



Algorithmic Mediation of Consciousness: Extending Integrated Reality Theory for AI Governance and Organizational Learning

La Himmah il Princess Choris¹, M. Shoim¹

¹Universitas Airlangga, Surabaya, Indonesia

²Universitas 17 Agustus 1945 Surabaya, Indonesia

*Corresponding Author: La Himmah il Princess Choris

Email: la.himmah.il@feb.unair.ac.id



Article Info

Article history:

Received 25 June 2026

Received in revised form 12 August 2026

Accepted 8 September 2026

Keywords:

Artificial Intelligence

Algorithmic Mediation of Consciousness

Integrated Reality Theory

Organizational Learning

Collective Sense-Making

JEL Classification:

M15; O33; D83; D91; L86.

Abstract

The rapid advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI), particularly Large Language Models (LLMs) and algorithmic recommendation systems, has fundamentally transformed how human beings produce, distribute, and consume information. Yet contemporary debates surrounding AI remain trapped between two dominant narratives: technological optimism, which views AI as a productivity accelerator, and technological pessimism, which perceives AI as a threat to human autonomy and intellectual labor. This article proposes an alternative analytical framework through Integrated Reality Theory (IRT). Unlike purely technological approaches, this paper argues that AI is no longer merely a computational instrument, but increasingly functions as a structural mediator shaping human consciousness through the reconstruction of global information architecture. Within IRT, Information (I) is not a neutral variable; it directly influences Consciousness (C). Since AI systems increasingly govern digital information flows, they indirectly participate in the formation of collective consciousness. This article introduces the concept of Algorithmic Mediation of Consciousness to explain how AI systems influence attention structures, cognitive framing, social perception, and civilizational evolution. The article further develops IRT from a static systems model into a co-evolutionary framework in which AI acts simultaneously as an amplifier and a potential distorter of human consciousness. The study concludes that the future trajectory of civilization will be determined not merely by control over energy and material resources, but increasingly by governance over algorithmic information architectures capable of shaping collective consciousness itself. The article also extends the discussion to organizational learning and managerial governance, highlighting how AI-mediated information architectures influence collective sense-making within organizations.

Introduction

Human civilization is entering a new historical phase in which information is no longer primarily mediated by traditional institutions such as schools, universities, print media, or religious communities, but increasingly by algorithmic systems powered by Artificial Intelligence (AI). Search engines, recommendation systems, social media algorithms, and Large Language Models (LLMs) increasingly determine what information individuals encounter, how that information is structured, and ultimately how social reality itself is perceived. This transformation raises a fundamental philosophical and sociological question: is AI merely an instrument for processing information, or has it become a structural actor participating in the formation of human consciousness?

The transformation is also increasingly relevant to organizations and management. Organizations depend on information systems to coordinate activities, develop knowledge, support decision-making, and facilitate organizational learning (Hamdat et al., 2024; Biswas et al., 2024; Hera et al., 2024; Kim, 2024). As AI becomes embedded in organizational communication, knowledge discovery, and decision-support processes, organizational members increasingly encounter information through algorithmically mediated environments. The managerial issue is therefore not limited to whether organizations adopt AI, but also how AI-mediated information structures influence collective sense-making, strategic attention, organizational learning, and managerial judgment (Khan et al., 2026; Cristofaro & Bañón-Gomis, 2026).

Most existing AI literature focuses on productivity enhancement, labor automation, and economic efficiency (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014; Susskind, 2020). Critical scholarship, meanwhile, emphasizes surveillance capitalism, algorithmic bias, digital manipulation, and platform power (Zuboff, 2019; O'Neil, 2016). However, both perspectives share an important limitation: they tend to treat information as a resource or technological input rather than as a constitutive force shaping human consciousness and collective understanding (Farivar et al., 2026).

The theoretical tradition of media ecology has long argued that communication technologies are not value-neutral conduits; they reshape cognition, social relations, and cultural formation (McLuhan, 1964; Postman, 1985; Edwards & Etzrodt, 2025). The concept of “the medium is the message” suggests that the structure of information delivery fundamentally alters human perception. More recently, Pariser (2011) introduced the concept of filter bubbles to describe how algorithmic personalization creates individualized informational ecosystems, while Sunstein (2017) documented how online environments can amplify group polarization. Floridi (2014) further emphasized the ethical challenges associated with information environments and their implications for human existence.

Emerging scholarship has substantially deepened this critical perspective. Crawford (2021) demonstrates that AI is fundamentally embedded in systems of material extraction, labor, and data production. Bommasani et al. (2021) provide a comprehensive account of the opportunities and risks associated with foundation models, while Bender et al. (2021) highlight concerns regarding large language models, including dataset curation, environmental costs, and the reproduction of linguistic patterns without genuine understanding. Weidinger et al. (2022) further structure the risk landscape of large language models around discrimination and toxicity, information hazards, misinformation harms, malicious uses, human-computer interaction harms, and automation and environmental harms.

