УДК 005.95/.96:[004.8:339.9](045)
JEL Classification: M12, M16, O33, J24, F23
DOI: 10.31767/nasoa.3-2026.09

O. M. KYRYLENKO,
Dsc in Economics, Professor,
Dean of the Faculty of Finance and Economics,
National Academy of Statistics, Accounting and Audit,
E-mail: kyrylenko@nasoa.edu.ua,
ORCID: 0000-0003-2406-7050

M. O. ZHYTAR,
Dsc in Economics, Professor,
Dean of the Faculty of Management, Finance and Marketing,
National University «Kyiv Aviation Institute»,
E-mail: maksym.zhytar@kai.edu.ua,
ORCID ID: 0000-0003-3614-0788

A. V. BORYSIUK,
PhD in Management,
National University «Kyiv Aviation Institute»,
E-mail: borysyuknote@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0005-8790-5797

Y. M. KOVALENKO,
PhD in Economics, Associate Professor,
Associate Professor of Management Department,
PhD in Management,
National University «Kyiv Aviation Institute»,
E-mail: yuliya.kovalenko@npp.kai.edu.ua,
ORCID: 0009-0007-1085-6696

The Workforce Readiness for Collaboration with AI Systems under Technological Transformation

The contemporary era sees the widening gap between the rapid maturation of artificial-intelligence technologies and the much slower readiness of people and organisations to capture value from them, an issue that is central to international human capital management. The paper is a theoretical and conceptual contribution that synthesises open international evidence from leading analytical reports and academic studies, with showing results of a structured comparative analysis and conceptual modelling. The analysis identified an adoption paradox: individual engagement with intelligent tools is high, yet trust is low, literacy is limited and corporate usage rules are routinely breached, so that formal adoption coexists with weak productive collaboration.

This gap is shown to be consistent across independent international datasets and to manifest at five distinct levels. On this basis the authors interpret the workforce readiness for collaboration with intelligent systems as a five-dimensional construct that integrates cognitive, technical-operational, behavioural-trust, ethical-normative and adaptive dimensions, and argue that the notion of collaboration – rather than mere use – captures the two-way, strictly supervised and accountable nature of the interaction. A three-level management architecture is then systematised, distinguishing the individual, organisational and institutional-international levels and linking them to learning programmes, governance and regulation, including the European Union regulatory regime for intelligent systems. The Ukrainian case is examined separately, where high individual adoption combines with low organisational maturity, wartime migration losses of human capital and European-integration requirements, producing a specific shadow-usage and security risk. It is concluded that bridging the human side of the gap rather than the technological one is the central task for the international management of human capital.

Keywords: *human capital management, artificial intelligence literacy, human-machine teaming, digital trust, change management, post-war recovery.*

О. М. КИРИЛЕНКО,
доктор економічних наук, професор,
декан фінансово-економічного факультету,
Національна академія статистики, обліку та аудиту,
E-mail: kyrylenko@nasoa.edu.ua,
ORCID: 0000-0003-2406-7050
М. О. ЖИТАР,
доктор економічних наук, професор,
декан факультету менеджменту, фінансів та маркетингу,
Національний університет «Київський авіаційний інститут»,
E-mail: maksym.zhytar@kai.edu.ua
ORCID: 0000-0003-3614-0788
А. В. БОРИСЮК,
кандидат наук із менеджменту,
Національний університет «Київський авіаційний інститут»,
e-mail: borysyuknote@gmail.com
ORCID: 0009-0005-8790-5797
Ю. М. КОВАЛЕНКО,
кандидат економічних наук, доцент,
доцент кафедри менеджменту,
Національний університет «Київський авіаційний інститут»,
e-mail: yuliya.kovalenko@npp.kai.edu.ua
ORCID: 0009-0007-1085-6696

Готовність персоналу до співпраці з AI-системами в умовах технологічної трансформації

