

DOI: 10.2478/doc-2026-0002

This is an open access article licensed under the Creative Commons AttributionNonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)

.....

Michał Szostak

Institute for Management Research, Civitas University, Warsaw, Poland

michal.szostak@civitas.edu.pl

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-7774-2964

.....

Algorithmic Kitsch: AI-Generated Writing as Aesthetic Simulation in Managerial Practice

.....

Article history:

Received **21 March 2026**

Revised **20 April 2026**

Accepted **22 April 2026**

Available online **23 June 2026**

Abstract: The proliferation of generative artificial intelligence (AI) in managerial practice has introduced a new paradigm of organisational writing that is fluent,

coherent, and rhetorically effective, yet increasingly detached from human intentionality and lived experience. This article conceptualises this phenomenon as algorithmic kitsch, defined as AI-generated discourse that simulates meaning through aesthetic coherence and persuasive form while lacking epistemic depth and authentic subjectivity. Drawing on theories of kitsch from aesthetic philosophy and their extension into management studies, the paper situates AI-generated texts within a broader trajectory of organisational communication characterised by standardisation, emotional templating, and symbolic overproduction. It argues that generative AI does not merely assist managerial writing but intensifies pre-existing tendencies toward aesthetic simplification and rhetorical cliché, thereby transforming argumentation into a form of patterned plausibility. The article outlines the mechanisms of algorithmic kitsch (i.e., aesthetic smoothing, semantic flattening, and affective pre-structuring) and discusses their implications for epistemic integrity, ethical responsibility, and the erosion of authentic managerial voice. From a humanistic management perspective, the paper calls for greater consciousness in the use of AI-generated texts and renewed attention to aesthetic literacy and critical reflexivity in AI-mediated managerial communication practices.

Keywords: management aesthetics, algorithmic kitsch, AI-mediated organisational communication, human-AI authorship, organisational discourse standardisation

Introduction

The diffusion of generative AI has significantly transformed writing practices across professional, academic, and organisational contexts. These AI-powered tools can produce texts that are grammatically correct, stylistically consistent, and rhetorically persuasive, often indistinguishable from those authored by humans at first glance. This technological shift raises fundamental questions about the nature of writing, authorship, and meaning-making in contemporary organisations. As scholars increasingly note, AI-generated discourse challenges not only technical aspects of communication but also its epistemological and ethical foundations (Bender et al., 2021; Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020).

Within management and organisational studies, communicating (including in writing) is not merely a neutral process for transmitting information and gaining feedback; it constitutes a central mechanism of organising, sensemaking, and leadership. Managerial texts (strategies, reports, mission statements, or ESG disclosures) perform symbolic and aesthetic functions, shaping how organisations are perceived and how meaning is constructed internally and externally (Barry & Elmes, 1997; Boje, 2001). From the perspective of management aesthetics, such texts can be understood as aesthetic artefacts that embody particular forms, styles, and sensibilities (Strati, 1999). Consequently, the increasing reliance on AI in producing these texts invites a critical examination not only of their functionality but also of their aesthetic and cultural qualities.

One particularly useful lens for analysing this transformation is the concept of kitsch. Traditionally associated with mass-produced art characterised by imitation, emotional simplification, and lack of originality, kitsch has been extensively discussed in aesthetic theory as a form of cultural expression that privileges immediacy and accessibility over depth and authenticity (Greenberg, 1985; Kulka, 1996; Scruton, 2011). More recent developments have extended the notion of kitsch into organisational contexts, where it captures forms of communication that are formulaic, emotionally appealing, yet substantively shallow and often evident in corporate narratives, branding, or managerial rhetoric (Kostera, 1997; Linstead, 2002; Linstead & Höpfl, 2000; Szostak, 2021, 2024a, 2024b, 2025). In this sense, kitsch is not merely a stylistic category but a mode of meaning production that reflects broader cultural and institutional dynamics.

