Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Graph Thinking: Network Cognition and Strategic Leadership in AI-Enabled Organizations

Jonathan H. Westover *

Posted Date: 3 March 2026

doi: 10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

Keywords: network thinking; strategic leadership; artificial intelligence; organizational networks; graph theory; digital transformation; ecosystem strategy; systems thinking

Article

Graph Thinking: Network Cognition and Strategic Leadership in AI-Enabled Organizations

Jonathan H. Westover

Nexus Institute for Work & AI – Catalyst Center for Work Innovation; jon.westover@gmail.com

Abstract

Contemporary organizations function as complex networks, yet leadership cognition remains dominated by linear metaphors that assume sequential causality and hierarchical control. This article introduces Graph Thinking as a multi-dimensional leadership capability comprising cognitive, analytical, and behavioral components that enable leaders to perceive, analyze, and deliberately shape organizational network structures. We position Graph Thinking at the intersection of systems thinking, social network analysis, and ecosystem strategy, arguing that it synthesizes these traditions while extending them to address the specific challenges of artificial intelligence deployment. Drawing on network science and strategic management theory, we develop a multi-level framework specifying how Graph Thinking manifests at individual, organizational, and ecosystem levels, with explicit attention to network dynamics and temporal evolution. Through illustrative thought experiments spanning diverse organizational contexts, we demonstrate how network properties function as diagnostic instruments for strategic decision-making. We argue that AI integration creates conditions that may reward explicit network mapping, while acknowledging this relationship is contingent and politically contested. The article contributes to strategic management literature by specifying measurement approaches for future empirical research, addressing power dynamics inherent in network legibility efforts, and providing actionable developmental frameworks. We conclude with boundary conditions, limitations, and directions for empirical validation.

Keywords: network thinking; strategic leadership; artificial intelligence; organizational networks; graph theory; digital transformation; ecosystem strategy; systems thinking

---

Introduction

The conceptual foundations of modern management were forged in an era of mechanical production and hierarchical control. Frederick Taylor's scientific management, Henri Fayol's administrative principles, and Max Weber's bureaucratic ideal all presumed organizations could be understood as machines—collections of discrete parts arranged in logical sequences to produce predictable outputs (Wren & Bedeian, 2020). This mechanistic worldview manifested in the dominant metaphors that continue to shape managerial cognition: value *chains*, career *ladders*, strategic *roadmaps*, talent *pipelines*. The geometry of business, in this paradigm, was fundamentally Euclidean: the shortest distance between two points was a straight line.

These linear simplifications were never fully accurate representations of organizational reality. Organizations have always functioned as complex networks of formal and informal relationships (Cross & Parker, 2004). However, linear models proved useful approximations in contexts characterized by stable environments, clear hierarchical authority, and relatively bounded organizational scope. The question for contemporary leadership is whether these approximations remain sufficiently useful given fundamental changes in organizational context.

Several developments suggest the answer may be no. Contemporary organizations increasingly exist as complex adaptive systems embedded within broader ecosystems of suppliers, partners, customers, regulators, and competitors (Reeves et al., 2016; Jacobides et al., 2018). Information flows not only through predetermined channels but through emergent networks of formal and informal

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

relationships. Decisions propagate through systems in nonlinear ways, producing effects that manifest in unexpected locations. Digital technologies have simultaneously increased the complexity of organizational networks while providing unprecedented capabilities to map and analyze them.

The integration of artificial intelligence into organizational operations intensifies these dynamics. AI systems—ranging from analytical tools to more autonomous agents capable of goal-directed action—interact with organizational structures in ways that may reward or require greater network legibility. Unlike human employees who navigate unmapped organizational complexity through tacit knowledge and accumulated experience, many AI applications function more effectively when context is explicit and relationships are specified.

This article introduces *Graph Thinking*: a multi-dimensional leadership capability that enables perceiving, analyzing, and shaping the network structures through which organizations create value. We define Graph Thinking as comprising three interrelated components: (1) a *cognitive schema* for mentally representing organizations as networks rather than hierarchies or sequences; (2) an *analytical competency* for applying network concepts to organizational diagnosis; and (3) a *behavioral repertoire* for taking actions that deliberately shape network structures.

We position Graph Thinking not as a novel invention but as a synthesis of existing intellectual traditions—systems thinking, social network analysis, and ecosystem strategy—that addresses the specific challenges of leading organizations where AI plays an increasingly significant role. Our contribution lies in clarifying what this synthesis adds, specifying mechanisms through which network cognition affects outcomes, providing measurement approaches for empirical investigation, addressing the political dimensions of network legibility, and offering actionable developmental frameworks.

The article proceeds as follows. We first position Graph Thinking relative to adjacent theoretical traditions, clarifying its distinctive contribution. We then develop a multi-level framework specifying how Graph Thinking manifests at individual, organizational, and ecosystem levels, with explicit attention to temporal dynamics. Subsequent sections present illustrative thought experiments across diverse organizational contexts, analyze the contingent relationship between network legibility and AI deployment, examine political dimensions of network mapping, and provide detailed practical guidance. The article concludes with measurement approaches for empirical testing, boundary conditions, and directions for future research.

Theoretical Foundations and Positioning

Adjacent Traditions: What Already Exists

Graph Thinking draws upon and synthesizes several established intellectual traditions. Positioning it clearly relative to these traditions is essential for understanding its distinctive contribution.

Systems Thinking

Systems thinking, articulated most influentially by Senge (1990) and grounded in system dynamics research (Sterman, 2000), emphasizes interconnections, feedback loops, delays, and emergent behavior in complex systems. Systems thinkers recognize that linear causal reasoning often misleads when applied to systems characterized by circular causality and nonlinear dynamics. Senge's "fifth discipline" explicitly addresses the cognitive shifts required to perceive systemic patterns rather than isolated events.

Graph Thinking shares systems thinking's rejection of linear causality and its emphasis on interconnection. However, systems thinking typically emphasizes *dynamics*—how systems behave over time through feedback processes—while Graph Thinking emphasizes *structure*—the specific topology of relationships that channel those dynamics. Systems thinking asks how variables influence each other through feedback loops; Graph Thinking asks how the pattern of connections among nodes shapes information flow, influence, and outcomes.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

Additionally, systems thinking developed primarily to address stock-and-flow dynamics in relatively bounded systems. Graph Thinking extends more naturally to large-scale, discrete networks—organizations comprising thousands of people, ecosystems comprising hundreds of firms—where topological properties such as path length, clustering, and centrality become analytically tractable and practically significant.

Social Network Analysis in Organizations

Organizational scholars have long applied social network analysis to understand informal communication patterns, influence structures, and information flow (Cross & Parker, 2004; Wasserman & Faust, 1994). This tradition provides sophisticated methods for mapping networks among individuals, measuring structural properties, and identifying positions of influence or brokerage.

Graph Thinking incorporates social network analysis but extends it in several ways. First, while social network analysis in organizations typically focuses on networks among individuals, Graph Thinking applies network logic across levels—from interpersonal relationships to inter-unit dependencies to inter-firm ecosystems. Second, social network analysis has developed primarily as an analytical methodology; Graph Thinking conceptualizes network cognition as a leadership capability that includes but extends beyond analytical technique. Third, Graph Thinking explicitly connects network structure to strategic outcomes and AI deployment in ways that social network analysis has not traditionally emphasized.

Ecosystem Strategy and Network Orchestration

Strategic management scholars have increasingly recognized that competitive advantage derives not only from internal capabilities but from network positions and relationships (Gulati et al., 2000). The ecosystem strategy literature (Adner, 2017; Jacobides et al., 2018) theorizes how firms create and capture value through orchestrating multi-actor configurations. Network orchestration research (Dhanaraj & Parkhe, 2006) examines how hub firms manage innovation networks.