Сучасна епоха характеризується зростанням розриву між швидким досягненням зрілості технологіями штучного інтелекту та значно повільнішою готовністю людей і організацій отримувати від них цінність, що є головною проблемою міжнародного менеджменту людського капіталу. У цій теоретико-концептуальній статті узагальнено відкриті міжнародні дані з провідних аналітичних звітів і наукових досліджень, наведено результати структурованого порівняльного аналізу і концептуального моделювання. Аналіз виявив парадокс адопції: індивідуальна залученість до використання інтелектуальних інструментів є високою, але довіра до них низька, грамотність обмежена, а корпоративні правила використання цих інструментів регулярно порушуються, тож формальна адопція співіснує зі слабкою продуктивною співпрацею. Цей розрив демонструють незалежні міжнародні масиви даних, і він проявляється на п'яти рівнях. На цій основі готовність персоналу до співпраці з інтелектуальними системами трактується авторами як п'ятивимірний конструкт, що поєднує когнітивний, технічно-операційний, поведінково-довірчий, етико-нормативний та адаптаційний виміри; підкреслено, що саме категорія співпраці, а не простого використання, відображає двосторонній, жорстко

контрольований і відповідальний характер взаємодії. Систематизовано трирівневу управлінську архітектуру, що має індивідуальний, організаційний та інституційно-міжнародний рівні й пов'язує їх із програмами навчання, врядуванням та регулюванням, зокрема регуляторним режимом ЄС. Окремо розглянуто приклад України, де висока індивідуальна адопція поєднується з низькою організаційною зрілістю, міграційними втратами людського капіталу внаслідок війни та вимогами євроінтеграції, що породжує специфічний ризик «тіньового» використання та безпековий ризик. Зроблено висновок, що подолання саме людської, а не технологічної сторони розриву є вирішальним завданням міжнародного менеджменту людського капіталу.

Ключові слова: *управління людським капіталом, грамотність у сфері штучного інтелекту, людино-машинна взаємодія, цифрова довіра, управління змінами, повоєнне відновлення.*

Introduction. The technological transformation triggered by mass access to generative artificial-intelligence models in late 2022 has become the most powerful force reshaping the global labour market since the computer revolution of the 1990s. The World Economic Forum reports that 86% of employers expect artificial intelligence and information-processing technologies to transform their business by 2030, with a net effect on global employment of about 78 million new jobs – 170 million jobs created and 92 million replaced [1]. Yet the pace of technological deployment substantially outstrips the competence and institutional adaptation of the workforce. According to McKinsey & Company, 92% of companies plan to increase artificial-intelligence investment within three years, while only 1% consider their organisations mature in deployment [2]. International human capital management has thus reached a point at which the classical logic of preparing, training and motivating staff no longer guarantees successful adaptation to hybrid human-machine teams.

The problem is particularly acute internationally, because large organisations operate across countries with markedly different levels of artificial-intelligence literacy, regulatory regimes and cultural attitudes. A contradiction has emerged: while technological readiness is relatively homogeneous, since cloud services are available almost everywhere, human readiness remains fragmented and uneven. The global study by the University of Melbourne and KPMG, covering more than 48,000 respondents in 47 countries, found that 66% of people used artificial intelligence regularly, yet only 46% trusted it and 70% called for additional regulation [3].

The problem has an additional dimension in Ukraine. Amidst the full-scale war, large-scale migration losses of labour and the movement toward EU membership, the requirements placed on human capital are changing rapidly. According to Deloitte, only 6% of workers worldwide – and 3% in Ukraine – believe their organisations have made significant progress in creating value through artificial intelligence [4]. Hence, a systematic study of the workforce readiness for collaboration with intelligent systems becomes a task affecting the competitiveness of domestic organisations in the international economic space.

The problem is studied along several converging lines. The foundational

treatment of human capital as an economic category, established by Becker, Schultz and Mincer, frames competencies as investable assets whose returns depend on continuous renewal [5, 6, 7]; its contemporary evolution under digitalisation is developed in the Ukrainian scholarship that links technological change to the structure of human capital [8, 9]. The Western research tradition advances the notion of artificial-intelligence readiness both at the level of organisational maturity, as in the work of Brynjolfsson and McAfee on the reorganisation of work around intelligent technologies [10], and at the individual level, where Jarrahi conceptualises human-machine symbiosis in organisational decision-making [11]. A distinct strand examines trust in intelligent systems in the workplace: the University of Melbourne–KPMG programme provides one of the most complete empirical bases for analysing trust, attitudes and use across 47 countries [3], while research on the effect of trust on career sustainability and on the effectiveness of human–machine cooperation extends this to individual outcomes [12]. In the Ukrainian discourse, the impact of artificial intelligence on the labour market has been analysed, including in the authors' earlier work [13]. Practice-oriented reports add an empirical edge: the World Economic Forum records that 39% of the core skills will change by 2030 – down from 44% in 2023 – and that some 22% of current roles will be substantially redefined [1]; McKinsey argues that the binding constraint on transformation is neither technology nor staff but the slow reaction of leadership [2]; and in October 2025 Gartner introduced an explicit distinction between technological and human readiness, stressing that the latter lags the former [14].