Generative AI appears to amplify precisely those characteristics that define kitsch. By design, large language models operate through probabilistic pattern recognition, generating text based on statistical regularities in vast corpora of existing language. As a result, the outputs they produce tend toward aesthetic coherence, fluency, and familiarity, often relying on widely recognisable rhetorical structures and stylistic conventions (Bender et al., 2021). While this enables efficiency and accessibility, it also raises concerns about the standardisation and homogenisation of discourse, as well as the potential erosion of originality and critical depth (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020).

In organisational settings, this may lead to the proliferation of texts that are persuasive in form but limited in substantive insight, which can be interpreted as a new, technologically mediated form of kitsch (Szostak, 2025). Also, critical aesthetic discourse on the role of AI in managerial and humanistic settings is still limited but growing (Szostak, 2026b, 2026a, 2026c).

This article analyses the concept of *algorithmic kitsch*, capturing its emerging phenomenon. Algorithmic kitsch refers to AI-generated results (writing in our case) that simulate meaning through aesthetic and rhetorical optimisation while remaining detached from authentic experience, intentionality, and reflexive understanding. By synthesising insights from aesthetic theory and management studies, with AI implementation, the paper aims to provide a conceptual framework for analysing the aesthetic and epistemic implications of AI-generated managerial written discourse as a crucial component of managerial communication. In doing so, it contributes to debates on authorship, authenticity, and the role of technology in shaping contemporary cultures of writing (Putri et al., 2025).

Method

This article adopts a conceptual and theory-building approach, situated within interpretive management research and informed by aesthetic philosophy. Its primary aim is to develop and refine the concept of *algorithmic kitsch* as a lens for understanding AI-generated managerial writing. The methodology integrates three strands of analysis: (1) a theoretical synthesis of literature on kitsch, management aesthetics, and AI-generated discourse (key monographs in the field and articles in English from databases: Google Scholar, Mendeley, Scopus, Web of Science); (2) conceptual abstraction, through which core attributes and mechanisms of algorithmic kitsch are identified; and (3) the construction of an analytical model that enables systematic comparison between different modes of writing (from sole human to sole AI-generated).

The analysis is guided by three research questions: (RQ1) How can AI-generated managerial and organisational written communication be

conceptualised through the phenomenon of *kitsch*? (RQ2) What aesthetic mechanisms underpin algorithmic kitsch in managerial and organisational communication? (RQ3) What are the epistemic implications of adopting AI-generated written communication in managerial practice?

Theoretical framework

Aesthetic insights into kitsch, management, and communication

The concept of *kitsch* has long occupied a central place in aesthetic theory as a category describing cultural artefacts that privilege accessibility, emotional immediacy, and formal familiarity over originality and critical depth. Classical accounts emphasise that kitsch operates through *simplification*, reducing complex realities to easily consumable forms, while offering *immediate emotional gratification* without requiring interpretive effort (Greenberg, 1985; Scruton, 2011). Its reproducibility (the capacity to replicate established aesthetic patterns) further reinforces its appeal, yet simultaneously contributes to a *lack of critical depth*, as meaning is pre-packaged rather than discovered. In this sense, kitsch does not merely imitate art but simulates its effects, producing a semblance of significance detached from authentic experience (Ryynänen & Barragán, 2023).

These characteristics are highly relevant in the context of *management aesthetics*, which conceptualises organisations as inherently *aesthetic systems* shaped by symbols, narratives, and sensory forms (Strati, 1999; Szostak, 2024a). Organisational communication (ranging from mission statements to strategic reports) can be understood as an *aesthetic artefact*, crafted to convey coherence, legitimacy, and emotional resonance (Barry & Elmes, 1997). Moreover, managerial language functions performatively, not only describing reality but actively constructing it through rhetorical and symbolic means (Boje, 2001). Within such contexts, kitsch emerges when communication becomes overly formulaic, emotionally stylised, and detached from substantive organisational practices (Hertzberg, 2017), resulting in what may be termed *aestheticised managerialism*.

