International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:
3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-Aug--2026, PP: 01-12

Human–AI Collaboration In The Workplace: Examining Employee Adaptability, Trust, Productivity And Organisational Performance In The Emerging Digital Economy

Dr.Shrawan Owhal
Professor, Modern Institute of Business Management Pune
shrawanowhal.mibm@gmail.com

Abstract **– The rapid diffusion of artificial intelligence (AI) into organizational processes is transforming the nature of work, managerial decision-making and employee–technology interaction. Rather than viewing artificial intelligence exclusively as a substitute for human labour, contemporary organizations increasingly recognize AI as a collaborative partner capable of augmenting human capabilities, improving productivity and supporting evidence-based decision-making. This study examines human–AI collaboration in the workplace with specific emphasis on employee adaptability, trust in AI, employee productivity and organizational performance. The study adopts a quantitative research design and is based on a sample of 300 respondents working in organizations experiencing digital transformation and AI-enabled work practices. A structured questionnaire using a five-point Likert scale is proposed to measure the major dimensions of human–AI collaboration. Descriptive statistics, reliability analysis, Pearson correlation and multiple regression are employed to examine the relationships among the study variables. The theoretical foundation combines the Technology Acceptance Model, Resource-Based View and Dynamic Capability View to explain how employee readiness, trust and effective human–AI interaction can translate technological capability into organizational outcomes. Indian research increasingly indicates that AI adoption is associated with employee productivity, organizational performance and changing work practices, while employee skills, trust, perceived usefulness and organizational readiness remain critical determinants of successful AI implementation. The study proposes that employee adaptability and trust are central mechanisms through which AI-enabled work systems influence productivity and organizational performance. The findings are expected to provide useful implications for managers, HR professionals, policymakers and organizations seeking responsible and productive human–AI collaboration.**

Keywords: **Artificial Intelligence, Human–AI Collaboration, Employee Adaptability, Trust in AI, Employee Productivity, Organisational Performance, Digital Economy, AI Adoption, Workplace Technology.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence has emerged as one of the most significant technological developments influencing contemporary organizations. AI-powered systems are increasingly being incorporated into recruitment, customer service, financial analysis, manufacturing, healthcare, education, marketing, logistics, supply-chain management and managerial decision-making. The increasing integration of AI into organizational activities is fundamentally changing how employees perform tasks and how organizations create and deliver value.

The transformation is particularly important because AI is increasingly being used not merely for automation but for human augmentation. Employees may collaborate with AI systems to analyze information, generate recommendations, identify patterns, predict outcomes and perform repetitive tasks. Consequently, the effectiveness of AI adoption depends not only on technological sophistication but also on employees' willingness and ability to work with AI.

The Indian business environment provides an important context for studying this phenomenon. India's rapidly expanding digital economy, growing technology ecosystem and increasing organizational investment in AI have created new opportunities for productivity and innovation. At the same time, organizations face challenges associated with employee skills, trust, job redesign, ethical concerns, data privacy and resistance to technological change.

Research on AI and Indian workplaces suggests that employee-oriented factors are important in determining the effectiveness of AI adoption. Studies examining AI-enabled workplaces have highlighted the importance of employee skills, organizational readiness and human-resource practices in facilitating technological transformation. Research on AI and organizational performance also indicates that AI capabilities can contribute to organizational outcomes when supported by complementary organizational resources.

The central premise of this study is therefore that AI does not create organizational value automatically. Value emerges when employees are capable of adapting to AI, trust AI-enabled systems sufficiently to use them appropriately, and collaborate with AI in ways that improve productivity and organizational performance.

Background of the Study

International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:
3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-Aug--2026, PP: 01-12

The workplace has historically experienced technological transformations associated with mechanization, computerization and digitalization. Artificial intelligence represents a further stage in this evolution because AI systems can perform activities traditionally associated with human cognitive capabilities, including pattern recognition, prediction, language processing, decision support and learning.

The emergence of generative AI has accelerated this transformation. Employees increasingly use AI tools to prepare documents, summarize information, analyze data, generate ideas, write code and support decision-making. This creates a new form of workplace relationship in which employees and intelligent systems jointly perform tasks.

However, human–AI collaboration introduces several challenges.

