Frontiers in Business, Economics and Management
ISSN: 2766-824X | Vol. 25, No. 2, 2026

Practices of Human-AI Collaboration in Enterprise Generative AI Adoption and Their Implications for Organisational Digital Innovation

Yifan Li

School of Business, The University of Sydney, Sydney, NSW 2050, Australia

Abstract: Generative artificial intelligence is beginning to be used in enterprise workflows as a flexible generator of text, code, images, summaries, and conversations. However, the organisation's value is not derived from technology alone. This conceptual paper explores how enterprises can organise human-AI collaboration during the adoption process and what such practices may achieve for digital innovation. Differentiate among support, sequential co-creation, iterative co-creation and supervised delegation; link these models to workflow redesign, knowledge sharing, service improvement and innovation capabilities. Based on the above discussion, the conditions for converting model outputs into responsible organisational behaviour are task decomposition, verification, role clarity, learning routines and governance. It will also solve hallucination, bias, confidentiality, deskilling, over-reliance and unequal participation. No original data, field research, experiments or performance tests were conducted. Therefore, this paper provides mechanisms and practice-oriented suggestions instead of causal results. It believes that generative AI should be treated as a fallible organisational participant in sociotechnical arrangements, and people are responsible for the goals, contextual judgement, verification and consequential decisions.

Keywords: Generative artificial intelligence; Human–AI collaboration; Enterprise adoption; Digital innovation; Workflow redesign; AI governance.

1. Introduction

Generative artificial intelligence has developed rapidly in recent years and can generate and transform various forms of symbols, including language, software code, images, etc., through natural language instructions. Organizations are using these systems to conduct experiments in customer service, software development, marketing, research, internal knowledge support and administration. Not all adoption is due to innovation. The model can help to speed up the preparation work, but new verification demands will also arise; otherwise, weak assumptions may be spread by extending access to expertise. Thus, the main managerial problem is not whether a company should introduce generative AI, but rather how to organise work in the presence of a probabilistic and occasionally unpredictable system.

This paper studies human-AI collaboration as a set of situated organisational practices. Collaboration refers to the planned distribution, arrangement and monitoring of tasks for employees and generative systems here. Designate a person to identify the problem, determine what data the model will use, how to verify the results, when to issue an alarm for errors, and who is responsible. Digital innovation is generally regarded as the creation or substantial modification of processes, services, products, and organisational capabilities by means of digital resources. Therefore, not all applications are considered new by definition.

The talks are ideas and applications. Integrate the above contents of information systems, organisation studies, human-AI collaboration, digitalisation, and recent research on generative AI. No reports of interviews, surveys, proprietary company data, experiments, model benchmarks or financial results are available. Therefore, statements about effects are presented as potential mechanisms, design suggestions or conditions for further research by others, rather than as the results of this study. Build a foundation of social technology to explore collaboration modes, organisational outcomes and risks, and implementation strategies.

2. Conceptual Foundations

Technology application by organisations is neither solely driven by tools nor entirely free from them. Orlikowski's idea of the duality of technology shows that technology is produced by people, but at the same time, it also creates systems that affect future behaviour [1]. This idea can be applied to generative AI to stabilize the behaviour of the model in practice through prompts, templates, access rights, review processes and local applications. A general-purpose assistant system can be established to act as a drafting aid for the first department, a controlled-search interface for the second, and an unacceptable-risk monitoring device for the third. Enterprise outcomes are thus determined by implemented arrangements rather than by model capabilities alone.

Digitalisation is also a change in the organisation, not just the adoption of new-technology equipment. Disruption refers to the process of disruption caused by digital technology, the subsequent strategic response, altered value-creation path and resulting structural change [2]. Generative AI is related to digital innovation when it modifies coordination, knowledge flow, service design and experimentation; it is not just about employees using a chatbot. The two will not be referred to as general automation; instead, attention will be paid to the corresponding changes in roles, incentives, data architecture and governance.

Generative AI is a type of computational system that learns the distribution of training data to create new content in response to prompts. Feuerriegel and others have introduced the technology, model foundation and applications of organizational change, as well as its limitations and

responsible use [3]. Do not mistake generated content for verified knowledge in an enterprise environment. Outputs are conditional constructions generated by model parameters, prompts, retrieved materials and system settings. Fluency enables communication but is not a guarantee of the truthfulness of the content, legal compliance or achievement of objectives. Therefore, verification will be carried out during the process of cooperation rather than after completion.

