FROM THE RESEARCH BENCH

Human and machine should divide the work

Human-machine design starts with tasks, handoffs, coordination, and accountability: assign complementary strengths before discussing replacement.

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)

Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

PUBLISHED
1 September 2026

READING TIME
9 min

WORDS
2,027

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/human-and-machine-should-divide-the-work/

CONTENTS

MANAGEMENT SUMMARY

A useful human-machine arrangement starts by assigning work, handoffs, coordination, and accountability, not by asking whether AI will replace people. Dellermann and colleagues define hybrid intelligence as a division of labor that uses complementary strengths of human and artificial intelligence. Jarrahi frames human-AI symbiosis around machine analysis and pattern recognition alongside human context, intuition, judgment, and responsibility. Raisch and Krakowski show why automation and augmentation are interdependent rather than one-time choices. Seeber and colleagues extend the design to AI machines as teammates, with task allocation, communication, trust, accountability, and team outcomes. This article turns the synthesis into a division-of-labor card. It does not forecast employment, evaluate a vendor, or claim that every hybrid team outperforms either humans or machines alone.

Keywords: Human-AI symbiosis · Hybrid intelligence · Automation and augmentation · Team collaboration

The useful question is not whether AI replaces people. It is which part of the work each actor can do, where the handoff occurs, and who remains accountable when the arrangement fails.

The short answer is that human-machine work should be designed as a division of labor before it is described as an automation project. A machine may contribute analysis and pattern recognition. A person may contribute context, intuition, judgment, and responsibility. That complementarity is not automatic. It has to be expressed through tasks, handoffs, coordination, communication, trust, and accountability.

Dellermann and colleagues define hybrid intelligence as a division of labor that uses complementary human and artificial strengths to outperform either alone. Jarrahi frames human-AI symbiosis as complementarity, not simple replacement. Raisch and Krakowski explain why automation and augmentation can reinforce or undermine each other over time. Seeber and colleagues treat AI machines as teammates and set out a research agenda around allocation, coordination, communication, trust, accountability, and team outcomes. Together, the sources support a design framework, not a universal performance promise.

Why must human-AI workflow design begin with discrete decisions rather than tools?

Consider a synthetic decision process with four steps: identify a pattern, interpret its relevance, choose an action, and explain the choice to someone affected. It is tempting to assign all four steps to one actor. The sources suggest a more useful starting point: ask which capabilities are complementary at each step.

Table 1 Why must human-AI workflow design begin with discrete decisions rather than tools?

Work field	Design question	Possible human contribution	Possible machine contribution
Task	What is the unit of work being assigned?	Define the decision and its boundary.	Process a specified search or comparison.
Contribution	Which strength is scarce at this step?	Context, intuition, judgment, empathy, and responsibility.	Analysis, pattern recognition, speed, and repeatability.
Handoff	When does one actor's output become another's input?	Interpret uncertainty and decide whether the output is usable.	Return a traceable result in the agreed format.
Coordination	How are disagreement and timing handled?	Ask for clarification, override, or escalation.	Surface alternatives, anomalies, or confidence information.
Accountability	Who can explain and own the action?	Accept responsibility for the decision and its effects.	Provide evidence of the processing step and its limits.
Failure mode	What happens when the output is wrong or incomplete?	Detect contextual mismatch and correct course.	Flag low coverage, uncertainty, or a pattern outside scope.

Table from this essay. Sources and interpretation are given in the article.

The machine column is not a claim about one current system. It is a design prompt. The human column is not a claim that people are always better at every listed activity. It identifies contributions that the sources associate with human context, judgment, and responsibility in complex and uncertain work.

Figure 1 The human-machine division-of-labor card

Review field	Human side	Machine side	Release question
Task	Define the decision and its context.	Process a specified search, pattern, or comparison.	Is the unit of work explicit?
Handoff	Interpret whether an output is usable.	Return a traceable result in the agreed format.	What exactly crosses the boundary?
Coordination	Clarify, challenge, override, or escalate.	Surface alternatives, anomalies, or uncertainty.	How are disagreement and timing handled?
Accountability	Own the action and explain its effects.	Show processing limits and supporting evidence.	Who answers when the arrangement fails?
Failure mode	Detect contextual mismatch and correct course.	Flag low coverage or out-of-scope patterns.	Is recovery designed before deployment?
Team outcome	Judge whether collaboration improved the decision.	Contribute repeatable capacity within the task boundary.	Is the outcome measured for the team, not one actor?

