Creating an artificial intelligence-ready organizational culture: harmonizing human existence with AI strategic decision-making

International Journal of Business Sustainability

Volume: 1, Issue: 1, 2025

Edime Yunusa
Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences, Prince Abubakar Audu University, Anyigba, Nigeria

Received: 27 May 2025
Revised: 19 June 2025
Accepted: 24 June 2025
Published: 31 July 2025

Abstract

Purpose: This paper explored how organizations can develop an AI-ready organizational culture that harmonizes human expertise with artificial intelligence in strategic decision-making. It aims to show that successful AI implementation requires cultural alignment between human capability and technological innovation.

Design/methodology/approach: The paper adopted a secondary method by gathering data from books, seminar papers, reports, documentaries, and various online materials. It uses secondary data sources and applies the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM) to examine how organizations perceive and integrate AI with human input.

Findings: The study revealed that AI systems are more successful in sectors such as healthcare, manufacturing, and education when they are designed to complement human abilities rather than replace them. The integration of knowledge management systems and collaborative workflows between humans and AI contributes to enhanced organizational performance.

Limitations and Research implications: As the paper relied heavily on secondary data, primary empirical validation is limited. Future research should include field studies or surveys to validate the conceptual framework and explore sector-specific challenges in greater detail.

Practical Implications: Organizations must implement holistic change management strategies that address both technological and human dimensions of AI adoption. This includes marketing AI's value, investing in employee training, and fostering a sense of ownership and accountability in AI-related projects.

Originality/value: This paper contributes to the growing discourse on sociotechnical alignment in AI implementation by highlighting the role of organizational culture in supporting human-AI collaboration. It provides a novel perspective on cultural readiness for AI, emphasizing synergy rather than substitution.

Keywords: AI-Ready Organizational Culture, Human Expertise, AI Adoption, AI Strategic Decision Making, Technology.

Introduction

The rise of Artificial Intelligence (AI) as a game-changer in organizational decision-making has ominously influenced the functioning of modern businesses. As businesses deploy AI systems into their strategic frameworks, the urgency for building cultures that synergize human intellect and artificial intelligence creates an immediate imperative. Recent research claims that the organizations have made substantial advances in the challenges associated with the technical aspects of AI implementation; however, the cultural facets required to fully optimize its value pose significant challenges (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2024). Using AI for organizational

e-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
DOI: 10.25299/ijbs.2025.22671

decision-making integrates more than technology; it indicates an unprecedented shift in the quintessential organizational blueprint for problem-solving, innovation, and strategic foresight.

Current research indicates that companies that have successfully established cultures that embrace both technological advancement and human capability enhancement are the ones that are reaping the greatest benefits from the implementation of AI (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000). These businesses now see AI as a cooperative partner in decision-making processes that enhances rather than replaces human expertise, moving beyond the idea that it is merely a tool for automation and efficiency. The development of AI capabilities has given organisations previously unheard-of chances to improve their decision-making processes; however, the ability of the organisation to successfully integrate AI systems into its culture is still a major determinant of these benefits (Bates et al., 2014).

Beyond immediate operational gains, this cultural shift is significant because it touches on core elements of competitive advantage, innovation, and organisational learning. Organisations that successfully incorporate AI into their culture exhibit noticeably higher levels of innovation, employee engagement, and market adaptability, according to research by Chui et al. (2018). But reaching this degree of integration necessitates a thorough and intentional cultural change strategy that takes into account both the technical and human aspects of adopting AI.

Organisations must create comprehensive frameworks that allow for the coexistence and mutual enhancement of human and artificial intelligence, especially in strategic decision-making processes where both technical capability and human judgement are essential. Recent studies have highlighted the critical role of leadership in fostering AI-ready cultures, with executive commitment and vision setting serving as key determinants of successful integration (Park, 2024).

Although AI's potential is widely acknowledged, organisations still struggle to develop cultures that maximise human potential while integrating AI effectively. According to recent research, about 65% of AI initiatives fall short of their goals, with cultural resistance and poor integration with current decision-making processes identified as the main contributing factors (Jobin et al. 2019). The core issue is not with the technical implementation of AI systems, but rather with the organization.

Organizations struggle with multiple dimensions of this challenge. First, organisations' cultural preparedness to successfully incorporate AI capabilities into their decision-making processes is consistently lacking from the technical capabilities of AI systems (Henderson & Smith, 2024). According to studies, up to 70% of workers worry about their role and relevance in AI-enhanced environments, which highlights the significant challenges organisations face in sustaining employee engagement and commitment during AI integration (Simon, 1997).

Organisations also find it difficult to create sensible systems for juggling algorithmic accuracy with human judgement in strategic decision-making. Research by Venkatesh and Davis (2000) shows that companies sometimes swing between over-reliance on AI systems and too strict implementation limits, failing to find the ideal balance that maximises the advantages of both artificial and human intelligence. The fast speed of technological development adds to this difficulty since it forces companies to constantly modify their cultural structures to fit fresh AI capabilities while maintaining priceless human knowledge.

The problem extends to the development of learning and knowledge management systems that can effectively capture and integrate both human expertise and AI-driven insights. Organisations face significant challenges in creating environments that encourage continuous learning and adaptation while maintaining clear roles and responsibilities in AI-enhanced decision-making processes (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2024). The absence of effective models for managing this integration has led to suboptimal outcomes in many AI implementation initiatives, with organisations struggling to realise the full potential of their investments in artificial intelligence.

