Official Conference Efarina University
INDEX COPERNICUS INTERNATIONAL
GARUDA
ScienceGate
International Conference on Health Science, Green Economics, Educational Review and Technology | ISSN(e): 2986-1985
Volumes 1 (2019)

THE EFFECT OF COGNITIVE OFFLOADING THROUGH GENERATIVE AI USE ON ORGANIZATIONAL COMMUNICATION EFFECTIVENESS

Farida Hanum Siregar
Universitas Medan Area, Medan, Indonesia
E-mail:faridasrg67@gmail.com

Received:06/11/2019 | **Revised** : 15/11/2019 | **Accepted:** 11/12/2019 | **Published:** 30/12/2019

Abstract

Delegating cognitive tasks to external systems may reduce immediate processing demands while changing how individuals understand and communicate information. This conceptual article examines the potential effects of cognitive offloading through generative artificial intelligence on organizational communication effectiveness, using literature available through 2017. A narrative literature review connects cognitive offloading, early neural text generation, automation reliance, and organizational communication theory. Generative AI is discussed in relation to research systems available within the period rather than contemporary general-purpose assistants. The synthesis proposes that external support may assist selected information-processing activities, but communication benefits depend on system capability, user verification, contextual interpretation, and opportunities for clarification. Reduced production effort should not be equated with accurate messages or shared understanding. Possible risks include inappropriate reliance, inconsistent output, and the transfer of unresolved interpretation to recipients. The article develops propositions concerning task suitability, verification, and human responsibility. It concludes that effects on organizational communication are conditional and require empirical evaluation. No causal effect, organizational adoption rate, or observed communication outcome is established by this review.

Keywords: cognitive offloading; generative artificial intelligence; human oversight; organizational communication; technology reliance.

INTRODUCTION

Producing a message and understanding its meaning are related but different activities. A system may assist with generating language while leaving the sender responsible for deciding whether the message is accurate and appropriate. This distinction becomes important when external support changes the effort required to communicate. Reduced effort may create opportunities for other work, but it may also change how closely information is examined. Cognitive offloading provides a framework for discussing these possibilities.

Risko and Gilbert (2016) describe cognitive offloading as actions that alter a task's information-processing requirements to reduce cognitive demand. Their review examines why people offload and the consequences of doing so. The concept includes familiar activities involving external reminders and other supports. It therefore predates contemporary generative assistants. Applying it to generated language requires examining which parts of the communication task are actually transferred.

By 2017, research had established technical foundations relevant to generative systems. Sutskever et al. (2014) presented sequence-to-sequence learning, while Vinyals and Le (2015) explored neural conversational modeling. These developments provide a historically appropriate basis for discussing automated language generation. They do not establish widespread organizational adoption or reliable performance across communication tasks. This article therefore develops prospective implications within the limits of that evidence.

Organizational communication effectiveness involves more than the speed of producing text. Messages need to convey relevant information and support interpretation, coordination, and appropriate action. A rapidly generated message may still require extensive checking or clarification. Conversely, external assistance may be useful when it supports a clearly bounded task. The central issue is how the allocation of cognitive work affects the communication process as a whole.

OPEN ACCESS

The word *effect* in the title identifies the relationship being examined conceptually. It does not indicate a measured causal relationship or a statistical result. The article involves no respondents or organizational field data. Its temporal scope is limited to literature available through 2017. Later systems and findings are excluded from the evidential basis.

This article asks how cognitive offloading associated with early generative systems might influence organizational communication effectiveness. It considers potential benefits, limitations, and conditions governing reliance. The objective is to connect cognitive and communication theories with emerging technical capabilities. The contribution consists of a conceptual framework and propositions for future examination. No particular organization's communication practices are assessed.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Cognitive Offloading and External Support

Cognitive offloading changes how a task is performed by using actions or resources outside internal processing alone. A reminder can support remembering an appointment without requiring continuous rehearsal. In communication, external support may assist with retaining information or constructing an expression. However, these activities involve different cognitive demands. They should not be treated as equivalent forms of delegation.

