Generative Change Management

Foundational Concepts for Human-AI Hybrid Productivity in Organizations

Dr. Marcelo Manucci
ORCID: 0000-0002-9990-2316
August 2026 | DOI:10.5281/zenodo.22033562

Abstract

The incorporation of generative artificial intelligence (AI) is transforming everyday work well beyond task automation. People increasingly work with systems capable of participating in analysis, creation, decision-making, and knowledge production. This transformation changes the professional relationship with AI, the organization of work, and the cultural frameworks through which organizations build relationships, distribute authority, recognize contributions, and produce meaning.

Generative Change Management (GChM) is proposed as a conceptual framework that grounds a methodological approach to three interdependent transformations resulting from the integration of human and AI capabilities: the redefinition of professional contribution, the design of new work architectures, and organizational coexistence with algorithmic intelligence. At the personal level, GChM addresses the relationship people establish with AI in developing their professional capabilities. At the operational level, it addresses hybrid production architectures that combine human capabilities with digital production units operating at different degrees of autonomy. At the cultural level, it addresses the development of hybrid organizational intelligence through new forms of symbolic-algorithmic linkage.

The GChM approach articulates analysis, design, and implementation as a core intervention cycle. Implementation generates experience that can be evaluated and converted into organizational learning, which then provides a basis for redesign. Through this recursive process, the integration of AI simultaneously transforms professional contribution, the organization of production, and the experience of belonging, trust, and cultural identification. GChM proposes that the articulation of these transformations can develop hybrid productivity as an organization-specific capability that is difficult to reproduce through access to technology alone.

Keywords: *Generative Change Management; hybrid productivity; hybrid competitiveness; expanded professional capability; attributional relationship; hybrid production architecture; digital production unit; agentic AI; hybrid organizational intelligence; symbolic-algorithmic linkage*.

1. Introduction

The adoption of artificial intelligence has reached unprecedented speed. According to the Artificial Intelligence Index Report 2026, 88% of organizations use AI and 70% use generative AI in at least one organizational function. The deployment of autonomous agents remains at an early stage. Productivity gains of up to 26% have been reported in technical tasks such as customer support and software development. Results are weaker and can even become negative in activities requiring a higher degree of human judgment (Sajadieh et al., 2026). In this context, the World Economic Forum (2026) estimates that only 15% of organizations use AI to fundamentally redesign work.

The gap between technology adoption and organizational transformation defines the contemporary problem this framework addresses. An AI tool can accelerate a specific task without changing the way people work. Organizations can increase production volume without improving people's ability to formulate problems, validate information, integrate knowledge, exercise judgment, or learn from experience. Without deliberate organizational criteria, technology can also redistribute authority and responsibility before an organization

has decided which capabilities it wants to preserve in people, which it wants to expand through AI, and which functions it is prepared to transfer to artificial systems.

The organizational challenge extends beyond adoption. It concerns the development of new ways of articulating human and AI capabilities within professional practice, production systems, and organizational life. This paper introduces Generative Change Management (GChM) as a conceptual framework for addressing that challenge.

The purpose of this paper is foundational rather than conclusive. It defines the conceptual territory of GChM, establishes its main categories and relationships, and proposes a basis for subsequent methodological development, organizational application, and empirical research. The framework opens a research and practice agenda around a central question: how can organizations deliberately integrate human and AI capabilities in ways that expand professional contribution, redesign production, preserve responsibility, and develop new forms of organizational intelligence and productivity?

2. A New Space for Organizational Change

Organizational change management has a well-established body of knowledge addressing planned transitions, emergent processes, sensemaking, and the transformation of routines (Bushe & Marshak, 2015; Feldman & Pentland, 2003; Lewin, 1947; Maitlis & Christianson, 2014; Weick, 1995). Research on technology adoption explains how innovations spread, what influences their acceptance, and why different groups interpret the same technology in different ways (Davis, 1989; Orlikowski & Gash, 1994; Rogers, 2003). Research on algorithmic work, dynamic capabilities, and human-AI collaboration further examines how control, competencies, organizational capabilities, and performance change when artificial systems participate in work (Gonzalez et al., 2026; Kellogg et al., 2020; Simón et al., 2024; Teece et al., 1997; Vaccaro et al., 2024).

