# Leadership in the Age of AI: Introducing FILE — The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution

**Author:** Guillaume Mariani
**ORCID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0003-1130-5061
**Affiliation:** Independent management scholar, Paris, France
**Date:** June 2026 (first version); August 2026 (revised version)
**Document Type:** Working Paper
**Subject Areas:** Leadership; Leadership Studies; Leadership Theory; Management; Management Theory; Organization Theory; Management Education; Artificial Intelligence

---

## Abstract

As artificial intelligence becomes a structural feature of organizational life, leadership studies faces a foundational challenge: what forms of human intelligence become more necessary when machine intelligence becomes more powerful? This working paper introduces **FILE: The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution** as a management theory and diagnostic framework proposing that responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics require the integrated development of five human intelligences: Augmented Intelligence (AI, "Mind"), Emotional Intelligence (EQ, "Heart"), Cultural Intelligence (CQ, "World"), Political Intelligence (PQ, "Society"), and Adaptive Intelligence (AQ, "Evolution"), expressed in the FILE Formula: FILE = AI + EQ + CQ + PQ + AQ. The FILE Odyssey introduces a new human-centered definition of leadership: **Leadership = Intelligence + Character + Judgment**, with Intelligence conceptualized through FILE, Character through SQL, and Judgment through LENS within the FILE Architecture. The paper maps the twelve original contributions of the FILE Odyssey: a human-centered definition of leadership (Leadership = Intelligence + Character + Judgment); a human-centered framework (FILE: The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution); a human-centered theory (FILE, FILE$^3$, FILE$^5$, FILE$^7$, and the 7E Cascade); a human-centered ethos (SQL: The Six Qualities of Leadership); a human-centered judgment model (LENS: Leadership, Ethics, Nondelegation, and Sensemaking); a human-centered vision (RC: The Relational Commons); a human-centered education (MAIL: Management, AI, and Leadership, supporting proposed MLT: Management, Leadership, and Technology degrees); a human-centered methodology (HACK: Human-AI Co-created Knowledge); a human-centered philosophy (Human Irreducibility); a human-centered AI governance codex (The Five Immutable Laws of AI and Robotics: HTTPS: Humanity, Truth, Transparency, Protection, and Security); a human-centered public policy (BASIC and RULES); and a human-centered civilization (Inalienable Leadership: the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics). This paper situates FILE in relation to existing scholarship on leadership theory, management frameworks, AI and management, algorithmic control, socio-technical systems, collective intelligence, human-centered AI, and management education, and identifies a gap concerning

the **second-order governance of human judgment** in AI-mediated organizations. The paper traces an intellectual progression across five equally weighted arcs: foundational framework, theory, ecosystemic philosophy, praxis, and the FILE School of Thought: **Humans + Machines, under human leadership**.

**Keywords:** leadership; leadership studies; leadership theory; leadership development; leadership in the age of AI; leadership after AI; AI leadership; augmented leadership; human leadership; future leadership; management; management theory; organization theory; decision-making; technology; artificial intelligence; augmented intelligence; AI governance; education; higher education; business education; management education; executive education; leadership education; FILE; FILE Corpus; FILE Formula; FILE Odyssey; FILE School of Thought; five intelligences of leadership evolution; SQL; The Six Qualities of Leadership; LENS; Sensemaking; 7E Cascade; RC; The Relational Commons; MAIL; MLT; HACK; HTTPS; Inalienable Leadership; Humans + Machines; human judgment; Human Irreducibility.

---

## 1. The Central Question: Leadership in the Age of AI

FILE is a transdisciplinary management theory and diagnostic framework for responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics, at the intersection of management, leadership studies, organization theory, the social sciences, the humanities, and technology.

FILE rests on a foundational belief about the future of work and management education. As artificial intelligence progressively automates the core analytical and administrative functions currently taught in BBA and MBA programs (accounting, finance, data analytics, marketing, human resource management, logistics, supply chain management, operations, and strategy), one of the central irreducibly human responsibilities will be leadership: the capacity to lead people and govern AI systems under conditions of uncertainty, responsibility, and moral accountability. The MBA educated generations of managers to administer these functions. **What the AI era demands is not better administration. It demands better human leadership:** the capacity to lead, to decide, to protect dignity, and to take responsibility for outcomes that machines can optimize but cannot own. This is what Henry Mintzberg called for when he argued, in *Managers Not MBAs* (2004), that business schools were confusing business education with management education. FILE goes further: **in the age of AI, the distinction is not between business and management. It is between administration and leadership.** As AI systems increasingly automate these functions, the most important remaining human responsibility will be to lead: to lead other humans with empathy, judgment, and purpose, and to govern AI systems and robots with oversight, accountability, and wisdom. That integrated capacity to lead people and to govern AI systems and robots is precisely what the five intelligences of FILE propose to develop.

The central question of the FILE Odyssey is: **What must human leadership become in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics?**

A human-centered definition follows from that question: Leadership = Intelligence + Character + Judgment. Within the FILE Architecture, Intelligence is conceptualized through FILE, Character through SQL, and Judgment through LENS.

This research program was built around one foundational question: **what forms of human intelligence become more necessary when artificial intelligence becomes more powerful?**

This question is not primarily a question about technology. It is a question about leadership, responsibility, and judgment. As AI systems take on growing portions of the cognitive, analytical, and communicative work once reserved for human beings, **the critical challenge for organizations is not technological adoption. It is human governance**: how do leaders and institutions direct, interpret, check, and take responsibility for what AI-mediated systems produce?

AI does not merely automate tasks. It transforms managerial work, expertise, decision-making, organizational authority, and accountability. Raisch and Krakowski's automation-augmentation paradox, Faraj, Pachidi, and Sayegh's work on learning algorithms, Dejoux's analysis of how AI reconfigures the manager, Jarrahi's account of human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision-making, and Shrestha, Ben-Menahem, and von Krogh's analysis of organizational decision-making structures in the age of AI all show that AI changes the conditions under which leaders perceive, decide, delegate, justify, and take responsibility.

This is the **Human Irreducibility** thesis at the heart of FILE. FILE proposes that certain human capacities (judgment, discernment, conscience, moral agency, dignity, meaning, responsibility, care, trust, and love) cannot be replaced by a machine, no matter how powerful it becomes.

The framework proposes that responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of AI and robots require five integrated intelligences and that the development, integration, and ethical application of these intelligences is the defining leadership challenge of the coming decades.

---

## 2. Literature Review and Comparative Positioning

This paper introduces FILE as a management theory and diagnostic framework for responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics. Before presenting the theory and framework themselves, it is necessary to situate FILE in relation to existing leadership theories, management frameworks, collective intelligence research, and human-centered AI scholarship. This section does not claim to offer a systematic literature review. Its purpose is more limited: to clarify the bodies of scholarship FILE enters, the contributions those traditions already make, the research gap this paper addresses, and the way FILE positions itself without claiming to replace established theories.

### 2.1 Major Leadership Theories: What the Canon Already Explains

Leadership studies already contains major theoretical traditions that have shaped research, teaching, executive education, and organizational practice for decades. Transformational leadership argues that leaders can inspire followers to transcend narrow self-interest through vision, intellectual stimulation, and collective purpose (Burns, 1978; Bass, 1985). Servant

leadership places follower development, care, humility, and stewardship at the center of leadership responsibility (Greenleaf, 1977). Authentic leadership emphasizes self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and values-based action (Avolio and Gardner, 2005). Ethical leadership focuses on normatively appropriate conduct, fairness, communication, and accountability (Brown, Treviño, and Harrison, 2005).

Adaptive leadership distinguishes technical problems from adaptive challenges and argues that leadership consists not simply in providing solutions, but in mobilizing people to confront difficult problems, losses, conflicts, and learning demands (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky, 2009). Distributed and complexity leadership approaches move beyond the individual leader to examine emergent, collective, and systemic leadership processes (Gronn, 2002; Uhl-Bien, Marion, and McKelvey, 2007). Leader-member exchange theory focuses on the quality of dyadic relationships between leaders and followers as a driver of leadership outcomes (Graen and Uhl-Bien, 1995). Situational and contingency approaches examine the fit between leadership behavior and context. Competency-based models identify the skills, traits, and capabilities associated with leadership effectiveness. More recent work on digital leadership, leader identity, AI literacy, and human-AI teaming examines what leadership requires under conditions of technological change.

These theories are not superficial precursors. They are serious intellectual achievements. Each illuminates something real. Each has generated concepts, debates, instruments, evidence, educational practices, and institutional influence. FILE does not replace any of them.

Transformational leadership is especially important for this positioning. Burns and Bass explain how leaders mobilize followers through vision, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and collective purpose. Yet transformational leadership was not designed for a condition in which AI systems generate classifications, predictions, recommendations, and decision-support outputs that leaders must govern. A leader may be inspiring, visionary, and charismatic in relation to human followers while remaining unprepared to govern the AI-mediated systems that shape what the organization sees, measures, and decides.

