Course:	SKOM12
Term:	Spring 2024
Supervisor	Howard Nothhaft
Examiner	

From Talk to Tech: Employee Perspectives on Generative AI Adoption in Corporate Communication

DARIA NEDASHKOVSKAIA

Lund University
Department of strategic communication
Master's thesis

Abstract

From Talk to Tech: Employee Perspectives on Generative AI Adoption in Corporate Communication

Generative AI (Gen AI) is rapidly transforming communication within organizations. While existing research delves into the ethical considerations and productivity impacts of Gen AI, a critical gap remains: how communication specialists, who play a vital role in organizational sensemaking, experience this change. This study addresses this gap by investigating how communication specialists from medium and large companies interpret the influence of Gen AI on their professional lives and the organizations they work in. The research employs an interpretive qualitative approach and utilizes in-depth interviews with communication specialists across various European industries. The study explores this process through the lens of SCARF and sensemaking theories. The findings reveal that communication specialists are in a transitional phase, redefining their roles as Generative AI automates some content creation tasks. While acknowledging a potential decrease in the value of technical content creation skills, the specialists recognize the need to develop their expertise in project management and crafting original, human-centric stories, which will be more valuable in a world saturated with quickly produced ordinary content. Furthermore, the study findings emphasize the importance of clear and open communication from leadership regarding Gen AI implementation to foster a sense of autonomy and certainty among employees.

Keywords: Generative AI, sensemaking, SCARF, organizational change, strategic communication

Number of words: 19 255

Acknowledgments

First and foremost, I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor, Howard Nothhaft, for his unwavering support, belief in my research topic, and invaluable guidance throughout this journey. Our discussions on ontology and the exploration of multiple levels of reality, coupled with his insightful advice on relevant literature, have profoundly influenced both my academic and personal growth.

I am deeply grateful to my family for their constant love and encouragement. My husband's support and my daughter's positive energy have been essential in helping me navigate this journey from start to finish.

Lastly, I want to express my appreciation to Lund University and the Strategic Communication Department. Huge thanks to all my professors and my bright and amazing classmates, many of whom became my friends. Inspiring conversations with you and the welcoming atmosphere truly made this program a rewarding experience, leading to the creation of this research.

Table of contents

1. Introduction

Nowadays, finding a more prominent and widely discussed topic than Generative AI (Gen AI) is challenging. Many issues arise in the context of the spread of this phenomenon and are already being considered in the academic community (McCorkindale, 2024; Noy & Zhang, 2023; Yalcin & Puntoni, 2023; Zhan et al., 2023). This research suggests looking at Generative AI as a technology that triggers the change of existing processes among communication professionals in various organizations. According to McKinsey's Global Survey on executives, conducted in April 2023, many businesses are already implementing Generative AI into their workloads (Chui et al., 2023). One-third of the respondents mentioned using Generative AI in at least one of their business functions, while 28% admitted that it is already on their companies' boards' agendas. As with any significant strategic change, it can be supposed that companies are not only changing current processes on a tactical level but also engaging in negotiation cycles and making sense of what this technological innovation means for organizations and professionals (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991). Based on the view of an organization as a dynamic system where individuals constantly create meaning through interactions and communication (Weick, 2001), the process of comprehension of this new phenomenon is happening within many companies right now.

Effective communication within the company, particularly the acknowledgment of the necessity for change by all stakeholders, including employees, constitutes a critical component without which organizational change remains unattainable (Christensen et al., 2008). Moreover, in the context of Generative AI, the company's employees are precisely the people whose workflow may undergo significant changes after the introduction of Generative AI systems (Chui et al., 2023). Furthermore, it is imperative to recognize that deliberately initiated organizational change by top management is not the only way a company can embark on the transformation process (Cheney et al., 2011). Drawing from the premise that communication is constitutive of the organization (Putnam et al., 2009) and sensemaking processes are a core of any organization (Weick, 2001), employees may be facilitators of change. Hence, employees should occupy a central position in discussions pertaining to organizational change in the context of AI adoption.

Nevertheless, the prevailing scholarly discourse predominantly gravitates toward philosophical and ethical inquiries associated with integrating Generative AI (Bran et al., 2023; Vinchon et al., 2023) or assessing its potential ramifications on specialists' productivity in different industries from a management perspective (Haj Bara et al., 2022; Noy & Zhang, 2023). Regrettably, such studies do not address the immediate phenomenon unfolding — the deployment of AI systems within large corporations, directly affecting thousands of employees' daily work routines.

Employees across diverse business functions are either currently encountering or will confront Gen AI in their operational procedures (Chui et al., 2023; McKinsey & Company, 2023). Nonetheless, considering the distinct characteristics of the phenomenon under observation and the unique role of communication specialists within the organization as people helping to make sense of challenging processes (Falkheimer & Heide, 2023), communication professionals are among the primary individuals whose responsibilities will undergo substantial transformation owing to this technological evolution. However, what is known about the readiness of communication specialists to meet this new reality? A significant research gap in this area provoked the current study. While there is existing data indicating that managers across numerous companies contemplate the implementation of AI systems (McKinsey & Company, 2023), alongside evidence suggesting that GenAI enhances efficiency and expedites workflows (Brynjolfsson et al., 2023; Noy & Zhang, 2023), our understanding of how communication specialists interpret these developments within the context of their roles and organizations remains deficient. Essential inquiries remain unaddressed: What stage has the implementation of AI systems reached within the communication field? How do communication specialists make sense of such advancements? What challenges do they encounter in deploying AI solutions at the organizational level? How do they react to these obstacles? These unanswered questions have motivated the initiation of this research endeavor.

The topic of Generative AI implementation on an organizational level presents a vital area for strategic communication. While the field of strategic communication boasts a rich history of evolving definitions, with some viewing it as a replacement for public relations and others as an umbrella term for diverse organizational communication efforts (Zerfass et al., 2018), a core principle persists: strategic communication is characterized by engaging in conversations critical for organizational survival (Falkheimer & Heide, 2023; Zerfass et al., 2018). As conversations surrounding AI adoption climb the corporate ladder and promise to reshape processes across industries (Chui et al., 2023; McKinsey

& Company, 2023), effectively communicating the implementation of Generative AI becomes a strategic imperative.

The research enriches the field of strategic communication on multiple levels. Firstly, the inquiry enriches organizational communication discourse by researching the phenomena under scrutiny unfolding in the organizational context. It explores organizational dynamics from an employee perspective, offering a counterbalance to the predominant top-management-centric perspective often favored by researchers (Davidson, 2006; Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991; Leinwand & Mani, 2022). Additionally, this study examines the type of organizational change caused by external technological factors (Christensen et al., 2008), thereby contributing to understanding the causes of organizational change within corporate structures. It adds knowledge to the academic research of organizational change and transformation processes, giving scholars more data on the specific type of organizational change. Secondly, the focus on communication specialists leads to the inquiry into the identity of communicational specialists. The study addresses how current communication professionals make sense of their knowledge, functions, and the profession's future. Thirdly, from a practical standpoint, the research is precious for practitioners within large corporations contemplating the integration of Gen AI in the workload of communication departments. The current study provides insights into how communication specialists make sense of the phenomena, what issues they encounter, and what they expect from managers to tackle them.

1.1 Research Design

The research adopts a qualitative approach, employing in-depth semi-structured interviews with communication specialists as its primary methodological framework. The sample consists of twelve communication practitioners employed by middle- and large-sized companies with over 500 employees across various industries in Europe. The companies in the study span a spectrum of stages in Generative AI implementation, ranging from those yet to initiate implementation to those actively developing operational internal Generative AI systems tailored for job-related tasks. Despite the diversity in implementation stages, all respondents possess firsthand experience utilizing at least one Generative AI platform.

The study pursues several goals and wants to consider the attitude of communication specialists to the phenomenon both on a personal and organizational level. Therefore, two research questions were formulated:

RQ1: How do corporate communication specialists make sense of Generative AI's influence on their professional lives?

RQ2: How do employees perceive hindering factors that may arise from organizational change associated with Generative AI implementation in corporate communication?

The study employs the combination of two theoretical frameworks as the theoretical lens for this investigation. The SCARF theory (Rock, 2007) and sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995) provide an opportunity for a profound analysis of the collected data while fostering consilience within the scientific domain. The SCARF is an abbreviation for Status, Certainty, Autonomy, Relatedness, and Fairness (Rock, 2007). According to neuroscientific experiments, thread and award reactions in the human brain are closely connected to these five domains of social experience. Therefore, situations that humans comprehend as dangerous or, on the contrary, favorable to their status or their understanding of fairness or certainty in the future may cause a specific reaction at the biological level, which in turn affects social behavior. The SCARF model serves as a framework for analysis, elucidating the categories of social situations that prompt reactions from respondents. However, the primary focus of the study lies in comprehending the nuanced interpretations that respondents attribute to these social situations. Following the interpretative paradigm, in which an individual's perspectives and experiences constitute their perception of any situation, sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995) was selected to illuminate precisely how respondents comprehend their biological reactions. It guides both the collection and the analysis of the data, helping to identify how the respondents' environment and experience influence their understanding of the organizational change. Sensemaking theory aligns seamlessly with organizational research and offers a complementary perspective to viewing organizations in alignment with the Constitutive Communication perspective (CCO) (Putnam et al., 2009).

Such a combination of theories also contributes to the advancement of the idea of consilience in science, social sciences, and, in particular, strategic communications, a necessity highlighted by numerous researchers (Bhaskar, 2008; Falkheimer & Heide, 2023; Wilson, 2003; Zerfass et al., 2018). Following the notion of multiple levels of reality and Depth Ontology (Bhaskar, 2008), which are situated within the theoretical background, the study attempts to comprehensively examine social situations that elicit responses from respondents. This interdisciplinary approach is vital for the strategic communication academic field as it enables a nuanced understanding of the complex

dynamics underlying human interactions and allows for the development of more effective communication strategies tailored to diverse contexts and audiences.

1.2 Background: Generative AI

As the study examines organizational change through the lens of Gen AI implementation in communication workflows, it is imperative to delve into the current state of technology development and its usage in contemporary communication practices. This section provides an overview and synthesizes existing data and research on the phenomenon of Generative AI.

The term generative AI encompasses a variety of AI systems distinguished by their capacity to generate new assets using the patterns in the data on which the systems were trained (Bubeck et al., 2023). Prominent applications under the umbrella of Generative AI include ChatGPT (Open AI, 2022), Gemini (Google, n.d.), MidJourney (Midjourney, n.d.), DALL-E (Open AI, n.d.). These applications use different machine-learning technologies to address users' requests. For example, Large Language Models (LLMs), a Generative AI class, can generate texts by predicting the following word in the sequence (Bubeck et al., 2023). Trained on massive amounts of data, these machine-learning models can compile grammatically correct and meaningful texts or programming code and audio. ChatGPT, which attracted much attention and started the boom of Generative AI, belongs specifically to the LLM class (Open AI, 2022).

The launch of ChatGPT in 2022 increased interest in the topic and brought the discussion about Generative AI to a fundamentally new level. Thanks to the availability of the ChatGPT app, which was free of charge and equipped with a user-friendly interface (Open AI, 2022), an enormous amount of people could take advantage of the novelty and evaluate it. If one types "Generative AI" into "Google Trends," which illustrates worldwide Google searches, they can display an impressive graph (Google, 2024). The curve started to go up rapidly in the fall of 2022 when Open AI released the ChatGPT (Open AI, 2022), and it remained at the top, slightly falling and rising throughout 2023 and early 2024. Collins Dictionary declared "AI" a word of the year 2023 (Collins Dictionary, 2023). Cambridge Dictionary, in turn, selected the word "hallucinate," highlighting how the Generative AI boom changed the meaning of this word that people started to use in situations when Generative AI tools provide false information (University of Cambridge, 2023). All these facts showcase the general audience's interest in

innovation and specific Generative AI tools that have become available to a broad audience during the last couple of years.

AI's ability to be creative and effective immediately attracted the interest of representatives of the academy and business, who began an active discussion (Bran et al., 2023; Bubeck et al., 2023; Noy & Zhang, 2023; Vinchon et al., 2023). Regarding efficiency, most of the experiments confirm that using generative AI tools increases the quality and speed of work in certain types of tasks, such as writing texts, especially among novice specialists (Bubeck et al., 2023; Noy & Zhang, 2023). However, it is more complex and controversial with creativity. Even though Generative AI can produce new assets like texts, visuals, audio, video, and code, it is still trained on the existing data (Bran et al., 2023). Therefore, the question about uniqueness and originality is in place. Moreover, it raises legal questions about the authorship of the content produced by Gen AI. World Intellectual Property Organization warns that AI output is not intellectually protected because the laws of most countries are still trying to comprehend how to approach this new content creation process from a legal point of view (WIPO, 2024).

Ethics is another topic that has been actively discussed because of the rapid spread of Gen AI. Researchers and specialists highlight that since Gen AI models are trained on data from the Internet, they reproduce racial, gender, and other biases, spreading inequality even further (Feng, 2024). Another concern is that Gen AI may be used for massive disinformation, deep fake creation, and scam schemes (Feng, 2024; WIPO, 2024). Reflecting on AI ethics, one cannot overlook the scandal involving OpenAI, which garnered unprecedented media coverage. The board of the OpenAI company fired the CEO, Sam Altman (Dastin et al., 2023; Jones, 2023; Merchant, 2023), who resumed his position shortly after that. Despite extensive media coverage, the underlying reasons for this event remain undisclosed. Notably, the resignation was initiated by Ilya Sutskever, who is responsible for AI's safe development within the company. Considering OpenAI's overarching narrative, which was centered on the responsible advancement of AI for the collective benefit of humanity, the media actively discussed that internal disagreements within the company stemmed from concerns over the rapid and potentially irresponsible advancement of technology. This speculation is particularly intriguing, given research indicating that public perceptions of AI tools are often influenced not by personal experience but by media coverage and informal conversations (Ford et al., 2002; Zhan et al., 2023).

Another topic that is attracting interest in both business and academia is the process of companies adopting Gen AI instruments and its impact on specific industries and

economic situations worldwide. According to the estimation of the economic effect of Generative AI based on 63 use cases, Generative AI is expected to add 2.6 trillion to 4.4 trillion dollars to the global economy annually (Chui et al., 2023). The mentioned use cases consider commercial campaigns and state marketing as one of the four areas in which the most significant changes are predicted. Drawing from data illustrating how AI systems can significantly enhance employee productivity and increase revenue (Brynjolfsson et al., 2023; Noy & Zhang, 2023), journalists foresee companies that delay the incorporation of AI into their workflows facing the emergence of a productivity gap (Gow, 2023). It, in turn, could lead to a decline or even the total disruption of their business operations.

