Call for Abstracts

Generative AI at the workplace: Challenges and implications for knowledge-intensive work

TATuP Special topic 36/1 (2027)

Submit your abstract by 19 March 2026

Background: Artificial intelligence-based technologies develop rapidly. AI is not only increasingly being used in various areas of life, it is also changing the world of work on several levels (Adolph, 2025; Grunwald 2025, Hähnel et al. 2025; Pfeiffer et al. 2024; OECD 2024). Much of the recent AI progress is owing to the development of Large Language Models (LLMS) which exhibit abilities to generate text, pictures or videos by responding to human prompts. This release of generative AI systems provides new AI capabilities, e.g., the ability for conversations in many languages, the summary of large texts, writing computer codes or generating images based on text specifications (Butollo et al. 2024).

While important imperfections of generative AI models remain, e.g., hallucinations, bias and incorrect reasoning (Peykani 2025), the functionalities have a broad applicability to a large fraction of knowledge work potentially changing *job profiles, qualifications and professional identities*. On the one hand, there is the potential to automate certain knowledge-intensive tasks (Butollo et al. 2025; Tegtmeier 2022). On the other hand, demands for new tasks develop, since professionals must combine domain-specific knowledge with judgment of the AI system to devise appropriate responses. This is discussed in the literature under the term 'translational expertise', i.e., a combination of domain-specific knowledge and expertise in assessing the content that is produced through generative AI (GenAI; National Academies 2024). This raises questions about a new, adequate division of labor between knowledge workers and machines.

When not introduced properly, GenAI and its effects on tasks and qualification can lead to job fears for knowledge workers regarding replacement and loss of professional autonomy fostering transgressional behavior, which threatens the quality of professional work (Zhao et al. 2024). Beyond this, new *challenges for human-machine-interaction* come up, since human-machine-interfaces might increase and modify through the dialogic ability of GenAI. As a consequence, on the one hand, dependency on and control by GenAI systems might rise while 'human-human dialogue' at the workplace might be reduced. On the other hand, new forms of 'human-machine dialogue' arise when GenAI is used as a brainstorming tool to develop new ideas or tasks are 'delegated' to generative AI as it is assigned to roles. This requires reflection under the perspective of an anthropomorphisation of AI (Placani 2024).

Further, issues of *organizational alignment arise*. For example, human planning and intervention is needed in the adaptation to context-specific requirements of the models as well as in the final assessment and processing of the results. Also, established workplace design principles are challenged by generative AI: While established design approaches emphasize a hierarchy of measures — from technical and organizational frameworks to individual behavior — this hierarchy becomes challenged with GenAI. Employees can independently access and use such tools, bypassing organizational introduction processes and by that threatening the quality of work outcomes (Hai et al. 2025; Huang & Gursoy 2024). The organizational challenges are further complicated, since corporations or authorities applying GenAI might be dependent on providers of AI models with big market power

potentially reducing an adequate alignment to organizational needs and value-sensitive design approaches (Butollo & Görnemann 2025; Kenney & Lincoln 2025).

Research interest: This call explicitly invites research-based contributions to the TATuP Special topic that analyze, compare, or critically assess existing use cases and effects of generative AI in work environments. The overarching goal is bringing together current research on the challenges and implications of GenAI systems in knowledge-intensive work contexts. These comprise:

- changes in skill sets and competencies needed by employees when using generative AI, e.g. 'translational expertise', selection of adequate use context, creation of adequate prompts, expertise on effective forms of cooperation, the evaluation of results and for a responsible use of generative AI
- understanding generative AI in organizational contexts, e.g., with regard to the agency of AI adoption by employees vs. systematic adoption by organizations, requirements for the models to be technically sound and to apply to quality standards, necessary frameworks to facilitate the responsible and effective use of GenAI by recommending best practices and models
- new forms of human-machine dialogue at the workplace, e.g., potentials in work performance or training while reflecting risks like surveillance, control, dehumanization; different modes of a human-machine division of labor between automating tasks such or transferring more responsibility to employees.

As GenAI continues to evolve, it is crucial to understand how its benefits and risks are framed, distributed, and governed across different workplace contexts, and how these processes shape the future of work. Thereby this special topic aims for an advanced understanding of the multifaceted impact of generative AI in knowledge-intensive tasks.