Digital and e-leadership scholarship begins to address this technological shift. Avolio, Kahai, and Dodge (2000) framed e-leadership as leadership mediated by advanced information technology; Cortellazzo, Bruni, and Zampieri (2019) review leadership in a digitalized world; Kane et al. (2019) emphasize that people, not technology alone, are the key to digital transformation; Long and Magerko (2020) clarify AI literacy as an emerging competence; and Seeber et al. (2020) examine machines as teammates in collaboration. FILE enters this conversation by arguing that AI is not only a competence to acquire, but a system of distributed cognition to govern through integrated human intelligence.

Research on the automation of leadership functions makes the technological challenge more direct. Wesche and Sonderegger (2019) examine the automation of leadership functions, while Höddinghaus, Sondern, and Hertel (2021) examine trust in decision algorithms performing leadership functions. Computational and algorithmic systems can take over functions historically performed by managers and leaders; human leadership remains the locus of judgment, responsibility, purpose, and moral accountability. This development sharpens

FILE's foundational question: what forms of human intelligence become more necessary when artificial intelligence becomes more powerful?

What has changed is not the relevance of leadership science, but the context in which leadership theories must now be interpreted. AI-mediated work raises questions about judgment, accountability, oversight, responsibility, transparency, legitimacy, and human agency that many established leadership theories were not originally designed to address. Cultural complexity raises questions about translation, inclusion, and legitimacy across difference. Political fragmentation raises questions about power, stakeholder trust, and institutional credibility. Adaptive turbulence raises questions about resilience, learning, and transformation under uncertainty. The argument of this paper is therefore not that existing theories are obsolete, but that leadership in the age of AI and robotics requires an additional integrative architecture connecting technological augmentation, emotional responsibility, cultural interpretation, political legitimacy, and adaptive judgment.

### 2.2 Major Management Frameworks: What Coordination Cannot Replace

Management frameworks provide organizations with tools for coordinating action, aligning strategy, and measuring performance. Strategy teams use frameworks such as Porter's Five Forces, SWOT, the resource-based view, dynamic capabilities (Teece, 2007), Blue Ocean Strategy, and the Business Model Canvas. Performance systems use Management by Objectives, OKRs, KPIs, and the Balanced Scorecard (Kaplan and Norton, 1992). Operations and quality traditions include Lean, Six Sigma, Total Quality Management, and Business Process Reengineering. Transformation and change management draw on models such as Kotter's (1996) change framework, ADKAR, McKinsey 7-S, and Theory U (Scharmer, 2007). Innovation work often uses Agile, Scrum, Design Thinking, and Lean Startup methods. Governance and responsibility frameworks include stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984), corporate social responsibility, ESG frameworks, and corporate governance codes. Mintzberg's critique of MBA education becomes more urgent in the age of AI because the analytical and administrative functions historically emphasized by business schools are increasingly subject to automation or augmentation, while the irreducible human task becomes judgment, responsibility, leadership, and governance.

These frameworks are not trivial. They are among the practical languages through which organizations make themselves manageable. They simplify reality, focus attention, make problems legible, and allow large groups of people to coordinate around a shared vocabulary. Management has helped organizations coordinate action for more than a century.

However, management frameworks do not govern themselves. They require human judgment, cultural translation, emotional responsibility, political legitimacy, and adaptive revision, especially when they become embedded in software, dashboards, HR analytics systems, AI-assisted strategy tools, algorithmic triage systems, and automated performance monitoring. A framework that once guided human interpretation can become a coded routine. A metric that once supported judgment can become a target. A dashboard that once increased visibility can narrow attention. A process system that once improved efficiency can intensify surveillance, emotional fatigue, cultural misfit, or political marginalization.

This is where FILE becomes relevant to management frameworks. FILE does not name another managerial toolkit. It names a way of governing management frameworks through integrated human intelligence. It asks what forms of human judgment must remain active when organizational tools increasingly become computational, automated, predictive, and AI-mediated.

AI and algorithmic management scholarship strengthens this point. Dejoux (2020) shows that AI modifies the role of the manager rather than merely adding a new technical tool. Raisch and Krakowski (2021) argue that automation and augmentation cannot be neatly separated in management. Kellogg, Valentine, and Christin (2020) show how algorithms reshape organizational control as a contested terrain, while Tambe, Cappelli, and Yakubovich (2019) examine the challenges of artificial intelligence in human resources management. These literatures confirm that AI-mediated management is not only a question of efficiency. It is a question of authority, legitimacy, responsibility, and human judgment.

### 2.3 Collective Intelligence and Human-Centered AI

FILE also enters into dialogue with collective intelligence and human-centered AI research. Thomas Malone's work on superminds examines how groups of humans and computers can think and act together more effectively than either humans or machines alone (Malone, 2018). Pierre Lévy's work on collective intelligence argues that knowledge is distributed across human communities rather than possessed by any single mind (Lévy, 1997). Edwin Hutchins's account of distributed cognition shows how cognition can be spread across people, artifacts, tools, routines, and environments (Hutchins, 1995). These traditions help explain why Augmented Intelligence in FILE is not reducible to the use of AI tools. It is a socio-technical capacity: the ability to govern distributed cognition across humans, machines, institutions, cultures, and artifacts.

The same issue appears in recent AI and organization research. Faraj, Pachidi, and Sayegh (2018) show how learning algorithms reshape work and organizing; Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2014) describe the structural automation of cognitive work; Daugherty and Wilson (2018) emphasize human-machine collaboration; Benbya, Pachidi, and Jarvenpaa (2021) identify AI's implications for automation, engagement, insight, decision-making, and innovation; and Berente, Gu, Recker, and Santhanam (2021) frame managing artificial intelligence as a distinctive organizational challenge. FILE interprets these developments through the lens of leadership: if cognition becomes distributed across humans, artifacts, algorithms, and institutions, leadership must govern that distribution rather than merely participate in it.

Decision theory and sensemaking deepen the problem of human judgment under uncertainty. Simon (1947) and March and Simon (1958) establish that organizational decision-making is bounded by limits of information, attention, cognitive capacity, and organizational routines; Weick (1995) establishes that organizations do not merely process information but construct meaning in ambiguous environments. AI transforms the informational and cognitive environment in which these processes occur, but it does not remove the human responsibility to interpret, decide, and answer for consequences.

Human-centered AI scholarship reinforces this position by insisting that AI systems should augment rather than replace human judgment, and that human dignity, agency, accountability, and responsibility must remain central to technological development and deployment. FILE shares this orientation. The FILE School of Thought is not based on Humans vs. Machines. It is based on **Humans + Machines, under human leadership**.

This matters because the use of AI systems in research and management is often interpreted in two reductive ways. One view treats AI as a shortcut that weakens intellectual responsibility. Another treats AI as a replacement for human expertise. FILE rejects both views. It treats the use of AI systems in research not as a shortcut, but as a central methodological and ethical question for management and social science research. This position becomes explicit in HACK, Human-AI Co-created Knowledge, which examines how human judgment governs, curates, challenges, and gives meaning to the contributions of AI systems in knowledge production.

### 2.4 The Gap FILE Addresses

The gap addressed by FILE is not the absence of leadership theory, management frameworks, collective intelligence research, AI-management scholarship, or human-centered AI scholarship. These fields are already rich. The gap is the absence of a compact, integrative, and diagnostically operable theory connecting AI-mediated cognition, emotional intelligence, cultural intelligence, political intelligence, adaptive intelligence, human irreducibility, management education, and AI-assisted knowledge production under one architecture organized around a single governing question: what integrated human intelligences must govern leadership judgment when AI systems increasingly shape what leaders see, what frameworks recommend, and what organizations decide?

Existing leadership theories explain important dimensions of leadership: inspiration, service, authenticity, ethics, adaptation, distributed agency, relational quality, contextual fit, and digital transformation. Existing management frameworks explain important dimensions of organizational coordination: strategy, execution, measurement, innovation, governance, change, and performance. Collective intelligence and human-centered AI research explain important dimensions of distributed cognition and responsible AI design.

Major leadership theories ask how leaders inspire, serve, adapt, distribute, relate, influence, and act ethically. Major management frameworks ask how organizations coordinate, align, measure, optimize, innovate, and execute. FILE asks: what integrated human intelligences must govern leadership judgment and management action when AI systems increasingly shape what leaders see, what frameworks recommend, and what organizations decide?

This is the distinction between first-order leadership and management tools and the **second-order governance of judgment**. FILE is not merely interested in whether a leader uses a tool, framework, model, dashboard, or AI system. It asks what human intelligences must govern the use of those systems so that leadership remains accountable, contextual, relational, legitimate, adaptive, and human-centered. Within the FILE Architecture, FILE contains the human capacities required for judgment, including Judgment Intelligence and Decision Intelligence, while LENS: Leadership, Ethics, Nondelegation, and Sensemaking names and

formalizes the second-order governance of how judgment is exercised, bounded, nondelegated, and kept under final human responsibility.