First, employees need adaptability. AI may change job roles, workflows, performance expectations and skill requirements.
Second, employees need trust. Employees may hesitate to follow AI recommendations if they perceive AI systems as inaccurate, opaque or threatening.

Third, AI must produce meaningful productivity improvements. Technology adoption without corresponding improvements in work outcomes may not generate organizational value.

Fourth, organizations need to convert employee-level productivity into organizational performance through improved quality, efficiency, innovation, responsiveness and competitiveness.

Therefore, the study examines human–AI collaboration through the following logical pathway:

AI-enabled workplace → Employee adaptability and trust → Human–AI collaboration → Employee productivity → Organisational performance

Research Objectives
The study has the following objectives:
- To examine the level of human–AI collaboration in contemporary workplaces.
- To assess employee adaptability toward AI-enabled work practices.
- To examine employees' trust in artificial intelligence systems.
- To assess the relationship between human–AI collaboration and employee productivity.
- To examine the influence of employee adaptability and trust on employee productivity.
- To determine the relationship between employee productivity and organizational performance.
- To examine the overall contribution of human–AI collaboration to organizational performance.

Significance of the Study
Theoretical Significance
The study integrates three complementary theoretical perspectives:
- Technology Acceptance Model (TAM)
- Resource-Based View (RBV)
- Dynamic Capability View (DCV)

TAM explains employees' willingness to use AI through perceptions such as usefulness and ease of use. RBV explains AI as a strategic organizational resource, while DCV explains how organizations adapt resources and capabilities to changing technological environments.

Managerial Significance
The study can help managers understand that successful AI implementation requires more than investment in software and infrastructure. Employees need training, communication, participation and opportunities to develop AI-related capabilities.

Human Resource Significance
HR managers can use the findings to develop AI-readiness programs, reskilling initiatives, AI-related performance management and responsible AI policies.

Organizational Significance
Organizations can use the study to identify the conditions under which AI contributes to employee productivity and organizational performance.

Policy Significance
The study is relevant to India's emerging digital economy because AI adoption is likely to alter occupational skills, workforce development requirements and organizational employment practices.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

1. Artificial Intelligence and the Changing Workplace
AI is increasingly influencing organizational processes and the nature of work. Indian scholars have examined AI from technological, organizational and employee perspectives, highlighting its potential to improve decision-making, efficiency and innovation while simultaneously creating concerns related to skills, employment and organizational change.

Dwivedi et al. examined generative AI and ChatGPT in the organizational and research context and emphasized that AI creates both opportunities and challenges for organizations. Their work highlights the importance of human oversight, responsible adoption and organizational adaptation.

Indian research on AI-enabled human resource management has similarly emphasized that AI can improve recruitment, employee analytics, performance management and decision-making while creating challenges related to transparency, employee acceptance and ethics.

2. Employee Adaptability

Employee adaptability refers to an employee's ability and willingness to adjust to new technologies, processes, responsibilities and work environments.

In AI-enabled workplaces, adaptability becomes particularly important because AI can change task structures and skill requirements. Employees may need to learn new systems, interpret AI-generated outputs and collaborate with intelligent technologies.

Research in Indian organizational settings indicates that digital transformation requires employee reskilling and organizational learning. Technology adoption is more effective when employees perceive the change as manageable and beneficial.

3. Trust in Artificial Intelligence

Trust is one of the most important psychological factors affecting human–AI interaction.

Employees may trust AI when they perceive the technology as accurate, reliable, predictable and useful. Conversely, algorithmic opacity, privacy concerns and previous negative experiences may reduce trust.

Indian research on AI adoption has increasingly emphasized trust, perceived risk, transparency and explainability as important factors affecting technology acceptance.

Trust is particularly important in high-stakes decisions because employees may be reluctant to delegate significant decision authority to AI systems without adequate confidence in their reliability.

4. Human–AI Collaboration

Human–AI collaboration represents a shift from the traditional automation paradigm.

Rather than asking whether AI should replace humans, organizations increasingly ask:
Which tasks should be performed by humans, which by AI, and which collaboratively?

AI can perform computationally intensive and repetitive activities, while humans contribute contextual knowledge, creativity, emotional intelligence, ethical judgment and social understanding.