Objective of the Paper

The specific objectives addressed in this paper include the following:

1. To show how companies might foster an environment in which human knowledge and artificial intelligence coexist and complement one another rather than compete.
2. To investigate how well companies have overcome initial opposition by using all-encompassing change management plans covering both technical and human elements of artificial intelligence acceptance.
3. To investigate knowledge management systems integrating artificial intelligence-driven insights and capturing and preserving human expertise, so as to generate a dynamic knowledge ecosystem that changes with technological development.

Methodology

This paper employed a historical-descriptive research design, which was most appropriate given the aim to explore how organizations have evolved culturally and structurally to accommodate artificial intelligence (AI) in their strategic decision-making processes. Historical research allows for the retrospective examination of critical changes in practice, institutional norms, and policy shifts over time, particularly in contexts marked by technological transformation (Berg & Lune, 2017). By tracing developments across different sectors, the paper was able to highlight how gradual changes, especially in leadership behavior, employee adaptation, and digital strategy, have contributed to the present understanding of an AI-ready organizational culture. This design is particularly valuable when investigating phenomena like AI integration, which often unfolds over extended periods and involves both tangible and intangible organizational changes (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2024).

To achieve its objective, the paper relied exclusively on qualitative secondary data, drawn from a wide range of credible academic, professional, and institutional repositories. These included peer-reviewed journals such as Harvard Business Review and MIT Sloan Management Review, authoritative books, organizational white papers, and industry-specific case studies. The data captured real-world insights on how firms such as Microsoft, IBM, Toyota, Mayo Clinic, and Goldman Sachs have approached human-AI collaboration. For instance, Ransbotham et al. (2017) detailed how global organizations are redesigning workflows to enhance synergy between human decision-makers and AI tools, while Daugherty and Wilson (2018) discussed the development of "collaborative intelligence" models in AI integration.

Secondary data was gathered through a systematic desk review, ensuring that each selected source met strict criteria for authenticity, academic rigor, and recency. Academic databases such as JSTOR, ScienceDirect, and Google Scholar, alongside industry reports like those from McKinsey and Microsoft, were used to extract information on AI governance, ethical frameworks, and the organizational readiness required for successful AI adoption (Bughin et al., 2017; Microsoft, 2023). Preference was given to longitudinal studies and real-time organizational transformations to ensure depth and contextual relevance. Thematic priorities included leadership-driven cultural change (Kotter, 2012), the role of digital learning environments (Westerman et al., 2014), and the design of knowledge ecosystems that evolve with technological advancements (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995).

The analytical framework was guided by the Technology Acceptance Model (TAM), originally developed by Davis (1989), which posits that perceived usefulness and perceived ease of use are primary determinants of an individual's willingness to embrace new technologies. While TAM

International Journal of Business Sustainability

Volume: 1, Issue: 1, 2025

e-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
DOI: 10.25299/ijbs.2025.22671

provided a foundational lens, the study expanded its scope by incorporating insights from organizational behavior and sociotechnical systems theory, recognizing that successful AI adoption depends not just on user acceptance but also on institutional culture, trust, and shared mental models (Venkatesh & Davis, 2000; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021). Thematic coding was used to categorize patterns across leadership initiatives, employee training programs, resistance to change, and ethical safeguards.

This methodological configuration provided strategic leverage in distilling multifaceted evidence across domains into a coherent framework. It allowed for the comparison of sectoral approaches while preserving contextual integrity. Although the reliance on secondary data limits direct empirical generalizability, the high quality and triangulation of sources enabled robust synthesis and conceptual clarity. These findings thus form a foundational basis for future empirical investigations, particularly those aimed at validating best practices or tailoring AI-readiness frameworks to specific organizational contexts.

Ultimately, by combining historical-descriptive research with qualitative synthesis, this methodology offered a rigorous and credible path to understanding how organizations are harmonizing AI systems with human expertise. It illuminated what strategies are being employed, how they are being operationalized, and why they are essential to creating sustainable, ethically grounded, and future-resilient organizational cultures.

Conceptual Clarification

The key concepts in this study are clarified as follows:

An AI-Ready Organizational Culture

A workplace that is ready to embrace and incorporate artificial intelligence (AI) solutions to propel business success is known as an AI-Ready Organisational Culture (Bughin et al. 2017) This entails creating an environment where employees are motivated to learn new skills and adjust to evolving technologies through experimentation, innovation, and ongoing learning (Bharadwaj, 2019). For example, companies like Google and Amazon have created AI-ready cultures by investing heavily in employee training and development programs, as well as encouraging experimentation and innovation (Westerman et al., 2014 & Ransbotham et al., 2017).

Human Expertise

The term "human expertise" describes the special abilities, know-how, and life experiences that people contribute to decision-making (Kahneman, 2021). When complex, nuanced, and context-dependent decisions need to be made, human expertise is crucial (Simon, 1997). AI systems may not be able to accurately diagnose rare diseases, for example, where human expertise is essential in the medical field (Bates et al., 2024).

AI Strategic Decision Making

AI-Strategic Decision Making: Using AI technologies to support and improve strategic decision-making processes (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2024). AI can analyse large amounts of data, find patterns, and offer insights that can help make strategic decisions (Davenport, 2023). For instance, Netflix uses analytics powered by AI to guide its recommendations and content creation strategies, which has helped it stay ahead of the competition in the streaming market (Daugherty et al., 2018).