Despite these contributions, a theoretical gap remains. Existing perspectives explain how media environments, algorithmic personalization, platform power, and AI systems influence information consumption and social behavior, but they provide limited explanation of how information architectures themselves become constitutive of consciousness and how this relationship can be understood within a unified systemic framework. This limitation is particularly important in organizational settings, where information is continuously transformed into shared knowledge, collective interpretation, strategic attention, and organizational action. The increasing mediation of organizational information by AI therefore requires a framework that can connect information architecture with consciousness, entropy, learning, and adaptive development.

Integrated Reality Theory (IRT) offers a broader analytical framework for synthesizing these dimensions. IRT conceptualizes reality as the dynamic interaction between Energy (E),

Information (I), Entropy (S), Consciousness (C), and Evolution. Unlike conventional systems theories that separate information from consciousness, IRT proposes that the structure, quality, and distribution of information fundamentally shape the evolution of consciousness at both individual and collective levels.

To clarify the theoretical position of this study, Table 1 summarizes the limitations of established perspectives and the contribution of IRT in addressing those limitations.

Table 1. Original Contributions of IRT vs. Existing Theories

Existing Theory	Limitation	IRT Contribution
Media Ecology (McLuhan, 1964; Postman, 1985)	Identifies media as environment-shaping but lacks formal modeling of how information structures consciousness	Provides mathematical formalization of the Information–Consciousness relationship through the IRT function
Filter Bubble & Echo Chamber (Pariser, 2011; Sunstein, 2017)	Describes personalization and polarization but does not connect to systemic concepts of entropy and collective consciousness	Integrates algorithmic personalization with entropy (S) as a systemic measure of informational disorder and fragmentation
Critical AI Studies (Zuboff, 2019; O’Neil, 2016; Crawford, 2021)	Documents power asymmetries and extraction but remains largely descriptive without a unified systemic framework	Offers a unified diagnostic framework (IRT) that relates information architecture, entropy, and consciousness to civilizational evolution
Foundation Model Research (Bommasani et al., 2021; Bender et al., 2021; Weidinger et al., 2022)	Identifies risks and opportunities but does not provide a philosophical framework for understanding how AI reshapes consciousness itself	Conceptualizes AI as a mediator of consciousness through four mechanisms: attention steering, cognitive framing, emotional amplification, and recursive co-evolutionary feedback

The table demonstrates that the contribution of IRT is not simply to introduce another interpretation of AI, but to provide a systemic bridge between information architecture, entropy, and consciousness. The proposed framework therefore extends existing approaches by treating AI-mediated information environments as part of the conditions through which individual and collective consciousness develops. This extension also creates a conceptual basis for examining organizational environments in which AI increasingly participates in knowledge processes, communication, decision support, and collective sense-making.

This article argues that AI has become an increasingly important mediator between Information (I) and Consciousness (C). AI systems do not merely expand humanity’s informational capacity; they increasingly structure the epistemological environment through which consciousness itself develops. This process is conceptualized in this study as Algorithmic Mediation of Consciousness (AMC). In organizational contexts, AMC refers to the process through which AI-mediated information architectures influence attention allocation, cognitive framing, collective sense-making, and organizational learning.

The concept extends beyond algorithmic bias or filter bubbles. Algorithms increasingly determine what information becomes visible, what receives attention, and how information is contextualized. In organizations, these processes can influence what managers and employees

perceive as important, how organizational problems are interpreted, and which forms of knowledge become incorporated into decision-making. Consequently, AI-mediated information architecture becomes not merely a technical infrastructure but an emerging component of the organizational cognitive environment.

The article has three primary objectives. First, it explains how AI restructures the relationship between Information (I) and Consciousness (C) within the IRT framework. Second, it develops the concept of Algorithmic Mediation of Consciousness as a theoretical extension of IRT. Third, it examines the philosophical, sociological, geopolitical, and managerial implications of AI-driven informational architectures, particularly for organizational learning, collective sense-making, strategic attention, and managerial governance.

The theoretical contribution of this study lies in establishing a conceptual bridge between AI research, media theory, philosophy of consciousness, and management. Rather than treating AI exclusively as a technological tool for increasing efficiency, the study conceptualizes AI as a structural mediator that can influence the informational conditions under which individuals and organizations develop knowledge, construct shared understanding, and make decisions. Through this perspective, IRT provides a framework for examining how organizations can manage the relationship between Information (I), Entropy (S), and Consciousness (C) in increasingly algorithmically mediated environments.

