sciendo

DOI: 10.2478/doc-2025-0012

Łukasz Sułkowski

Jagiellonian University, Cracow, Poland

lukasz.sulkowski@uj.edu.pl

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-1248-2743

Agnieszka (Aggie) Chidlow

University of Birminghm, Birmingham, United Kingdom

a.chidlow@bham.ac.uk

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-0855-6332

Iga Maria Lehman

WSB University in Warsaw, Poland

iga.lehman@wsb.edu.pl

ORCID ID: 0000-0002-2092-8119

Language and Generative AI: A New Paradigm of Organizational Research

Article history:

Received	**14 October 2025**
Revised	**15 October 2025**
Accepted	**15 October 2025**
Available online	**16 December 2025**

Abstract: Language is not merely a medium of communication but a constitutive force in organization management. Three decades after the first "linguistic turn" in organization studies, generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) and large language models (LLMs) are provoking a second, data-intensive turn that reconfigures the relationship between language, technology, and management. LLMs now operate as discursive actors that simulate, generate, and transform organizational communication.

This paper advances algorithmic discourse research as a new paradigm for studying language in organizations. It reframes metthodological rigor as pluralistic and reflexive, combining computational scale with interpretive depth. It retains traditional standards of evidence while extending them to encompass ethical and contextual reflexivity, acknowledging that meaning, data, and validity are co-constructed.

An integrated multilevel framework links micro-linguistic forms (lexical, metaphorical, modal), meso-level routines and narratives, and macro-level outcomes such as innovation, trust, and performance. The new paradigm expands the methodological and epistemological foundations of organizational research by positioning language as both data and process, and LLMs as analytic partners in the study of sensemaking. In doing so, it marks a shift from observing discourse to co-engaging with algorithmic language, opening new avenues for understanding how organizations think, communicate, and act in the age of AI.

Keywords: algorithmic discourse research, Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), organizational discourse, methodological reflexivity, epistemology of AI

Introduction

In an era defined by globalization, migration, and digital transformation, organizations increasingly operate in a hyper-linguistic world. Language is no longer a neutral conduit for communication but a strategic, ethical, organizational and political resource. Managers must navigate not only multiple languages and dialects but also the socio-cultural dynamics of inclusion, voice, and legitimacy. Thus, the study of organizational language has become both a methodological frontier and a strategic imperative.

This article builds on the earlier issue of *Discourses on Culture* (*DoC* 22), which redefined leadership as a relational, rhetorical, and discursive process (Grint, 2000; Fairhurst & Uhl-Bien, 2012). That issue emphasized how leadership emerges not from static roles but from situated interactions shaped by discourse, material conditions, and symbolic constructions of context (Fairhurst & Cooren, 2009; Bitzer, 1968). Here, we extend that conversation by exploring how generative AI (GenAI) and large language models (LLMs) are transforming organizational discourse, not just as analytical tools, but as simulated interlocutors and actors in the communication of aspects of organization leadership, and working practices.

Foundational theories in management have long recognized the central role of language. Communication Accommodation Theory (Giles, 1973) and Social Identity Theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) explain how language shapes group identity and cohesion. Storytelling inspires action (Denning, 2005), inclusive phrasing fosters psychological safety, and shared terminologies encode organizational culture (Schein, 1992). As Grint (2005) and Fairhurst (2011) show, leadership is not exercised within a fixed context but created through how leaders define and frame that context rhetorically. From this perspective, language plays a central role in shaping organizational reality.

Three decades ago, the "linguistic turn" in organization studies made this insight explicit: scholars began viewing organizations as discursively constructed through narrative, metaphor, and symbolic framing (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000; Fairclough, 2005). However, this early analysis through the lens of discourse was often limited by small-scale qualitative methods. While corpus linguistics and automated text analysis have expanded scale, they remain

methodologically constrained in addressing the multilingual, multicultural, and power-laden dynamics of contemporary organizational communication.

Meanwhile, executive practice has rapidly embraced GenAI (Brzozowska et al., 2023). A majority of firms now use AI-driven tools to analyze sentiment, simulate strategy narratives, and even generate compliance or policy texts. LLMs are no longer merely passive tools. When used to draft communications or simulate strategy messaging, they influence the language and framing through which decisions, leadership, and culture are enacted (Jarco & Sułkowski 2023).

These twin trends, a renewed scholarly focus on language in organization and a technological leap in language creation and use, call for a second linguistic turn in management studies: one grounded in both critical discourse theory and algorithmic mediation. Scholars have noted that LLMs are inherently modeling varieties of language, including dialects, roles, and identity markers (Grieve et al., 2025). Yet management research has yet to fully theorize the implications of LLMs as discursive actors within organizations. This article proposes to do so.

