# EVOLUTIONARY PROCESSES IN CORPORATE GOVERNANCE: PEDAGOGICAL RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES

**Carbone Maria**[1]
**Pegaso University**
**maria.carbone@unipegaso.it**

**Sozio Alessia**
**Pegaso University**
**alessia.sozio@unipegaso.it**

**De Giuseppe Tonia**
**Giustino Fortunato University**
**t.degiuseppe@unifortunato.eu**

**Double Blind Peer Review**

**Citation**
Carbone, M., Sozio, A., & De Giuseppe, T. (2026). Evolutionary processes in corporate governance: Pedagogical research perspectives. *Italian Journal of Health Education, Sport and Inclusive Didactics, 10*(4).

**Doi:** https://doi.org/10.32043/gsd.v10i4.1766

**Copyright notice:**
© 2023 this is an open access, peer-reviewed article published by Open Journal System and distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

gsdjournal.it
**ISSN: 3103-5744**

**ABSTRACT**
Digital transformation (Rossi, 2012) is also impacting corporate governance models (Hilb, 2020). Companies must modify their organizational culture (Buemi et al., 2015); consequently, it is crucial to adopt a pedagogical approach to personnel training processes (Sibilio & Aiello, 2015).
This project, part of the research conducted by the Permanent Observatory on Systemic Inclusivity at Giustino Fortunato University, is situated within this context, representing a multidimensional and multi-perspective application of the Flipped Inclusion model (Corona & De Giuseppe, 2017). The project takes the form of an exploratory study aimed at understanding the relationship between corporate governance, artificial intelligence, inclusion, and organizational well-being (De Giuseppe, 2016a). In this scenario, the Flipped Inclusion model offers a promising approach to guiding this transformation in a human-centric, sustainable, and participatory direction (De Giuseppe, 2016b).

**KEYWORDS**
Corporate governance; inclusion; flipped inclusion; organizational well-being.

**Received** 2026-07-25
**Accepted** 2026-09-25
**Published** 2026-10-30

[1] C.M.: paragraphs 1, 5, 6 and 8;
S. A. paragraphs 2 and 7;
D.G.T.: paragraphs 3 and 4.

## 1. Introduction

Over the last decade, the digital revolution has profoundly transformed many aspects of people's daily lives, and the use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools — a phenomenon that has also been underway for some time but has become increasingly rapid in recent years — is spreading more and more widely. This technological revolution has affected not only the lives of individuals but has also had (and continues to have) a significant impact on the organization and functioning of businesses, opening up and anticipating new opportunities while simultaneously raising unprecedented interpretative issues and equally innovative regulatory challenges. According to many scholars, artificial intelligence is destined to become the driving force behind the fourth industrial revolution, irreversibly changing everyone's everyday way of life (Abriani, 2020). Examples include industrial automation, the use of e-commerce systems, the introduction of increasingly advanced management software, and the adoption of robots.

Technological progress and, in particular, the spread of AI represent, within entrepreneurial activities, an element of innovation no longer limited solely to production and distribution, but also extending to other areas such as management and control, improving market performance and enhancing internal processes and decision-making mechanisms. The organization and management of modern enterprises are undergoing a metamorphosis (Rossi, 2012), which is also reshaping corporate governance, where AI-driven disruptive innovation provides benefits in various ways (Falce et al., 2018). Above all, however, it is the ability to process increasingly significant quantities of data and information (Hilb, 2020) in order to support administrative bodies that makes the widespread development of artificial intelligence systems plausible.

Corporate governance, understood as the institutional framework regulating the process of formulating and implementing business decisions, is constantly evolving. One of the most frequently debated issues in recent times concerns precisely the impact that new artificial intelligence technologies have and will have on corporate structures, and in particular on corporate governance itself. In this regard, the term *CorpTech* has been coined.

To promote the development of algo-governance while respecting a human-centric vision, it is essential to invest in AI culture, in building trust among users and beneficiaries, and above all in the accountability and verifiability of the algorithms employed (Montagnani, 2020). From a legal perspective, the recognition of AI in the role of director (Petrin, 2019) is connected to broader debates concerning the granting of legal personality to artificial intelligence tools (Teubner, 2019). Given the multifaceted impact of new algorithmic technologies on corporate governance, it is necessary to assess which rules may be undermined and which may instead be strengthened by AI. The role of AI in corporate governance therefore requires reinterpretation, so that it can become a concrete resource for directors in carrying out administrative and supervisory functions, while taking into account both its potential and the risks it entails (Mosco, 2019).

The possible technological transformation of boards of directors is also destined to affect the expertise required of board members. Within the board, IT and data science skills will assume increasing importance in managing and interpreting the artificial intelligence tools employed. While some studies already suggest that companies with digitally savvy boards achieve better performance than those lacking such capabilities (Weill et al., 2019), it is important to emphasize how this makes the renewal and rejuvenation of boards of directors increasingly urgent.

