International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 04 July-August; 2026 Page. No. 346-352

To cite this article: M. Farina Begam and Dr. S. Sudhamathi (2026). LEADING CHANGE IN THE AGE OF INTELLIGENT MACHINES: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR HUMAN-CENTERED AI IMPLEMENTATION, International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies (IJRCMS) 8 (4): 346-352 Article No. 824 Sub Id 1379

LEADING CHANGE IN THE AGE OF INTELLIGENT MACHINES: A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR HUMAN-CENTERED AI IMPLEMENTATION

M. Farina Begam[1] and Dr. S. Sudhamathi[2]

[1]Ph.D (Full Time) Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University, Karaikudi.
farinabegamphd@alagappauniversity.ac.in.

[2]Alagappa Institute of Management, Alagappa University, Karaikudi.
sudhamathis@alagppauniversity.ac.in

DOI: https://doi.org/10.38193/IJRCMS.2026.8427

ABSTRACT

While there is growing interest in the use of AI in numerous sectors, the human dimension of AI's transformation has largely not been theorized in change management literature. Previous research on AI adoption ultimately relies on technology acceptance perspectives that emphasize individual cognition (perceived usefulness, ease of use) relative to comparatively less attention on leadership behaviors, communication practices, and resource dynamics that can shape how a workforce feels about AI adoption as threatening or empowering. This conceptual paper fills this void by proposing a framework for an integrative approach to AI-adapted change leadership, based on the Conservation of Resources (COR) theory and classical change management theory, that puts AI-adapted change leadership at the center of the success of digital transformation. The framework recognizes techno-uncertainty and employee AI-change readiness as parallel mechanisms of mediation and employee resilience and organizational AI maturity as boundary conditions, which influence these relationships. Six testable propositions are presented that will direct empirical research in the future, especially across technology-intensive and software organizations where AI implementation will be widespread and impactful on the professional identity of people working in the field. The paper extends the COR theory to algorithmic change, thereby making a contribution to theory, and provides a framework for algorithmic change for practitioners to sequence the leadership interventions during AI implementations. Empirical validation limitations and directions are discussed, such as using variance-based structural equation modeling.

KEYWORDS: change management; artificial intelligence adoption; human-centered AI; Conservation of Resources theory; techno-stress; digital transformation; change leadership

1. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence is no longer a peripheral experiment confined to innovation labs; it is being woven into recruitment, quality assurance, software development pipelines, customer service, and managerial decision-making. Despite its widespread failure in the market, the reality is that the AI algorithms are not the root cause of failure of AI initiatives; they are the failure of the organizations to comprehend the behavioral and emotional disruption, and identity loss, that follows the automation of traditionally human tasks. In fact, the same way in which the dominant view of studying the adoption of algorithmic systems in organizational research is the technology acceptance model (TAM) and its descendants, which were developed to explain individual acceptance of comparatively static software tools, is also a change management issue at its core. This paper makes the case that there are at least three reasons why the implementation of AI is not the same as previous waves of information technology implementations that are not adequately accounted for by the existing change models. First, AI systems are often used to automate cognitive or judgmental work, not just manual or transactional work, which raises the question of what the role of the employees is and makes them feel less indispensable than they were in the past with enterprise software. Second, uncertainty about the operation of a new tool is not the same as uncertainty about what the tool is doing and why (the so called black-box problem) with many AI systems. Third, once implemented, AI is likely to be an ongoing process that evolves after it goes live, and the change episode as described by classical change models like Lewin's, unfreeze-change-refreeze, is rarely closed off in that manner. Accordingly, this paper advances a conceptual model that reframes the role of change leadership as the primary driver of transforming AI implementation to the success of digital transformation, beyond individual technology beliefs. The framework is grounded in Conservation of Resources (COR) theory which regards the implementation of AI as an event that employees can appraise as a threat to their resources or as an opportunity to resources, contingent on the way change is led and communicated. The main contribution of the paper is the combination of leadership centered theory of change management with a resource-based theory of employee psychological response, resulting in a small number of parsimonious, testable propositions, appropriate for an environment like a software company where technology is becoming the primary part of the organization.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Classical and Contemporary Change Management Theory

Lewin's three step change model of unfreeze, change, refreeze is the bedrock of change theory in organizations and it stresses the importance of disrupting the old behaviors before new behaviors can be introduced and become established. Expanding on the eight steps, Kotter's work added urgency building and vision articulation as key ingredients to successfully build a guiding vision and then gain broad-based action, which would lead to a strengthening of gains. Where both traditions overlap, they have a shared idea: change is more effective when its leaders minimize ambiguity, establish a compelling and mutually understood justification for change, and create a psychologically safe environment for employees to try out new approaches without worrying about getting it wrong and facing punitive consequences. In the context of AI, this literature indicates that how leaders tell the story and how they lead the sequence of implementation of AI is a key factor in how employees react to it, and that this can be more critical than the level of technology. But classical change models have been designed for discrete, bounded change periods, and cannot fully capture the continuous and adaptive nature of AI systems that are retrained, updated and expanded long after deployment. In this paper, classical change theory is therefore considered to be a necessary but incomplete basis that can only be supplemented by a resource-based perspective that can explain the psychological adjustment process that is continuing rather than just one transition.