### 2.4bis The Management Education Gap

The gap is not only theoretical and organizational. It is also educational. Business and management education have long been criticized for excessive abstraction, overreliance on analytic models, weak attention to managerial judgment, and insufficient connection to lived managerial practice. Mintzberg (2004) argued that MBA programs confuse business education with management education; Bennis and O'Toole (2005) argued that business schools lost their way by privileging academic abstraction over practical relevance; Ghoshal (2005) warned that bad management theories can damage good management practice; Khurana (2007) traced the unfulfilled promise of management as a profession; and Pfeffer and Fong (2002) questioned the actual success of business schools in preparing managers for practice.

The AI era makes this critique more urgent. If analytical, administrative, and predictive tasks are increasingly automated or augmented, the educational challenge is not only to teach students how to use AI systems. It is to develop the human intelligences required to lead people, interpret AI outputs, contest algorithmic recommendations, protect dignity, navigate power, and take responsibility for consequences that machines can help optimize but cannot morally own.

MAIL: Management, AI, and Leadership, and the proposed MLT degrees are introduced later in this paper as one of the original contributions of the FILE Odyssey. This subsection prepares their scholarly foundation by showing that the management-education gap is real, long recognized, and intensified by artificial intelligence.

### 2.5 Comparative Positioning

FILE builds on four major theoretical traditions while proposing a distinct contribution to each. It also enters recent debates on AI and management, responsible AI, trust in AI, and leadership identity.

**First, FILE builds on the plural intelligence tradition** associated with multiple intelligences, emotional intelligence, and cultural intelligence (Gardner, 1983; Goleman, 1995; Earley and Ang, 2003). In the age of AI, FILE introduces Augmented Intelligence as a core leadership intelligence and integrates five intelligences into a unified diagnostic architecture rather than treating them as separate competency domains. Leadership identity research also matters here: Petriglieri and Petriglieri (2010) show that leadership development is not only skill acquisition but identity work supported by holding environments. For FILE, leadership identity is linked to the integrated development of human intelligences under AI-mediated complexity.

**Second, FILE builds on socio-technical systems thinking.** Socio-technical approaches show that organizations cannot be understood as purely technical systems or purely social systems (Trist and Bamforth, 1951; Orlikowski, 2000). Applied to AI-mediated leadership, this insight leads FILE to treat leadership as the orchestration of distributed cognition across humans, AI systems, cultures, institutions, and organizational tools. This raises a central question: who remains accountable when machine outputs shape leadership decisions? This positioning also

resonates with human-centered AI scholarship: Shneiderman (2022) argues for reliable, safe, and trustworthy human-centered AI; Riedl (2019) frames human-centered AI and machine learning as part of larger human systems; and Glikson and Woolley (2020) show that trust in AI is a central condition for organizational integration. FILE translates these concerns into leadership theory by asking what human intelligences must govern AI-mediated systems once they become part of organizational cognition.

**Third, FILE builds on adaptive leadership theory.** Adaptive leadership explains how leaders mobilize people to confront difficult problems and learn under conditions of uncertainty (Heifetz, 1994; Heifetz, Grashow, and Linsky, 2009). FILE places Adaptive Intelligence within a broader five-intelligence architecture. In the FILE framework, Adaptive Intelligence includes Decision Intelligence, Judgment Intelligence, and Learning Intelligence. These nested dimensions clarify that adaptation must not become mere reactivity, opportunism, or moral drift. Adaptation requires judgment, learning, and responsible decision-making.

**Fourth, FILE builds on stakeholder theory, political intelligence, and normative political philosophy.** Stakeholder theory emphasizes the plurality of claims that organizations must recognize (Freeman, 1984). Organizational power and influence scholarship examines power, influence, coalitions, and institutional navigation (Pfeffer, 2010). Normative political philosophy clarifies questions of justice, capability, legitimacy, and human flourishing (Rawls, 1971; Sen, 1999). FILE brings these traditions together in Political Intelligence, which includes Purpose Intelligence, Moral Intelligence, and Sustainable Intelligence. This prevents power from being reduced to manipulation and prevents purpose from becoming abstract rhetoric detached from institutional reality.

Beyond these four theoretical traditions, the FILE Corpus also distinguishes FILE from two adjacent bodies of scholarship: major management frameworks and major leadership theories. In relation to management frameworks, FILE is not presented as another operational tool, but as a management theory and diagnostic framework for responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of AI. In relation to leadership theories, FILE is not presented as a replacement for established theories, but as an integrative and research-generating framework organized around five intelligences. Dejoux's work on how AI reconfigures the manager provides a French management-scholarship anchor for what FILE theorizes at the level of leadership intelligence: AI does not simply add new tools to managerial work; it redistributes where human judgment, responsibility, and relational presence are most needed.

The distinction can be summarized through two positioning sentences from the FILE Corpus.

From *FILE vs. Major Management Frameworks*:

**"Management frameworks help organizations coordinate action; FILE asks what human intelligences must govern that coordination."**

From *FILE vs. Major Leadership Theories V2*:

**"Major leadership theories explain dimensions of leadership; FILE asks what integrated human intelligences must govern leadership judgment under AI-mediated complexity."**

These two positioning sentences synthesize arguments developed in *FILE vs. Major Management Frameworks* and *FILE vs. Major Leadership Theories V2*, all part of the FILE Corpus.

FILE therefore contributes to leadership scholarship not as a replacement for existing theories, but as an integrative architecture for a question those theories were not originally designed to answer in full: what integrated human intelligences must govern leadership judgment when AI systems distribute cognition across humans, machines, cultures, and institutions simultaneously?

### 2.6 Summary Comparison

The following table is a heuristic comparison, not a systematic review. Its purpose is to clarify FILE's positioning relative to existing leadership theories and management frameworks.

| Dimension | Major leadership theories | Major management frameworks | FILE's positioning |
|---|---|---|---|
| Primary question | How do leaders inspire, serve, adapt, relate, influence, distribute leadership, or act ethically? | How do organizations coordinate, align, measure, optimize, innovate, transform, and execute? | What integrated human intelligences must govern leadership judgment and management action in the age of AI and robotics? |
| Unit of analysis | Leader, follower, dyad, team, organization, or leadership process | Tool, process, framework, organization, strategy, metric, capability, or governance system | Individual, team, organization, ecosystem, and AI-mediated decision context |
| AI-era specificity | Most theories remain highly relevant but were developed before AI-mediated cognition became a structural feature of organizational life | Most frameworks were not designed around algorithmic mediation, although many are now embedded in digital tools and AI systems | Augmented Intelligence and Human Irreducibility are central to leadership and management in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics |
| Human judgment | Treated through ethics, authenticity, adaptation, decision-making, relational responsibility, or leader development | Often assumed as the interpretive human layer behind tools, metrics, dashboards, processes, and frameworks | Explicitly central; within the wider FILE Architecture, LENS formalizes the second-order governance of human judgment under AI-mediated complexity |
| Ethical architecture | Strong in ethical, servant, authentic, and adaptive traditions; less explicit in some others | Present in stakeholder, CSR, ESG, and governance frameworks; weaker in purely operational tools | Explicitly nested in Political Intelligence through Purpose Intelligence, Moral Intelligence, and Sustainable Intelligence |

| Dimension | Major leadership theories | Major management frameworks | FILE's positioning |
|---|---|---|---|
| Cultural and political complexity | Present in several traditions, but often treated separately from AI-mediated cognition | Present in stakeholder, governance, and change frameworks, but often subordinated to execution | Integrated through Cultural Intelligence and Political Intelligence as co-equal intelligences |
| Developmental logic | Varies by theory, from leader development to adaptive learning and relational maturity | Varies by framework, from strategy formulation to execution, measurement, improvement, or transformation | Developed through FILE, FILE$^3$, FILE$^5$, FILE$^7$, and the 7E Cascade |
| Main risk if misused | Reduction to traits, heroic leadership, abstraction, or decontextualized competency lists | Reduction to dashboards, metrics, process compliance, tool worship, or algorithmic routine | Overextension if treated as established rather than proposed, conceptual, and research-generating |
| Main contribution | Explains important dimensions of leadership | Enables organizational coordination and action | Provides an integrative architecture for governing leadership judgment and management action under AI-mediated complexity |

The comparison above shows why FILE should be read neither as a substitute for existing leadership theories nor as another operational management framework. Its contribution lies in an integrative layer: identifying what forms of human intelligence must remain active, accountable, and integrated when intelligent technologies become part of the conditions of management, leadership, education, and research. Within the wider FILE Architecture, LENS formalizes the second-order governance of how human judgment is exercised under those conditions.