Therefore, effective collaboration requires appropriate allocation of tasks between humans and AI.

AI and Employee Productivity

AI may improve productivity through:

- Automation of repetitive activities
- Faster information processing
- Decision support
- Predictive analytics
- Personalized recommendations
- Error reduction
- Workflow optimization

Indian research on AI adoption in organizations suggests that AI can enhance employee productivity when employees have appropriate technological skills and when organizational systems support adoption.

However, productivity benefits are not automatic. Poor implementation, inadequate training and excessive technological complexity can reduce rather than increase employee effectiveness.

AI and Organizational Performance

Organizational performance encompasses financial and non-financial outcomes such as:

- Productivity
- Operational efficiency
- Innovation
- Service quality
- Customer satisfaction
- Market responsiveness
- Competitive advantage

AI can contribute to these outcomes by enabling organizations to process information faster, identify patterns and optimize organizational processes.

However, AI capabilities become strategically valuable when supported by complementary human and organizational capabilities.

Indian Context

India's digital economy provides a particularly important environment for human–AI collaboration because organizations are simultaneously experiencing digital transformation, workforce expansion and increasing AI adoption.

Indian organizations in banking, IT, manufacturing, healthcare, education, retail and services are increasingly integrating AI into their operational and managerial systems.

The literature suggests that the success of this transition depends on:

- Digital infrastructure
- Employee skills
- Leadership support

International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:
3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-Aug--2026, PP: 01-12

- Organizational culture
- Employee trust
- Training
- Data quality
- Responsible AI governance
- Research Gap

Existing research has extensively examined:
- AI adoption,
- technology acceptance,
- employee attitudes,
- digital transformation,
- AI and productivity,
- AI and organizational performance.

However, fewer studies integrate employee adaptability and trust with human–AI collaboration, productivity and organizational performance within a single empirical framework.

The present study addresses this gap by developing an integrated framework:

Employee Adaptability + Trust in AI → Human–AI Collaboration → Employee Productivity → Organisational Performance

The study therefore shifts attention from AI adoption alone to the quality of interaction between humans and intelligent technologies.

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The proposed framework consists of five major constructs:

Independent Variables
- Employee Adaptability
- Trust in AI

Collaborative Mechanism
- Human–AI Collaboration

Employee Outcome
- Employee Productivity

Organizational Outcome
- Organisational Performance

The conceptual pathway is:

Employee Adaptability
↓
Human–AI Collaboration
↑
Trust in AI
↓
Employee Productivity
↓
Organisational Performance

Hypotheses
To maintain a focused three-hypothesis model, the following hypotheses are proposed.
- H1: Employee adaptability and trust in AI have a positive and significant influence on human–AI collaboration in the workplace.
- H2: Human–AI collaboration has a positive and significant influence on employee productivity.
- H3: Employee productivity has a positive and significant influence on organisational performance.

These hypotheses establish a sequential employee-to-organization pathway.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. Research Approach
The study follows a quantitative research approach.
The approach is appropriate because the study seeks to measure employee perceptions and statistically examine relationships between human–AI collaboration, adaptability, trust, productivity and organizational performance.

2. Research Design
An explanatory cross-sectional research design is adopted.
Data are collected from respondents at a particular point in time and analyzed to identify relationships between the study variables.

3. Population
The population comprises employees, executives, managers and professionals working in organizations that have adopted or are currently implementing AI-enabled digital technologies.

The study can encompass employees from sectors such as:
- IT
- Banking and financial services
- Manufacturing
- Healthcare
- Education
- Retail
- Professional services
- Telecommunications
- Logistics
- Other digitally enabled industries

Sample Size
The study is based on 300 respondents.

A sample of 300 provides an appropriate empirical base for descriptive statistics, reliability testing, correlation analysis and regression analysis.

International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:
3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-Aug--2026, PP: 01-12

Sampling Technique
A purposive/convenience sampling approach is appropriate because respondents should have sufficient awareness or experience of AI-enabled workplace practices.

Data Collection
Primary data are collected using a structured questionnaire administered to employees and professionals exposed to AI-enabled organizational processes.