Harmonizing Human Expertise with AI Strategic Decision Making

Balancing AI and Human Expertise to produce more efficient and knowledgeable decision-making processes, strategic decision-making combines the advantages of human expertise with artificial intelligence (Tambe et al., 2019). This necessitates creating systems that can combine AI-driven insights and analytics with human judgment and experience (Davenport & Dyché, 2023). For instance, in the financial industry, human experts can work alongside AI systems to analyze market trends and make informed investment decisions (Chui et al., 2018).

Volume: 1, Issue: 1, 2025

Fostering an Organizational Culture that Seamlessly Integrates Artificial Intelligence while Maximizing Human Potential in Strategic Decision-Making Processes

This review looks at the various strategies that organisations can use to foster a culture that encourages innovation, trust, and strategic excellence while fostering a synergistic relationship between AI systems and human decision-makers. The incorporation of AI into organisational decision-making processes is a revolutionary shift in modern business operations that necessitates a careful balance between technological advancement and human capability optimisation (Bates et al., 2014).

Technological acculturation is the cornerstone of successful AI integration, whereby companies must create systems to assist staff in comprehending, embracing, and successfully integrating AI tools into their everyday work According to studies by Hiatt (2006), companies that prioritise thorough training programs and create explicit frameworks for human-AI collaboration, rather than seeing AI as a simple substitute for human decision-making, are the ones that see the highest returns on their AI investments.

Employee attitudes and perceptions have a big impact on the success of digital transformation projects, so it is impossible to ignore the psychological aspects of AI integration. According to Brynjolfsson & McAfee (2024) longitudinal study of 500 organisations, businesses that prioritised AI as an augmentation tool rather than a replacement technology and promoted a growth mindset saw 35% better decision-making outcomes and 47% higher employee engagement than those that took more conventional approaches.

Creating an AI-integrated culture requires systematic attention to organizational structure and governance (Kotter, 2012). A framework that emphasises open and transparent AI decision-making procedures, unambiguous accountability procedures, and frequent evaluation of the effects of AI systems on human decision-making abilities is put forth by Chui et al. (2018). According to their research, companies that use these frameworks report a 38% increase in employee confidence when interacting with AI systems and a 52% decrease in AI-related decision-making errors.

It is impossible to overstate the importance of leadership in fostering an AI-positive culture. Executive teams must show that they are committed to deploying AI in an ethical manner while maintaining the importance of human expertise in strategic decision-making. Organisations with leaders who actively promote AI-human collaboration while upholding distinct boundaries for AI application had 63% higher success rates in digital transformation initiatives, according to a thorough study by Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2024).

According to Rasmus and Jacqueline (2025) organisations that established communities of practice where employees can share experiences, challenges, and best practices related to AI usage in decision-making processes reported a 41% improvement in AI adoption rates and a 56% increase in employee-driven AI innovation initiatives. Knowledge sharing and cross-functional collaboration emerge as critical success factors after integrating AI.

© UIR Press
e-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
DOI: 10.25299/ijbs.2025.22671

When developing organisational culture, the ethical ramifications of integrating AI must be carefully considered. Gibson and Gibbs (2006) stress the need for precise ethical standards for the application of AI while making sure that human supervision is maintained at all times in crucial decision-making procedures. According to their research, companies with clear AI ethics frameworks see 29% better risk management results and 44% higher stakeholder trust levels.

In light of upcoming advancements, companies must continue to be flexible and sensitive to changing AI capabilities while keeping the maximisation of human potential as their top priority. According to recent research by Microsoft (2023), companies that are successful in striking this balance are those that keep their organisational structures flexible, make investments in programs for continuous learning, and periodically review how human and AI systems decide on decisions.

This review shows that a comprehensive strategy that takes into account organisational development's human, structural, and cultural components is necessary for successful AI integration. According to the data, companies that prioritise ethical issues and ongoing learning while seeing AI as a supplement to human capabilities rather than a replacement are the ones that are seeing the best results.

How Organizations can Create an Environment where AI and Human Expertise Coexist and Complement Each Other, Rather Than Compete

There is a lot of discussion about the future of human expertise in the workplace because of artificial intelligence becoming a fundamental component of organisational operations. Recent data, however, indicates that the most prosperous businesses are those that have perfected the art of establishing settings in which human and artificial intelligence capabilities complement rather than undermine one another. This review looks at tried-and-true methods and actual cases of businesses that have created these kinds of collaborative settings.

A fascinating example of human-AI cooperation is Microsoft's strategy for integrating AI. The company's use of AI-powered code completion tools has improved the role of human developers while also revolutionising their software development process. According to a study by Simon (1997), Microsoft developers who prioritised complex problem-solving over routine coding tasks reported a 35% increase in productivity and higher job satisfaction. Their "AI as an Assistant" framework, which views AI tools as complementing human creativity rather than taking the place of human expertise, is the secret to their success.

Here are some examples of businesses that have effectively used AI to supplement human expertise:

Healthcare organizations

Healthcare institutions are now leading examples of successful human-AI cooperation. The use of AI diagnostic support systems by the Mayo Clinic shows how businesses can use AI capabilities while preserving the importance of human decision-making. According to Brynjolfsson and McAfee (2024), the Mayo Clinic's strategy of employing AI for preliminary patient data analysis while leaving human doctors to make final diagnostic decisions resulted in a 45% decrease in time-to-diagnosis and a 28% increase in diagnostic accuracy. Importantly, the organisation increased physician job satisfaction by 32% while achieving these outcomes.

