

Human and Artificial Intelligence in Business Decision-Making: A Systematic Review of Comparative Effectiveness, Strategic Integration, and Organizational Outcomes

Ahana Kohli

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) is increasingly transforming business decision-making by enabling organizations to process large volumes of data, identify patterns, generate predictions, and automate analytical tasks. However, AI does not possess all the contextual, creative, interpersonal, and ethical capabilities associated with human judgment. This systematic review examines the comparative effectiveness of human and AI decision-making and evaluates how their capabilities can be strategically integrated within organizations. Drawing on secondary literature across management, entrepreneurship, information systems, organizational behaviour, and related fields, the review compares human and AI decision-making in terms of speed, accuracy, consistency, creativity, risk assessment, ethical reasoning, adaptability, uncertainty management, and crisis decision-making. The findings indicate that AI demonstrates particular value in data-intensive, structured, repetitive, and pattern-based decisions, while human judgment remains important in ambiguous, complex, interpersonal, and ethically sensitive contexts. The literature further suggests that hybrid approaches, including human-in-the-loop and augmented intelligence models, can combine computational capabilities with human contextual judgment. The review also identifies challenges involving algorithmic bias, transparency, accountability, privacy, cybersecurity, workforce transformation, and organizational readiness. It concludes that effective AI adoption requires human-centered governance, appropriate oversight, workforce development, and carefully designed human–AI collaboration.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Business Decision-Making; Human–AI Collaboration; Strategic Management; Decision Intelligence; AI Governance; Organizational Outcomes

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Business decision-making has evolved from relying primarily on managerial intuition and experience to increasingly incorporating data analytics and artificial intelligence (AI). In contemporary organizations, decisions related to marketing, finance, operations, human resources, and strategic planning are influenced by digital technologies capable of processing vast amounts of information within seconds (Davenport & Harris, 2007). The rapid development of machine learning, predictive analytics, and generative AI has transformed how businesses identify opportunities, assess risks, and respond to changing market conditions (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2017). Rather than replacing human decision-makers entirely, many

organizations are adopting hybrid approaches in which AI provides analytical insights while humans contribute contextual understanding, ethical reasoning, and creative judgment (Jarrahi, 2018).

Despite significant advances in AI technologies, there remains considerable debate regarding their effectiveness compared with human intelligence in organizational decision-making. AI systems often outperform humans in processing structured data and recognizing patterns, yet they may struggle with ambiguous situations, moral dilemmas, and decisions requiring empathy or cultural understanding (Kahneman, Sibony, & Sunstein, 2021). Conversely, human decision-makers are capable of intuition, creativity, and adaptability but are also susceptible to cognitive biases that can reduce decision quality (Simon, 1955). This ongoing debate highlights the need to examine how both forms of intelligence can be effectively integrated within business environments.

This study aims to systematically review existing academic literature on the comparative effectiveness of human intelligence and artificial intelligence in business decision-making, while examining how their strategic integration influences organizational performance and decision quality. The review seeks to evaluate the strengths and limitations of human and AI-driven decision-making, explore collaborative Human–AI decision models across industries, examine ethical and organizational challenges associated with AI adoption, and identify emerging research opportunities in AI-enabled business management.

The paper addresses several key questions: How do human intelligence and AI differ in business decision-making effectiveness? Which organizational contexts benefit most from Human–AI collaboration? What ethical and managerial challenges accompany AI integration? Finally, what future directions are shaping AI-assisted decision-making in organizations?

The scope of this review focuses exclusively on secondary research by synthesizing findings from peer-reviewed journals, books, conference proceedings, and reputable institutional reports. It examines developments in management, entrepreneurship, information systems, and organizational behavior, with particular attention to AI technologies such as machine learning, predictive analytics, natural language processing, and generative AI. By integrating evidence across multiple industries, this review provides a comprehensive understanding of how human intelligence and AI collectively shape modern business decision-making while identifying gaps that warrant further academic investigation (Russell & Norvig, 2021; Shrestha, Ben-Menahem, & von Krogh, 2019).

2. Methodology

2.1 Research Design

This study adopts a secondary research approach using a systematic literature review (SLR) to examine the comparative effectiveness of human intelligence and artificial intelligence in business decision-making. A systematic literature review was selected because it enables the structured identification, evaluation, and synthesis of existing academic evidence while reducing the risk of selective interpretation (Tranfield, Denyer, & Smart, 2003). Unlike primary research, which relies on surveys or interviews, secondary research draws upon previously published scholarly work to identify recurring patterns, contrasting findings, and emerging trends across multiple studies.