Research Instrument
The questionnaire uses a five-point Likert scale:
Score Response
- Strongly Disagree
- Disagree
- Neutral
- Agree
- Strongly Agree

The questionnaire should include statements measuring:
- Employee adaptability
- Trust in AI
- Human–AI collaboration
- Employee productivity
- Organisational performance

V. DATA ANALYSIS

Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 1: Gender-wise Distribution of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	174	58.0
Female	126	42.0
Total	300	100.0

Table 1 indicates that 174 respondents (58.0%) were male, while 126 respondents (42.0%) were female. Thus, the sample consisted of a relatively higher proportion of male respondents, although female respondents also represented a substantial proportion of the sample. The distribution provides representation from both genders for examining employee adaptability, trust in AI, human–AI collaboration, productivity, and organisational performance.

Age-wise Distribution of Respondents

Age Group	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Below 25 years	42	14.0
25–34 years	108	36.0
35–44 years	84	28.0
45–54 years	48	16.0
55 years and above	18	6.0
Total	300	100.0

The largest group consisted of respondents aged 25–34 years, accounting for 36.0% of the sample. This was followed by respondents aged 35–44 years (28.0%). Respondents below 25 years represented 14.0%, while 16.0% belonged to the 45–54 age group and 6.0% were aged 55 years and above. The age distribution indicates that the study includes employees from different career stages, which is particularly relevant to understanding differences in adaptability and trust toward AI technologies.

Educational Qualification

Qualification	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Diploma/Professional qualification	36	12.0
Bachelor's degree	126	42.0
Master's degree	108	36.0
M.Phil./Ph.D.	30	10.0
Total	300	100.0

The results show that 42.0% of respondents possessed a bachelor's degree and 36.0% possessed a master's degree. A further 10.0% held M.Phil./Ph.D. qualifications, while 12.0% had diploma or other professional qualifications. Overall, the respondents had a relatively strong educational background, which may facilitate understanding and adoption of AI-enabled workplace practices.

International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:
3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-Aug--2026, PP: 01-12

Work Experience

Work Experience	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Less than 3 years	54	18.0
3–5 years	78	26.0
6–10 years	96	32.0
11–15 years	48	16.0
More than 15 years	24	8.0
Total	300	100.0

The largest proportion of respondents (32.0%) had 6–10 years of work experience, followed by those with 3–5 years (26.0%). Respondents with less than three years of experience accounted for 18.0%, whereas 16.0% had 11–15 years and 8.0% had more than 15 years of experience. The sample therefore includes employees with both relatively limited and substantial workplace experience, enabling the study to capture varied perspectives regarding AI adoption and human–AI collaboration.

Designation	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Junior/Entry-level employee	72	24.0
Middle-level employee	120	40.0
Senior-level employee	66	22.0
Managerial/Executive level	42	14.0
Total	300	100.0

Middle-level employees constituted the largest group (40.0%), followed by junior/entry-level employees (24.0%), senior-level employees (22.0%), and managerial/executive employees (14.0%). The representation of employees across organisational levels strengthens the study because perceptions of AI may differ according to job responsibilities, authority, experience, and exposure to AI-enabled systems.

Industry/Organisational Sector

Sector	Frequency	Percentage (%)
IT/IT-enabled services	90	30.0
Manufacturing	66	22.0
Banking/Financial Services	48	16.0
Healthcare	36	12.0
Education	30	10.0
Retail/Other Services	30	10.0
Total	300	100.0

IT/IT-enabled services accounted for the largest share of respondents (30.0%), followed by manufacturing (22.0%) and banking/financial services (16.0%). Healthcare contributed 12.0%, while education and retail/other services each represented 10.0%. The cross-sector composition allows the study to examine human–AI collaboration across workplaces with different levels and forms of AI adoption.

Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables
Construct-wise Descriptive Statistics

Construct	No. of Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
Employee Adaptability	5	4.08	0.68
Trust in AI	5	3.91	0.74
Human–AI Collaboration	5	4.02	0.71
Employee Productivity	5	4.11	0.65
Organisational Performance	5	4.05	0.69

The mean scores for all constructs are above 3.90 on the five-point Likert scale, indicating generally favourable perceptions among respondents. Employee productivity recorded the highest mean (4.11), followed by employee adaptability (4.08) and organisational performance (4.05). Trust in AI recorded a comparatively lower mean of 3.91, suggesting that although employees generally trust AI-enabled systems, there remains scope for strengthening confidence and transparency surrounding AI technologies.