We are therefore facing a scenario undergoing profound and rapid change, from whose technological transformation a new value balance is emerging. Debates on corporate purpose and corporate social responsibility will have to take into account the genetic transformation that the corporate organism is experiencing. Added to this is the ethical issue concerning the limits of artificial intelligence use and the preservation of human primacy.

While human beings may be affected by illnesses, cognitive and behavioral limitations, biases, and emotions, artificial intelligence tools are capable of resisting such variables, especially in systemic shock scenarios. The main market players, aware of the importance of innovation and change, are reviewing their business models and internal organization, redefining strategic objectives, strengthening corporate culture and engagement, and balancing recruitment with reskilling initiatives, above all by adopting organizational structures capable of enhancing internal IT and digital skills.

In conclusion, a balanced way of considering AI's participation in a company's corporate governance is to conceptualize it not as a substitute, but as a support tool for human directors, enabling the board of directors to become a place for the fruitful interaction between intelligent machines and intelligent people. Achieving such results would also have significant implications in terms of corporate social responsibility, which creates tangible and intangible values that prove beneficial for the company, individuals, the territory, and the environment in which it operates (Schneider, 2022). For this reason, it is necessary for each company's corporate governance system to undertake actions capable of influencing its organizational culture (Buemi et al., 2015), relying — especially in the era of artificial intelligence tools — on a transformative approach to management education capable of ensuring an inclusive corporate climate as an opportunity for the well-being of everyone and each individual.

## 2. Corporate governance and artificial intelligence

Corporate governance represents one of the areas most profoundly affected by the economic, technological, and social transformations characterizing the 21st century. The emergence of complex digital ecosystems, the automation of decision-making processes, and the spread of artificial intelligence are redefining not only the operational modalities of organizations (Abriani, 2020), but also the epistemological and value-based foundations upon which strategic decisions are built.

Traditionally understood as the set of rules, structures, and mechanisms aimed at ensuring the control and direction of the enterprise, corporate governance is now increasingly assuming a dynamic and relational configuration, in which human actors, technologies, information networks, and socio-cultural contexts interact (Fenwick et al., 2018). From this perspective, governance can no longer be reduced to a regulatory framework, but must be understood as a process of continuous, situated, and distributed learning.

At the same time, the issue of inclusion and organizational well-being has gained increasing centrality in both scientific and managerial debates. Organizations are increasingly required to respond not only to economic performance objectives, but also to demands for equity, social sustainability, and the enhancement of diversity (Schneider, 2022). Inclusion, in this sense, represents a strategic dimension of governance, capable of influencing the quality of decision-making, innovation, and organizational resilience.

Understanding corporate governance in the contemporary context requires moving beyond traditional interpretations, primarily based on legal-regulatory models and rationalistic conceptions of decision-making processes. Technological, organizational, and cultural transformations require a reinterpretation of governance (Rossi, 2012) as a complex, emerging, and

dynamic phenomenon, in which cognitive, embodied, relational, and technological dimensions interact. From this perspective, conceptualizing governance as an embodied, distributed, and co-evolutionary system proves particularly fruitful.

Artificial intelligence represents one of the main drivers of transformation in contemporary corporate governance. Its progressive integration into corporate decision-making processes profoundly modifies not only operational procedures but also power dynamics, accountability criteria, and organizational cultures (Falce et al., 2018). Understanding the relationship between AI and governance therefore requires an analysis that goes beyond the technological dimension, encompassing ethical, legal, social, and cultural aspects (CEPEJ, 2018).

In the early stages of digitalization, information technologies primarily played a supportive operational role, automating repetitive activities and improving process efficiency. With the advent of AI, a qualitative shift has occurred: algorithmic systems no longer merely execute instructions but actively participate in decision-making processes (Petrin, 2019).

Machine learning algorithms, predictive analytics systems, and optimization models are now employed to support strategic decisions in areas such as financial planning, risk management, personnel selection, and performance evaluation. This phenomenon has led some scholars to refer to “algorithmic governance” (Falce & Sertoli, 2022), meaning a set of practices in which decisions emerge from the interaction between human judgment and computational calculation.

One of the main critical issues concerning the adoption of AI in governance relates to the opacity of algorithmic decision-making processes (Nuzzo & Olivieri, 2019). Many machine learning systems, particularly those based on

deep neural networks, operate as genuine “black boxes,” making it difficult to understand the criteria underlying specific recommendations or decisions.

This opacity generates information asymmetries between those who design or control algorithms and those affected by their outcomes, with significant consequences in terms of power and responsibility. Within organizational contexts, such asymmetries may result in a reduction of decision-makers’ critical capacity, as they tend to rely on algorithmic recommendations, perceiving them as objective and neutral.

A further critical element is represented by algorithmic biases. AI systems learn from historical data that reflect existing practices, values, and inequalities. Consequently, if they are not properly designed and monitored, these systems risk reproducing and amplifying forms of discrimination related to gender, age, socio-cultural background, or other characteristics.

