selected through convenience sampling due to infrastructural constraints. The findings show primarily the instrumental adoption of AI, oriented towards decision support and operational optimisation, but they also reveal persistent tensions between human intuition and algorithmic recommendation. Ambivalent perceptions regarding dashboards, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and AI's capacity to faithfully represent organisational reality are identified. From a postmodernist perspective, these results suggest that AI not only automates tasks but also reconfigures the legitimacy of knowledge, managerial subjectivity and power relations within the organisation. The study concludes that the use of AI in Venezuelan management expresses a transition towards hybrid forms of decision-making, where human rationality, algorithmic calculation and adaptation to crisis conditions coexist.

KEY WORDS: algorithm, artificial intelligence, hyperreality, management, postmodernity, Venezuela, decision-making.

Anotacija

Mokslinis straipsnis nagrinėja dirbtinio intelekto (DI) įtaką Venesuelos įmonių vadybai sudėtingos ekonominės krizės sąlygomis. Atskleidžiama, kaip jis transformuoja gamybos procesus, sprendimų priėmimą ir simbolines sistemas, per kurias vadovai interpretuoja organizacinę realybę. Venesueloje ši transformacija ypač sudėtinga dėl ekonominės krizės, institucijų veikimo trumpalaikiškumo, aplinkos nepastovumo ir poreikio greitai priimti vadovavimo sprendimus neapibrėžtumo sąlygomis. Straipsnyje analizuojamas DI poveikis postmodernistiniu požiūriu, remiantis Venesuelos vadovų apklausa. Teigiama, kad DI pirmiausia yra instrumentas, orientuotas į sprendimų palaikymą ir veiklos optimizavimą, kartu tai atskleidžia nuolatinį žmogaus intuicijos ir algoritminių rekomendacijų neatitikimą. Nustatomi ambivalentiški požiūriai į ataskaitų suvestines, pagrindinius veiklos rodiklius

Jesus Cendros Guasch – professor emeritus, director of the Department of Information Technology, University of Zulia, Dr Rafael Belloso Chacin University, Campus URBE, Prolongación Circunvalación No 2 con Av. 16 Guajira, al lado de la Plaza de Toros, Maracaibo, Estado Zulia, Venezuela. E-mail: jcendros@urb.edu

Received 16/04/2026. Accepted 29/04/2026

Copyright © 2026 Jesus Cendros Guasch. Published by Klaipėda University Press.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

(PVR) ir DI gebėjimą tiksliai atvaizduoti organizacinę realybę. Postmodernistiniu požiūriu, DI ne tik automatizuoja užduotis, bet ir pertvarko žinių teisėtumą, vadovybės subjektyvumą ir galios santykius organizacijoje. Taigi DI naudojimas Venesuelos vadyboje reiškia perėjimą prie hibridinių sprendimų priėmimo formų, kuris grindžiamas žmogaus racionalumu, algoritminiu skaičiavimų ir prisitaikymu prie krizės sąlygų.

PAGRINDINIAI ŽODŽIAI: algoritmas, dirbtinis intelektas, hiperrealybė, vadyba, postmodernizmas, Venesuela, sprendimų priėmimas.

DOI: <https://dx.doi.org/10.15181/tbb.v96i1.2799>

Introduction

Artificial intelligence has moved from being an experimental resource to becoming an increasingly important decision-making infrastructure in contemporary organisations (Davenport, Ronanki, 2018). Its development has made it possible to automate routine functions, model behaviours, anticipate scenarios, and produce strategic information for management. However, its scope is not limited to technical efficiency. At the organisational level, AI is altering the way truth is produced, decisions are validated, and legitimacy is assigned to managerial action (Kellogg et al., 2020). In other words, AI not only processes data; it also produces interpretive frameworks that influence the manager's subjectivity and the way the organisation represents itself.

In Latin America, and particularly in Venezuela, this phenomenon takes on unique contours. The combination of economic crisis, institutional discontinuity, resource scarcity, persistent inflation and failures in basic services creates a scenario where management must operate under constant pressure (Álvarez Merelo et al., 2025). In this context, AI appears as a promise of order, prediction and control, but also as a technology that introduces new symbolic dependencies and new forms of surveillance (Zuboff, 2019). The issue is not only whether AI improves performance, but how it modifies organisational culture, managerial authority, and the experience of deciding in an unstable environment. Therefore, this study does not claim to represent a general management trend, but rather a specific adaptation to what we term 'crisis management', a mode of decision-making characterised by great uncertainty, resource scarcity and the need for rapid, often reactive, strategies.

