

**Kavun F.**

*PhD student at the Department of Management of Enterprises  
National Technical University of Ukraine  
«Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute»,  
Kyiv, Ukraine  
ORCID: 0009-0004-2749-743X*

## **HUMAN–AI TEAMING AS A NEW PARADIGM OF ENTERPRISE MANAGEMENT IN THE DIGITAL ECONOMY**

The accelerating integration of artificial intelligence (AI) technologies into enterprise management processes represents one of the most consequential structural shifts in contemporary organizational science. As digital transformation reshapes competitive dynamics across industries, the concept of human–AI teaming has emerged as a fundamentally new paradigm that redefines how managerial decisions are made, how workflows are structured, and how organizational capabilities are built and sustained over time. According to McKinsey’s landmark study on workplace transformation, more than 70 percent of organizations have already adopted at least one AI function in their operations; yet the majority have not redesigned their management processes to exploit collaborative human–AI configurations in a systematic way [2]. This widening gap between technological adoption and organizational adaptation constitutes the central challenge that the human–AI teaming paradigm seeks to address, and it provides the primary motivation for the present investigation.

Human–AI teaming refers to collaborative configurations in which human managers and AI-enabled systems jointly perform cognitive and operational tasks, each contributing distinct capabilities toward shared organizational objectives. Unlike earlier automation paradigms—which sought to replace human labour with machine efficiency—human–AI teaming is premised on the principle of complementarity: AI systems augment human judgment, expand analytical capacity, and accelerate information processing, while human agents provide contextual understanding, ethical reasoning, and adaptive decision-making under conditions of ambiguity and uncertainty [2]. This theoretical distinction is fundamental for enterprise management, as it shifts the unit of analysis from the isolated employee or the standalone algorithm to the integrated human–AI dyad, and ultimately to the broader sociotechnical system in which such dyads operate. The implications for organizational design, talent strategy, and leadership practice are correspondingly profound.

From an organizational design perspective, the formation of effective human–AI teaming processes within an enterprise requires deliberate intervention across three interdependent dimensions. The first is workflow architecture: management processes must be redesigned to delineate clearly which tasks are delegated to AI agents, which remain under exclusive human authority, and which are performed jointly through structured iterative interaction. Poorly defined boundaries between human and machine roles create accountability gaps, generate decision-making friction, and undermine the reliability of AI-generated outputs [1]. The second dimension concerns leadership competency development. Managers operating in human–AI environments must possess AI literacy—the ability to critically evaluate algorithmic recommendations, identify model limitations, and exercise informed override when contextual factors fall outside automated analysis. The third dimension is organizational culture, which must be deliberately shaped to support psychological safety, calibrated trust in AI recommendations, and a continuous learning orientation that enables employees to adapt as AI capabilities evolve [4].

The empirical evidence in support of this multi-dimensional approach is substantial and growing. PwC estimates that AI could contribute up to USD 15.7 trillion to the global economy by 2030, with the highest concentration of value creation in enterprises that embed AI into core managerial and decision-support workflows rather than deploying it in isolated operational functions [3]. Deloitte’s longitudinal research on the future of work corroborates this finding, demonstrating that AI augmentation—in which intelligent systems extend rather than supplant human capability—consistently outperforms full automation strategies in complex management contexts requiring judgment, stakeholder engagement, and non-routine problem-solving [1]. These results align with the established literature on sociotechnical systems theory, which holds that sustainable organizational transformation requires the concurrent redesign of technological infrastructure, social structures, role definitions, and managerial governance mechanisms.

KPMG’s international studies on intelligent automation further underscore that enterprises neglecting the cultural and structural dimensions of AI integration consistently underperform relative to those adopting a holistic transformation approach encompassing technology, people, and process simultaneously [4]. Organizations treating AI implementation as a purely technical undertaking—without accompanying investment in change management, workforce upskilling, and process governance—routinely fail to capture anticipated productivity gains and experience elevated rates of employee resistance and operational disruption. This finding carries important implications for enterprise management practice: the value of human–AI teaming is not inherent in the technology itself but emerges from the quality of the organizational system in

which it is embedded. Senior leadership commitment, dedicated training infrastructure, and transparent communication regarding the scope and purpose of AI deployment each emerge from the evidence as critical enabling factors.