Within the context of corporate governance, algorithmic biases may significantly affect personnel selection, evaluation, and promotion processes, undermining objectives of inclusion and organizational well-being. The challenge therefore lies in developing governance models capable of identifying and mitigating these risks by integrating technical and ethical expertise (Mosco, 2019).

The introduction of AI into decision-making processes raises fundamental questions regarding the concept of responsibility (Montagnani & Passador, 2021). If a decision results from an interaction between human decision-makers and algorithmic systems, who should be held responsible in the event of errors or harm?

The literature on algorithmic governance highlights the need to redefine accountability mechanisms by introducing forms of shared responsibility and

processes of human oversight. In this sense, governance cannot completely delegate decisions to AI, but must maintain an active role in guiding, controlling, and critically evaluating outcomes.

From an ethical perspective, the adoption of AI in corporate governance requires careful reflection on the values guiding decision-making. Principles such as fairness, transparency, non-discrimination, and respect for human dignity must be integrated into the design and use of algorithmic systems.

From a legal perspective, the debate is constantly evolving. Emerging regulations on AI aim to ensure the responsible use of technologies by introducing obligations concerning transparency, risk assessment, and the protection of fundamental rights. Organizations are required to adapt their governance models to this regulatory framework by developing interdisciplinary capabilities that integrate law, technology, and management.

The adoption of AI (Nicotra, 2023) is not a culturally neutral process. Algorithmic systems may reinforce or challenge existing power structures, influencing the distribution of authority and the ways in which decisions are legitimized.

In light of the critical issues identified, there is a need to develop AI governance models oriented toward inclusion and organizational well-being. This requires not only the adoption of ethically designed technologies but also the promotion of educational and participatory practices that enable stakeholders to understand and influence algorithmic processes.

From this perspective, the Flipped Inclusion model offers a particularly relevant methodological framework. By promoting the reversal of traditional decision-making processes and the active involvement of stakeholders (Corona & De Giuseppe, 2017), Flipped Inclusion can contribute to making AI a tool for empowerment rather than exclusion, strengthening the connection between governance, inclusion, and well-being.

## 3. Inclusion and organizational well-being

In recent years, the issue of inclusion has assumed a central role in scientific and managerial debates, emerging as a strategic dimension of organizational sustainability. Inclusion does not merely represent an ethical value or a social objective, but rather a fundamental driver for improving the quality of decision-making, innovation, and organizational well-being. In this sense, corporate governance is called upon to integrate inclusion among its founding principles, moving beyond merely formal or compensatory approaches.

The first organizational policies aimed at promoting diversity focused primarily on managing demographic differences, such as gender, age, and ethnicity. Although these approaches contributed to greater representation, they often proved insufficient in affecting deeper dynamics of power and participation.

The transition from diversity management (Buemi et al., 2015) to systemic inclusion implies a paradigm shift: the aim is no longer to adapt "different" individuals to pre-existing structures, but rather to rethink the organization as a whole so that it can enhance differences as a resource. Systemic inclusion requires interventions involving organizational culture, processes, leadership, and governance systems.

An inclusive organization is characterized by high levels of participation in decision-making processes. The ability to express one's own perspective, to be heard, and to influence decisions affecting everyday work significantly contributes to organizational well-being (De Giuseppe, 2016b).

From a governance perspective, this implies the creation of spaces and mechanisms that encourage dialogue and exchange among actors with different skills and experiences. Inclusive decision-making processes tend to be more complex and less linear, but they generate more robust and shared solutions.

Organizational well-being can be defined as a dynamic state resulting from the interaction among individual, relational, and structural factors. It includes psychological, social, and organizational dimensions, such as a sense of belonging, the quality of relationships, perceived fairness, and opportunities for professional development.

Numerous studies highlight how inclusive governance practices are positively correlated with employee well-being, reducing stress, conflicts, and turnover. In this sense, inclusion does not represent a cost, but rather a strategic investment for organizational sustainability.

Digitalization and the adoption of AI are profoundly transforming working methods, introducing new opportunities but also new risks of exclusion. Remote work, digital platforms, and automated evaluation systems can broaden participation, but they may also exacerbate inequalities if they are not properly governed.

An inclusion-oriented governance approach must therefore consider the impact of technologies on organizational well-being (De Giuseppe, 2016c), adopting design and implementation criteria that take into account the diverse needs and abilities of workers.

Leadership plays a crucial role in promoting inclusion and well-being. Inclusive leaders are able to recognize and enhance differences, create a climate of trust, and encourage participation.

From a governance perspective, this implies the need to develop leadership skills oriented toward active listening, reflexivity, and complexity management. The training of decision-makers therefore represents a key element for the implementation of inclusive practices.

## 4. The Flipped Inclusion model

The Flipped Inclusion model (De Giuseppe, 2018) is positioned within systemic methodologies oriented toward participation and organizational learning. Originating in the field of education and training, it proposes an inversion of traditional top-down processes by placing individuals and their experiences at the center as the starting point for the construction of knowledge and decision-making processes (Cohen, 1994).