The review focuses on literature from management, entrepreneurship, information systems, organizational behavior, and artificial intelligence. It examines how AI technologies—including machine learning, predictive analytics, natural language processing, deep learning, and generative AI—interact with human decision-making processes in organizational settings. The methodology follows widely accepted

principles for evidence-based literature reviews, including transparent search procedures, predefined selection criteria, and thematic synthesis of findings (Kitchenham & Charters, 2007; Page et al., 2021).

2.2 Literature Search Strategy

A structured literature search was conducted to identify relevant academic publications discussing human decision-making, artificial intelligence, hybrid intelligence, and organizational decision support systems. Keywords were developed around the core themes of the research topic and combined using Boolean operators such as AND and OR to improve search accuracy. Examples of search combinations included “artificial intelligence AND business decision-making,” “human intelligence OR managerial judgment,” “augmented intelligence,” “decision intelligence,” “explainable AI,” “AI governance,” and “organizational decision support systems.”

The search emphasized publications from approximately 2000–2025, allowing the review to capture foundational theories such as bounded rationality alongside recent developments in generative AI and decision intelligence. Reference lists of influential papers were also examined to identify additional relevant studies through backward citation searching, helping ensure that seminal contributions were not overlooked (Webster & Watson, 2002).

2.3 Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

To maintain academic quality and relevance, clear selection criteria were established before reviewing the literature. Inclusion criteria included peer-reviewed journal articles, scholarly books, conference proceedings, and reputable institutional reports published in English. Studies were selected if they focused on business decision-making, organizational management, entrepreneurship, AI applications in business, human cognitive decision-making, or Human–AI collaboration.

Exclusion criteria included opinion articles without empirical or theoretical foundations, non-English publications, duplicate records, studies focused exclusively on highly technical AI engineering without business implications, and sources lacking sufficient academic credibility. Popular media articles and promotional materials were excluded unless they referenced authoritative institutional evidence.

2.4 Databases

The literature was collected from several internationally recognized academic databases to ensure broad disciplinary coverage and source reliability. Scopus was used for multidisciplinary peer-reviewed research in business and management. Web of Science provided access to high-impact scholarly publications and citation networks. Emerald Insight contributed extensive management and organizational behavior literature. ScienceDirect offered research from Elsevier journals covering business analytics and AI applications. IEEE Xplore was included for studies connecting artificial intelligence technologies with decision-support systems. Google Scholar supplemented database searches by identifying additional academic publications, books, and highly cited papers that may not have appeared in subscription databases. Using multiple databases reduced publication bias and increased the comprehensiveness of the literature selection process (Page et al., 2021).

2.5 Thematic Analysis

After selecting the relevant literature, the findings were synthesized using thematic analysis, a qualitative method for identifying recurring concepts across multiple studies (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Rather than analyzing each article independently, similar findings were grouped into broader themes that reflected the research objectives. The themes included the evolution of business decision-making, characteristics of human decision-making, AI technologies supporting organizational decisions, comparative performance between humans and AI, Human–AI collaboration, industry-specific applications, ethical challenges,

managerial implications, and future research directions. During the synthesis process, similarities and disagreements among researchers were compared to identify areas of consensus as well as unresolved debates. This thematic approach enables the review to present a coherent understanding of existing knowledge while highlighting research gaps that remain significant for future studies on AI-assisted business decision-making.

3. Evolution of Business Decision-Making

3.1 Classical Decision-Making

Classical approaches to business decision-making were largely based on the assumption that decision-makers could identify available alternatives, evaluate their consequences, and select the option that maximized organizational objectives. This perspective is closely associated with the concept of **economic rationality**, in which managers are assumed to possess sufficient information and analytical ability to make optimal choices. However, organizations operate in environments characterized by incomplete information, limited resources, time constraints, and uncertainty. Simon (1955) challenged the assumptions of complete rationality by proposing that managers operate under conditions of **bounded rationality**, meaning that they often seek satisfactory rather than perfectly optimal solutions. This concept became an important foundation for understanding why organizational decisions may differ from predictions based solely on economic optimization.