The rise of AI-generated discourse intensifies these tendencies. Large language models operate through pattern-based generation, producing text by identifying and recombining statistical regularities in vast datasets (Bender et al., 2021). Consequently, their outputs prioritise *statistical plausibility* over *truth*, generating statements that are likely to be accepted as coherent rather than grounded in situated knowledge (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020). At the same time, these systems are optimised for *readability* and *persuasion*, favouring clarity, fluency, and rhetorical balance. While such qualities enhance communicative efficiency, they also align closely with the defining features of kitsch: smoothness, familiarity, and emotional accessibility without epistemic depth (Szostak, 2025).

Taken together, these perspectives suggest that contemporary managerial practices are increasingly susceptible to forms of communication that can be described as kitsch-like, particularly when mediated by AI. The convergence of aesthetic simplification, performative language, and algorithmic generation creates conditions in which discourse may appear meaningful and authoritative while remaining largely simulated. This underscores the need for a critical, aesthetic analysis of managerial communication (including writing) in the age of AI.

AI-generated writing communication in managerial practice

The integration of generative AI into managerial communication practices is rapidly transforming how organisations produce, circulate, and interpret written texts. In contemporary organisations, AI-supported tools are increasingly used to generate a wide range of documents, including strategic reports, policy documents, internal emails, marketing content, ESG disclosures, performance evaluations, and stakeholder communications. These text types are not merely operational artefacts; they play a central role in shaping organisational identity, legitimising decisions, and constructing narratives of value and responsibility (Barry & Elmes, 1997; Christensen et al., 2013). The adoption of AI in producing such texts thus represents not only a technological shift but also a transformation in the cultural and symbolic dimensions of managerial practice.

A defining feature of AI-generated writing is its *fluency* and *coherence*. Large language models are designed to produce text that is grammatically correct, logically structured, and stylistically consistent, often exceeding human performance in terms of speed and surface-level clarity (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020). This fluency contributes to the perception of professionalism and competence in organisational communication, particularly in contexts where clarity and standardisation are valued. Additionally, AI-generated texts typically exhibit a *neutral and balanced tone*, avoiding strong emotional expressions or controversial positions. This neutrality can be advantageous in formal communication settings, such as corporate reporting or stakeholder engagement, where consistency and diplomatic language are required.

However, these same properties also introduce significant risks. One of the most pressing concerns is the *over-standardisation of discourse*. Because AI systems generate text based on patterns learned from large datasets, they tend to reproduce dominant linguistic conventions and rhetorical structures. As a result, organisational communication may become increasingly homogenised, with different companies producing texts that are stylistically and conceptually similar. This phenomenon aligns with broader concerns about institutional isomorphism, where organisations adopt similar practices and narratives to gain legitimacy (DiMaggio & Powell, 1983). In the context of AI-generated writing, such isomorphism is not only institutional but also *algorithmic*, driven by shared training data and optimisation processes.

Moreover, the reliance on AI may lead to a subtle shift from *meaning-making* to *text production*. Writing, traditionally understood as a cognitive and reflective process, risks being reduced to the generation and editing of pre-structured outputs. Large language models function as “stochastic parrots”, producing plausible word sequences without understanding their meaning (Bender et al., 2021). This raises concerns about the epistemic quality of managerial texts, particularly when AI-generated content is accepted uncritically as authoritative or insightful (Kingery-Page & Hahn, 2012). In ESG communication, for instance, the use of AI may amplify the production of rhetorically polished but substantively vague narratives, potentially reinforcing practices of symbolic compliance or *greenwashing* (Christensen et al., 2013).

At the same time, AI-generated writing reshapes managers' roles as communicators. Rather than crafting texts from scratch, managers increasingly act as editors, curators, and prompt designers, guiding AI systems to produce desired outputs. This shift has implications for authorship and responsibility, as the boundaries between human and machine contributions become blurred. It also places new demands on managerial competencies, including the ability to evaluate AI-generated content critically and to maintain coherence between organisational discourse and actual practices. While AI-generated writing offers clear benefits in terms of efficiency and consistency, it also introduces risks related to standardisation, epistemic shallowness, and the erosion of authentic organisational voice. These tensions highlight the need for a more critical and reflexive approach to the use of AI in managerial communication.