We introduce a new research paradigm, namely, algorithmic discourse research (ADR), that integrates linguistic insight, organizational theory, and GenAI's affordances. The ADR represents both a methodological and epistemological shift in the Kuhnian sense (Kuhn, 1962), reconfiguring assumptions about ontology, epistemology, and method. Methodologically, it introduces novel AI-enabled research designs that combine computational scale with interpretive depth; epistemologically, it reframes how knowledge is generated and validated through a reflexive, context-aware engagement with language. The ADR treats language models not just as analytic tools, but as rhetorical and epistemic agents that co--construct organizational realities. While the ADR retains data-driven commitment to evidence and computational rigor, it adds a discursive and reflexive dimension, recognizing that language data are not neutral but value-laden and contextually situated. In this sense, the ADR may be understood as a recalibrated empiricism: aligned with the scale and precision of the fourth paradigm, yet broadened by sensitivity to meaning, interpretation, and organizational context.

We proceed conceptually rather than empirically. First, we revisit how prior research has conceptualized organizational language. Then, we examine how GenAI reshapes discursive possibilities, from multilingual simulations to

agent-based dialogue systems. Finally, we propose a multilevel framework and agenda for studying GenAI-mediated discourse, touching on leadership, power, inclusion, and organizational outcomes. While the framework links GenAI-mediated discourse from micro-level language to macro-level outcomes, it also points to an important caveat. GenAI appears to draw heavily on Anglo-American leadership ideals, such as individualism, assertiveness, and heroic masculinity, which may limit its sensitivity to alternative cultural models. This raises questions about how universal its insights can be and underscores the need for more contextually inclusive approaches (Westwood & Chan, 2001). Thus, understanding how GenAI transforms what language can do in organizations is both an empirical challenge and a critical opportunity for contemporary management research.

Literature Review

Early discourse scholarship emphasized that organizational reality is socially constructed through language (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000). Researchers showed how leaders' framing, metaphors, and narratives actively shape culture, strategy, and power relations (Fairclough, 2005; Denning, 2005; Spolsky, 2004). Key insights emerged: language is constitutive (not just reflective) of organization, ambiguity fosters multiple interpretations, and narratives give collective identity and purpose (Alvesson & Kärreman, 2000; Fairclough, 2005). For example, the simple act of describing a strategy as "aggressive" or "responsible" can alter investors' perceptions or employees' attitudes. These studies drew on theories from linguistics and social psychology, e.g., Communication Accommodation Theory shows how people adjust speech to converge or diverge socially, shaping group cohesion. Social Identity Theory explains how language signals in-group membership and values (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). Likewise, the sociology of language highlights that language serves as a vehicle for transmitting organizational culture (Schein, 1992, p. 236). Schein (1992), for example, noted that shared terminologies and stories encode implicit assumptions.

This line of work generated a rich understanding of internal processes. For instance, research on leadership found that through the effective use of language, leaders can articulate a compelling vision that aligns with the linguistic preferences of their employees, enhancing engagement and commitment (Fairhurst, 2011; Denning, 2005; Kahn, 1990). While early theorists focused on language as a vehicle for communication or culture transmission (e.g., Schein, 1992), our argument moves beyond this conduit model, emphasizing that language is constitutive, it actively shapes, rather than merely conveys, organizational reality. Studies on communication underscored that managers' linguistic skill affects trust and that inclusive phrasing promotes psychological safety. Investigations into diversity flagged both challenges and opportunities: a multilingual workforce is both an asset and a challenge as multiple languages can spur creativity, but also create barriers if not managed. Empirical surveys show firms with clear language policies and training (e.g. in second-language support) have higher employee engagement and fewer misunderstandings (Holmes, 2006). In sum, the literature established that organizational behavior is mediated by symbolic and linguistic processes, from cross-cultural communication (Hall, 1976) to narrative leadership (Denning, 2005).

However, these qualitative insights had practical limits. Most classic discourse studies were narrow in scope, e.g. single ethnographies or interview transcripts, making it hard to generalize. Manual coding of texts limited sample sizes, and researchers often worried about observer effects (as employees might alter language if recorded). Computational corpus linguistics partially addressed scale (e.g., through keyword counts or topic modeling on large documents), but it remained disconnected from the cutting edge of linguistic computation. Importantly, until recently, language and management research remained largely separate disciplines: management scholars rarely engaged computational linguistics, and language technologists seldom considered organizational contexts.

Yet context is not a neutral backdrop; it shapes both the production, content and interpretation of organizational discourse. In our theoretical framing, context is integral rather than peripheral. ADR explicitly operates on

the premise that context both shapes and is shaped by language. We describe the paradigm as a "situated, contextually nuanced epistemology" to signal that any analysis involving LLMs must account for the situational and cultural conditions surrounding the data. Accordingly, the proposed methodology pairs AI with human, context-aware oversight to ensure that interpretations remain reflexive and grounded in meaning. This contextual sensitivity is particularly important given the dominance of certain linguistic and cultural frames in organizational life. Dominant Anglo-American leadership discourses, saturated with values such as individualism, assertiveness, and heroic masculinity, have been exported globally "along with Coca-Cola and blue jeans" (Westwood & Chan, 2001, p. 204). Such discourses are treated as universal even though they clearly reflect culturally bounded assumptions that marginalize alternative traditions and perspectives, such as East Asian models of headship rooted in harmony and cohesion.