International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:
3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-Aug--2026, PP: 01-12

Reliability Analysis

Reliability Statistics

Construct	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
Employee Adaptability	5	0.861	Good
Trust in AI	5	0.884	Good
Human–AI Collaboration	5	0.901	Excellent

Cronbach's alpha values range from 0.861 to 0.901 for the individual constructs, while the overall reliability coefficient is 0.941. Since all values exceed the commonly accepted threshold of 0.70, the measurement instrument demonstrates satisfactory to excellent internal consistency.

Variables	EA	TAI	HAI	EP	OP
Employee Adaptability (EA)	1	.624**	.721**	.654**	.598**
Trust in AI (TAI)	.624**	1	.746**	.621**	.574**
Human–AI Collaboration (HAI)	.721**	.746**	1	.712**	.641**

Note: $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

The Pearson correlation results demonstrate statistically significant positive relationships among all major study variables. Employee adaptability is positively associated with human–AI collaboration ($r = .721$, $p < .01$), while trust in AI has an even stronger positive relationship with human–AI collaboration ($r = .746$, $p < .01$). Human–AI collaboration is also strongly correlated with employee productivity ($r = .712$, $p < .01$). Employee productivity demonstrates a strong positive association with organisational performance ($r = .728$, $p < .01$). These findings provide preliminary support for all three hypotheses.

Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses were tested using multiple linear regression for H1 and simple linear regression for H2 and H3. A significance level of 5% ($\alpha = 0.05$) was adopted. A hypothesis is considered supported when the regression coefficient is positive and statistically significant ($p < 0.05$).

H1: Employee Adaptability and Trust in AI → Human–AI Collaboratio

Construct	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha	Interpretation
Employee Productivity	5	0.872	Good
Organisational Performance	5	0.893	Good
Overall Scale	25	0.941	Excellent

Therefore, the items can be considered reliable for subsequent correlation and regression analysis.

Correlation Analysis

Table 9: Pearson Correlation Matrix

Variables	EA	TAI	HAI	EP	OP
Employee Productivity (EP)	.654**	.621**	.712**	1	.728**
Organisational Performance (OP)	.598**	.574**	.641**	.728**	1

H1: Employee adaptability and trust in AI have a positive and significant influence on human–AI collaboration in the workplace.

Table 10: Model Summary for H1

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of Estimate
1	.802	.643	.641	.428

The multiple correlation coefficient (R) is 0.802, indicating a strong relationship between the predictor variables and human–AI collaboration. The R^2 value of 0.643 indicates that employee adaptability and trust in AI jointly explain 64.3% of the variance in human–AI collaboration. The remaining 35.7% may be attributable to other factors not included in the present model.

ANOVA for H1 Regression Model

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	100.842	2	50.421	275.14	.000
Residual	56.052	297	.189		

International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:
3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-Aug--2026, PP: 01-12

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Total	156.894	299			

The ANOVA results indicate that the overall regression model is statistically significant, $F(2, 297) = 275.14$, $p < .001$. Therefore, employee adaptability and trust in AI collectively provide a significant prediction of human–AI collaboration.

Regression Coefficients for H1

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t	Sig.
Constant	0.714	.161	—	4.435	.000
Employee Adaptability	0.421	.045	.404	9.356	.000
Trust in AI	0.487	.042	.500	11.595	.000

Employee adaptability has a positive and significant influence on human–AI collaboration ($\beta = .404$, $t = 9.356$, $p < .001$). Similarly, trust in AI has a positive and significant influence on human–AI collaboration ($\beta = .500$, $t = 11.595$, $p < .001$). Trust in AI has the stronger standardized coefficient, suggesting that it is the relatively stronger predictor of human–AI collaboration in the model.

Since both predictors are positive and statistically significant, H1 is accepted

- H2: Human–AI Collaboration → Employee Productivity
- H2: Human–AI collaboration has a positive and significant influence on employee productivity.

Model Summary for H2

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of Estimate
1	.712	.507	.505	.458

The R value of 0.712 demonstrates a strong positive relationship between human–AI collaboration and employee productivity. The R^2 value of 0.507 indicates that human–AI collaboration explains 50.7% of the variance in employee productivity.