---

## 3. FILE: The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution

### 3.1 The Framework

FILE: The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution is a management theory and diagnostic framework for understanding and developing responsible leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics. Its central proposition is expressed in the FILE Formula:

**FILE = AI + EQ + CQ + PQ + AQ**

The FILE Formula summarizes FILE's core claim: responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics require the integration of five human

intelligences. It is not a sequential checklist. It is a simultaneous integration, in which each intelligence amplifies and disciplines the others.

Where:

AI: Augmented Intelligence ("Mind") is the capacity to collaborate with artificial intelligence systems while retaining ethical oversight, critical evaluation, contextual interpretation, and strategic judgment. Augmented Intelligence is not artificial intelligence. It is the human capacity to direct, govern, and make responsible use of machine capabilities without surrendering intellectual responsibility or moral accountability. It is the thumb of the leadership hand, the intelligence that makes the other four actionable. This conception builds on the automation-augmentation debate (Raisch and Krakowski, 2021), human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision-making (Jarrahi, 2018), and research on organizational decision-making structures in the age of AI (Shrestha, Ben-Menahem, and von Krogh, 2019).

Within Augmented Intelligence, two particularly relevant nested dimensions are: *Cognitive Intelligence*: the capacity for analytical reasoning, problem-framing, and critical evaluation; and *Complexity Intelligence*: the capacity to understand interdependence, non-linear systems, and emergent consequences. These nested dimensions explain why AI literacy alone is insufficient: leaders need not only to use AI tools, but to think clearly about what those tools do and do not reveal.

EQ: Emotional Intelligence ("Heart") is the capacity for empathy, trust, psychological safety, relational presence, and human connection. In the age of artificial intelligence and robotics, Emotional Intelligence is not softened or reduced. It becomes more structurally important because the conditions of trust, dignity, and mutual recognition that make organizations function and form part of what FILE calls the Relational Commons cannot be built or sustained by machines. They require human presence, human care, and human responsibility. In this respect, Emotional Intelligence also connects to psychological safety research (Edmondson, 2018), because trust and voice are not peripheral to leadership but conditions of collective learning. Emotional Intelligence in FILE is grounded in research by Salovey and Mayer (1990), Goleman (1995), and Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2008).

CQ: Cultural Intelligence ("World") is the capacity for plural meaning, cultural translation, contextual interpretation, and cross-cultural fluency. As AI systems are deployed across diverse linguistic, cultural, and institutional contexts, the risk of cultural flattening, false universality, and algorithmic bias increases dramatically. Cultural Intelligence is the intelligence that makes AI-mediated leadership globally legitimate rather than locally effective. This extends cultural intelligence research into AI-mediated contexts where model outputs, categories, training data, and interface assumptions may flatten cultural difference or obscure local meaning.

PQ: Political Intelligence ("Society") is the capacity for legitimate power use, stakeholder navigation, institutional design, and purposive governance. Within Political Intelligence, three particularly relevant nested dimensions are: Purpose Intelligence: the capacity to orient power toward worthy human ends; Moral Intelligence: the capacity to recognize ethical limits, human

dignity, and accountability; and Sustainable Intelligence: the capacity to account for long-term consequences, ecosystems, and future generations. In AI-mediated organizations, Political Intelligence also governs algorithmic control, surveillance risk, HR analytics, stakeholder legitimacy, and institutional accountability.

The central principle of Political Intelligence in FILE is: **Political Intelligence without Purpose degenerates into Machiavellianism**: the skillful use of power without a worthy human end. This principle is the moral axis of the entire FILE framework. It means that no amount of political skill, strategic sophistication, or institutional competence constitutes leadership if it is not governed by a worthy human purpose. Political skill is not leadership. Political skill in the service of human flourishing is leadership. This is why Purpose Intelligence, Moral Intelligence, and Sustainable Intelligence are nested within PQ rather than standing as separate pillars: they are the ethical architecture that makes political intelligence legitimate.

AQ: Adaptive Intelligence ("Evolution") is the capacity for learning, revision, decision-making, and judgment under uncertainty. Within Adaptive Intelligence, three particularly relevant nested dimensions are: Decision Intelligence: the capacity to make responsible choices under uncertainty; Judgment Intelligence: the capacity to decide what to preserve, what to change, when to compromise, when to resist, and how to act responsibly when conditions are changing faster than established frameworks can accommodate; and Learning Intelligence: the capacity to learn from feedback, revise assumptions, and transform action over time, and to commit to continuous self-development as a lifelong discipline. In the age of AI, where knowledge becomes obsolete faster than in any previous era, **leaders who stop learning stop leading**. Learning Intelligence is not only retrospective (drawing lessons from experience) but prospective: the proactive, ongoing cultivation of new capacities, new knowledge, and new ways of thinking before circumstances force it. **Adaptation without judgment becomes opportunism**. Judgment Intelligence disciplines adaptation so that change remains connected to responsibility, while Learning Intelligence ensures that adaptive leadership remains developmental rather than merely reactive. This connects adaptive leadership and complexity leadership to the practical need for decision-making, revision, and learning when AI systems change the speed, visibility, and uncertainty of organizational action.

The integrated exercise of the five intelligences produces five emergent outcomes: Responsible Leadership and Decision-Making; Collective Intelligence and Human-AI Co-creation; Creativity and Innovation; Wisdom and Discernment; and Human Flourishing through RC: The Relational Commons. These outcomes are not additional intelligences. They emerge when the five intelligences operate together, with RC naming the human-centered relational ecosystem through which human flourishing becomes possible.

### 3.2 The Hand Metaphor

The visual architecture of FILE is the human hand. Each intelligence corresponds to one finger: the thumb (AI, Mind), the index finger (EQ, Heart), the middle finger (CQ, World), the ring finger (PQ, Society), and the little finger (AQ, Evolution). The metaphor is not decorative. It conveys three important ideas: that each intelligence is distinct but connected to the others;

that the hand (the leader) is only fully functional when all five fingers work together; and that **the hand is a human hand, reminding us that leadership, however augmented by technology, remains a human responsibility.**

### 3.3 What FILE Is and Is Not

FILE is a management theory and diagnostic framework for leadership and management studies, not a master theory of world history or a universal theory of human behavior. It does not claim that leaders who possess these intelligences will always succeed, or that leadership outcomes are determined by intelligence profiles. Applied to historical cases, FILE operates as a retrospective diagnostic lens, a way of reading what intelligences were present, absent, overdeveloped, or underdeveloped, not as a claim about what historical actors believed, intended, or understood about their own leadership. The distinction between applying a contemporary analytical framework and making claims about historical consciousness is essential to the integrity of the method. It proposes that these five intelligences, when integrated and developed, constitute the most complete map currently available for understanding what responsible leadership and decision-making require in an age when artificial intelligence and robotics are becoming structural features of organizational life and everyday life.

FILE builds on and extends the multiple intelligences tradition (Gardner, 1983), emotional intelligence theory (Goleman, 1995; Salovey and Mayer, 1990; Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso, 2008), cultural intelligence research (Earley and Ang, 2003), adaptive leadership theory (Heifetz, 1994), and organizational power and influence scholarship (Pfeffer, 2010). It differs from these traditions in two important ways: it introduces Augmented Intelligence as a new leadership-intelligence category specific to the AI era, and it integrates these intelligences into a unified diagnostic architecture rather than treating them as separate competency domains.

---

## 4. The Intellectual Progression of the FILE Corpus: Five Arcs

The FILE Corpus is presented here not as a substitute for engagement with external scholarship, but as the internal development of the research program introduced after the preceding literature review and comparative positioning.

The FILE Corpus is organized across five intellectual arcs, each representing a distinct phase in the development of the FILE framework into a theory, an ecosystemic philosophy, and a practice architecture.

### 4.1 Arc 1: The Birth of a Framework: FILE (Articles 1–6)

The first arc establishes the foundational FILE framework. Six articles introduce the five intelligences, the FILE Formula, and the hand metaphor, approaching the same intellectual content from six distinct analytical registers: socio-technical theory, human amplification, governance architecture, cultural translation, ecosystemic organization, and evidence-based management.

This multiplicity is deliberate. Arc 1 begins by demonstrating that the five intelligences can be approached from multiple disciplinary angles, and that each angle reveals dimensions that others do not emphasize. Arc 1 establishes the foundational claim: leadership after AI is not a technological problem. It is an integrative intelligence problem.

**What Arc 1 establishes:** the five intelligences and their definitions; the FILE Formula; the hand metaphor; the distinction between Augmented Intelligence and AI as autonomous replacement; and the foundational claim that leadership after AI requires integration, not simply technological adoption.