Methods

Research Design

This study employs a conceptual-theoretical research design combining mathematical formalization and interdisciplinary theoretical synthesis. The purpose of the study is to extend Integrated Reality Theory (IRT) into the context of Artificial Intelligence (AI) by examining how AI-mediated information architectures influence the relationship between Information (I) and Consciousness (C). The study does not conduct original empirical testing. Instead, it adopts a theory-building approach to develop a conceptual explanation of how algorithmic systems increasingly mediate informational environments and influence individual, collective, and organizational processes of sense-making.

The theory-building process consists of four interconnected stages. The first stage identifies the theoretical limitation of the existing IRT formulation, particularly the insufficiently explicit relationship between Information (I) and Consciousness (C). The second stage develops the concept of Algorithmic Mediation of Consciousness (AMC) as an extension of IRT. The third stage derives the philosophical, sociological, geopolitical, and managerial implications of AI-driven information architectures. The fourth stage formulates falsification conditions that can be used to guide future empirical investigation of the proposed theoretical relationships.

Epistemological Position

The study adopts a heuristic and theoretically modest epistemological position. IRT is treated as a meta-framework for diagnosing systemic relationships among Energy (E), Information (I), Entropy (S), Consciousness (C), and Evolution rather than as a universal predictive model. Accordingly, the mathematical formulation within IRT functions as a heuristic relational model and systemic diagnostic tool rather than as a precise predictive equation. The purpose of the formulation is to generate theoretically meaningful propositions and provide a conceptual structure for subsequent empirical investigation.

This epistemological position is important because the central contribution of the study is conceptual rather than statistical. The analysis does not claim to measure consciousness directly

or establish causal relationships between AI and human behavior. Instead, it extends the theoretical relationship between Information and Consciousness by conceptualizing information as a constitutive force in the development of consciousness.

Interdisciplinary Theoretical Synthesis

The theoretical development is informed by an interdisciplinary synthesis of literature addressing media ecology, algorithmic personalization, digital platforms, critical AI studies, foundation models, information ethics, and AI governance. These perspectives are brought together to identify how technological information environments influence cognition, social perception, and collective understanding. The synthesis particularly examines the relationship between established concepts such as media environments, filter bubbles, algorithmic bias, platform power, and foundation-model risks and the systemic dimensions of IRT. This approach enables the study to move from isolated discussions of algorithmic effects toward a broader conceptual framework connecting information architecture, entropy, consciousness, and evolutionary development.

The interdisciplinary synthesis is also extended to organizational and management contexts. Organizational learning and knowledge management provide an important contextual dimension because organizations increasingly depend on AI-mediated systems for knowledge discovery, communication, decision support, and information coordination. Within this context, the study examines how algorithmic information architectures may influence collective sense-making and strategic attention, while recognizing that these organizational implications remain theoretical propositions rather than empirically tested relationships.

Analytical Framework

The analysis is organized around the proposed relationship:

AI → Information Architecture → Consciousness → Organizational and Collective Sense-Making

Within the IRT framework, AI possesses substantial information-processing capacity and increasingly influences the information encountered by human users. Because Information (I) is conceptualized as influencing Consciousness (C), AI indirectly participates in the conditions through which consciousness develops. The analysis therefore conceptualizes AI as a structural mediator between information and consciousness rather than as a conscious agent itself. Within the IRT framework, AI is assigned $C = 0$, meaning that it does not possess subjective experience, intentional understanding, or ethical responsibility.

The analytical framework identifies four mechanisms through which this mediation occurs: attention steering, cognitive framing, emotional amplification, and recursive co-evolutionary feedback. These mechanisms are examined as interconnected processes through which AI systems influence what information becomes visible, how information is interpreted, how emotional responses are amplified, and how human behavioral data subsequently contribute to the development of algorithmic systems.

Plausibility Assessment

The plausibility of the proposed framework is assessed heuristically through engagement with empirical findings from the existing AI and digital-media literature. Studies concerning algorithmic recommendation, emotional contagion, and digital-media behavior are used to illustrate whether the four proposed mechanisms have a plausible basis in observed technological and social processes.

This assessment is not treated as empirical validation of the AMC framework. Rather, the empirical literature functions as illustrative evidence supporting the conceptual plausibility of the proposed mechanisms. This distinction is essential because the present study does not independently test the effects of algorithmic mediation on consciousness.

Falsification Strategy

To strengthen the scientific testability of the proposed framework, the study develops falsification conditions for its principal theoretical claims. These conditions address whether algorithmically curated information significantly affects attention allocation, whether algorithmic exposure influences cognitive framing, whether AI-driven information proliferation is associated with measurable changes in collective consciousness, whether AI-generated entropy is negatively associated with collective consciousness, and whether recursive feedback exists between algorithmic outputs and human behavioral data. These conditions are not treated as tests conducted within the present research. Instead, they establish potential empirical criteria through which future-controlled experiments, longitudinal studies, and cross-context investigations can evaluate or reject the proposed theoretical relationships.