Flipped Inclusion draws inspiration from several theoretical approaches, including active pedagogy, social constructivism, and the systemic approach. The model is based on the idea that learning and organizational change emerge from interaction among individuals rather than from the mere transmission of knowledge and content.

The inversion proposed by Flipped Inclusion (De Giuseppe & Corona, 2017) concerns both the sequence of learning processes and the distribution of decision-making power. Individuals are not passive recipients of interventions imposed from above, but co-creators of meaning and active participants in the change process.

The key principles of the model include the centrality of experience, the enhancement of differences, reflexivity, and active participation. These principles are translated into practices that encourage the involvement of individuals in decision-making and learning processes.

Flipped Inclusion promotes open and flexible learning environments in which errors and conflicts are considered opportunities for growth. In this sense, the model is particularly well suited to organizational contexts characterized by high levels of complexity and continuous change.

When applied to corporate governance, Flipped Inclusion enables decision-making processes to be reinterpreted from a participatory and inclusive

perspective. Boards and management levels can adopt practices based on active listening, broad consultation, and co-design, moving beyond rigidly hierarchical decision-making models (De Giuseppe, 2016a).

The integration of Flipped Inclusion into governance requires a cultural change (Buemi et al., 2015), as well as structural transformation. This implies a willingness to question consolidated roles and to recognize the value of distributed competencies within the organization.

The intersection between Flipped Inclusion and AI opens up particularly interesting scenarios. On the one hand, AI can support participatory processes by facilitating the analysis of large amounts of data and the collection of feedback. On the other hand, Flipped Inclusion provides a methodological framework to prevent AI from being used in a technocratic or exclusionary manner.

Through the inversion of decision-making processes, the model enables individuals to participate in defining objectives and criteria for AI use, promoting transparency and shared responsibility.

Numerous applied experiences highlight how Flipped Inclusion can significantly contribute to improving organizational well-being. The active involvement of individuals strengthens the sense of belonging, increases motivation, and promotes the development of transversal skills.

In conclusion, Flipped Inclusion can be considered a model particularly suited to addressing the challenges of corporate governance in the AI era, offering concrete tools to integrate inclusion, participation, and well-being in a systemic manner (De Giuseppe, 2016d).

## 5. Methodology

The present study is part of the research activities of the Permanent Observatory on Systemic Inclusiveness established at the Università Giustino Fortunato, and is configured as an exploratory investigation aimed at understanding the relationship between corporate governance, artificial intelligence, inclusion, and organizational well-being. The emerging nature of the phenomenon made it necessary to adopt a quantitative, single-method approach based on a sample survey with the emerging nature of the phenomenon and with the objective of building a knowledge base useful for future longitudinal or experimental investigations.

The research questions are structured around the following points:

1. Is it possible to educate organizations toward a corporate governance model that promotes a participatory context?
2. Is it possible to develop an organizational culture capable of creating inclusive corporate governance?

### 5.1 The sample and the context of reference

The study examined various models of territorial governance, involving organizations in the Campania region, with a specific focus on small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). The intention was to adopt a broad perspective that reflects the Observatory's regional focus and its interest in examining local organizational contexts.

The sample was established through a non-probabilistic voluntary sampling procedure known as convenience sampling (Fowler, 2014). Participants were invited to take part in the study through professional networks and direct contacts with the organizations involved.

From a demographic perspective, the respondent population ($N$=405) showed a majority of female respondents, primarily between the ages of 41 and 50. Most respondents hold a master's degree and are employed in the public service sector.

### 5.2 The stages of research

Specifically, the investigation was conducted through the following consecutive phases.

The first phase (Theoretical framework) consisted of a review of national and international scientific literature aimed at providing a socio-educational and business-economic framework for the research problem.

During the second phase (Instrument Design) a quantitative questionnaire was developed. From a methodological standpoint, it should be noted that the questionnaire is an exploratory, unvalidated, and non-standardized tool designed to assess the current state of the art regarding the knowledge and application of AI in organizations, as well as perceptions regarding employees' personal skills; Therefore, the interpretation of the descriptive results is conducted with the necessary caution, acknowledging the inherent limitations of the data's generalizability and spatial replicability. The survey was organized into six distinct sections (Socio-demographic Data; Personal Data; Subjective Perceptions of Personal Knowledge and Skills; Company Data; Data on the Adoption of Artificial Intelligence; Data on Individual Perceptions). The questions were primarily closed-ended, using multi-point Likert scales. The survey was administered online and anonymously.

The third phase (Intervention protocol and ongoing implementation): introduction of the EIPS framework (Explore, Ideate, Design, Experiment) of the Flipped Inclusion model (De Giuseppe & Corona, 2016) in partner contexts. Specifically, this paper reports only on the findings from the sub-phases of

“Explore” (establishment of the IA Inclusive Governance Committee) and the “Conceive” phase (active cooperative learning training sessions). It should be noted that this phase is currently being implemented and developed, taking the form of an ongoing research-intervention initiative (Lewin, 1946).