Technology, media, and telecom specialists outpace others in their usage of Gen AI at work (McKinsey & Company, 2023). Unsurprisingly, people working with technologies and texts have already felt the advantages of the new models released on the market. It was already mentioned that the main breakthroughs of 2022 were Large Language Models and AI technology for turning text into image. Text generation, creation of images, localization, and data analysis are the main functions of these services, which makes them especially interesting for communication specialists, who have many of these functions in their scope.

PR source PRovoke Media states that 86% of communicators worldwide perceive AI rather as an opportunity than a threat, and 58% are concerned that their leaders do not take rapid actions to use the advantages (PRovoke Media, 2023). Simultaneously, 59% expect leaders to jump on Generative AI risk mitigation. In 2024, the Institute of Public Relations published a report based on interviews with 30 communication executives and exploring commonalities in attitudes toward Generative AI among industry representatives (McCorkindale, 2024). This study's respondents were also primarily optimistic and emphasized the effectiveness of Generative AI in idea generation, content creation, and workflow efficiency. However, they note that Generative AI should be approached as a tool supervised by a human and emphasized the need for training and professional development to use this tool safely and effectively. In media, on the other hand, the discussion between communication professionals is also evolving. Practitioners actively share their experiences and forecasts about the future of the Communication Industry on media and personal blogs (Cornuke, 2023; Gandzeichuk, 2023).

In addition to discussions in the media, the analysis of educational courses on various platforms suggests much information about how communicators can use AI for their purposes. For example, it is possible to find the following online courses on LinkedIn:

"Generative AI Skills for Creative Content: Opportunities, Issues, and Ethics" with more than 25,000 participants (Kennedy, 2023); "Elevate your Business Branding with Generative AI" with more than 3,000 participants (York, 2023,), "Generative AI for Business Leaders" with more than 215,000 participants (Cohen, 2023) and "What is Generative AI" with more than 910,000 participants (Demirdag, 2023). Summing up the insights from the mentioned courses, communication specialists can leverage Generative AI across diverse communication domains for various purposes. Firstly, these systems prove valuable in generating texts, visual images, and videos for different communication needs. Secondly, their utility extends to the localization of various texts and messages, which is a particularly convenient function in our modern multicultural world. Thirdly, AI chatbots play a dual role, facilitating communication with customers and serving internal communication needs, acting as conversational partners capable of shaping opinions about the company and influencing overall brand perception. Lastly, contemporary applications can assist in crafting documents for presentations and events, from traditional presentations to video instructions.

1.3 Delimitations

The study has some delimitations that were intentionally set due to the chosen frame and method of research. Firstly, as the current study adopts a qualitative approach within an interpretive paradigm, it does not aim to uncover universal truths applicable to all companies and communication specialists worldwide (Prasad, 2017). The study is delimited to the chosen sample of communication specialists in European companies of various industries with more than 500 employees. Due to the research's focus on Gen AI, respondents have to obtain experience with at least some Generative AI instruments; therefore, the research does not consider those communication professionals who are not acquainted with the technology. Even though this approach limits the audience and shifts the focus toward early adopters, it allows for a deeper understanding of the phenomena, providing more nuanced and insightful results. Secondly, due to the snowball sampling approach chosen because of the complicated sampling, the research should be considered critically since the relationship between respondents may also determine some of the results. Its sampling methodology also shapes the limitations of the study. Given that the research entails engaging with employees rather than top management or professionals responsible for implementing generative AI systems in communication workflows, the perspectives presented herein predominantly reflect employees' perceptions. However,

these delimitations are also justified by the purpose of the study, which intends to explore the applications of Gen AI in the organizational dynamics of large companies from employees' perspectives. Thirdly, the data collection method, which is conducting deep interviews with respondents, provides some limits for the research. Whereas sensemaking is an ongoing process in which understanding is constantly being formed through social interaction (Weick, 1995), interviews represent a single point in time and do not provide a complete picture. Nevertheless, interviews are still the most appropriate method to identify specialists' backgrounds and conduct an in-depth analysis of their feelings and ideas about the phenomenon. Fourthly, the analysis of collected data is done through the lens of chosen theories, which dictate the angle of interpretation.

2. Literature review

The literature review focuses on previous research on organizational change provoked by technological advancement, communication specialists' identity and role in organizational transformation, and factors identified as obstacles to technological change in the literature. While using Gen AI as an example, the literature review nevertheless concentrates on broader themes, allowing us to consider Generative AI implementation in the context of existing knowledge.

2.1. Organizational Change

Nowadays, organizations often find themselves under pressure to change. Within management literature and within the discourse of consultancy firms, organizational change is frequently depicted as not only pivotal for achieving success but also as a requisite for maintaining competitiveness within an ever-changing global business landscape (Christensen et al., 2008; Lewis, 2011). In this context, organizational change is seen as a way to solve problems, become more efficient, or introduce new technology. Managers often conceptualize organizational changes as manageable endeavors that can be controlled and implemented from above and precede the stability stage (Cheney et al., 2011). However, the understanding and definition of organizational change depend on the very understanding of the organization.

The current research is based on Karl Weick's vision (2001) of organization as a dynamic system that constantly creates and recreates meaning through communication, which is aligned with the "Communication is constitutive of organizing" (CCO) perspective (Heide & Simonsson, 2011; Putnam et al., 2009). This view challenges the outdated perception of the organization as consisting of real objects. According to this view, communication plays a central role in shaping an organization (Putnam et al., 2009; Weick, 2001). The process of organizing occurs during communication, and therefore, communication is the foundation of the existence of any organization. Thus, as an organization is perceived as a constantly reinventing system, organizational change may be construed as an ongoing process that unfolds to varying degrees persistently. From this point of view, the definition of organizational change proposed by Cheney et al. (2011)

posits that organizational change constitutes "a succession of differences in time within a persisting identity."

Even though the change in one form or another occurs in organizations on an ongoing basis and is an integral feature of any organization (Weick, 2001), some triggers may lead to a significant "succession of differences in time within a persistent identity." What can lead to such changes? There are many external and internal triggers for organizational change, and the development of new technology is one of them (Christensen et al., 2008). However, it is essential to note that the emergence of a new technology does not guarantee change. For changes to happen, it is necessary that the participants of the process — managers and employees — notice the technology and use communication to launch the change process (Christensen et al., 2008). For instance, if the top management and employees of the company believe that Generative AI will not benefit the company, then even the emergence of new, more tailored Gen AI technologies will likely not encourage them to implement them into their framework. It underlines the importance of the study, showing that understanding the attitude of communication professionals to new technology can largely explain the dynamics of the use of new technologies in companies.

The current study is centered on employees' perspectives within companies, emphasizing their opinions as pivotal in contrast to traditional approaches, which primarily prioritize organizational change from the standpoint of top management (Gioia & Chittipeddi, 1991). Scholarly discourse within organizational studies acknowledges that organizational changes can stem from both hierarchical directions, either top-down or vice versa (Cheney et al., 2011). However, academic examinations of organizational transformations precipitated by the emergence of novel technologies have predominantly approached the subject through a managerial lens (Davidson, 2006; Leinwand & Mani, 2022). Established conceptual frameworks, such as the Technological Frames Perspective elucidated by Davidson (2006), tend to overlook the origins of innovation and instead emphasize the reception of technology by the audience as passive participants. While it is acknowledged that audience representatives may construct divergent frames and exhibit varied responses to technology contingent upon their social group affiliations, such dynamics often occur within contexts where technology is introduced from hierarchical levels above. This observation aligns with the stereotype in organizational sciences portraying employees as passive recipients rather than proactive and influential agents of change (Heide & Simonsson, 2011).

Nevertheless, the situation under consideration significantly changes the dynamics and forces us to look at the companies' employees first. Since the current inquiry focuses on

Generative AI, introduced to a broad audience in 2022 as a cost-free and user-friendly tool, employees got a unique opportunity to use it independently without top-management notice. It is documented that certain communication personnel have already begun adopting emergent technologies autonomously, without explicit directives from upper management (McCorkindale, 2024; PRovoke Media, 2023). Thus, the inquiry poses the question: Can employees serve as catalysts for organizational change and drive technological advancements within their respective organizations? In the case of a positive answer, how does it change their attitude toward organizational change? These inquiries remain unresolved within the existing literature.

2.2. Corporate Communication Specialists

The study uses the term corporate communication in two key ways. Firstly, it functions as an umbrella, encompassing various activities typically undertaken by companies for internal and external communication to justify the social presence and legitimacy of their actions (Christensen et al., 2008). Secondly, it represents a mindset and an endeavor to unify all communication strategies under a singular business goal (Christensen et al., 2008). Based on this description, it is possible to say that corporate communication specialists are all communicators working within Public Relations, Community Relations, Employee Communication, Crisis Communication, Digital Communication, Marketing Communication, and other Communication departments, and striving to represent the company from a unified point of view in the same narration, branding, style, and tone of voice.

What functions are performed by communication specialists? The answer to this question is crucial for the following discussion on how corporate communication specialists may react to organizational and technological change. There are five primary functions of communication specialists featured by Beurer-Züllig et al. (2009): (1) Negotiating with external constituencies; (2) Engaging in communication with both external and internal stakeholders; (3) Handling marketing communication responsibilities; (4) Providing advisory services; (5) Evaluating and reviewing policies. All of these points include both strategic and technician functions. For instance, engaging in communication with external and internal stakeholders requires specialists to formulate a strategy while concurrently undertaking basic tasks such as drafting press releases and reaching out to journalists. Despite the aspiration for strategic thinking and the inclination of communication specialists to view themselves as top management representatives, it

is notable that many specialists still engage in predominantly technical functions (Beurer-Züllig et al., 2009). This observation is particularly noteworthy since these specialists may be among the first to experience the impact of transformative change by Generative AI (Chui et al., 2023).

In the context of organizational changes driven by technological advancements and, in particular, the adoption of Gen AI, communication specialists represent a unique group for the study. On the one hand, due to the similarity of functions between Gen AI and tasks performed by communication specialists, they stand as among the initial potential adopters (McKinsey & Company, 2023). Moreover, as previously mentioned, many industry representatives already regularly utilize Gen AI and value its efficacy for communication tasks (McCorkindale, 2024). On the other hand, communication regarding the implementation of new frameworks and technologies is a key task during organizational changes in a company (Lewis, 2011). Communication specialists, by virtue of their role, are thus poised to encounter this challenge. Consequently, communication specialists occupy a distinctive position on both sides of organizational change, which makes them an immensely interesting audience for research.

In the current research, communication specialists are primarily viewed as an audience susceptible to the impacts of organizational changes. Since the study aims to explore how communication professionals comprehend new technology and the challenges they encounter, it becomes imperative to understand their role within the companies and the communication professional identity. As previously noted, a significant proportion of communication specialists still dedicate a considerable portion of their time to technical tasks (Beurer-Züllig et al., 2009). Moreover, some studies indicate that communication specialists often perceive their responsibilities as more strategic than they are (Hogg & Doolan, 1999). It means that communication managers consider some tasks strategic, while top management sees them as quite tactical. It is crucial, as the ability to participate in strategic activity and especially to influence decision-making processes is a pivotal factor in accepting the professional identity of communication managers (Jeffrey & Brunton, 2012). Therefore, it is vital to assess how the development of new technologies, particularly Gen AI, may alter the balance between strategic and technical tasks and whether such shifts influence communication specialists' perceptions of their identity and impact their sensemaking processes.

2.3. Obstacles to Technological Change

In the course of crafting this literature review and drawing insights from the texts, two primary factors that can impede technological change and, specifically, the implementation of AI-enhanced technologies in communication teams were identified. These are technological and psychological factors that encompass both the challenges posed by familiarity with technology itself and the psychological barriers that may arise among team members during the adoption process.

Psychological factors can also be called an issue of self-identification, as they are closely related to how people using any technology and Generative AI, in particular, perceive themselves. In an article written by Gizem Yalcin and Stefano Puntoni for Harvard Business Review (2023), the authors review recent experiments related to how people use AI technologies in different situations. One of the experiments showed that people who identify themselves with a specific activity react more negatively to AI technologies performing similar tasks. For example, if a person considers themselves an expert in creating graphic illustrations and perceives this activity as a part of his identity, something that characterizes him in a certain way, he will be less inclined to use the AI tool to create illustrations.

This discovery is crucial in the context of barriers to adopting Gen AI in communications. Fears about technologies, which include the one that AI can replace specialists in some fields and deprive them of work, can be a significant enough barrier to including these tools in the daily workflow (Zhan et al., 2023). First of all, these fears may be relevant for representatives of technical roles, which are, as discussed above, people working directly on implementing specific steps within the approved strategy. For example, employees responsible for writing texts and preparing creative assets for campaigns and localization specialists may feel threatened by AI - both from the point of view of identity and from a very practical side related to the potential reduction or even loss of work. According to another study (Yalcin & Puntoni, 2023), people respond better to AI tools if they are presented not as something that can fully automatize or replace a human specialist but rather help and perform part of routine or non-creative work.

In addition to the fear that AI can replace people in their work, many other fears can be included in the psychological factor. For instance, (1) the fear associated with the fact that AI tools do not treat data confidentially enough; (2) the fear of biased behavior, namely discrimination by AI; (3) the fear of existential risk, which means the destruction of humanity due to the development of AI systems, and many other issues related to ethical

aspects (Zhan et al., 2023). According to a quantitative study conducted by Zhan, Molina, Rheu, and Peng (2023), there are different factors that may reduce all mentioned types of fear. Among them are the ability to synchronously interact with AI systems and get logical answers, understanding how AI stores data, and understanding who controls the process. The latter condition strongly affects all types of fears since the assumption that AI independently makes decisions without the participation of humans causes an increase in anxiety in all categories.