3. Emerging Collaboration Practices

The first is a human-led aid. The employee is accountable for the objectives and decisions; only a few applications of the model, such as providing an outline, paraphrasing, translation, categorization, summarization or generating alternatives, will be used. Jarrahi proposes the concept of human-AI symbiosis and believes that computational ability should be used together with human contextual judgment in decision-making [4]. Complementarity in a Generative Environment Requires Explicit Task Division. The procurement specialist can request a comparison of clauses, but after consulting the relevant documents, exercise professional judgment and then accept the comparison. Support is most effective when the user knows the field, can identify errors and trace the source of the output, etc.

The second type is sequential co-production. Alternating work by people and machines: A person issues a task, AI drafts or analyses it, a person reviews, AI corrects, and a responsible employee signs off. Research on organising with learning algorithms has shown that algorithmic systems can redistribute expertise and reshape occupational boundaries [5]. Sequentially, these redistributions will be displayed. Set up checkpoints for managers to log any modifications and prevent unauthorised release of customer data, codebases, etc. Too many handoffs will increase coordination costs; thus, a sequence of operations should be chosen to minimise the impact and reversibility of handoffs.

A third way is iterative co-creation. The employees have tried multiple ways, held several discussions, used the model to challenge their own beliefs and explore other ideas, and gathered some initial thoughts. Hybrid intelligence refers to the combination of human and machine capabilities to achieve an end that would not be possible for either party alone [6]. For example, in product discovery, a team can use a model to generate scenario variations and then exclude implausible options based on market, engineering and ethics. Expand the Search Space; determine the necessary conditions and decide whether an idea is worth exploring. Co-creation should preserve dissent; convergence on the most probable answer to the model will reduce, not increase, innovation.

The fourth kind is a constrained teammate for AI. Working with others to operate machinery raises problems of roles, communication, trust, shared mental models, and coordination [7]. The company can use this idea without giving human agency or responsibility to the model. A team can provide a stable function for the system, such as a meeting summariser or a code-review tool, and publish the allowed input, expected output, known limitation and escalation rules. Anthropomorphic Language should not be used to avoid responsibility; employees and managers remain accountable for the resulting behaviour, and the organisation is responsible for selecting and operating the system.

A Fifth Mode is Supervised Delegation. Agentic information systems need to consider how to evaluate, distribute and coordinate tasks among people and computational artifacts [8]. Generative tools that can connect to databases, applications or workflow engines are capable of performing multi-step operations and do not have to output text. Therefore, delegation should be graduated. Low-consequence, reversible behaviour can be automatised to a certain extent; high-consequence behaviour needs verification, independent evidence or specialist consent. Adopt a least-privilege approach to permissions and record logs of inputs, retrieved sources, outputs, tool calls, overrides and final authorizations.

4. Implications for Digital Innovation

Human-AI collaboration may optimise the division of labour to improve organisational efficiency rather than replacing workers. The automation-augmentation paradox shows that organisations' choices of automation and augmentation are linked and not in opposition [9]. Generative AI can automate the modification of information and enhance interpretation, communication or design. A good Design is to split the workflow into framing, retrieval, generation, evaluation, decision, execution and learning. Managers will distribute these modules according to the strengths, risks and responsibilities of the staff. Therefore, it will be more practical to use AI for a particular job or process rather than for the whole operation.

Field research in recent years has provided some cases, but these cannot be generally applied. Brynjolfsson, Li and Raymond examined a generative assistant for customer-support agents and reported productivity increases among different groups of workers [10]. The structure shows that learning can be transmitted through experience; thus, a system that has learned about organisational behaviour can assist new staff in learning more efficiently by imitation. It cannot be concluded that the same gains will be achieved by other companies, professions, languages or applications. Enterprises can use the external results as hypotheses for controlled local experiments and pay attention to quality, worker experience, customer outcomes and long-term learning.

Generative tools can also reduce the cost of producing preliminary materials for business optimisation. Noy and Zhang conducted an experiment on professional writing tasks to observe changes in completion time and quality under specific experimental conditions [11]. For organisations, the practical impact will not be an all-round enhancement of all knowledge work; rather, some areas of drafting and revision may be reduced in cost. The teams can use the released capacity for customer exploration, exception management, coaching, and in-depth analysis. Reallocation depends on workload design and incentives; otherwise, the saved time may only lead to an increase in the quantity of work and higher review pressure.

Digital innovation can arise from collaboration to accelerate experimentation and implement strict evaluation. Based on the management consulting project, it was found that AI-assisted operation improved the efficiency of some links but reduced the accuracy of others outside the scope of the system [12]. Thus, the design of enterprise capability maps should be task-oriented and flexible. The innovation team will investigate the applications and shortcomings of the model, as well as how these defects are modified. Sandboxes, limited pilots, red-team exercises and comparisons with human or established-process baselines can be used to learn without exposing exploratory outputs as production-ready.