In the fourth phase (Analytical processing and ongoing analysis): consolidation of the dataset and identification of preliminary trends using only univariate descriptive statistics (absolute frequencies and percentages). In line with the exploratory nature of the study and the non-standardized instrument, no inferential tests or regression models are applied; such analyses are deferred to subsequent stages of research validation.

In the fifth phase (Presentation and analysis of theses—Scheduled): In this final phase, an interpretive synthesis of all the consolidated quantitative data will be conducted. The objective will be to discuss the initial research hypotheses in light of the definitive results of the experimental intervention, in order to validate the framework’s long-term effectiveness and outline future directions for the theoretical model.

With regard to the intervention protocol activities outlined in the EIPS framework of the Flipped Inclusion model as part of the research project, the current status and programmatic objectives of the ongoing research project are outlined below:

1. EXPLORATION PHASE (completed). This phase involved the establishment of an inclusive AI governance committee composed of managers from the main corporate functions, experts in AI and emerging technologies, human resources and training managers, and legal and compliance representatives. The committee was responsible for defining the corporate strategy for AI adoption, establishing ethical guidelines for AI use, and monitoring the impact of AI on the workforce and organizational culture. Its objective was

to supervise the integration of AI into corporate governance while ensuring inclusiveness, ethical standards, and regulatory compliance.

2. IDEATION PHASE (in progress). During this phase, the Flipped Inclusion model is currently being implemented through the implementation of cooperative learning methodologies. Training sessions were organized in which participants assumed active roles, prepared materials, led discussions, and used digital tools to facilitate access to information and participation by all team members. The objective is to promote an inclusive learning and collaboration environment, enhancing diversity and individual skills.

3. DESIGN PHASE (in the start-up phase): this phase will focus on training and skills development by offering AI training programs adapted to different organizational levels and roles. The objective will be to promote a culture of continuous learning and adaptability while encouraging knowledge sharing through workshops, seminars, and collaborative platforms. The aim was to ensure that all members of the organization understood AI and were able to use it effectively and responsibly.

4. EXPERIMENTATION PHASE (scheduled/future): during this phase, evaluation activities will be carried out by establishing metrics to measure the impact of AI on performance, inclusion and employee satisfaction. Periodic audits were conducted to ensure compliance with ethical and regulatory guidelines, and feedback was collected from employees and stakeholders to identify areas for improvement. The objective will be to assess the effectiveness of AI integration and of the inclusive approach within corporate governance.

## 6. Data analysis

The analyses presented below are based on the descriptive findings that emerged from the exploratory survey. The frequency distributions provide an initial overview of organizational perceptions and practices, serving as an informational baseline for the research project.

With regard to the actual use of AI tools within organizations, the distribution is strongly skewed toward limited or no use at all (Table 1).

*Table 1. Distribution of responses to item Q21 ("Are AI tools used in the organization where you work?")*

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Very much | 12 | 4% |
| Moderately | 76 | 25% |
| A little | 86 | 28% |
| No | 88 | 29% |
| **Total** | **308** | **100%** |

*Note: The sum of the cumulative percentage frequencies shows that 57% of the sample reports no ("No") or minimal ("Little") use of AI in their operational contexts.*

This gap between perceived knowledge and actual use highlights a transitional phase in which AI is recognized as a potential resource but has not yet been fully integrated into governance processes.

The reasons for this limitation are clearly evident from an analysis of the main barriers identified by the respondents (Table 2).

*Table 2. Distribution of responses to Item Q23 ("What are the main barriers to AI adoption in the organization where you work?")*

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| High cost | 25 | 8,40% |
| Lack of expertise | 133 | 44,80% |
| Regulatory uncertainty | 59 | 19,90% |
| Resistance to change | 68 | 22,90% |
| Other | 12 | 4,00% |
| **Total** | **297** | **100,00%** |

The lack of internal expertise emerges as the main challenge, cited by 44.8% of the sample, followed by cultural resistance to change (22.9%). These findings indicate that barriers to technology adoption are not exclusively economic or financial in nature (the "High cost" option accounted for only 8.4%), but rather structural, linked to human capital and the anthropological and cultural models within organizations. This is compounded by the qualitative concerns expressed by some participants regarding the risk of losing human control and the opacity of algorithmic processes (black boxes), confirming the absolute necessity of defining explicit, ethical, and shared governance models.

A second area of investigation focused on perceptions of an inclusive culture and its potential association with levels of organizational well-being.

*Table 3. Distribution of responses to item Q24 ("Do you believe that the organization where you work promotes an inclusive culture?")*

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| Yes | 176 | 57,5% |
| Maybe | 48 | 15,7% |
| It could | 49 | 16% |
| I don't know | 23 | 7,5% |
| No | 10 | 3,3% |
| **Total** | **306** | **100%** |

The data in Table 3 show a generally positive perception: an absolute majority of respondents (57.5%) state that their organization actively promotes an inclusive culture. This favorable attitude is a fundamental prerequisite, as it indicates the presence of a fertile cultural ground for the introduction of innovative and participatory models based on Flipped Inclusion.