Technological barriers also should be carefully considered. The exploration of the digitization of the communication industry and the consequent essentiality of evaluating the digital competence of communication professionals has been previously researched within scholarly discourse (Shahlaei et al., 2017). Nevertheless, extant research has predominantly concentrated on the broader aspect of digitalization (Brockhaus et al., 2023; Shahlaei et al., 2017), primarily scrutinizing the adeptness of individuals in employing specific digital tools and applications (Ilomäki et al., 2016). The advancements in Artificial Intelligence underscore the increasing significance of research in this domain. While some researchers may consider proficiency in working with AI-enhanced systems to be a component of 'digital competence' (Brockhaus et al., 2023), this topic's rapid evolution over the past few years necessitates dedicated and focused scrutiny.

Research has revealed a significant discrepancy between the 'digital competence' levels that corporate communication specialists desire and their actual proficiency (Brockhaus et al., 2023). This finding raises the question of how communication specialists can enhance their traditional skills to meet the evolving demands of the world. Furthermore, alternative perspectives from researchers suggest that 'digital competence' should not be viewed as a completely new skillset but rather as a modern iteration of traditional communication competencies (Shahlaei et al., 2017).

2.4. Literature Review Summary

Summing up all the above, several research gaps related to the topic of this study have been identified.

Firstly, despite the extensive research related to organizational changes, most of it considers the phenomenon from the point of view of top management, paying attention primarily to recommendations that allow effective implementation of a planned transformation within the company (Christensen et al., 2008; Davidson, 2006; Leinwand, & Mani, 2022; Lewis, 2011). It refers to organizational changes caused by various factors,

including technological ones (Davidson, 2006). Following the vision of the sensemaking base of the organization by Karl Weick (2001), this research focuses on employees' perspectives since Gen AI technology or the phenomenon itself offers the possibility to provoke transformation from both top management and employees themselves.

Secondly, corporate communication specialists, which are represented by Public Relations, Community Relations, Employee Communication, Crisis Communication, Digital Communication, Marketing Communication, and other professionals, are invested both in strategic and tactical tasks nowadays (Beurer-Züllig et al., 2009). By the nature of the profession, they may be seen as the most exciting audience to analyze since they not only make sense of the technology themselves but also help other company employees comprehend the organizational change (Lewis, 2011). The balance between strategic and tactical tasks is a crucial topic for communication specialists' identity since the ability to make decisions and validations by the community is critical and influences acceptance of the rejection of professional identity by communicators (Jeffrey & Brunton, 2012). Therefore, assessing how organizational and technological change may affect the dynamics is vital.

Thirdly, technological changes always encounter obstacles, which the academic literature represents. These obstacles may be divided into two groups: physiological (Yalcin & Puntoni, 2023; Zhan et al., 2023) and technological (Brockhaus et al., 2023). The first one is connected to identity, and the second one represents the audience's ability to adopt technological advancements. Therefore, these factors should be evaluated in relation to Generative AI in corporate communication.

3. Theoretical framework

This research explores employees' reactions to technological changes that instigate organizational shifts. In pursuit of understanding the responses of communication specialists to this phenomenon, two interrelated theories are utilized as analytical frameworks. The SCARF theory (Rock, 2007), grounded in neuroscientific experiments, elucidates how individuals respond to specific social situations based on innate biological mechanisms and universal brain reactions. The sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995) delves into how individuals interpret these reactions, drawing upon past experiences, cultural nuances, identity, and social context. The incorporation of these distinct theories significantly enhances the depth of comprehension regarding the subject matter while also fostering consilience within the scientific domain. This aspect will be explored in a separate section.

3.1. Consilience of Science

Given that this study examines the phenomenon using two very different theories, I believe it is necessary to dedicate time to discussing consilience in social science in order to explain how the selected theories work together and what such an approach brings to the world of social science and strategic communication. Consilience in science has always been a topic that has raised a lot of fierce arguments and discussions. Despite the agreement shared by most researchers that the consistency of scientific thought is necessary for progress, the methods of achieving it have always been incomprehensible and questionable. It applies primarily to social sciences, where consistency and integrity are difficult to find even within the discipline (Wilson, 2003).

Wilson (2003), in his book "Consilience: The Unity of Knowledge," argues that the deep split between social science and the broader scientific community stems from the field's internal inconsistencies, inherent complexity, and reluctance to integrate with natural science and leverage its findings for research purposes. One of the fundamental reasons for this disconnect lies in the disparities between the ontological perspectives researchers in these domains adopt. Notably, a defining characteristic of modern social science is its adherence to the ontological position that reality is socially constructed and

resides within individuals' consciousness (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Prasad, 2017). On the contrary, scholars in natural science predominantly operate within the positivist paradigm, which asserts the existence of a singular, universal reality comprising tangible physical objects (Prasad, 2017). This ontological difference influences the epistemological orientations of the respective disciplines and, consequently, shapes their methodological approaches. It leads to more significant division and inconsistency within science, which prevents the exchange of knowledge necessary for developing scientific knowledge (Wilson, 2003).

However, what does this ontological difference mean for modern science? Should all researchers choose one position and accept that the world is either created in our minds or exists in reality, regardless of human interpretation? Both options seem limited since they cannot fully reflect the world's versatility. Trying to find an answer to these questions, Roy Bhaskar (2008) proposed the concept of Depth Ontology, which implies that reality consists of different levels, each of which exists simultaneously, and only a combination of all of them can give an understanding of the phenomenon in question. Based on this ontology, Bhaskar (2008) introduces the concept of Transcendental Realism, arguing that reality exists independently of people but can only be understood through interpretation since our knowledge is formed through social context and conceptual frameworks.

I see tremendous opportunities for social science to adopt the idea of multiple levels of reality. Even though the figure of Roy Bhaskar represents the philosophy of critical realism, primarily associated with more naturalistic directions of research (Bhaskar, 2008), I believe that his ideas may be used in different epistemological approaches and paradigms, including interpretivism. The existence of personal experience does not negate the biological laws that operate universally, and this understanding may enrich the social science field as this view allows researchers to combine insights from neuroscience on how the human brain operates with deeper underlying structures, such as cultural norms, social structures, historical contexts, and personal beliefs (Bhaskar, 2008).

Therefore, this research employs the Depth Ontology view, which is reflected in the usage of two theories: SCARF (Rock, 2007), based on neuroscience experiments, asserting the commonality of individuals in their biological reactions to specific social situations, and sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995), which will help elucidate how individuals make sense of these reactions based on their personal experiences. Thus, I stay within the framework of interpretivism without denying the basic biological commonalities shared by all humans as a species.

The commitment to consilience in this study signifies a departure from traditional disciplinary boundaries and a step towards integrating diverse theoretical frameworks to shed light on complex social phenomena. By embracing consilience, I acknowledge the inherent interconnectedness of knowledge and strive to bridge the chasm between disparate ontological perspectives in science. By synthesizing insights from neuroscience and sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995), the research offers a nuanced understanding of reality that acknowledges both its objective and subjective dimensions. As the researcher spearheading this endeavor, I recognize that while the commitment to consilience offers promising avenues for advancing social science research, it also presents certain limitations. Firstly, integrating diverse theoretical frameworks may entail challenges in reconciling conflicting assumptions and methodologies, potentially leading to inconsistencies or oversimplifications. Additionally, the reliance on Depth Ontology and its assertion of multiple levels of reality (Bhaskar, 2008) may pose epistemological challenges, requiring careful consideration of how these ontological assumptions influence the interpretation of research findings. However, awareness of these difficulties allows to devote more time and attention to a cautious approach to avoid them.

3.2. SCARF Theory

The SCARF model (Rock, 2007) is a theory from social neuroscience that explains reactions to human interactions from a biological point of view. The SCARF is an abbreviation for Status, Certainty, Autonomy, Relatedness, and Fairness. According to neuroscientific experiments, threat and award reactions in the human brain are closely connected to these five domains of social experience. Therefore, situations that humans comprehend as dangerous or, on the contrary, favorable to their status or their understanding of Fairness or certainty and others may cause specific biological reactions connected to serotonin, dopamine, norepinephrine, and cortisol release, which in turn affects social behavior. The authors of this theory state that it is especially beneficial for "change agents", including organizational managers, development, and learning leaders (Rock & Cox, 2012). It is supposed to guide their actions and help predict where the threat reaction may appear in communicating new organizational solutions and approaches.

The SCARF theory is currently under development and establishment since a few researchers tested it empirically. However, it has a solid base in neuroscience research and is continuously updated due to new findings in this area (Rock & Cox, 2012). SCARF

has been used in several social science studies dedicated to the educational experience and organizational environment (Aplin-Houtz et al., 2023; Campbell et al., 2022).

For a deeper understanding, it is necessary to highlight each model component and consider its impact on the described problem. Rock (2008) considers status as a person's perception of importance in relation to others. Contributors to the SCARF theory cite data from various neuroscience studies showing how changes in social status affect respondents (Rock, 2008; Rock & Cox, 2012). For example, lowering social status, expressed in the fact that a person is excluded from social activity, affects the same parts of the brain as physical pain (Eisenberger et al., 2003, as cited in Rock, 2008). However, receiving social status validation, like acquiring a good reputation with others, showed activity in the striatum similar to when a person receives a monetary reward (Izuma et al., 2008, as cited in Rock & Cox, 2012). Based on the data from these and many other experiments, Rock argues that this provokes people to assert their social status and constantly avoid threatening social status situations. Accordingly, it is expected that questioning one's status in the context of any organizational changes will provoke employee resistance. Due to the organizational changes associated with the implementation of generative AI, we are interested to see whether communication specialists perceive a novelty as something threatening their status or, on the contrary, whether knowing how to use new tools increases their value in the eyes of the public.

Certainty within the model pertains to the social aspect of formulating precise and accurate predictions concerning the immediate future (Rock & Cox, 2012). Neuroscience studies have identified a link between ambiguity and heightened levels of stress. Consequently, individuals tend to strategize for the future and gravitate towards more foreseeable options to mitigate uncertainty. At an organizational level, developing business plans, strategies, and mind maps contributes to this objective (Rock, 2008). Concerning Generative AI implementation, it is crucial to identify communication specialists' ability to predict the future of organizational change and technological development. Moreover, their vision of how this technological change is connected to their job and personal lives should be under scrutiny.

Autonomy represents the next part of the model and social experience that has shown numerous connections with threat and reward reactions in the human brain (Rock, 2008). Autonomy refers to the extent to which an individual can independently control a situation and make choices. According to one experiment, a correlation was found between a sense of control and health outcomes (Rodin, 1986 as cited in Rock, 2008);

according to another, even in highly stressful situations, individuals feel significantly better if they perceive the stress environment as escapable (Donny et al., 2006, as cited in Rock, 2008). When considering this within the context of organizational changes associated with technological advancements, according to this theory, individuals' understanding of how to adapt to a new situation independently and the perception that it is possible to do so autonomously should lead to lower levels of threat reaction. Consequently, this leads to less resistance to change, improved well-being, and a desire to continue the experience.

Relatedness is characterized by the extent to which an individual feels part of a community and senses belongingness to a group (Rock & Cox, 2012). "In-group preference" and "out-group bias" phenomenon demonstrates that individuals experience greater empathy towards those they consider part of their group or more similar to themselves and lesser empathy towards others. Consequently, it is logical for individuals to desire to be "one of the group," as it ensures safe social interactions. At the same time, the absence of such belongingness generates a threat response in the body (Rock, 2008). Can organizational change alter the dynamics of relatedness within a group? Another question arises: How does group membership influence perceptions of Generative AI within a company? It is intriguing to explore how this aspect of the theory correlates with organizational research on change and group resistance. The already mentioned study by Ford et al. (2002), suggesting that attitudes towards organizational change are shaped during background conversations, underscores the interrelation of SCARF theory with findings in organizational research.

The concept of Fairness in the SCARF theory pertains to how individuals perceive the exchange of resources among people (Rock, 2008). Suspicions of unfair treatment, such as unequal pay compared to colleagues or unfair praise, can trigger a threatening reaction, whereas feelings of Fairness and justice make people happier. Can this category of social experience influence the interpretation of technological change within a corporation? Within the scope of the discussed topic, the author is interested in how respondents perceive Fairness in access to new resources and guidelines for their usage and whether they consider the implementation fair towards diverse specialists.

Using SCARF as a lens for this study allows us to depart from specific social experiences, which, although interpreted differently by individuals, play a crucial role in determining reactions to significant changes. In addition to fostering consilience of science, this provides an opportunity to understand what exactly underlies the

respondents' experiences. In turn, the sensemaking theory helps to delve deeper into the phenomenon, as implied by the paradigm and research questions.

3.3. Sensemaking Theory

According to the SCARF model, a commonality exists in how humans react to specific social situations. However, what occurs after an individual experiences certain emotions and reacts biologically with threat and reward responses? As sentient beings, they must make sense of the situation and rationalize their biological reaction at the cognition and social interaction level. At this stage, the sensemaking theory by Karl Weick (1995) can be utilized as a framework for analyzing this process.

Sensemaking is defined as the "ongoing retrospective development of plausible images that rationalize what people are doing" (Weick et al., 2005). Beginning when an individual's perceptions of reality diverge from what is happening, the sensemaking process encompasses various stages, from noticing and bracketing to action. Action simultaneously represents an interim outcome of sensemaking and facilitates the individual's progression through the sensemaking process (Weick, 1995). Indeed, it is through action that an individual's understanding of their surrounding reality is expressed. Moreover, it is essential to note that sensemaking is a continuous process wherein the narrative is constantly rewritten and edited to most accurately reflect the data from the surrounding world, striving to become the most plausible explanation of reality and resilient to external criticism.

Karl Weick, Kathleen Sutcliffe, and David Obstfeld (2005) argue that sensemaking and organization are complementary concepts. The essence of the organization lies in the continuous process of collective sensemaking necessary for defining reality and establishing generalized rules and meanings essential for collective action. When events occur within organizations that do not align with established shared understandings, members of the organization question the meaning of what is happening. In the context of technological changes, exemplified by the advancement of generative AI, such a question could be: "What does this mean for my organization and personally for my work?". The answer to this question, distilled 'into words and salient categories' (Weick et al., 2005), constitutes the process of sensemaking. Accordingly, the interpretation of new forms and circumstances, expressed in oral communication among colleagues or written instructions, guidelines, plans, and other documents, represents a process of sensemaking and organizing.