Generative AI can enhance the spread of knowledge in organisations. Prompt libraries, verified examples, evaluation rubrics and documented failure cases can turn single experiments into shared infrastructure. The repositories should not be fixed recipes. Ownership, version control, expiration dates and context notes are required due to changes in models and business conditions. Communities of practice can share use cases for different functions and present tacit knowledge about when not to use AI. In this way, the digital innovation ability is not only in the model but also in the organisation's capacity to learn, revise standards and coordinate expertise.

Generative AI will also be applied to service and business-model innovation through more conversational interfaces and adaptable content. Firms can develop personalised explanation prototypes, multi-language support, internal copilots, or new combinations of data and professional services. They still need to have reliable data access, customer consent, domain verification and an economically viable operating model. Newness is not enough. A digitally innovative service should solve a real problem, be based on a reasonable system, create value without transferring excessive risks to workers, customers and the community.

5. Risks and Governance

The same attributes of generative AI are also sources of organisational risk. Many research groups have studied the issues of misinformation, bias, privacy, security, transparency and illegality in conversational generative AI [13]. A plausible but unsubstantiated answer may spread quickly among the presentations, customer communications and software in the enterprise workflow. Sensitive information may be disclosed in the prompt or retrieval connection. Biased Outputs may affect service quality and employment decisions. Therefore, the scope of governance should cover all applications of the base model, such as data, interfaces, users, vendors, downstream recipients and organisational incentives, etc.

A risk-tiered control structure provides a practical response. The four activities of the NIST AI Risk Management Framework are governance, mapping, measurement and management [14]. A company can set up responsible owners for these functions, identify the affected parties and failure paths, quantify the consequences of harm under specific circumstances, and select corresponding controls. Low-risk ideation may only require disclosure and a normal review, but customer-facing or regulated applications need source grounding, privacy assessment, adversarial testing, human approval, monitoring, and incident procedures. Specify the prohibited uses of the policy and do not assume that all tasks can be made safe by prompting.

Human supervision should be meaningful. If the person clicking "approve" does not have the time, knowledge, supporting data or authority to verify the output, then no defence is offered. The design of the review should specify what to observe, where to find it, and how to report. Have another person verify the high-consequence output for errors. Display the source, uncertainty indicator and system limitations of interfaces, if available. Random audits can find routine over-reliance, and the audit results should be used to improve training, access control and workflow.

Employment problems are also serious. AI assistance can help learners compare the results with those given by experts, but if the beginners do not try to derive the solutions themselves, their own ability will decline. The organisation should offer some basic training opportunities, direction and evaluation. The performance system should not favour the quantity of output over verification labour. Employees should be able to report performance deficiencies anonymously and join the design of workflow systems. Participation may increase the probability of formal governance aligning with the realities of work and deviating from an idealised process map.

Finally, the enterprise needs a reasonable plan for evaluation. Other indices to be used in the evaluation of the drafting support tool are the accuracy of facts, frequency of corrections, consistency, privacy leakage, user workload, convenience and downstream effectiveness. Baselines and evaluation indicators should be set before deployment, if possible. Split the results by task and user group to prevent the dilution of different benefits or harms. In the absence of such evidence, one cannot state that an organisation has achieved the expected outcome.

6. Practice-Oriented Implementation Path

The first step in the responsible adoption path is problem selection, not tool enthusiasm. The manager will find the bottleneck in the work, divide the process, and then decide whether to generate. Then they need to categorize the effects of errors, reversibility of actions, sensitivity of information and requirement for explanation. Use cases that are simple to understand and have a low risk are suitable for beginners to learn from first. The organisation should also provide a non-AI option for comparison with a suitable reference point of model use.

Next is the group Design phase. The roles, inputs, prompts or instructions, retrieval sources, validation criteria and escalation paths for domain experts, IT staff, risk specialists and affected employees need to be specified. The responsibility matrix shows who starts the output request, who processes it, who approves the related operation, and who is responsible for the system. Train operation skills and domain-specific failure scenarios in training. It should allow users to be suspicious of the unquestionable, examine the source, protect private data, and know when to leave the system.