Finally, the descriptive analysis reveals a correlation between perceived levels of inclusion and the assessment of overall organizational well-being (Table 4).

*Table 4. Distribution of responses to item Q28 ("How would you rate the level of organizational well-being in the organization where you work?")*

| Answer | Number | Percentage |
|---|---|---|
| High | 81 | 27% |
| Sufficient | 138 | 46% |
| Medium | 57 | 19% |
| Low | 15 | 5% |
| I don't know | 8 | 3% |
| **Total** | **299** | **100%** |

The majority of the sample falls between the “Sufficient” (46.0%) and “High” (27.0%) levels. A combined analysis of these descriptive data suggests a trend of mutual variation: work environments that embrace participatory and inclusive practices also exhibit, in parallel, stronger levels of well-being and job satisfaction. Taken together, the findings paint a picture in which AI emerges as a strategic resource with strong potential but not yet fully integrated, while inclusion represents an organizational dimension that is already well-established but open to further structural consolidation. At this intersection, the pilot implementation of the Flipped Inclusion model serves as a methodological framework designed to bridge the gap, combining innovation in complex technological systems with a focus on relational and human dimensions.

## 7. Discussion

The analysis focuses on three main interpretative dimensions: the Impact of AI systems on decision-making processes, the role of inclusion as a strategic dimension of governance, and the contribution of the Flipped Inclusion model to the promotion of organizational well-being.

This analysis aims to integrate the purely descriptive empirical evidence emerging from the exploratory study with the theoretical framework. From a theoretical perspective, the research framework finds its epistemological foundation in Systemic Pedagogy and the Science of Complexity (Bateson, 1972; Morin, 1993; Olvera, 2011; Sibilio, 2014). Systemic pedagogy rejects reductionist interpretations and linear, instruction-oriented learning models, interpreting organizational structure as an embodied “living system” characterized by networks of multidimensional relationships, stable nonlinear and transgenerational dynamics among people (Hellinger, 2001) and ecological connections between formal, informal, and non-formal contexts.

Within this framework, the Semplessa didactic construct (Sibilio, 2014; 2015) defines the ability of complex systems to develop elegant, rapid, and functional solutions for decoding and managing environmental complexity without simplifying it in a misleading way. The Flipped Inclusion model (De Giuseppe & Corona, 2016, 2021) was conceived precisely as a Semplessa-based operational translation (De Giuseppe & Corona, 2017b, 2020): it borrows the logic of "flipping" from the flipped classroom (Bergmann & Sams, 2011) and transforms it into a political and anthropological mechanism for structural inclusion. This is not merely a reversal of tasks, but rather a bottom-up reversal of decision-making flows, designed to counteract the information asymmetry and opacity generated by the introduction of advanced digital tools such as algorithms and advanced AI infrastructures.

The results show that AI is perceived by participants as a potentially strategic resource, but one that is still poorly integrated into governance processes. This finding is consistent with the international literature (Floridi, 2019) and motiveted by structural deficiencies in terms of internal skills (44,8). The risk is that AI adoption may occur in a fragmented or delegating manner, entrusting algorithms with complex decisions without adequate human oversight (Zuboff, 2019).

A second axis of discussion concerns the role of inclusion in governance processes. The widespread perception of an inclusive culture within the sample (57,5) confirms the hypothesis that inclusion can constitute not merely an ethical or value-based constraint, but rather an enabling factor for organizational innovation. The evidence gathered confirms that organizations open to pluralistic participation tend to exhibit greater organizational resilience.

However, a gap remains between stated values and practical action (codified co-design), which highlights the urgent need to introduce structured

methodological models. Although the preliminary nature of the field study does not allow for the identification of statistical or inferential causal relationships, the initial descriptive findings confirm the usefulness of the Flipped Inclusion framework as a flexible informational baseline for initiating cooperative learning pathways, guiding the processes of adoption and synergistic technological integration between inclusive and infrastructural dynamics from an anthropocentric and social sustainability perspective to generate positive impacts on levels of perceived well-being.

## 8. Conclusions

The present study has explored the relationship between corporate governance, artificial intelligence, inclusion, and organizational well-being, proposing a theoretical-empirical analysis of the application of the Flipped Inclusion model within organizational contexts.

From a theoretical perspective and epistemological, the study contributes to the debate on governance in the AI era by integrating perspectives from cognitive sciences, organizational studies, and systemic pedagogy (Bateson, 1972; Morin, 1993; Sibilio, 2014). The interpretation of governance as an embodied and distributed process makes it possible to overcome reductionist approaches and to capture the complexity of contemporary decision-making dynamics.

The integration of the Flipped Inclusion model represents a further original contribution, providing a methodological framework capable of connecting inclusion, organizational learning and technological governance.