Generative AI introduces a new organizational condition because it participates in productive processes that until recently were associated primarily with human cognitive capabilities. A professional can increase output with AI assistance while some capabilities that previously distinguished expertise become more widely available. At the same time, workflows can be reorganized around sequences partially or extensively executed by AI systems, with people concentrating their contribution on framing, interpretation, verification, relationships, judgment, and final responsibility.

This shift also changes how authority and trust are distributed. A recommendation generated by a system can acquire practical authority before the organization has explicitly defined the value assigned to that recommendation, the evidence required to support it, or the conditions under which it should be accepted. Regardless of how production is distributed, the organization remains accountable for results issued under its name before customers, regulators, authorities, workers, communities, and the public.

The incorporation of generative AI cannot be addressed solely as the adoption of a tool. It requires examining how professional contribution changes, how production is organized, and how criteria for trust, authority, recognition, and responsibility are constructed. GChM proposes three shifts that redefine how the integration of AI into organizational work can be analyzed, designed, and implemented.

From the tool to the professional relationship. The incorporation of AI requires people and organizations to understand the place artificial systems occupy in professional work: which tasks they perform, which decisions they influence, what level of trust they receive, how their outputs are verified, and how they interact with professional knowledge and judgment. Making a tool available is only a starting point. The relationship

people establish with AI must be analyzed, designed, and developed so that human and AI capabilities can be combined deliberately and improved through experience.

From adoption to the integration of capabilities. AI acquires organizational value when its capabilities are integrated with human expertise and production flows. This requires understanding how capabilities are currently combined, designing new forms of articulation, and implementing them with explicit criteria for delegation, autonomy, traceability, verification, and responsibility. The scope of AI participation can expand as people and organizations develop the capacity to understand, evaluate, intervene in, and remain accountable for results.

From efficiency to new organizational relationships. The participation of AI in the production of language, knowledge, alternatives, recommendations, and decisions also transforms the relational life of organizations. It changes how people build trust, attribute authority, recognize contributions, share knowledge, establish legitimacy, and generate meaning. GChM addresses this emerging cultural fabric as a condition for developing an organizational intelligence capable of combining algorithmic sophistication with interpretation, relationships, situated knowledge, and human meaning-making.

These shifts define the space addressed by GChM between technological availability and the development of organizational capability. Its object is the transformation of the conditions under which people, production systems, and organizational culture generate value with AI. Its central design unit is the articulation of capabilities. Its scope includes professional contribution, production architectures, and organizational coexistence. Its intended result is the development of hybrid productivity as a capability of the organization itself.

Technology can become widely accessible. The particular way each organization articulates that technology with its knowledge, relationships, judgment, practices, and learning develops through experience. GChM proposes that this accumulated capability can become a source of competitive differentiation that cannot be reproduced simply by gaining access to the same technologies.

3. Definition and Purpose

3.1. Generative Change Management

Generative Change Management is a conceptual framework that grounds a methodological approach to three interdependent transformations resulting from the integration of human and AI capabilities: the redefinition of professional contribution, the design of new work architectures, and organizational coexistence with algorithmic intelligence.

Addressing these transformations supports the development of an organization-specific productive capability with the potential to sustain competitive differentiation. Analysis identifies how the professional relationship with AI, production flows, and existing cultural frameworks are configured. Design defines new combinations of capabilities, roles, criteria, relationships, degrees of autonomy, and production architectures. Implementation turns these designs into organizational practice and generates experience that can be evaluated, converted into learning, and used to guide subsequent redesign.

GChM addresses change not as a transition toward a fixed technological state but as the continuing development of organizational capability in a context where both AI capabilities and organizational conditions evolve.

3.2. The Meaning of Generative

The term generative describes the change process rather than the technology itself. A change process is generative when it produces capabilities the organization did not previously have, redefines the criteria through which it makes decisions and recognizes value, and creates new working relationships.

An organization can deploy generative AI assistants throughout its functions without producing this kind of change if it leaves its workflows, incentives, verification practices, professional recognition criteria, and culture of authority substantially unchanged. Technology creates new possibilities. A generative change process turns those possibilities into new organizational capabilities.

3.3. Purpose of the Framework

The purpose of GChM is to transform available AI capabilities into new conditions for professional development, production, and organizational coexistence.

The framework addresses the redefinition of professional value when certain cognitive capabilities become more widely available; the deliberate articulation of human and AI capabilities within new work architectures operating at different degrees of autonomy; and the development of an organizational intelligence capable of integrating algorithmic participation with human relationships, situated judgment, responsibility, and the production of shared meaning.