Subsequent actions of individuals and their perception of their own identity depend on the sensemaking process (Weick et al., 2005). In this aspect, sensemaking theory intersects significantly with the socio-cultural communication tradition (Craig, 1999) and George Herbert Mead's ideas (1972). Within the socio-cultural tradition, communication is perceived as a symbolic process that generates and sustains shared socio-cultural patterns (Craig, 1999). Given that communication occurs through common symbols and shared rituals, rules, and expectations, any broad changes may result in communication challenges. Consequently, alterations in the work of communication specialists following the implementation of generative AI may be perceived as a disruption to customary communication within this community, necessitating the sensemaking process and, therefore, the establishment of new patterns and identity within the profession. Following Mead's distinctions between the "I" and the "Me" (1972), this process may be delineated into two stages: the initial confrontation of new technology by the "I" of communication specialists, followed by the formation of the "Me" as society reevaluates the new role of communication professionals and incorporates these novel attributes into the conventional perception of a communication specialist.

The sensemaking theory is utilized in the study on multiple levels. It aids in a deeper analysis of how respondents make sense of their reactions to specific social situations. Firstly, owing to the sensemaking theory, attention is directed not only to what respondents say but also to how they frame the sensemaking process. It is facilitated by examining their past experiences. Secondly, by acknowledging unclear or subjective experiences, as well as the retrospective construction of meanings, a more critical lens is applied to respondents' statements, understanding that they reflect a specific moment in time. Thirdly, by recognizing the social construction of meaning, significant emphasis is placed on investigating respondents' environment and professional trajectory and understanding who may have influenced their opinions.

4. Methodology

The methodology section covers various topics concerning the planning and execution of the research endeavor. The chapter starts with the justification of the choice of interpretivism as the overarching epistemological framework. The discussion progresses to encompass a detailed exposition of the research design's elements. Following an explication of sample selection procedures, data collection methodologies, and data analysis techniques, validity and ethical considerations are discussed. Consistent with the interpretivism paradigm, particular emphasis is placed on the reflexivity statement, in which potential researcher biases are acknowledged, and efforts to mitigate their influence are delineated.

4.1. Epistemological Approach

An interpretive tradition was adopted in this study to gather and understand information about the personal experiences of communication specialists during their interactions with AI-enhanced systems at an organizational level. According to interpretivism, reality should be comprehended through lived experiences (Prasad, 2017). In this reality, knowledge is continually reproduced through interactions and communication (Tracy, 2020). This perspective prompts researchers to not only focus on the data itself but also on how and why these data are interpreted, the contexts in which they were collected, and the past experiences through which they were reflected. This approach is well-suited to the current research due to the perspective of an organization as a living, constantly evolving entity shaped by communication and sensemaking (Putnam et al., 2009; Weick, 2001). From this viewpoint, it is impossible to separate an organization from the experiences of its members, as they are inherently intertwined.

Adopting the interpretivist paradigm imposes certain obligations on the researcher regarding how to conduct research and interpret data. Firstly, adhering to the idea of interpretivism, it is crucial to deeply understand the social reality of each respondent to the fullest extent possible, as everyday reality and previous experiences shape the sensemaking process of each individual (Prasad, 2017). Secondly, the researcher's own experience is inseparable from this process, as the researcher analyzes the collected data

based on their own knowledge and understanding of the subject, interpreting them through the lens of their own knowledge and experience. Epistemologically, interpretivism dictates that the researcher is also a part of the knowledge acquisition process since their questions partially shape the respondent's worldview (Tracy, 2020). The researcher does not attempt to detach themselves from the knowledge acquisition process but rather deeply reflects on their role in the research process. In this study, I am aware of my contribution to the sensemaking process of the respondents, which occurs not only before but also during the interviews themselves. A separate section of the paper will be dedicated to self-reflection on this topic.

It is important to note that analyzing data through the lenses of two theories — SCARF (Rock, 2007) and sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995; Weick et al., 2005) — allows for an examination of respondents' reactions to specific social situations related to the phenomenon and considers different levels of reality (Bhaskar, 2008). One might argue that since SCARF is based on neuroscience experiments, this research could not fully adopt the interpretivist paradigm. However, it is essential to emphasize that despite the universality of SCARF asserting some commonality in human reactions, this study is not focused on discovering these reactions but rather on deeply analyzing how individuals make sense of them from the perspective of their inherent experiences and the process of understanding their own identity in a changing context. Consequently, it is part of the interpretation of social reactions, which is related to how respondents socially construct their reality.

4.2. Research Design

The chosen design for this study entails conducting in-depth semi-structured interviews. This choice is grounded in the research goal and questions, which imply the necessity of collecting personal reflections from individuals regarding the phenomenon, as well as in social constructionism as the guiding philosophy of the research, which aims for a deep understanding of the process of meaning construction among respondents. Moreover, interviews provide an opportunity not only to learn about respondents' actions but also to discern their motivations and attitudes, identify narratives, and understand the linguistic constructs they employ (Tracy, 2020). Interviews enable the exploration of an individual's background, placing them within a specific context that is accessible for analysis, which is not feasible through, for example, observation (Tracy, 2020). Therefore, interviews are one of the most suitable methods for this study.

While it is true that this method has its limitations, it is crucial to understand that these are not overlooked. Organizational change is an ongoing process, and the organization itself is a dynamic structure constantly evolving through the communication of its members (Weick, 2001). In contrast, interviews represent discrete points in time, capturing respondents' perspectives at specific moments. From this perspective, observation may be considered a more comprehensive research method, allowing for tracking the sensemaking process over time and influenced by the actions of actors. I fully acknowledge and recognize this limitation. However, given the topic's novelty, the desire to include representatives from different organizations, and considering time constraints, interviews were consciously chosen for this study. This decision was not taken lightly, and the audience can be confident in the thoroughness of the decision-making process.

4.2.1. Sampling Procedures

In adherence to the qualitative nature of the study, which does not seek to generalize results (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), a nonprobability purposive sampling approach was meticulously chosen. This method allows for selecting information-rich cases, providing an in-depth examination of the issue. Such a rigorous sampling process ensures that the data collected is of the highest value for analysis (Patton, 2015).

Aligned with the first research question, 'How do corporate communication specialists make sense of Generative AI's influence on their professional lives?', the sampling was specifically tailored to specialists working in corporate communications. This category encompasses all communicators in Public Relations, Community Relations, Employee Communication, Crisis Communication, Digital Communication, Marketing Communication, and other Communication departments. The sampling was further refined to those who use at least one Generative AI platform. The second question, 'How do employees perceive hindering factors that may arise from organizational change associated with Generative AI implementation in corporate communication?', led to a more specific sample of specialists who work within companies rather than being freelance specialists.

Moreover, considering the significant differences among companies depending on their sizes, it was decided to focus on medium and large-sized companies, specifically those with over 500 employees. The rationale behind this decision is to reflect on the influence of organizational structure on adopting new technology. Structural elements such as hierarchy, specialization, formalization, and time orientation (Cheney et al., 2011)

may impact the organization's position and readiness to adopt something new. For instance, elements like specialization differ significantly in startups compared to large corporations with numerous specialized departments (Cheney et al., 2011). This diversity can pose barriers to employee communication and participation, consequently complicating the utilization of organizational change and responses to external influences. With these considerations in mind, the decision was made to interview individuals from medium and large-sized companies. The decision was made to concentrate on European companies to add geographical coherence.

Within the purposeful sampling, a snowball sampling approach was chosen to find appropriate respondents (Tracy, 2020). Leveraging my network remaining from my work at a large IT corporation and internship at one of the biggest retail companies in the world, I initially identified the first three respondents. These respondents then provided contacts for subsequent interviewees. I deliberately reached out to former colleagues with whom I did not have active or personal interaction during our previous work, aiming to avoid overly familiar communication that could potentially influence the interview dynamics. All interviews were arranged through LinkedIn.

The study conducted 15 interviews, of which 12 were included in the final analysis. Two interviews were not included in the analysis because respondents ultimately did not fit the final sampling criteria because they worked in startups. The third interview was withdrawn because of the wish of the respondent, whose legal department prohibited her participation in the research after the interview was conducted. The final respondents represent a rich diversity of industries, positions, and countries, as seen in Table 1. This diversity underscores the broad scope of our study and the wide-ranging applications of generative AI tools across various sectors and geographical locations.

ID	Role	Industry	Company's information	Language	Experie-nce with Gen AI
1	Employer brand manager	Marketing technologies (digital apps)	International company with headquarter in Germany, around 700 employees.	English	Uses for job tasks a few times per week.
2	Leader of PR team	Finance (banking industry)	International company with headquarter in Netherlands, around 600 employees.	English	Uses for job tasks daily.
3	Communication business partner	Retail	International company with headquarter in Sweden, around 170,000 employees.	English	Uses for job tasks daily.

4	Content Leader	Commercial Real Estate	International company with headquarter in Netherlands, around 2,000 employees.	English	Uses for job tasks a few times per week.
5	Brand Communication Manager	IT	International company with headquarter in Netherlands, around 600 employees.	Russian	Uses for job tasks daily.
6	Communication Knowledge and Development Leader	Retail	International company with headquarter in Sweden, around 170,000 employees.	English	Uses for job tasks daily.
7	Digital PR Manager	IT	International company with headquarter in Russia, around 26,000 employees.	English	Uses for personal tasks. Tried but does not use for job purposes regularly.
8	Community Manager	Construction	International company with headquarter in Russia around 10,000 employees.	Russian	Uses for job tasks a few times per week.
9	Content and Design Leader	IT	International company with headquarter in Netherlands, around 600 employees.	English	Uses for job tasks daily.
10	Strategic planning and performance leader	Retail	International company with headquarter in Sweden, around 170,000 employees.	English	Uses for personal tasks. Tried but does not use for job purposes regularly.
11	Global Brand PR Manager	Retail (sportswear)	International company with headquarter in Germany, around 20,000 employees.	English	Uses for job tasks a few times per week.
12	Internal Communication Project Manager	Marketing technologies (digital agency)	International company with headquarter in Netherlands, around 4,000 employees.	English	Uses for job tasks a few times per week.

Table 1

Four respondents work in the Retail industry, three in IT, two in MarTech, one in construction, one in the banking industry, and one in commercial real estate. All of them hold different positions in communications. Geographically, the respondents work in communication departments of companies in the following countries: Sweden, Netherlands, Germany, Serbia, and Russia.

The companies where these specialists work are among the leading ones in their industries. As per the agreement with the respondents, I refrain from identifying the companies, ensuring complete anonymity of our interviews. A detailed explanation of

this will be provided in the research ethics section. The number of interviews is connected to the complexity of sampling. Since most representatives of large European companies are bound by NDA agreements, which prohibit the disclosure of organizational information even under conditions of anonymity, securing interviews with representatives of such large organizations is challenging.

4.2.2. Data Collection

Within this study, 12 in-depth interviews were conducted with the researcher, ranging from 40 minutes to 1.5 hours. Despite having a pre-prepared list of questions following theoretical frameworks (refer to Appendix 1), I acted situationally, striving to create a trusting atmosphere and following the respondents' desire to delve deeper into various topics. This approach aligns with the concept of semi-structured interviews (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016).

Interviews were conducted between March 1st and April 18th. Considering the wide geographical distribution of respondents, as most reside in different parts of Europe, and financial constraints, all interviews took place online using the Zoom conferencing platform. As a researcher, I understand this imposes some limitations since online calls do not allow for a complete analysis of non-verbal cues and may influence respondents' behavior. Two interviews were conducted in Russian, which is my native language. The remaining interviews were conducted in English.

Before the interviews, each respondent received a description of the study and the terms of participation, and a consent form was signed, which was sent via LinkedIn and securely stored on my computer. Since the interviews were conducted under confidentiality agreements, the consent forms are not included in the study, but a template can be found in the appendix (refer to Appendix 2). All Zoom interviews were recorded with the consent of the respondents. The recordings were transcribed using the Microsoft Word transcription feature and then reviewed by me to avoid machine transcription errors. Afterward, all videos were deleted, and company names and respondent names were changed in the transcripts to comply with confidentiality agreements.

4.2.3. Data Analysis Plan

The first stage of data analysis involved preparing materials. Although this step occurs before developing a code book and conducting the analysis, it constitutes the initial phase of comprehending the data (Tracy, 2020). At this stage, I reviewed interview recordings, created transcripts, and compiled my field notes into a separate file for further analysis. This process facilitated the organization of a convenient and accessible dataset for analysis on my computer.

After several rounds of reading the transcripts and notes, the next step was creating a code book. A code refers to a unit that denotes a belief, concept, action, theme (Tracy, 2020), or data category pertinent to the research inquiries (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The codebook, presented in Table form (Tracy, 2020) (refer to Appendix 3), compiles details regarding identified codes and their respective descriptions. Given the study's theoretical framework, a combination of deductive and inductive approaches was employed in code creation. Initially, deductive coding (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) was implemented based on the SCARF theory, delineating the five primary categories of social experience. These components served as the initial identified codes — termed "categories" in this study to enhance clarity and simplicity, aligning with a deductive approach (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016), even preceding extensive data analysis. According to the SCARF theory, categories in this research study are Status, Certainty, Autonomy, Relatedness, and Fairness, and they initially guided the preliminary exploration of the data.

However, as mentioned before, the mere categorization of data within these categories is insufficient for interpretive research aimed at addressing the questions posed by this research inquiry. Hence, I employed an inductive approach, concentrating on the identified data pieces within Categories. This approach not only facilitated the identification of situations in which individuals experience reactions but also shed light on how they make sense of these experiences. Consequently, adhering to the inductive approach, open coding (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016) was conducted. According to Tracy (2020), this is a process of secondary-cycle coding during which the hierarchical codes that go beyond asking "what" to exploring "why" and "how" are created. To make the process crystal clear, I'll provide an explanatory example. In the first stage, I locate all data in the text related to, for instance, the first category — Status. Then, I deeply analyze these text segments, uncover deeper meanings associated with the sensemaking process, and synthesize new codes overlay for the categories. For a more in-depth understanding, one can refer to the appendix containing the code book (refer to Appendix 3).

As for the data analysis process approach, I utilized color coding (Tracy, 2020) conducted on my computer using Microsoft Word software. Using the created codebook, I assigned each code a specific color category and highlighted certain sections of the transcripts with corresponding colors. It allowed for better orientation in the text and gathering the necessary insights to conclude the research.