Risko and Dunn (2015) examine the use of external storage in a short-term memory task, while Dunn and Risko (2016) develop a metacognitive account of cognitive offloading. These studies support considering how perceived demands and expected benefits influence the use of external support. Offloading should therefore be examined as a strategy rather than an automatic consequence of technology availability. Its usefulness depends on the task and the processes involved. These findings do not directly establish outcomes associated with generative language systems.

Clark and Chalmers (1998) examine the relationship between cognitive activity and external resources through the extended mind argument. Their philosophical account provides a perspective on cognition involving interactions with the environment. It does not establish the effectiveness of a particular technology. Its relevance here concerns the allocation of cognitive work. Evaluation still requires attention to how the combined person–resource arrangement functions.

Sparrow et al. (2011) report experimental findings concerning memory when people expect information to remain externally available. Their study provides an early example of research examining information access and remembering. It should not be interpreted as proof that all technology use weakens memory. Nor does it establish outcomes associated with generative systems. Its role here is to motivate questions about what users retain when relying on external information.

Storm and Stone (2015) investigate how saving information can affect learning and remembering other information. Their findings provide a counterpoint to accounts focused only on possible costs. External support can be examined in terms of what it enables as well as what it replaces. However, saving information differs from accepting generated content. The consequences of one activity cannot automatically be transferred to the other.

Gilbert (2015) investigates how individuals strategically use external reminders to support delayed intentions. His findings highlight the relevance of metacognitive processes to decisions about offloading. This provides a further basis for distinguishing purposeful assistance from indiscriminate reliance. However, remembering an intention differs from interpreting or composing an organizational message. Application to generative systems therefore requires separate examination of the task and its outcomes

Generative Systems within the 2017 Scope

Generative modeling was an established research direction before 2017. Goodfellow et al. (2014) introduced an adversarial framework involving generative and discriminative models. This demonstrates a technical foundation for generative AI research within the period. It is not evidence about organizational writing or communication effectiveness. Different generative architectures and application areas require separate consideration.

For language-related applications, Sutskever et al. (2014) developed a sequence-to-sequence approach using neural networks. Vinyals and Le (2015) subsequently explored conversational response generation using that framework. Their work demonstrates research possibilities while also reporting limitations, including inconsistency. The present article uses these studies to define a bounded prospective discussion. It does not attribute later general-purpose capabilities to the systems examined.

Vaswani et al. (2017) introduced the Transformer architecture in research on sequence transduction. This contribution belongs within the article's temporal scope. However, an architectural development does not by itself

OPEN ACCESS

establish successful application to organizational communication. Performance on a technical task and effectiveness in an organizational setting are different outcomes. Their connection requires additional evidence.

Reliance on Automation

Parasuraman and Riley (1997) distinguish use, misuse, disuse, and abuse of automation. Their framework supports examining the relationship between technological capability and human reliance. Availability alone does not determine appropriate use. Users may rely on a system beyond its capabilities or fail to use assistance that would be suitable. These possibilities are relevant to prospective applications of generative systems.

Lee and See (2004) examine trust in automation in relation to appropriate reliance. Their review provides a foundation for considering whether users' expectations fit system capabilities. In communication, trust in a tool should remain distinct from verification of a particular message. A generally useful system may still produce an unsuitable output. Reliance therefore needs to be examined at the level of tasks and conditions.

Bainbridge (1983) explains how automation can change rather than eliminate the demands placed on human operators. Her analysis provides a foundation for examining the work that remains after a task is partly automated. In this article, that perspective motivates attention to reviewing and correcting generated messages. Assistance with production does not establish that the remaining judgment is simple. This is a conceptual application of automation research rather than evidence about generative AI use in organizations.

Organizational Communication Effectiveness

Daft and Lengel (1986) connect organizational information requirements with media richness and structural design. Their framework directs attention to uncertainty and the interpretation of information. This supports evaluating communication according to the demands of the organizational situation. Increasing the amount of available text does not necessarily resolve differences in meaning. The communication process must address the relevant informational problem.

Dennis et al. (2008) distinguish conveyance and convergence within media synchronicity theory. Conveyance concerns exchanging information, while convergence concerns developing shared meaning. This distinction is useful when discussing automated message production. Assistance with expression may support one activity without completing the other. Organizational effectiveness therefore cannot be inferred solely from the availability of a generated message.