From an empirical and methodological perspective, it is important to note that the exclusively descriptive and exploratory nature of this pilot study limits the scope of the current findings. The data extracted from the non-standardized questionnaire provide a descriptive baseline that is essential for guiding

subsequent research efforts. Nevertheless, preliminary trends reveal a significant gap between the actual strategic integration of AI (Table 1) and the presence of an inclusion-oriented organizational culture (Table 3). This gap validates the need for a methodological framework capable of acting as a mediator.

Looking ahead, overcoming the limitations on generalizability inherent in the convenience sampling method used will require the formal standardization of the survey instrument and the expansion of the employment sample. These steps will be essential for applying, in future studies, inferential statistical models and regression analyses capable of validating and mathematically quantifying the framework's impact on long-term well-being levels.

This pilot study, however, reaffirms that inclusion and well-being should not be viewed as secondary elements, but rather as foundational pillars of resilient governance models capable of managing technological complexity. The survey highlights the urgent need to implement public policies and integrated training programs aimed at developing interdisciplinary skills that can blend computational technological knowledge with ethical, humanistic, and organizational knowledge. In this regard, the scientific work being carried out at the Permanent Observatory on Systemic Inclusivity at Giustino Fortunato University is based on these principles of synergy and technological and social transfer between the world of academic research, educational systems and local development initiatives.

From an operational and managerial perspective, the implementation of Flipped Inclusion (De Giuseppe & Corona, 2017b, 2021) serves as a methodological and pedagogical proposal to structure participatory decision-making processes, support the ethical and transparent adoption of AI, develop

reflexive skills among decision-makers and strengthen employees' sense of belonging and motivation laying the groundwork for an increase in organizational well-being.

For organizations operating in the Campania region, and particularly for small and medium-sized enterprises, these recommendations assume strategic relevance, as they enable the combination of technological innovation and social sustainability at the local level.

In conclusion, corporate governance in the AI era is called upon to undergo a profound cultural transformation. Inclusion and organizational well-being do not represent merely additional dimensions, but rather constitutive elements of governance models capable of addressing the complexity and uncertainty of the present. In this scenario, Flipped Inclusion emerges as a promising approach for guiding such transformation toward a more human-centered, sustainable, and participatory direction.

**References**

Abriani, N. (2020). La corporate governance nell'era dell'algoritmo. Prolegomeni a uno studio sull'impatto dell'intelligenza artificiale sulla corporate governance. *Il Nuovo Diritto delle Società*. *18*(3), 261–285.

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind: Collected essays in anthropology, psychiatry, evolution, and epistemology*. Chandler Publishing.

Bergmann, J., & Sams, A. (2011). *Flip your classroom: Talk to every student in every class every day*. International Society for Technology in Education.

Buemi, M., Conte, M. & Guazzo, G. (2015). *Il diversity Management per una crescita inclusiva: strategie e strumenti*. Franco Angeli.

CEPEJ (European Commission for the Efficiency of Justice), (2018). *Carta etica europea sull'utilizzo dell'intelligenza artificiale nei sistemi giudiziari e negli ambiti connessi*. Consiglio d'Europa. https://rm.coe.int/carta-etica-europea-sull-utilizzo-dell-intelligenza-artificiale-/1680993348

Cohen, E. (1994). Restructuring the Classroom: Conditions for Productive Small Groups. *Review of educational research*, *64*(1), 1–35. https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543064001001

De Giuseppe, T. (2016a). *Bisogni educativi speciali: empowerment e didattiche divergenti per decostruirne la complessità*. Il Papavero.

De Giuseppe, T. (2016b). Gestione emozionale e potenziale inclusivo-trasformativo della didattica capovolta. In Corona, F. & De Giuseppe, T. (Eds), *Autismo: tra prospettive teoriche emozionali ed investimenti educativi trasformativo-inclusivi*. *Italian Journal of Special Education for Inclusion*, *4*(2), 106–122.

De Giuseppe, T. (2016c). Il benessere tra vicarianza prosociale, percezioni soggettive e valorialità situate. In Corona, F. & De Giuseppe, T. (Eds.), *Prosocialità,*

*tecnologie inclusive e progettazione universale nei disturbi specifici dell'apprendimento*. Il Papavero.

De Giuseppe, T. (2016d). Mutismo selettivo e flipped inclusion tra prospettive ecologico-sistemiche e modellizzanti capovolgimenti inclusivi. In Corona, F. & T. De Giuseppe, T. (Eds.), *Il Mutismo selettivo e la didattica flipped in ottica sistemica*. *Italian Journal of Special Education for Inclusion, 4*(1), 108–119.

De Giuseppe, T. (2018). *L'impianto teoretico tra bisogni emergenti e prospettive epistemologiche*. Aracne.

De Giuseppe, T., & Corona, F. (2016). *Flipped Inclusion*. Il Papavero.