Author's design framework grounded in Dellermann, Ebel, Sollner and Leimeister (2019), Jarrahi (2018), Raisch and Krakowski (2021), and Seeber et al. (2020). The card is synthetic and does not predict team performance.

How does hybrid intelligence establish functional complementarity between humans and AI?

Dellermann and colleagues define hybrid intelligence as a division of labor that uses complementary strengths of human and artificial intelligence to outperform either alone. They distinguish hybrid intelligence from collective intelligence among homogeneous human or animal groups because the agents are heterogeneous. The difference is operationally useful. A human-machine team is not simply a larger human team with a faster assistant. It brings different capabilities, limits, and coordination requirements into the same work system.

For complex and uncertain tasks, the authors highlight human creativity, empathy, intuition, and domain knowledge alongside machine analytic capacity. They also identify trust, transparency, governance, and incentives as open design issues. Those issues are not decoration around the technical system. They determine whether the division of labor can be understood, challenged, and maintained.

The strongest unsupported sentence would be “hybrid intelligence outperforms humans and machines.” The source definition supplies a direction for design, not a performance result for every team. The permitted sentence is narrower: hybrid intelligence is a proposed division of labor in which complementary strengths can be arranged for a complex task, subject to trust, transparency, governance, incentives, and context.

How should workflow architects assign distinct cognitive strengths to each task step?

Jarrahi frames human-AI symbiosis as a complement to, rather than a simple replacement for, human decision making. AI can contribute analytical processing and pattern recognition. Humans can contribute contextual understanding, intuition, judgment, and responsibility. The appropriate division depends on task characteristics and organizational context.

This produces a more precise way to discuss automation. Suppose a system detects a pattern in a large set of records. That does not decide whether the pattern is relevant to a local situation, whether the evidence is fairly interpreted, or who must explain the action. Conversely, a person may define the decision but benefit from machine-supported comparison across a large search space. The design task is to specify the boundary between those contributions.

The boundary also changes the meaning of accuracy. A machine can be accurate at a subtask while the overall decision is poor because the wrong task was assigned, the handoff omitted context, or nobody owned the final action. A human can make a justified override even when it lowers agreement with the machine. Team quality is therefore not identical to machine agreement.

Why are process automation and human cognitive augmentation mutually interdependent?

Raisch and Krakowski describe an automation-augmentation paradox. Automation takes over tasks, while augmentation collaborates with people. The two processes are interdependent over time and space. A team that automates one step can change the remaining work, the information available to people, and the skills needed for the next handoff.

Overemphasizing either automation or augmentation can create negative feedback cycles that undermine the benefits of the other. If automation removes the context needed for good human judgment, later augmentation has less useful material to work with. If augmentation is added without clarifying task ownership, the system can create more coordination burden rather than complementary capacity.

The broader perspective is not a compromise in which every task is split fifty-fifty. It is an organizational design choice about where automation and augmentation can create complementarities. The question is not “How much AI should we use?” It is “Which sequence of tasks, handoffs, and feedback keeps the combined work effective and governable?”

What structural governance questions arise when AI agents function as team members?

Seeber and colleagues develop a research agenda for AI machines acting as teammates in collaborative work. They identify questions about task allocation, coordination, communication, trust, accountability, and team outcomes. This extends the discussion beyond a tool-user interface. If a machine participates in a team-like process, the team must decide how information is shared, how disagreements are surfaced, and how responsibility is assigned.

The teammate framing does not mean a machine has the same status, motives, or accountability as a person. It means that collaborative work creates social and organizational processes that technical capability alone does not settle. A system can generate a useful suggestion and still be poorly integrated if the team cannot understand its timing, challenge its result, or recover from an error.

A release review should therefore ask four questions:

1. What work is allocated to the machine, and what work remains with the person?
2. What information must cross the handoff for the next actor to act responsibly?
3. How can team members challenge, correct, or escalate the machine output?
4. Who owns the final decision and the consequences of the collaboration?