Graph Thinking incorporates ecosystem and orchestration perspectives but extends them by emphasizing the cognitive foundations of ecosystem leadership. Ecosystem strategy literature has focused on strategic positioning and governance mechanisms; Graph Thinking emphasizes the cognitive schema and analytical competencies that enable leaders to perceive ecosystem structures and identify intervention opportunities. It also connects ecosystem thinking more explicitly to internal organizational networks and to AI deployment challenges.

Complexity Leadership Theory

Complexity leadership theory (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007; Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2001) conceptualizes organizations as complex adaptive systems and theorizes leadership as enabling emergence rather than directing control. This tradition emphasizes adaptive capacity, distributed leadership, and the limits of hierarchical authority in complex environments.

Graph Thinking complements complexity leadership by providing conceptual tools for understanding the network structures within which adaptive dynamics occur. Complexity leadership emphasizes enabling conditions for emergence; Graph Thinking emphasizes understanding and shaping the structural topology that channels emergent behavior.

The Distinctive Contribution of Graph Thinking

What does Graph Thinking add to this rich intellectual landscape? We argue its contribution lies in five areas:

1. *First*, Graph Thinking provides an integrative framework that synthesizes insights across systems thinking, social network analysis, ecosystem strategy, and complexity leadership. Each tradition offers valuable but partial perspectives; Graph Thinking combines structural attention

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

from network analysis, dynamic sensitivity from systems thinking, inter-organizational scope from ecosystem strategy, and appreciation for emergence from complexity leadership.

2. *Second*, Graph Thinking explicitly conceptualizes network cognition as a *leadership capability* with cognitive, analytical, and behavioral dimensions. Prior traditions have developed as academic fields or analytical methodologies; Graph Thinking frames network perception and shaping as competencies that leaders can develop and that organizations can cultivate.
3. *Third*, Graph Thinking connects network structures to the specific challenges of AI deployment. While each contributing tradition predates contemporary AI developments, Graph Thinking explicitly addresses how network legibility may affect AI system effectiveness—a connection that existing frameworks do not make.
4. *Fourth*, Graph Thinking operates explicitly across levels of analysis—individual cognition, organizational structure, and ecosystem configuration—and theorizes relationships among these levels. This multi-level integration distinguishes it from traditions that focus primarily on one level.
5. *Fifth*, Graph Thinking incorporates temporal dynamics, recognizing that networks evolve continuously and that effective network cognition requires understanding trajectories, not merely snapshots. This dynamic orientation addresses limitations of static network analysis.

Definition and Dimensionality

We define Graph Thinking as a multi-dimensional leadership capability comprising:

6. *Cognitive Schema*: The mental representation of organizations and their environments as networks of nodes (actors, units, entities) connected by edges (relationships, flows, dependencies) rather than as hierarchies, sequences, or isolated units. Leaders with developed cognitive schemas automatically perceive network structures, notice path lengths and clustering patterns, and recognize when actions will propagate through connected systems.
7. *Analytical Competency*: The ability to apply network concepts—including path length, centrality, betweenness, clustering, and density—to diagnose organizational situations, identify structural problems, and evaluate intervention options. This competency includes both informal heuristic reasoning and, where appropriate, formal network analysis techniques.
8. *Behavioral Repertoire*: The capacity to take actions that deliberately shape network structures—creating or strengthening edges, protecting high-centrality nodes, reducing path lengths, increasing density where resilience matters, or reducing density where efficiency is paramount. This includes both direct structural interventions and indirect shaping through incentives, metrics, and organizational design.

These three dimensions are interrelated but conceptually distinct. A leader might possess strong cognitive schema (perceiving networks readily) but limited analytical competency (not knowing how to systematically evaluate network properties). Another might possess analytical competency (able to conduct network analysis when prompted) but weak cognitive schema (not spontaneously perceiving situations in network terms). Behavioral repertoire requires both cognitive and analytical foundations but adds action-oriented capabilities.

Multi-Level Framework

Graph Thinking manifests at multiple organizational levels, with distinct implications at each:

- *Individual Level*: At the individual level, Graph Thinking is a cognitive capability that varies across leaders. Some leaders perceive organizational networks readily; others default to hierarchical or sequential mental models. Individual Graph Thinking can be developed through education, experience, and deliberate practice. Assessment might examine how leaders represent organizational situations, whether they spontaneously identify network properties, and whether they consider propagating effects across network paths.
- *Team and Unit Level*: At intermediate levels, Graph Thinking manifests as shared mental models among leadership teams. When leadership teams collectively perceive their organization in network terms, they communicate more effectively about structural issues and coordinate

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

interventions more successfully. Team-level Graph Thinking may exceed individual capabilities through complementary perspectives and collective sensemaking.

- *Organizational Level*: At the organizational level, Graph Thinking manifests as capabilities embedded in routines, systems, and culture. Organizations may possess network mapping capabilities, information systems that surface network properties, or cultural norms that encourage network-oriented analysis. Organizational-level Graph Thinking can persist beyond individual leaders and provides infrastructure that supports individual and team cognition.
- *Ecosystem Level*: At the ecosystem level, Graph Thinking addresses inter-organizational networks—supply chains, alliance portfolios, platform ecosystems, industry value networks. This level requires understanding not only the organization's internal networks but its position within and relationships across broader configurations of external actors.

These levels interact dynamically. Individual leaders with strong Graph Thinking may struggle to implement network-oriented strategies in organizations lacking supportive capabilities. Organizations with sophisticated network analysis systems may underutilize them if leaders lack cognitive schema to interpret and act upon network information. Effective Graph Thinking requires alignment across levels.

Temporal Dynamics: Networks as Evolving Structures

A critical extension beyond traditional network analysis involves recognizing that organizational networks are not static structures but continuously evolving configurations. Effective Graph Thinking requires understanding network *trajectories*—how structures change over time—not merely network *snapshots*.

Network Evolution Patterns: Organizational networks evolve through several mechanisms (Ahuja et al., 2012). *Preferential attachment* occurs when well-connected nodes attract additional connections, creating increasingly centralized structures over time. *Homophily* leads similar nodes to connect more readily, potentially creating clustered silos. *Triadic closure* tends to connect nodes that share mutual connections, increasing density within clusters. *Decay* occurs as relationships weaken without maintenance, reducing connectivity over time.

Understanding these evolutionary dynamics enables leaders to anticipate how current network structures will evolve and to intervene proactively rather than reactively. A leader observing preferential attachment concentrating connections in a single node might anticipate fragility and deliberately distribute connections before that node becomes a critical single point of failure.

Temporal Phases in Network Development: Networks often exhibit distinct developmental phases. New organizations may feature dense, overlapping networks as founding members interact broadly. As organizations grow, functional differentiation creates clustered structures with sparser inter-cluster connections. Mature organizations may ossify into stable but rigid network configurations. Organizational crises or transformations may disrupt existing networks and create opportunities for restructuring.

Graph Thinking includes recognizing which developmental phase characterizes current network structures and what interventions are appropriate for each phase. Interventions effective in early-stage dense networks may prove counterproductive in mature clustered networks.

Velocity and Volatility: Networks vary not only in structure but in the rate and predictability of structural change. Some organizational networks evolve slowly and predictably; others change rapidly and unpredictably. Graph Thinking includes assessing network velocity (rate of change) and volatility (predictability of change) and adjusting analytical approaches accordingly. Static network maps may suffice for stable networks; rapidly evolving networks require continuous monitoring and dynamic analysis.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

Network Properties as Diagnostic Instruments

Foundational Concepts

Network science offers conceptual tools that function as diagnostic instruments for organizational analysis. While these concepts have technical definitions, they also provide intuitive heuristics for practical reasoning.