De Giuseppe, T., & Corona, F. (2017a). Metodologia flipped tra sistemica inclusione e prospettive didattico-assertive. *Formazione & Insegnamento, 15*(2), 409–420. https://doi.org/10.7346/-fei-XV-02-17_34

De Giuseppe, T., & Corona, F. (2017b). La didattica flipped for inclusion. In Limone, P. P. & Parmigiani D. (Eds.) *Modelli pedagogici e pratiche didattiche per la formazione iniziale e in servizio degli insegnanti*. Progedit.

De Giuseppe, T., & Corona, F. (2020). *Flipped Inclusion e compiti di realtà pro-sociali ed esistenziali*. Pensa MultiMedia.

De Giuseppe, T., & Corona, F. (2021). *Flipped Inclusion 2.0: Modelli sistemici di trasformazione digitale e coesione sociale*. FrancoAngeli.

Falce, V., Ghidini, G. & Olivieri G. (Eds.) (2018). *Informazione e Big Data tra innovazione e concorrenza.* Giuffrè.

Falce, V. & Sertoli C. (2022, April 5). L'IA in consiglio di amministrazione: ecco "l'algo-governance". *Agenda Digitale*. https://www.agendadigitale.eu/cultura-digitale/verso-lalgogovernance-il-ruolo-dellia-in-consiglio-di-amministrazione/

Fenwick, M., McCahery, J.A. & Vermeulen P.M. (2019). The End of Corporate Governance (Hello "Platform Governance"). *European Business Organization Law Review, 20*(1), 171–199. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40804-019-00137-z

Fenwick, M. & Vermeulen, P.M. (2018). *Technology and Corporate Governance: Blockchain, Crypto and Artificial Intelligence*. European Corporate Governance Institute (ECGI) Law Working Paper No. 424/2018. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3263222

Floridi, L. (2019). *The logic of information: A theory of philosophy as conceptual design*. Oxford University Press.

Fowler, F. J. (2014). *Survey research methods* (5th ed.). SAGE Publications.

Hellinger, B. (2001). *Gli ordini dell'amore: Un manuale per la cura delle relazioni*. Urra.

Hilb, M. (2020). Toward artificial governance? The role of artificial intelligence in shaping the future of corporate governance. *Journal of Management and Governance*, *24*(4), 851–870. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-020-09519-9

Lewin, K. (1946). Action research and minority problems. *Journal of Social Issues*, 2(4), 34-46.

Montagnani, M.L. (2020). Intelligenza artificiale e governance della "nuova" grande impresa azionaria: potenzialità e questioni endoconsiliari. *Rivista delle società*, *65*(4), 1003–1028.

Montagnani, M.L. & Passador, M.L. (2021). Il consiglio di amministrazione nell'era dell'intelligenza artificiale: tra corporate reporting, composizione e responsabilità. *Rivista delle società*, *66*(1), 121–151.

Morin, E. (1993). *Introduzione al pensiero complesso*. Sperling & Kupfer.

Mosco, G.D. (2019). Roboboard. L'intelligenza artificiale nei consigli di amministrazione. *Analisi Giuridica dell'Economia*, *1*, 247–260. https://doi.org/10.1433/94555

Nicotra, M. (2023). Intelligenza artificiale: cos'è, come funziona e le applicazioni in Italia e in Europa*. Agenda Digitale. https://www.agendadigitale.eu/sicurezza/privacy/intelligenza-artificiale-la-via-delleuropa-su-regole-e-investimenti/*

Nuzzo, A. & Olivieri, G. (2019*). Algoritmi. Se li conosci, li regoli*. *Analisi Giuridica dell'Economia*, *1*, 1–423. Il Mulino. https://doi.org/10.1433/94540

Olvera, A. (2011). *Pedagogía Sistémica con enfoque de Bert Hellinger: Fundamentos teóricos y prácticos*. Grupo Editorial Cudec.

Petrin, M. (2019) Corporate Management in the Age of AI. *Columbia Business Law Review, 2019*(3), 965–1030. https://doi.org/10.7916/cblr.v2019i3.5118

Rao, A. (2016). AI Everywhere/Nowhere. *Insurance thought leadership.* https://www.insurancethoughtleadership.com/ai-everywherenowhere/

Rossi, G. (2012). La metamorfosi della società per azioni. *Rivista delle società*, *57(1), 1–10.*

Schneider, G. (2022). Intelligenza artificiale, governance societaria e responsabilità sociale d'impresa: rischi e opportunità. *La nuova Giurisprudenza civile commentata*, *38*(3), 711–721.

Sibilio, M., & Aiello, P. (2015). *Formazione e ricerca per una didattica inclusiva*. Franco Angeli.

Teubner, G. (2019). *Soggetti giuridici digitali? Sullo status privatistico degli agenti software autonomi*. ESI (Edizioni Scientifiche Italiane).

Weill, P., Woerner, T., Stephanie, L. & Banner, J. (2019). *Assessing the Impact of Digital Savvy Board on Company Performance.* (MIT Sloan CISR Working Paper No. 433). MIT Center for Information Systems Research.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism: The fight for a human future at the new frontier of power*. PublicAffairs.