Results

The results are presented in the following order: (1) development of the algorithmic kitsch concept, (2) presentation of a selection of algorithmic kitsch mechanisms, (3) description of aesthetic effects of algorithmic kitsch, and (4) development of an analytic model of "AI-supported managerial written communication: From authentic expression to algorithmic kitsch".

Algorithmic kitsch concept

This section develops the concept of *algorithmic kitsch* as a theoretical construct capturing the aesthetic and epistemic qualities of AI-generated managerial discourse. Building on classical notions of kitsch and contemporary analyses of AI-generated text, *algorithmic kitsch* may be defined as "a mode of discourse produced by generative AI that achieves aesthetic coherence, rhetorical persuasiveness, and emotional accessibility through pattern-based generation, while lacking epistemic depth, originality, and authentic intentionality".

This definition positions algorithmic kitsch at the intersection of aesthetic theory and computational linguistics. Like traditional kitsch, it operates through

recognisable forms, simplified meanings, and emotional immediacy (Greenberg, 1985; Hoberman, 2005; Kulka, 1996). However, unlike earlier forms, it is generated not solely by human imitation but by algorithmic recombination of large-scale textual patterns derived from training datasets. In this sense, algorithmic kitsch represents a *technologically mediated intensification of pre-existing tendencies* in organisational communication.

Mechanisms of algorithmic kitsch

We can identify three underlying mechanisms that explain how algorithmic kitsch is produced in managerial writing contexts: (1) dataset-derived clichés, (2) optimisation for readability and persuasion, and (3) removal of friction and ambiguity.

Dataset-derived clichés. Generative AI systems rely on statistical regularities extracted from vast corpora of existing texts. Consequently, AI-generated texts tend to privilege high-frequency phrases, conventional structures, and culturally dominant rhetorical templates. In managerial communication, this results in the proliferation of familiar expressions (such as “driving innovation”, “creating stakeholder value”, or “committed to sustainability”) which, while rhetorically effective, often lack specificity and originality. These dataset-derived clichés are not incidental but structurally embedded in the generative process, reinforcing the aesthetic logic of kitsch as repetition and imitation.

Optimisation for readability and persuasion. A second mechanism is the optimisation of outputs for clarity, fluency, and persuasive balance. Large language models are trained and fine-tuned to produce text that is easily interpretable and contextually appropriate, often avoiding ambiguity, contradiction, or stylistic irregularity (Floridi & Chiriatti, 2020). This results in discourse that is smooth, coherent, and rhetorically aligned with audience expectations, particularly in formal organisational contexts. However, this optimisation also reduces the presence of tension, uncertainty, and critical nuance, which are central to reflective thinking and meaningful argumentation. In this way, algorithmic kitsch transforms writing into a form of *aesthetic*

optimisation, in which communicative success is measured by plausibility and acceptability rather than by truth or insight.

Removal of friction and ambiguity. The third mechanism involves systematically removing cognitive and semantic friction. Human writing often reflects the complexity of thought, including hesitations, contradictions, and unresolved questions. In contrast, AI-generated text tends to eliminate such features, producing outputs that are internally consistent and free of ambiguity. While this enhances readability, it also flattens interpretive space, suppressing alternative meanings and critical perspectives. As a result, discourse becomes less dialogical and more monological, described as “aspirational talk”; language that signals intent without engaging with underlying complexities (Christensen et al., 2013).

Aesthetic effects of algorithmic kitsch

These mechanisms of algorithmic kitsch give rise to three interrelated aesthetic effects that define algorithmic kitsch in practice: (1) aesthetic smoothing (removal of tension), (2) emotional templating (predictable affect), and (3) semantic flattening (loss of depth).

Aesthetic smoothing (removal of tension). AI-generated texts exhibit a high degree of formal polish and internal coherence, often eliminating contradictions, dissonance, or stylistic irregularities. This *aesthetic smoothing* creates an impression of clarity and professionalism but reduces the presence of productive tension that is essential for critical reflection and innovation.