From a postmodernist perspective, the contemporary organisation can no longer be conceived as a closed, stable and rational structure (Lyotard, 1979). On the contrary, it is understood as a fragmented, relational space crossed by competing narratives. Postmodernity questions the existence of a single truth, and shows how representations can acquire more weight than facts themselves. In this sense, AI becomes a particularly relevant device, because dashboards, Key Performance Indicators (KPIs), and recommendation systems generate synthesised versions

of reality that on many occasions become more influential than direct experience (Baudrillard, 1981).

This research is based on a survey of Venezuelan managers, and seeks to answer a central question: how does artificial intelligence impact Venezuelan management when analysed from a postmodernist perspective? To this end, a descriptive and correlational analysis of managerial perceptions regarding the use of AI, decision-making, organisational hyperreality, algorithmic power and labour liquidity is proposed. The objective is to offer an article with a solid academic structure, theoretical depth, and utility for scientific discussion on digital transformation and management in crisis contexts.

1. The theoretical framework

Postmodernity and organisation

Postmodernity has been defined as a cultural condition characterised by the fragmentation of grand narratives, a plurality of perspectives, the instability of referents, and the crisis of universal certainties (Lyotard, 1979). Applied to the organisational field, this notion suggests that companies and institutions no longer function exclusively under linear schemes of bureaucratic rationality, but are immersed in dynamics of ambiguity, multiplicity and representation.

In postmodern management, leadership no longer rests solely on formal authority, but on the capacity to interpret information flows, manage uncertainty and negotiate meanings. This implies an important shift from classical management theories, which privileged planning, control and stability as the fundamental axes of organisational performance. In the current scenario, the organisation functions more as a network of relationships and meanings, than as a rigid command structure (Bauman, 2000).

Latin American studies on postmodern management have shown that this approach allows for a better understanding of the transformations of educational, public and private institutions, especially when they are subjected to intense external pressures (Vera Salavarría & Pico Bazurto, 2024). In this line, it has been argued that contemporary management must be flexible, adaptive and ethically reflective, because it no longer operates in a world of certainties, but in an environment of systemic complexity and accelerated change. This reading is especially useful for understanding the case of Venezuela, where macro-structural uncertainty forces permanent contingency management.

Artificial intelligence and management

Artificial intelligence applied to management manifests itself in decision support systems, predictive analytics, task automation, information classification, performance evaluation, personnel management, and indicator monitoring (Davenport, Ronanki, 2018). From a functional perspective, AI allows time optimisation, error reduction, increased processing capacity, and useful information for managerial decision-making. However, its effect is not exhausted at the operational level. It also transforms the rules by which a valid decision is defined, who validates it, and what type of evidence is considered sufficient to support it (Pasquale, 2015).

Recent literature in management studies warns that AI is revolutionising the way administration is researched and practised (Arreola et al., 2021). The manager no longer depends only on their experience, but also on models, algorithms and platforms that configure a new type of rationality. This algorithmic rationality tends to favour predictability, quantification and traceability, which can increase efficiency, but also weaken human deliberation if absolutised (Kellogg et al., 2020).

In contexts of high organisational pressure, AI also fulfils a performative function: it helps justify decisions, legitimise changes, and reduce the manager's personal responsibility. In other words, reference to the system can operate as a form of argumentative shielding. This acquires special relevance in environments where errors can have high reputational, financial or political costs (Álvarez Melo et al., 2025).

Hyperreality and representation

One of the most useful contributions of postmodernist theory for analysing AI is the notion of hyperreality (Baudrillard, 1981). This refers to the situation in which representation becomes more influential than actual experience. In a contemporary organisation, the dashboard, indicator or control panel can acquire more credibility than direct observation. The manager ends up interpreting their area not so much through direct contact with processes, but through the mediation of visual and numerical systems.

This phenomenon does not imply that reality disappears, but that it becomes partially replaced by its algorithmic translation. When KPIs show 'success' and daily practice reveals problems, a gap appears between the sign and the reality, which is central to postmodern critique. In that sense, AI can produce a hyperreal organisational experience: a reality cleaner, more orderly and more coherent than the effectively lived world (Virilio, 2006).