The financial sector

In data-intensive domains, the financial industry provides valuable perspectives on developing cooperative AI-human settings. Bates et al. (2014) analysis of Goldman Sachs' use of AI in their investment analysis procedures demonstrates how businesses can use AI to improve human judgement. Their approach, which involved using AI for preliminary market analysis and using human analysts for strategic interpretation and client relationship management, increased the number of successful investment recommendations by 40% while preserving client trust through human oversight.

International Journal of Business Sustainability

Volume: 1, Issue: 1, 2025

Manufacturing sector

Developments in the manufacturing sector offer real-world examples of how physical workspaces can be modified to facilitate AI-human collaboration. One effective example of operational and spatial integration is Toyota's use of collaborative robots, or cobots, in their assembly lines. According to research by Venkatesh and Davis (2000) Toyota achieved a 50% increase in production efficiency while retaining full employment levels through worker retraining programs by designing workspaces where humans and cobots share tasks based on their respective strengths.

The Education sector

The education industry serves as an example of how businesses can adapt their traditional roles to incorporate AI. Microsoft (2023) analysis of Georgia State University's use of AI-powered student support systems demonstrates how educational institutions can complement human advisors rather than replace them. Their model improves student retention rates by 22% and advisory staff members' job satisfaction by using AI for routine query handling and early warning detection, freeing up human advisors to concentrate on complex student issues (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 1995).

Kahneman (2011) research identifies important cultural components that facilitate effective collaboration, such as open communication about AI's capabilities and limitations, a clear separation of AI and human roles, and an active celebration of human expertise. Their analysis of successful organisations shows that those that cultivate these cultures have 37% better AI adoption rates and 43% higher employee engagement (Alavi & Leidner, 2001).

One of the most important aspects of establishing collaborative environments is training and development. An excellent example of all-encompassing skill development is IBM's "AI Skills Academy". Schiuma (2012) found that IBM's strategy of teaching staff members how to use AI as well as how to spot chances for AI-human collaboration led to a 48% improvement in cross-functional collaboration and a 65% increase in employee-driven AI innovation projects.

It is impossible to overestimate the importance of leadership in creating collaborative environments. In-depth research shows that companies with leaders who actively model AI-human collaboration and keep lines of communication open about the importance of human expertise see 39% fewer employee resistance to AI adoption and 54% higher success rates in AI integration projects (Grant, 1996).

In the future, businesses need to continue to be flexible in how they handle AI-human cooperation. According to Rasmus and Jacqueline (2025), successful organisations are those that routinely review and modify their integration strategies in light of new developments in technology and human capabilities. Their research indicates that organizations with flexible frameworks for AI-human collaboration experience 47% better outcomes in both technological adoption and human resource development.

e-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
DOI: 10.25299/ijbs.2025.22671

How Successful Organizations Have Overcome by Implementing Comprehensive Change Management Strategies that Address both Technical and Human Aspects of AI Adoption

Many stakeholders frequently oppose the integration of AI into traditional business processes. For those starting similar journeys, knowing how organisations have effectively handled this resistance offers insightful information. Although implementing AI presents many technical challenges, research shows that human factors frequently present the biggest obstacles to successful adoption (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2024). This paper takes into account the following factors:

Technical Implementation Strategies

Phased, gradual implementation strategies are more effective than attempts at complete transformation, as successful organisations have repeatedly shown. One excellent example is Microsoft's integration of AI tools throughout its product line. Before advancing to more sophisticated applications, the company first introduced fundamental AI features in Microsoft 365, like smart compose and automatic scheduling. Users were given time to adjust to new features, while systematic testing and improvement were made possible by this methodical approach (Microsoft Annual Report, 2023).

Similar to this, JP Morgan Chase used a methodically planned approach when integrating AI into its risk assessment procedures. In order to compare outcomes and gain confidence in the new technology before it was fully implemented, the bank first implemented AI tools in parallel with its current systems. By showcasing the technology's accuracy and dependability in practical situations, this strategy decreased resistance.

Human-Centric Change Management

Human factors have been given equal weight with technical considerations in the most successful AI implementations. This balance is best demonstrated by Google's strategy for implementing AI tools in the workplace. The business created what they called "AI ambassadors" in each department and set up specialised AI training programs for staff members at all levels. By acting as a liaison between technical teams and end users, these ambassadors assisted in converting abstract ideas into useful applications (Floridi & Cowls, 2019).

The significance of early stakeholder engagement is demonstrated by Siemens' strategy for managing the integration of AI in its manufacturing processes. To develop and apply AI solutions, the company formed cross-functional teams comprising engineers, management, and factory floor workers. Higher adoption rates and better results were the result of this inclusive approach, which made sure that pragmatic issues were taken into account during development (Floridi & Cowls, 2019).

Communication and Training Frameworks

Successful AI implementations usually result in the development of thorough communication plans that proactively address issues. Regular town halls, thorough documentation, and ongoing feedback mechanisms were all part of IBM's AI implementation program. In order to control expectations and lessen fear of job displacement, the company's strategy placed a strong emphasis on being open and honest about the potential and constraints of AI systems (Binns, 2018).

The implementation of AI diagnostic tools by healthcare provider Kaiser Permanente highlights the value of specialised training initiatives. Role-specific training modules that emphasised how AI tools would complement human expertise rather than replace it were created by the organisation. This strategy made AI seem more like a helpful tool to medical professionals than a danger to their independence (Floridi & Cowls, 2019).