These three transformations provide the basis for the development of hybrid productivity as a broader organizational capability.

4. Foundational Definitions

The foundational concepts of GChM are organized at two levels. Structural concepts define the capabilities that the framework seeks to develop and the hybrid productivity that results from their articulation. Operational concepts provide the conceptual tools required to analyze, design, implement, and evaluate those capabilities in organizational practice.

Structural Concepts

4.1. Expanded Professional Capability

Expanded professional capability is a person's ability to formulate problems, decide, create, learn, and respond with a broader range of possibilities than would be available without AI assistance. This expansion assumes that the person maintains an active position toward the problem being addressed, the criteria guiding action, the interpretation of results, and the professional and ethical consequences of decisions.

Expansion does not refer only to producing more output. It refers to increasing the range and quality of professional action while maintaining situated judgment and responsibility.

4.2. Hybrid Production Architecture

A hybrid production architecture is the way an organization deliberately combines human capabilities and digital production units to generate results that it issues under its own name and for which it remains accountable to third parties.

The architecture includes workflow structure, assigned functions, dependencies, intervention points, degrees of autonomy, delegation criteria, evidence requirements, verification practices, records, and the distribution of responsibility and accountability.

4.3. Hybrid Organizational Intelligence

Hybrid organizational intelligence is the collective capability of an organization to combine the cognitive sophistication of AI with situated knowledge, interpretation, relationships, institutional memory, and human meaning-making.

This articulation expands the organization's possibilities for understanding situations, deliberating, deciding, learning, coordinating, and innovating by combining different forms of intelligence without treating them as interchangeable.

4.4. Hybrid Productivity

Hybrid productivity is the capability of an organization to generate results through the deliberate articulation of human and AI capabilities within its work systems.

It includes the efficiency gains traditionally associated with productivity but extends beyond them through five distinctive outcomes: cognitive breadth, decision quality, adaptive fluidity, cumulative learning, and responsible scalability.

Hybrid productivity is understood as an organizational capability rather than simply as a short-term increase in output attributable to the use of AI.

Operational Concepts

4.5. Attributional Relationship

An attributional relationship is the relationship people establish with a digital production unit based on the properties they attribute to it, such as competence, understanding, availability, reliability, judgment, or authority.

These attributions are part of organizational practice rather than properties objectively possessed by the system. They can be observed in what people verify, what they accept without verification, what they cite to support a decision, what closes a discussion, and what they are willing to sign or issue under their own responsibility (Manucci, 2026).

4.6. Recognition Base

The recognition base of an organizational unit is the set of contributions through which professional value is actually recognized, evaluated, and rewarded in practice, as distinct from the criteria formally stated in competency models, job descriptions, or evaluation systems.

Analyzing the recognition base helps identify which contributions create value in practice, which are becoming more widely available through AI, which remain distinctive, and how the criteria of professional recognition may need to evolve as available capabilities and ways of working change.

4.7. Digital Production Unit

A digital production unit is the technological and operational configuration through which AI participates in work. It includes the model, interface, memory, information retrieval arrangements, instructions, rules, tools, connections, and context of use.

Depending on how these components and operating rules are configured, the unit can assist with a specific activity or operate with greater autonomy by interpreting objectives, using resources, executing sequences, and adjusting its intervention.

The design of a digital production unit is an organizational decision as well as a technical one because different configurations create different working relationships, distributions of capability, and levels of autonomy.

4.8. Delegation of Execution and Delegation of Judgment

Delegation of execution defines which parts of production an AI system can perform.

Delegation of judgment defines the extent to which an AI system can participate in evaluating, selecting, prioritizing, or validating alternatives and results.

Delegation of criterion is a specific and consequential form of delegation of judgment. It occurs when the standard by which an output is judged adequate is itself transferred, explicitly or implicitly, to the artificial system. Characteristics such as fluency, structure, confidence, or formal consistency are then treated as evidence of adequacy rather than evaluated against independent criteria.

This risk is consistent with evidence that sustained reliance on AI assistance can affect critical engagement and that these effects depend on how human-AI interaction is structured (Gerlich, 2025a, 2025b; Sarkar et al., 2024).