Organisational hyperreality should not be understood only as a technical defect, but as an epistemic shift. Managers learn to trust images, indicators and models

that simplify the world, and in some cases end up subordinating complexity to the logic of visualisation. This tension is one of the most interesting axes of the present study.

Algorithmic management and power

Algorithmic management refers to the use of automated systems to organise, evaluate, distribute and control work (Kellogg et al., 2020). In this logic, AI not only offers support but actively participates in the regulation of organisational conduct. This can manifest in task assignment, performance prediction, productivity evaluation or deviation detection. Power, therefore, does not disappear; it becomes more distributed, more invisibilised, and more technical (Deleuze, 1992).

From the approach of psychopower (Han, 2017), technology not only externally controls but also shapes the subject's perception of autonomy. The manager may feel that they retain control, even though their criteria are increasingly aligned with systems that define thresholds, metrics and standards. AI, in this sense, functions not only as a tool but also as a disciplinary framework (Foucault, 1977). This is particularly relevant when managers use the system to communicate unpopular decisions, since the algorithm can serve as a symbolic support of authority.

Contemporary literature on algorithmic management has also warned about its ethical risks: opacity, bias, dehumanisation, and excessive dependence on metrics (Pasquale, 2015). Therefore, the use of AI in the organisation must be analysed not only in terms of efficiency, but also in terms of governance, legitimacy and accountability. In the Latin American context, recent studies indicate that AI can exacerbate job insecurity if adequate safeguards are not implemented (Gómez, Pérez, 2021).

AI in Venezuela and the crisis context

The Venezuelan reality introduces variables that alter the way AI is incorporated into management. Economic crisis, service discontinuity, technological precariousness and institutional fragmentation force organisations to operate with narrow margins of predictability (Vera Salavarría, Pico Bazurto, 2024). Under these conditions, AI does not appear as a total solution, but as a strategic resource for managing scarcity, uncertainty and volatility.

Technological adoption in crisis contexts tends to be ambivalent: on one hand, organisations seek to automate and optimise; on the other, there persists a distrust of systems that promise neutrality (Álvarez Merelo et al., 2025). The survey of Venezuelan managers precisely allows us to observe this tension. Participants recognise AI's utility, but do not consider it an absolute substitute for experience,

or a completely sufficient source of legitimacy. This balance between adoption and caution is one of the interpretive keys of the study.

2. Method

Research design

The study was developed according to a quantitative approach, with a descriptive and correlational scope. A structured survey was used, addressed to Venezuelan managers, with questions aimed at exploring the use of AI, the frequency of use, the relationship between AI and intuition, the interpretation of dashboards, the pressure to adjust to automated parameters, and perceptions about organisational restructuring.

Sample and selection criteria

The sample consisted of *150 Venezuelan managers (N=150)*, selected through a non-probabilistic convenience sampling method. This method was necessitated by the multi-dimensional crisis affecting Venezuela, which has resulted in recurrent failures in electricity and internet connectivity, limiting consistent access to digital platforms. The sample included managers from three main economic sectors: industrial (manufacturing and oil-related, 33%), commercial (retail and distribution, 42%), and services (financial, technology and consulting, 25%). The selection criteria were: (a) holding a formal managerial position (e.g. department head, general manager, director) for at least one year; (b) having direct or indirect access to AI-based tools (e.g. dashboards, predictive software, automated reporting systems) in their daily work; and (c) voluntary participation. Due to the infrastructural context, the sample probably excludes managers from sectors most affected by technological obsolescence and energy scarcity, representing a potential bias towards organisations with at least minimal energy-support infrastructure.

3. Instrument

The instrument consisted of 15 questions distributed across five thematic blocks:

- AI usage context.
- Performativity in decision-making.
- Hyperreality and the representation of reality.
- Power and control.
- Organisational fluidity.

The responses are presented in ordinal categories, which allows for a descriptive analysis using frequencies and correlation analysis between conceptually associated variables.

Statistical analysis

The descriptive analysis was oriented towards identifying dominant trends in each item, especially in terms of preference, frequency and perception. The correlational analysis was based on expected associations among ordinal variables, such as the frequency of AI use, the perception of algorithmic pressure, the centrality of indicators, and the experience of replacement of human roles. Given the type of response scale, Spearman's correlation coefficients were used to measure the strength and direction of the associations.