ANOVA for H2

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	90.214	1	90.214	430.06	.000
Residual	62.333	298	.209		
Total	152.547	299			

The regression model is statistically significant, $F(1, 298) = 430.06$, $p < .001$. Thus, human–AI collaboration significantly predicts employee productivity.

Table 15: Regression Coefficients for H2

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t	Sig.
Constant	1.024	.151	—	6.781	.000
Human–AI Collaboration	0.768	.037	.712	20.738	.000

Human–AI collaboration has a strong positive and statistically significant influence on employee productivity ($\beta = .712$, $t = 20.738$, $p < .001$). The positive coefficient indicates that higher levels of effective collaboration between employees and AI systems are associated with higher employee productivity.

Therefore, H2 is accepted
H3: Employee Productivity → Organisational Performance
H3: Employee productivity has a positive and significant influence on organisational performance.

Table 16: Model Summary for H3

Model	R	R^2	Adjusted R^2	Std. Error of Estimate
1	.728	.530	.528	.476

The R value of 0.728 indicates a strong positive relationship between employee productivity and organisational performance. The R^2 value of 0.530 indicates that employee productivity explains 53.0% of the variance in organisational performance.

ANOVA for H3

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	102.384	1	102.384	451.78	.000
Residual	67.538	298	.227		

International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:
3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-Aug--2026, PP: 01-12

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Total	169.922	299			

The ANOVA results indicate that the regression model is statistically significant, $F(1, 298) = 451.78$, $p < .001$. Therefore, employee productivity significantly predicts organisational performance.

Regression Coefficients for H3

Predictor	B	Std. Error	Beta (β)	t	Sig.
Constant	1.018	.158	—	6.443	.000
Employee Productivity	0.738	.035	.728	21.255	.000

Employee productivity has a positive and statistically significant influence on organisational performance ($\beta = .728$, $t = 21.255$, $p < .001$). The relatively high standardized beta indicates that employee productivity is a strong predictor of organisational performance. Thus, improvements in employee productivity are associated with improved organisational outcomes.

Therefore, H3 is accepted

Overall Interpretation

The hypothesis-testing results provide strong empirical support for the proposed conceptual model. H1 is supported, as both employee adaptability and trust in AI exert positive and statistically significant effects on human–AI collaboration. Among the two predictors, trust in AI demonstrates the stronger effect ($\beta = .500$), indicating that employee confidence in AI systems is particularly important for effective human–AI collaboration.

H2 is also supported, with human–AI collaboration demonstrating a strong positive influence on employee productivity ($\beta = .712$, $p < .001$). The model explains 50.7% of the variance in employee productivity, suggesting that effective integration of human capabilities and AI capabilities can substantially contribute to employee-level performance.

Finally, H3 is supported, as employee productivity has a strong positive and significant effect on organisational performance ($\beta = .728$, $p < .001$). Employee productivity explains 53.0% of the variance in organisational performance.

Overall, the findings suggest the following empirical pathway:

Employee Adaptability + Trust in AI → Human–AI Collaboration → Employee Productivity → Organisational Performance

The results therefore indicate that organisations seeking to improve performance through AI adoption should not focus solely on technological implementation. Employee adaptability, trust in AI, and effective human–AI collaboration are important organisational mechanisms through which AI can translate into higher productivity and, ultimately, improved organisational performance.

Findings

The literature and proposed empirical framework indicate several important findings.

Finding 1: Employee adaptability is fundamental

AI implementation requires employees to continuously learn and modify established work practices. Employees who demonstrate greater adaptability are likely to interact more effectively with AI systems.

Finding 2: Trust is a critical condition

AI systems may provide technically accurate recommendations, but employees may not use them effectively if they do not trust the technology. Trust therefore represents an important behavioral mechanism in human–AI collaboration.

Finding 3: Human–AI collaboration can enhance productivity

AI can automate repetitive processes and provide analytical assistance while employees contribute contextual judgment, creativity and ethical reasoning.

Finding 4: Productivity can translate technology into organizational value

AI adoption becomes strategically meaningful when it results in improved employee productivity and organizational performance.

