MANREAU
& PARTNERS

MANREAU ESSAY

Transformation Is Not Change at Scale

By Waheeda Görlitz | 22 August 2026

Transformation does not simply alter what an organization does. It changes what the organization is capable of doing, and, more fundamentally, what it is capable of becoming.

Transformation is not change delivered at greater scale. It is the reconstitution of an organizational system.

Transformation is among the most overused words in management. It is applied to restructurings, technology implementations, cost programs, operating-model changes and cultural initiatives. The breadth of usage creates a dangerous ambiguity: almost any significant change can be presented as transformation.

But change and transformation are not the same. Change alters something an organization does. Transformation alters what the organization is capable of doing, and, more fundamentally, what it is capable of becoming.

That distinction matters especially in the age of artificial intelligence. AI does not merely offer a new set of tools. It enters the arrangements through which organizations know, decide, coordinate and act. It changes which activities require human effort, whose expertise counts, how performance becomes visible, where authority sits and how quickly assumptions expire.

Transformation is therefore not change at scale. It is the reconstitution of an organizational system: its capabilities, relationships, practices, authority, identity and capacity for judgment.

That reconstitution is ultimately a collective human endeavour. Its constraints are both motivational and practical: the organization must form collective judgment and credible commitment, and possess the skill, rigor, cadence, authority and resources required to turn them into coherent action.

© MANREAU 2026

The capacity to do so resides within the organization. External judgment, specialist expertise and intelligence can strengthen it, but cannot substitute for the people who must see together, judge together, commit and act coherently in their own operating reality.

In this essay, AI refers to a family of technologies, including predictive machine learning, generative AI and large language models, decision-support systems, task automation and algorithmic management. Their effects differ by task, institution and design. Treating them as one uniform force would reproduce precisely the simplification this essay argues against.

Transformation used to have an ending

The conventional transformation program rests on a familiar temporal assumption. An organization is normally stable. A disruption creates the need for change. A temporary program moves the organization from a current state to a defined future state. Once implementation is complete, the program closes and the organization returns to normal operations.

That logic remains useful for bounded changes. It becomes inadequate when the conditions shaping the organization continue to move while the program is being delivered.

Digital-transformation research already described transformation as a process through which digital technologies trigger significant changes in how organizations create value. AI deepens that challenge because it reaches into knowledge work, judgment and action themselves. At the same time, competition shifts value pools, weakens industry boundaries and allows new entrants to reshape business models faster than conventional planning cycles can absorb.

There is no stable future state waiting at the end. Organizations must repeatedly judge what business they need to become and reconfigure themselves while continuing to perform. AI and competition make transformation more radical, more systemic and permanently ongoing.

Permanently ongoing transformation cannot mean permanently intensified effort. When initiatives accumulate, priorities compete and value remains difficult to see, fatigue becomes a constraint on organizational capacity. People may still accept the direction while no longer being able to sustain the attention, learning and discretionary effort another transformation asks of them.

© MANREAU 2026

An organization is not an object

Many transformation methods treat the organization as an object that can be redesigned from above: change the structure, install the technology, redefine the process and communicate the new model. Sociology offers a more demanding view. Organizations are continuously reproduced through the interaction of formal structures and situated human action.

Stephen Barley's study of CT scanners showed that the same technology produced different organizational consequences in different settings because it entered different patterns of roles and interaction. Technology did not determine the structure by itself. It became an occasion through which existing relationships were challenged and reorganized.

AI likewise enters arrangements of expertise, status, trust, accountability and power. Its effects emerge from how people interpret it, how tasks are redesigned, which outputs are accepted, who can contest them and who remains accountable. AI transformation is therefore sociotechnical before it is technical.

AI changes the distribution of agency

Earlier automation often replaced or standardized specified activities. Contemporary AI can generate options, make predictions, recommend decisions, produce language and mediate interaction. It participates in activities previously treated as signs of professional judgment.

This does not mean that machines simply replace human agency. Research describes an automation-augmentation paradox: the same technology may substitute for human work in one configuration and expand human capability in another. Acemoglu and Restrepo similarly distinguish the displacement of existing tasks from the creation of new tasks and forms of work.

Which outcome occurs is not inherent in the model. It is shaped by design choices: which decisions are delegated, where human review remains meaningful, how errors are detected, who owns consequences and whether productivity gains are reinvested in greater capability or extracted as reduced labor.

AI transformation is therefore a redesign of the relationship between human and machine agency, not merely the deployment of a tool.

© MANREAU 2026

AI changes knowledge and expertise

Generative AI can make expert-like performance available to people with less prior experience. In a study of 5,172 customer-support agents, Brynjolfsson, Li and Raymond found an average productivity improvement of about 15 percent, with the strongest benefits among less experienced and lower-skilled workers in that setting. The finding is significant, but its boundary is equally important: one field study does not establish a universal productivity law.

The deeper implication is organizational. When systems can retrieve, synthesize and generate plausible answers, expertise may be redistributed. Novices may perform more capably; experts may shift from producing answers to framing problems, evaluating outputs and handling exceptions. At the same time, plausible error can travel faster and become harder to detect.

Research on the jagged technological frontier shows why simple claims about human replacement or universal augmentation fail. AI performs unevenly across tasks, sometimes excelling at apparently difficult work while failing at adjacent tasks that seem simple. Human judgment becomes more consequential precisely because machine capability becomes more impressive.