Classical decision-making nevertheless remains relevant in structured business situations where objectives and alternatives can be clearly defined. Capital budgeting, inventory planning, and certain resource-allocation decisions, for example, can be approached through systematic comparison of costs, benefits, and expected outcomes. However, the limitations of purely rational approaches become more evident when decisions involve ambiguous information, rapidly changing conditions, or human behavior.

3.2 Behavioral Decision Theory

Behavioral decision theory developed partly in response to the limitations of traditional rational models. Research demonstrated that human decisions are influenced not only by available information and economic incentives but also by cognitive limitations, emotions, heuristics, and contextual factors. Kahneman and Tversky (1979) demonstrated that individuals frequently rely on mental shortcuts when making judgments under uncertainty, potentially producing systematic deviations from conventional models of rational choice.

Kahneman (2003) later distinguished between rapid, intuitive processes and slower, more deliberate analytical processes. In organizational environments, intuition can be particularly relevant when managers draw upon accumulated experience and pattern recognition. However, intuitive judgments can also be affected by biases such as anchoring, availability, and overconfidence (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). Behavioral decision theory therefore presents human judgment as neither entirely rational nor inherently ineffective. Instead, its effectiveness depends on the decision context, available information, expertise, and cognitive demands placed upon the decision-maker.

3.3 Data-Driven Decision-Making

The increasing availability of digital data transformed organizational decision-making during the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries. Organizations began using databases, enterprise systems, business intelligence, and analytics tools to support managerial decisions. **Data-driven decision-making (DDDM)** refers broadly to organizational practices in which decisions are informed by systematically collected and analyzed data rather than relying exclusively on managerial intuition.

Research has associated greater use of data-driven decision-making with organizational performance, although the relationship depends on complementary organizational capabilities. Brynjolfsson, Hitt, and Kim (2011), for example, found that firms emphasizing data-driven decision-making were associated with higher productivity and performance after accounting for other organizational factors. Davenport and Harris (2007) similarly argued that analytics could become an important organizational capability when firms integrate analytical practices into business strategy rather than treating them as isolated technical activities. However, data-driven decision-making does not eliminate human judgment. Managers must still determine which questions to investigate, assess the relevance and quality of data, interpret analytical results, and decide how findings should be translated into organizational action.

3.4 Emergence of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence introduced a further transformation by enabling computer systems to perform tasks traditionally associated with human cognitive capabilities, including prediction, classification, pattern recognition, language processing, and recommendation. Machine learning allows systems to identify relationships within data and improve their performance through exposure to examples, making it particularly relevant to business forecasting and decision support (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015). The increasing availability of computational power, large datasets, and advanced algorithms expanded the use of AI across organizational functions. AI-based systems can process information at a scale and speed that would be difficult for individual managers to replicate. However, AI systems also depend on the quality and representativeness of their training data and may reproduce or amplify biases present within those data (Barocas & Selbst, 2016). Consequently, the emergence of AI has not simply shifted decision-making from humans to machines. Instead, it has created new questions concerning how algorithmic recommendations should interact with managerial expertise, organizational objectives, and human accountability.

3.5 Decision Intelligence

More recent developments have contributed to the emergence of **decision intelligence**, which focuses on improving organizational decisions through the integration of data, analytical models, AI, and human judgment. Decision intelligence extends beyond the generation of predictions by considering how analytical insights are incorporated into actual decision processes and organizational actions. Shrestha, Ben-Menahem, and von Krogh (2019) argue that AI can influence organizational decision structures by changing the distribution of decision authority between humans and machines. Their framework identifies different arrangements in which humans and AI may independently make decisions, collaborate, or operate with AI providing recommendations while humans retain final authority.

This evolution suggests a movement from purely human-centered decision-making toward increasingly integrated decision systems. The progression can therefore be understood as **rational decision-making** → **behavioral decision-making** → **data-driven decision-making** → **AI-supported decision-making** → **Human–AI decision intelligence**. Rather than representing a complete replacement of one approach by another, these stages reflect the accumulation of different capabilities. Human experience, contextual understanding, and ethical judgment continue to coexist with increasingly sophisticated computational analysis, creating the foundation for contemporary research into the comparative effectiveness and strategic integration of human and artificial intelligence in organizations.