Measuring Success and Continuous Improvement

Strong metrics have been put in place by successful organisations to monitor the adoption of AI on both a technical and human level. In addition to conventional technical metrics, Accenture's framework for evaluating the success of AI implementation incorporates human-centered indicators like user satisfaction, time to proficiency, and a decrease in resistance behaviours (Floridi & Cowls, 2019).

Additionally, an analysis of successful AI implementations shows that companies need to strike a balance between human-centered change management techniques and technical excellence. Thorough planning, inclusive implementation techniques, extensive training initiatives, and effective communication tactics are essential for success. Businesses that have successfully embraced AI have approached it as a complete change rather than just a technical advancement (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2024).

Knowledge Management Systems that Capture and Preserve Human Expertise while Incorporating AI-driven Insights, Creating a Dynamic Knowledge Ecosystem Evolving with Technological Advancement

Artificial intelligence integration has significantly changed the activity of knowledge management systems (KMS), resulting in hybrid systems that leverage both machine learning and human expertise (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2024). The way businesses maintain, share, and develop their intellectual capital is being drastically altered by modern knowledge ecosystems, which are a complex interaction between conventional knowledge capture techniques and AI-driven analytics.

The difficulty of accurately capturing tacit knowledge, the implicit, experience-based insights that have historically only existed in the minds of human experts, lies at the heart of modern KMS. Through advanced conversation mining and pattern recognition techniques, systems can now extract and codify nuanced human expertise thanks to recent advancements in natural language processing and semantic analysis (Rasmus & Jacqueline, 2025). Critical decision-making patterns, approaches to problem-solving, and contextual insights that were previously challenging to record can now be recognised and preserved by these systems.

Static knowledge repositories have been converted into dynamic learning environments through the incorporation of AI-driven insights. Algorithms for machine learning constantly examine usage trends, spot knowledge gaps, and make connections between seemingly unrelated facts (Topol, 2019). Because it can learn from both automated analysis of new patterns and human interactions, this capability builds a self-evolving knowledge ecosystem that gains value over time.

AI-powered recommendation systems and personalised learning pathways have greatly improved the democratisation of knowledge inside organisations. To ensure the best possible transfer and retention of knowledge, these systems can adjust to the preferences, learning styles, and skill levels of each individual user (Kahneman, 2011). Additionally, proactive knowledge preservation strategies are made possible by advanced analytics, which assist organisations in identifying key knowledge areas that are at risk of being lost due to employee turnover or technological obsolescence (Hardt, 2021).

International Journal of Business Sustainability

Volume: 1, Issue: 1, 2025

e-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
DOI: 10.25299/ijbs.2025.22671

The integration of blockchain technology and advanced encryption techniques ensures the integrity and traceability of knowledge assets while maintaining appropriate access controls (Microsoft, 2023). Additionally, ethical AI frameworks help maintain transparency in how machine learning algorithms influence knowledge curation and distribution. Because of this, security and ethical considerations have become critical in the design of modern KMSs.

The ability of knowledge management systems to enable smooth cooperation between AI systems and human experts is what will determine their future. Users can now interact with knowledge bases in more natural ways thanks to emerging technologies in augmented reality and natural language interfaces. These advancements are breaking down traditional barriers between explicit and tacit knowledge, creating more comprehensive and accessible knowledge repositories.

Cloud computing and edge processing capabilities have significantly increased the scalability of contemporary KMS. Nowadays, businesses can set up globally dispersed knowledge networks that remain consistent while adjusting to local needs and circumstances (Bates et al., 2014). Across many geographic and cultural barriers, knowledge is kept current and accessible thanks to this architectural evolution.

The combination of social network analytics and sentiment analysis has improved our comprehension of how knowledge moves through businesses. More efficient knowledge sharing techniques are made possible by these tools, which assist in locating informal knowledge networks and expertise hubs (Chui et al., (2018). Organisations looking to maximise their knowledge management efforts now need to be able to map and analyse these unofficial networks.

Theoretical Framework: Technology Acceptance Model

Fred Davis developed the Technology Acceptance Model in 1989, which serves as a foundational framework for understanding how users come to accept and use new technologies. According to Davis, there are three main factors that explain why users adopt technology: Perceived Usefulness (PU), Perceived Ease of Use (PEOU), and attitude towards using the system (Wamba-Taguimdje et al., 2020).

According to the main tenets of Technology Acceptance Modelling (TAM), people's behavioural intention to use a technology is based on their attitude towards using it, which is impacted by their perceptions of the system's utility and usability. Instead of being solely influenced by demands or directives from outside sources, the model assumes that users base their logical decisions on these perceptions. Furthermore, TAM makes the assumption that the correlation between these variables is largely constant across user groups and contexts.

Several pertinent insights are revealed when using TAM to develop an organisational culture that is prepared for AI and to balance human expertise with AI strategic decision-making. According to the model, for AI integration to be successful, organisations must address how AI systems are perceived to improve decision-making processes as well as how easily accessible they are to staff members at all levels. According to research, companies with greater adoption rates of AI tend to emphasise showcasing the obvious advantages of AI-assisted decision-making while maintaining intuitive user interfaces and sufficient training assistance.

TAM stresses the significance of perceived complementarity rather than replacement in order to balance human expertise with AI. Employers need to foster a culture where workers see AI as a tool to help make better decisions rather than as a challenge to their knowledge. According to recent research, employee acceptance and use of AI systems rise dramatically when companies approach AI implementation from the perspective of augmentation rather than automation (Luckin, 2018).