AI transformation is political

AI systems do not only perform tasks. They classify, rank, recommend, monitor and allocate attention. They influence what becomes visible, whose knowledge is recognized and which actions appear legitimate. This creates what scholars describe as computational authority: the growing capacity of algorithmic systems to shape beliefs and conduct.

Algorithmic management makes these dynamics concrete. Systems can schedule work, evaluate performance, distribute opportunities and enforce behavioral norms. They may improve consistency or coordination, but they can also reduce autonomy, intensify surveillance and conceal contestable judgments inside apparently neutral procedures.

Workers and managers closest to the work hold knowledge that system designers and executives often lack. Excluding that knowledge is not merely an engagement mistake; it weakens the design. Transformation must therefore be negotiated, not because every interest can be reconciled, but because consequences, dependencies and disagreements must become visible before credible commitment is possible.

© MANREAU 2026

AI makes transformation continuous

AI capabilities evolve, regulations change, use cases migrate and competitors learn. Systems interact with new data and generate effects that cannot be fully specified at the moment of implementation. The organization cannot design once, deploy once and hand the result back as finished.

This does not justify permanent mobilization or endless programs. Research on algorithmic work describes a temporal paradox: technologies introduced to save time can intensify work and create new forms of time pressure. Continuous transformation must not become continuous disruption.

The alternative is to build a recurring organizational capacity: to observe what is changing, interpret consequences, revise decisions, reconfigure work and validate whether value is actually being realized. The object of management shifts from the individual transformation program to the organization's capacity to transform.

Transformation as collective judgment

The central capacity in continuous transformation is collective judgment: the organization's ability to perceive material reality across different positions, interpret incomplete and contested evidence, form credible commitments and translate those commitments into coherent action while remaining able to revise them.

AI makes this capacity more important, not less. It changes knowledge and expertise, redistributes human activity, introduces new forms of authority, accelerates competitive response and makes the consequences of design choices harder to contain within a single function or program.

The purpose of AI transformation is therefore not adoption, use-case volume or productivity alone. It is to reconstitute the organization so that people and intelligent systems can create observable, defensible value, and so that the organization becomes more capable of questioning, learning and transforming after each change rather than starting over when the next one arrives.

Transformation is not the moment the fragments disappear.

It is the capacity to form a more capable whole without denying that the fragments, and the tensions between them, remain.

Sources

1. Acemoglu, D. & Restrepo, P. (2019). Artificial Intelligence, Automation, and Work.

https://academic.oup.com/chicago-scholarship-online/book/34158/chapter-abstract/289500256

2. Airoldi, M. (2023). Computational Authority and the Performative Power of Algorithms.

https://academic.oup.com/edited-volume/55209/chapter-abstract/426919636

© MANREAU 2026

3. Barley, S. R. (1986). Technology as an Occasion for Structuring. Administrative Science Quarterly, 31(1), 78-108.

https://www.jstor.org/stable/2392767

4. Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D. & Raymond, L. R. (2025). Generative AI at Work. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 140(2), 889-942.

https://academic.oup.com/qje/article/140/2/889/7990658

5. Dell'Acqua, F. et al. (2025). Navigating the Jagged Technological Frontier. Organization Science.

https://pubsonline.informs.org/doi/10.1287/orsc.2023.18441

6. Dewey, J. (1934). Art as Experience. See Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy: Dewey's Aesthetics.

https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/dewey-aesthetics/

7. Heidegger, M. (1977; original German 1954). The Question Concerning Technology.

https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2022/entries/heidegger/

8. Nedzhvetskaya, N. & Tan, J. S. (2022). The Role of Workers in AI Ethics and Governance.

https://academic.oup.com/edited-volume/41989/chapter-abstract/371702524

9. Parent-Rocheleau, X. (2025). The Perils of Algorithmic Management for Employee Well-being.

https://academic.oup.com/book/60029/chapter-abstract/513543267

10. Piasna, A. (2024). Algorithms of Time: How Algorithmic Management Changes the Temporalities of Work. Cambridge Journal of Economics, 48(1), 115-132.

https://academic.oup.com/cje/article-abstract/48/1/115/7153064

11. Raisch, S. & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation-Augmentation Paradox. Academy of Management Review, 46(1), 192-210.

https://journals.aom.org/doi/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

12. Vial, G. (2019). Understanding Digital Transformation. Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 28(2), 118-144.

https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0963868717302196

© MANREAU 2026

About MANREAU

A transformation program is not yet a transformation.

Your strategy can be sound, delivery disciplined and change carefully planned. Yet your transformation can still fail.

Managing the initiatives is one job. Managing the system that must transform the business is another. Most organizations manage the first explicitly. The second goes unmanaged. That system is the Transformation Operating System.

MANREAU works with leaders on their Strategic Mobilization to improve the conditions for successful transformation by making the Transformation Operating System visible and manageable. Strategic intent turns into coherent action, booked and sustained value, and the capacity to transform again.

About the author

Waheeda Görlitz is the founder of MANREAU. She works with leadership teams on the organizational, political and human system through which transformation becomes executable and enduring.

Read the founder conversation

Bring Us the Situation.

Discuss what your organization is facing and where transformation is losing momentum.

Start a Conversation

© MANREAU 2026