Delegation dimensions can be combined in different ways according to the type of task, level of autonomy, organizational exposure, and verification conditions. Their explicit definition establishes where AI participates, which decisions remain with people, what standards govern acceptance, and how authority and responsibility are distributed throughout the workflow.

4.9. Verification and Process Reconstruction

Verification establishes how AI-generated outputs, recommendations, or actions are evaluated and whether a review is capable of modifying the result.

Process reconstruction is the organizational capability to recover the process through which a result was produced, including the relevant information, criteria, decisions, system interventions, and human interventions.

Their joint design enables organizations to expand AI participation while maintaining the capacity to understand how results were produced, intervene when necessary, and remain accountable for outcomes.

4.10. Responsibility and Accountability

Responsibility identifies who performs, leads, or owns a task. Accountability identifies who answers for the result before third parties.

In a hybrid production architecture, both must be aligned with the effective capability to understand, verify, and intervene in the production of the result. No person should be held accountable for an output that they had no effective capacity to evaluate or modify (Elish, 2019).

4.11. Knowledge Map

A knowledge map is the collective understanding of where relevant experience, expertise, judgment, and verification capacity reside within an organization. It includes knowing who knows what, who can interpret exceptional situations, who can challenge a conclusion, and where institutional memory can be found.

Repeated consultation of AI can expand access to information while weakening human routes of consultation. If people stop knowing who possesses relevant expertise, the organization may gain individual

speed while losing collective learning, escalation capacity, and the transactive memory that supports coordination (Lewis, 2003).

Preserving and updating the knowledge map is therefore a productive requirement. Human consultation circuits are not retained for symbolic reasons alone. They function as infrastructure for learning, verification, and resilience.

4.12. Distinctive Core

The distinctive core is the set of human and organizational capabilities that sustain the identity, legitimacy, quality, and competitive differentiation of a professional practice or organizational unit.

The objective is not to preserve every existing human activity but to understand which capabilities should remain, which can be expanded through AI, and which can be transferred without eroding the organization's ability to interpret situations, learn, verify results, respond to exceptions, and remain accountable.

Because distinctive capabilities develop through experience, their identification is a strategic decision about the organization's future and not merely an inventory of current tasks (Teece et al., 1997).

4.13. Symbolic-Algorithmic Linkage

Symbolic-algorithmic linkage is the organizational process through which algorithmic productions (including language, analyses, classifications, alternatives, recommendations, and actions generated by AI) are integrated with human processes of interpretation, legitimation, relationship-building, memory, and meaning-making.

The concept addresses the cultural status acquired by algorithmic production. It asks how artificial outputs enter deliberation, what authority they receive, how their use is declared, which contributions they displace or expand, and how they affect the organization's narratives about competence, trust, authorship, and responsibility.

Designing this linkage is necessary because algorithmic participation does not remain confined to workflows. It becomes part of the symbolic life through which the organization defines what counts as valid knowledge, valuable contribution, and legitimate action.

5. Three Interdependent Transformations

The three transformations addressed by GChM are interdependent. Professional contribution cannot be redefined independently of the architecture in which work is produced. Production architectures cannot be sustained without cultural criteria that define trust, authority, legitimacy, and recognition. Cultural coexistence with algorithmic intelligence develops through the concrete experiences generated by professional practice and production. Change in one plane affects the conditions of the others.

5.1. Redefinition of Professional Contribution

The first transformation concerns the basis on which professional value is created and recognized. AI expands the available repertoire, and professional value is increasingly redefined around capabilities that remain dependent on context, judgment, responsibility, relationships, and the formulation of problems. This revaluation can affect occupational identity because people may experience the system that increases their output as the same system that reduces the scarcity of capabilities through which they were previously recognized (Nelson & Irwin, 2014; Petriglieri, 2011).

GChM analyzes the recognition base before prescribing new roles. It distinguishes declared competency models from contributions actually rewarded in practice. It then examines which contributions have become more abundant, which remain distinctive, which new contributions are emerging, and how the organization can expand professional capability without converting assistance into passive dependence.

This transformation also affects disclosure. If acknowledging AI assistance is interpreted as admitting a loss of professional value, people have incentives to hide its use. Hidden assistance weakens traceability and prevents the organization from learning how work is actually produced. Recognition systems are therefore operational conditions for governed delegation, not secondary cultural variables.