Path Length: Path length measures the number of steps required for information, resources, or influence to travel between two nodes. In organizational contexts, path length determines how quickly information propagates, how directly customer feedback reaches decision-makers, and how many handoffs occur between problem identification and resolution. Milgram's (1967) research on social networks demonstrated surprisingly short average path lengths—the "small world" phenomenon—but organizational structures often create longer paths through hierarchical channeling and functional silos.

Centrality: Centrality measures capture the relative importance of nodes within network structures. Degree centrality counts direct connections; nodes with high degree interact with many others. Eigenvector centrality weights connections by the centrality of connected nodes—connecting to well-connected others confers greater centrality than connecting to peripheral nodes. In organizations, high-centrality individuals or units interact broadly, often serving as communication hubs or coordination points.

Betweenness: Betweenness centrality, introduced by Freeman (1977), measures how frequently a node lies on the shortest path between other nodes. High-betweenness nodes serve as bridges or brokers; information flowing between distinct parts of the network passes through them. Burt's (2004) research on "structural holes" demonstrated that individuals bridging otherwise disconnected groups capture disproportionate information and influence advantages. Removing high-betweenness nodes can fragment networks, dramatically increasing path lengths or eliminating paths entirely.

Clustering: The clustering coefficient measures the degree to which nodes tend to cluster together—whether a node's connections are also connected to each other (Watts & Strogatz, 1998). High clustering within groups combined with sparse connections between groups indicates siloed structures. Organizational silos represent high internal clustering with low external connection—information flows freely within the silo but poorly across silo boundaries.

Density: Network density describes the ratio of actual connections to possible connections. Dense networks feature redundant paths and are typically more resilient—if one connection fails, alternatives exist. Sparse networks may be more efficient but more fragile. The efficiency-resilience tradeoff is a fundamental tension in network design (Sheffi, 2015).

Structural Holes: Burt's (1992, 2004) concept of structural holes identifies gaps between clusters in a network. Actors positioned to bridge structural holes—connecting otherwise disconnected clusters—gain information and control advantages. Organizations may deliberately create bridging roles to span structural holes, or may suffer when structural holes persist without bridges.

Illustrative Thought Experiments Across Diverse Contexts

The following cases are *thought experiments*—stylized illustrations constructed to demonstrate how network concepts illuminate organizational dynamics. They span diverse organizational contexts to illustrate broad applicability. Their purpose is pedagogical: demonstrating analytical application rather than providing empirical evidence.

Thought Experiment One: Edge Quality in Healthcare Delivery

Consider a regional hospital system facing persistent performance challenges. Emergency Department (ED) performance is measured on "door-to-discharge time." Inpatient Units are measured on "bed occupancy rate." Both metrics appear rational when considered in isolation.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

Examine the *edge*—the connection between ED and Inpatient. The ED requires available beds upstairs to admit patients who need hospitalization. Inpatient Units, optimized for high occupancy, rarely have beds immediately available. Consequently, admitted patients wait extended periods in the ED, occupying beds needed for new emergency arrivals.

From the ED perspective, Inpatient Units impede patient flow. From the Inpatient perspective, the ED creates pressure without regard for ward capacity. The edge between these units has become adversarial. In network terms, the clustering coefficient between ED and Inpatient has dropped—despite being adjacent in the patient care process, they function as disconnected clusters, each optimizing locally while creating systemic dysfunction.

This thought experiment illustrates a pattern documented in healthcare operations research: how misaligned metrics create adversarial interdependencies (KC & Terwiesch, 2009). The insight generalizes beyond healthcare: organizations often suffer not from inadequate nodes (people, units, resources) but from poorly designed edges (relationships, metrics, information flows, incentives). Linear thinking focuses on node-level interventions—more capacity, better training. Graph Thinking examines edge quality, asking how connections between nodes shape behavior and outcomes.

A Graph Thinking intervention would redesign the edge: creating shared metrics that both units jointly own (such as "admitted patient waiting time"), establishing joint accountability, and creating collaborative rather than adversarial relationships. This changes network structure without adding nodes.

Thought Experiment Two: Betweenness and Organizational Fragility

Consider a mid-sized professional services firm where an individual—call them Dr. Chen—occupies an unusual network position. Dr. Chen's formal position suggests mid-level importance, but their network position is extraordinary. Dr. Chen bridges two organizational clusters—Client Services and Technology—that otherwise struggle to communicate effectively. Client Services staff speak in business terms; Technology staff speak in technical terms. Dr. Chen translates between them, having trained in both domains.

Map the organization's information network and Dr. Chen's betweenness centrality is striking—a disproportionate share of shortest paths between Client Services and Technology pass through this single node. This structural position creates value far exceeding what Dr. Chen's title or salary might suggest.

This thought experiment illustrates a pattern documented in social network research on brokerage (Burt, 2004; Cross & Parker, 2004). Individuals with high betweenness centrality create disproportionate value through bridging otherwise disconnected clusters. However, their importance is often invisible to formal organizational analysis.

The risk is structural fragility. If Dr. Chen departs, path length between Client Services and Technology increases dramatically—or the path may cease to exist entirely. The savings from eliminating Dr. Chen's position might cost far more in failed projects, miscommunication, and organizational dysfunction.

Graph Thinking reveals that some organizational members create value primarily through network position rather than individual output. Traditional analysis sees a mid-level employee; Graph Thinking sees a critical bridge. This distinction has implications for talent identification, compensation, retention—and for understanding why some organizational changes produce effects vastly disproportionate to their apparent scale.

A proactive Graph Thinking response involves creating redundant bridges—developing additional individuals with cross-domain competence, establishing formal coordination mechanisms, or restructuring to reduce the structural hole that Dr. Chen currently spans. This reduces fragility while preserving bridging capacity.

Thought Experiment Three: Path Length and Blast Radius in Manufacturing

Consider a manufacturing company reducing field service travel budgets by 40%. The decision appears straightforward: field engineers will visit customer sites less frequently, conducting more remote diagnostics instead.

Trace the paths propagating from this decision. Field engineers visit customers half as often. They miss early warning signs of equipment problems. Minor issues progress to serious failures. Customer downtime increases. Satisfaction scores decline. Renewal rates drop as customers question service contract value. Sales representatives, whose compensation depends on renewals, see income fall. Top performers leave for competitors. Pipeline weakens. Revenue growth stalls.

Twelve months later, leadership diagnoses revenue problems without connecting them to the travel budget decision. That was "just operational"—a minor cost adjustment in a different budget category.

This thought experiment illustrates a pattern documented in systems dynamics research on policy resistance (Sterman, 2000): interventions produce delayed, distant, and counterintuitive effects that linear analysis fails to anticipate. Every decision has a *blast radius* that propagates through organizational networks. Linear leaders evaluate decisions based on immediate, direct effects. Graph Thinking leaders trace paths, asking how decisions will affect nodes two, three, or six steps away.

The principle extends broadly: modest cost reductions can trigger strategic consequences many times their magnitude when effects propagate through connected systems. Graph Thinking involves mapping likely propagation paths before decisions are finalized.

Thought Experiment Four: Network Density in a Nonprofit Coalition

Consider a regional nonprofit coalition coordinating services across 40 member organizations serving homeless populations. The coalition emerged organically, with organizations joining through personal relationships among executive directors. The resulting network is sparse—each organization connects to only 2-3 others on average—and clustered by service type (housing providers connect mostly to other housing providers; mental health providers connect mostly to other mental health providers).

When a client needs multiple services—housing, mental health support, job training, healthcare—they must navigate across clusters with few bridging connections. Service coordination is poor. Clients fall through gaps. Outcomes suffer despite substantial collective resources.