4.3. Validity

Following the interpretivist paradigm, I address the validity of the research not in terms of finding and proving the "ultimate truth" but in terms of its credibility (Kvale & Brinkmann, 2009). Therefore, to show the trustworthiness of the research, I imply different techniques dedicated to presenting the approach to the investigation transparently. Following Merriam and Tisdell's (2016) advice, I share information about all the research steps, including a description of the methodology, transcripts of all interviews, and coding memos. It allows readers to make their own conclusions regarding the quality of the analysis and evaluate and critique the research. Another applied technique employed to ensure validity is participation in the peer review. Gaining feedback from peers throughout the research process is another way to increase the validity and credibility of the research (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). The third procedure aims to obtain validation from the respondents to ensure that I understood their answers correctly and did not distort their thoughts due to my biases (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016). To achieve this, I sought clarification on specific points during the interviews and gave the respondents a summary of their answers afterward.

In addition to the procedures outlined above, I also employed the seven steps of the validation process developed by Brinkmann and Kvale (2009). The themes and research questions were formulated only after thoroughly exploring previous academic inquiries. The research design and methodology were then based on the research goals. Interview questions were crafted to avoid guiding questions and biases, which were made possible by deep reflection, as stated in the reflection statement. Transcription and analysis were transparently described to enable readers to assess the trustworthiness themselves. Validation was conducted through discussions of the findings with respondents. Reporting was carried out clearly, and transcripts with color codes are provided.

4.4. Reflexivity Statement

Following the interpretive research approach, which emphasizes including the researcher's personality and personal experiences in all stages of the research process (Prasad, 2017), it is necessary to address this aspect explicitly in a separate section. To ensure transparency and reflect on how my background shapes the research, I have identified several essential experiences that connect me to the topic and the potential biases they may introduce.

Firstly, my longstanding interest in Generative AI stems from six years of experience working in an IT company that developed various AI solutions. This background may introduce a bias as I consider myself well-informed about the industry, potentially leading to a less objective viewpoint in approaching the research. Additionally, my professional network, which I initially used for looking for respondents, includes many communication specialists with IT backgrounds. Conscious of this situation, I devoted more time to researching resources about generative AI and talked to several experts to ensure that my knowledge of the subject was sufficient to communicate with respondents. Regarding the respondent search framework, I focused on reaching respondents from different industries, deliberately refusing to interview more IT specialists so as not to gain a limited view of the topic.

Secondly, my involvement in preparing educational courses about Generative AI for communication specialists at a Swedish retail company during an internship has influenced my perspective on the readiness of communication professionals to adopt Generative AI. A potential bias arises from the perception of the current technical proficiency of communication specialists as insufficient to fully utilize new tools. Knowing about this view, I approached the analysis of interviews very carefully, ensuring that I did not overemphasize answers about technical competence.

Conscious of these biases in general, I have been vigilant during the formulation of questions, conducting interviews, and data analysis stages. By openly acknowledging these biases, I aimed to approach the analysis with a clear understanding of how my previous experiences may influence my conclusions and mitigate their impact. This self-awareness is a testament to the integrity of my research.

4.5. Ethical Considerations

As mentioned earlier, all research participants agreed to participate in the interviews under the condition of anonymity. I assured them that I would not disclose the names of

their companies or their identities. Recognizing the potential risks to participants who shared partially confidential information during our interviews, I took the following steps to ensure their safety: (1) I deleted the video recordings of the interviews, which were conducted with the participants' consent, immediately after transcription. (2) I anonymized their names and company names in all transcripts. (3) The transcripts containing the real names and company names are stored as secure files on my computer. (4) All research participants signed consent forms, which are stored as secure files and not included in the research.

5. Analysis

The section is devoted to analyzing how communication specialists make sense of Generative AI instruments and how they perceive hindering factors they experience throughout implementing or using these tools for job purposes. The analysis begins by describing the level of implementation of Generative AI tools in the respondents' organizations and their experience using these instruments. It is crucial information as it indicates the company's position concerning the organizational change provoked by the external technological innovation that Generative AI systems represent. Further, based on SCARF (Rock, 2007) and sensemaking (Weick, 1995) theories, the empirical experience of respondents is considered within the categories of Status, Certainty, Autonomy, Relatedness, and Fairness. Within each category, using inductive reasoning and the lenses of sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995), specific categories of respondents' experience related to feelings and thoughts provoked by Generative AI usage on an organizational level were identified.

5.1. Experience Using Generative AI Instruments for Communication Tasks on an Organizational Level

As per sampling criteria, all respondents were familiar with Generative AI platforms. However, the significant variation in usage levels stood out after respondents' interviews. This aspect, critical for our further analysis, has led to the devotion of a separate section to studying this aspect. Almost all of the respondents got acquainted and began using Generative AI for different tasks after the release of ChatGPT (Open AI, 2022) and, therefore, broad conversation about this tool in media (Cornuke, 2023; Gandzeichuk, 2023). Only one of the respondents expressed interest in generative AI tools even before this period, which may be due to the specifics of the respondent's work, who, as a content creator, creates many video materials. Therefore, he tried creating videos with AI-generated avatars even before the advent of ChatGPT. All other respondents admit that they became interested after the success of the ChatGPT and the appearance of numerous mentions of this tool in the media field.

> I think there was at the same time as pretty much everybody. When ChatGPT was booming. This is when I started using it, and since then, I have been using it daily. Virtually every day (Respondent 2).

Without exception, all respondents mentioned ChatGPT as either the only platform they use or one of them. Some respondents also mentioned Gemini by Google (Google, n.d.), YandexGPT, a local Russian neural network (Yandex, n.d.), Copilot from Microsoft (Microsoft 365, n.d.), and internal LLMs developed within companies. Ten out of twelve respondents admitted using Generative AI applications to solve job tasks. The most common use cases are writing and editing texts, researching, summarizing, brainstorming ideas, and translating. It is important to note that since all respondents work in different communications fields, tasks often reflect their specialty.

During the study, it emerged that all respondents, except a sole respondent, work in a non-native language — English. It is primarily dictated by sampling, which aims at middle- and large-size company employees, whose work language is often English. It is a limitation of the study, as it primarily provides the perspective of people who may use LLM to write more intensively based on their uncertainty about the quality of content in a non-native language.

> I think it's really cool thing to use in your daily tasks, especially if you're working not in your home country or another culture. Especially when you're working with another language, because we cannot really use it on the same level as native speakers (Respondent 11).

Given the study's emphasis on organizational change, a pivotal inquiry concerns how these tools have been viewed, managed, and impacted within the respondents' organizations. Four respondents said they had not received any information from the company regarding utilizing Generative AI platforms to perform work tasks. Two respondents said that they received information from their managers verbally, without the appearance of any official guidelines or rules. The remaining respondents admitted that their companies had already drawn up and distributed guidelines and policies related to Gen AI usage.

In the context of integrating Generative intelligence systems within enterprises' internal operational frameworks, numerous participants have indicated that their

respective organizations have either already trained systems using their data or are training models tailored for internal applications right now. Additionally, certain respondents have mentioned using Microsoft's enterprise-centric tool, Copilot (Microsoft 365, n.d.), within their corporate settings. It is an indicator that some companies are not only seeking to regulate the use of external tools by communications specialists but also mastering these tools at a deeper level to influence employee performance. However, the remaining respondents continue to use the tools autonomously, without any communication from managers, consistent with several previous studies mentioned in the literature review (McCorkindale, 2024; PRovoke Media, 2023).

Following sensemaking theory (Weick et al., 2005), respondents retrospectively created plausible rationalizations of their interaction with Generative AI for job tasks. Some of these insights emerged during the interviews, as many respondents admitted that they had not previously considered how they conceptualized the use of Generative AI in communication tasks. In the following sections, I will examine how respondents made sense of their responses by the five dimensions: Status, Certainty, Autonomy, Relatedness, and Fairness (Rock, 2007).

5.2. Status

As discussed previously, status is mainly connected to social validation and willingness to be perceived better by surrounding people (Rock, 2008). The primary objective of the study was to explore respondents ’experiences concerning their status in the context of generative AI and to identify categories for conceptualizing these sensations. Following an in-depth analysis of the interviews using sensemaking theory (Weick et al., 2005), two categories of experience emerged: the shame associated with using Gen AI and the comparison of skills with AI.

5.2.1. The Shame Associated With Using Gen AI

> I believe it's connected with perception because, for me, it was like... I'm cheating. So basically, as I work as a Public Relations specialist, my skills are writing texts to be capable to create some comprehensive and compelling communication. And I felt like... Ok, so if I delegate this task to Gen AI, it might feel as I'm cheating (Respondent 7).

When talking about their first experiences using Generative Intelligence, many respondents overtly or more covertly mention feelings of shame, reluctance to tell others about their usage of this tool, or the need to prove to their manager that using Gen AI applications is not dictated by laziness. The theme of shame unites all of these cases and is deeply intertwined with the themes of identity and status issues. Reflecting on this experience, respondents note their hidden desire not to share the achievements of Generative AI. For example, one of the respondents talked about her experience using ChatGPT to create texts for an advertising campaign:

> And then I told my manager, and he was, like, ʻOh my God. So genius phrases! ʼAt first, I didn't want to tell that it's ChatGPT, but I'm too, too good person and too honest (Respondent 1).

As was discussed in the previous section, respondents mainly mention their experience using Large Language Models like ChatGPT and internal analogs. These systems allow the generation of texts by predicting the most suitable next word in the sequence (Bubeck et al., 2023). Since the research participants work in communication and frequently encounter tasks dedicated to writing, they often use Generative AI systems to create, edit, and adjust text pieces. Peculiarly, this specific case evokes the greatest feeling of shame among respondents. They note that writing texts has always been one of the main hard skills of a communications specialist.

> ...if we speak about, for instance, hiring process of Public Relations specialists, usually there is a test, task to create some kind of press release, for instance. So, it's kind of considered to be a core task for such kind of specialist, but probably it will somehow modify the profession in the future… (Respondent 7).

This finding is consistent with the research of Yalcin and Puntoni (2023), who stated that people who identify themselves with a specific activity rarely easily adopt the AI tool that is supposed to perform the same function. All respondents negatively describe the practices when communication professionals "just copy-paste the texts generated by AI" and emphasize the need for human assessment and adjustment.

However, the old view, in which the work of a communication specialist was evaluated by the quality of the content they could produce, no longer reflects reality. In

accordance with sensemaking theory (Weick, 2005), this triggers the sensemaking process, in which respondents rethink the role of communication specialists. A new picture of the ideal communication specialist is already being created through interactions with others, following Mead's distinctions between the "I" and the "Me" (1972). Answering questions about their colleagues' and other communication specialists' attitudes toward the new technology, all respondents mentioned that almost everyone is trying it out. The utilization of this technology by others validates this experience. It turns it from an activity threatening the respondent's status into something typical and not dangerous for social and professional recognition (Rock, 2008). Based on the respondents' responses, it can be noticed that this comprehension process is happening right now, causing complicated feelings for the respondents. Reflecting on the future, they admit that the creation of assets using new Gen AI technology may become common in the industry. It shows the respondents' recognition of the sensemaking process:

> First and foremost, probably, perception will be changed... Probably, in three years it will be totally normal and totally fine to use ChatGPT in your day-to-day routine (Respondent 7).

Another observation is related to the fact that respondents who work in the IT industry are apparently at a more advanced stage of acceptance of Gen AI tools usage as an integral part of communication jobs. Unlike respondents from other fields, they expressed less anxiety about judging colleagues and, according to their answers, generally adapted to the new framework more easily. Moreover, a few respondents from tech companies even noted that they specifically used neural networks to prepare external content to publish, noting that the neural network created it because it is a “trend.”

5.2.2. The Comparison of Skills With AI

> I don't need to use my brain anymore. So you start feeling a bit underestimated (Respondent 1).

Another category related to the concept of status found in the study is the comparison of skills with neural networks. Even though the following topic is inextricably linked to the previous one, I still intend to divide it into a separate category since it does not apply to all respondents. This topic was only encountered in a few interviews and mentioned by respondents who had an editorial background or were working with texts extensively in

their current occupation. Therefore, their previous empirical experience affects how they make sense of the current change in reality (Weick, 1995).

> Anyone who has at least tried to receive content through prompts immediately understands that… once I was hired to do it (Respondent 5).

The respective respondents expressed frustration that neural networks can now do the work they have dedicated part of their lives and professional paths. It is important to note that the respondents typically showed these feelings at the end of the interview, relaxing and trusting me as a researcher. These feelings could also be read through non-verbal gestures and facial expressions. Respondents compared their past work with the current situation, noting that neural networks can complete it in seconds now. However, the frustration was hidden because the respondents emphasized that they consider Gen AI a positive phenomenon and noted that they are not afraid of new technology right now. These feelings of nostalgia and frustration are also associated with communication specialists' understanding of their status. Some of the past skills that confirm professional competence are no longer relevant, which leads to a rethink of the situation and internal dialogue.

5.3. Certainty

Certainty is perceived as an ability to formulate accurate predictions of the immediate future (Rock & Cox, 2012). As mentioned above, neuroscientists see an intersection between high uncertainty and stress levels. However, since uncertainty also depends on respondents' perception of what is happening and their processes of comprehension of the situation, this section thoroughly examines the topics of concern to communication specialists in connection with the future development of technology and its impact on their work. Using the questions: "What is your vision of what we can anticipate in three years in terms of implementing generative AI in communication jobs?" and "How do you feel about it?" I provoked a discussion whose aim was not to foresee the future but to assess what exact topics are in the focus of respondents' attention. The following themes were encountered in most of the interviews: (1) the replacement of humans by AI; (2) change of the skillset; (3) legalization issues; (4) uncertainty connected to the fast development of the technology.

5.3.1. The Replacement of Humans by AI

> Researcher: Do you feel that it changes your professional life?
>
> Respondent: Oh, you ask like if I'm gonna lose my job because of AI? *laughs*
>
> Researcher: I didn't ask you that *smiles*
>
> Respondent: No. Well, not yet, anyway. Because communication, more than anything, is about building connections, building relationships, and telling stories. Human stories, unique stories. And generative AI so far is not there yet (Respondent 2).

Knowing about the widespread discussion in the media about whether neural networks can replace humans and take their jobs away from them (Stanford University, 2024), as well as confirmed information from research that this fear associated with generative AI platforms is inherent in the audience (Zhan et al., 2023), I avoided asking questions related to this topic, trying not to lure respondents into this theme and not to influence their answers. Nevertheless, in all interviews, without exception, the respondents themselves started to talk about it, answering questions about their professional lives and the future development of the industry. It shows that this specific theme is something that respondents reflected upon and tried to make sense of this discussion in professional circles.

