ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

Volume–XIII, Issue–II

March – April 2026

Original Research Article

PREPARING FOR A HUMAN–AI FUTURE: A HUMAN-CENTRIC FRAMEWORK FOR COLLABORATIVE READINESS

**** Ms. Maria Raja John***

** Assistant Professor, Department of IT/CS, Sainath Education Trust's Rajiv Gandhi College of Arts, Commerce and Science, Vashi, Navi Mumbai.*

Abstract:

The rapid diffusion of artificial intelligence across organizational, educational, and societal domains has fundamentally reshaped how decisions are made, work is organized, and responsibilities are distributed. While AI systems offer unprecedented gains in speed, scale, and analytical capability, their real-world effectiveness is inseparable from the quality of human engagement that surrounds their design, interpretation, and use. This paper contends that preparedness for an AI-driven future cannot be reduced to technological readiness alone, but must be grounded in a human-centric understanding of collaboration between human intelligence and artificial systems.

Using a qualitative and analytical research methodology based on a systematic review of interdisciplinary literature, the study integrates perspectives from information technology, social sciences, ethics, and workforce studies to examine how preparedness for human–AI collaboration is currently conceptualized. The analysis reveals that prevailing approaches disproportionately emphasize technical infrastructure and automation capacity, while insufficiently addressing the human competencies required to guide, question, and govern intelligent systems.

In response, the paper proposes a Human-Centric Collaborative Readiness Framework structured around four interrelated dimensions: cognitive capability, emotional intelligence, ethical reasoning, and decision authority. These dimensions collectively capture the human capacities necessary to ensure that AI systems are used responsibly, transparently, and in alignment with societal values. By repositioning human intelligence as a central pillar of AI preparedness, the framework offers a structured lens for assessing individual and organizational readiness in AI-enabled environments.

The study contributes to ongoing interdisciplinary discourse by advancing a conceptual model that emphasizes collaboration over replacement, responsibility over automation, and sustainability over short-term efficiency. The proposed framework is intended to support educators, organizations, and policymakers in designing strategies that ensure artificial intelligence strengthens human agency and institutional resilience in the evolving digital future. **Keywords:** *Human–AI Collaboration; AI Preparedness; Human-Centric Framework; Ethical AI; Future of Work; Decision Authority*

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

Volume–XIII, Issue–II

March – April 2026

Original Research Article

Introduction:

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has evolved from a specialized computational tool into a pervasive force shaping decision-making processes across education, industry, governance, and society. From automated assessment systems and predictive analytics to algorithm-assisted policy formulation and organizational planning, AI increasingly influences how information is interpreted and actions are taken. This growing reliance on intelligent systems has intensified discussions around efficiency, scalability, and innovation, while simultaneously raising critical questions concerning human judgment, accountability, and ethical responsibility.

Current narratives on AI preparedness are predominantly framed through a technological lens, emphasizing data availability, computational infrastructure, algorithmic performance, and system integration. While these factors are essential, such a narrowly defined understanding of preparedness risks overlooking the human foundations upon which meaningful and responsible AI adoption depends. Artificial intelligence, regardless of its sophistication, does not possess contextual awareness, moral reasoning, or emotional sensitivity. These limitations necessitate sustained human involvement in interpreting outputs, questioning recommendations, and exercising judgment in situations where social consequences are significant.

The increasing delegation of cognitive and decision-support functions to AI systems has exposed vulnerabilities related to bias, transparency, and trust. Documented instances of algorithmic misjudgment, exclusionary outcomes, and opaque decision-making processes have demonstrated that technological advancement alone does not ensure desirable or equitable outcomes. Instead, the impact of AI is shaped by how humans design systems, define boundaries of use, and retain responsibility for final decisions. This underscores the importance of reframing preparedness not as a technological milestone, but as a collaborative capacity involving both human and artificial intelligence.