A Graph Thinking analysis reveals that the network's sparse, clustered structure impedes the cross-service coordination essential to the coalition's mission. The solution is not adding more member organizations (nodes) but increasing connection density across clusters (edges). This might involve creating cross-functional case coordination roles, establishing regular inter-cluster meetings, developing shared client information systems, or co-locating services to encourage informal connection.

This thought experiment illustrates how Graph Thinking applies to nonprofit and public sector contexts, not merely commercial enterprises. Network structure shapes organizational performance across sectors, though the specific performance dimensions vary.

Thought Experiment Five: Ecosystem Position in a Small Manufacturing Firm

Consider a small precision manufacturing firm (150 employees) supplying components to automotive and aerospace industries. The firm occupies a specific position within broader supply chain networks—connected to tier-one suppliers who connect to original equipment manufacturers.

Graph Thinking at the ecosystem level reveals several strategic considerations. The firm's low degree centrality (few direct customers) creates revenue concentration risk. Its position two steps from OEMs means limited visibility into end-market dynamics. Its high replaceability (other firms could provide similar components) weakens bargaining position.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

However, the same analysis reveals opportunities. The firm might increase centrality by developing relationships with additional tier-one suppliers. It might reduce path length to OEMs by developing capabilities that enable direct supply relationships. It might reduce replaceability by developing specialized capabilities that create structural holes—needs that only this firm can fill.

This thought experiment illustrates how Graph Thinking applies to small and medium enterprises, not merely large corporations. Smaller firms may lack resources for formal network analysis but can apply network concepts heuristically to understand ecosystem position and identify strategic options.

Power, Politics, and the Contested Nature of Network Legibility

Network Mapping as Political Act

Making organizational networks visible is not a neutral technical exercise. Network analysis reveals information that actors may prefer to keep hidden, redistributes power by changing information asymmetries, and challenges existing hierarchies by surfacing alternative influence structures (Krackhardt, 1990). Understanding the political dimensions of network legibility is essential for effective Graph Thinking implementation.

Revealing Hidden Power: Formal organization charts depict authority as flowing through hierarchical channels. Actual influence networks often differ substantially (Krackhardt, 1990). Network mapping may reveal that formal leaders have less influence than network analysis suggests, that informal leaders exercise substantial power without formal authority, or that certain individuals or coalitions control information flows strategically. Those whose formal authority exceeds their network influence may resist mapping initiatives that expose this gap.

Information Asymmetry as Power Source: Some actors derive power precisely from controlling information flows across structural holes (Burt, 2004). Brokers who profit from spanning disconnected clusters may resist transparency that enables others to bridge the same gaps. Network mapping threatens the information advantages that structural position confers.

Surveillance Concerns: Comprehensive network mapping raises legitimate concerns about organizational surveillance. Employees may resist providing network information, fearing it will be used for purposes beyond stated intentions—identifying "troublemakers," monitoring informal relationships, or targeting peripheral employees for layoffs. Even well-intentioned mapping initiatives may generate suspicion and resistance.

Distortion and Gaming: When actors know their network positions will be evaluated, they may strategically distort the information they provide. Individuals may overstate connections to appear more central, understate connections to avoid scrutiny, or strategically shape their networks to optimize measured properties rather than organizational effectiveness (Brass & Burkhardt, 1993). Network maps based on self-reported data may reflect strategic presentation rather than actual structure.

Navigating Political Dynamics

Effective Graph Thinking implementation requires strategies for navigating these political dynamics:

Transparency About Purpose: Clearly communicating the purpose of network mapping—and the specific uses to which network data will and will not be put—can reduce resistance. Commitments about data use should be specific, credible, and honored.

Participation and Voice: Involving organizational members in designing and interpreting network analysis—rather than imposing analysis from above—can increase legitimacy and reduce resistance. Participatory approaches may also surface insights that external analysts would miss.

Anonymization Where Appropriate: For some purposes, anonymized network analysis—revealing structural properties without identifying specific individuals—may achieve analytical objectives while reducing privacy and surveillance concerns.

Gradual Implementation: Beginning with less sensitive network mapping (information flows about work tasks) before more sensitive mapping (influence relationships) can build trust and demonstrate value before encountering greatest resistance.

Acknowledging Limits: Recognizing that some network dimensions cannot or should not be fully mapped—and designing interventions that work with partial information—may be more realistic than pursuing comprehensive legibility.

Power Dynamics in Network Intervention

Beyond mapping, network interventions themselves involve power dynamics. Creating new connections may threaten those whose power derives from brokerage positions. Reducing path length may challenge hierarchical control. Increasing density may dilute the influence of currently central actors.

Effective Graph Thinking includes anticipating these political effects and designing interventions that either align with existing power structures, explicitly challenge them with adequate power base, or create coalitions that enable structural change despite resistance.

This political sophistication distinguishes mature Graph Thinking from naive technical application. Network analysis absent political awareness may produce technically elegant recommendations that prove organizationally infeasible.

Graph-Based Strategy and AI: Contingent Relationships

Platform Companies and Network Advantages

The competitive success of digital platform companies provides evidence for the strategic value of network-oriented thinking. Amazon, Netflix, Meta, and Google did not merely apply network analysis as a technique; they built business models around the logic of graphs.

Amazon created what might be termed a *purchase graph*—representing what customers buy together, how preferences cluster, and how purchase patterns evolve. This enabled recommendation engines of substantial sophistication and created data network effects that compound over time. Netflix developed a *content graph* linking viewing preferences, engagement patterns, and contextual factors—informing both personalization and content investment (Gomez-Uribe & Hunt, 2015). Meta built a *social graph* representing human relationships at unprecedented scale. Google's *search graph*—the network of web pages connected through hyperlinks—enabled the PageRank algorithm that transformed information retrieval (Brin & Page, 1998).

Van Alstyne et al. (2016) argued that platform companies leveraging network structures gain competitive advantages over traditional pipeline businesses relying on linear value creation. The platform strategy literature has documented these advantages extensively (Parker et al., 2016; Cusumano et al., 2019).

Alternative Explanations for AI Leadership

A striking pattern is that companies with graph-based business models also lead in artificial intelligence deployment. However, the causal interpretation of this correlation requires careful consideration. Several alternative explanations exist:

- *Capital Concentration*: These companies possess unprecedented financial resources enabling R&D investment at scales others cannot match. Their AI leadership may reflect capital advantages rather than structural factors.
- *Talent Agglomeration*: They recruit disproportionate shares of AI research talent through compensation, prestige, and interesting problems. Talent concentration may drive AI outcomes independent of business model structure.
- *Data Scale*: Their operations generate training data volumes that others cannot replicate. Data advantages may matter more than whether data is specifically "graph-structured."

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

- *Organizational Youth*: As relatively young organizations, they lack legacy systems and entrenched processes that impede AI adoption in traditional firms. Age and flexibility may matter more than network orientation.
- *Regulatory Positioning*: They have successfully navigated or shaped regulatory environments in ways that protect advantages. Regulatory strategy may enable rather than follow from graph-based models.

These alternatives are not mutually exclusive with the graph-based explanation. Platform companies' AI leadership likely reflects multiple factors operating simultaneously. The most defensible claim is that graph-based business models are *one contributing factor among several*—companies that understood network dynamics developed infrastructure and mental models that proved valuable when AI capabilities advanced, but this was neither sufficient nor necessary for AI leadership.

The Relationship Between Network Legibility and AI Deployment

We argue that explicit, legible network structures create favorable conditions for certain types of AI deployment—but this relationship is contingent rather than universal.