The first thing to note in the analysis is that almost all respondents accompanied their reflections on this topic with emotional reactions. The most common is laughter and smiles. In the context of interpretativism as a paradigm (Merriam & Tisdell, 2016; Prasad, 2017) and sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995; Weick et al., 2005), these manifestations are part of the response and show how respondents interpret the topic being addressed. Despite the fact that research participants bring up this topic themselves, with smiles and jokes, they seem to show that this theme is not essential, that it does not bother them at all, and that they talk about it only because other people are afraid of it. Respondents used the phrases: "I am not afraid of this", "Gen AI does not scare me," and "I am just kidding". Several respondents returned to this question at the end of the interview or even after the recording was turned off, emphasizing that they had no fear of losing their jobs.

At the same time, respondents did not deny that neural networks can substitute some communication specialists. However, eleven out of twelve respondents were convinced this does not apply to them.

> We have very often encountered the thesis that artificial intelligence will take away the work of editors and all sorts of community managers. I know for sure that it won't take away... It will take it away from those who have retrained from manicurists to copywriters on courses. It may take away from these people. Those who write some basic text (Respondent 8).

Many respondents shared cases of their colleagues, copywriters, or entry-level specialists who, in their opinion, could suffer in the future. However, as mentioned above, eleven out of twelve respondents expressed views that this does not apply to them due to their high competence. In social psychology, there is the phenomenon of Actor-Observer Asymmetry, which explains that actors or people who themselves have faced some negative consequences of their actions express situational explanations for their behaviors, while observers or people looking at it from the outside, preferring personal or dispositional explanations for the actors' behaviors (Jones & Nisbett, 1971). Through the lenses of this phenomenon, it can be assumed that respondents tend to see a potential threat to others associated with a low level of their competencies but overlook their own position. Another possible explanation may be that respondents feel threatened in terms of their professional future but prefer to make sense of this situation in such a way as to feel safe.

Justifying the impossibility of AI to replace communication specialists, the respondents provided several arguments. Almost everyone mentioned the inability of generative tools to create unique and creative content. Respondents stated that the more generated content appears on the Internet, the higher the request for unique stories will be, and this is something that generative AI cannot create.

> What people in general appreciates the most is originality, like something original, right? I really don't think any service ever is gonna be able to do it (Respondent 4).

The second reason is a request for sincere content and storytelling. Respondents talk about the sincerity and authenticity of the content, explaining that such content can only be

produced by humans. The third mentioned take on why Gen AI cannot replace communication specialists is the need for the creation of high-level strategies and project-management ability to organize campaigns that imply communication with real people: journalists, bloggers, and employees.

5.3.2. Change of the Skillset

> To be honest, I don't know what's going to be the ideal profile of comms person in five to ten years. I don't, but definitely I think what will be the requirement that you know how to use these tools in your daily job (Respondent 7).

Respondents who presently integrate Generative AI into their daily professional practices have articulated perspectives about a potential change in the communication professional skillset in the future. Primarily, discourse centers on two salient themes: the need to enhance technical competencies to use and leverage new tools to increase operational efficacy and the idea that the focus of the job is shifting towards project management and strategic planning instead of producing the content. It is important to note that respondents with limited exposure to Gen AI tools or not involved in large-scale content production mentioned this topic to a lesser extent or even did not notice any changes. For example, an employee of the strategic planning team at the communication department, exclusively engaged in planning high-level campaigns, said:

> Do I need to upskill? Well, that's threatening. I think, in general, people are thinking that. But then, the reality is that, at least in our department, people are still doing the same things in the same way (Respondent 10).

From the perspective of sensemaking theory (Weick, 1995), the reality of the strategic planning communication specialist has not undergone sufficiently dramatic alterations to initiate a sensemaking process. Despite being aware of the joint discussion about potential shifts in their profession in media and professional circles, she said that her daily routine and everyday tasks remain largely unchanged. Nevertheless, respondents in areas related to large-scale content production already require these competencies from their employees. The content and design team leader, who manages a team of eight people, shared a story about conducting interviews with potential employees:

> I had some interviews with people looking for a job. It was a position very close to the content site managers in my team... I found myself listening to people saying, 'I'm not using Generative AI' and 'I'm using Generative AI,' and I understood that not using Generative AI is actually a failure. Now, I suppose that if someone says 'I'm not using,' I doubt I would want to work with the person because I encourage my team to use it (Respondent 9).

Accordingly, depending on how actively the respondent uses generative AI in their work and which direction of communication they belong to, they make sense of the potential change in the skillset of specialists in different ways. However, the general uncertainty about how the industry is changing and what skills will be in demand in the future is based on the reaction to the threat caused by the inability to predict the immediate future accurately (Rock & Cox, 2012).

5.3.3. Legalization Issues

> But for me, the biggest interest is in legislation part. How? How will it work? How will it be organized to secure that you as a business can use something safely and not create any additional risk, like not creating any opportunities for potential damage to the brand? (Respondent 6).

One notable concern among respondents hindering the adoption of generative AI tools for professional applications is the legal implications surrounding their utilization. This issue is frequently voiced by respondents affiliated with multinational corporations occupying strategic roles. For instance, a Communication Knowledge and Development Leader representing a global company operating across 31 countries underscored the imperative of ensuring the legalization of Generative AI tools across all their geography. In her opinion, the absence of such legal validation and proper laws renders effective tool implementation at the organizational level. Hence, legal considerations emerge as a significant constraint impeding the widespread adoption of AI technologies.

Since most countries are still drafting laws regulating the use of generative AI (WIPO, 2024), this situation increases the feeling of uncertainty and needs to be clarified about how to use tools for specific purposes properly. Respondents mentioning legalization expressed concern and said that they are very much waiting for the release of laws to feel safer.

5.3.4. Uncertainty Connected to the Fast Development of Technology

> Respondent 11: You can be skeptical, or you can be excited. But it... I mean, it's progress. You cannot really stop it. So, you just can adapt... I don't like to think about it because I cannot really influence it.

Another factor that caused emotional reactions from many respondents connected to the swift pace of Generative AI technological advancement. Reflecting on the potential evolution of the communication profession, they articulated concern regarding the rapid development of Generative AI systems and expressed uncertainty regarding the future trajectory of this advancement. Deliberating upon potential future scenarios, respondents admitted the difficulty in making accurate predictions, noting the substantial difference between their current reality and their foresight just two years prior. From the point of view of the SCARF theory (Rock & Cox, 2012), this category may cause the most remarkable threat reaction among respondents since the absence of understanding of the direction and speed of technology development deprives people of guidance for all other topics related to confidence in the future. Knowing how Generative AI systems will develop could suggest which skills will be beneficial in the future, who will not be replaced by generative AI, and what laws can be adopted to regulate it.

5.4. Autonomy

Autonomy, in the context of the SCARF theory, implies the ability to control the process independently and make choices (Rock, 2008). Within the framework of organizational changes caused by the advent of new technology, autonomy is a significant parameter indicating how respondents view their subjectivity in decision-making in a changing environment. After conducting interviews with respondents, three phenomena related to the reaction to the autonomy of decision-making were identified: (1) the presence of guidelines, (2) permission to use particular tools, (3) and data security.

5.4.1. The Presence of Guidelines

> There are guidelines for the usage of AI tools. First, images are not allowed to be used externally. Second, disclose it. You need to tell other people that you are using AI. And the third one is that they also limited the tools. Ok, you can try them, and we encourage you to

> try them all, right? But in order to create something for actual use, we have these options. Just these options (Respondent 4).

Of the twelve respondents, half, or six people, noted that their companies have guidelines concerning the usage of Gen AI tools. Knowing that the sensemaking process takes place when a new reality is decomposed into words and salient categories (Weick et al., 2005), the appearance of guidelines can be seen as an indicator of this process, showing that people at the respective companies are in the process of understanding and accepting of the new reality at the organizational level.

According to insights from these six respondents, guidelines, instructions, and policies concerning Gen AI usage emerged after employees started adopting external tools. Consequently, employees act as primary agents of organizational transformation using Generative AI tools. Specific actions of employees are changing the reality of organizations, leading to organizational changes from below. This situation provokes the process of organizational sensemaking (Weick et al., 2005), which resulted in the creation of guidelines and rules governing the use of Gen AI.

> We are sort of conservative when it comes to new tools. So, it took us a while to create guidelines and training and E-learning solutions that can support our coworkers to use Generative AI... People were already using something, but then there were still no guidelines in place. Now I feel like we have quite a big variety of trainings and learning solutions (Respondent 6).

Respondents generally view guidelines as a positive development. They appreciate how guidelines foster autonomous decision-making and provide a sense of certainty. Most guidelines are accompanied by educational resources to facilitate understanding of new platforms and detailed instructions on ethical and data privacy issues. This factor also allows employees to study and try out new tools more autonomously, following the instructions in the online courses. Respondents at companies without official communication on the topic may be divided into two groups by their position: those who anticipate future communication and those who believe it's unnecessary, citing employees' ability to navigate new tools independently.

However, one main issue that frustrated most of the respondents who encountered its manifestations at the organizational level — both in guidelines and in oral communication — is permission to use only specific tools.

5.4.2. Permission to Use Particular Tools

> I think it's a matter of time before ChatGPT gets banned like the website. You know, sometimes it happens like that… But people will find ways. Of course, I will keep using ChatGPT. I don't care. I will use a different computer, but I will use it (Respondent 3).

None of the respondents mentioned encountering a scenario where they were prohibited from utilizing Generative AI tools. Nevertheless, six respondents indicated that their companies either recommended using the developed in-house application of the Large Language Model or a third-party enterprise Gen AI platform bought and explicitly tailored for enhanced security and reliability at the organizational level. It causes ambiguous reactions among respondents. Some respondents have raised valid concerns about the limitations of internal tools. They find these solutions inconvenient due to their restricted functionality, which can hinder their work efficiency and productivity.

> They’re gonna say, 'ok, now it's allowed to use generative images, but just, I don't know, DALL-E, for instance. And then, it is not the best when it comes to creating content. Because then if you have many more options, most likely you're gonna find what you are looking for in an easier way. Maybe you prompt all of them, and then, ok, this is the best result. That's what I want (Respondent 4).

Even though companies are not restricting employees now, respondents already feel this recommendation threatens their autonomy. The inability to control the choice of tools leads to restrictions and causes frustration among employees. It also resonates with the theme of fairness — another part of SCARF theory (Rock & Cox, 2012).

Two respondents also underscored their reluctance to utilize internal tools because they wish to avoid being monitored. This shows a general lack of trust in the company and also echoes the theme of shame around the use of AI, as respondents noted that they do not want their managers to know how often they use generative AI.

> …if they ask to use only this one, I think maybe I will use it if I'm sure that they are not really controlling everything that we are putting in this tool (Respondent 11).

When respondents make sense of this situation, they view introducing a new tool for employees as a threat to their autonomy rather than a tool intended to make their lives easier and provide a safe way to use the new technology.

5.4.3. Data Security

> Guidelines were very strict.... You can't ask it to write a message for you saying.... company name. What you can ask is — I'm at a company with a bold, youthful, energetic language. You cannot say that you work here…. So, a lot of times, I was a bit like... I'm not going to use it because it's kind of more effort than worth it for me (Respondent 12).

Another factor emerging across most interviews concerns the autonomy associated with data security while utilizing generative AI tools for job-related tasks. Respondents expressed concerns about how generative tools handle their data. For some respondents, this concern is so significant that they either refrain from using generative tools altogether or limit their usage to a minimal extent.

An intriguing observation lies in the fact that respondents who express concerns about data security often also voice dissatisfaction regarding limitations on the usage of specific platforms imposed by companies. Consequently, individuals perceive the situation in a highly threatening light — on the one hand, they resist company surveillance, while on the other hand, they distrust external Gen AI platforms and feel a lack of autonomy in their usage due to uncertainty about how these Tech companies handle data. Accordingly, such a dilemma poses a significant challenge for companies. From the perspective of recommendations derived from the SCARF theory (Rock, 2007), approaching communication at the organizational level should be done in a manner that minimizes respondents' perception of threat.

5.5. Relatedness

Relatedness from the SCARF point of view refers to belonging to a community and, in general, perceiving oneself as part of a group (Rock, 2007). To assess which phenomena falls into this category, respondents were asked whether their colleagues in the communication team use generative AI, whether they discuss it with colleagues, and how popular these tools are in general among the communication community. Within this category, one theme emerged — everyone is using AI but not talking about it.

5.5.1. Everyone is Using AI but not Talking about it

> I think it's not that only I'm genius and using it for some stuff. I think that everyone does it for different purposes (Respondent 1).

This theme also strongly resonates with the theme of shame regarding using Gen AI and the topic of the new skillset discussed previously. On the one hand, respondents are convinced that many people in the communication community are already using Gen AI to solve work tasks and admit the need to train themselves to be ahead of the progress. On the other hand, respondents note that they rarely talk about it with their colleagues and generally are not very open about using Gen AI for work tasks at their organizations.

This contradiction creates a bizarre process of sensemaking in which knowledge of Gen AI is already a necessary skill but is not widely discussed in communication with colleagues. In the context of this conclusion, it is also important to note once again that the process of sensemaking is constant and ongoing within organizations, while interviews represent situations at a certain point in time and take into account the opinions of a limited number of individuals. Consequently, it would be intriguing to observe how this meaning-making process concerning group membership evolves in the future.

5.6. Fairness

According to the SCARF theory, fairness reflects how individuals view the exchange of resources among people (Rock, 2008). Social situations in which exchange is perceived as fair, therefore, cause the award reaction, while knowledge about the unfair distribution of goods leads to the extreme threat reaction. Concerning the Gen AI implementation, social experience that may be connected to fairness was mentioned less than other topics. Respondents generally view the situation as fair due to the free access to the ChatGPT and other tools.

As mentioned before, some respondents predict potential restrictions in using tools at the company level, which evokes reactions related to autonomy and fairness. In addition, only one factor related to fairness can be analyzed: the difference in technical expertise.

5.6.1. The Difference in Technical Expertise

> I'm the judging the closest to me, which is the business partner unit. They're mostly 50-plus-year-old people, and I think that affects their usage. You know what I mean? I mean, they're not as tech-savvy. So, for them, it's not natural (Respondent 3).

Respondents note that some communication specialists have lower technical knowledge, and for them, it will be more challenging to start using generative AI tools. Respondents usually refer to this topic in the context of discussions about the new skillset, implying that people who are poorly versed in technology will find it difficult to fit into the profile of a future communications specialist.