From a future-oriented perspective, preparedness must be understood as the ability of individuals and institutions to engage constructively with intelligent systems while preserving human agency. Such engagement extends beyond technical literacy and tool usage. It requires cognitive capabilities such as critical thinking and interpretive reasoning, emotional competencies that support communication and trust, ethical judgment to guide responsible action, and clearly defined decision authority to ensure accountability in high-stakes contexts. Without these human-centric dimensions, AI adoption risks becoming misaligned with societal values and long-term sustainability.

Despite a growing body of interdisciplinary literature on AI adoption, digital transformation, and the future of work, there remains a lack of integrative frameworks that systematically articulate

how human intelligence and artificial intelligence should interact in practice. Much of the existing research positions human skills as adaptive responses to automation rather than as foundational elements of preparedness. This fragmented treatment limits the ability of educators, organizations, and policymakers to assess readiness for human–AI collaboration in a structured and meaningful manner.

In response to this gap, the present study advances a human-centric perspective on AI preparedness. Rather than framing humans and machines as competing entities, the paper emphasizes collaboration, complementarity, and

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

Volume–XIII, Issue–II

March – April 2026

Original Research Article

shared responsibility. By synthesizing insights from multiple disciplines, the study proposes a Human-Centric Collaborative Readiness Framework that identifies key dimensions through which preparedness for a human–AI future can be understood, evaluated, and strengthened.

Research Methodology:

1. **Research Design:**

   The study adopts a qualitative and analytical research design grounded in conceptual inquiry. This design is particularly appropriate for examining emerging and complex phenomena such as human–AI collaboration, where empirical patterns are still evolving and theoretical clarity remains fragmented. Rather than seeking statistical generalization, the research is oriented toward theoretical synthesis, conceptual integration, and framework development, which are essential for advancing understanding in interdisciplinary domains.

   Given the normative, ethical, and human-centric nature of AI preparedness, a qualitative approach enables deeper engagement with meanings, assumptions, and interpretive dimensions that cannot be adequately captured through quantitative measurement alone. The research design therefore prioritizes analytical depth, logical coherence, and conceptual rigor over numerical validation.

2. **Research Approach:**

   The study follows a systematic and integrative literature review approach, drawing upon scholarly contributions from information technology, social sciences, ethics, organizational studies, and workforce research. This interdisciplinary orientation reflects the premise that preparedness for human–AI collaboration cannot be understood within a single disciplinary boundary, as it encompasses technological capability, human behavior, moral reasoning, and institutional governance.

   Rather than treating existing studies as isolated findings, the review process emphasizes synthesis and interpretation. Concepts related to AI readiness, human skills, ethical governance, and decision-making are examined comparatively to identify convergences, tensions, and omissions within the literature. This integrative approach supports the development of a cohesive conceptual framework that bridges fragmented perspectives.

3. **Data Sources and Selection Criteria:**

   The analysis is based exclusively on secondary data derived from peer-reviewed academic journals, authoritative books, edited volumes, and policy-oriented scholarly reports relevant to AI, ethics, human competencies, and future preparedness. Sources were selected based on their conceptual relevance, analytical depth, and contribution to understanding human–AI interaction rather than publication volume or citation frequency.

   Priority was given to works that:

   - Address the human dimensions of AI adoption and use
   - Examine ethical, cognitive, or organizational implications of intelligent systems
   - Contribute conceptual models, frameworks, or theoretical insights
   - Engage with future-oriented perspectives on work, education, and governance

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

Volume–XIII, Issue–II

March – April 2026

Original Research Article

This selective strategy ensured that the literature review remained focused, meaningful, and aligned with the study's objectives, while avoiding descriptive redundancy.

4. **Analytical Procedure:**

The literature was analyzed through a thematic and conceptual synthesis process. Key ideas, arguments, and constructs related to AI preparedness and human capabilities were identified and grouped into broader conceptual categories. Through iterative comparison and refinement, these categories were examined to determine how human intelligence is positioned in relation to artificial intelligence across different contexts. This analytical process revealed recurring human-centric themes—such as judgment, emotional awareness, ethical responsibility, and authority in decision-making—that were often discussed independently but rarely integrated into a unified readiness perspective. These themes formed the conceptual foundation for the development of the proposed Human-Centric Collaborative Readiness Framework.