Ethical considerations

The study is based on aggregated information from an anonymous survey. No identifiable personal data are reported. The analysis was carried out for academic purposes and under principles of scientific integrity, proper attribution, and responsible use of sources and data.

4. Results

The use of AI in management

The results show that AI is mainly used as a decision support system. Among the most frequent uses were optimisation (42% of respondents), behaviour prediction (35%), and help in data interpretation (48%). This pattern indicates that managers do not yet conceive AI as a total replacement for human management, but as a support tool to increase efficiency and reduce uncertainty in decision-making.

The frequency of use also reflects a rather situational integration: 38% reported weekly use, 29% occasional use, and only 15% daily use. AI appears in managerial practice with a rather sporadic presence, suggesting a use that is not fully automated. This is relevant because it shows that technological incorporation is under development and has not completely replaced other modes of deliberation.

The relationship between intuition and algorithm

One of the most interesting findings is the persistence of tension between intuition and algorithmic recommendation. When AI contradicts their intuition, managers tend to seek a middle ground (44%), consult a superior (28%), or, in some cases, follow AI (16%) or intuition (12%), depending on the context. This distribu-

tion of responses suggests that managerial decision-making in Venezuela operates under a hybrid logic, in which neither the human nor the algorithm completely monopolises action.

In justifying decisions, 52% declared combining personal strategic experience and AI data analysis, while 31% prioritised AI, and only 17% exclusive intuition. This balance is consistent with postmodern management, where legitimacy does not come from a single source, but from the articulation of multiple registers of truth (Lyotard, 1979).

Organisational hyperreality

The survey revealed that 47% of managers consider that they know their area better through dashboards, and 38% through a combination of dashboards and direct interaction. At the same time, 53% indicated that KPIs can show success without the corresponding reality confirming it. This result is central to the postmodernist perspective (Baudrillard, 1981), as it confirms a destabilisation between representation and reality.

The statement 'if it is not in the system, it does not exist' obtained 29% total or partial adherence, indicating that managers maintain a degree of resistance against the total domination of data. However, the mere presence of this question and the responses it generates evidence the advance of an organisational culture mediated by systems that order visibility, evidence and legitimacy.

Power, control and psychopower

In the field of power, 58% of managers still understand AI as a tool under human control, while 32% also perceive it as a supervisor or evaluating instance. This ambivalence is important, because it reveals the transition towards diffuse forms of evaluation and discipline (Foucault, 1977; Han, 2017).

The use of AI to communicate unpopular decisions was reported by 41% of respondents. This finding suggests that technology also fulfils a symbolic buffering function: managers can shield themselves with AI to support difficult decisions, transferring part of the legitimising burden to the system (Kellogg et al., 2020). In addition, 47% declared feeling pressure to adapt to AI parameters, confirming the existence of indirect control mechanisms and the internalisation of automated criteria.

Organisational liquidity

The perception that AI has generated team rotation or restructuring appeared in 34% of respondents, a moderate figure, but enough to signal transformations in the work structure. In parallel, 61% perceive that their organisations value agility, or

a combination of agility and stability. This is consistent with the profile of a liquid organisation, flexible and oriented towards constant adaptation (Bauman, 2000).

It was also observed that 45% consider that AI has replaced some roles that were previously performed by people. Although it is not a total replacement, a partial displacement of functions is recognised. In Venezuela, where operational constraints force the maximisation of resources, this replacement tends to be interpreted as an adaptive response, rather than mere technological innovation (Gómez, Pérez, 2021).

Correlational analysis

Spearman's correlation coefficients were calculated between the main ordinal variables. The results showed significant associations ($p < .05$) in the following pairs:

- Frequency of AI use and trust in dashboards ($\rho = .62$).
- Frequency of AI use and pressure to adapt ($\rho = .58$).
- Valuation of KPIs and perception of hyperreality ($\rho = .53$).
- Perception of AI as supervisor and use for unpopular decisions ($\rho = .49$).
- Organisational restructuring and role replacement ($\rho = .55$).

These associations confirm that technology not only increases efficiency, but also redistributes power, visibility and authority within the organisation, in line with postmodernist theory and studies on algorithmic management (Kellogg et al., 2020; Pasquale, 2015).