5.7. Analysis Summary

Summing up all the above, a deductive approach based on SCARF theory and inductive inquiry through the sensemaking theory helped analyze collected data and find patterns within each category. Despite the generally positive attitude towards generative intelligence, respondents expressed mixed feelings, which can be linked to the threat reactions connected to Status, Certainty, Autonomy, Relatedness, and Fairness. Due to the different levels of implementation of generative AI in companies, diverse industries, and various levels of expertise, the respondents shared very different experiences, which, on the one hand, shows the breadth and depth of research, and on the other hand, indicates the need for further investigation.

Analyzing the impact of Gen AI on the Status of communication specialists within an organization, I identified two phenomena: shame associated with the usage of neural networks and frustration experienced when comparing skills with Gen AI in people with an editorial background. It intersects with findings connected to the Relatedness category, in which the phenomena of people already using AI but being hesitant to share it with colleagues was identified. Certainty is the category with the most data to analyze, as all respondents mentioned the feeling of insecurity caused by various reasons. Replacing people with generative AI has become a topic that all respondents have addressed, even though I deliberately did not mention the theme first. Meanwhile, all but one respondent said that Gen AI may replace some communication specialists, but they would not be affected personally. Despite the statement that this topic does not cause uncertainty, the emotional reaction of the respondents was so contradictory that it was nevertheless

included in this category. There are also issues of insufficient legalization, changes in the package of necessary skills, and simply the rapid and unpredictable development of technology, which cause uncertainty among respondents. The concept of Autonomy is also connected to plenty of insights. According to the findings, the presence of clear guidelines and the availability of educational products increases the sense of Autonomy among respondents, allowing them to make informed decisions independently. However, the request to use only specific platforms and the fear of jeopardizing privacy and data security causes a sense of threat and discontent. Fairness is the less-mentioned social experience. However, some respondents expressed that since the usage of Gen AI demands a sufficient level of technical expertise, it may be unfair to some specialists who are not tech-savvy.

The following section discusses how these findings answer the questions posed at the beginning of the current research.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

In the final chapter of this study, the significance of the collected data is analyzed and discussed in different contexts. First, I elaborate on how research findings answer the research questions and meet the aim of the study. Considering each of the questions separately, the discussion summarizes the analysis conducted in the previous chapter and completes the study. Following this, the contribution to scientific knowledge of strategic communication is addressed. A separate section is dedicated to the study's limitations and suggestions for future research.

6.1. **Discussion of the Sensemaking Process**

The study considers the implementation of Generative artificial intelligence as an organizational change or "a succession of differences in time within a persisting identity" (Cheney et al., 2011). Within this view, the company's employees are seen as people who create meaning and the company itself through communication with each other (Christensen et al., 2008; Weick, 2001; Putnam et al., 2009). Accordingly, the process of understanding the current change is connected simultaneously with respondents' personal identities and with the organizational view on the change.

Therefore, what can be said to answer the first research question: "How do corporate communication specialists make sense of Generative AI's influence on their professional lives"? According to the data obtained, it can be noted that now, the respondents and their companies are in a transition period characterized by changing from the old understanding of the situation to the new one. According to the theory of sensemaking (Weick, 1995), the comprehension process begins at the moment when reality differs from the perception of people who observe this reality. Most respondents noted that specialists' skills are changing, and some competencies are no longer as significant. Technical skills related to content creation are becoming less critical, as they can be outsourced to technology, and specialists notice this. It is the reason for the increased frustration of specialists, whose main task is to create content. Despite the initial resistance to this idea, expressed, according to SCARF classification (Rock, 2008), in the sense of threat to status and a sense of unfair treatment due to the difference in technical expertise, specialists are

beginning to realize that the profession is changing and interpret it in a safe way for them. As a matter of fact, by saying that Gen AI will not be able to replace communicators due to the need to create original and sincere stories, the presence of a live connection between people, and the transition of focus towards project management, respondents create a new reality in which their profession already looks different. According to sensemaking theory, they are rewriting the narrative to reflect the data from the surrounding world, striving to become the most plausible explanation of reality (Weick, 1995). It may also be connected with an overly emotional reaction, with which almost all respondents claimed that AI would never replace them. By creating the most likely narrative and reflecting the information from the media, they interpreted it so that it corresponded to their expectations about reality.

However, the research data indicate that the transit process is still in its early stages, as specialists still feel uneasy discussing the use of generative AI with their colleagues despite being convinced that others are also using it. It would be intriguing to observe how attitudes towards the use of AI evolve among communication professionals in the future as the process of reflection continues and develops.

6.2. **Discussion of Hindering Factors**

According to the collected data, in most of the companies presented in the study, the appearance of guidelines, rules, and pieces of training on Generative AI was preceded by the employees' beginning to use these tools. Therefore, this research shows that employees may act as early adopters and even catalysts for organizational change provoked by technological advancement. This outcome should be noticed and researched further in the context of organizational change. In this case, organizational sensemaking and acting are not aimed at introducing technology from above, as considered in many studies (Davidson, 2006; Leinwand & Mani, 2022), but rather at creating boundaries within which employees can use new technologies safely and effectively.

Nevertheless, whether companies only want to create boundaries for the safe usage of new tools or implement Gen AI to enhance effectiveness in alignment with the latest research (Brynjolfsson et al., 2023; Noy & Zhang, 2023), they have to know what can raise resistance among communication specialists. Answering the second question of the research, "How do employees perceive hindering factors that may arise from organizational change associated with Generative AI implementation in corporate communication?', following the SCARF theory (Rock, 2008), I identified a list of

obstacles that should be considered prior to implementation of Gen AI systems as an example of technological innovation within organizations.

The first hindering factor is the absence of clear, open communication about the company's stance and planned actions regarding Gen AI implementation. The data collected revealed that respondents highly value the presence of guidelines, which contribute to their sense of autonomy and certainty. It is consistent with current studies and applicable to all types of organizational change (Christensen et al., 2008; Lewis, 2011). The atypical thing is that despite the external development of technology, the task of top management, among other things, is to explain to employees how the company understands the current state of affairs and assesses risks. Is it possible to use particular tools before the appearance of clear laws? How does the company approach the issue of data security? Answers to such questions, according to the findings of this study, do not limit employees but rather give them a sense of autonomy and confidence in their actions, reducing anxiety. Therefore, in case of external technological changes, employees expect even more detailed communication from the company.

Another obstacle is employees' reluctance to use only the tools the company offers as safe solutions. As mentioned above, in the case of an external technological change, employees may represent early adopters or facilitate change. Accordingly, receiving recommendations from the company after they have mastered the product is perceived by them as a limitation of their autonomy. This factor should be considered when thinking through both technological and organizational strategies.

The last factor is related to the first issue and how communication specialists perceive generative AI. Based on the results of this part of the study, it is also possible to conclude what can slow down the implementation of AI in a company. The feeling of unfairness due to different levels of technical expertise and the fear of status reduction due to the use of Gen AI can affect the dynamics within the organization. These fears are consistent with the study of Zhan, Molina, Rheu, and Peng (2023). SCARF theory (Rock & Cox, 2012) proposes to address this through communication, showing the rewarding part of the new technology.

6.3. **Knowledge Contribution**

This research enriches the strategic communication domain and contributes to academic scholarship in several dimensions. Primarily, it provides actionable recommendations for practitioners keen to apply Generative AI in their corporate communication frameworks.

Moreover, the incorporation of hindering factors analysis through the SCARF theory enhances the study's value proposition. This theoretical lens not only helps find factors impeding successful AI adoption but also offers strategic communication advice for effectively addressing these issues. Thus, the study fosters the development of holistic strategic plans to mitigate barriers to Gen AI implementation.

From an academic point of view, describing the sensemaking process among employees of large- and medium-sized companies adds knowledge to the organizational communication field. It provides information on how organizational change provoked by technological development can be viewed by employees instead of through a managerial lens, contributing to existing studies (Davidson, 2006; Leinwand & Mani, 2022). Moreover, the study touches on the topic of the identity of communication professionals, which is changing by the sensemaking process, as explained above. Therefore, the research enriches the research inquiry into this topic.

The combination of two robust theories helps to get an insight into the complex dynamics of Generative AI adoption within organizations. The utilization of SCARF and sensemaking theories represents a pioneering endeavor in exploring the cognitive and social dimensions of Generative AI implementation among communication specialists.

6.4. **Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research**

As specified in the delimitations outlined in the introduction, the research targets a specific audience — communication specialists in European companies with more than 500 employees who are already familiar with Generative AI tools. It facilitates a profound analysis of the employee perspective on Generative AI adoption within corporations, aligning with an interpretive qualitative study. However, for a more comprehensive exploration of this subject, it is recommended that the scope be broadened to include other audiences, specifically professionals in smaller-scale organizations in different countries, and to investigate the standpoint of top management. Moreover, despite the robustness of the theoretical framework expressed through the combination of SCARF and sensemaking theories, which also contribute to the consilience of science, it undeniably shapes the approach to data analysis. I suggest continuing the research using alternative theories and methods since it will enrich the understanding of the phenomena.

Moreover, several limitations emerged during the data collection phase. The finding that eleven out of twelve respondents reported working in their non-native language could potentially influence the findings. While this outcome is a logical consequence of the

sampling, which implies interviews with representatives of international organizations in which English is a primary communication language, it impacts the results. Hence, it is crucial to conduct further research with a sampling strategy that examines employees working in their native language and utilizing Generative AI for content creation in languages other than English. Another limitation identified at this stage is the high level of tech-savviness among the respondents. While it is understandable given the study's topic, including individuals with diverse opinions on Generative AI adoption could provide a more comprehensive view of the topic.

In terms of the strategic communication field, the theme may benefit from an analysis of how the perception of implementation differs depending on different approaches to communication within companies. It may be analyzed using observation and case study methodologies.

References

Aplin-Houtz, M., Munoz, L., Fergurson, J. R., Fleming, D. E., & Miller, R. J. (2023). What Matters to Students? A SCARF-Based Model of Educational Service Recovery. *Marketing Education Review, 33*(4), 320–340. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1080/10528008.2023.2241450

Beurer-Züllig, B., Fieseler, C., & Meckel, M. (2009). Typologies of Communicators in Europe. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 14*(2), 158–175.

Bhaskar, R. (2008). *A realist theory of science*. Routledge.

Bran, E., Rughinis, C., Nadoleanu, G., & Flaherty, M. G. (2023). The Emerging Social Status of Generative AI: Vocabularies of AI Competence in Public Discourse. *2023 24th International Conference on Control Systems and Computer Science (CSCS)*, 391–398. https://doi.org/10.1109/CSCS59211.2023.00068

Brockhaus, J., Buhmann, A., & Zerfass, A. (2023). Digitalization in corporate communications: Understanding the emergence and consequences of CommTech and digital infrastructure. *Corporate Communications: An International Journal, 28*(2), 274–292. https://doi.org/10.1108/CCIJ-03-2022-0035

Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. (2023). *Generative AI at Work.*

Bubeck, S., Chandrasekaran, V., Eldan, R., Gehrke, J., Horvitz, E., Kamar, E., Lee, P., Lee, Y. T., Li, Y., Lundberg, S., Nori, H., Palangi, H., Ribeiro, M. T., & Zhang, Y. (2023). *Sparks of Artificial General Intelligence: Early experiments with GPT-4*.

Campbell, S. J., Walsh, K., Prior, S. J., Doherty, D., Bramble, M., Marlow, A., & Maxwell, H. (2022). Examining the engagement of health services staff in change management: Modifying the SCARF assessment model. *International Practice Development Journal, 12*(1), 1–13. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.19043/ipdj.121.005

Cheney, G., Christensen, L. T., Zorn, T., & Ganesh, S. (2011). *Organizational communication in an age of globalization: Issues, reflections, practices* (2nd ed.). Waveland Press.

Chui, M., Hazan, E., Roberts, R., Singla, A., Smaje, K., Sukharevsky, A., Yee, L., & Zemmel, R. (2023c). The economic potential of generative AI: The next productivity frontier. In *McKinsey & Company*. Retrieved February 6, 2024, from

https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/mckinsey-digital/our-insights/the-economic-potential-of-generative-ai-the-next-productivity-frontier#key-insights

Cohen, T. (2023c, December 15). *Generative AI for business leaders - Generative AI for Business Leaders*. LinkedIn. Retrieved February 6, 2024, from https://www.linkedin.com/learning/generative-ai-for-business-leaders/generative-ai-for-business-leaders

Collins Dictionary. (2023b). *The Collins Word of the Year 2023 is. . .* Retrieved February 6, 2024, from https://www.collinsdictionary.com/woty. https://www.collinsdictionary.com/woty

Cornuke, W. (2023, October 5). Artificial intelligence content: marketing friend or foe? Three ways to use AI content tools. *Forbes*. Retrieved February 6, 2024, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbescommunicationscouncil/2023/02/16/artificial-intelligence-content-marketing-friend-or-foe-three-ways-to-use-ai-content-tools/?sh=7391b6c941e9

Craig, R. T. (1999). Communication theory as a field. *Communication Theory, 9*(2), 119–161. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2885.1999.tb00355.x

Christensen, L. T., Morsing, M., & Cheney, G. (2008). *Corporate Communications: convention, complexity, and critique*. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446214466

Dastin, J., Tong, A., A, S., & Hu, K. (2023, November 18). ChatGPT maker OpenAI ousts CEO Sam Altman. *Reuters*. Retrieved February 6, 2024, from https://www.reuters.com/technology/openai-ceo-sam-altman-step-down-2023-11-17/

Davidson, E. (2006). A Technological Frames Perspective on Information Technology and Organizational Change. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 42*(1), 23–39. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886305285126

Demirdag, P. S. (2023, March 15). *What Is Generative AI?* LinkedIn. Retrieved February 6, 2024, from https://www.linkedin.com/learning/what-is-generative-ai/generative-ai-is-a-tool-in-service-of-humanity

Falkheimer, J., & Heide, M. (2023). *Strategic communication: An introduction to theory and global practice* (Second edition). Routledge.