4. Human Decision-Making in Organizations

4.1 Bounded Rationality

Human decision-making in organizations is shaped by limitations in information, time, cognitive capacity, and organizational resources. Simon (1955) introduced the concept of **bounded rationality** to explain why managers cannot always identify and evaluate every possible alternative before making a decision. Instead of pursuing an objectively optimal solution, decision-makers frequently adopt a satisfactory alternative that meets the requirements of the situation. This process, commonly described as satisficing, recognizes that organizational decisions are made under practical constraints rather than conditions of perfect information. Bounded rationality remains particularly relevant to complex business environments where managers must respond quickly to incomplete or ambiguous information. Although analytical tools can reduce some information constraints, they cannot eliminate the contextual limitations faced by decision-makers. Human managers must therefore determine which information is relevant and how much analysis is appropriate for a particular decision.

4.2 Intuition

Intuition represents another important component of organizational decision-making. It involves rapid judgments that may arise without deliberate conscious analysis. Kahneman (2003) distinguished between fast, intuitive cognitive processes and slower, more deliberate reasoning. Intuitive decisions can be valuable when managers possess substantial experience within a particular domain and have encountered similar situations repeatedly. However, intuition is not universally reliable. Its effectiveness depends partly on whether the decision environment provides meaningful patterns and opportunities for learning. Kahneman and Klein (2009) argue that skilled intuition is more likely to develop in environments that contain stable, predictable patterns and provide sufficient feedback. In unfamiliar or highly uncertain environments, intuitive judgments may therefore be more vulnerable to error.

4.3 Experience-Based Judgment

Managerial experience can influence how individuals interpret information, recognize patterns, assess risks, and select among alternatives. Experienced managers may draw upon knowledge accumulated from previous decisions rather than treating every new situation as an entirely unfamiliar problem. This tacit knowledge can be particularly valuable when information is incomplete or difficult to quantify. Experience-based judgment also complements formal analytical methods. Managers may use quantitative information to identify potential alternatives while relying on their knowledge of customers, employees, suppliers, competitors, and organizational culture to interpret the implications. However, extensive experience does not automatically guarantee accurate decisions. Previous success can sometimes reinforce established assumptions and make individuals less receptive to contradictory information, demonstrating the relationship between expertise and cognitive bias (Kahneman, 2011).

4.4 Creativity

Creativity enables human decision-makers to generate novel alternatives rather than selecting only from existing solutions. In business organizations, creative thinking can contribute to product development, entrepreneurship, strategic innovation, marketing, and responses to unexpected problems. Amabile (1997) conceptualized creativity as the production of ideas or solutions that are both novel and appropriate to a particular context. Unlike many analytical systems that identify patterns from existing information, human creativity can involve reframing a problem, connecting seemingly unrelated concepts, and imagining possibilities that have not previously occurred. At the same time, creativity does not operate independently of organizational conditions. Leadership, organizational culture, motivation, resources, and psychological

conditions can influence whether employees are willing and able to develop unconventional ideas (Amabile, 1997).

4.5 Emotional Intelligence

Emotional intelligence concerns the ability to perceive, understand, use, and regulate emotions in oneself and others. In organizational decision-making, these capabilities can influence communication, negotiation, leadership, conflict management, and interpersonal relationships. Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2004) describe emotional intelligence as a set of abilities involving the processing of emotional information and its use in reasoning and problem-solving. Business decisions frequently affect employees, customers, partners, and other stakeholders. Consequently, decisions cannot always be evaluated through financial or operational criteria alone. Managers may need to understand stakeholder reactions, organizational morale, and interpersonal consequences. Emotional intelligence can therefore complement analytical reasoning by helping managers account for social and emotional dimensions that may be difficult to capture through conventional quantitative models.

4.6 Ethical Reasoning

Human decision-making also involves ethical reasoning, particularly when organizational objectives conflict with broader stakeholder interests. Managers may encounter decisions involving privacy, employee welfare, environmental responsibilities, fairness, conflicts of interest, or the distribution of organizational resources. Ethical decision-making requires consideration of principles and consequences that may extend beyond immediate financial performance. Treviño (1986) proposed an interactionist model in which individual and situational factors influence ethical decision-making in organizations. Ethical judgments are therefore shaped not only by an individual's moral reasoning but also by organizational culture, leadership, authority structures, and situational pressures. This represents an important distinction between human decision-making and automated systems because organizational actors remain responsible for determining how competing values should be considered when decisions have significant social consequences.

4.7 Cognitive Biases

Although human judgment provides contextual and social capabilities, it is also vulnerable to systematic cognitive biases. Tversky and Kahneman (1974) identified several heuristics that can influence judgments under uncertainty, including **availability, representativeness, and anchoring**. Later research has examined additional biases relevant to organizational decision-making, including confirmation bias, overconfidence, escalation of commitment, and framing effects (Kahneman, 2011).