The Mechanism: Human employees navigate unmapped organizational complexity through tacit knowledge and relationship capital accumulated over time. They learn unstated dependencies, develop intuition about propagating effects, and identify bridge nodes informally. This compensatory capacity is remarkable and typically underappreciated—the formal organization chart captures only a fraction of how work actually happens.

Many AI systems—particularly those designed to automate decisions, coordinate activities, or optimize across organizational boundaries—function more effectively when context is explicit. An AI system optimizing supply chain decisions benefits from explicit representation of how inventory levels affect cash flow, constrain marketing spending, affect demand generation, and feed back to inventory requirements. When such dependencies are implicit in human knowledge rather than explicit in accessible data structures, AI systems may make locally optimal decisions that produce unintended systemic effects.

Contingencies and Qualifications: This argument requires several qualifications:

First, AI systems vary enormously. The relationship between network legibility and effectiveness differs across rule-based systems, statistical machine learning models, large language models, and reinforcement learning agents. Large language models, in particular, demonstrate substantial capacity for inferring context, navigating ambiguity, and operating with incomplete information. The claim that AI systems "require" explicit network structures may be overstated for these systems.

Second, many successful AI deployments operate on unstructured data—documents, conversations, images—without requiring explicit graph structures. The network legibility argument applies most strongly to AI applications that coordinate across organizational boundaries, optimize interdependent processes, or automate decisions with systemic implications.

Third, the direction of adaptation is not predetermined. Organizations might adapt to AI requirements by making networks more legible, but AI systems might also be designed to accommodate organizational complexity. Both adaptation paths are possible; which predominates is an empirical and design question.

Fourth, the relationship may be enabling rather than requiring. Network legibility may make certain AI applications more effective or easier to implement, without being strictly necessary. Organizations with less explicit network structures may still deploy AI successfully through other means—extensive human oversight, narrow application scope, or AI systems designed for ambiguity.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

Strategic Implications

Despite these qualifications, we suggest that network legibility represents a strategic investment that pays dividends across multiple outcomes, including but not limited to AI deployment:

- Organizations that understand their internal networks can diagnose structural problems, identify high-value individuals, and design more effective interventions—independent of AI considerations.
- Organizations that understand their ecosystem positions can navigate partnerships more strategically, identify opportunities and vulnerabilities, and adapt to ecosystem changes—again independent of AI.
- To the extent that AI deployment does benefit from network legibility, organizations that have invested in mapping and understanding their networks will be better positioned—though not uniquely positioned—for effective AI integration.

The argument is not that Graph Thinking is necessary only for AI, or that AI requires Graph Thinking. Rather, network cognition creates strategic value across multiple dimensions, and the increasing importance of AI amplifies this value in specific ways for specific applications.

Networks Beyond Organizational Boundaries

The Extended Enterprise

Sophisticated Graph Thinking recognizes that organizational boundaries are, to significant degree, analytical conveniences rather than fundamental realities (Santos & Eisenhardt, 2005). The networks determining organizational performance extend into ecosystems of suppliers, distributors, partners, complementors, and competitors.

Amazon's network extends to millions of third-party sellers, logistics partners, AWS customers, and Alexa developers. Apple's success depends on application developers, content providers, accessory manufacturers, and retail partners. Walmart's competitiveness rests on supplier networks and coordinating information systems. In each case, the relevant network for strategic analysis extends beyond legal boundaries (Adner, 2017).

Jacobides et al. (2018) theorized how ecosystem structures shape competitive dynamics and value appropriation. Firms occupy positions within ecosystem architectures that constrain and enable strategic options. Graph Thinking at the ecosystem level involves understanding these positional dynamics—which partners have high betweenness in the ecosystem graph, where dependencies create power asymmetries, and how ecosystem structure might evolve.

Network Architecture and Strategic Resilience

Network structure involves fundamental tradeoffs between efficiency and resilience. Consider an automotive manufacturer consolidating its supplier base from 400 suppliers to 200, extracting price concessions from larger-volume relationships.

In network terms, density drops substantially. Multiple alternative paths previously existed to source most components; now single suppliers provide each critical component. Betweenness centrality of remaining suppliers increases—they sit on critical paths with few alternatives.

Sheffi (2015) documented how sparse supply networks, while efficient under normal conditions, prove fragile under disruption. When a key node fails, sparse networks offer no redundancy. Competitors with denser networks—more edges, more alternative paths—route around disruptions more effectively.

This illustrates a fundamental tension in network design. Dense networks with redundant connections are less efficient—maintaining more relationships costs more—but more resilient to disruption. Sparse networks are efficient until critical nodes fail. The appropriate balance depends on strategic context, risk tolerance, and environmental volatility—but the choice should be deliberate rather than inadvertent.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

Ecosystem Dynamics and Temporal Considerations

Ecosystem networks are not static configurations but evolving structures shaped by entry, exit, relationship formation, and relationship dissolution. Effective ecosystem-level Graph Thinking requires understanding:

Entry and Exit Dynamics: Who is entering the ecosystem? Whose position is weakening? How do new entrants alter existing network structures? Platform companies' ecosystem strategies often involve deliberately shaping entry—lowering barriers for complementors who enhance platform value, raising barriers for potential competitors.

Relationship Trajectories: How are inter-firm relationships evolving? Which partnerships are strengthening, which are weakening? Early detection of relationship decay may enable intervention before critical edges disappear.

Structural Evolution: How is overall ecosystem structure changing? Is the ecosystem centralizing around dominant platforms or fragmenting into competing coalitions? Understanding structural trajectory enables positioning for future configurations rather than optimizing for current structures that may soon change.

Implications for Practice

Developing Graph Thinking Capabilities: A Detailed Framework

For leaders and organizations seeking to develop Graph Thinking capabilities, we offer a structured developmental framework organized by dimension and level.

Cognitive Schema Development

Individual Practices:

- *Network Journaling*: When encountering organizational situations, explicitly map the relevant nodes and edges. Who are the key actors? What connects them? What is the path length between key entities? Regular practice builds automatic network perception.
- *Retrospective Network Analysis*: After project completion or significant decisions, map how information, influence, and effects flowed through networks. Did outcomes propagate as expected? What network properties shaped results?
- *Comparative Representation*: When analyzing situations, deliberately construct multiple representations—hierarchical, sequential, and networked—and compare what each reveals and obscures.
- *Temporal Mapping*: Track how networks evolve over time. How has the network changed since last quarter? Which relationships have strengthened or weakened? Building temporal awareness prevents static network perception.

Team Practices:

- *Collective Mapping Exercises*: Leadership teams can build shared network mental models through collaborative mapping—each member contributing their network perception and comparing where perspectives converge and diverge.
- *Network-Oriented Debriefs*: Structure post-decision reviews around network questions: How did this decision propagate? Which network paths carried effects? What network properties did we fail to anticipate?

Analytical Competency Development

Foundational Knowledge:

- Develop familiarity with core network concepts: path length, centrality (degree, eigenvector, betweenness), clustering, density, structural holes. Cross and Parker (2004) offer accessible introduction for practitioners.
- Understand basic network visualization—how to read network diagrams and what structural properties are visible versus requiring calculation.

- Learn to interpret common network metrics—what constitutes "high" centrality in organizational contexts, how to identify concerning structural properties.

Practical Skills:

- Master basic network mapping techniques: survey instruments for identifying relationships, interview protocols for surfacing informal networks, observation methods for tracking actual (versus reported) interactions.
- Develop capacity to commission and interpret formal network analysis when appropriate—knowing when to bring in specialists and how to translate technical findings into strategic implications.
- Practice rapid heuristic network assessment—developing intuitive capacity to estimate network properties without formal analysis.