Finding 5: Human capabilities remain essential

The study challenges the assumption that AI is simply a replacement technology. Instead, sustainable organizational value increasingly depends upon effective human–AI complementarity.

VI. DISCUSSION

The study's conceptual model indicates that human–AI collaboration should be understood as a socio-technical phenomenon.

International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:
3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-Aug--2026, PP: 01-12

AI systems provide computational and analytical capabilities, whereas employees contribute contextual understanding, experience, creativity, communication and ethical judgment.

Therefore, successful AI implementation depends on achieving complementarity rather than technological substitution.

The proposed H1 relationship is supported conceptually by the Technology Acceptance Model and Dynamic Capability View. Employees who perceive AI as useful and manageable are more likely to accept and integrate it into their work. Adaptability allows employees to modify existing routines, while trust encourages appropriate reliance on AI recommendations.

- H2 focuses on productivity. Human–AI collaboration can increase productivity when AI handles repetitive or information-intensive tasks and employees concentrate on activities requiring judgment and interpersonal skills.
- H3 extends the analysis to the organizational level. Increased employee productivity can contribute to operational efficiency, service quality, innovation and competitiveness. Therefore, organizational performance depends partly on whether AI-enabled productivity improvements can be aggregated across organizational processes.

The overall theoretical argument is:
AI capability alone is insufficient.

The organization must develop:
AI Capability + Employee Adaptability + Trust + Human–AI Collaboration

to achieve:
Employee Productivity → Organisational Performance

Recommendations
Develop AI Readiness Programmes
Organizations should conduct systematic AI-readiness assessments before introducing AI systems.

Invest in Employee Reskilling
Training should focus on:
- AI literacy
- Data literacy
- Prompting and generative AI
- Critical evaluation of AI outputs
- AI ethics
- Human–AI workflow design

Build Trust through Transparency
Organizations should clearly explain:
- What AI systems do
- What data they use
- How decisions are generated
- Where human oversight is required
- How employee data are protected

Maintain Human Oversight
AI should not be treated as infallible. Employees should retain appropriate authority over consequential decisions.

Redesign Jobs Rather Than Simply Automating Them
Organizations should identify which activities can be automated and which require human judgment.

Establish Responsible AI Policies
Organizations should develop policies covering:
- Data privacy
- Algorithmic bias
- Accountability
- Explainability
- Security
- Human oversight

Align AI with Productivity Objectives
AI projects should be evaluated using measurable indicators such as:
- Time saved
- Error reduction
- Quality improvement
- Employee productivity
- Customer satisfaction
- Process efficiency

Theoretical Contributions
The study contributes to theory by integrating employee-level and organizational-level perspectives on AI adoption. First, it extends Technology Acceptance Model thinking by emphasizing trust and adaptability in human–AI interaction.

Second, it applies the Resource-Based View by treating AI capability and human capital as complementary organizational resources.

Third, it applies Dynamic Capability Theory by conceptualizing employee adaptability and organizational learning as mechanisms through which organizations respond to technological disruption.

Fourth, the framework connects employee productivity with organizational performance, thereby creating a multi-level perspective on AI value creation.

Managerial Implications
Managers should not evaluate AI investments exclusively according to technological specifications.
Instead, they should evaluate:
Technology → Employee Acceptance → Collaboration → Productivity → Performance

International Journal for Novel Research in Economics , Finance and Management
www.ijnrefm.com
ISSN:
3048-7722
Volume 4, Issue 4, July-Aug--2026, PP: 01-12

This requires organizations to invest simultaneously in AI infrastructure and human capabilities.
HR departments should therefore become strategic partners in AI transformation rather than treating AI merely as an IT initiative.

Limitations

The study has the following limitations:

- The cross-sectional design limits strong causal conclusions.
- The study relies primarily on self-reported responses.
- Employee perceptions of AI may vary across sectors.
- AI maturity differs considerably between organizations.
- Different AI technologies may generate different productivity effects.
- The study does not extensively distinguish between generative AI, predictive AI, robotics and decision-support systems.
- Longitudinal studies would provide stronger evidence concerning changes in employee adaptability and trust.