### 4.2 Arc 2: The Development of a Theory: FILE³ (Articles 7–18)

The second arc transforms the FILE framework from a formula into a theory. Twelve articles develop FILE³: the Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution, Effectiveness, and Excellence, by establishing construct boundaries, clarifying relationships between intelligences, developing the nested intelligence architecture, introducing the Triple-E Process Model, and articulating a multi-level operating system architecture for AI-era organizations.

FILE³ represents the theoretical maturation of the framework. It moves from "these are the five intelligences" to "this is how they work, how they interact, what they govern, and how they can be developed across multiple organizational levels."

**The Triple-E Process Model** at the heart of FILE³ maps three stages of leadership development:

- *Evolution*: the recognition that leadership must change in the age of AI: not merely adapt to new tools, but fundamentally reconceive what leadership requires
- *Effectiveness*: the development of measurable leadership outcomes through the integrated application of the five intelligences
- *Excellence*: the sustained, integrated mastery of the five intelligences across diverse contexts and organizational levels

**The nesting logic** is established in Arc 2. Rather than adding new meta-intelligences with each theoretical development, FILE³ nests secondary dimensions within the five primary intelligences. Among the dimensions developed are Cognitive Intelligence and Complexity Intelligence within AI; Purpose Intelligence, Moral Intelligence, and Sustainable Intelligence within PQ; and Decision Intelligence, Judgment Intelligence, and Learning Intelligence within AQ. This nesting architecture protects the simplicity and memorability of the five-intelligence formula while allowing the theory to recognize cognition, complexity, purpose, morality, sustainability, decision-making, judgment, and learning as essential dimensions of responsible leadership.

**The multi-level architecture** extends FILE³ from the individual leader to team, organizational, institutional, and ecosystemic levels. Leadership in the age of AI is not only an individual competency. It is a systemic capability that operates across levels simultaneously.

**What Arc 2 establishes:** FILE³ as a rigorous leadership theory; the Triple-E Process Model; the nested intelligence architecture; the multi-level operating system from individual to ecosystem; and the constitutional governance logic of FILE³.

### 4.3 Arc 3: The Maturity of an Ecosystem: FILE⁵ (Articles 19–30)

The third arc extends FILE from the organizational to the ecosystemic. Twelve articles develop FILE⁵: the Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution, Effectiveness, Excellence, Ecosystems, and Empowerment, by positioning ecosystems as the central unit of AI-era leadership analysis and empowerment as the moral apex of leadership purpose.

Two new stages are added to the developmental model:

*Ecosystems* (plural, not singular) recognizes that leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics does not operate inside one bounded organization or one single environment. It unfolds across multiple interconnected ecosystems (technological, organizational, educational, governance, cultural, and societal ecosystems) simultaneously. The plural matters: "ecosystem" suggests one environment; "ecosystems" suggests overlapping, interdependent, adaptive systems. That complexity is the actual condition of AI-era leadership.

*Empowerment* is placed last because it is the moral conclusion of the model. FILE⁵ does not end with performance, control, automation, or even excellence. It ends with human empowerment: the expansion of human agency, dignity, autonomy, responsibility, creativity, learning, and freedom. The test of a leadership ecosystem in the FILE framework is not whether it is efficient, innovative, or profitable. It is whether it expands or constrains the human beings within it.

The sequence of FILE⁵ therefore tells a complete story: Evolution means leadership must change. Effectiveness means it must work. Excellence means it must reach mastery. Ecosystems means it must scale across interconnected systems. Empowerment means it must ultimately serve human freedom.

Arc 3 is also where the Relational Commons is fully theorized. If leadership is ecosystemic, then trust, meaning, legitimacy, psychological safety, and mutual recognition are not soft by-products of good management. They are common goods, shared conditions that make responsible action possible, that must be cultivated, protected, and governed as seriously as any technological or financial resource.

**What Arc 3 establishes:** the ecosystemic extension of FILE beyond individual organizations; empowerment as the moral apex of leadership; the Relational Commons; the Sovereign Ecosystem framework; the Civilizational Responsibility Thesis; and the full philosophical grounding of FILE in Sen (1999), Rawls (1971), and Arendt (1958).

### 4.4 Arc 4: The Practice of Future Leadership: FILE⁷ (Articles 31–45)

The fourth arc completes the intellectual journey by addressing the question that all theory must eventually face: can it be practiced? Fifteen articles develop FILE⁷: the seven-stage developmental architecture of Leadership Evolution, Effectiveness, Excellence, Ecosystems, Empowerment, Execution, and Embodiment, by translating the theoretical and ecosystemic

architecture into organizational governance, leadership practice, AI governance design, curriculum reform, and cross-civilizational application.

Two new stages complete the 7E Cascade:

*Execution*, the sixth E, formalizes the operational dimension of augmented leadership: the disciplined translation of the five intelligences into decisions, roles, workflows, governance structures, rituals, curricula, evaluation systems, and institutional habits. Execution answers the question: how do organizations and leaders actually do FILE? How does the theory appear in daily practice rather than in conceptual diagrams?

In the FILE framework, execution is not implementation alone. It is intelligent orchestration: the coordination of human and machine intelligence under conditions of complexity, accountability, and moral responsibility. Augmented Intelligence plays the coordinating role, the thumb that makes all other actions possible, in organizing execution across the five intelligences.

*Embodiment*, the seventh E, formalizes the ontological dimension: the internalization of the five intelligences into a stable leadership identity, where augmented leadership becomes a way of being rather than a set of behaviors. Embodiment distinguishes leaders who perform FILE from leaders who have become FILE. It is the point where framework becomes character, where theory becomes judgment, and where practice becomes presence.

Execution without embodiment becomes instrumentalization: FILE as a toolkit, a checklist, a performance metric. Embodiment without execution becomes moral theater: FILE as aspiration without action. FILE$^7$ insists on both simultaneously.

The transition from FILE$^5$ to FILE$^7$ is therefore not an expansion of the theory but its completion. FILE$^7$ unifies the prior arcs into a seven-stage developmental architecture that moves from the necessity of change (Evolution) to the lived expression of integrated leadership (Embodiment).

Arc 4 also introduces the explicit safeguards that become necessary once a theory enters practice: anti-instrumentalization mechanisms, contestability principles, non-data sanctuaries for human judgment, and protections against the reduction of FILE to managerial brand language or training package. Praxis requires not only translation but protection.

**What Arc 4 establishes:** FILE$^7$ as the complete seven-stage developmental architecture; Execution as intelligent human-AI orchestration; Embodiment as the ontological internalization of FILE into leadership identity; the FILE$^7$ Organizational Operating System; the MAIL curriculum proposal; cross-civilizational translation of FILE; and anti-instrumentalization safeguards including non-data sanctuaries: organizational spaces where metrics and algorithmic outputs are explicitly suspended to protect human judgment, psychological safety, and moral reasoning.

### 4.5 Arc 5: The FILE School of Thought (Articles 46–60)

The fifth arc articulates what the FILE Corpus as a whole represents: the FILE School of Thought. Fifteen articles test, critique, compare, humanize, limit, and conclude the intellectual program, with the same rigor and depth as any of the preceding arcs.

The governing philosophical position of the FILE School of Thought is stated simply: it is not Humans vs. Machines. It is Humans + Machines, under human leadership. The FILE School of Thought does not oppose artificial intelligence. It insists that artificial intelligence must remain answerable to human judgment, human purpose, and human responsibility, and that leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics is precisely the capacity to ensure that this accountability is real rather than nominal.

Arc 5 addresses the questions that any serious research program must answer. It examines FILE's theoretical consistency, construct boundaries, comparative positioning, empirical risks, and possible failure modes. This self-critical work is important because FILE is presented as a research-generating theory, not as a closed doctrine or established model.

How does FILE compare to existing major leadership theories: transformational leadership, servant leadership, adaptive leadership, authentic leadership, LMX theory? How does it compare to major management frameworks: the balanced scorecard, dynamic capabilities, organizational learning, stakeholder theory? What are its failure modes, boundary conditions, and empirical risks? What would count as evidence against FILE? What can artificial intelligence not replicate or replace, regardless of how powerful it becomes? And at the deepest level: what makes us human, and what must remain human in an age of AI-mediated work and life?

The most important intellectual move of Arc 5 is its systematic engagement with FILE's limits. Arc 5 explicitly documents where FILE may be wrong, redundant, difficult to measure, culturally biased, or liable to misuse. It identifies the constructs, hypotheses, boundary conditions, possible weaknesses, and lines of critical inquiry through which FILE can be examined, narrowed, revised, or refuted. This critical self-examination is not a weakness of the corpus. It is its most important intellectual virtue: the demonstration that FILE is a research program in formation, not a closed doctrine. A framework that cannot be criticized cannot be trusted.

**What Arc 5 establishes:** systematic comparisons of FILE with major leadership theories and management frameworks; an epistemology of augmented knowledge; a comprehensive failure-mode and boundary-condition analysis; a treatment of Human Irreducibility: what AI outputs cannot reduce, replace, or make morally equivalent to human judgment and responsibility; and a conclusion situating FILE within the future of work and human flourishing.