METHOD

This article uses a narrative literature review to develop a prospective conceptual analysis. Its evidence base is limited to publications available through 2017. It involves no respondents, interviews, questionnaires, or observations of organizational use. The article does not claim that it was historically written or published in 2017. That year defines the boundary of the literature considered.

The approach draws on Baumeister and Leary's (1997) discussion of narrative literature reviews. Sources are used to compare concepts and develop relationships across research areas. The review does not claim an exhaustive or systematic search. Its purpose is to clarify a plausible framework rather than estimate an effect size. Conclusions remain bounded by the sources and their application contexts.

The literature covers cognitive offloading, external information, early generative modeling, automation reliance, and organizational communication. Technical capabilities are distinguished from evidence about human behavior and organizational outcomes. Findings about memory aids are not treated as direct findings about generated language. Likewise, technical demonstrations are not treated as evidence of communication improvement. These distinctions guide the synthesis.

The analysis develops possible pathways linking external assistance with communication outcomes. It considers task allocation, verification, contextual interpretation, and clarification. These pathways are propositions developed in the article rather than observed processes. Illustrations explain how they might operate under specified conditions. No mediation, moderation, or causal relationship is statistically tested.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Offloading a Component of Communication

The synthesis proposes that offloading should be identified at the level of a specific activity. Remembering a detail, arranging wording, and deciding what an organization should communicate are different tasks. A system

OPEN ACCESS

may support one without being suitable for the others. Treating them as a single delegated process obscures the remaining human work. Analysis should therefore begin with what the user is attempting to transfer.

In a prospective organizational application, a language-generation component might produce a candidate response within a bounded domain. The user would still need to determine whether it addresses the actual request. The message might also require checking against current organizational information. This illustration describes a possible workflow rather than a documented 2017 practice. Its feasibility depends on the system and task.

Table 1. Proposed Allocation of Communication Work

Activity	Possible external support	Human responsibility remaining
Retaining information	External records or reminders	Checking relevance and current validity
Producing candidate wording	Bounded language generation	Reviewing meaning and suitability
Interpreting a request	Assistance within a defined domain	Confirming the sender's actual concern
Communicating a decision	Support with expression	Confirming authority and the decision itself
Resolving ambiguity	Providing material for discussion	Establishing shared understanding through clarification

The table distinguishes possibilities from demonstrated capabilities. It does not imply that a single system available in 2017 could perform every activity. The allocation also depends on the communication setting. Some tasks require information that the system does not possess. Human responsibility cannot be inferred to disappear because part of the process is assisted.

Potential Benefits and Their Conditions

A potential benefit is reduced effort on a bounded production activity. If assistance is suitable and requires limited correction, the user may have more attention available for other aspects of communication. This is a conceptual possibility rather than a measured organizational outcome. It depends on whether the saved effort exceeds the effort required to use and review the system. Faster initial production alone cannot establish that balance.

External support may also help users maintain access to information needed during a task. The relevance of offloading research lies partly in examining such changes in cognitive demands. However, accessible information still needs interpretation. A record or generated response cannot determine its own suitability for every context. Benefits therefore depend on the interaction between the user, resource, and task.

Production Speed and Communication Quality

A message can be produced quickly while remaining inaccurate or incomplete. It may omit a qualification or express a position the sender did not intend. Recipients may then spend additional time seeking clarification.

Evaluation should consider that downstream work. Otherwise, effort may appear to be reduced merely because it has moved to another person.

Communication quality also includes whether participants understand what action is expected. A grammatically clear statement may leave responsibility or timing unspecified. These omissions can persist regardless of whether the wording is generated or written manually. The relevant assessment concerns the message and its use. Technology should not be credited with effectiveness solely because the output appears fluent.

Reliance, Verification, and Inconsistent Output

The inconsistency reported by Vinyals and Le (2015) is especially relevant to the historical scope of this article. Their finding illustrates why conversational capability should not be equated with dependable organizational advice. A system can produce a plausible response without maintaining consistency across exchanges. This limitation supports retaining explicit checks in prospective applications. It does not establish the frequency of errors in every generative architecture.