Scope of the Methodological Approach

The methodological scope is limited to the conceptual extension of IRT to the AI domain. The study does not employ surveys, interviews, experiments, statistical modeling, or other forms of original empirical data collection. Consequently, the proposed mechanisms and relationships should be interpreted as exploratory theoretical propositions requiring future empirical validation. In particular, the operationalization of Consciousness (C) at the collective and organizational levels remains an important methodological challenge for subsequent research.

Result and Discussion

Extension of the Information–Consciousness Relationship

The first theoretical finding of this study is the explicit extension of the relationship between Information (I) and Consciousness (C) within Integrated Reality Theory (IRT). In its original formulation, IRT conceptualizes reality as a dynamic interaction among Energy (E), Information (I), Entropy (S), Consciousness (C), and Evolution. Within this framework, Information represents the structure, accessibility, and quality of knowledge, while Consciousness refers to reflexivity, meaning-making, ethical orientation, and intentional awareness. Evolution represents adaptive and learning capacity over time.

The present theoretical development makes the relationship between Information and Consciousness explicit. Information is not treated as a neutral resource that is simply transmitted between actors. Instead, the structure, accessibility, quality, and distribution of information constitute part of the environment through which consciousness develops. Human consciousness is consequently conceptualized as a dynamic systemic outcome shaped by informational exposure, attention architecture, algorithmic prioritization, symbolic framing, and digital interaction systems.

This extension becomes particularly significant in organizational environments. Organizations traditionally manage information through institutional mechanisms such as communication structures, knowledge-management systems, professional norms, managerial hierarchies, and organizational learning processes. However, AI increasingly introduces algorithmic mechanisms into these processes. Information can now be automatically selected, ranked, summarized, recommended, and interpreted before it reaches organizational members.

Consequently, the informational environment in which employees and managers construct shared understanding is increasingly influenced by algorithmic systems.

The theoretical finding is therefore that the relationship between Information and Consciousness should be understood not only at the individual or societal level but also at the organizational level. The availability of information alone does not guarantee organizational learning or effective decision-making. What becomes important is how information is structured and transformed into shared interpretation, collective understanding, and purposeful organizational action.

AI as a Structural Mediator

The second finding is the conceptualization of AI as a structural mediator between Information and Consciousness. AI systems possess extraordinary information-processing capacity and increasingly shape the information encountered by human beings. Because Information influences Consciousness within the extended IRT framework, AI indirectly participates in the conditions through which consciousness develops.

This proposition does not imply that AI itself possesses consciousness. Within IRT, AI is explicitly assigned $C = 0$, meaning that AI does not possess subjective experience, intentional understanding, or ethical responsibility. The theoretical problem is therefore not whether AI can become conscious, but how non-conscious algorithmic systems reshape the informational environments through which human consciousness develops.

In organizational contexts, this distinction is important. AI may increasingly participate in knowledge discovery, communication, recommendation, and decision support without becoming an organizationally conscious actor. The influence of AI therefore occurs through the architecture of information mediation. Managers and employees encounter organizational realities through information that may already have been algorithmically filtered or prioritized. AI consequently becomes part of the cognitive infrastructure within which organizations interpret their environment.

This finding extends the role of AI beyond the conventional understanding of technology as an instrument for efficiency. AI can simultaneously function as a technological infrastructure, an information filter, and a mediator of collective sense-making. The organization therefore does not simply *use* AI; it increasingly operates within an informational environment partly structured by AI.

Four Mechanisms of Algorithmic Mediation

The third theoretical finding is the identification of four interconnected mechanisms through which AI-driven information architectures mediate consciousness: attention steering, cognitive framing, emotional amplification, and recursive co-evolutionary feedback.

Attention Steering

The first mechanism is attention steering. AI systems determine what users encounter through ranking systems, recommendation algorithms, and personalized content delivery. This represents an extension of conventional agenda-setting because algorithmic systems can personalize what becomes visible to particular users.

The article draws on evidence from Haroon et al. (2022), who conducted a systematic audit of YouTube's recommendation system using 100,000 sock puppets and reported evidence that recommendations could direct some users, particularly right-leaning users, toward ideologically biased and more extreme content. Kramer et al. (2014) provided experimental

evidence that emotional states could be transmitted through social networks through algorithmically curated content. The article also identifies TikTok's "For You" page as an example of a system that constructs an individualized information environment based on micro-behavioral signals.

The theoretical implication is that human attention becomes increasingly algorithmically governed and that collective awareness becomes structurally steerable. In organizational settings, the same mechanism can influence strategic attention. If AI systems determine which reports, risks, market signals, employee feedback, or knowledge resources receive priority, algorithmic curation can influence what organizational members perceive as urgent or strategically important.