Despite this body of publications, several gaps remain. The notion of workforce readiness for collaboration with intelligent systems is most often conflated with artificial-intelligence literacy or with readiness for digital transformation, although these categories differ in scope. There is no agreed multidimensional model of such readiness suitable for international human-resource-management systems. Moreover, the specifics of forming such readiness in the context of Ukraine's post-war recovery and European-integration requirements have not received systematic treatment. Addressing these gaps defines the subject field of this article.

The aim of the article is to conceptualise workforce readiness for collaboration with intelligent systems within the logic of international human capital management, and to propose a multidimensional model for managing this readiness at the individual, organisational and institutional-international levels. The research objectives are: to substantiate the conceptual distinction between the readiness of technologies and of people, and to identify the adoption paradox; to elaborate a five-dimensional model of workforce readiness for collaboration with intelligent systems; to define the levels of managing its formation in international human capital management; and to reveal the specifics of forming such readiness in Ukraine under conditions of war and European integration.

Research methods. This paper presents the results of a theoretical and conceptual study; accordingly, the methodological section sets out the logic of the proposed framework rather than a primary-data sampling procedure. The research design combines three elements. First, a structured synthesis of open

international evidence establishes the empirical basis of the problem; the principal sources are the World Economic Forum Future of Jobs Report 2025, the McKinsey Superagency in the Workplace report (a survey of 3,613 employees and 238 C-suite executives), the University of Melbourne–KPMG global study (more than 48,000 respondents in 47 countries), the 2025 Deloitte Global Human Capital Trends (93 countries), and the October 2025 Gartner survey of more than 700 chief information officers, complemented by national Ukrainian sources for the country analysis. Second, a comparative analysis juxtaposes these data and derives a typology of the readiness gap. Third, conceptual modelling defines a multidimensional readiness construct and a multi-level management architecture. The units of analysis are the individual employee, the organisation, and the institutional-international environment. The principal limitation is that the proposed construct and architecture are conceptual: they are grounded in secondary evidence and existing competence frameworks but have not yet been quantitatively validated on a primary sample, which is acknowledged as a direction for further research and does not affect the internal consistency of the conceptualisation.

Results and discussion. In the current discourse, several related but non- identical terms are used alongside readiness for artificial intelligence: literacy, digital readiness, organisational maturity and adoption. None fully captures the phenomenon that is the object of international human capital management as intelligent systems become embedded in production processes. Literacy denotes a basic understanding of how such systems work, their capabilities and limitations. Digital readiness is broader, encompassing all digital competencies, some unrelated to intelligent systems. Maturity refers to the organisational level – infrastructure, data, governance – rather than the individual. Adoption is the bare fact of using a tool and says nothing about the quality or appropriateness of that use.

In the authors' view, workforce readiness for collaboration with intelligent systems denotes the integral quality of an employee and a working community that enables productive and responsible interactions with intelligent tools within hybrid human-machine teams. The category of collaboration – as opposed to use – is essential: the employee does not passively consume the output of an intelligent system but critically evaluates and directs its work, verifies outputs and bears responsibility for decisions taken on that basis.

The empirical basis for distinguishing this category is the adoption paradox documented by the University of Melbourne–KPMG global study, the detailed figures of which are summarised together with other evidence in Table 1. Also, the study shows that more than half of employees do not disclose to management that intelligent systems were used in their results, while around half nonetheless report gains in efficiency, quality and innovation. Formal adoption is, therefore, high, yet productive collaboration in the strict sense is low. This confirms that the classical sequence "deploy the tool – train people to use it – obtain the effect" does not work for intelligent systems; a different frame is required, one that accounts for the cognitive, behavioural and ethical components of interactions. The principal levels of the gap between the readiness of technologies and of people are summarised in Table 1.