Verification needs to address content as well as expression. A user may check that a sentence is readable while overlooking whether its claims are supported. Appropriate review therefore depends on the purpose of the message. An administrative instruction may require confirmation of dates and responsibilities. A statement of organizational policy requires confirmation of authority and meaning.

OPEN ACCESS

Offloading and Understanding

Delegating production may change the amount of engagement with the underlying material. A user might review a candidate message carefully or accept it with little examination. These are different forms of use and should not be combined analytically. Neither cognitive disengagement nor deeper understanding follows automatically from assistance. The relevant process requires empirical investigation.

Fisher et al. (2015) report that searching for explanations online can inflate estimates of internal knowledge under the conditions they studied. Their findings help distinguish access to information from judgments about personal understanding. This distinction motivates examining whether users can explain the messages they transmit. However, Internet searching and generative text production are different activities. The study therefore supports a question for future research rather than proving an equivalent effect for generative systems.

A useful distinction concerns being able to transmit a message and being able to explain it. If the sender cannot answer reasonable questions about its meaning, recipients may encounter difficulties. This possibility motivates attention to retained understanding. It does not imply that every user must reproduce all information from memory. Organizational communication can appropriately rely on records while preserving access to explanation.

Conveyance and Shared Meaning

The distinction between conveyance and convergence provides a framework for evaluating generated messages. A candidate response may assist the presentation of information without resolving competing interpretations. Members may still disagree about what a decision requires. Opportunities for questions and feedback remain relevant. Text production should therefore be considered one component of a broader communication process.

This distinction is particularly important when the issue involves ambiguous responsibilities or conflicting priorities. Generating additional wording may elaborate an existing uncertainty rather than resolve it. The sender needs to establish what has actually been decided. Recipients then need an opportunity to clarify their understanding. The effectiveness of assistance depends partly on whether these processes remain available.

Conceptual Propositions

The synthesis supports propositions for future examination. They describe relationships that could be investigated rather than findings established by this review. Each identifies conditions that may alter the consequences of offloading. Their purpose is to make the conceptual argument more testable. They do not imply a confirmed direction or magnitude of effect.

Table 2. Propositions for Future Empirical Examination

Proposition	Proposed relationship	Evidence needed
P1	Assistance is more likely to improve efficiency when the task matches the system's demonstrated capability	Comparison of completion time, corrections, and output quality
P2	Reduced production effort does not necessarily improve recipient understanding	Assessment of comprehension and clarification needs
P3	The consequences of reliance depend partly on verification behavior	Observation of review practices and detected errors
P4	Support for message production does not necessarily resolve interpretive disagreement	Examination of convergence and subsequent coordination
P5	Sender understanding remains relevant when recipients request explanations	Assessment of explanation quality and response accuracy

These propositions distinguish individual effort from organizational effectiveness. They also avoid assuming that cognitive offloading is uniformly beneficial or harmful. A technology may support one outcome while leaving another unchanged. Evaluation must therefore specify which consequence is being examined. A single general measure of effectiveness may obscure those differences.

Organizational Implications

Organizations considering an experimental generative application would need to define its intended task. The application should be assessed against that task rather than broad expectations of intelligent communication. Review responsibilities also need to be understandable. A generated statement should not be treated as an authorized

OPEN ACCESS

decision merely because it is available. These are proposed implementation considerations rather than findings about actual adoption. Evaluation should consider the complete communication process. Relevant questions include the time required for use, checking, correction, clarification, and follow-up. Recipient understanding should be examined alongside sender convenience. This allows potential benefits to be assessed without overlooking transferred effort. Appropriate reliance remains a joint issue of system capability and organizational practice.

Limitations

The article connects literatures that address different phenomena and settings. Research on reminders or saved information does not directly test generative language use. Technical research demonstrates capabilities under specified conditions rather than organizational effectiveness. These differences limit the strength of the proposed relationships. The framework should be treated as prospective.

The review also excludes developments and evidence appearing after 2017. It therefore cannot describe later general-purpose assistants or their organizational consequences. No adoption rate, productivity gain, or communication effect is estimated. Future empirical work would need clearly specified systems, users, tasks, and outcomes. Such evidence would be necessary to evaluate the propositions.