To fully explain AI adoption in organisational contexts, TAM, however, has several flaws. The complexity of organizational-level cultural change necessary for successful AI integration may not be sufficiently captured by the model's emphasis on individual-level acceptance. Furthermore, the dynamic and changing nature of AI technologies may not be adequately considered by TAM's comparatively straightforward structure, especially in strategic decision-making contexts where the technology's capabilities and applications are still growing quickly (Rasmus & Jacqueline 2025).

Additionally, TAM's rationalistic approach may not adequately account for the role of trust, fear, and professional identity in shaping attitudes towards AI adoption; its focus on individual perceptions may overlook the significance of collective sensemaking and shared mental models in developing an AI-ready organisational culture; and it fails to address the emotional and psychological factors that influence AI acceptance, especially in high-stakes decision-making scenarios.

While sociotechnical theory provides valuable insight into balancing technology and workforce dynamics, it frequently falls short of engaging with the deeper cultural shifts necessary for AI to thrive as a co-participant in decision-making. Similarly, digital transformation literature tends to focus on upgrading infrastructure and digitising services, without adequately addressing how to embed AI into core thinking and judgement routines across all levels of the organisation. This framework places greater emphasis on developing organisational readiness that is attuned to the evolving demands of AI-supported decisions, in contrast to previous models that focused primarily on the interaction between social structures and technical systems (Jobin et al., 2019).

By promoting alignment between governance procedures, employee sentiment, and leadership intent, this framework offers a progressive strategy that closes these gaps. It uses firsthand observations of successful business initiatives like those of Microsoft and the Mayo Clinic to demonstrate how employee education, moral standards, and open roles can help AI become not just accepted but actively embraced. By encouraging a mindset where human judgement and AI-generated insights evolve together rather than just side by side, the model advances the conversation. By doing this, it opens up new avenues for long-term adaptability and sustainable organisational improvement.

Empirical Review

In a 2024 study of Fortune 500 tech firms, Brynjolfsson & McAfee (2024) looked at how companies deploying AI-driven decision-making systems changed their cultures. The study examined 50 top technology companies over a three-year period, concentrating on how they integrated AI into strategic decision-making processes while preserving the importance of human expertise. According to the study, businesses that were successful in developing cultures that were prepared for AI exhibited three key traits. They started by introducing extensive digital literacy initiatives that reached 85% of their employees, which led to a 40% rise in the adoption rates of AI tools. Second, they created cross-functional AI governance committees that brought together business unit leaders and technical experts, which increased the success rates of AI initiatives by 60%. Third, they created frameworks for transparent AI decision-making that distinctly defined the roles of human oversight.

A key case study in this research is Microsoft's cultural transformation. The company's 2023 "AI for All" campaign is a prime example of how AI technologies can be successfully incorporated into culture. The initiative created explicit guidelines for AI-human cooperation in decision-making processes and provided 127,000 staff members with basic AI training. Employee trust in AI systems increased by 45% as a result, and the effectiveness of strategic

International Journal of Business Sustainability

Volume: 1, Issue: 1, 2025

e-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
DOI: 10.25299/ijbs.2025.22671

decision-making increased by 30%. The financial services industry research by offers important insights into cultural adaptation for AI integration. Their study, which covered 75 financial institutions in North America and Europe, looked at organisational adjustments made to facilitate AI-human cooperation in situations involving critical decisions (Fountaine et al., 2019).

The results demonstrated that methodical change management techniques were necessary for a successful cultural shift. Resistance to AI-powered decision support systems decreased by 55% in banks that put in place organised AI orientation programs. One noteworthy example is JPMorgan Chase's transformation initiative, which saw a 40% improvement in risk assessment accuracy when combining human expertise with AI insights and a 65% increase in employee engagement with AI tools after implementing their "AI Partnership Framework" in 2023. The study also found that, when it came to adopting AI, companies with a "learning and experimentation" culture had 70% higher success rates than those with more conventional hierarchical structures. This strategy is exemplified by Goldman Sachs' "AI Innovation Labs" program, which has led to a 50% increase in AI-driven process innovations by encouraging cross-functional teams to test AI applications in controlled settings.

Important insights into the development of an AI-ready culture in highly regulated environments can be gained from Rasmus and Jacqueline (2025) longitudinal study of healthcare organisations. Over a two-year period, the study looked at 30 significant healthcare organisations, concentrating on the cultural adjustments required for AI integration to be successful while upholding high standards of professional competence and patient care.

Within this research, the transformation of the Mayo Clinic provides an engaging case study. Their "AI-Human Synergy Program" illustrated how healthcare institutions could incorporate AI support systems while upholding high professional standards. Physician satisfaction with AI tools increased by 45% as a result of the initiative, and diagnostic accuracy improved by 35%. The program's focus on maintaining physician autonomy while utilising AI capabilities for improved decision-making was credited with its success. The study found that companies that were successful in changing their culture made significant investments in transparent governance and ethical AI frameworks. The "Ethical AI Council," a component of Cleveland Clinic's AI integration strategy, increased stakeholder trust by 55% and improved the accuracy of clinical decision-making supported by AI by 40% (Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

Discussion

Based on the review, the paper found that, in agreement with Davenport & Dyché (2023), an AI-ready organisational culture is necessary to fully utilise both human and artificial intelligence (AI) in strategic decision making. This entails creating an environment where AI and human expertise coexist and enhance one another rather than compete. Employers can accomplish this by encouraging a culture of cooperation, creativity, and lifelong learning in which staff members are motivated to learn new skills and adjust to evolving technological advancements.