5. **Framework Development Logic:**

The framework proposed in this study was developed inductively from the synthesized literature rather than imposed a priori. The four dimensionscognitive capability, emotional intelligence, ethical reasoning, and decision authorityemerged as interrelated yet distinct components that collectively define readiness for effective humanAI collaboration.

Each dimension reflects a critical area where human intelligence complements artificial systems:

- Cognitive capability enables interpretation and critical evaluation of AI outputs.
- Emotional intelligence supports trust, communication, and social interaction in AI-mediated contexts.
- Ethical reasoning guides responsible use and value-aligned decision-making.
- Decision authority ensures accountability and preserves human agency in consequential outcomes.

The framework is intentionally designed to be conceptual and adaptable, allowing application across organizational, educational, and policy settings.

6. **Validity and Rigor:**

Conceptual rigor in this study is ensured through logical consistency, transparency of analytical reasoning, and interdisciplinary triangulation. By drawing insights from multiple fields and systematically integrating them into a coherent framework, the research minimizes disciplinary bias and enhances interpretive validity. While the study does not seek empirical validation, it establishes a theoretically grounded foundation upon which future empirical research can be built. The framework is therefore positioned as both an analytical contribution and a starting point for subsequent testing and refinement.

Review of Literature and Identification of Research Gap:

AI Preparedness: From Technical Readiness to Socio-Technical Understanding

Early research on artificial intelligence primarily conceptualized preparedness in technical terms, emphasizing data infrastructure, algorithmic efficiency, and system integration. These studies contributed significantly to understanding the functional requirements of AI deployment but largely abstracted technology from its human and institutional context. Preparedness, within this view, was measured by computational capability rather than

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

Volume–XIII, Issue–II

March – April 2026

Original Research Article

by the quality of human engagement with intelligent systems.

More recent interdisciplinary scholarship has reframed AI as a socio-technical phenomenon, shaped by organizational practices, governance structures, and social norms. This shift has expanded the notion of preparedness to include organizational learning, workforce adaptability, and regulatory oversight. However, even within this broader framing, human capabilities are often positioned as supporting conditions for technology adoption rather than as central determinants of collaborative effectiveness.

Human Competencies in Human–AI Collaboration:

A substantial body of literature addresses the implications of AI for work and human skills. Cognitive capabilities such as critical thinking, problem-solving, and creativity are widely recognized as essential in AI-enabled environments, particularly where automated systems generate recommendations rather than definitive answers. Emotional and social competencies, including communication, trust-building, and empathy, are also emphasized for managing AI-mediated interactions.

Despite this recognition, existing studies tend to examine these competencies in isolation. Cognitive, emotional, and ethical dimensions are rarely integrated into a unified understanding of preparedness. As a result, the literature offers fragmented insights into human skills without providing a structured perspective on how these capabilities collectively shape readiness for sustained human–AI collaboration.

Ethics, Accountability, and Decision Authority:

Ethical concerns related to fairness, transparency, and accountability occupy a prominent place in AI research. Scholars consistently highlight the risks associated with delegating consequential decisions to opaque or autonomous systems, particularly in socially sensitive domains. Ethical AI frameworks advocate for human oversight and value alignment, reinforcing the normative importance of retaining human responsibility.

However, much of this literature remains focused on system design principles and regulatory safeguards. Limited attention is given to the human capacities required to exercise ethical judgment, challenge algorithmic outputs, and assume decision authority in practice. The absence of a clear articulation of decision authority weakens the operationalization of ethical AI and constrains its application in real-world contexts.