Themes to be explored: We encourage submissions that build on completed or ongoing research projects, including empirical case studies, comparative analyses as well as theoretical frameworks and debates, to ensure an evidence-based discussion of generative AI in the workplace. The following list is an overview of possible topics; further contributions are welcome.

Exploring current use cases of generative AI in knowledge work

- In which fields of knowledge work is GenAI applied, e.g., medicine, science, programming, journalism, public administration? Which applications prevail? How are job profiles and work organization affected in these different fields? Which requirements for accuracy, trustworthiness, transparency and robustness come up?
- How does the automation of knowledge work by generative AI differ from previous waves of automation of knowledge work (e.g., typewriters, calculators, personal computers, …)?

Socio-technical conditions and consequences of generative AI

- How does GenAI change the exertion and organization of knowledge work? Which tasks are substituted? Which forms of assistance are developed? Which new job profiles and tasks ('prompt engineering') come up? How does the corporate division of labor changes? Which new spaces for professional autonomy or organizational hierarchy are established?
- How does the use of GenAI in knowledge-intensive work affect processes of knowledge production, validation, and expertise?
- In which ways can GenAI become an instrument of social or informational control in the workplace, for example through surveillance infrastructures, algorithmic bias, or the manipulation of information flows? How should such risks be addressed to ensure transparency, autonomy, and democratic accountability in future work environments?

- How does the fact that AI is increasingly taking on the role of a dialogue partner affect interaction work, e.g. in the area of human resource management and interpersonal exchange as a base for professional knowledge work? What are the potential consequences of premature human substitution?
- Which consequences result from GenAI implementation and use with regard to machine and operational safety as well as to occupational health?
  How is GenAI in the workplace shaped by overall economic conditions like market structures, market powers and dependencies of organizations applying GenAI from market dominating AI providers?

Towards responsible governance of generative AI

- Which regulatory and organizational frameworks, context-specific standards or shared guidelines are developed and introduced to adopt generative AI by ensuring its trustworthiness while mitigating risks?
- How can generative AI be safely and transparently designed for knowledge-intensive tasks? How to deal with conflicting goals in this context? How to deal with the imperfections of AI models and connected risks, e.g., 'hallucinations', bias, or incorrect reasoning?
- How can generative AI be implemented in accordance with human-centered work design at the organizational level?
- Which potentials and problems regarding the development and implementation of generative AI for the workplace result from regulatory requirements, also from an international perspective? How should they be dealt with in the sense of decent work in the future?
- Which areas of AI at the workplace should be considered off-limits for ethical or safety reasons, and who defines these boundaries?

Relevant disciplines

Computer science, Human-computer interaction / Ethics and philosophy / Law and economy / Science and technology studies / Science and engineering studies / Social sciences / Technology assessment / Sociology of work / Work and organizational psychology

How to submit

- Please make yourself familiar with TATuP's requirements for research articles in journal section 'Special topic'. These requirements will only become relevant if you are invited to submit a full article on the basis of your abstract submission in response to this call: https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/JournalSections
- TATuP recommends the submission of manuscripts in English (US), but German versions are also welcome.
- Please submit your abstract by **19 March 2026** at the latest via our homepage: https://www.tatup.de/index.php/tatup/user/register.
- Length of the abstract: max. 1.5 pages.
- The editorial office will contact the author submitting the abstract.
- Please state full names, e-mail addresses, and institutional affiliations of all co-authors.

Editorial process outline

19 March 2026	Submit your abstract
March 2026	Notification of invitation or rejection to submit research articles
June 2026	Submit your research articles, followed by peer review
September 2026	Feedback from the reviewers, followed by revision by the authors
October 2026	Submission of the revised research articles
December 2026	Further revisions, if necessary
February 2027	Editorial deadline
March 2027	Publication (print and online)

Special topic guest editors

Linda Nierling[1], Reinhard Heil[1], Felix Gnisa[1], Britta Kirchhoff[2], Ulrike Rösler[2]

[1]Institut für Technikfolgenabschätzung und Systemanalyse (ITAS)
[2]Bundesanstalt für Arbeitsschutz und Arbeitsmedizin (BAuA)

Corresponding Special topic guest editor: kirchhoff.britta@baua.bund.de

References

Adolph, L. (2025): Arbeitssysteme mit KI-Technologien und ihre gesundheitlichen Implikationen. In: Schröder, H.; Ducki, A.; Meyer, M. (Hrsg.): Fehlzeiten-Report 2025: Künstliche Intelligenz und Gesundheit. Berlin: Springer, pp. 107-123.