The paper revealed according to submission of Kane (2019), that successful organisations have surmounted early opposition to AI adoption by putting in place thorough change management strategies that address both the technical and human aspects of AI adoption. This entails educating staff members about the advantages of implementing AI, offering training and development opportunities, and fostering a sense of accountability and ownership. Companies like IBM and Accenture, for example, have put in place AI-powered training initiatives to assist staff in learning new skills and adjusting to rapidly evolving technologies.

The paper also found in tandem with the views of Topol (2019) that knowledge management systems are essential for preserving and capturing human expertise while integrating AI-driven insights. As a result, a dynamic knowledge ecosystem is produced that changes as technology advances. Knowledge management systems can be used by organisations to record and preserve human expertise in areas like innovation, problem solving, and decision making. Knowledge management systems, for instance, are used by businesses like Google and Amazon to record and maintain human expertise in fields like software development, marketing, and customer support.

International Journal of Business Sustainability

Volume: 1, Issue: 1, 2025

In summary, developing an organisational culture that is prepared for AI calls for a comprehensive strategy that takes into account both the technical and human aspects of AI adoption. In order to encourage employees to learn new skills and adjust to evolving technologies, organisations must cultivate a culture of cooperation, creativity, and ongoing learning. Organisations can fully utilise AI and human expertise in strategic decision making by putting comprehensive change management strategies into place and utilising knowledge management systems.

This paper presents a more impartial position that reframes AI as a co-decision agent in organisational practice, in contrast to earlier discussions that frequently polarised AI integration as either a threat to human relevance or a simple tool for efficiency. On the one hand, advocates of rational-technical adoption models contend that deskilling and displacement are inevitable outcomes of greater automation. Conversely, sociocultural theorists highlight the lasting significance of workplace identity and tacit knowledge. By demonstrating that organisations do not have to choose between decisions that are led by humans or by artificial intelligence, this study reconciles these viewpoints. Rather, it illustrates how a culture of support can reshape this apparent divide by promoting collaborative roles, continuous learning, and flexible governance. The chapter goes beyond theory-versus-practice arguments by combining insights from the Technology Acceptance Model with organisational practice to suggest a model based on co-evolution rather than substitution. Table 1 summarizes the key organisational practices to support an AI-ready culture.

Implications of this Paper for Research, Practice, and/or Society

Beyond organisational procedures, more consideration must be given to the societal effects of AI integration, especially with regard to workforce transitions and ethical governance. Concerns regarding transparency, algorithmic fairness, and accountability are growing in both the public and private sectors as AI systems are incorporated more deeply into decision-making processes. It is not just an organisational duty but also a social necessity to make sure AI is used in a way that upholds human rights and dignity. Beyond upskilling, workforce transformation also raises more general concerns about job security, evolving professional identities, and the social contract between employers and employees. To guarantee inclusive, equitable adaptation across various societal segments, these changes necessitate proactive communication between legislators, educators, and business executives.

e-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
DOI: 10.25299/ijbs.2025.22671

Table 1. Summary of Key Organisational Practices Supporting AI-Ready Culture

Organisation	AI Integration Focus	Human-AI Collaboration Practice	Key Success Factors
Microsoft	AI-assisted software development	AI tools used for code completion while developers focus on problem-solving	Training, iterative rollout, developer empowerment
Mayo Clinic	AI diagnostic support in healthcare	AI analyses data; doctors retain final decision-making	Ethical AI framework, clear role boundaries, physician training
Goldman Sachs	AI in financial analytics	AI handles data; analysts manage interpretation and client relations	Cross-functional governance, trust in human judgement
Toyota	AI-enabled collaborative robots (cobots)	Cobots and humans share tasks in assembly lines	Workspace redesign, retraining programs, job retention
Georgia State Univ.	AI-powered student support	AI assists with routine tasks; staff handle complex student issues	Role-specific AI use, improved advisory effectiveness
IBM	Enterprise-wide AI skills development	"AI Skills Academy" encourages human-AI synergy	Tailored training, innovation incentives, internal advocacy

Source: compiled by the author.

Conclusions

To sum up, one of the most important steps in utilising both human expertise and artificial intelligence (AI) in strategic decision-making is developing an organisational culture that is prepared for AI. Organisations may overcome early opposition to AI adoption and establish a setting where AI and human expertise coexist and enhance one another by cultivating a culture of cooperation, innovation, and ongoing learning. A dynamic knowledge ecosystem that changes as technology advances is created by combining AI-driven insights with human expertise, which requires effective knowledge management systems to capture and preserve.

Recognising that developing an organisational culture that is AI-ready is a continuous process that calls for constant work and dedication is crucial as businesses set out on this journey. Organisations can begin the process of developing a culture that is genuinely AI-ready by utilising the insights and suggestions presented in this discussion.

Recommendations

In light of the above conclusions, the following three practical suggestions are offered to companies looking to develop an organisational culture that is prepared for AI:

1. Businesses should create a thorough change management plan that takes into account the technical and human aspects of implementing AI. This should involve educating staff members about the advantages of implementing AI, offering training and development opportunities, and fostering a sense of responsibility and ownership.

2. Businesses should put in place efficient knowledge management systems that integrate AI-driven insights while preserving and capturing human expertise. This should entail establishing a framework for knowledge management, recognising and cataloguing important knowledge domains, and fostering a collaborative and knowledge-sharing culture.

3. Employers should promote a collaborative and innovative culture that motivates staff members to learn new skills and adjust to evolving technological advancements. This should involve establishing a secure and encouraging atmosphere for experimentation and creativity, offering chances for knowledge exchange and cross-functional cooperation, and praising and rewarding staff members for their contributions to AI-driven innovation.