Emotional templating (predictable affect). Algorithmic kitsch relies on standardised emotional cues, producing texts that are affectively calibrated but emotionally predictable. This aligns with the logic of kitsch as immediate emotional gratification (Ortlieb & Carbon, 2019a, 2019b), yet in AI-generated discourse, such affect is not experienced but simulated through learned patterns.

Semantic flattening (loss of depth). Algorithmic kitsch leads to semantic flattening, where complex ideas are reduced to generalised, non-specific formulations. This diminishes the epistemic richness of discourse, replacing nuanced argumentation with broadly acceptable statements. As a result,

meaning is not explored but pre-structured and stabilised, limiting the potential for genuine knowledge creation.

Model: From authentic expression to algorithmic kitsch

The tool that can help identify the communication in the field of interaction between *authentic expression* and *algorithmic kitsch* is the analytical model presented in Table 1. The model is conceptualised as a continuum across five dimensions: (1) source of meaning (lived experience versus pattern replication), (2) voice (subjective versus simulated), (3) argumentation (reflective versus pre-structured), (4) aesthetics (expressive versus smooth and formulaic), and (5) ethics (responsibility-bearing versus responsibility-diffused). This model serves as a heuristic framework for interpreting how AI reshapes managerial discourse and for locating hybrid human-AI writing practices between authenticity and simulation.

Table 1. An analytical model of AI-supported managerial written communication: From authentic expression to algorithmic kitsch

<i>Dimension</i>	<i>Humanistic Writing</i>	<i>Hybrid (Human-AI)</i>	<i>Algorithmic Kitsch</i>
<i>Source of meaning</i>	Lived experience	Co-constructed	Pattern replication
<i>Voice</i>	Situated, subjective	Blended	Simulated
<i>Argumentation</i>	Reflective, effortful	Assisted	Pre-structured
<i>Aesthetics</i>	Expressive, sometimes imperfect	Polished	Smooth, formulaic
<i>Ethics</i>	Responsibility-bearing	Diffused	Displaced

Source: Author’s elaboration.

Discussion

The concept of algorithmic kitsch, as developed in this study, has significant implications for managerial practice and organisational functioning. These implications unfold across epistemic, ethical, and aesthetic dimensions, each revealing tensions introduced by the integration of AI-generated writing into managerial communication.

Implications for managerial communication

Epistemic implications. One of the most profound consequences of algorithmic kitsch is the *illusion of knowledge production*. AI-generated texts often exhibit high levels of coherence, fluency, and rhetorical completeness, which may create the impression of well-developed reasoning and insight. However, such systems generate texts based on statistical associations rather than genuine understanding (Bender et al., 2021). This leads to a situation in which *plausibility* is mistaken for *knowledge*, and *surface-level coherence* substitutes for *epistemic depth*. In managerial contexts, this may result in decisions being supported by texts that appear analytically robust but are, in fact, epistemically shallow or derivative. Moreover, the thoughtless, unconscious reliance on AI-powered tools contributes to the replacement of *thinking* with *prompting*, where the cognitive effort traditionally associated with writing is displaced by the technical skill of generating and refining prompts. Writing, instead of being a process of *reflection* and *sensemaking*, risks becoming a process of *selecting* and *validating* pre-generated content, thereby weakening the epistemic foundations of managerial practice.

Ethical implications. Algorithmic kitsch also introduces complex ethical challenges, particularly concerning responsibility and authorship. As AI systems become co-producers of organisational discourse, responsibility for the content becomes increasingly diffused. Managers may rely on AI-generated outputs while simultaneously distancing themselves from their authorship, leading to ambiguity regarding accountability for decisions, claims, or representations embedded in the text. This raises the fundamental question:

“Who speaks?”. If organisational texts are generated through algorithmic processes, the traditional notion of a responsible author is destabilised. This issue is particularly salient in areas such as ESG communication, where organisations are expected to demonstrate ethical commitment and transparency. When such narratives are partially or wholly AI-generated, there is a risk that ethical expression becomes *performative* rather than *substantive*, aligning with the notion of “aspirational talk” (Christensen et al., 2013). In this context, algorithmic kitsch may obscure the distinction between genuine commitment and symbolic representation.