Attention steering therefore has direct implications for management. Managerial attention is a scarce organizational resource, and the algorithmic prioritization of information may affect how managers identify problems, evaluate opportunities, and allocate organizational resources.

Cognitive Framing

The second mechanism is cognitive framing. AI does not simply select information; it can also influence the interpretive structure through which information is understood. LLMs, for example, generate responses that organize information through particular linguistic and conceptual associations. Such outputs may influence political interpretation, moral perception, identity formation, and epistemological orientation.

Bender et al. (2021) characterize large language models as systems that probabilistically link words without genuine understanding. Nevertheless, the outputs of these systems can possess an appearance of authority and may influence users' conceptual frameworks over time. This creates an important organizational implication: when managers or employees use AI-generated information to interpret organizational problems, the framing embedded in algorithmic outputs may influence how problems are defined before managerial judgment is applied.

Thus, cognitive framing can affect organizational sense-making by shaping not only what information is considered, but also how that information is interpreted. The theoretical significance is that AI-mediated organizational learning may involve a hidden interpretive layer in which algorithmic systems participate in constructing the cognitive frames through which organizational members understand events.

Emotional Amplification

The third mechanism is emotional amplification. Digital platforms can prioritize emotionally charged information because emotional intensity can increase engagement. The resulting informational environment may encourage political polarization, outrage amplification, informational instability, and increasing systemic entropy (S).

Within IRT, the circulation of emotionally amplified and distorted information increases informational disorder. As entropy increases, the quality of collective discourse can decline and the formation of coherent collective consciousness becomes more difficult. Weidinger et al. (2022) identify misinformation harms and erosion of trust in shared information among the significant risks associated with language models.

The organizational relevance is substantial. Organizational communication can become fragmented when emotionally salient information receives disproportionate attention. Employees may respond more strongly to highly engaging information than to information that

is strategically important but less emotionally stimulating. Consequently, managers face the challenge of preventing algorithmic engagement mechanisms from replacing organizational priorities as the primary determinant of attention.

Recursive Co-Evolutionary Feedback

The fourth mechanism is **recursive co-evolutionary feedback**. Unlike a simple one-way model in which AI influences human users, the relationship is conceptualized as cyclical:

Consciousness → Behavior → Data → AI Training → Algorithmic Output → Consciousness

Human consciousness influenced by AI produces behavioral data, while those data subsequently contribute to the development and adaptation of AI systems. The resulting algorithmic outputs then influence human consciousness again.

This feedback mechanism has particular importance for organizations because organizational behavior itself can become part of the informational inputs through which AI systems adapt. Employee interactions, managerial decisions, search behavior, communication patterns, and usage patterns can contribute to organizational AI systems and subsequently influence future information environments.

The relationship is therefore not unidirectional. Humans remain active participants in the system, but the article identifies a major asymmetry because AI systems operate at computational speeds and scales that exceed human cognitive capacities. Algorithms can adapt to human psychology faster than humans can understand the mechanisms shaping their informational environments.

AI as an Amplifier of Organizational Capability

The fourth finding concerns the dual role of AI as both an amplifier of informational capability and a potential generator of systemic entropy. Under favorable conditions, AI can enhance knowledge accessibility, accelerate learning, increase intellectual productivity, support scientific collaboration, and strengthen coordination. In systemic terms, AI functions as an amplifier of Information (I).

For organizations, this amplification can support faster knowledge discovery, more efficient information processing, improved decision support, and broader access to organizational knowledge. When AI systems prioritize accuracy, diversity of perspectives, and transparency, increased informational capacity can contribute to organizational learning and collective problem-solving.

The theoretical implication is that AI adoption can create significant organizational value, but this value cannot be evaluated solely through technological performance or information-processing speed. The organizational benefit of AI depends on whether increased Information (I) can be transformed into meaningful collective understanding and adaptive organizational action.

This finding extends conventional technology-oriented approaches to management by positioning AI as part of the organizational cognitive environment. AI does not merely increase the amount of information available to managers; it can influence how organizational members learn from that information and how they construct shared interpretations of organizational conditions.

AI as a Generator of Organizational Entropy

The fifth finding is that the same AI systems capable of amplifying organizational information can also generate systemic entropy (S). The article identifies misinformation and disinformation, algorithmic bias, epistemic fragmentation, echo chambers and filter bubbles, deepfakes and synthetic media, cognitive overload, and behavioral manipulation as major sources of increasing entropy.

The central theoretical proposition is that if entropy increases faster than consciousness evolves, collective awareness becomes unstable and socially fragmented. AI can generate and distribute distorted information at a speed that exceeds the ability of human institutions to verify and correct it. This creates a civilizational paradox in which AI simultaneously amplifies signal and noise, truth and falsehood, coherence and fragmentation.