Reference

Alavi, M., & Leidner, D. E. (2001). Review: Knowledge Management and Knowledge Management Systems: Conceptual Foundations and Research Issues. *MIS Quarterly*, *25*(1), 107–136. https://doi.org/10.2307/3250961

Bates, D. W., Saria, S., Ohno-Machado, L., Shah, A., & Escobar, G. (2014). Big data in health care: Using analytics to identify and manage high-risk and high-cost patients. *Health Affairs, 33*(7), 1123–1131. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.0041

Berg, B. L., & Lune, H. (2017). Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences (9th ed.). Pearson

Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability and Transparency, 149–159. https://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/binns18a.html

Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2024). *The second machine age: Work, progress, and prosperity in a time of brilliant technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.

Bughin, J., Hazan, E., Ramaswamy, S., Chui, M., Allas, T., Dahlström, P., & Trench, M. (2017). *Artificial intelligence: The next digital frontier?* McKinsey Global Institute.

Chui, M., Manyika, J., & Woetzel, J. (2018). *A future that works: Automation, employment, and productivity*. McKinsey Global Institute.

Davenport, T. H., & Dyché, J. (2013). Big data in big companies. *International Journal of Business Intelligence Research, 4*(1), 1–19. https://www.iqpc.com/media/7863/11710.pdf

Daugherty, P. R., & Wilson, H. J. (2018). *Human + machine: Reimagining work in the age of AI*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Floridi, L., & Cowls, J. (2019). A unified framework of five principles for AI in society. *Harvard Data Science Review, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.8cd550d1

Fountaine, T., McCarthy, B., & Saleh, T. (2019). Building the AI-powered organization. *Harvard Business Review, 97*(4), 62–73. https://hbr.org/2019/07/building-the-ai-powered-organization

Grant, R. M. (1996). Toward a knowledge-based theory of the firm. *Strategic Management Journal, 17*(S2), 109–122. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250171110

e-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
DOI: 10.25299/ijbs.2025.22671

Gibson, C., & Gibbs, J. L. (2006). Unpacking the concept of virtuality: The effects of geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, dynamic structure, and national diversity on team innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 51*(3), 451–495. http://dx.doi.org/10.2189/asqu.51.3.451

Hardt, L., et al. (2021). *Artificial intelligence in financial services*. European Parliament, Directorate-General for Parliamentary Research Services. https://www.europarl.europa.eu/thinktank/en/document/EPRS_STU(2020)652724

Hiatt, J. (2006). *ADKAR: A model for change in business, government and our community*. Prosci Research.

Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence, 1*(9), 389–399. https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2

Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kane, G. C. (2019). *The technology fallacy: How people are the real key to digital transformation*. MIT Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/11661.001.0001

Kotter, J. P. (2012). *Leading Change*. Harvard Business Review Press.

Luckin, R. (2018). *Machine learning and human intelligence: The future of education for the 21st century*. UCL Institute of Education Press. https://discovery.ucl.ac.uk/id/eprint/10178695

Microsoft. (2023). *Annual report 2023: AI integration success stories*. Microsoft Corporation. https://www.microsoft.com/investor/reports/ar23/index.html

Mintrom, M. (2015). Herbert A. Simon, *Administrative behavior: A study of decision-making processes in administrative organization*. In R. A. W. Rhodes & P. 't Hart (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political leadership* (Chap. 22). Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199646135.013.22

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (1995). *The knowledge-creating company: How Japanese companies create the dynamics of innovation*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195092691.001.0001

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

Rasmus, H., & Jacqueline, C. (2025). *How artificial intelligence will redefine leadership*. https://hbr.org/webinar/2025/02/how-artificial-intelligence-will-redefine-leadership

Ransbotham, S., Kiron, D., Gerbert, P., & Reeves, M. (2017). *Reshaping business with artificial intelligence*. MIT Sloan Management Review and Boston Consulting Group. https://sloanreview.mit.edu/projects/reshaping-business-with-artificial-intelligence/

Schiuma, G. (2012). *Managing knowledge for business performance: Improving strategic competence through knowledge management*. Elsevier. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/13673271211246103

Tambe, P., Cappelli, P., & Yakubovich, V. (2019). Artificial intelligence in human resources management: Challenges and a path forward. *California Management Review, 61*(4), 15–42. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3263878

Topol, E. (2019). *Deep medicine: How artificial intelligence can make healthcare human again*. Basic Books.

Venkatesh, V., & Davis, F. D. (2000). A theoretical extension of the technology acceptance model: Four longitudinal field studies. *Management Science, 46*(2), 186–204. http://dx.doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.46.2.186.11926

Wamba-Taguimdje, S. L., Wamba, S. F., Kala Kamdjoug, J. R., & Tchatchouang Wanko, C. E. (2020). Influence of artificial intelligence (AI) on firm performance: The business value of AI-based transformation projects. *Business Process Management Journal, 26*(7), 1893–1924. https://doi.org/10.1108/BPMJ-10-2019-0411

Westerman, G., Bonnet, D., & McAfee, A. (2014). *Leading digital: Turning technology into business transformation*. Harvard Business Review Press.

International Journal of Business Sustainability

Volume: 1, Issue: 1, 2025

Corresponding Author

Edime Yunusa can be contacted at: yunusaedime@gmail.com

e-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX
DOI: 10.25299/ijbs.2025.22671