The theory of conservation of resources (COR) and technostress

Conservation of Resources (COR) theory suggests that people strive to gain, retain, and defend resources, valued items, situation, personal attributes and energies and that stress occurs when resources are threatened, lost, or not gained at the level of resource investment. In this sense, the implementation of AI is easily seen as a resource event, as it could be the case that employees see the use of AI as a threat to the resources they value, like their working position, their professional status, autonomy in the execution of tasks, accumulated know-how, etc. In previous technostress studies, each of the threat appraisals has been associated with withdrawal behaviors, lower performance, and decreased job satisfaction, and in this study they were found to be linked to lowered performance. Most importantly, the possibility of the same change being appraised as a resource gain opportunity is considered under COR theory, such as when the understanding of AI is that it would free capacity for higher value work, but remove low value drudgery. The technology itself does not determine the valence of this appraisal, rather contextual and leadership factors such as clarity of communication, participative involvement in decisions about technology implementation, and perceived fairness of benefits and costs among workforce significantly influence the valence of the appraisal. This places leadership as one of the upstream levers that can influence the trajectory of employees from loss appraisal to gain appraisal.

Human-Centered AI Implementation

A parallel and increasingly influential stream of scholarship on human-centered and responsible AI argues that successful AI integration depends on designing not only the algorithm but the sociotechnical system around it, including governance structures, human oversight mechanisms, and channels for employee voice. This literature complements the change management perspective by specifying what a well-led AI implementation should look like in practice: transparent communication about system capabilities and limitations, meaningful opportunities for employees to shape how AI is deployed in their own workflows, and visible investment in reskilling rather than displacement. The present framework draws on this literature to specify the observable behaviors that constitute AI-adapted change leadership, distinguishing it from generic change leadership by its explicit attention

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 04 July-August; 2026 Page. No. 346-352

to algorithmic transparency and employee epistemic agency over AI-mediated decisions.

3. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Building on the theoretical foundations above, this paper proposes a mediated framework in which AI-adapted change leadership is the primary antecedent construct, techno-uncertainty and employee AI-change readiness operate as parallel mediating mechanisms, and digital transformation success is the ultimate outcome. Employee resilience and organizational AI maturity are proposed as boundary conditions that respectively strengthen or weaken these pathways. Table 1 summarizes the core constructs.

Construct	Role	Working definition
AI-Adapted Change Leadership	Antecedent	Leader behaviors that combine classical change leadership (vision articulation, participative decision-making, urgency framing) with AI-specific practices such as explaining algorithmic rationale and involving employees in workflow redesign.
Techno-Uncertainty	Mediator (loss path)	Employee-perceived ambiguity about the logic, scope, and long-term implications of AI systems affecting their work.
Employee AI-Change Readiness	Mediator (gain path)	The degree to which employees perceive themselves and their organization as psychologically and practically prepared to adopt AI-enabled ways of working.
Employee Resilience	Moderator	An individual's capacity to adapt positively to disruption, buffering the translation of techno-uncertainty into negative outcomes.
Organizational AI Maturity	Moderator	The extent to which an organization has established governance, infrastructure, and prior experience for deploying AI responsibly.
Digital Transformation Success	Outcome	Sustained achievement of intended performance, adoption, and well-being outcomes following AI-enabled change.

Table 1. Core constructs of the proposed framework.

The framework's logic proceeds as follows. AI-adapted change leadership is expected to reduce techno-uncertainty by supplying the transparency and rationale that algorithmic systems otherwise withhold, while simultaneously building employee AI-change readiness by fostering participation and

International Journal of Research in Commerce and Management Studies

ISSN 2582-2292

Vol. 8, No. 04 July-August; 2026 Page. No. 346-352

demonstrating organizational commitment to reskilling. Techno-uncertainty, left unaddressed, is expected to erode digital transformation success through resource-depletion mechanisms consistent with COR theory, whereas AI-change readiness is expected to promote transformation success through active engagement and constructive adaptation. Employee resilience is proposed to buffer the negative techno-uncertainty pathway, such that resilient employees experience smaller performance and well-being decrements even under high uncertainty. Organizational AI maturity is proposed to amplify the positive effect of AI-adapted change leadership on readiness, since leadership behaviors are more credible and more easily enacted where supporting governance and infrastructure already exist.