Feng, Y. (2024). Ethical Responsibilities in the Backends of Media and Digital Technologies. *Journal of Media Ethics, 39*(1), 61–66. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1080/23736992.2024.2296194

Ford, J. D., Ford, L. W., & McNamara, R. T. (2002). Resistance and the background conversations of change. *Journal of Organizational Change Management, 15*(2), 105–121. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1108/09534810210422991

Google. (n.d.). *Welcome to the Gemini era.* Google DeepMind. Retrieved January 15, 2024, from https://deepmind.google/technologies/gemini/#introduction

Gandzeichuk, I. (2023, October 23). How Generative AI can improve communication within an Organization. *Forbes*. Retrieved February 6, 2024, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/forbestechcouncil/2023/10/23/how-generative-ai-can-improve-communication-within-an-organization/?sh=2ad88a513b95

Gioia, D. A., & Chittipeddi, K. (1991). Sensemaking and Sensegiving in Strategic Change Initiation. *Strategic Management Journal, 12*(6), 433–448.

Gow, G. (2023, November 12). No, ChatGPT And Generative AI Won't Destroy Humanity (But They Could Severely Damage Your Business). *Forbes*. Retrieved February 6, 2024, from https://www.forbes.com/sites/glenngow/2023/11/12/no-chatgpt-and-generative-ai-wont-destroy-humanity-but-they-could-severely-damage-yourbusiness/?sh=99baf19508a8

Google. (2024). Google Trends. Retrieved March 5, 2024, from https://trends.google.ru/trends/explore?date=today%205-y&q=Generative%20AI&hl=en-GB

Haj Bara, B. A., Pokrovskaia, N. N., Ababkova, M. Y., Brusakova, I. A., & Korban, A. A. (2022). Artificial Intelligence for Advertising and Media: Machine Learning and Neural Networks. *2022 Conference of Russian Young Researchers in Electrical and Electronic Engineering (ElConRus)*, 8–11. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1109/ElConRus54750.2022.9755590

Heide, M., & Simonsson, C. (2011). Putting coworkers in the limelight: New challenges for communication professionals. *International Journal of Strategic Communication, 5*(4), 201-220–220. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1080/1553118X.2011.605777

Hogg, G., & Doolan, D. (1999). Playing the part: Practitioner roles in public relations. *European Journal of Marketing, 33*(5/6), 597–611. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1108/03090569910262189

Ilomäki, L., Paavola, S., Lakkala, M., & Kantosalo, A. (2016). Digital competence – An emergent boundary concept for policy and educational research. *Education and Information Technologies, 21*(3), 655–679.

Jones, N. (2023). What the OpenAI drama means for AI progress — and safety. *Nature*. https:// doi.org/10.1038/d41586-023-03700-4

Jones, E. E., & Nisbett, R. E. (1971). *The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.

Jeffrey, L., & Brunton, M. (2012). Professional identity: How communication management practitioners identify with their industry. *Public Relations Review, 38*(1), 156–158. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1016/j.pubrev.2011.09.005

Kennedy, A. (2023, June 30). *The art of generative AI: Balancing creativity and ethics - Generative AI Skills for Creative Content: Opportunities, Issues, and Ethics.* LinkedIn. Retrieved February 6, 2024, from https://www.linkedin.com/learning/generative-ai-skills-for-creative-content-opportunities-issues-and-ethics/the-art-of-generative-ai-balancing-creativity-and-ethics

Kvale, S., & Brinkmann, S. (2009). *InterViews: learning the craft of qualitative research interviewing* (2. ed.). Sage Publications.

Leinwand, P. & Mani M. (2022). *Beyond Digital: How Great Leaders Transform Their Organizations and Shape the Future.* [Elektronisk resurs]. Harvard Business Review.

Lewis, L. K. (2011). *Organizational change: Creating change through strategic communication.* John Wiley & Sons.

McCorkindale, T. (2024, February 7). Generative AI in Organizations: Insights and Strategies from Communication Leaders. *Institute for Public Relations*. https://instituteforpr.org/ipr-generative-ai-organizations-2024/

McKinsey & Company. (2023a, August 1). *The state of AI in 2023: Generative AI's breakout year.* Retrieved March 5, 2024, from https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/quantumblack/our-insights/the-state-of-ai-in-2023-generative-ais-breakout-year#/

Mead, G. H. (1972). *Mind, self, and society: from the standpoint of a social behaviorist*. University of Chicago Press.

Merchant, B. (2023, November 21). Merchant: Why Silicon Valley hated Sam Altman's OpenAI ouster - Los Angeles Times. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved February 6, 2024, from https://www.latimes.com/business/technology/story/2023-11-20/column-openais-board-had-safety-concerns-big-tech-obliterated-them-in-48-hours

Merriam, S. B., & Tisdell, E. J. (2016). *Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation* (4th ed.). Jossey Bass.

Microsoft 365. (n.d.-b). *Copilot for Microsoft 365*. Microsoft. Retrieved April 9, 2024, from https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/microsoft-365/enterprise/copilot-for-microsoft-365

Midjourney. (n.d.). *Midjourney.* Retrieved March 2, 2024, from https://www.midjourney.com/home

Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. *Science, 381*(6654), 1–6. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1126/science.adh2586

Open AI. (n.d.). *DALL·E 2*. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from https://openai.com/dall-e-2

Open AI. (2022, November). Introducing ChatGPT. Retrieved March 5, 2024, from https://openai.com/blog/chatgpt

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4. ed.). SAGE Publications, Inc.

Prasad, P. (2017). *Crafting qualitative research. beyond positivist traditions.* (Second edition.). Routledge.

PRovoke Media. (2023, April 6). *AI in comms: Nearly nine out of 10 pros see opportunity as governance concerns grow*. Retrieved March 11, 2024, from https://www.provokemedia.com/latest/article/ai-in-comms-nearly-nine-out-of-10-pros-see-opportunity-as-governance-concerns-grow

Putnam, L. L., Nicotera, A. M., & McPhee, R. D. (2009). Introduction. In L. L. Putnam & N. A. Maydan (Eds.), *Building theories of organization: The constitutive role of communication* (pp. 1–19). New York: Routledge.

Rock, D. (2007). SCARF: A brain-based model for collaborating with and influencing others. *NeuroLeadership Journal, 1*(1), 44–52.

Rock, D. (2008). SCARF: A brain-based model for collaborating with and influencing others. *Neuro Leadership Journal, 1*(1), 44–52.

Rock, D., & Cox, C. (2012). SCARF in 2012: Updating the social neuroscience of collaborating with others. *NeuroLeadership Journal, 4*(4), 1–16.

Shahlaei, C. A., Rangraz, M., & Stenmark, D. (2017). Transformation of Competence – the Effects of Digitalization on Communicators' Work. *Proceedings of the 25th European Conference on Information Systems (ECIS)*, Guimarães, Portugal, June , 2017

Stanford University. (2024). *AI Index Report 2024 – Artificial Intelligence Index.* Retrieved April 25, 2024, from https://aiindex.stanford.edu/report/

Tracy, S. J. (2020). *Qualitative research methods: collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact.* (Second edition). Wiley-Blackwell.

University of Cambridge. (2023, November 15). *Cambridge Dictionary names 'Hallucinate' Word of the Year 2023.* Retrieved March 2, 2024, from https://www.cam.ac.uk/research/news/cambridge-dictionary-names-hallucinate-word-of-the-year-2023

Vinchon, F., Lubart, T., Bartolotta, S., Gironnay, V., Botella, M., Bourgeois-Bougrine, S., Burkhardt, J., Bonnardel, N., Corazza, G., Glăveanu, V. P., Hanson, M. H., Ivčević, Z., Karwowski, M., Kaufman, J. C., Okada, T., Reiter-Palmon, R., & Gaggioli, A. (2023). Artificial Intelligence & Creativity: A Manifesto for Collaboration. *The Journal of Creative Behavior, 57*(4), 472–484. https://doi.org/10.1002/jocb.597

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

Weick, K. E. (2001). Making sense of the organization: The impermanent organization. In B. M. Staw & R. I. Sutton (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of organizational behavior: Micro approaches* (pp. 7-25). Sage Publications.

Weick, K. E., Sutcliffe, K. M., & Obstfeld, D. (2005). Organizing and the Process of Sensemaking. *Organization Science, 16*(4), 409–421. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1287/orsc.1050.0133

Wilson, E. O. (2003). *Consilience: The unity of knowledge*. Abacus.

WIPO. (2024, February 28). *About IP*. Retrieved March 5, 2024, from https://www.wipo.int/about-ip/en/frontier_technologies/ news/2024/news_0002.html

Yalcin, G., & Puntoni, S. (2023). How AI Affects Our Sense of Self. *Harvard Business Review, 101*(5), 130–136.

Yandex. (n.d.). *YandexGPT*. ya.ru. Retrieved May 2, 2024, from https://ya.ru/ai/gpt-3

York, D. (2023, November 22). *Elevate your brand with generative AI - Elevate Your Business Branding with Generative AI.* LinkedIn. Retrieved March 2, 2024, from https://www.linkedin.com/learning/elevate-your-business-branding-with-generative-ai/elevate-your-brand-with-generative-ai

Zerfass, A., Verčič, D., Nothhaft, H., & Werder, K. P. (2018). Strategic Communication: Defining the Field and its Contribution to Research and Practice. *International Journal of Strategic Communication, 12*(4), 487-505–505. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1080/1553118X.2018.1493485

Zhan, E. S., Molina, M. D., Rheu, M., & Peng, W. (2023). What is there to fear? Understanding multi-dimensional fear of AI from a technological affordance perspective. *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*. https://doi-org.ludwig.lub.lu.se/10.1080/10447318.2023.2261731

Appendix 1. Interview questions

(1) Could you please tell me a little bit about yourself?
(2) Where do you work, and what position do you currently hold?
(3) How many people work in your company?

Generative AI experience

(4) Do you remember when you first became acquainted with Generative AI?
(5) Do you use Generative AI for job purposes? If so, could you describe how you use it?

(a) How often do you use it?
(b) What platforms or tools do you prefer?

(6) Could you share your last experience using it for job purposes?
(7) Have you ever encountered obstacles in using generative AI for job purposes?

Generative AI implementation

(8) What is your company's position on Generative AI adoption for corporate usage?
(9) Does your company have any guidelines and ethical policies regarding AI usage? Tell me about them.

(a) How autonomously can you use Gen AI tools?

(10) How do your colleagues feel about Generative AI?

(a) Is it common among communicators nowadays?
(b) Suppose I am your colleague and think about starting to use Generative AI. What would you say to me?

(11) Does, in your opinion, Generative AI change the landscape of the communication profession now?

(a) How do you feel about that?

(12) What is your vision of what we can anticipate in 3 years in terms of generative AI implementation in communication jobs?
(13) How, in your opinion, does Generative AI affect the perception of communication specialists of their work?

Overcoming hindering factors

(14) What, in your opinion, is an ideal way to approach Generative AI implementation in a company?
(15) What problems, in your opinion, may arise when inserting generative AI systems in job frameworks on a company's level?
(16) Would you describe what you think is the ideal way to overcome these factors?

Appendix 2. Consent form

You are invited to participate in a research study investigating employee perspectives on the adoption of Generative AI (Artificial Intelligence) in corporate communication practices within medium and large organizations. This study is conducted by Daria Nedashkovskaia, a Master's student at Lund University.

Title

From Talk to Tech: Employee Perspectives on Generative AI Adoption in Corporate Communication

Researcher

Daria Nedashkovskaia, Master's Student, Lund University

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to explore employees' perceptions and experiences regarding the implementation of Generative AI in corporate communication. Your insights will contribute to a deeper understanding of the sense-making process and potential hindering factors associated with this technological shift.

Procedures

If you choose to participate, you will be asked to participate in a one-hour, semi-structured interview conducted via Zoom. During the interview, you will be invited to share your professional experience with Generative AI usage within your organization. The interview will focus on your perceptions of the potential benefits and challenges associated with its adoption in corporate communication.

Data Management

The interviews will be audio-recorded to ensure accurate capture of your responses. Transcripts will be generated within one week of the interview. Your interview video will be stored securely on the researcher's computer for a maximum of one week. After this period, the video recording will be permanently deleted without the possibility of recovery.

Confidentiality

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. You have the right to withdraw from the interview at any point without penalty. To ensure anonymity, your name and the name of your organisation will not be mentioned in the final research paper. All interview transcripts and anonymized data will be stored securely on the researcher's personal computer and will not be shared online.

Risks and Benefits

There are no direct benefits to participating in this study. However, your insights will contribute valuable knowledge to the understanding of Generative AI adoption in corporate communication. While participation involves minimal risk, there is a possibility that some of your responses could be unintentionally revealing. To mitigate this risk, the researcher will ensure anonymity in all data analysis and reporting.

Sharing of Results

You will be offered a copy of the final research paper once completed.

Contact Information

If you have any questions or concerns about this research study, please do not hesitate to contact:

- The researcher, Daria Nedashkovskaia

E-mail: dasha.nedashkovskaia@gmail.com

Telephone: +46 72 993 68 15

- Data Protection Officer at Lund University:

E-mail: dataskyddsombud@lu.se

Phone: +46 46 222 00 00

For more information regarding the privacy policy, please visit: https://www.lunduniversity.lu.se/about-university/contact-us/privacy-policy

Participation

By signing below, you acknowledge that you have read and understood this Informed Consent Form. You agree to participate in this research study voluntarily.

Participant Signature _____

Date _____

Appendix 3. Code book

Category	Code	Description
Status	The shame associated with using Gen AI	Feelings of shame, reluctance to tell others about their usage of this tool, or the need to prove to their manager that using Gen AI applications is not dictated by laziness.
	Comparison of skills with AI	Frustration that neural networks can do the work respondents have dedicated part of their lives and professional paths.
Certainty	AI will replace human	Mentions of the future in which neural networks replace communication professionals and feelings around these predictions.
	Change of skillset	Views on how Generative AI may change the skillset of communication professionals.
	Legalisation	Feelings and thoughts connected to the current and future status of legalization of Gen AI.
	Uncertainty because of fast development of technology	Feelings about the development of Artificial Intelligence technologies in the modern world.
Autonomy	The presence of guidelines	Reaction to the presence or absence of guidelines explaining the Gen AI position within the company.
	Permission to use particular tools	Information about any current or planned restrictions and recommendations regarding specific Gen AI tools at the company.
	Data Security	Opinion on the security of Gen AI usage in terms of data and privacy.
Relatedness	Everyone is using AI but not talking about it	Mentions of the usage of Gen AI by other people who prefer not to disclose it.
Fairness	The difference in technical expertise	Opinions on the level of technical expertise necessary to adopt Gen AI instruments.