Meanwhile, the field of education and second-language acquisition has been a proving ground for generative AI's impact on language. Numerous studies (Creely, 2024; Lai, 2025; Daud et al. 2025) document that LLM-based tutors and writing assistants can personalize learning. For example, AI platforms now provide interactive grammar correction and vocabulary feedback; in classroom experiments, these tools have been shown to significantly benefit learners, particularly in acquiring new languages. Pack & Maloney (2023) and Wei (2023) report that introducing generative AI (e.g., ChatGPT) into language instruction increases student engagement and even short-term performance: students using AI tools often write longer, more complex texts and report higher motivation.

However, these studies also warn of challenges such as issues of academic integrity, overreliance on AI, and potential cognitive or cultural biases. These challenges are not merely technical but speak directly to underlying scientific values. Within a data-intensive paradigm, researchers inevitably make value--laden choices about data selection, fairness, and interpretive framing. Cognitive biases, for instance, arise when learners or systems overgeneralize AI outputs or adopt erroneous patterns that reflect the statistical shortcuts of training data (e.g., fossilizing non-standard grammar), while cultural biases emerge when LLMs reproduce dominant cultural references, stereotypes, or idioms

that marginalize alternative perspectives. Such phenomena illustrate how value judgments about what counts as accurate, fair, or representative are embedded within computational processes themselves. Rather than downplaying this, the ADR emphasizes transparency and reflexivity around these choices, recognizing that context and human judgment shape what counts as valid data or evidence. Traditional values such as rigor and reproducibility remain vital, but the value set is broadened to include ethical commitments to inclusivity, bias awareness, and cultural sensitivity as integral dimensions of methodological robustness in the AI era.

These challenges are not merely technical but tied to scientific and epistemic values, that is, to the standards by which research communities determine what counts as legitimate language, knowledge, and voice. Studies of multilingual academic publishing show how EAL scholars must navigate Anglo-centric rhetorical norms at the expense of their own voices and culturally situated ways of writing (Lehman & Sułkowski, 2023). As Ibarra-Colado observed in the context of Latin American organization studies, "to be allowed in you must deny your own identity: to belong in 'the international community', you must speak the Centre's language, use its concepts, discuss its agendas" (2006, p. 471). This signals a wider loss, not only of linguistic diversity but also of epistemic traditions for making sense of the world. Similar dynamics are visible in organizational scholarship, where English-language conventions privilege monologic, formulaic styles and marginalize alternative perspectives (Lehman & Tienari, 2024). In intercultural communication, such biases can generate semantic noise: messages may be linguistically correct yet pragmatically misaligned, reinforcing misunderstanding, exclusion, or unequal power relations.

Crucially, generative AI also promises to support endangered and low--resource languages. Recent work shows that AI-driven tools can document and teach nearly extinct languages, democratizing access (Wang, 2024). At the same time, Zaki and Ahmed (2024) argue that AI-powered translation systems could bridge linguistic divides and promote communication equity, but only if designed with cultural sensitivity. In sum, the language-education literature underscores that AI is a double-edged sword: it creates unprecedented learning opportunities (adaptive, interactive content) but raises pedagogical and ethical questions.

These insights foreshadow the broader stakes when LLMs are deployed in organizational settings.

Generative AI and the Transformation of Scholarly Inquiry

Generative AI (especially LLMs) has begun to attract scholarly attention in management and organization studies. A recent editorial essay by Cornelissen et al. (2024) argued that LLMs might support theoretical development in organization studies, offering unique conceptual frameworks. Empirical work is still nascent, but trends are visible: firms increasingly integrate AI into decision support, marketing, HR, and innovation processes. Organizations are deploying generative AI not only to parse customer sentiment and automate reporting, but also to optimize operational logistics, supply chain planning, and executive decision support systems. LLMs can therefore be seen as "linguistic actors", insofar as they produce, reframe, and circulate discourse within organizations. Rather than only classifying existing text, they generate new narratives, metaphors, and formulations that can shape managerial communication and decision-making. For example, analyses of board meeting transcripts can now employ AI-based coding of metaphors and modality to gauge executive confidence; preliminary evidence suggests such text metrics correlate with organizational strategy and investment patterns (Tang, 2024).

One emerging thread is the sociolinguistic nature of LLMs. Researchers like Grieve et al. (2025) emphasize that large language models "in general are inherently modelling varieties of language", that is, they encode regional dialects, styles, and registers from their vast training data. This aligns well with discourse theory, which argues that organizational language reflects social identity and power structures. In this case, LLMs are effectively learning these socio-cultural scripts. In practice, many studies have begun to address this issue from an interdisciplinary perspective: for instance, Wang (2024) use LLMs to analyze corporate earnings call narratives across countries, revealing shifts in moral framing related to global ESG trends (Senni et al., 2025). Such work

unites organizational storytelling, discourse differentiation (Denning, 2005) with computational capacity.