A further dimension of the human–AI teaming paradigm with significant management implications concerns the dynamic and evolutionary nature of human–AI collaboration over time. Unlike conventional management tools, AI systems in organizational contexts learn from interaction, refine their outputs based on accumulated feedback, and progressively expand their operational scope as enterprise data grows. This evolutionary quality introduces temporal complexity into management process design that has no direct precedent in classical management theory. Enterprises must therefore develop adaptive governance frameworks capable of continuously recalibrating the division of cognitive labour between human and artificial agents as the capabilities of both evolve. Research consistently points to the importance of structured feedback loops, periodic performance reassessment, and clearly defined escalation protocols as mechanisms through which organizations can maintain effective human oversight while progressively extending the autonomous scope of AI participation in managerial processes [2]. Without such mechanisms, organizations risk either under-utilizing the growing capability of AI systems or, conversely, extending algorithmic autonomy beyond the boundaries of validated reliability.

Despite the compelling strategic case for human–AI teaming, the practical implementation of such configurations is accompanied by significant organizational challenges that management theory and practice have only begun to systematically address. Chief among these is the problem of algorithmic opacity: many high-performance AI systems operate as “black boxes,” producing outputs whose internal logic is not transparent to human managers, thereby complicating accountability assignment and eroding the trust that effective teaming requires [4]. A second barrier concerns the uneven distribution of AI readiness across organizational levels; frontline managers and operational staff frequently lack the technical literacy needed to engage productively with AI-generated recommendations, creating a capability gap that senior leadership investment alone cannot bridge without structured, role-specific training programmes. Third, regulatory uncertainty—particularly pronounced in sectors such as finance, healthcare, and public administration—introduces institutional constraints on the scope of AI autonomy that organizations may delegate within management processes, necessitating ongoing legal review as part of governance design. Finally, the measurement of human–AI teaming performance itself remains methodologically underdeveloped: conventional productivity and efficiency metrics were calibrated for purely human workflows and frequently fail to capture the distinctive value contributions of collaborative human–AI configurations, such as decision quality under uncertainty, speed of anomaly detection, or the reduction of cognitive load on senior managers [2]. Addressing these implementation barriers is therefore a prerequisite for translating the theoretical promise of human–AI teaming into measurable and sustainable organizational value.

In conclusion, human–AI teaming constitutes a strategic imperative rather than a tactical option for modern enterprise management. Organizations that conceptualize AI not merely as a productivity instrument but as an active and evolving participant in managerial processes will be substantially better positioned to realize the full transformative potential of artificial intelligence in the digital economy. Translating this paradigm into practice requires a coherent, evidence-based organizational framework that integrates workflow redesign, leadership development, and cultural transformation into a unified and measurable programme of change. Future research should prioritize the empirical validation of such frameworks, with particular attention to cross-sectoral variation in human–AI teaming configurations, the identification of critical success factors in large-scale deployment, and the long-term performance outcomes that different teaming architectures produce across diverse organizational contexts.

## References

1. Deloitte. The Future of Work: Reimagining Work, Workforce and Workplaces. Deloitte Insights, 2023. URL: <https://www2.deloitte.com/us/en/insights/focus/technology-and-the-future-of-work.html> (the date of application: 15.03.2026).
2. Mayer E., Hancock B., Weddle B. et al. Superagency in the Workplace: Empowering People to Unlock AI's Full Potential. McKinsey & Company, 2025. URL: <https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/people-and-organizational-performance/our-insights/superagency-in-the-workplace> (the date of application: 15.03.2026).
3. PwC. Global Artificial Intelligence Study: Exploiting the AI Revolution. PricewaterhouseCoopers, 2023. URL: <https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/issues/analytics/assets/pwc-ai-analysis-sizing-the-prize-report.pdf> (the date of application: 15.03.2026).
4. KPMG. Intelligent Automation: The Intersection of Technology and the Future of Work. KPMG International, 2024. URL: <https://kpmg.com/xx/en/home/insights/2024/01/intelligent-automation.html> (the date of application: 15.03.2026).

**Scientific Supervisor:** Full Prof., Doctor of Economic Sciences, Head at the Department of Management of Enterprises  
Derhachova V.