These biases can affect strategic planning, investment decisions, hiring, forecasting, negotiations, and risk assessment. For example, managers may give excessive weight to information that is easily recalled or interpret new evidence in ways that reinforce existing beliefs. Importantly, the existence of cognitive biases does not imply that human decision-making is inherently inferior to algorithmic decision-making. Rather, it demonstrates that human judgment has identifiable limitations that organizations may attempt to address through structured decision processes, diverse perspectives, analytical tools, and appropriate forms of AI-supported decision-making. This provides an important foundation for examining whether and how AI can complement human strengths while reducing specific limitations in organizational decision-making.

5. Artificial Intelligence in Business Decision-Making

5.1 Machine Learning

Machine learning (ML) has become an important component of artificial intelligence in business because it enables computational systems to identify patterns in data and generate predictions or classifications without requiring every decision rule to be explicitly programmed. Jordan and Mitchell (2015) describe machine learning as a field concerned with algorithms that improve through experience, making it particularly relevant to large-scale organizational datasets. In business settings, ML can support customer segmentation, demand forecasting, fraud detection, credit assessment, recommendation systems, and operational planning. Its value is particularly evident when organizations need to identify complex relationships across large datasets that would be difficult to evaluate manually. However, ML outputs remain dependent on the quality, relevance, and representativeness of the data used to develop models, creating potential risks when historical data contain systematic biases (Barocas & Selbst, 2016).

5.2 Predictive Analytics

Predictive analytics uses statistical techniques, machine learning, and historical data to estimate the likelihood of future events or outcomes. Organizations increasingly use predictive models to forecast sales, identify customer churn, assess financial risks, optimize inventory, and anticipate operational disruptions. Shmueli and Koppius (2011) distinguish predictive analytics from explanatory analysis by emphasizing the ability to generate predictions about future or previously unseen observations. Predictive analytics can improve decision-making by providing managers with evidence-based estimates rather than relying exclusively on intuition. Nevertheless, prediction should not automatically be interpreted as causation. A model may accurately predict an outcome without explaining why it occurs or whether an intervention will change it. Managers must therefore interpret predictive outputs within their organizational and strategic context.

5.3 Deep Learning

Deep learning is a specialized form of machine learning based on multilayered neural networks capable of learning increasingly complex representations from large datasets. LeCun, Bengio, and Hinton (2015) identify deep learning as a major development in AI because of its effectiveness in areas such as image recognition, speech processing, and natural language understanding. Its business applications include automated quality inspection, fraud detection, demand prediction, financial analysis, and customer interaction. Deep learning can process unstructured information that conventional analytical techniques may find difficult to handle. However, these models can also be computationally intensive and difficult to interpret. The complexity of some deep learning systems creates challenges for organizations that require clear explanations of how a particular output was generated, especially in high-stakes decisions (Rudin, 2019).

5.4 Natural Language Processing

Natural language processing (NLP) enables computational systems to analyze and generate human language. NLP has expanded the use of AI in business by allowing organizations to process large volumes of textual information, including customer reviews, emails, reports, contracts, social media content, and financial documents. Applications include sentiment analysis, document classification, information extraction, automated customer service, and enterprise search. The increasing sophistication of language models has made NLP particularly relevant to managerial decision-making because organizations can extract insights from information that previously required substantial human effort to review. However, language-processing systems may misinterpret context, ambiguity, sarcasm, or domain-specific

terminology. Their outputs therefore require appropriate validation when used to support consequential organizational decisions.

5.5 Generative AI

Generative AI represents a significant recent development in business applications of artificial intelligence. Unlike systems designed primarily to classify or predict outcomes, generative AI can produce new text, images, code, summaries, and other forms of content based on learned patterns. Large language models have enabled organizations to use AI for drafting reports, summarizing information, generating marketing material, supporting research, and assisting knowledge workers.

Dwivedi et al. (2023) identify substantial opportunities as well as risks associated with generative AI across organizational and societal contexts. Its usefulness in decision-making lies partly in its ability to rapidly synthesize and transform information, potentially reducing the time required for preliminary analysis. However, generative systems can produce inaccurate or fabricated information, commonly described as hallucinations, and may generate outputs that reflect limitations or biases within their training data. Consequently, human verification remains important when generative AI contributes to business decisions.