Yet gaps remain. Studies like Cornelissen et al., (2024) and Dvorak et al. (2025) are among the first to theorize LLMs' role in management, but a broader conceptual framing is needed. In particular, there is an opportunity to integrate: (1) discourse-based management research, (2) computational text analytics, and (3) pragmatics of human–AI interaction. For example, insights from critical discourse analysis, which emphasize that language perpetuates power structures, can be extended to AI-mediated settings: how might LLM-generated narratives reinforce or challenge existing hierarchies? Likewise, agentic conceptions of AI suggest LLMs themselves participate in organizational sensemaking. Indeed, Dvorak et al. (2025) warn of adverse reactions when LLMs are mistaken for human experts, implying ethical and epistemic complexities.

Generative AI (especially LLMs) has begun to attract scholarly attention in management and organization studies. A recent editorial essay by Cornelissen et al. (2024) argued that LLMs might "support theoretical development in organization studies, offering unique conceptual frameworks". Empirical work is still nascent, but trends are visible: firms increasingly integrate AI into decision support, marketing, HR, and innovation processes. Organizations are deploying generative AI not only to parse customer sentiment and automate reporting, but also to optimize operational logistics, supply chain planning, and executive decision support systems. LLMs can therefore be seen as "linguistic actors", insofar as they produce, reframe, and circulate discourse within organizations. Rather than only classifying existing text, they generate new narratives, metaphors, and formulations that can shape managerial communication and decision-making. For example, analyses of board meeting transcripts can now employ AI-based coding of metaphors and modality to gauge executive confidence; preliminary evidence suggests such text metrics correlate with organizational strategy and investment patterns (Tang, 2024).

One emerging thread is the sociolinguistic nature of LLMs. Researchers like Grieve et al. (2025) emphasize that large language models in general are inherently modeling varieties of language, that is, they encode regional dialects, styles, and registers from their vast training data. This aligns well with discourse theory, which argues that organizational language reflects social

identity and power structures. In this case, LLMs are effectively learning these socio-cultural scripts. In practice, many studies have begun to address this issue from an interdisciplinary perspective: for instance, Wang (2024) use LLMs to analyze corporate earnings call narratives across countries, revealing shifts in moral framing related to global ESG trends (Senni et al., 2025). Such work unites organizational storytelling, discourse differentiation (Denning, 2005) with computational capacity.

Yet gaps remain. Studies like Cornelissen et al., (2024) and Dvorak et al. (2025) are among the first to theorize LLMs' role in management, but a broader conceptual framing is needed. In particular, there is an opportunity to integrate: (1) discourse-based management research, (2) computational text analytics, and (3) pragmatics of human–AI interaction. For example, insights from critical discourse analysis, which emphasize that language perpetuates power structures, can be extended to AI-mediated settings: how might LLM-generated narratives reinforce or challenge existing hierarchies? Likewise, agentic conceptions of AI suggest LLMs themselves participate in organizational sensemaking. Indeed, Dvorak et al. (2025) warn of adverse reactions when LLMs are mistaken for human experts, implying ethical and epistemic complexities.

The phenomena observed in generative AI research reflect a broader paradigmatic shift in empirical inquiry, as researchers engage with vast, dynamic, and computationally mediated data in ways that challenge traditional positivist assumptions (Knight et al., 2022). Earlier forms of empiricism, including logical and empirical positivism, emphasized hypothesis-driven research, controlled observation, and the falsifiability of theories (Popper, 1957; Kageyama, 2003). However, advances in technology enabled positivist approaches to extend these principles, enhancing rigor, confidentiality, and data handling in organizational research. As such, the rise of digital empiricism represents a significant development in this trajectory, extending classical empiricist commitments into a computational age while also prompting reflection on traditional assumptions about objectivity and value-neutrality.

Digital empiricism emerges in response to the scale and complexity of contemporary data environments where large datasets and computational tools transform how researchers engage with evidence as part of empirical inquiry

(Knight et al., 2022). This is not a break from prior empirical traditions; rather, it is a recalibration. Digital empiricism retains the empiricist commitment to grounding knowledge in observation and evidence but may modify the methods and analytical reasoning used to generate and interpret those observations.

A central distinction between digital and classical empiricism is the role of the data itself. In digital empiricism, data are not only evidence to test pre-existing hypotheses but also serve as a starting point for exploratory inquiry. Due to the unprecedented rise of digitalization, researchers increasingly work with large, unstructured datasets that allow patterns, correlations, and anomalies to surface without reliance on predefined theoretical frameworks. This encourages inductive approaches, where theory may develop in response to insights emerging from the data. Computational models and algorithmic tools further enhance this process by detecting subtle patterns at scale, often inspiring new theoretical directions.

In this sense, digital empiricism offers an alternative approach to studying phenomena, shaped by both technological affordances and novel epistemological possibilities. Rather than replacing earlier paradigms, it builds on them, expanding the repertoire of methods and perspectives available to researchers in the era of generative AI.

This evolution can also be situated within the broader Kuhnian concept of paradigms. While Kuhn (2009) focused on transformations in the natural sciences, his idea of paradigms, as shared frameworks of assumptions, values, and practices, remains relevant for understanding changes in empirical research. The rise of data-intensive, computational research exemplifies such a shift. It does not discard previous modes of knowledge but rather broadens the epistemic tools and approaches available to scientific communities.