Table 1

Levels of the gap between the readiness of technologies and of people, international dimension

Level of the gap	Nature of the gap	Empirical illustration (2024–2025)
Investment–maturity	The pace of investment outstrips organisational maturity	92% of companies increase AI investment, yet only 1% are AI-mature
Management–awareness	Real bottom-up adoption outruns the leadership's top-down picture	Employees use AI for 30%+ of tasks three times more often than leaders assume
Adoption–collaboration	Using a tool does not equal productive collaboration	66% do not verify AI outputs; 56% made mistakes; 48% breach policies
Trust	High engagement coexists with low trust	66% use AI regularly, yet only 46% trust AI systems
Value–outcome	Perceptions of AI value diverge between leaders and employees	Only 6% of workers worldwide and 3% in Ukraine see significant progress in value creation

Source: compiled by the authors based on [1, 2, 3, 4, 14]

This multi-level gap is corroborated across independent sources, which is itself analytically significant, since the pattern is not an artefact of a single dataset. Gartner frames the issue as a distinction between the readiness of the technology to create value in specific business cases and the readiness of the organisation and its people to capture, realise and sustain that value; by 2030, chief information officers expect no information-technology work to be performed by humans without artificial intelligence, 75% to be performed by humans augmented with it, and 25% by intelligent systems alone, so that technological readiness ceases to be the bottleneck and human readiness becomes the binding constraint [14]. McKinsey's 2025 survey reaches the same conclusion from the workforce side, attributing the gap chiefly to the slow reaction of leadership rather than to employees [2]. Deloitte's 2025 data point in the same direction: despite the low perceived progress in value creation, more than 70% of managers and workers state they are more likely to stay with an organisation whose value proposition helps them thrive in a world shaped by intelligent systems [4]. Taken together, these results reveal a clear demand for meaningful participation in such work, conditional on the organisation creating an enabling environment.

The evidence argues for a multidimensional rather than one-dimensional operationalisation. Neither technical skill, nor attitude toward intelligent systems, nor ethical conduct alone describes readiness fully. Drawing on existing competence frameworks and synthesising the empirical material, the authors propose a five-dimensional model (Table 2).

Table 2

A five-dimensional construct of workforce readiness for collaboration with intelligent systems

Dimension	Content	Key risk if underdeveloped
Cognitive	Understanding how intelligent systems work, including model limitations and hallucination, and judging the relevance of a tool in a given context	Inability to assess where and when a tool is appropriate
Technical-operational	Practical interaction skills: prompting, tool configuration, integration into workflows, basic data handling	Low productivity; superficial use
Behavioural-trust	Attitudes toward intelligent systems: calibrated trust, willingness to delegate tasks, critical attitude to outputs	Over-trust (unverified outputs) or demonstrative distrust
Ethical-normative	Compliance with corporate and national rules; data confidentiality, copyright, algorithmic bias, transparency of use	Routine breaches of usage policies; data leakage
Adaptive	Capacity to reconfigure one's competence profile as tools evolve; reliance on fast-growing soft skills	Competence obsolescence; resistance to change

Source: developed by the authors

The relationship between the dimensions is not linear but mutually reinforcing. A weak cognitive dimension amplifies errors in the behavioural-trust dimension, which in turn provokes breaches in the ethical-normative dimension; the high share of employees who breach corporate policies (Table 1) signals the critical immaturity of that dimension. Empirically, the behavioural-trust dimension is the most problematic, as many employees display either excessive trust or demonstrative distrust [3]. The adaptive dimension foregrounds the soft skills that the World Economic Forum identifies as the fastest-growing – critical thinking, creativity, flexibility, lifelong learning, leadership and emotional intelligence [1]. These dimensions must therefore be developed as a system rather than in isolation, which is the practical implication that distinguishes the proposed construct from approaches reducing readiness to literacy alone.

Managing the formation of this readiness is best considered at three levels. The individual level covers the development of each employee – personalised learning plans, access to tools, mentoring and assessment against the five dimensions – with personalised learning-and-development programmes as the key instrument; the World Economic Forum estimates that 59 of every 100 workers will need some form of retraining by 2030 [1]. The organisational level defines the conditions in which individual readiness forms – usage policies, governance models, infrastructure, culture, incentives and performance assessment – with two-way communication as the pivotal factor: leaders must see how employees actually use intelligent tools rather than rely on assumptions, while employees need clear rules, the lack of which is the source of most policy breaches. The institutional-international level comprises national regulation, international standards

and industry agreements; in 2025, it grew markedly more complex with the entry into force of the first provisions of the European Union Artificial Intelligence Act, which, among other things, prohibits emotion-monitoring of workers and other high-risk uses in employment [15]. Transnational corporations bear a special role, since they must meet the strictest regulatory requirements across jurisdictions, account for cultural variation in attitudes – trust being empirically higher in emerging than in advanced economies [3] – and apply a unified model for assessing and developing readiness.