Applied to organizations, this suggests that greater information volume does not necessarily produce better organizational intelligence. An organization may possess increasingly sophisticated AI systems while simultaneously experiencing cognitive overload, fragmented interpretations, biased information flows, or declining trust in organizational knowledge. The managerial implication is therefore that AI implementation must be evaluated in relation to organizational entropy. Managers need to consider not only whether AI increases informational capacity, but whether the resulting information environment improves or undermines collective understanding.

Algorithmic Mediation and Organizational Learning

The sixth finding is that AI-mediated information architectures have direct theoretical relevance to organizational learning. Conventional knowledge management emphasizes the acquisition, creation, storage, and dissemination of organizational knowledge, while organizational learning depends on the ability of organizational members to interpret information and develop shared understanding.

Within the extended IRT framework, organizational learning can be conceptualized as a process in which Information (I) is transformed into collective Consciousness (C) while organizational Entropy (S) is managed. This means that learning effectiveness depends not simply on how much information an organization possesses but on whether information can be converted into shared meaning and purposeful action.

AI changes this process because algorithmic systems increasingly participate in information selection, prioritization, and interpretation. Consequently, organizational learning becomes partly dependent on the architecture through which information is mediated. If algorithmic systems promote diverse, accurate, and contextually relevant information, they may reduce informational barriers and accelerate learning. If they amplify bias, fragmentation, or misinformation, they may increase organizational entropy and constrain learning.

This finding establishes a direct conceptual connection between AMC and management. Organizational learning becomes a key mechanism through which AI-mediated information can either strengthen or weaken organizational adaptation.

Collective Sense-Making and Strategic Attention

The seventh finding concerns collective sense-making. Algorithmic mediation can influence what organizational members see, how they interpret information, and which issues receive collective attention. Attention steering and cognitive framing therefore operate together to influence the construction of organizational reality.

In this context, collective sense-making refers to the process through which organizational members develop shared interpretations of information and organizational conditions. AI-mediated systems may accelerate this process by providing rapid access to knowledge and analytical support. At the same time, they may constrain it when algorithmic outputs narrow the diversity of available perspectives or present particular interpretations as authoritative.

Strategic attention is similarly affected. When algorithmic systems rank or prioritize information, they participate in determining what managers perceive as significant. This means that managerial cognition is potentially influenced before formal decision-making begins. The strategic challenge is therefore not merely to use AI effectively but to ensure that algorithmic information architectures do not unintentionally determine organizational priorities.

Managerial Governance of Algorithmic Information Architectures

The eighth finding is that managerial governance becomes an essential component of organizational AI adoption. The article's theoretical extension suggests that managers have a dual responsibility: they must critically audit the algorithmic systems deployed within organizations and simultaneously cultivate organizational consciousness the capacity to reflect on the organization's information environment and correct course when algorithmic mediation distorts collective perception.

Four managerial governance principles emerge from this theoretical development.

First, algorithmic transparency is required so that organizational members can understand how information is curated and prioritized. Second, information diversity is necessary to reduce the possibility of organizational echo chambers and prevent narrow algorithmic environments from dominating collective interpretation. Third, feedback mechanisms should enable employees to challenge, correct, and contextualize algorithmic outputs. Fourth, human oversight remains necessary so that algorithmic recommendations are interpreted through ethical and strategic judgment rather than accepted automatically.

These principles directly extend the IRT relationship between Information (I), Entropy (S), and Consciousness (C). Managers should seek to increase useful Information while controlling the Entropy generated by algorithmic systems and sustaining organizational Consciousness.

Cognitive Sovereignty and Organizational Governance

Table 2. Managerial Implications of Algorithmic Mediation of Consciousness

AMC Mechanism	Organizational Effect	Managerial Concern	Management Response
Attention Steering	Influences strategic attention and information priorities	Algorithmic prioritization may determine what managers and employees perceive as important	Algorithmic transparency and critical auditing
Cognitive Framing	Influences collective interpretation and sense-making	AI-generated framing may shape organizational judgments	Human oversight and contextual interpretation
Emotional Amplification	May increase informational instability and fragmentation	Emotionally salient information may disrupt	Information diversity and

		organizational communication	entropy management
Recursive Co-Evolutionary Feedback	Creates continuous interaction between organizational behavior, data, and AI outputs	Organizational behavior can reinforce existing algorithmic patterns	Employee feedback and continuous system evaluation

The ninth finding extends the concept of cognitive sovereignty into organizational environments. At the societal level, the article argues that excessive algorithmic personalization can make autonomous thinking fragile because individuals increasingly inhabit distinct informational realities. This can weaken shared understanding and collective deliberation.