The growth of data-intensive research also complicates the traditional distinction between facts and values. Computational science positions value-laden decisions as central to the research process. These decisions are particularly relevant in contexts where data equivalence must be maintained across different languages, as highlighted by Chidlow et al. (2014). Ensuring equivalence is not merely a technical concern, it reflects interpretive judgments

about what counts as valid, relevant, and meaningful data, especially when terms, concepts, or idioms do not translate neatly across linguistic contexts. Such judgments are central to methodological credibility.

In digitally mediated research, both computational tools and human decisions interact to shape outcomes, meaning that considerations of equivalence, translation choices, context, and interpretive framing are inseparable from epistemic and ethical choices (Knight et al., 2022). For instance, an algorithm trained primarily on English corpora may misrepresent or oversimplify discourse in other languages, raising questions of bias and representational fairness. From selecting data and designing algorithms to interpreting outputs, researchers face choices that reflect epistemic, ethical, social, and political considerations. Issues such as privacy, fairness, interpretability, cross-language comparability, and accountability are central to the credibility of knowledge. The reliance on opaque or proprietary algorithms further challenges conventional standards like reproducibility and falsifiability, prompting a re-examination of what counts as objective and reliable evidence.

Importantly, these developments do not signal a rejection of empirical rigor or positivist traditions. Instead, they reflect an evolution in scientific practice, where values. both epistemic and non-epistemic, are acknowledged as integral to research within data-intensive, computational contexts. These approaches introduce new methods, tools, and dilemmas while continuing to ground claims in observable evidence, representing a recalibrated and technologically informed form of inquiry suited to contemporary research environments.

Generative AI and large language models exemplify this shift. They do not merely classify existing information but produce, reframe, and circulate discourse, revealing patterns that might not have been anticipated. Studying LLMs in organizational contexts represents a move toward a situated, reflexive, and contextually nuanced epistemology, in which AI functions both as a tool and as an agent shaping knowledge. This aligns with the broader data-driven paradigm shift, illustrating how contemporary organizational research increasingly integrates computational, linguistic, and epistemological innovation.

Conceptual Framework

We propose a multilevel, processual framework linking GenAI affordances to organizational discursive transformations and outcomes, moderated by organizational context. At the micro level are the linguistic features of discourse: words, syntax, sentiment, metaphor, modality, etc. Using LLMs, researchers can code or generate text to quantify these micro-elements automatically. For instance, an earnings-call Q&A transcript can be parsed for epistemic modality (hedges, certainty) to infer managerial confidence; early work shows such modality shifts predict innovation announcements. At the meso level are discursive routines and genres, e.g. strategy narratives, sensemaking meetings, annual reports. GenAI enables creation and experimentation with these routines: for example, researchers could prompt a GPT-based agent to play a CEO creating a vision statement, and observe how slight changes in language affect simulated stakeholder reactions. At the macro level are organizational outcomes like performance, trust, or innovation rate. Our framework posits that shifts at the micro and meso levels (e.g. more direct language, new metaphors) impact these outcomes, potentially mediated by factors such as company culture, AI-readiness, and governance. To operationalize this, Table 1 outlines illustrative LLM capabilities and research applications.

Table 1. Examples of using LLM/generative AI capabilities for organizational discourse research

AI Capability	Organization Research Use	Example
Text Generation	Scenario prototyping, counterfactual simulations	Use GPT agents to simulate boardroom discussions under different strategies (e.g., varying vision statements)
Contextual Classification	Automated coding of discourse (sentiment, topics, speech acts)	Classify internal chat logs by speech act (request, complaint) to study group norms
Agentic Simulation	Emergent interactions & norms (multi-agent dialogues)	Instantiate LLM personas (CEO, engineer, HR) in simulation to see how discourse evolves and how policies might form
Translation & Paraphrasing	Cross-cultural communication analysis	Generate translated or style-shifted versions of employee feedback to examine inclusion
Dialogue Systems	Mixed human-AI interviews or surveys	Use conversational AI to conduct qualitative interviews, or to help code responses with AI-assist

Source: Authors' own elaboration.

These capabilities make novel methods possible. For example, one could assemble a synthetic corpus combining internal memos, public filings, and AI--generated scenarios, then apply few-shot LLM prompts to annotate discourse patterns. Or one could use LLMs as collaborative co-researchers: for instance, pose theoretical questions to GPT (aided by human oversight) and compare its outputs across model versions as a form of exploratory theorizing (Cornelissen et al., 2024).

Conceptually, the flow can be depicted as: GenAI affordances ⇒ Discursive transformations ⇒ Organizational capabilities ⇒ Outcomes, with organizational

readiness factors (strategic alignment, culture, IT infrastructure, employee skills) moderating these relationships. For instance, a firm with high AI literacy (readiness) may rapidly adopt clear, unambiguous AI-generated messaging, leading to faster decision-making, whereas a low-readiness firm may misinterpret AI suggestions, risking miscommunication.