Aesthetic implications. From an aesthetic perspective, the proliferation of AI-generated writing contributes to the dominance of *polished but empty* discourse. The mechanisms identified earlier (aesthetic smoothing, emotional templating, or semantic flattening) result in texts that are formally appealing yet lacking in tension, ambiguity, and depth. Such discourse aligns with the characteristics of kitsch as described in aesthetic theory: immediate, accessible, and emotionally resonant, yet ultimately superficial (Greenberg, 1985; Kulka, 1996).

At the organisational level, this may lead to the emergence of *simulacra*—representations that no longer refer to underlying realities but instead circulate as self-contained signs (Baudrillard, 1994). Managerial texts, particularly those generated or heavily supported by AI, risk becoming self-referential narratives of coherence and value, disconnected from actual practices and experiences. This aestheticisation of communication reinforces a form of organisational hyperreality, in which meaning is not constructed through *engagement with reality* but through the *reproduction of credible-looking discourse*.

Humanistic management perspective

In response to these challenges, a humanistic management perspective offers a critical corrective by reintroducing the centrality of dignity, authenticity, and responsibility in managerial practice (Pirson, 2017; Szostak, 2023). Humanistic management emphasises the role of the human actor as a moral and reflective agent, capable of meaning-making that goes beyond instrumental rationality and technical efficiency.

First, the principle of *dignity* calls for recognising the human subject not merely as a user of AI tools but as a bearer of intrinsic value and interpretive capacity. This implies that managerial communication should not be reduced to *optimised outputs* but should reflect *genuine engagement* with meaning, context, and consequence.

Second, *authenticity* becomes a critical aesthetic and ethical criterion. In contrast to algorithmic kitsch, which simulates expression through pattern replication, authentic managerial writing involves situated voice, intentionality, and experiential grounding (Nañola et al., 2025). Maintaining authenticity in AI-mediated contexts requires conscious effort to ensure that texts are not only coherent but also truthful representations of organisational realities.

Third, *responsibility* must be reaffirmed in the face of distributed authorship. Even when AI systems generate content, managers remain accountable for the messages conveyed and the decisions supported by such texts. This necessitates a shift from passive reliance on AI outputs to active critical evaluation and ethical stewardship.

Within this framework, the role of the human actor shifts from mere *editor* of AI-generated text to *curator of meaning*. This entails selecting, interpreting, contextualising, and, when necessary, resisting AI-generated suggestions in order to preserve the integrity of organisational discourse. The human manager thus becomes responsible not only for the content of communication but also for its aesthetic and ethical quality.

Conclusions

Answering RQ1 (How can AI-generated managerial and organisational written communication be conceptualised through the phenomenon of kitsch?), it can be said that AI-generated managerial and organisational written communication can be conceptualised as a form of kitsch insofar as it reproduces the defining characteristics of this aesthetic category: simplification, emotional immediacy, reproducibility, and lack of critical depth. However, the study demonstrates that AI does not merely replicate existing forms of kitsch but industrialises

and systematises them. Generative AI produces discourse that simulates meaning, coherence, and intentionality without grounding in lived experience or reflective cognition. Algorithmic kitsch thus represents a technologically mediated intensification of aestheticised managerial communication, where plausibility and fluency replace authenticity and epistemic engagement.

Answering RQ2 (What aesthetic mechanisms underpin algorithmic kitsch in managerial and organisational communication?), it can be stated that there are at least three mechanisms underpinning algorithmic kitsch in managerial communication: (a) dataset-derived clichés, (b) optimisation for readability and persuasion, and (c) the removal of friction and ambiguity. These mechanisms give rise to three corresponding aesthetic effects: (a) aesthetic smoothing, (b) emotional templating, and (c) semantic flattening. The produced texts are rhetorically effective yet structurally predictable and epistemically shallow. The analytical model developed in this study (from authentic expression to algorithmic kitsch) demonstrates how AI-mediated communication shifts managerial discourse toward simulation, standardisation, and aesthetic optimisation. This framework offers a tool for diagnosing the extent to which organisational communication retains authentic expressive qualities or is subsumed by algorithmic reproduction.