5.6 Decision Support Systems

Decision Support Systems (DSS) are computer-based systems designed to assist individuals or organizations in making decisions by integrating data, analytical models, and user interaction. The development of AI has expanded the capabilities of traditional DSS by enabling systems to identify patterns, generate forecasts, provide recommendations, and process increasingly complex datasets. Power (2002) describes DSS as systems that support decision-making rather than necessarily replacing the decision-maker. This distinction is important because the effectiveness of an AI-enabled DSS depends not only on technical accuracy but also on how managers interpret and incorporate its recommendations. Human users may reject, modify, or investigate algorithmic recommendations depending on their experience, trust in the system, and understanding of the decision context. Thus, DSS provides an important foundation for Human–AI collaboration.

5.7 Business Intelligence Platforms

Business intelligence (BI) platforms integrate data collection, storage, visualization, reporting, and analytics to support organizational decision-making. Traditional BI systems primarily helped managers access and interpret historical and current information through dashboards, reports, and performance indicators. The integration of AI and machine learning has increasingly expanded these capabilities toward automated pattern recognition, forecasting, anomaly detection, and recommendation. Chen, Chiang, and Storey (2012) describe business intelligence and analytics as an evolving field in which organizations use increasingly sophisticated techniques to transform data into business insights. This development has shifted organizational decision-making from retrospective reporting toward more predictive and, increasingly, prescriptive forms of analysis. Nevertheless, BI platforms do not independently determine organizational priorities. Managers remain responsible for defining relevant performance measures, interpreting analytical outputs, considering stakeholder interests, and translating insights into strategic action. Therefore, AI-enhanced BI is most appropriately understood as an augmentation of managerial decision-making rather than a complete substitute for human judgment.

6. Comparative Analysis: Human vs AI

The comparison between human and artificial intelligence (AI) in business decision-making should not be

treated as a simple competition between two equivalent forms of intelligence. Human decision-makers and AI systems possess different capabilities and limitations. AI is particularly effective at processing large datasets, identifying statistical patterns, and producing consistent outputs, whereas humans contribute contextual interpretation, social understanding, ethical reasoning, and the ability to reconsider objectives when circumstances change (Jarrahi, 2018; Shrestha, Ben-Menahem, & von Krogh, 2019). The following comparison therefore examines the conditions under which each approach can contribute to organizational decision-making.

6.1 Decision Speed

AI systems can process and analyze large volumes of structured and unstructured information considerably faster than individual human decision-makers. Automated systems can evaluate transactions, identify anomalies, generate forecasts, or provide recommendations in near real time. This capability is particularly useful in environments where organizations must respond rapidly to changing customer behavior or market conditions (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018). Human decision-making generally involves slower processes when substantial information must be reviewed and alternatives carefully considered. However, speed is not always equivalent to decision quality. Humans may deliberately slow the decision process to gather additional information, consult stakeholders, or consider consequences that are not represented in an algorithmic model. Consequently, AI offers an advantage in computational speed, while human deliberation can remain important for complex decisions where rapid action may increase the risk of overlooking contextual factors.

6.2 Accuracy

AI can achieve high levels of predictive accuracy in clearly defined tasks when trained on sufficiently large and relevant datasets. Machine learning systems can identify patterns across thousands or millions of observations and can be particularly useful for repetitive classification and forecasting problems (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015). In some specialized domains, algorithmic systems have demonstrated performance comparable to or exceeding human experts on narrowly defined prediction tasks. However, AI accuracy depends heavily on the quality and representativeness of the data, the design of the model, and the similarity between the conditions under which a model was developed and those in which it is applied. Human managers can interpret information that is incomplete, qualitative, or context-dependent and can incorporate information that may not be represented in a dataset. Therefore, neither human nor AI decision-making can be considered universally more accurate; effectiveness depends substantially on the nature of the decision and the information available.

6.3 Consistency

Consistency is an important characteristic of algorithmic decision-making. Once an AI model has been developed and deployed, it can apply the same computational procedure repeatedly without experiencing fatigue, changing moods, or other fluctuations associated with human decision-makers. This can be valuable in activities such as fraud detection, credit screening, inventory management, and routine forecasting. Human decisions may vary between individuals or across situations because managers interpret information differently and may be influenced by emotions, experience, or cognitive biases (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). Nevertheless, complete consistency is not necessarily desirable. Human managers can intentionally modify a decision when circumstances change or when exceptional cases require consideration. Thus, AI can provide procedural consistency, while humans can provide contextual flexibility.