---

## 5. The Twelve Original Contributions to Management, Leadership, and the Social Sciences

The FILE Odyssey presents twelve original contributions to management, leadership, and the social sciences. They are connected but distinct: each addresses a different dimension of the challenge of human leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics.

1. **A human-centered definition of leadership.** Leadership = Intelligence + Character + Judgment, with Intelligence conceptualized through FILE, Character through SQL, and Judgment through LENS within the FILE Architecture.
2. **A human-centered framework.** FILE: The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution. FILE = AI + EQ + CQ + PQ + AQ, where AI means Augmented Intelligence ("Mind"), EQ means Emotional Intelligence ("Heart"), CQ means Cultural Intelligence ("World"), PQ means Political Intelligence ("Society"), and AQ means Adaptive Intelligence ("Evolution").
3. **A human-centered theory.** FILE, FILE$^3$, FILE$^5$, FILE$^7$, and the 7E Cascade.
4. **A human-centered ethos.** SQL: The Six Qualities of Leadership, identifying six fundamental qualities that define the embodied human leader: Vision, Intuition, Taste, Courage, Discipline, and Integrity.
5. **A human-centered judgment model.** LENS: Leadership, Ethics, Nondelegation, and Sensemaking.
6. **A human-centered vision.** RC: The Relational Commons.
7. **A human-centered education.** MAIL: Management, AI, and Leadership, a curriculum supporting proposed MLT: Management, Leadership, and Technology degrees as alternatives to the traditional BBA and MBA.
8. **A human-centered methodology.** HACK: Human-AI Co-created Knowledge.
9. **A human-centered philosophy.** Human Irreducibility.
10. **A human-centered AI governance codex.** The Five Immutable Laws of AI and Robotics: HTTPS: Humanity, Truth, Transparency, Protection, and Security.
11. **A human-centered public policy.** BASIC: Basic Income, AI Access, Skills, Inclusion, and Care, and its French equivalent, RULES : Revenu Universel, Lutte contre la pauvreté et les inégalités, Éducation et accès à l'IA et Solidarité.
12. **A human-centered civilization.** Inalienable Leadership: the twelfth and culminating original contribution of the FILE Odyssey and the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics.

This paper does not develop all twelve contributions at equal depth. The leadership definition, SQL, LENS, Human Irreducibility, HTTPS, BASIC and RULES, and Inalienable Leadership are

introduced here to establish the FILE Odyssey architecture, while the subsections that follow retain fuller treatment of FILE, MAIL and MLT, the 7E Cascade, RC, and HACK.

### 5.1 FILE: The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution

A diagnostic framework proposing that effective and responsible leadership in the age of AI and robotics requires the integrated development of five intelligences: Augmented Intelligence ("Mind"), Emotional Intelligence ("Heart"), Cultural Intelligence ("World"), Political Intelligence ("Society"), and Adaptive Intelligence ("Evolution").

The FILE Formula (FILE = AI + EQ + CQ + PQ + AQ) summarizes the core claim: when the five intelligences are genuinely integrated rather than sequentially applied, they produce the emergent condition of the Relational Commons.

FILE is both a theory and a diagnostic framework. As a theory, it organizes its claims around six explicit propositions:

**Proposition 1: The Multi-Intelligence Claim:** effective leadership in AI-mediated organizational environments requires the integration of multiple intelligences operating interdependently rather than in isolation.

**Proposition 2: The Augmented Intelligence Claim:** Augmented Intelligence is a distinctive leadership capacity: the ability to work productively with AI systems without surrendering human judgment, responsibility, or critical evaluation.

**Proposition 3: The Persistence of Human Intelligences Claim:** Emotional Intelligence, Cultural Intelligence, Political Intelligence, and Adaptive Intelligence remain essential even as AI systems become more capable of simulating emotionally appropriate, culturally adapted, politically strategic, or adaptively responsive outputs.

This is the **Human Irreducibility** proposition: **simulation is not equivalence**. Human Irreducibility is FILE's human-centered philosophy. It recognizes that certain human capacities, such as judgment, discernment, conscience, moral agency, dignity, meaning, responsibility, care, trust, and love, cannot be replaced by a machine, no matter how powerful it becomes. These capacities are the conditions under which leadership remains human. An AI system can produce outputs that resemble empathy, cultural sensitivity, or moral reasoning without possessing the embodied human responsibility that makes those qualities morally accountable in leadership.

**Proposition 4: The Interdependence Claim:** the five intelligences are not merely additive traits; they function as an interdependent profile in which absence or overdevelopment of any single intelligence undermines the others.

**Proposition 5: The Maturity and Development Claim:** the five intelligences are developable capacities rather than fixed traits, and their integrated development follows the seven-stage arc of the 7E Cascade.

**Proposition 6: The Organizational and Educational Scope Claim:** the FILE framework applies not only to individual leaders but also to teams, organizations, institutional systems, and educational programs, including the MAIL curriculum and the proposed MLT degrees.

These six propositions are analytically distinct. Evidence challenging one would not necessarily invalidate the entire framework. FILE should be treated as a research program whose components can be critically examined, revised, narrowed, or rejected.

Taken together, these propositions remain open to theoretical and critical scrutiny: individual claims may be supported, narrowed, revised, or challenged without requiring the entire framework to stand or fall as one closed doctrine.

### 5.2 MAIL: Management, AI, and Leadership

MAIL is proposed as a successor to the traditional MBA: a curriculum for leading people and governing AI systems in AI-mediated organizational environments. The critique of MBA education is not new: Henry Mintzberg's *Managers Not MBAs* (2004) argued that business schools were producing the wrong graduates through the wrong curriculum for the wrong reasons. What is new is the AI era, which makes the separation of management, technology, and leadership increasingly difficult to defend pedagogically. MAIL argues that management, artificial intelligence, and leadership must be taught and practiced as one integrated field rather than three separate domains.

MAIL supports proposed MLT: Management, Leadership, and Technology degrees, designed as human-centered alternatives to the traditional MBA and intended to prepare graduates to lead human teams, govern AI systems and robots, and exercise responsible judgment in AI-mediated organizational environments.

The core claim: management without leadership risks administration without judgment; leadership without management risks inspiration without execution; technology without management and leadership risks power without accountability. The educational implication is significant: the separation of these three fields in current business school curricula produces graduates ill-equipped for the organizations they will inhabit.

Concretely, a MAIL curriculum would integrate leadership theory, AI governance, human-AI decision simulations, case studies, ethical dilemma analysis, reflective practice, cultural interpretation, stakeholder judgment, and responsible action, preparing participants to articulate their reasoning, contest algorithmic recommendations, and exercise human judgment in complex managerial situations.

### 5.3 The 7E Cascade

A developmental framework mapping the seven stages through which leadership intelligence matures:

**Evolution → Effectiveness → Excellence → Ecosystems → Empowerment → Execution → Embodiment**

The 7E Cascade describes how responsible leadership develops: from the necessity of change, through performance and mastery and ecosystemic responsibility and human empowerment, to the operational execution and personal embodiment that transform the five intelligences from a practice into a way of being. It is not a stage-gate model requiring sequential

completion. It is a developmental map in which leadership intelligence deepens and integrates as leaders and organizations mature.

### 5.4 RC: The Relational Commons

RC: The Relational Commons names the shared human ecosystem built on trust, dignity, psychological safety, meaning, respect, emotional recognition, mutual recognition, human connection, belonging, care, reciprocity, collaboration, voice, ability to challenge and contest, autonomy, responsibility, legitimacy, harmony, wellbeing, and creative possibility. It is the North Star and final destination of the FILE Odyssey: the human ecosystem that FILE seeks to protect, cultivate, and renew through the integrated exercise of all five intelligences.

The Relational Commons is not a sixth intelligence. It is the emergent condition of integrated leadership, and the human-centered vision that orients the entire FILE research program. When present, it enables voice, risk, learning, disagreement, creativity, and creation. When absent or damaged by fear, cynicism, surveillance, extraction, or the simulation of care without its substance, the five intelligences cannot function at their full potential regardless of individual capability. Leadership exists not only to optimize metrics or execute strategies, but also to build and protect the shared human field in which people can work, create, and flourish with dignity.

### 5.5 HACK: Human-AI Co-created Knowledge

A methodological framework theorizing a model of intellectual collaboration in which human judgment governs, curates, questions, edits, verifies, and gives meaning to the contributions of AI systems.

HACK: Human-AI Co-created Knowledge is a methodology for responsible human-AI intellectual collaboration and scholarship. It proposes that AI tools can assist exploration, drafting, critique, comparison, organization, and synthesis in intellectual work, but that human judgment must remain responsible for purpose, ethics, verification, meaning, and final accountability. It is not a model of AI authorship or co-authorship. It is a model of Augmented Authorship: human-governed AI-assisted scholarship in which the human author makes all decisions about what is worth saying, how it should be said, whether it is accurate, and what it means.