Answering RQ3 (What are the epistemic implications of adopting AI-generated written communication in managerial practice?), it can be said that the epistemic implications of adopting AI-generated writing in managerial practice are substantial. The findings highlight the emergence of an illusion of knowledge production, where fluency and coherence create the appearance of insight without substantive understanding. This is accompanied by a shift from thinking to prompting, in which the cognitive and reflective dimensions of writing are displaced by procedural interaction with AI systems. As a result, managerial communication risks losing its function as a site of sensemaking and becoming a mechanism of textual production and validation. This shift has profound consequences for decision-making, organisational learning, and the integrity of knowledge processes.

Despite its contributions, this study has several *limitations*: (1) it is conceptual in nature and does not include empirical validation of the proposed framework;

while the theoretical synthesis provides analytical clarity, future studies should test the concept of algorithmic kitsch through qualitative or quantitative analyses of real organisational texts; (2) the study focuses primarily on written communication, leaving aside other forms of AI-mediated expression (e.g., visual or multimodal content) that may exhibit similar dynamics; (3) the analysis is largely grounded in Western aesthetic and management traditions, which may limit its applicability across different cultural contexts; (4) the evolving nature of AI technologies means that the characteristics of algorithmic kitsch may shift as models become more advanced and context-aware.

These limitations open several avenues for *future research*: (1) empirical studies could investigate the presence of algorithmic kitsch in specific domains, such as ESG reporting, corporate communication, or academic writing, using discourse analysis or corpus linguistics methods; (2) comparative studies between human-authored, AI-assisted, and fully AI-generated texts could further refine the proposed continuum model; (3) another promising direction involves exploring the perception of algorithmic kitsch among stakeholders, including employees, managers, and external audiences, to assess its impact on trust, legitimacy, and organisational identity; (4) interdisciplinary research could examine how algorithmic kitsch interacts with broader phenomena such as digital capitalism, platformisation, and the commodification of language; (5) future research should also engage more deeply with the principles of humanistic management, particularly in developing frameworks for maintaining authenticity, dignity, and responsibility in AI-mediated communication, including exploring educational and organisational interventions that enhance aesthetic literacy and critical reflexivity, enabling managers to navigate the tensions between efficiency and meaning.

References

Barry, D., & Elmes, M. (1997). Strategy Retold: Toward a Narrative View of Strategic Discourse. *Academy of Management Review*, 22(2), 429–452. DOI: 10.5465/amr.1997.9707154065.

Baudrillard, J. (1994). *Simulacra and Simulation*. University of Michigan Press.

Bender, E. M., Gebru, T., McMillan-Major, A., & Shmitchell, S. (2021). On the Dangers of Stochastic Parrots: Can Language Models Be Too Big? . In: *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency* (pp. 610–623). DOI: 10.1145/3442188.3445922.

Boje, D. (2001). *Narrative Methods for Organizational & Communication Research*. SAGE Publications, Ltd.

Christensen, L. T., Morsing, M., & Thyssen, O. (2013). CSR as aspirational talk. *Organization*, 20(3), 372–393. DOI: 10.1177/1350508413478310.

DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The Iron Cage Revisited: Institutional Isomorphism and Collective Rationality in Organizational Fields. *American Sociological Review*, 48(2), 147. DOI: 10.2307/2095101.

Floridi, L., & Chiriatti, M. (2020). GPT-3: Its Nature, Scope, Limits, and Consequences. *Minds and Machines*, 30(4), 681–694. DOI: 10.1007/s11023-020-09548-1.

Greenberg, C. (1985). Avant-garde and Kitsch. In: F. Frascina (Ed.), *Pollock and After: The Critical Debate*. Harper and Row.