Those questions are author-owned governance prompts grounded in the research agenda. They are not findings that a current AI teammate has solved coordination or accountability.

How should operating teams evaluate a synthetic human-machine decision sequence?

Take a synthetic review task with one machine step and three human steps. The machine scans a bounded set of records and returns candidate patterns. A person checks whether the records are comparable. A second person interprets the pattern in context. An accountable decision-maker chooses an action and records why the machine output was accepted, modified, or rejected.

The arrangement can fail in several ways. The machine may search the wrong set. The first reviewer may not receive the context needed to assess comparability. The interpreter may treat a candidate pattern as a conclusion. The decision-maker may assume that machine involvement transfers responsibility. Each failure is a division-of-labor problem before it is a model-performance problem.

The review card makes those points visible without claiming that the synthetic sequence is optimal. It names the task, contribution, handoff, coordination, accountability, and recovery. A later evaluation can then measure whether the team outcome improved and under which conditions. Without the card, a result may be attributed to "AI" even though the decisive change was a human handoff or a governance rule.

What phased governance sequence should govern human-in-the-loop task handoffs?

Use this sequence before a claim about collaboration enters a strategy or operating document:

1. Define the unit of work and the decision that follows it.
2. Assign machine and human contributions by capability and task boundary.
3. Specify the information, timing, and format of every handoff.
4. Define how uncertainty, disagreement, override, and escalation are communicated.
5. Name the person or role accountable for the final action and its effects.
6. Design failure recovery before measuring performance.
7. Measure the team outcome, including coordination cost and decision quality where relevant.

8 State whether the evidence concerns a concept, a research agenda, a controlled evaluation, or an actual deployment.

This sequence keeps the promise proportionate. A concept paper can motivate a design. A research agenda can identify open questions. A deployment evaluation can report an observed outcome. They should not be written as if they were interchangeable evidence.

Where are the empirical limits of human-machine task allocation research?

The four sources do not forecast employment, evaluate a current vendor or model, or establish that every human-machine team outperforms either humans or machines alone. They do not remove the need for organizational judgment, communication, governance, or accountability. They provide complementary capability lenses and a research agenda for designing collaborative work.

The stopping rule is concrete. Do not release “AI and humans work better together” until the task allocation, handoffs, coordination, accountability, failure recovery, and measured team outcome are named. If one is missing, the arrangement may still be promising. The collaboration claim is not yet ready.

The division-of-labor boundary connects to hybrid intelligence and the capability-outcome boundary and sales-force control through observable work, while acknowledging that algorithm trust changes with the task depending on whether decisions involve objective calculation or subjective judgement.

Dellermann, D., P. Ebel, M. Söllner, and J. M. Leimeister. (2019). Hybrid Intelligence. Business & Information Systems Engineering, 61, 637-643. DOI

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

Raisch, S., and S. Krakowski. (2021). Artificial Intelligence and Management: The Automation-Augmentation Paradox. Academy of Management Review, 46(1), 192-210. DOI

Seeber, I., E. Bittner, R. Briggs, T. de Vreede, G.-J. de Vreede, A. Elkins, R. Maier, A. Merz, S. Oeste-Reiß, K. Randrup, G. Schwabe, and M. Söllner. (2020). Machines as Teammates: A Research Agenda on AI in Team Collaboration. Information & Management, 57(2), 103174. DOI

END OF ESSAY

HOW TO CITE THIS ESSAY

Isoglu, S. (2026, September 1). Human and machine should divide the work. Sinan Isoglu. https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/human-and-machine-should-divide-the-work/

KEEP READING

From the research bench

Hybrid intelligence needs a boundary between capability and outcome

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/hybrid-intelligence-needs-a-boundary-between-capability-and-outcome/

From the research bench

Staggered difference-in-differences needs a cohort-time estimand

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/staggered-difference-in-differences-needs-a-cohort-time-estimand/

From the research bench

What are parallel trends? The assumption behind difference-in-differences

https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/what-are-parallel-trends/

Sinan Isoglu, MBA (Quantic)
Commercial growth leader, lecturer and doctoral researcher

Online version: https://isoglu.com/insights/journal/human-and-machine-should-divide-the-work/