---

## 6. Limits and Open Questions

The following are among the most important limitations.

**FILE is a theoretical contribution.** It defines constructs, specifies relationships, develops hypotheses, and identifies open questions for future scholarship. The FILE Research Agenda papers in Arc 5 examine these questions in greater detail.

Future research should develop qualitative and observable indicators for Human Irreducibility, including how leaders preserve responsibility, judgment, empathy, cultural meaning, and purposive action when AI systems generate recommendations, classifications, or

decisions; how they justify decisions that contradict AI recommendations; and how they express concern for human consequences, assume moral responsibility, preserve dignity, and maintain relational trust under algorithmic pressure.

**Cultural scope requires expansion.** FILE was developed primarily from Western management and leadership theory traditions. Arc 4 explicitly addresses the cross-civilizational translation of FILE beyond the Western paradigm, but further scholarship is needed to examine how the five intelligences may vary across cultural contexts in their applicability, expression, and interpretation.

The Human Irreducibility thesis itself, as formulated here around judgment, moral responsibility, empathy, cultural meaning, and purposive action, may carry Western normative assumptions that require critical cross-cultural examination rather than assumption.

**Construct boundaries require refinement.** The overlap between intelligences, particularly between Emotional Intelligence and Cultural Intelligence, and between Adaptive Intelligence and Augmented Intelligence, is acknowledged as a theoretical challenge. The conceptual boundaries among these intelligences require further theoretical clarification.

This is especially important in AI-mediated intercultural contexts, where future research may examine how Emotional Intelligence, Cultural Intelligence, and their interaction shape leadership responses.

**The risk of instrumentalization is real.** Any framework that enters organizational practice risks being simplified into a checklist, a scoring tool, or a branding language. FILE's anti-instrumentalization safeguards, developed in Arc 4, attempt to address this risk. But vigilance is required by anyone who applies the framework in organizational contexts.

Future field research should also examine whether non-data sanctuaries can operate as active design variables that protect psychological safety, reduce surveillance pressure, and strengthen responsible judgment under algorithmic management.

The governing principle of FILE's self-critical discipline is direct: a narrower FILE may be a stronger FILE. Construct overlap, weak conceptual distinctiveness, measurement fragility, cross-cultural variation, and ethical misuse are treated not as objections to be deflected but as substantive risks to be examined critically and used to revise, narrow, merge, or abandon specific claims where necessary. A theory that cannot name how it could fail cannot mature scientifically.

**The research agenda.** Future scholarship may examine how AI-mediated leadership affects trust, innovation, psychological safety, burnout, leadership legitimacy, cultural interpretation, human responsibility, and organizational judgment across different contexts. The FILE Research Agenda papers in Arc 5 develop these questions in greater detail.

---

## 7. Conclusion: An Invitation to Engage

This paper has introduced FILE as a sustained, rigorous, and self-critical research program on one of the most consequential questions facing management: what does responsible leadership require when artificial intelligence becomes part of the fabric of organizational life and everyday life?

The FILE Corpus is organized across five equally weighted intellectual arcs: framework (FILE), theory (FILE$^3$), ecosystem (FILE$^5$), praxis (FILE$^7$), and the FILE School of Thought. Across those arcs, the FILE Odyssey now presents twelve original contributions to management, leadership, and the social sciences: Leadership = Intelligence + Character + Judgment; FILE; FILE, FILE$^3$, FILE$^5$, FILE$^7$, and the 7E Cascade; SQL: The Six Qualities of Leadership; LENS: Leadership, Ethics, Nondelegation, and Sensemaking; RC: The Relational Commons; MAIL and MLT; HACK: Human-AI Co-created Knowledge; Human Irreducibility; HTTPS; BASIC and RULES; and Inalienable Leadership.

The corpus raises questions for scholarship, education, and practice concerning its constructs, theoretical boundaries, organizational applications, and possible limitations. The most important legacy of a research program is not the answers it provides but the quality of the questions it makes it possible to ask.

By positioning FILE within leadership theory, management frameworks, AI and management scholarship, socio-technical systems, collective intelligence, human-centered AI, and management education, this paper presents FILE not as a replacement for existing scholarship, but as an integrative management theory and diagnostic framework for responsible leadership and decision-making in AI-mediated organizations. Within the wider FILE Architecture, LENS formalizes the second-order governance of human judgment.

The question FILE asks, "what forms of human intelligence become more necessary when artificial intelligence becomes more powerful?", is not a question that will be settled quickly. It is the central leadership question of the coming century. FILE offers one serious, sustained, self-critical attempt to answer it.

**The FILE Odyssey has only just begun.**

---

## References

### Academic References


Arendt, Hannah. 1958. *The Human Condition*. University of Chicago Press.

Avolio, Bruce J., and William L. Gardner. 2005. "Authentic Leadership Development: Getting to the Root of Positive Forms of Leadership." *The Leadership Quarterly* 16, no. 3: 315–338.

Avolio, Bruce J., Surinder S. Kahai, and George E. Dodge. 2000. "E-Leadership: Implications for Theory, Research, and Practice." *The Leadership Quarterly* 11, no. 4: 615–668.

Bass, Bernard M. 1985. *Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectations*. Free Press.

Benbya, Hind, Stella Pachidi, and Sirkka L. Jarvenpaa. 2021. "Special Issue Editorial: Artificial Intelligence in Organizations: Implications for Information Systems Research." *Journal of the Association for Information Systems* 22, no. 2: 281–303. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00662.

Bennis, Warren G., and James O'Toole. 2005. "How Business Schools Lost Their Way." *Harvard Business Review* 83, no. 5: 96–104, 154.

Berente, Nicholas, Bin Gu, Jan Recker, and Radhika Santhanam. 2021. "Managing Artificial Intelligence." *MIS Quarterly* 45, no. 3: 1433–1450.

Brown, Michael E., Linda K. Treviño, and David A. Harrison. 2005. "Ethical Leadership: A Social Learning Perspective for Construct Development and Testing." *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 97, no. 2: 117–134.

Brynjolfsson, Erik, and Andrew McAfee. 2014. *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. W. W. Norton.

Burns, James MacGregor. 1978. *Leadership*. Harper & Row.

Cortellazzo, Laura, Elena Bruni, and Rita Zampieri. 2019. "The Role of Leadership in a Digitalized World: A Review." *Frontiers in Psychology* 10: 1938.

Daugherty, Paul R., and H. James Wilson. 2018. *Human + Machine: Reimagining Work in the Age of AI*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Dejoux, Cécile. 2020. "Comment l'intelligence artificielle s'attaque au manager ?" *Management & Datascience* 4, no. 3. https://doi.org/10.36863/mds.a.13025.

Earley, P. Christopher, and Soon Ang. 2003. *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions Across Cultures*. Stanford University Press.

Edmondson, Amy C. 2018. *The Fearless Organization: Creating Psychological Safety in the Workplace for Learning, Innovation, and Growth*. Wiley.

Faraj, Samer, Stella Pachidi, and Karla Sayegh. 2018. "Working and Organizing in the Age of the Learning Algorithm." *Information and Organization* 28, no. 1: 62–70.

Freeman, R. Edward. 1984. *Strategic Management: A Stakeholder Approach*. Pitman.

Gardner, Howard. 1983. *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Basic Books.

Ghoshal, Sumantra. 2005. "Bad Management Theories Are Destroying Good Management Practices." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 4, no. 1: 75–91.

Glikson, Ella, and Anita Williams Woolley. 2020. "Human Trust in Artificial Intelligence: Review of Empirical Research." *Academy of Management Annals* 14, no. 2: 627–660.

Goleman, Daniel. 1995. *Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam Books.

Graen, George B., and Mary Uhl-Bien. 1995. "Relationship-Based Approach to Leadership: Development of Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) Theory of Leadership over 25 Years:

Applying a Multi-Level Multi-Domain Perspective." *The Leadership Quarterly* 6, no. 2: 219–247.

Greenleaf, Robert K. 1977. *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Paulist Press.

Gronn, Peter. 2002. "Distributed Leadership as a Unit of Analysis." *The Leadership Quarterly* 13, no. 4: 423–451.

Heifetz, Ronald A. 1994. *Leadership Without Easy Answers*. Harvard University Press.

Heifetz, Ronald A., Alexander Grashow, and Marty Linsky. 2009. *The Practice of Adaptive Leadership: Tools and Tactics for Changing Your Organization and the World*. Harvard Business Press.

Höddinghaus, Miriam, Dominik Sondern, and Guido Hertel. 2021. "The Automation of Leadership Functions: Would People Trust Decision Algorithms?" *Computers in Human Behavior* 116: 106635. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2020.106635.