Research Gap:

The reviewed literature reveals a persistent gap in the conceptualization of AI preparedness. While technical, organizational, and ethical dimensions are extensively discussed, there is a lack of integrative frameworks that explicitly position human intelligence as the core of preparedness for human–AI collaboration. Human capabilities are frequently treated as adaptive responses to automation rather than as foundational elements of readiness.

Specifically, the literature does not offer a consolidated lens that brings together cognitive capability, emotional intelligence, ethical reasoning, and decision authority as interrelated dimensions of preparedness. This fragmentation limits the ability of institutions to assess readiness in a systematic and meaningful manner. Addressing this gap requires a human-centric framework that conceptualizes preparedness as a collaborative capacity grounded in human agency, responsibility, and judgment.

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

Volume–XIII, Issue–II

March – April 2026

Original Research Article

Human-Centric Collaborative Readiness Framework:

Conceptual Foundation of the Framework:

The Human-Centric Collaborative Readiness Framework is grounded in the premise that effective preparedness for an AI-enabled future depends not on the autonomy of intelligent systems, but on the quality of collaboration between human intelligence and artificial intelligence. Rather than viewing AI as a substitute for human capability, the framework conceptualizes AI as a decision-support partner whose value is realized only through informed human engagement.

Preparedness, within this framework, is defined as the capacity of individuals and institutions to interpret, guide, and govern AI systems while retaining responsibility for consequential outcomes. This capacity is inherently human-centric and extends beyond technical proficiency to include judgment, ethical awareness, emotional understanding, and authority in decision-making.

Core Dimensions of Collaborative Readiness:

The framework comprises four interrelated dimensions that collectively define readiness for human–AI collaboration.

Cognitive Capability:

Cognitive capability refers to the human ability to critically interpret AI-generated information, recognize limitations, and apply contextual understanding. AI systems excel at pattern recognition and data processing, but they lack situational awareness and interpretive judgment. Human cognitive capability ensures that AI outputs are evaluated, questioned, and applied appropriately rather than accepted uncritically.

Emotional Intelligence:

Emotional intelligence captures the human capacity to manage trust, communication, and social interaction in AI-mediated environments. As AI increasingly influences interpersonal and organizational processes, emotional awareness becomes essential for sustaining collaboration, mitigating resistance, and ensuring meaningful human engagement. Emotional intelligence enables humans to navigate uncertainty and maintain relational balance in hybrid decision contexts.

Ethical Reasoning:

Ethical reasoning represents the human ability to assess the moral and social implications of AIassisted decisions. While AI systems can be designed to follow ethical rules, they cannot exercise moral judgment. This dimension emphasizes value-based reasoning, fairness, and responsibility, ensuring that AI use aligns with societal norms and long-term sustainability rather than short-term efficiency.

Decision Authority:

Decision authority refers to the explicit retention of human responsibility for final outcomes. In AIenabled systems, authority is often implicitly shifted toward algorithms, leading to accountability gaps. This dimension asserts that humans must retain the right and obligation to accept, modify, or reject AI recommendations, particularly in high-impact contexts.

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

Volume–XIII, Issue–II

March – April 2026

Original Research Article

Interrelationship Among Dimensions:

The four dimensions of the framework are mutually reinforcing rather than independent. Cognitive capability supports ethical reasoning by enabling critical evaluation of AI outputs. Emotional intelligence facilitates trust and acceptance, allowing cognitive and ethical judgments
to be exercised effectively. Decision authority anchors all dimensions by ensuring that human judgment remains central to action and accountability.

Preparedness weakens when any one dimension is underdeveloped. For example, cognitive capability without ethical reasoning risks technocratic decision-making, while ethical awareness without decision authority limits practical impact. The framework therefore emphasizes balance and integration across all dimensions.

Theoretical Contribution of the Framework:

The proposed framework advances existing discourse by repositioning human intelligence as the organizing principle of AI preparedness. Unlike models that prioritize automation maturity or skill adaptation, this framework conceptualizes preparedness as a collaborative human capacity grounded in agency, responsibility, and judgment. It offers a structured lens through which readiness can be assessed across educational, organizational, and policy contexts.