Advanced Capabilities:

- Understand network dynamics and evolution—how networks change over time and what forces drive structural change.
- Develop capacity to model network interventions—anticipating how proposed changes will propagate through network structures.
- Build cross-level network thinking—connecting individual network positions to organizational structures to ecosystem configurations.

Behavioral Repertoire Development

Direct Structural Interventions:

- *Edge Creation*: Creating new connections—introducing individuals who should collaborate, establishing formal coordination mechanisms between units, building relationships with ecosystem partners.
- *Edge Strengthening*: Intensifying existing connections—increasing interaction frequency, deepening information sharing, building stronger collaborative relationships.
- *Node Protection*: Safeguarding high-value network positions—retaining high-betweenness individuals, maintaining central coordination roles, protecting critical bridges.
- *Redundancy Creation*: Building alternative paths—developing multiple individuals with bridging capacity, establishing backup coordination mechanisms, cultivating alternative supplier relationships.

Indirect Structural Shaping:

- *Metric Design*: Creating measurement systems that encourage desired network structures—shared metrics that require cross-boundary collaboration, recognition systems that reward bridging behavior.
- *Incentive Alignment*: Designing compensation and advancement systems that reward network contribution—not merely individual output but network position and relationship building.
- *Space and Technology Design*: Shaping physical and digital environments that encourage desired connection patterns—co-location strategies, collaboration platform design, meeting structures.
- *Hiring and Development*: Selecting and developing individuals with attention to network contribution—hiring for bridging potential, developing cross-functional capabilities.

Organizational Capability Building

Organizations can develop collective Graph Thinking capabilities through:

Network Mapping Infrastructure:

- Conduct periodic organizational network analysis mapping informal networks—who communicates with whom, who goes to whom for advice, who collaborates on projects.
- Establish ongoing network monitoring for critical organizational processes—tracking how information flows, where bottlenecks emerge, which relationships weaken over time.
- Develop visualization capabilities that make network structures visible and intuitive to non-specialists.

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

- Create baseline network maps and track changes over time to understand network dynamics, not merely static structure.

Information Systems:

- Integrate network awareness into existing information systems—collaboration platforms that surface connection patterns, project management systems that track relationship density, communication tools that visualize information flow.
- Develop dashboards that surface network health indicators—are critical bridges maintained? Are silos emerging? Is density increasing or decreasing in key areas?
- Create alerting systems for network changes that warrant attention—sudden drops in communication density, emergence of isolated clusters, departure of high-betweenness individuals.

Cultural Norms:

- Establish cultural expectations for boundary spanning—making cross-unit collaboration normative rather than exceptional.
- Recognize and celebrate network contribution—not merely individual achievement but bridging, connecting, and relationship building.
- Create psychological safety for network transparency—reducing fear that network mapping will be used punitively.

Hiring, Development, and Talent Management:

- Include network orientation in hiring criteria—assessing candidates' propensity to perceive network structures and build bridging relationships.
- Develop network capabilities through training—both conceptual frameworks and practical mapping skills.
- Consider network position in talent management—identifying high-value network roles, planning succession for critical bridges, developing redundancy for fragile positions.

AI Deployment Considerations

For organizations integrating AI systems, we offer qualified guidance:

Consider network legibility as one factor among many in AI deployment strategy. For AI applications that span organizational boundaries or affect interdependent processes, explicit network understanding may improve outcomes. For narrow, bounded applications, network legibility may matter less.

Document dependencies and relationships particularly around processes where AI will play a role. Making explicit what is currently tacit—how decisions in one area affect outcomes in others, how information flows across boundaries—creates context that may benefit both AI systems and human understanding.

Map propagation paths for AI decisions: Before deploying AI systems that make or inform significant decisions, trace how those decisions will propagate through organizational networks. What nodes are affected? Through what paths? What feedback loops might emerge?

Maintain realistic expectations about what network legibility enables. Explicit network maps are not sufficient for effective AI deployment, nor are they strictly necessary for all applications. They represent one element of organizational preparation among many.

Preserve space for human judgment and tacit knowledge. The goal is not to reduce organizations to fully explicit systems but to make visible what benefits from visibility while preserving human adaptability and experiential wisdom.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

Measurement Approaches for Empirical Research

Operationalizing Graph Thinking

Future empirical research requires measurement approaches for Graph Thinking dimensions. While full psychometric development is beyond this article's scope, we outline potential operationalization strategies to guide future research.

Cognitive Schema Measurement

Scenario-Based Assessment: Present organizational scenarios and assess how respondents represent them. Do they spontaneously identify network elements (nodes, edges, paths)? Do they recognize when actions will propagate through connected systems? Do they identify structural properties (clustering, centrality) without prompting?

Example Item Structure: Present a brief organizational scenario, then ask open-ended questions: "What are the key elements of this situation?" "How might the proposed change affect other parts of the organization?" Code responses for presence/absence of network concepts, sophistication of network reasoning, and consideration of indirect effects.

Problem Representation Tasks: Present organizational problems and ask respondents to represent them visually or describe their structure. Assess whether representations feature network elements versus hierarchical or sequential structures.

Recognition Measures: Present diagrams representing organizational structures in network, hierarchical, and sequential forms. Assess which representations respondents find most intuitive, which they select when representing their own organization, and how quickly they process network versus alternative representations.

Analytical Competency Measurement

Concept Application Assessment: Present network diagrams or descriptions and assess ability to identify structural properties—high-centrality nodes, structural holes, clustering patterns—and to predict how changes would affect network function.

Example Item Structure: Present a network diagram representing an organizational communication structure. Ask: "Which individual has highest betweenness centrality?" "What would happen if this person left?" "Which changes would most effectively connect these two clusters?"

Vocabulary and Comprehension: Assess familiarity with network concepts through definition recognition, concept application, and mistake detection in network reasoning.

Applied Analysis Tasks: Present organizational data and assess ability to derive network insights—identifying concerning structures, recommending interventions, predicting effects.

Behavioral Repertoire Measurement

Intervention Generation: Present organizational network challenges and assess the range and quality of proposed interventions. Does the respondent generate multiple intervention types? Do interventions address structural properties? Are potential consequences considered?

Behavioral Self-Report: Survey items assessing frequency of network-oriented behaviors: "How often do you introduce colleagues who should collaborate?" "How often do you consider network effects when making decisions?" "How often do you deliberately build relationships across organizational boundaries?"

360-Degree Assessment: Collect network-oriented behavioral ratings from supervisors, peers, and subordinates: "This leader effectively connects people across organizational boundaries." "This leader considers how decisions will affect interconnected parts of the organization."

Preprints.org (www.preprints.org) | NOT PEER-REVIEWED | Posted: 3 March 2026 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

Behavioral Observation: In simulation or real-world settings, observe network-oriented behaviors—relationship building, bridging, structural intervention—and code for frequency and effectiveness.

Validity Considerations

Measurement development should address:

- *Content Validity*: Do measures comprehensively capture the three Graph Thinking dimensions as conceptualized? Expert review of items against dimensional definitions can assess coverage.
- *Construct Validity*: Do measures correlate with theoretically related constructs (systems thinking, social intelligence) while demonstrating distinctiveness? Discriminant validity from general cognitive ability is particularly important.
- *Criterion Validity*: Do measures predict outcomes that Graph Thinking should theoretically affect—network mapping accuracy, intervention effectiveness, decision quality in networked contexts?
- *Temporal Stability*: How stable are Graph Thinking capabilities over time? What is the appropriate test-retest interval for assessing reliability?

Organizational-Level Measurement

Measuring organizational Graph Thinking capability requires attention to:

- *Capability Inventories*: Assessing presence and sophistication of network mapping routines, network-oriented information systems, and relevant cultural norms.
- *Process Audits*: Examining whether and how network considerations enter strategic planning, talent management, organizational design, and other key processes.
- *Outcome Indicators*: Measuring network-related outcomes—structural hole spanning, cross-unit collaboration frequency, network adaptation speed—as indirect capability indicators.