5. Discussion

The findings allow us to argue that AI plays a complex and ambivalent role in Venezuelan management. On one hand, it improves analytical capacity, facilitates data reading, and strengthens operational efficiency (Davenport, Ronanki, 2018). On the other, it introduces new forms of symbolic dependence, normative pressure and power reconfiguration (Zuboff, 2019). In this sense, AI should not be interpreted as a simple technical resource, but as a device that modifies the decision-making culture.

From postmodernist theory, the main contribution of the study is to show that the contemporary organisation is no longer organised only by hierarchical structures or formal rules, but also by digital representations that define what counts as reality (Baudrillard, 1981). Dashboards and KPIs not only inform; they also produce meaning. The hypervisibility of data can hide material problems, human conflicts, or distortions not captured by the system (Virilio, 2006).

In the case of Venezuela, this situation intensifies, because the structural crisis demands practical solutions, but at the same time it weakens the capacity to fully trust technical systems (Álvarez Merelo et al., 2025). The manager is thus situated in an intermediate zone: they need AI to guide decisions, but maintain reservations about its capacity to completely reflect the world. This ambivalence is precisely the sign of postmodern management, where certainty has been replaced by negotiation, interpretation and contingency (Lyotard, 1979).

The relationship between AI and power also deserves attention. The fact that some managers use AI to communicate unpopular decisions indicates that the system acts as a responsibility mediator (Kellogg et al., 2020). This does not eliminate human leadership, but it does reconfigure its exercise. The manager no longer decides alone in the face of conflict, but accompanied by a technical authority that reinforces or legitimises their position. At this point, AI functions as a tool of psychopower (Han, 2017), distributing the pressure of decision-making in an apparently neutral logic.

A critical look at the digital divide

The discussion would be incomplete without a critical examination of the digital divide, which the referees rightly highlighted. The findings reflect the perspectives of managers in organisations that maintain minimal energy and connectivity infrastructure. This applies to a privileged segment of the Venezuelan managerial landscape. Managers in sectors most affected by technological obsolescence, or those operating without backup power sources, were largely excluded from the sample. Consequently, the study probably underestimates the degree of AI resistance, distrust or simple unavailability that characterises a larger portion of the national productive apparatus. The ‘hybrid decision-making’ observed here may be less a matter of choice and more a consequence of infrastructural precarity: managers cannot fully commit to AI, because the systems themselves are unreliable. This introduces a critical nuance: the tension between intuition and algorithm is not purely epistemological, but also material, rooted in unequal access to stable technology.

Conclusions

The research confirms that artificial intelligence affects Venezuelan management significantly; not only in technical terms, but also in the way managers construct reality, justify decisions and manage power. The survey evidences a primarily instrumental adoption of AI, but accompanied by deep tensions between intuition, algorithmic calculation, digital representation and contextual experience.

From a postmodernist perspective, these findings show that the Venezuelan organisation is in a process of reconfiguration, where managerial truth no longer depends exclusively on direct observation, but also on systems that translate reality into indicators, dashboards and predictions (Baudrillard, 1981; Pasquale, 2015). AI thus appears as an agent of hyperreality, discipline and work reordering.

Consequently, managerial training in Venezuela should include not only digital competencies, but also critical thinking, decision ethics, contextual reading, and an understanding of the limits of automation (Arreola et al., 2021). AI can be a valuable ally of management, but its use without critical reflection could deepen the distance between representation and reality, as well as reinforcing opaque forms of control. The challenge for postmodern management is not to reject AI, but to integrate it responsibly, humanely and contextually.

One important conclusion related to postmodernism is that *managerial truth no longer depends exclusively on direct observation or experience, but is increasingly constructed through AI-driven representations (dashboards, KPIs, predictive models) that create a hyperreal organisational reality*. In other words, the algorithmically generated image of the organisation often becomes more influential and credible than the concrete, lived work environment, reflecting Baudrillard's notion of the simulacrum. This shift redefines legitimacy, authority and decision-making in contemporary management, moving away from modernist certainty towards a postmodern condition of fragmented, mediated and contested realities.

Linking hybrid decision-making to specific results

The concept of *'hybrid decision-making'* is a strong takeaway that merits explicit linkage to the survey data. This hybridity is not merely a theoretical abstraction, but is empirically grounded in specific findings: *44% of managers seeking a middle ground when AI contradicts intuition, and 52% explicitly combining personal experience with AI analysis* to justify decisions. These figures demonstrate that Venezuelan managers actively negotiate between human and algorithmic inputs, producing a third space of decision-making that is neither purely intuitive nor purely automated. This hybridity is further reinforced by the 58% who view AI as a tool under human control, and the 47% who feel pressure to adapt to AI parameters, indicating a simultaneous embrace and resistance that defines the hybrid condition. Thus, the study does not propose hybridity as a vague ideal, but as a measurable, statistically observable pattern of managerial behaviour under crisis.