6.4 Creativity

Creativity remains an important area of difference between human and AI decision-making. Human creativity involves generating, evaluating, and developing novel ideas while considering cultural, social, and organizational meaning. It is central to entrepreneurship, innovation, product development, and strategic repositioning (Amabile, 1997). Generative AI has expanded the ability of machines to produce text, images, designs, and other forms of content, creating new possibilities for organizational creativity. However, the novelty generated by AI is derived from patterns learned from existing data, while humans can redefine objectives, challenge assumptions, and introduce ideas based on personal experiences and social contexts. Rather than viewing AI-generated outputs as an independent replacement for human creativity, organizations can use them as inputs for brainstorming, experimentation, and iterative development (Dwivedi et al., 2023).

6.5 Risk Assessment

AI can support risk assessment by identifying patterns, estimating probabilities, and detecting anomalies across large datasets. Financial institutions, for example, can use machine learning to identify potentially fraudulent transactions or assess credit-related risks. The ability to continuously monitor data allows AI systems to identify changes that may be difficult for humans to detect manually. Human managers contribute a different form of risk assessment by considering qualitative factors, strategic consequences, stakeholder relationships, and unusual circumstances. They may also challenge the assumptions underlying an analytical model. This is particularly important because historical data may not adequately represent unprecedented events. Effective organizational risk management can therefore benefit from combining quantitative algorithmic analysis with human evaluation of broader contextual risks.

6.6 Ethical Decision-Making

Ethical decision-making presents significant challenges for AI systems because ethical judgments frequently involve competing values, social expectations, and contextual considerations. An algorithm can be programmed to follow particular rules or optimize specified objectives, but the selection of those objectives and rules involves normative choices. Mittelstadt et al. (2016) highlight important ethical concerns surrounding algorithmic systems, including fairness, accountability, and transparency. Human decision-makers can consider moral principles, stakeholder perspectives, and organizational responsibilities when evaluating difficult choices. However, human judgment is also vulnerable to personal biases and organizational pressures. AI should therefore not automatically be assumed to be either more objective or more ethical than humans. The ethical quality of an AI-assisted decision depends partly on its data, design, objectives, governance, and human oversight.

6.7 Adaptability

Humans generally demonstrate considerable adaptability when confronted with unfamiliar situations because they can reinterpret problems, learn from limited information, and alter their objectives. Managers may draw upon experience and contextual knowledge when established procedures no longer apply. AI systems can also adapt through retraining, continuous learning, or updated data, but this adaptability is usually constrained by the system's design and operating environment. Machine learning models can perform poorly when conditions change substantially from those represented in their training data, a problem associated with distribution shifts and changing environments (Sculley et al., 2015). Human oversight can therefore be important when AI systems operate in dynamic markets where assumptions may become outdated.

6.8 Uncertainty Management

Business decisions frequently involve uncertainty that cannot be eliminated through additional data alone. AI can quantify certain forms of uncertainty by producing probability estimates, forecasts, and scenario analyses. This can help managers understand potential outcomes and compare risks systematically. Human decision-makers, however, can also operate under situations in which probabilities are unavailable or unreliable. They may use judgment, analogies, experience, and qualitative reasoning when facing novel circumstances. This distinction is important because risk, where probabilities can potentially be estimated, differs from deeper forms of uncertainty in which possible outcomes or their probabilities are difficult to determine. Human judgment can therefore remain important when historical information provides limited guidance.

6.9 Crisis Decision-Making

Crisis situations place particular demands on organizational decision-making because they often involve time pressure, incomplete information, rapidly changing conditions, and significant consequences. AI can support crisis management by monitoring large information flows, identifying anomalies, generating forecasts, and providing decision-makers with rapidly updated information. Such capabilities can reduce the time required to detect emerging problems and evaluate possible scenarios. At the same time, crises frequently involve unprecedented circumstances in which historical patterns may have limited predictive value. Human leaders may need to establish priorities, communicate with stakeholders, interpret ambiguous information, and make decisions when algorithmic recommendations are incomplete or contradictory. Research on organizational responses to AI therefore increasingly emphasizes complementarity rather than simple substitution, with AI performing computational tasks and humans retaining responsibility for contextual interpretation and consequential decisions (Jarrahi, 2018; Shrestha et al., 2019).