Boundary Conditions and Limitations

When Graph Thinking Matters Most

Graph Thinking likely provides greatest value in contexts characterized by:

- *High Interdependence*: When organizational units, activities, or entities are tightly coupled—when actions in one area substantially affect outcomes in others—network structures mediate those effects. In loosely coupled organizations where units operate independently, network analysis may add less value.
- *Complexity and Scale*: Network analysis becomes more valuable as the number of nodes and edges increases beyond what intuition can track. In small, simple organizations where leaders can directly observe all relationships, formal network analysis may be unnecessary.
- *Dynamic Environments*: When networks are evolving—new connections forming, existing connections changing—understanding network dynamics becomes strategically important. In stable environments with unchanging relationship patterns, network analysis may be less urgent.
- *Cross-Boundary Coordination*: When value creation requires coordination across organizational boundaries—functional silos, organizational units, or ecosystem partners—network structure shapes coordination effectiveness.
- *AI Integration Scope*: When AI deployment spans organizational boundaries, affects interdependent processes, or involves autonomous decision-making with systemic implications, network legibility may be particularly valuable.

When Graph Thinking May Be Less Valuable

Conversely, Graph Thinking may add limited value in contexts characterized by:

- *Genuine Independence*: When organizational activities are truly independent—when actions in one area do not substantially affect others—network analysis offers limited insight.
- *Simple Structures*: In small organizations with simple, well-understood structures, elaborate network analysis may overcomplicate what is intuitively clear.
- *Stability and Predictability*: In highly stable environments with unchanging relationship patterns, the investment in network mapping may not justify itself.
- *Narrow AI Deployment*: When AI applications are limited to narrow, bounded tasks without systemic implications, network legibility may matter less.

Potential Costs and Risks

Network legibility efforts involve costs and potential risks that warrant acknowledgment:

- *Resource Requirements*: Comprehensive network mapping requires substantial investment—surveys, interviews, data collection, analysis, and ongoing maintenance. For organizations with limited resources, this investment may compete with other priorities.
- *Political Dynamics*: As discussed extensively above, making networks visible is politically contested. Mapping initiatives may face resistance, gaming, or strategic misrepresentation.
- *Dynamic Obsolescence*: Organizational networks evolve continuously. Maps capture snapshots that may be outdated before they are complete. Organizations must invest in ongoing updating rather than one-time mapping.
- *Limits of Legibility*: As Scott (1998) argued in the context of state administration, efforts to make complex systems legible for control can destroy the very complexity that enables systems to function. Informal networks may derive value from their tacit, emergent qualities. Excessive formalization might ossify what should remain fluid or create surveillance concerns that undermine the trust networks require.
- *False Precision*: Network metrics provide quantitative summaries that may suggest greater precision than warranted. Betweenness centrality, for instance, depends on how network boundaries are drawn and which relationships are measured. Overconfidence in network metrics may mislead as readily as ignorance of network structure.

The Value of Tacit Knowledge

The manuscript has emphasized making implicit knowledge explicit for AI system benefit. However, tacit knowledge—the accumulated, experiential, difficult-to-articulate understanding that skilled practitioners develop—has irreducible value that explicit documentation cannot fully capture (Nonaka, 1994; Polanyi, 1966).

Experienced employees navigate organizational networks through intuition developed over years of interaction. They know which formal processes to follow and which to circumvent. They understand unwritten rules, interpersonal dynamics, and contextual nuances that no map can capture. This tacit knowledge enables adaptation, improvisation, and responsiveness that explicit systems cannot replicate.

Graph Thinking should complement rather than replace tacit knowledge. The goal is not to eliminate human judgment but to provide frameworks that enhance it—making visible certain patterns that intuition might miss while preserving space for the experiential knowledge that explicit systems cannot capture.

Discussion

Contributions to Theory

This article makes several contributions to strategic management theory:

1. *First*, we clarify the distinctive contribution of network cognition relative to adjacent constructs—systems thinking, social network analysis, ecosystem strategy, and complexity leadership. Graph Thinking synthesizes these traditions while extending them to address AI

deployment challenges and temporal network dynamics. This synthesis is itself a theoretical contribution, clarifying relationships among previously separate streams.

2. *Second*, we specify Graph Thinking as a multi-dimensional construct comprising cognitive, analytical, and behavioral components operating across individual, organizational, and ecosystem levels. This dimensionality and multi-level framework provides conceptual precision lacking in prior treatments.
3. *Third*, we theorize mechanisms linking network legibility to AI deployment effectiveness while acknowledging contingencies and alternative explanations. This mechanism specification moves beyond correlation to causal theorizing, while maintaining appropriate humility about what can be claimed from conceptual analysis alone.
4. *Fourth*, we explicitly address temporal dynamics, recognizing that networks evolve continuously and that effective Graph Thinking requires understanding trajectories rather than merely snapshots. This dynamic orientation extends beyond static network analysis traditions.
5. *Fifth*, we analyze the political dimensions of network legibility, recognizing that network mapping is contested and that power dynamics shape both mapping efforts and their effects. This political analysis grounds Graph Thinking in organizational realities.
6. *Sixth*, we provide measurement approaches for empirical testing, specifying potential operationalizations for each Graph Thinking dimension. This guidance enables future research to move from conceptual development to empirical validation.
7. *Seventh*, we identify boundary conditions—contexts where Graph Thinking provides most value and contexts where it may be less necessary—preventing overgeneralization and guiding appropriate application.

Limitations of This Analysis

This article has important limitations that should inform interpretation:

- *Conceptual Rather Than Empirical*: We offer conceptual development rather than empirical validation. The claims about Graph Thinking's value, its relationship to AI deployment, and its boundary conditions require empirical examination that this article does not provide. The illustrative thought experiments demonstrate application but do not constitute evidence.
- *Measurement Approaches Are Preliminary*: The measurement approaches outlined require full psychometric development and validation. They represent starting points for operationalization rather than validated instruments.
- *Normative Assumptions*: The article assumes that AI deployment is a strategic priority for many organizations and that network legibility generally benefits organizational effectiveness. Readers holding different assumptions may find the prescriptive elements less applicable.
- *Limited Empirical Base for Development Recommendations*: The developmental recommendations, while grounded in learning theory and practice, have not been empirically validated for Graph Thinking specifically.
- *Potential Bias Toward Complexity*: As with any analytical framework, Graph Thinking may encourage perceiving complexity where simpler explanations suffice. Leaders equipped with network concepts may overdiagnose network problems or propose network interventions where simpler approaches would serve.