The same theoretical problem can occur within organizations. If employees and managers receive highly personalized algorithmic information, different organizational members may develop different informational realities. This can complicate coordination, weaken shared organizational understanding, and make collective decision-making more difficult.

Cognitive sovereignty in organizations therefore refers to the capacity of organizational members to critically evaluate algorithmically mediated information rather than becoming entirely dependent on algorithmic prioritization. Organizational consciousness requires the ability to question how information is selected, what assumptions are embedded in algorithmic outputs, and whether those outputs remain consistent with organizational values and strategic objectives.

The IRT-Based Management Proposition

Taken together, the theoretical findings produce a management-oriented extension of IRT. The relationship can be expressed conceptually as:

AI → Information Architecture → Information (I) → Consciousness (C) → Organizational Learning → Collective Sense-Making → Managerial Action

while simultaneously:

AI → Entropy (S) → Fragmentation/Distortion → Weakened Collective Consciousness

The resulting proposition is that organizational performance in AI-mediated environments depends not simply on maximizing information-processing capacity but on maintaining an appropriate balance among Information (I), Entropy (S), and Consciousness (C).

The organization therefore becomes an important site in which Algorithmic Mediation of Consciousness can be examined. AI can amplify organizational intelligence when information is accurate, diverse, transparent, and subject to human judgment. Conversely, AI can amplify organizational entropy when information flows become fragmented, biased, emotionally manipulated, or excessively dependent on algorithmic prioritization.

This theoretical finding is consistent with the broader IRT proposition that civilization should not seek merely to maximize Information (I), but should maintain equilibrium between Information, Entropy, and Consciousness. In organizational terms, the equivalent objective is to create information ecosystems in which AI-supported information processing contributes to shared understanding, adaptive learning, ethical reflection, and purposeful action.

Theoretical Findings and Governance Context

The management implications are further supported by the governance frameworks discussed in the article. The OECD AI Principles, updated in May 2024, emphasize inclusive growth and

well-being, human rights and democratic values, transparency and explainability, robustness, security and safety, and accountability. The UNESCO Recommendation on the Ethics of AI emphasizes human rights, dignity, transparency, fairness, human oversight, and responsible data governance. The European Union AI Act, which entered into force on August 1, 2024, adopts a risk-based approach that prohibits certain unacceptable-risk practices and imposes obligations on high-risk AI systems.

For organizational management, these frameworks reinforce the importance of transparency, accountability, human oversight, and responsible AI implementation. They provide institutional foundations for governing the informational architectures through which AI increasingly participates in organizational decision-making and collective sense-making.

Conclusion

This article extends Integrated Reality Theory (IRT) by conceptualizing artificial intelligence as a structural mediator between information and consciousness through the framework of Algorithmic Mediation of Consciousness (AMC). The analysis identifies four interconnected mechanisms through which AI-mediated information architectures influence consciousness: attention steering, cognitive framing, emotional amplification, and recursive co-evolutionary feedback. AI can therefore function simultaneously as an amplifier of information and a generator of informational entropy. While AI can improve knowledge accessibility, learning, coordination, and adaptive capacity, algorithmic personalization, misinformation, bias, polarization, and cognitive overload may fragment collective understanding when entropy increases faster than the capacity for critical reflection. The extended IRT framework consequently emphasizes the importance of maintaining a constructive relationship between information, entropy, and consciousness in increasingly algorithmically mediated environments.

The findings also have important implications for organizational management, particularly organizational learning, collective sense-making, strategic attention, and managerial governance. Organizations increasingly operate within AI-mediated cognitive environments in which communication, knowledge discovery, and decision-making are shaped by algorithmic information architectures. Managers therefore need to ensure that AI-mediated information is transparent, diverse, contextualized, and subject to meaningful human oversight, while developing organizational capabilities to critically evaluate and correct algorithmic distortions. Beyond its implications for society and governance, Algorithmic Mediation of Consciousness suggests that future organizations will increasingly compete not only through capital, technology, or data, but through their capacity to transform information into collective understanding while minimizing entropy. Organizational success may therefore depend on leaders' ability to cultivate conscious information ecosystems capable of transforming algorithmically mediated information into collective understanding, adaptive learning, and ethical action. As this study is conceptual, future empirical research is needed to operationalize and test the proposed relationships across different organizational and institutional contexts.