The following research questions flow from this model:

RQ1: *How does the integration of GenAI into knowledge-work routines reshape discursive sensemaking among cross-functional teams?*

RQ2: *What linguistic markers in strategy documents differentiate successful from unsuccessful GenAI initiatives?*

RQ3: *How do LLM-mediated dialogues alter power dynamics in hierarchical versus flat organizational structures?*

RQ4: *Can simulated AI-agent interactions predict emergent governance norms in digital-native firms?*

RQ5: *Which organizational readiness factors (strategic, cultural, technical) most strongly moderate the effect of GenAI affordances on innovation outcomes?*

As generative AI becomes embedded in organizational research, it invites designs that transcend conventional methodological boundaries by combining computational, experimental, and interpretive approaches. In practice, research designs may adopt methodologically pluralistic pipelines that integrate computational scale with interpretive depth. For example, large-scale topic modeling across thousands of documents, complemented by GPT-mediated narrative simulations, and subsequently triangulated through interpretive case interviews. Such hybrid designs exemplify the emerging paradigm of *Algorithmic Discourse Research*, in which generative AI is mobilized as a discursive collaborator that enables new forms of methodological triangulation and epistemic pluralism.

Discussion

The proposed paradigm offers several contributions, including:

1) Theoretical contributions,
2) Methodological contributions,
3) Practical implications,
4) Ethical and epistemic considerations.

Theoretical contributions. GenAI recenters language in organization theory by recognizing language models as new organizational actors. Traditional discourse studies treated language as held by people; ADR treats algorithms as co-constructing discourse. This helps integrate sociolinguistics (language varieties, registers) with management. For instance, the finding that LLMs are inherently modeling varieties of language suggests we can quantitatively study dialect use in corporate narratives, linking back to theories of cultural diversity. More broadly, ADR may constitute a third epistemic path alongside quantitative and qualitative research. It allows hypothesis generation by simulation, not just testing, which is closer to abductive or design science methodologies.

Methodological contributions. Hybrid human, AI workflows are becoming a key innovation in organizational research and exemplify data-driven research in practice. For example, LLMs can pre-code sentiment, speech acts, or themes across thousands of emails, while human experts review and refine these labels. This combination ensures that patterns detected by AI remain accurate, meaningful, and appropriate, reflecting the balance between computational pattern generation and human interpretive judgment, a hallmark of data-driven inquiry. Another promising approach is agent-based linguistic simulation, where LLM-driven personas model employee behaviors or test organizational strategies before implementation.

This allows researchers to explore complex social interactions in a controlled yet flexible manner, extending traditional empirical methods through computational experimentation (Knight et al., 2022). Moreover, in linguistically sensitive research, these workflows raise distinctive challenges of equivalence.

As Chidlow et al. (2014) emphasize, ensuring that meanings remain valid across linguistic and cultural settings is not simply a technical issue but one bound up with interpretive and ethical choices. Data-driven research highlights how algorithmic tools may amplify or distort such issues, for instance, when corpora are dominated by English-language data or when cultural metaphors do not translate neatly. Human review therefore remains central to ensure that AI-enabled analysis does not flatten linguistic or cultural richness. By sharing prompt libraries and synthetic datasets, researchers also improve transparency, replicability, and reflexivity, making both the computational processes and interpretive choices explicit and open to scrutiny. Overall, this hybrid methodology combines the scale and efficiency of AI with the critical oversight of human researchers. It moves beyond purely manual coding or statistical NLP, illustrating how generative AI not only transforms methods but also reshapes the epistemological approach to organizational research, consistent with the principles of data-driven inquiry and the dynamic nature of meaning in language.

Practical implications. For managers, ADR offers early-warning indicators and process insights. For instance, AI analysis of internal chat could flag rising confusion (via rising interrogative usage) before it manifests in attrition. LLMs can generate role-based narratives to train teams on communication strategies. Importantly, ADR highlights readiness gaps. If our framework is correct, firms will find cognitive readiness (AI literacy, openness to new narratives) and cultural readiness (e.g., tolerance for algorithmic suggestions) to be critical enablers. The language-based indicators of adoption success might include decreasing modal hedges in strategy docs (a sign of growing confidence) or the emergence of metaphors (e.g., "digital twin") which LLMs can help track. Governance implications are also evident: as firms deploy AI-generated content externally, transparency norms may require labeling and discourse standards (e.g., clear denotation of AI-generated reports).