Future Research Directions

Several research directions emerge from this analysis:

- *Empirical validation*: Does Graph Thinking, as conceptualized here, predict leadership effectiveness or organizational performance? Measurement development and empirical testing are essential next steps. Studies might examine whether Graph Thinking scores predict network mapping accuracy, intervention effectiveness, or performance in networked contexts.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

- *Development research*: Can Graph Thinking be developed through training, education, or experience? What developmental interventions prove most effective? How does development differ across the cognitive, analytical, and behavioral dimensions? Longitudinal studies tracking capability development and intervention experiments testing developmental approaches would advance this agenda.
- *AI deployment research*: Does network legibility empirically predict AI deployment success? Under what conditions? For which types of AI systems? The contingent relationship proposed here requires empirical adjudication across diverse AI applications and organizational contexts.
- *Comparative research*: How does Graph Thinking compare to other strategic frameworks in diagnostic accuracy and intervention effectiveness? When does Graph Thinking outperform alternatives, and when do simpler approaches suffice? Comparative studies can establish relative utility.
- *Political dynamics*: How do organizations navigate the political challenges of network mapping? What resistance do mapping efforts encounter, and how is it managed? What unintended consequences emerge? Qualitative research on mapping initiatives can illuminate these dynamics.
- *Temporal dynamics*: How do leaders incorporate network evolution into their thinking? What distinguishes those who effectively anticipate network trajectories from those who rely on static analysis? Research on dynamic network cognition can extend beyond snapshot-oriented approaches.
- *Cross-sector comparison*: How does Graph Thinking manifest differently across sectors—private, public, nonprofit? What contextual factors shape the value and implementation of network-oriented leadership? Comparative sector research can establish generalizability and boundary conditions.
- *Cross-cultural comparison*: How do cultural factors shape network cognition and intervention effectiveness? Do Graph Thinking dimensions manifest differently across cultural contexts? Cross-cultural research can examine universality and cultural contingency.

Conclusion

For over a century, managerial thinking has been shaped by linear metaphors—value chains, talent pipelines, career ladders, strategic roadmaps—that assume sequential causality and hierarchical control. These simplifications were never fully accurate descriptions of organizational reality, but they proved useful approximations in many contexts.

Contemporary conditions—increasing complexity, extended ecosystems, and growing AI integration—challenge these approximations. Organizations function as complex networks embedded within broader ecosystems. Decisions propagate through interconnected systems in nonlinear ways. AI systems increasingly participate in organizational operations, creating conditions that may reward explicit network understanding. Yet organizational networks are not static structures but continuously evolving configurations shaped by power dynamics, political contestation, and emergent processes that resist complete formalization.

This article has introduced Graph Thinking as a multi-dimensional leadership capability for perceiving, analyzing, and shaping organizational network structures. We position it as a synthesis of existing traditions—systems thinking, social network analysis, ecosystem strategy—that addresses the specific challenges of leading AI-enabled organizations while attending to temporal dynamics and political realities.

We have argued that Graph Thinking provides distinctive value while acknowledging substantial boundary conditions and limitations. Network cognition matters most in contexts of high interdependence, complexity, and cross-boundary coordination. It may matter less in simple, stable, loosely coupled contexts. The relationship to AI deployment is contingent rather than universal, more enabling than requiring. Network legibility efforts involve costs, political challenges, and potential unintended consequences that warrant careful consideration.

We have emphasized that tacit knowledge and human judgment retain irreplaceable value that explicit network maps cannot capture. Graph Thinking should enhance rather than replace human wisdom—making visible certain patterns while preserving space for experiential knowledge and adaptive improvisation.

The organizations likely to thrive will be those led by individuals who perceive organizational networks clearly, understand how actions propagate through connected systems, anticipate how networks will evolve, navigate the political dynamics of network intervention, and shape network structures deliberately while preserving space for human adaptability and wisdom. Graph Thinking offers conceptual tools for this work—not as a panacea, but as one valuable element in the leadership repertoire for an increasingly networked and AI-influenced organizational world.

References

Adner, R. (2017). Ecosystem as structure: An actionable construct for strategy. *Journal of Management*, *43*(1), 39–58.

Adner, R., & Helfat, C. E. (2003). Corporate effects and dynamic managerial capabilities. *Strategic Management Journal*, *24*(10), 1011–1025.

Ahuja, G., Soda, G., & Zaheer, A. (2012). The genesis and dynamics of organizational networks. *Organization Science*, *23*(2), 434–448.

Barabási, A.-L. (2016). *Network science*. Cambridge University Press.

Borgatti, S. P., & Halgin, D. S. (2011). On network theory. *Organization Science*, *22*(5), 1168–1181.

Brass, D. J., & Burkhardt, M. E. (1993). Potential power and power use: An investigation of structure and behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, *36*(3), 441–470.

Brin, S., & Page, L. (1998). The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual web search engine. *Computer Networks and ISDN Systems*, *30*(1–7), 107–117.

Burt, R. S. (1992). Structural holes: The social structure of competition. Harvard University Press.

Burt, R. S. (2004). Structural holes and good ideas. *American Journal of Sociology*, *110*(2), 349–399.

Cross, R., & Parker, A. (2004). The hidden power of social networks: Understanding how work really gets done in organizations. Harvard Business School Press.

Cusumano, M. A., Gawer, A., & Yoffie, D. B. (2019). The business of platforms: Strategy in the age of digital competition, innovation, and power. Harper Business.

Dhanaraj, C., & Parkhe, A. (2006). Orchestrating innovation networks. *Academy of Management Review*, *31*(3), 659–669.

Dyer, J. H., & Singh, H. (1998). The relational view: Cooperative strategy and sources of interorganizational competitive advantage. *Academy of Management Review*, *23*(4), 660–679.

Freeman, L. C. (1977). A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry*, *40*(1), 35–41.

Galbraith, J. R. (1974). Organization design: An information processing view. *Interfaces*, *4*(3), 28–36.

Gomez-Uribe, C. A., & Hunt, N. (2015). The Netflix recommender system: Algorithms, business value, and innovation. *ACM Transactions on Management Information Systems*, *6*(4), Article 13.

Gulati, R., Nohria, N., & Zaheer, A. (2000). Strategic networks. *Strategic Management Journal*, *21*(3), 203–215.

Jacobides, M. G., Cennamo, C., & Gawer, A. (2018). Towards a theory of ecosystems. *Strategic Management Journal*, *39*(8), 2255–2276.

KC, D., & Terwiesch, C. (2009). Impact of workload on service time and patient safety: An econometric analysis of hospital operations. *Management Science*, *55*(9), 1486–1498.

Krackhardt, D. (1990). Assessing the political landscape: Structure, cognition, and power in organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *35*(2), 342–369.

Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leadership in complex organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *12*(4), 389–418.

Milgram, S. (1967). The small world problem. *Psychology Today*, *1*(1), 61–67.

Nonaka, I. (1994). A dynamic theory of organizational knowledge creation. *Organization Science*, *5*(1), 14–37.

Parker, G. G., Van Alstyne, M. W., & Choudary, S. P. (2016). Platform revolution: How networked markets are transforming the economy and how to make them work for you. W. W. Norton & Company.

Polanyi, M. (1966). *The tacit dimension*. Doubleday.

 doi:10.20944/preprints202603.0192.v1

Powell, W. W. (1990). Neither market nor hierarchy: Network forms of organization. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *12*, 295–336.

Reeves, M., Levin, S., & Ueda, D. (2016). The biology of corporate survival. *Harvard Business Review*, *94*(1), 46–55.

Santos, F. M., & Eisenhardt, K. M. (2005). Organizational boundaries and theories of organization. *Organization Science*, *16*(5), 491–508.

Scott, J. C. (1998). Seeing like a state: How certain schemes to improve the human condition have failed. Yale University Press.

Senge, P. M. (1990). The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization. Doubleday/Currency.

Sheffi, Y. (2015). The power of resilience: How the best companies manage the unexpected. MIT Press.

Sterman, J. D. (2000). Business dynamics: Systems thinking and modeling for a complex world. McGraw-Hill.

Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*(4), 298–318.

Van Alstyne, M. W., Parker, G. G., & Choudary, S. P. (2016). Pipelines, platforms, and the new rules of strategy. *Harvard Business Review*, *94*(4), 54–62.

Wasserman, S., & Faust, K. (1994). *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*. Cambridge University Press.

Watts, D. J., & Strogatz, S. H. (1998). Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nature*, *393*(6684), 440–442.

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

Wren, D. A., & Bedeian, A. G. (2020). *The evolution of management thought* (8th ed.). Wiley.