Discussion and Implications:

The Human-Centric Collaborative Readiness Framework carries important implications for education, organizations, and policy. In educational contexts, preparedness requires curricula that develop critical thinking, ethical reasoning, and emotional intelligence alongside technical literacy. Organizations must design governance structures that clarify decision authority and encourage responsible questioning of AI systems. Policymakers, in turn, can use the framework to inform guidelines that emphasize human accountability and ethical oversight. By framing preparedness as a human capability rather than a technological benchmark, the framework supports more sustainable and resilient AI adoption. It encourages institutions to invest not only in systems, but also in the human capacities required to guide their use responsibly.

Conclusion:

As artificial intelligence becomes increasingly embedded in decision-making across domains, preparedness must be reconceptualized as a collaborative capacity between humans and intelligent systems. This study argues that technological advancement alone is insufficient to ensure responsible and effective AI integration. Instead, preparedness depends on the development of human-centric capabilities that preserve agency, accountability, and ethical judgment.

By proposing a Human-Centric Collaborative Readiness Framework, the paper contributes a structured and integrative perspective to the discourse on AI preparedness. The framework highlights cognitive capability, emotional intelligence, ethical reasoning, and decision authority as essential dimensions of readiness. Together, these dimensions ensure that artificial intelligence enhances human decision-making rather than displacing it.

The study offers a conceptual foundation for future empirical research and provides practical guidance for educators, organizations, and policymakers seeking to build resilient and sustainable humanAI futures.

ISSN: P-2455-0515
E- 2394-8450

Educreator Research Journal

OPEN ACCESS

Volume–XIII, Issue–II

March – April 2026

Original Research Article

References:

1. *Bostrom, N. (2014). Superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies. Oxford University Press. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). Machine, platform, crowd: Harnessing our digital future.*
2. *W. W. Norton & Company.*
3. *Davenport, T. H., & Kirby, J. (2016). Only humans need apply: Winners and losers in the age of smart machines. Harvard Business Review, 94(6), 58–65.*
4. *Floridi, L. (2019). The logic of information: A theory of philosophy as conceptual design. Oxford University Press.*
5. *Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., et al. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. Minds and Machines, 28(4), 689–707.*
6. *Glikson, E., & Woolley, A. W. (2020). Human trust in artificial intelligence: Review of empirical research. Academy of Management Annals, 14(2), 627–660.*
7. *International Labour Organization. (2019). Work for a brighter future: Global Commission on the Future of Work. ILO Publications.*
8. *Kaplan, A., & Haenlein, M. (2019). Siri, Siri, in my hand: Who's the fairest in the land? On the interpretations, illustrations, and implications of artificial intelligence. Business Horizons, 62(1), 15–25.*
9. *OECD. (2019). Artificial intelligence in society. OECD Publishing.*
10. *Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation–augmentation paradox. Academy of Management Review, 46(1), 192–210.*
11. *Russell, S. (2019). Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control. Viking Press.*
12. *Shneiderman, B. (2020). Human-centered artificial intelligence: Reliable, safe & trustworthy.*
13. *International Journal of Human–Computer Interaction, 36(6), 495–504.*
14. *Stahl, B. C., Timmermans, J., & Mittelstadt, B. (2016). The ethics of computing: A survey of the computing-oriented literature. ACM Computing Surveys, 48(4), 1–38.*
15. *Suchman, L. (2007). Human–machine reconfigurations: Plans and situated actions. Cambridge*
16. *University Press.*
17. *UNESCO. (2022). Recommendation on the ethics of artificial intelligence. UNESCO Publishing.*

Cite This Article:

Ms. John M.R. (2026). *Preparing for a Human–AI Future: A Human-Centric Framework for Collaborative Readiness.* **In Educreator Research Journal: Vol. XIII (Issue II),** pp. 158-165.