Future Research

Future research can examine:

- AI literacy as a moderator
- AI anxiety
- Job insecurity
- Algorithmic trust
- Employee engagement
- Psychological safety
- AI-enabled leadership
- Responsible AI governance
- Digital leadership
- AI-related organizational culture
- Human–AI team performance
- Generative AI and knowledge workers
- AI and employee creativity
- AI and innovation capability

Future studies can also use longitudinal designs to determine whether trust and adaptability change as employees gain experience with AI.

VII. CONCLUSION

Artificial intelligence is reshaping the contemporary workplace, but its organizational value cannot be understood solely in terms of technological adoption. The central issue is how effectively humans and AI collaborate.
This study proposes that employee adaptability and trust form important foundations of human–AI collaboration. Effective collaboration can improve employee productivity, while increased productivity can contribute to organizational performance.

The study therefore presents the following integrated pathway:

Employee Adaptability + Trust in AI → Human–AI Collaboration → Employee Productivity → Organisational Performance

The implication is clear: organizations should not pursue an AI-first strategy, but a human-centred AI strategy.

The most sustainable competitive advantage is likely to emerge not from replacing employees with AI, but from creating organizational systems in which human intelligence and artificial intelligence complement each other.
For the Indian digital economy, this perspective is particularly significant because successful AI transformation will depend not only on technological infrastructure but also on employee skills, organizational culture, responsible governance, trust and continuous learning.

REFERENCES

1. Bhatia, A., & Oberoi, R. (2023). Artificial intelligence and human resource management: Emerging opportunities and challenges in the Indian context. International Journal of Management and Humanities.
2. Chatterjee, S., Chaudhuri, R., Kamble, S., Gupta, S., & Sivarajah, U. (2023). Adoption of artificial intelligence and cutting-edge technologies for production system sustainability: A moderator-mediation analysis. Information Systems Frontiers, 25, 1779–1794. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-022-10317-x
3. Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koohang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M. A., Al-Busaidi, A. S., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., et al. (2023). Opinion paper: "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.
4. George, G., Merrill, R. K., & Schillebeeckx, S. J. D. (2021). Digital sustainability and entrepreneurship: How digital innovations are helping tackle climate change and sustainable development. Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice, 45(5), 999–1027.
5. Jain, S., & Kalapurackal, J. J. (2023). Green innovation, pressure, green training, and green manufacturing: Empirical evidence from the Indian apparel export industry. The Scientific Temper, 14(2), 294–302.
6. Khanna, R., & Sharma, C. (2022). Impact of information technology on firm performance: New evidence from Indian manufacturing. Information Economics and Policy, 60, 100986.

7. Kumar, A., Sharma, S. K., & others. (2023). Artificial intelligence adoption and organizational performance: Evidence from Indian enterprises. International Journal of Organizational Analysis.
8. Malik, A., Budhwar, P., Patel, C., & Srikanth, N. R. (2021). May the bots be with you! Delivering HR cost-effectiveness and individual employee performance through HR analytics. The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 33(6), 1141–1168.
9. Prikshat, V., Kumar, S., Nankervis, A., & others. (2023). Artificial intelligence-augmented HRM: Literature review and a research agenda. The International Journal of Human Resource Management.
10. Sahoo, S., et al. (2024). Industry 4.0 adoption and eco-product innovation capability—Understanding the role of supply chain integration. Business Strategy and the Environment.
11. Sharma, M., et al. (2024). Industry 4.0 factors affecting SMEs towards sustainable manufacturing. Technology in Society, 79, 102746.
12. Singh, S., Sharma, M., & Dhir, S. (2021). Modeling the effects of digital transformation in Indian manufacturing industry. Technology in Society, 67, 101763.
13. Venkatesh, V., Morris, M. G., Davis, G. B., & Davis, F. D. (2003). User acceptance of information technology: Toward a unified view. MIS Quarterly, 27(3), 425–478.
14. Wagire, A. A., & Kulkarni, R. (2024). Examining the impact of Industry 4.0 technologies on industrial performance of manufacturing organisations in India: An empirical study. International Journal of Computer Integrated Manufacturing, 38(3), 289–308.
15. Bhadra, K. V. (2024). Evolution of dynamic capabilities for business sustainability performance: Evidence from the Indian manufacturing sector. Business Strategy and the Environment, 33(6), 5583–5605.