Deploy via limited-scope pilots and record the corresponding hypotheses. Record output defects, overrides, near misses and unexpected benefits by the team, then revise the workflow before expansion. Continue monitoring after approval, as the model version, connected data, user behaviour and external circumstances may change. Add clauses to the supply contract for reporting of incidents, version control, security obligations and an exit plan. Organise the internal knowledge assets created during the pilot, such as rubrics, validated examples and failure taxonomies, as organisational resources instead of leaving them as informal materials for a few enthusiasts.

Scale according to the evidence and organisational capacity. A successful pilot of one function does not automatically warrant enterprise-wide application. Other reasons for the risk are differences in language and regulations, customer vulnerability, poor data quality, and lack of professionalism. Leaders should also examine the learning, access, accountability and impact on stakeholders of the workforce. Human-AI collaboration is a form of digital innovation capability when an organisation repeatedly discovers suitable

applications, honestly evaluates them, redesigns work, and retires or restricts systems based on evidence.

7. Conclusion

Enterprise adoption of generative AI can be seen as organisational redesign around a powerful but imperfect technology. Human-AI collaboration can be in the form of bounded assistance, sequential co-production, iterative co-creation, constrained teamwork, and supervised delegation. Each pattern has a separate function of framing, generation, verification, authorisation and learning. It should be suitable for the specific purpose, relatively minor in terms of damage caused by errors, and easy to obtain convincing evidence of the error.

Well-designed collaborations can support optimisation of operations, knowledge sharing, experimentation, service development, and more digital innovation. These results are not the result of model access. They are supported by the following related investments: workflow design, employee capabilities, data governance, evaluation and responsible leadership. Organizations need to preserve the human element of purpose and outcome, and provide adequate resources for visible review work.

As this paper does not have new empirical data, causality or organisational returns cannot be established. Its contribution is a system of mechanisms and practices based on the existing literature. In the future, empirical studies will examine collaboration patterns in different industries and occupations, investigate long-term learning and deskilling, and assess the impact of participation and governance on innovation quality. The first practical lesson is that adoption should be viewed as an ongoing process of Design, evidence collection, optimisation and accountability, rather than a one-time installation of software.

References

[1] Orlikowski, W. J. (1992). The duality of technology: Rethinking the concept of technology in organizations. Organization Science, 3(3), 398–427. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.3.3.398

[2] Vial, G. (2019). Understanding digital transformation: A review and a research agenda. The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 28(2), 118–144. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2019.01.003

[3] Feuerriegel, S., Hartmann, J., Janiesch, C., & Zschech, P. (2024). Generative AI. Business & Information Systems Engineering, 66(1), 111–126. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-023-00834-7

[4] Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human–AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. Business Horizons, 61(4), 577–586. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007

[5] Faraj, S., Pachidi, S., & Sayegh, K. (2018). Working and organizing in the age of the learning algorithm. Information and Organization, 28(1), 62–70. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2018.02.005

[6] Dellermann, D., Ebel, P., Söllner, M., & Leimeister, J. M. (2019). Hybrid intelligence. Business & Information Systems Engineering, 61(5), 637–643. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-019-00595-2

[7] Seeber, I., Bittner, E., Briggs, R. O., de Vreede, T., de Vreede, G.-J., Elkins, A., Maier, R., Merz, A. B., Oeste-Reiß, S., Randrup, N., Schwabe, G., & Söllner, M. (2020). Machines as teammates: A research agenda on AI in team collaboration. Information & Management, 57(2), 103174. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2019.103174

[8] Baird, A., & Maruping, L. M. (2021). The next generation of research on IS use: A theoretical framework of delegation to and from agentic IS artifacts. MIS Quarterly, 45(1), 315–341. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/15882

[9] Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. Academy of Management Review, 46(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

[10] Brynjolfsson, E., Li, D., & Raymond, L. R. (2023). Generative AI at work (NBER Working Paper No. 31161). National Bureau of Economic Research. https://doi.org/10.3386/w31161

[11] Noy, S., & Zhang, W. (2023). Experimental evidence on the productivity effects of generative artificial intelligence. Science, 381(6654), 187–192. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.adh2586

[12] Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland, E., III, Mollick, E. R., Lifshitz-Assaf, H., Kellogg, K. C., Rajendran, S., Krayer, L., Candelon, F., & Lakhani, K. R. (2023). Navigating the jagged technological frontier: Field experimental evidence of the effects of AI on knowledge worker productivity and quality (Harvard Business School Working Paper No. 24-013).

[13] Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., et al. (2023). "So what if ChatGPT wrote it?" Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. International Journal of Information Management, 71, 102642. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642

[14] National Institute of Standards and Technology. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Risk Management Framework (AI RMF 1.0) (NIST AI 100-1). U.S. Department of Commerce. https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1