Ethical and epistemic considerations. ADR extends classic discourse concerns into the AI era, foregrounding the complex interplay between computational tools, human judgment, and organizational context. Issues of authorship and originality are especially salient: who "owns" an AI-generated report? Akinwande et al. (2024) highlight how human and machine creativity merge, challenging

traditional notions of intellectual ownership. Data bias remains a critical concern. LLMs can reproduce or amplify racial, gender, or cultural biases unless carefully audited. Moreover, cross-language research introduces additional complexity: ensuring data equivalence across languages requires interpretive decisions that are inherently value-laden (Chidlow et al., 2014). The ADR thus emphasizes that computational outputs cannot be treated as neutral; context, human oversight, and reflexive interpretation shape what counts as valid and meaningful data. Transparency and reproducibility are equally central. When researchers analyze corpora of AI-generated or translated texts, disclosure of AI usage and methodological choices is necessary, echoing emerging journal policies (Organization Theory). A reflexive process operates as organizations adopt and internalize AI-generated narratives, which in turn reshape the discourse that constructs organizational life. For example, ChatGPT-generated training materials may shift educational or workplace culture, as Huovinen (2024) found in a business-school pilot. In sum, researchers must study a "moving target": what Luhmann (1993, 1995) describes as second-order observation of language changes. ADR highlights that ethical, epistemic, and contextual considerations are inseparable: AI affordances, human interpretation, organizational context, and cross-language equivalence collectively determine the meaning, validity, and societal implications of research outputs.

A potential critique is that the ADR represents little more than a technologically fashionable extension of existing methods. Yet generative AI does not replicate prior approaches as it substantially extends the foundational aims of discourse analysis. Whereas traditional studies sought to elucidate how language constitutes power and meaning, large language models now enable this inquiry at unprecedented scale and depth. By processing billions of tokens and generating counterfactual or "what-if" dialogues, LLMs afford interactive experimentation with discursive dynamics that were previously accessible only through small--scale case studies. Moreover, the ability to generate multilingual corpora on demand makes it possible to study cross-cultural discourse with a level of detail and comparability that was previously out of reach. In this respect, generative AI may be understood as a natural progression of computational social science; one that places language at the center of organizational inquiry.

Conclusion

We have argued that generative AI heralds a new paradigm in organizational research by knitting together linguistics and management in novel ways. The once-separate streams of discourse analysis and information technology now converge. Generative AI and LLMs do not merely analyze language, but they create and mediate it. As such, they demand we reconceive our epistemology: language is no longer just a window on organization, but an actor in its own right. By foregrounding AI's linguistic affordances, we have outlined an agenda for the ADR. This agenda re-centers language (and its algorithmic generation) in theory-building, positioning the ADR alongside positivist and interpretive paradigms.

Importantly, the path ahead is collaborative and open-ended. We encourage scholars to develop open-science infrastructures (shared prompt repositories, synthetic benchmark corpora) to enable cumulative progress. Cross-cultural work is vital: multilingual LLMs can help de-center the Anglo-American bias in management discourse. We also urge investigation into co-agency: as organizations outsource tasks to LLMs, how do decision-making and creativity patterns change? For example, does having an AI collaborator in a strategic workshop democratize participation or reinforce existing power roles?

In practical terms, the marriage of linguistics and management through GenAI offers rich potential. Organizations may soon evaluate ESG commitments through AI-coded narratives, or predict cultural clashes by simulating multilingual team meetings. However, this future depends on careful guidance: managers and regulators should work with researchers to set standards for transparency, fairness, and accountability in AI-mediated language.

In conclusion, generative AI has ushered in a second linguistic turn: an era of algorithmic construction that redefines the relationship between language and organization. Embracing this shift offers scholars and practitioners not only sharper analytical tools but also the possibility of shaping more inclusive, innovative organizational futures. The horizon is no longer confined to studying language in organizations; it now extends to organizing with language models themselves. The challenge, and the opportunity, is to guide this transformation

wisely: grounding it in linguistic insight while unleashing the creative force of AI innovation.

Disclosure

We hereby declare that our scientific work was researched and written independently by us. We used only standard editing tools, such as language-correction functions in word processors, as well as our own notes and the scholarly literature necessary for preparing the text.

References

Akinwande, M., Adeliyi, O., & Yussuph, T. (2024). Decoding AI and human authorship: Nuances revealed through NLP and statistical analysis. *International Journal on Cybernetics & Informatics*, *13*(4), 85–103.

Alvesson, M., & Kärreman, D. (2000). Varieties of discourse: On the study of organizations through discourse analysis. *Human Relations*, *53*(9), 1125–1149.

Bitzer, L. F. (1968). The rhetorical situation. *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, *1*(1), 1–14.

Brzozowska, M., Kolasińska-Morawska, K., Sułkowski, Ł., & Morawski, P. (2023). Artificial-intelligence-powered customer service management in the logistics industry. *Entrepreneurial Business and Economics Review*, *11*(4), 109–121.

Chidlow, A., Plakoyiannaki, E. & Welch, C. (2014). Translation in cross-language international business research: Beyond equivalence. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *45*(5), 562–582.

Cornelissen, J., Höllerer, M. A., Boxenbaum, E., Faraj, S., & Gehman, J. (2024). Large language models and the future of organization theory. *Organization Theory*, 5(1).

Creely, E. (2024). Exploring the role of generative AI in enhancing language learning: Opportunities and challenges. *International Journal of Changes in Education*, *1*(3), 158–167.