References

- Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the dangers of stochastic parrots: Can language models be too big? *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 610–623. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3442188.3445922>
- Biswas, T. R., Hossain, M. Z., & Comite, U. (2024). Role of management information systems in enhancing decision-making in large-scale organizations. *Pacific Journal of*

- Bommasani, R., Hudson, D. A., Adeli, E., Altman, R., Arora, S., von Arx, S., Bernstein, M. S., Bohg, J., Bosselut, A., Brunskill, E., Brynjolfsson, E., Buch, S., Card, D., Castellon, R., Chatterji, N. S., Chen, A., Creel, K., Davis, J. Q., Demszky, D., ... Liang, P. (2021). *On the opportunities and risks of foundation models*. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.07258>
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Carr, N. (2010). *The shallows: What the Internet is doing to our brains*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Crawford, K. (2021). *Atlas of AI: Power, politics, and the planetary costs of artificial intelligence*. Yale University Press.
- Cristofaro, M., & Bañón-Gomis, A. J. (2026). Dancing with the algorithm: a framework to navigate knowledge and autonomy in AI-assisted managerial decisions. *Journal of Knowledge Management*, 30(11), 1-31. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JKM-06-2025-0870>
- Dignum, V. (2019). *Responsible artificial intelligence: How to develop and use AI in a responsible way*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-30371-6>
- Edwards, A. P., & Etzrodt, K. (2025). Being and becoming in human-machine communication: Core commitments and conceptual foundations of a trans-ontological field. *Human-Machine Communication*, 10(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.30658/hmc.10.1>
- European Union. (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 June 2024 laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). *Official Journal of the European Union*.
- Farivar, F., Klarin, A., & Kanani-moghadam, V. (2026). Industry 5.0: A socio-technical system perspective on human agency and institutional legitimacy. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 32(4), 1168-1189. <https://doi.org/10.1017/jmo.2026.10095>
- Floridi, L. (2014). *The fourth revolution: How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford University Press.
- Hamdat, A., Ceskakusumadewi, B., Samalam, A. G., Rizal, M., & Lawalata, I. L. (2024). The impact of management information systems on decision-making efficiency. *Vifada Management and Digital Business*, 1(2), 56-74. <https://doi.org/10.70184/qpw1rq78>
- Haroon, M., Chhabra, A., Liu, X., Mohapatra, P., Shafiq, Z., & Wojcieszak, M. (2022). *YouTube, the great radicalizer? Auditing and mitigating ideological biases in YouTube recommendations*. arXiv. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.10666>
- Hera, A., Al Rian, A., Faruque, M. O., Sizan, M. M. H., Khan, N. A., Rahaman, M. A., & Ali, M. J. (2024). Leveraging information systems for strategic management: Enhancing decision-making and organizational performance. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 14(8), 1045-1061. <https://doi.org/10.4236/ajibm.2024.148054>
- Khan, I., Gul, M., & Shah, S. M. (2026). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence Adoption on Managerial Decision-Making Effectiveness. *Journal of Management Science Research Review*, 5(1), 1196-1218.

- Kim, D. H. (2024). Managerial practice fields: Infrastructures of a learning organization. In *Learning Organizations* (pp. 351-364). Productivity Press.
- Kramer, A. D. I., Guillory, J. E., & Hancock, J. T. (2014). Experimental evidence of massive-scale emotional contagion through social networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 111(24), 8788–8790. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1320040111>
- Lakatos, I. (1970). Falsification and the methodology of scientific research programmes. In I. Lakatos & A. Musgrave (Eds.), *Criticism and the growth of knowledge* (pp. 91–196). Cambridge University Press.
- McCombs, M. E., & Shaw, D. L. (1972). The agenda-setting function of mass media. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 36(2), 176–187. <https://doi.org/10.1086/267990>
- McLuhan, M. (1964). *Understanding media: The extensions of man*. McGraw-Hill.
- Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press.
- OECD. (2024). *OECD AI principles*. OECD Publishing. <https://oecd.ai/en/ai-principles>
- O'Neil, C. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. Crown Publishing.
- Pariser, E. (2011). *The filter bubble: What the Internet is hiding from you*. Penguin Press.
- Postman, N. (1985). *Amusing ourselves to death: Public discourse in the age of show business*. Viking.
- Russell, S. J. (2019). *Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control*. Viking Press.
- Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. Doubleday.
- Shoim, M. (2026). *Integrated Reality Theory (IRT): A processual-relational framework* [Conceptual monograph]. ADCENT Press.
- Sunstein, C. R. (2017). *#Republic: Divided democracy in the age of social media*. Princeton University Press.
- Susskind, D. (2020). *A world without work: Technology, automation, and how we should respond*. Metropolitan Books.
- Tufekci, Z. (2018, March 10). YouTube, the great radicalizer. *The New York Times*.
- Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together: Why we expect more from technology and less from each other*. Basic Books.
- UNESCO. (2021). *Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence*. UNESCO Publishing.
- Weidinger, L., Mellor, J., Rauh, M., Griffin, C., Uesato, J., Huang, P. S., Cheng, M., Glaese, A., McNamara, D., & Gabriel, I. (2022). Taxonomy of risks posed by language models. *Proceedings of the 2022 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, 214–229. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3531146.3533088>
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.