CONCLUSION

Cognitive offloading provides a framework for examining how external systems redistribute the demands of communication tasks. Early generative research available through 2017 supports a prospective discussion of selected language-processing applications. It does not establish widespread organizational use or dependable communication outcomes. Potential effects depend on task suitability, verification, retained understanding, and opportunities for clarification. Reduced production effort should remain distinct from organizational effectiveness.

The article proposes that assessment should encompass sender effort and recipient understanding. It should also examine correction, explanation, and coordination after a message is produced. The resulting propositions provide questions for empirical investigation. No positive or negative causal effect is established. Within the 2017 literature boundary, the contribution is a conceptual framework for evaluating possible applications.

REFERENCES

Bainbridge, L. (1983). Ironies of automation. *Automatica, 19*(6), 775–779. https://doi.org/10.1016/0005-1098(83)90046-8ScienceDirect

Baumeister, R. F., & Leary, M. R. (1997). Writing narrative literature reviews. *Review of General Psychology, 1*(3), 311–320. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2680.1.3.311

Clark, A., & Chalmers, D. (1998). The extended mind. *Analysis, 58*(1), 7–19. https://doi.org/10.1093/analys/58.1.7

Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management Science, 32*(5), 554–571. https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.32.5.554

Dennis, A. R., Fuller, R. M., & Valacich, J. S. (2008). Media, tasks, and communication processes: A theory of media synchronicity. *MIS Quarterly, 32*(3), 575–600. https://doi.org/10.2307/25148857

Dunn, T. L., & Risko, E. F. (2016). Toward a metacognitive account of cognitive offloading. *Cognitive Science, 40*(5), 1080–1127. https://doi.org/10.1111/cogs.12273 Wiley Online Library

Fisher, M., Goddu, M. K., & Keil, F. C. (2015). Searching for explanations: How the Internet inflates estimates of internal knowledge. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144*(3), 674–687. https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000070 apa.org

Gilbert, S. J. (2015). Strategic offloading of delayed intentions into the external environment. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology, 68*(5), 971–992. https://doi.org/10.1080/17470218.2014.972963 Sam J. Gilbert, 2015

Goodfellow, I., Pouget-Abadie, J., Mirza, M., Xu, B., Warde-Farley, D., Ozair, S., Courville, A., & Bengio, Y. (2014). Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 27*. https://papers.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2014/hash/f033ed80deb0234979a61f95710dbe25-Abstract.html

Lee, J. D., & See, K. A. (2004). Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. *Human Factors, 46*(1), 50–80. https://doi.org/10.1518/hfes.46.1.50_30392

Parasuraman, R., & Riley, V. (1997). Humans and automation: Use, misuse, disuse, abuse. *Human Factors, 39*(2), 230–253. https://doi.org/10.1518/001872097778543886

OPEN ACCESS

Risko, E. F., & Dunn, T. L. (2015). Storing information in-the-world: Metacognition and cognitive offloading in a short-term memory task. *Consciousness and Cognition, 36*, 61–74. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.concog.2015.05.014

Risko, E. F., & Gilbert, S. J. (2016). Cognitive offloading. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 20*(9), 676–688. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2016.07.002

Sparrow, B., Liu, J., & Wegner, D. M. (2011). Google effects on memory: Cognitive consequences of having information at our fingertips. *Science, 333*(6043), 776–778. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1207745

Storm, B. C., & Stone, S. M. (2015). Saving-enhanced memory: The benefits of saving on the learning and remembering of new information. *Psychological Science, 26*(2), 182–188. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614559285

Sutskever, I., Vinyals, O., & Le, Q. V. (2014). Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 27*, 3104–3112. https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2014/hash/5a18e133cbf9f257297f410bb7eca942-Abstract.html

Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, Ł., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). Attention is all you need. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems, 30*. https://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2017/hash/3f5ee243547dee91fbd053c1c4a845aa-Abstract.html

Vinyals, O., & Le, Q. (2015). *A neural conversational model* [Preprint]. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.1506.05869

OPEN ACCESS