The Ukrainian case is paradoxical. At the grassroots level, individual engagement is high: according to the Stayinno AI study (October 2024 – March 2025; 240 companies, 460 managers), about 90% of employees have experience using intelligent tools both at work and personally [16], and PwC estimates that the number of artificial-intelligence specialists in Ukraine has grown fivefold over the past decade, placing the country second in Eastern Europe by the number of companies operating in the field [17]. On the other hand, only 22.4% of companies use such tools in business processes according to GEM Ukraine 2024 [18], and the organisational maturity is extremely low (Table 1). This combination of high individual adoption and low organisational maturity creates a specific risk: staff use intelligent tools in an uncontrolled way, outside corporate infrastructure and without built-in safeguards – effectively a shadow usage economy within organisations. Under post-war conditions, given the heightened cyber-vulnerability and information-leakage risks, this shifts from a purely managerial to a security concern. Migration and mobilisation deplete the qualified human capital, complicating the formation of organisational readiness; yet intelligent systems may partly offset these losses if their adoption is purposeful and aligned with international standards. The European-integration context requires systematic alignment of the Ukrainian practice with the Artificial Intelligence Act – governance mechanisms, risk assessment, documentation, transparency, and staff training – which, for regulated sectors such as financial services, transport and healthcare, means building readiness across all five dimensions, with emphasis on the ethical-normative component.

The sectoral dimension deserves a separate mention. In the air-transport and logistics sectors – central to the scope of supply-chain management – the workforce readiness for collaboration with digital and intelligent systems bears directly on the safety and service quality. The integration of intelligent systems into airport and supply-chain management, from passenger handling to operational control and demand forecasting, turns staff from operators of traditional processes into partners of intelligent systems within complex socio-technical systems, which makes the readiness especially critical and makes these sectors a useful reference for other internationally integrated industries.

The contribution differs from existing approaches in two respects. Whereas Gartner frames the readiness chiefly at the level of technology versus organisation [14], and much of the literature reduces it to literacy or digital readiness, the proposed construct locates the readiness at the level of the individual within a team, and decomposes it into five interacting dimensions; and whereas prior studies treat the phenomenon generically, the article situates it explicitly

within the international human capital management and the Ukrainian post-war, pre-accession context, thereby connecting an international empirical pattern with a concrete national agenda.

Conclusions. The study shows that technological transformation has deepened the gap between the readiness of technologies, which is approaching maturity, and that of people and organisations, which lags substantially; this gap manifests across at least five levels – investment versus maturity, real versus leadership-perceived adoption, adoption versus productive collaboration, and the trust and value dimensions – and bridging it is the central task of the international management of human capital. The workforce readiness for collaboration with intelligent systems is best treated as a five-dimensional construct – cognitive, technical-operational, behavioural-trust, ethical-normative and adaptive – rather than as a synonym for literacy or digital readiness, with collaboration implying two-way, strictly supervised and accountable interaction. Managing its formation must span the individual, organisational and institutional-international levels, and for transnational organisations it requires reconciling the EU Artificial Intelligence Act, cultural variations in attitudes and unified competence models. The Ukrainian context is marked by the high individual adoption alongside the low organisational maturity; under post-war conditions and full European integration, institutional regulation becomes critical to convert today's shadow practice into managed and secure use, and to compensate, through purposeful readiness-building programmes, for the competencies lost to migration. The research objectives have thus been achieved, with the concept defined, the five-dimensional construct and the three-level architecture built, and the Ukrainian specifics characterised. Further research will focus on a quantitative methodology for assessing readiness across the five dimensions, its testing in specific sectors – notably air transport – and a comparative analysis of successful readiness-building practices in EU countries.