Daud, A., Aulia, A. F., Muryanti, Harfal, Z., Nabilla, O., & Ali, H. S. (2025). Integrating artificial intelligence into English language teaching: A systematic review. *European Journal of Educational Research*, *14*(2), 677–691.

Denning, S. (2005). *The Leader's Guide to Storytelling*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Dvorak, F., Stumpf, R., Fehrler, S., & Fischbacher, U. (2025). Adverse reactions to the use of large language models in social interactions. *PNAS Nexus*, 4(4).

Fairclough, N. (2005). *Critical Discourse Analysis: The Critical Study of Language*. Longman.

Fairhurst, G. T. (2011). *The Power of Framing: Creating the Language of Leadership*. Jossey-Bass.

Fairhurst, G. T., & Cooren, F. (2009). Leadership as the hybrid production of presence(s). *Leadership*, 5(4), 469–490.

Fairhurst, G. T., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2012). Organizational discourse analysis (ODA): Examining leadership as a relational process. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *23*(6), 1043–1062.

Giles, H. (1973). Communication accommodation theory. In *Language and social psychology* (pp. 103–114). Basil Blackwell.

Grieve, J., Bartl, S., Fuoli, M., Grafmiller, J., Huang, W., Jawerbaum, A., Murakami, A., Perlman, M., & Winter, B. (2025). The sociolinguistic foundations of language modeling. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, *7*, 1472411.

Grint, K. (2005). Problems, problems, problems: The social construction of leadership. *Human Relations*, *58*(11), 1467–1494.

Grint, K. (2000). *The Arts of Leadership*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Books.

Holmes, P. (2006). Problematising intercultural communication competence in the pluricultural classroom: Chinese students in a New Zealand university. *Language and intercultural communication*, (6)1, 18–34.

Huovinen, L. (2024). Assessing usability of large language models in education. *Electronic Journal of Education Research*, OSF Preprint.

Ibarra-Colado, E. (2006). Organization studies and epistemic coloniality in Latin America: Thinking Otherness from the margins, *Organization*, *13*(4), 463–488.

Jarco, D., Sułkowski, Ł. (2023). Is ChatGPT better at business consulting than an experienced human analyst? An experimental comparison of solutions to a strategic business problem. *Forum Scientiae Oeconomia*, *11*(2), 87–109.

Kageyama, Y. (2003). Openness to the Unknown: The Role of Falsifiability in Search of Better Knowledge. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences*, *33*, 100–121.

Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, *33*(4), 692–724.

Knight, G., Chidlow, A., & Minbaeva, D. (2022). Methodological Fit for Empirical Research in International Business: A Contingency Framework. *Journal of International Business Studies*, *53*(1), 39–52.

Kuhn, T. (1962). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lai, Z. (2025). The impact of AI-assisted blended learning on writing efficacy and resilience. *International Journal of Computer-Assisted Language Learning and Teaching*, *15*(1), 1–21.

Lehman, I. M., & Tienari, J. (2024). What do you mean? Linguistic sensitivity and relational reflexivity in scholarly writing. *Organization*, *32*(3), 464–475.

Lehman, I. M., & Sułkowski, Ł. (2023). Reader perceptions of authorial voice in top-tier management journals: The case of doctoral students of management from Eastern Europe. *Journal of Management Education*, *47*(4), 349–387.

Luhmann, N. (1995). *Social systems*. Stanford University Press.

Luhmann, N. (1993). Deconstruction as second-order observing. *New Literary History*, *24*(4), 763–782.

Pack, A., & Maloney, J. (2023). Using generative AI for language education research: Insights from using OpenAI's ChatGPT. *TESOL Quarterly*, *57*(4), 1571–1582.

Popper, K. (1957). *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. Oxford: Routledge.

Schein, E. H. (1992). *Organizational Culture and Leadership* (2nd ed.). Jossey-Bass.

Senni, C., Schimanski, T., Bingler, J., Ni, J., & Leippold, M. (2025). Using AI to assess corporate climate transition disclosures. *Environmental Research Communications*, *7*(2), 021010.

Spolsky, B. (2004). *Language Policy*. Cambridge University Press.

Tang, N. (2024). Leveraging big data and AI for enhanced business decision-making: Strategies, challenges, and future directions. *Journal of Applied Economic and Policy Studies*, *11*(1), 25–29.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations* (pp. 33–47). Brooks/Cole.

Wang, L. (2024). AI's role in endangered languages: Documentation and teaching. *Applied and Computational Engineering*, *48*(1), 123–129.

Wei, L. (2023). Artificial intelligence in language instruction: Impact on English learning achievement, L2 motivation, and self-regulated learning. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *14*, 1261955.

Westwood, R. I., & Chan, A. (2001). The Transferability of Leadership Training in the East Asian Context. In Gannon, M.J. (Ed), *Cultural Metaphors: Readings, Research Translations, and Commentary* (pp. 203–230). Thousand Oaks, CA.: SAGE.

Zaki, M., & Ahmed, U. (2024). Bridging linguistic divides: The impact of AI-powered translation systems on communication equity and inclusion. *Journal of Translation and Language Studies*, 5(2).