4. RESEARCH PROPOSITIONS

Proposition 1: AI-adapted change leadership is negatively associated with employee techno-uncertainty during AI implementation.

Proposition 2: AI-adapted change leadership is positively associated with employee AI-change readiness.

Proposition 3: Techno-uncertainty is negatively associated with digital transformation success.

Proposition 4: Employee AI-change readiness is positively associated with digital transformation success.

Proposition 5: Employee resilience moderates the relationship between techno-uncertainty and digital transformation success, such that the negative relationship is weaker for employees with higher resilience.

Proposition 6: Organizational AI maturity moderates the relationship between AI-adapted change leadership and employee AI-change readiness, such that the positive relationship is stronger in organizations with higher AI maturity.

5. DISCUSSION

Theoretical Contributions

In this paper, the Conservation of Resources theory is expanded to the context of algorithmic organizational change, by defining leadership behavior as the variable that influences the appraisal of the implementation of AI as either a threat or a resource. This is diverges from technology-acceptance models of AI adoption, which focus on individual cognition and allocate less attention to leadership as an antecedent factor. The framework connects classical change management theory (Lewin, Kotter) to COR theory and the literature on human-centered AI and includes insights from the literature to account for the unique characteristics of AI: opacity and continuously changing nature after initial deployment. Practical Implications In technology and software companies, the framework implies that investments in change leadership that are informed by artificial intelligence, and that communicate transparently about the "how" and "why" of the introduction of AI algorithmic tools, and that involve employees in redesigning workflows affected by the introduction, are likely to pay off for the manager in terms of less uncertainty and more readiness. As organizational AI maturity is suggested to shape their organizational behaviour's effectiveness, organizations that are still at the beginning of their AI journey should first focus on governance and infrastructure investments before investing in leadership communication as an alternative to being prepared and ready for organizational behaviour. Resilience building interventions can also be used as a complementary approach to safeguarding employee well-being in times of unavoidable uncertainty in the human resource and organizational development functions.

6. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

This paper is a conceptual approach and the propositions offered here are preliminary to the development of hypotheses, not definitive conclusions. In order to explore and test relationships contained in this framework, future research should operationalize each construct with validated psychometric scales and use variance-based structural equation modeling (VBESEM) more specifically: Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM), which is suitable for the exploratory and predictive nature of this framework and for the relatively small sample sizes usually found in a single industry or single region study. This empirical research would complement parallel research that investigates employee readiness through trainings and the quality of communication, placing the current leadership-based approach in a separate, but theoretically similar vein of employee-AI-adoption research. To confirm the proposed relationships across industry and across cultures, as well as to investigate whether the constructs in the framework change over time, as the AI system is iteratively updated after its implementation, there is a need for cross-industry and cross-cultural replication and longitudinal designs.

7. CONCLUSION

The effectiveness of change leadership more than the complexity of the algorithm will be the key factor in whether employees find the change threatening or enabling. This paper presents a parsimonious conceptual model and propositions that can be tested in future empirical studies on leading change in the intelligent machines era by combining classical change management theory, Conservation of Resources theory and insights from the human-centered AI literature.

REFERENCES

Davis, F. D. (1989). Perceived usefulness, perceived ease of use, and user acceptance of information technology. MIS Quarterly, 13(3), 319–340.

Hobfoll, S. E. (1989). Conservation of resources: A new attempt at conceptualizing stress. American Psychologist, 44(3), 513–524.

Hobfoll, S. E., Halbesleben, J., Neveu, J. P., & Westman, M. (2018). Conservation of resources in the organizational context: The reality of resources and their consequences. Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior, 5, 103–128.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). Leading change. Harvard Business School Press.

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.

Ragu-Nathan, T. S., Tarafdar, M., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Tu, Q. (2008). The consequences of technostress for end users in organizations: Conceptual development and empirical validation. Information Systems Research, 19(4), 417–433.

Shneiderman, B. (2020). Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe & trustworthy. International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 36(6), 495–504.

Tarafdar, M., Tu, Q., Ragu-Nathan, B. S., & Ragu-Nathan, T. S. (2007). The impact of technostress on role stress and productivity. Journal of Management Information Systems, 24(1), 301–328.

Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478.