5.2. Design of New Work Architectures

The second transformation concerns the deliberate redistribution of production among people and digital production units. The resulting redistribution has no universal configuration. It depends on the task, exposure, evidence requirements, available expertise, system design, and the organization's capacity for verification and reconstruction.

Agentic AI systems expand this participation by introducing greater degrees of operational autonomy. A configured unit can interpret objectives, use tools, connect operations, execute sequences, monitor conditions, and adjust actions. As autonomy grows, the architecture must specify intervention thresholds, escalation paths, record requirements, decision rights, and the conditions under which people can interrupt or reverse an action.

The central question is not whether a task is human or artificial. It is how capabilities are combined across a production sequence and whether responsibility, authority, verification, and accountability remain aligned with actual capacity to intervene. Research on algorithmic work and human-AI teaming similarly shows that value depends on interaction design, trust calibration, role definition, and mutual learning rather than on technical capability alone (Gonzalez et al., 2026; Kellogg et al., 2020; Simón et al., 2024).

A hybrid architecture becomes an organizational capability when it can be evaluated and improved through experience. The organization must learn which configurations expand cognitive breadth and decision quality, which create coordination costs, which produce unacceptable dependence, and which can scale responsibly.

5.3. Organizational Coexistence with Algorithmic Intelligence

The third transformation concerns the cultural frameworks through which people and organizations coexist with algorithmic intelligence. Trust develops from understanding the place AI occupies in work, the evidence that supports its outputs, the limits of its intervention, and the accountability retained by people, beyond mere exposure to the technology.

Algorithmic outputs can acquire symbolic authority because of their speed, consistency, scale, or apparent neutrality. This authority is not produced only by the system. It is constructed through organizational practices: what is presented in meetings, what managers accept, what reviewers challenge, what becomes part of institutional memory, and what is used to justify decisions.

GChM treats culture as a productive and relational infrastructure. It addresses how AI participation changes belonging, identity, recognition, consultation, trust, and the production of meaning. It also examines whether new routines preserve the organization's capacity for sensemaking and learning rather than allowing technically fluent outputs to close deliberation prematurely (Feldman & Pentland, 2003; Maitlis & Christianson, 2014; Weick, 1995).

Hybrid organizational intelligence develops when algorithmic contribution is integrated with situated knowledge, relationships, institutional memory, and human interpretation. This requires maintaining spaces in which disagreement, explanation, contextualization, and reconstruction can affect results.

6. Architecture of the GChM Framework

GChM organizes the integration of AI across three planes of organizational preparation and one emergent result. The framework can be applied across organizations with different purposes (commercial, civil-society, and governmental) and at different scales. Its categories remain stable while their operational definitions must be adapted to the unit, activity, exposure, and institutional context under analysis.

Plane	Primary object	Transformation	Capability developed
Personal	Professional relationship with AI and the recognition base	Redefinition of professional contribution	Expanded professional capability
Operational	Articulation of human capabilities and digital production units	Design of new work architectures	Hybrid production architecture
Cultural	Symbolic-algorithmic linkage, authority, trust, and meaning	Organizational coexistence with algorithmic intelligence	Hybrid organizational intelligence
Integrated	Recursive articulation of the three planes	Organizational learning and redesign	Hybrid productivity

Note. *The table defines the conceptual architecture. Operational indicators, instruments, and evaluation criteria belong to subsequent methodological development and empirical application.*

The five outcomes associated with hybrid productivity specify how the integrated result can be examined. Cognitive breadth refers to the range of information, perspectives, and alternatives that can be incorporated into action. Decision quality concerns the adequacy of criteria, evidence, and contextual interpretation. Adaptive fluidity concerns the capacity to reconfigure work as situations and technologies change. Cumulative learning concerns the conversion of experience into organizational knowledge. Responsible scalability concerns the ability to expand AI participation without losing traceability, intervention capacity, or accountability.

7. Intervention Process

Analysis, design, and implementation constitute the core intervention cycle. Evaluation and learning convert implementation experience into organizational knowledge, and redesign incorporates that learning into subsequent decisions. Together, the five phases form a recursive and cumulative process.

7.1. Analysis

Analysis identifies how work is currently produced, which capabilities are combined, how AI is used, what people verify, where authority is attributed, how professional value is recognized, what knowledge circuits sustain judgment, and where responsibility and accountability are located. It also identifies gaps between formal descriptions and actual practice.