References

1. World Economic Forum (2025). The future of jobs report 2025. Geneva: World Economic Forum. Retrieved from https://www.weforum.org/publications/the-future-of-jobs-report-2025/
2. McKinsey & Company (2025). Superagency in the workplace: Empowering people to unlock AI's full potential at work. Retrieved from https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/tech-and-ai/our-insights/superagency-in-the-workplace-empowering-people-to-unlock-ais-full-potential-at-work
3. Gillespie, N., Lockey, S., Ward, T., Macdade, A., & Hassed, G. (2025). *Trust, attitudes and use of artificial intelligence: A global study 2025*. The University of Melbourne and KPMG. DOI: 10.26188/28822919
4. Deloitte (2025). 2025 Global Human Capital Trends: Turning tensions into triumphs. Deloitte Insights. Retrieved from https://www.deloitte.com/global/en/issues/work/content/human-capital-trends.html
5. Becker, G. S. (1964). *Human Capital: A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis, with Special Reference to Education*. New York: Columbia University Press.
6. Schultz, T. W. (1961). Investment in human capital. *The American Economic Review, 51 (1),* 1–17.
7. Mincer, J. (1974). *Schooling, Experience, and Earnings*. New York: Columbia University Press.
8. Hryshnova, O. A. (2001). *Liudskyi kapital: formuvannia v systemi osvity i profesiinoi pidhotovky [Human capital: Formation in the education and vocational training system]*. Kyiv: Znannia [in Ukrainian].
9. Kolot, A. M., & Herasymenko, O. O. (2020). Tsyfrova ekonomika ta transformatsiia sfery pratsi: hlobalni trendy ta natsionalni osoblyvosti [Digital economy and transformation of the world of work: Global trends and national features]. *Sotsialno-trudovi vidnosyny: teoriia ta praktyka – Social and Labour Relations: Theory and Practice, 2,* 8–22 [in Ukrainian].

10. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
11. Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human–AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. *Business Horizons, 61 (4)*, 577–586. DOI: 10.1016/j.bushor.2018.03.007
12. Kong, H., Yin, Z., Baruch, Y., & Yuan, Y. (2023). The impact of trust in AI on career sustainability: The role of employee–AI collaboration and protean career orientation. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 146*, 103928. DOI: 10.1016/j.jvb.2023.103928
13. Rossomakha, I., Kyrylenko, O., & Borysiuk, A. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence on the labor market in the world and particularly in Ukraine. *Economics. Finances. Law, 2*, 27–30. DOI: 10.37634/efp.2024.2.6
14. Gartner (2025, October 20). Gartner survey finds all IT work will involve AI by 2030. Press release. Retrieved from https://www.gartner.com/en/newsroom/press-releases/2025-10-20-gartner-survey-finds-all-it-work-will-involve-ai-by-2030
15. European Union (2024). Regulation (EU) 2024/1689 of the European Parliament and of the Council laying down harmonised rules on artificial intelligence (Artificial Intelligence Act). Retrieved from https://eur-lex.europa.eu/eli/reg/2024/1689/oj/eng
16. Bilous, A. (2025, May 27). Bez ShI vazhko bude konkuruvaty. 240 ukrainskykh kompanii rozpovily, yak vony vykorystovuiut shtuchnyi intelekt [It will be difficult to compete without AI. 240 Ukrainian companies told how they used artificial intelligence]. Forbes Ukraine. Retrieved from https://forbes.ua/company/bez-vprovadzhennya-shi-bude-skladno-konkuruvati-240-ukrainskikh-kompaniy-rozpovili-yak-voni-vikoristovuyut-shtuchniy-intelekt-analiz-trendu-vid-andriya-bilousa-27052025-30066 [in Ukrainian].
17. PwC Ukraine (2025). The Fearless Future. Global AI jobs barometer 2025. Retrieved from https://www.pwc.com/gx/en/issues/artificial-intelligence/job-barometer/2025/executive-summary.pdf
18. Apalkova, V., Apalkov, S., Meshko, N., & Tarasiuk, O. (2024). Global Entrepreneurship Monitor Ukraine 2023/2024. Zenodo. DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.14234661

Надійшла до редакції / Received on: 08.06.2026
Прорецензована / Reviewed on: 24.06.2026
Підписана до друку / Signed for printing on: 28.08.2026
Оприлюднена / Published on: 31.08.2026

Cite this article:

Kyrylenko, O., Zhytar, M., Borysiuk, A., Kovalenko, Y. (2026). The Workforce Readiness for Collaboration with AI Systems under Technological Transformation. *Scientific Bulletin of the National Academy of Statistics, Accounting and Audit*, 2, 111–121. DOI: 10.31767/nasoa.3-2026.09