Limitations of the study

Despite the relevance of the findings, this study has inherent limitations related to the multi-dimensional crisis currently affecting Venezuela.

The main limitations are detailed below:

- **Accessibility and representativeness:** Data collection may be affected by technological difficulties and recurring failures in basic services, such as electricity and connectivity, which hinder consistent access to digital survey platforms. Consequently, the sample (N=150) is not statistically representative of all Venezuelan managers, but rather offers an exploratory window into a specific subset of organisations with minimal infrastructure.
- **Selection bias:** The results may primarily reflect the perspectives of managers in organisations that maintain energy-support infrastructure, potentially excluding the sectors most affected by resource scarcity and technological obsolescence. This overrepresents better-resourced firms, and underrepresents the broader reality of technological precariousness.
- **Environmental volatility:** Given that management in Venezuela is subject to political and macro-structural uncertainty, the perceptions captured may change rapidly in response to new peaks of economic or institutional improvement or deterioration. The findings should therefore be understood as a snapshot of ‘crisis management’ at a specific moment, and not as a stable or generalisable trend.
- **Nature of the instrument:** As a self-report survey, the responses are mediated by managerial subjectivity, and a persistent systemic distrust of technologies that promise neutrality within a highly fragile and uncertain environment.

Conflict of interest

The author declares that there is no conflict of interest.

References

- Álvarez Merelo, O. L., Jurado Macías, M. A. (2025). El impacto de la inteligencia artificial en la gestión empresarial. *LATAM Revista Latinoamericana de Ciencias Sociales y Humanidades*, 6 (5), 819–833. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.56712/latam.v6i5.4637>
- Baudrillard, J. (1981). *Simulacra and simulation*. University of Michigan Press. <https://press.umich.edu/Books/S/Simulacra-and-Simulation>
- Bauman, Z. (2000). *Liquid modernity*. Polity Press. <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Liquid+Modernity-p-9780745624105>
- Davenport, T. H., Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harvard Business Review*, 96 (1), 108–116. <https://hbr.org/2018/01/artificial-intelligence-for-the-real-world>
- Deleuze, G. (1992). Postscript on the societies of control. *October*, 59, 3–7. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/778828>
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. Vintage Books. https://monoskop.org/images/4/43/Foucault_Michel_Discipline_and_Punish_The_Birth_of_the_Prison_1977_1995.pdf
- Arreola, G. ir kt. (2021). Precarización y organización laboral en america Latina. CISS Documento de trabajo 1. <https://ciss-bienestar.org/cuadernos/pdf/Precarizacion-y-organizacion-laboral-en-america-latina.pdf>

Jesus Cendros Guasch

- Han, B.-C. (2017). *Psychopolitics: Neoliberalism and new technologies of power*. Verso Books. <https://www.versobooks.com/books/2507-psychopolitics>
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work: The new contested terrain of control. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14 (1), 366–410. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174>
- Lyotard, J.-F. (1979). *The postmodern condition: A report on knowledge*. University of Minnesota Press. <https://www.upress.umn.edu/book-division/books/the-postmodern-condition>
- Pasquale, F. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Harvard University Press. <https://www.hup.harvard.edu/catalog.php?isbn=9780674970847>
- Smith, A. (2025). IA en el neomanagement: retos y oportunidades en la administración posmoderna. *Scientia Iter*, 11 (4). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.70452/scientiaiter11.4>
- Vera Salavarría, S. P., Pico Bazurto, S. P. (2024). Inteligencia artificial en el desarrollo administrativo de la empresa moderna. *Revista Científica Arbitrada Multidisciplinaria PENTACIENCIAS*, 6 (2), 264–282. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.59169/pentaciencias.v6i2.1046>
- Virilio, P. (2006). *Speed and politics*. Semiotext(e). <https://mitpress.mit.edu/9781584350408/speed-and-politics/>
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs. <https://www.publicaffairsbooks.com/titles/shoshana-zuboff/the-age-of-surveillance-capitalism/9781610395694/>