7.2. Design

Design defines new combinations of capabilities, production sequences, roles, intervention points, degrees of autonomy, verification criteria, evidence requirements, escalation paths, records, recognition practices, and cultural conditions. Its unit is the articulation of capabilities rather than the isolated tool or task.

7.3. Implementation

Implementation turns the design into situated organizational practice. Its purpose is not only to execute a predetermined design but also to generate experience. People test new relationships, production units operate under real conditions, and the organization observes how authority, trust, workload, quality, and responsibility are redistributed.

7.4. Evaluation and Learning

Evaluation examines both results and the process that produced them. It asks whether review changed outputs, whether people retained the ability to intervene, whether the knowledge map was strengthened or weakened, whether professional contribution expanded, and whether the architecture generated the intended dimensions of hybrid productivity. Learning converts these findings into organizational knowledge.

7.5. Redesign

Redesign adjusts capabilities, configurations, roles, criteria, and relationships in response to evidence. It recognizes that the target is not a stable end state. AI capabilities, organizational conditions, regulations, knowledge, and professional expectations continue to change, so the architecture must remain revisable.

8. Principles of the Approach

8.1. The purpose is capability development.

GChM begins with the organizational capabilities that should emerge from AI integration. Technology adoption is a means, not the endpoint of change.

8.2. The articulation of capabilities is the central design unit.

The framework does not treat the person, the system, or the task in isolation. It designs how different capabilities are combined across a production sequence and how their interaction changes through experience.

8.3. Delegation must remain visible.

Execution, judgment, and criteria must be distinguished. Delegation becomes governable when the organization can identify what has been transferred, under which conditions, and with what evidence and limits.

8.4. Verification must be capable of changing the result.

A review that never modifies an output is a ritual rather than a control. Verification requires competence, time, access to evidence, authority to intervene, and a reconstructible production process.

8.5. Accountability requires effective intervention capacity.

People can remain accountable only when they can understand, evaluate, interrupt, modify, or reject the result for which they answer before third parties.

8.6. Organizational learning closes the change cycle.

Implementation experience must be evaluated and incorporated into redesign. Hybrid productivity develops cumulatively through repeated cycles of practice, evidence, learning, and adjustment.

9. Scope and Research Agenda

GChM is proposed here as a foundational conceptual framework that grounds a methodological approach. Its categories organize a field of inquiry and intervention, but they do not yet constitute a closed or empirically validated model. The relationships proposed among professional contribution, production architecture, organizational coexistence, and hybrid productivity require systematic operationalization, comparison, and refinement.

First, the three core capabilities (expanded professional capability, hybrid production architecture, and hybrid organizational intelligence) need operational definitions that make them observable without reducing them to technology use or self-reported adoption. Their development may require indicators at personal, workflow, team, unit, and organizational levels.

Second, the five dimensions of hybrid productivity require empirical examination: cognitive breadth, decision quality, adaptive fluidity, cumulative learning, and responsible scalability. These dimensions are proposed here as theoretically relevant outcomes; their independence, interaction, and measurement remain open empirical questions.

Third, attributional relationships and symbolic authority require longitudinal research. Organizations need evidence about how trust, verification, consultation, authorship, and the practical authority of AI outputs change through repeated use and through different configurations of assistance and autonomy.

Fourth, the distinction between delegation of judgment and delegation of criterion opens a specific research agenda. Studies can examine when formal human decision rights coexist with practical dependence on AI-generated standards of adequacy, how verification practices affect critical engagement, and what forms of interaction preserve professional judgment (Gerlich, 2025a, 2025b; Sarkar et al., 2024).

Fifth, configurations of human-AI capabilities may produce substantially different outcomes depending on how organizations develop professional contribution, configure digital production units, preserve and reorganize knowledge maps, establish recognition and accountability, and integrate algorithmic production into their cultural life. Comparative cases across organizations with different purposes, activities, exposures, and scales can test the boundary conditions of the framework (Gonzalez et al., 2026; Vaccaro et al., 2024).

The operational concepts introduced in this paper (including attributional relationship, recognition base, digital production unit, delegation, verification and process reconstruction, knowledge map, distinctive core, and symbolic-algorithmic linkage) provide the basis for developing instruments, protocols, case studies, and longitudinal designs. Methodological work should specify units of observation, evidence requirements, decision rules, and criteria for evaluating organizational learning and redesign.