Hutchins, Edwin. 1995. *Cognition in the Wild*. MIT Press.

Jarrahi, Mohammad Hossein. 2018. "Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Work: Human-AI Symbiosis in Organizational Decision Making." *Business Horizons* 61, no. 4: 577–586.

Kane, Gerald C., Anh Nguyen Phillips, Jonathan Copulsky, and Garth Andrus. 2019. *The Technology Fallacy: How People Are the Real Key to Digital Transformation*. MIT Press.

Kaplan, Robert S., and David P. Norton. 1992. "The Balanced Scorecard: Measures That Drive Performance." *Harvard Business Review* 70, no. 1: 71–79.

Kellogg, Katherine C., Melissa A. Valentine, and Angèle Christin. 2020. "Algorithms at Work: The New Contested Terrain of Control." *Academy of Management Annals* 14, no. 1: 366–410.

Khurana, Rakesh. 2007. *From Higher Aims to Hired Hands: The Social Transformation of American Business Schools and the Unfulfilled Promise of Management as a Profession*. Princeton University Press.

Kotter, John P. 1996. *Leading Change*. Harvard Business School Press.

Lévy, Pierre. 1997. *Collective Intelligence: Mankind's Emerging World in Cyberspace*. Perseus Books.

Long, Duri, and Brian Magerko. 2020. "What Is AI Literacy? Competencies and Design Considerations." In *Proceedings of the 2020 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, 1–16. Association for Computing Machinery. https://doi.org/10.1145/3313831.3376727.

Malone, Thomas W. 2018. *Superminds: The Surprising Power of People and Computers Thinking Together*. Little, Brown.

March, James G., and Herbert A. Simon. 1958. *Organizations*. John Wiley & Sons.

Mayer, John D., Peter Salovey, and David R. Caruso. 2008. "Emotional Intelligence: New Ability or Eclectic Traits?" *American Psychologist* 63, no. 6: 503–517.

Mintzberg, Henry. 2004. *Managers Not MBAs: A Hard Look at the Soft Practice of Managing and Management Development*. Berrett-Koehler.

Orlikowski, Wanda J. 2000. "Using Technology and Constituting Structures: A Practice Lens for Studying Technology in Organizations." *Organization Science* 11, no. 4: 404–428.

Petriglieri, Gianpiero, and Jennifer Louise Petriglieri. 2010. "Identity Workspaces: The Case of Business Schools." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 9, no. 1: 44–60.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey. 2010. *Power: Why Some People Have It — and Others Don't*. HarperBusiness.

Pfeffer, Jeffrey, and Christina T. Fong. 2002. "The End of Business Schools? Less Success Than Meets the Eye." *Academy of Management Learning & Education* 1, no. 1: 78–95.

Raisch, Sebastian, and Sebastian Krakowski. 2021. "Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation–Augmentation Paradox." *Academy of Management Review* 46, no. 1: 192–210.

Rawls, John. 1971. *A Theory of Justice*. Harvard University Press.

Riedl, Mark O. 2019. "Human-Centered Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning." *Human Behavior and Emerging Technologies* 1, no. 1: 33–36. https://doi.org/10.1002/hbe2.117.

Salovey, Peter, and John D. Mayer. 1990. "Emotional Intelligence." *Imagination, Cognition and Personality* 9, no. 3: 185–211.

Scharmer, C. Otto. 2007. *Theory U: Leading from the Future as It Emerges*. Society for Organizational Learning.

Seeber, Isabella, Eva Bittner, Robert O. Briggs, Triparna de Vreede, Gert-Jan de Vreede, Aaron Elkins, Ronald Maier, Alexander B. Merz, Sarah Oeste-Reiß, Nils Randrup, Gerhard Schwabe, and Matthias Söllner. 2020. "Machines as Teammates: A Research Agenda on AI in Team Collaboration." *Information & Management* 57, no. 2: 103174.

Sen, Amartya. 1999. *Development as Freedom*. Knopf.

Shneiderman, Ben. 2022. *Human-Centered AI*. Oxford University Press.

Shrestha, Yash Raj, Shiko M. Ben-Menahem, and Georg von Krogh. 2019. "Organizational Decision-Making Structures in the Age of Artificial Intelligence." *California Management Review* 61, no. 4: 66–83.

Simon, Herbert A. 1947. *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization*. Macmillan.

Tambe, Prasanna, Peter Cappelli, and Valery Yakubovich. 2019. "Artificial Intelligence in Human Resources Management: Challenges and a Path Forward." *California Management Review* 61, no. 4: 15–42.

Teece, David J. 2007. "Explicating Dynamic Capabilities: The Nature and Microfoundations of (Sustainable) Enterprise Performance." *Strategic Management Journal* 28, no. 13: 1319–1350.

Trist, Eric L., and Kenneth W. Bamforth. 1951. "Some Social and Psychological Consequences of the Longwall Method of Coal-Getting: An Examination of the Psychological Situation and Defences of a Work Group in Relation to the Social Structure and Technological Content of the Work System." *Human Relations* 4, no. 1: 3–38.

Uhl-Bien, Mary, Russ Marion, and Bill McKelvey. 2007. "Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting Leadership from the Industrial Age to the Knowledge Era." *The Leadership Quarterly* 18, no. 4: 298–318.

Weick, Karl E. 1995. *Sensemaking in Organizations*. Sage Publications.

Wesche, Jenny S., and Andreas Sonderegger. 2019. "When Computers Take the Lead: The Automation of Leadership." *Computers in Human Behavior* 101: 197–209. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2019.07.027.

### FILE Corpus Overview

The full FILE Corpus is available at: guillaumemariani.com/research

Arc 1: The Birth of a Framework: FILE (Articles 1–6)

Arc 2: The Development of a Theory: FILE³ (Articles 7–18)

Arc 3: The Maturity of an Ecosystem: FILE⁵ (Articles 19–30)

Arc 4: The Practice of Future Leadership: FILE⁷ (Articles 31–45)

Arc 5: The FILE School of Thought: Humans + Machines, under human leadership (Articles 46–60)

Selected FILE Corpus references cited in this working paper:

Mariani, Guillaume. 2026. *FILE vs. Major Management Frameworks*. guillaumemariani.com. https://guillaumemariani.com/file-vs-major-management-frameworks/.

Mariani, Guillaume. 2026. *FILE vs. Major Leadership Theories (V2)*. guillaumemariani.com. https://guillaumemariani.com/file-vs-major-leadership-theories-v2/.

---

## AI Use Disclosure

Generative AI tools were used as assistive technologies for organization, drafting support, critical review, and language refinement. The author retained full responsibility for the theory, argument, interpretation, claims, references, and final text. No AI system is listed as an author or cited as an author.

---

## About the Author

Guillaume Mariani is a French management scholar, entrepreneur, executive, and educator, and the author and creator of Inalienable Leadership and FILE: The Five Intelligences of Leadership Evolution, a management theory and diagnostic framework for responsible leadership and decision-making in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics, and of original contributions to management, leadership, and the social sciences, including a human-centered definition of leadership (Leadership = Intelligence + Character + Judgment, with Intelligence conceptualized through FILE, Character through SQL, and Judgment through LENS within the FILE Architecture); a human-centered framework (FILE = AI + EQ + CQ + PQ + AQ, where AI means Augmented Intelligence ("Mind"), EQ means Emotional Intelligence ("Heart"), CQ means Cultural Intelligence ("World"), PQ means Political Intelligence ("Society"), and AQ means Adaptive Intelligence ("Evolution")); a human-centered developmental theory (FILE, FILE$^3$, FILE$^5$, FILE$^7$, and the 7E Cascade); a human-centered ethos (SQL: The Six Qualities of Leadership: Vision, Intuition, Taste, Courage, Discipline, and Integrity); a human-centered judgment model (LENS: Leadership, Ethics, Nondelegation, and Sensemaking); a human-centered vision (RC: The Relational Commons); a human-centered education (MAIL: Management, AI, and Leadership, a curriculum supporting proposed MLT: Management, Leadership, and Technology degrees as alternatives to the traditional BBA and MBA); a human-centered methodology (HACK: Human-AI Co-created Knowledge); a human-centered philosophy (Human Irreducibility); a human-centered AI governance codex (The Five Immutable Laws of AI and Robotics: HTTPS: Humanity, Truth, Transparency, Protection, and Security); a human-centered public policy (BASIC: Basic Income, AI Access, Skills, Inclusion, and Care, and its French equivalent, RULES : Revenu Universel, Lutte contre la pauvreté et les inégalités, Éducation et accès à l'IA et Solidarité); and a human-centered civilization (Inalienable Leadership: the overarching metatheory of leadership in the age of artificial intelligence and robotics). Humans + Machines, under human leadership.

The FILE Odyssey is an ongoing research program and will be developed further in subsequent publications.