Butollo, F.; Gerber, C.; Görnemann, E.; Greminger, L.; Katzinski, A.; Kulla, M.; Sirman-Winkler, M.; Spott, J. (2024): The Symbiosis of Generative AI and Work: Expanding Horizons or Eroding Human Competence. In: Weizenbaum Discussion Paper 41.

Butollo, F.; Görnemann, E. (2025): Big Tech kontra Gemeinwohl. In: Weizenbaum Discussion Papers 46. Weizenbaum-Institut.

Butollo, F.; Haase, J.; Katzinski, A.-K.; Krüger, A. K. (2025): Uncertain futures of work: The perception of generative AI in knowledge professions. In: Kox, T.; Ullrich, A.; Zech, H. (Eds): Uncertain Journeys into Digital Futures, pp. 129-150. Baden-Baden: Nomos Verlagsgesellschaft mbH & Co. KG. https://doi.org/10.5771/9783748947585-129

Grunwald, A. (2025): Technology Assessment Contributing to AI Management in Society. In: Hoffmann, C. H. (Ed.): Artificial Intelligence, Entrepreneurship and Risk. Technikzukünfte, Wissenschaft und Gesellschaft / Futures of Technology, Science and Society. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Hähnel, M.; Pfeiffer, S.; Graßmann, S. (2025): Striking the balance: Ethical challenges and social implications of AI-induced power shifts in healthcare organizations. In: AI & SOCIETY 40 (4), pp. 2789-2806.

Hai, S.; Long, T.; Honora, A.; Japutra, A.; Guo, T. (2025): The dark side of employee–generative AI collaboration in the workplace: An investigation on work alienation and employee expediency. In: International Journal of Information Management 83, p. 102905. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijin-fomgt.2025.102905

Huang, Y.; Gursoy, D. (2024): How does AI technology integration affect employees' proactive service behaviors? A transactional theory of stress perspective. In: Journal of Retailing and Consumer Services 77, p. 103700. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jretconser.2023.103700

Kenney, M.; Lincoln, M. (2025): Let Them Eat Large Language Models: Artificial Intelligence and Austerity in the Neoliberal University. In: SocArXiv. https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/6z5pa_v1

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine (2024): Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Work. Washington, DC: The National Academies Press. https://doi.org/10.17226/27644

OECD (2024): Using AI in the Workplace: Opportunities, Risks and Policy Responses. OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers 11. Paris: OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/ea0a0fe1-en Seite 5 von 5

Peykani, P.; Ramezanlou, F.; Tanasescu, C.; Ghanidel, S. (2025): Large language models: A structured taxonomy and review of challenges, limitations, solutions, and future directions. In: Applied Sciences 15 (14), p. 8103. https://doi.org/10.3390/app15148103

Pfeiffer et al. (2024): Digitalisierung der Arbeitswelten: Zur Erfassbarkeit einer systematischen Transformation. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Placani, A. (2024): Anthropomorphism in AI: hype and fallacy. In: AI and Ethics. https://doi.org/10.1007/s43681-024-00419-4

Tegtmeier, P.; Certa, M.; Wischniewski, S. (2022): Informationsbezogene Tätigkeiten. In: Tisch, A.; Wischniewski, S. (Hrsg.): Sicherheit und Gesundheit in der digitalisierten Arbeitswelt. Kriterien für eine menschengerechte Gestaltung. Baden-Baden: Nomos, pp. 133-184.

Zhao, H.; Yuan, B.; Song, Y. (2024): Employees' perception of generative artificial intelligence and the dark side of work outcomes. In: Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Management 61, pp. 191–199. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jhtm.2024.10.007