The purpose of the framework is not to establish a final model of human-AI organization. It is to provide a conceptual structure from which organizations, researchers, educators, and practitioners can examine how new productive capabilities emerge, how responsibility can be preserved as autonomy expands, and how organizational learning can guide the continuing development of hybrid productivity.

References

Bushe, G. R., & Marshak, R. J. (2015). *Dialogic organization development: The theory and practice of transformational change*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. *MIS Quarterly, 13*(3), 319-340. https://doi.org/10.2307/249008

Elish, M. C. (2019). Moral crumple zones: Cautionary tales in human-robot interaction. *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society, 5*, 40-60. https://doi.org/10.17351/ests2019.260

Feldman, M. S., & Pentland, B. T. (2003). Reconceptualizing organizational routines as a source of flexibility and change. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 48*(1), 94-118. https://doi.org/10.2307/3556620

Gerlich, M. (2025a). AI tools in society: Impacts on cognitive offloading and the future of critical thinking. *Societies, 15*(1), 6. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006

Gerlich, M. (2025b). From offloading to engagement: An experimental study on structured prompting and critical reasoning with generative AI. *Data, 10*(11), 172. https://doi.org/10.3390/data10110172

Gonzalez, C., Donahue, K., Goldstein, D. G., Heidari, H., Jalali, M. S., Schelble, B., Singh, A., & Woolley, A. W. (2026). Toward a science of human-AI teaming for decision-making: A complementarity framework. *PNAS Nexus, 5*(3), pgag030. https://doi.org/10.1093/pnasnexus/pgag030

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. https://doi.org/10.5465/annals.2018.0174

Lewin, K. (1947). Frontiers in group dynamics: Concept, method and reality in social science; social equilibria and social change. *Human Relations, 1*(1), 5-41. https://doi.org/10.1177/001872674700100103

Lewis, K. (2003). Measuring transactive memory systems in the field: Scale development and validation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 88*(4), 587-604. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.4.587

Maitlis, S., & Christianson, M. (2014). Sensemaking in organizations: Taking stock and moving forward. *Academy of Management Annals, 8*(1), 57-125. https://doi.org/10.1080/19416520.2014.873177

Manucci, M. (2026). *The generative attributional bond: Conceptual foundations for a generative sociology*. Zenodo. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20749141

Nelson, A. J., & Irwin, J. (2014). Defining what we do, all over again: Occupational identity, technological change, and the librarian/Internet-search relationship. *Academy of Management Journal, 57*(3), 892-928. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0201

Orlikowski, W. J., & Gash, D. C. (1994). Technological frames: Making sense of information technology in organizations. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems, 12*(2), 174-207. https://doi.org/10.1145/196734.196745

Petriglieri, J. L. (2011). Under threat: Responses to and the consequences of threats to individuals' identities. *Academy of Management Review, 36*(4), 641-662. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.0087

Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.

Sajadieh, S., Fattorini, L., Perrault, R., Gil, Y., Parli, V., Santarlasci, L., Pava, J., Maslej, N., Altman, R., Brynjolfsson, E., Brodley, C., Clark, J., Dignum, V., Kumar, V., Landay, J., Lyons, T., Manyika, J., Niebles, J. C., Shoham, Y., … Weld, D. (2026). *Artificial intelligence index report 2026*. Stanford Institute for Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence. https://hai.stanford.edu/ai-index/2026-ai-index-report

Sarkar, A., Xu, X., Toronto, N., Drosos, I., & Poelitz, C. (2024). *When Copilot becomes autopilot: Generative AI's critical risk to knowledge work and a critical solution*. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2412.15030

Simón, C., Revilla, E., & Sáenz, M. J. (2024). Integrating AI in organizations for value creation through human-AI teaming: A dynamic-capabilities approach. *Journal of Business Research, 182*, 114783. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114783

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal, 18*(7), 509-533. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7%3C509::AID-SMJ882%3E3.0.CO;2-Z

Vaccaro, M., Almaatouq, A., & Malone, T. W. (2024). When combinations of humans and AI are useful: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nature Human Behaviour, 8*(12), 2293-2303. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-024-02024-1

Weick, K. E. (1995). *Sensemaking in organizations*. SAGE Publications.

World Economic Forum. (2026). *Organizational transformation in the age of AI: How organizations maximize AI's potential*. https://www.weforum.org/publications/organizational-transformation-in-the-age-of-ai-how-organizations-maximize-ais-potential/