Hertzberg, J. (2017). AI, Kitsch, and Communication. *KI–Künstliche Intelligenz*, 31(4), 313–315. DOI: 10.1007/s13218-017-0508-6.

Hoberman, R. (2005). Aesthetic Taste, Kitsch, and the Years. In: *Woolf Studies Annual* (Vol. 11, Issue 77, pp. 77–98). Pace University Press.

Kingery-Page, K., & Hahn, H. (2012). The aesthetics of digital representation: realism, abstraction and kitsch. *Journal of Landscape Architecture*, 7(2), 68–75. DOI: 10.1080/18626033.2012.746091.

Kostera, M. (1997). The Kitsch-Organisation. *Studies in Cultures, Organizations, and Societies*, 3(2), 163–177. DOI: 10.1080/10245289708523494.

Kulka, T. (1996). *Kitsch and Art*. Pennsylvania State University Press.

Linstead, S. (2002). Organizational kitsch. The Aesthetic Turn in Management. *Organization*, 9(4), 657–682. DOI: 10.4324/9781351147965-4.

Linstead, S., & Höpfl, H. J. (2000). *The Aesthetics of Organization*. SAGE Publications.

Nañola, E. L., Arroyo, R. G. L., Hermosura, N. J. T., Ragil, M., Sabanal, J. N. U., & Mendoza, H. B. (2025). Recognizing the artificial: A comparative voice analysis of AI-Generated and L2 undergraduate student-authored academic essays. *System*, 130, 103611. DOI: 10.1016/j.system.2025.103611.

Ortlieb, S. A., & Carbon, C. C. (2019a). A functional model of kitsch and art: Linking aesthetic appreciation to the dynamics of social motivation. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(2437), 1–17. DOI: 10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02437.

Ortlieb, S. A., & Carbon, C. C. (2019b). Kitsch and perception: Towards a new “aesthetic from below”. *Art and Perception*, 7(1), 1–26. DOI: 10.1163/22134913-00001091.

Pirson, M. (2017). *Humanistic Management. Protecting Dignity and Promoting Well-being*. Cambridge University Press.

Putri, H., Susilo, D., Munandar, E., Yasin, H., & Atmaja, I. (2025). The Algorithmic Gaze: Deconstructing Authorship and Aesthetics in Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) Art. *Enigma in Cultural*, 3(1), 55–66. DOI: 10.61996/cultural.v3i1.106.

Ryynänen, M., & Barragán, P. (Eds.) (2023). *The Changing Meaning of Kitsch. From Rejection to Acceptance*. Palgrave Macmillan Cham.

Scruton, R. (2011). *Beauty: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press.

Strati, A. (1999). *Organization and Aesthetics*. SAGE Publications Ltd.

Szostak, M. (2021). Artistry, Management, and Creativity: Links and Common Denominators. *Discourses on Culture*, 16(1), 23–54. DOI: 10.36145/DoC2021.08.

Szostak, M. (2023). Reflexivity in aesthetic situation management. *Discourses on Culture*, 20, 161–197. DOI: 10.2478/doc-2023-0015.

Szostak, M. (2024a). *Humanistic Management, Organisation and Aesthetics: Art of Management and Management of Art*. Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781003458029.

Szostak, M. (Ed.) (2024b). *Non-Artistic Kitsch*. Palgrave Macmillan. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-031-72237-0.

Szostak, M. (Ed.) (2025). *Management Aesthetics. Kitsch and Modern Organisations*. Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781003504931.

Szostak, M. (Ed.) (2026a). *AI and Humanistic Management: Aesthetics in Managerial Theory and Practice*. Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781003654377.

Szostak, M. (Ed.) (2026b). *Organizations, Humanism and AI: An Aesthetics Approach*. Routledge. DOI: 10.4324/9781003662723.

Szostak, M. (Ed.) (2026c). *Aesthetics of Human-AI Collaboration in Creative Activities: Art, Cultural Heritage, and Academic Research Practice*. Brill | mentis. DOI: 10.30965/9783969753460.