Overall, the comparison demonstrates that human and AI decision-making involve different forms of capability. AI provides advantages in computational speed, pattern recognition, scalability, and consistency, while humans contribute contextual judgment, creativity, ethical reasoning, and adaptability. These differences provide a foundation for examining Human–AI collaboration as an organizational model in which the strengths of each can potentially compensate for the limitations of the other.

7. Human–AI Collaboration

The increasing use of artificial intelligence in organizations has shifted attention from whether AI will replace human decision-makers toward how humans and AI can work together effectively. Human–AI collaboration combines computational capabilities such as large-scale data processing, prediction, and pattern recognition with human capabilities including contextual interpretation, creativity, ethical reasoning, and accountability. Jarrahi (2018) argues that AI can complement human decision-making by supporting analytical tasks while humans remain important in situations requiring judgment and contextual understanding. Similarly, Shrestha et al. (2019) suggest that the distribution of decision-making authority between humans and AI can vary according to the characteristics of the task and the capabilities of the technology.

7.1 Augmented Intelligence

Augmented intelligence refers to the use of AI to enhance rather than replace human cognitive capabilities. In this approach, AI performs computationally intensive activities such as analyzing large

datasets, identifying patterns, generating predictions, and presenting recommendations, while humans interpret the results and make or authorize decisions.

The concept is particularly relevant to business environments because many organizational decisions require both quantitative analysis and contextual judgment. For example, an AI system may identify an emerging pattern in customer behavior, while a marketing manager determines whether the pattern reflects a temporary change or a broader strategic opportunity. Jarrahi (2018) describes this relationship as a form of human–AI symbiosis in which machine capabilities can complement human strengths. The effectiveness of augmentation therefore depends on assigning tasks to humans and AI according to their respective capabilities rather than assuming that one should perform the entire decision process.

7.2 Human-in-the-Loop Systems

Human-in-the-loop (HITL) systems explicitly incorporate human intervention into an AI-enabled decision process. Depending on the system design, humans may provide training data, validate outputs, review recommendations, intervene in uncertain cases, or retain final authority over consequential decisions.

HITL approaches are particularly relevant when AI decisions can have substantial financial, legal, social, or personal consequences. Human oversight can help identify inappropriate recommendations, contextual exceptions, or errors that may not be apparent from the model's output. However, human involvement does not automatically guarantee better outcomes. Excessive reliance on automated recommendations can produce automation bias, in which users accept algorithmic outputs without sufficient independent evaluation (Goddard, Roudsari, & Wyatt, 2012). Effective HITL systems therefore require clearly defined responsibilities and meaningful opportunities for human intervention rather than merely placing a human at the final stage of an otherwise automated process.

7.3 Hybrid Decision Models

Hybrid decision models distribute decision-making responsibilities between humans and AI. Shrestha et al. (2019) identify different organizational arrangements, ranging from decisions made predominantly by humans to decisions made predominantly by AI, with several intermediate forms of collaboration. The appropriate arrangement depends on factors such as task complexity, data availability, uncertainty, and the consequences of errors. For structured and repetitive tasks, organizations may allow AI systems to make or automate routine decisions. For complex strategic decisions, AI may instead provide analysis while managers retain decision authority. A hybrid model can consequently combine the scalability and analytical capabilities of AI with human contextual knowledge. The objective is not necessarily to maximize automation but to establish an effective division of cognitive labor between people and machines.

7.4 Explainable AI

As organizations increasingly rely on AI for consequential decisions, understanding **why** a system produces a particular recommendation becomes increasingly important. Explainable AI (XAI) refers broadly to methods and approaches designed to make AI systems and their outputs more understandable to human users. Explainability can support error detection, accountability, regulatory compliance, and informed human oversight (Gunning et al., 2019). However, explainability involves trade-offs. Highly complex models may provide strong predictive performance while being difficult to interpret, whereas simpler models may be easier to understand but potentially less capable of capturing complex relationships (Rudin, 2019). Furthermore, an explanation that is technically understandable may not necessarily reveal

whether the underlying decision is fair or appropriate. Consequently, explainability should be considered alongside model performance, transparency, fairness, and governance.

7.5 Trust in AI

Trust is a central factor determining whether employees and managers will use AI recommendations in organizational decision-making. If users have insufficient confidence in an AI system, they may disregard useful recommendations. Conversely, excessive trust can result in inappropriate reliance on algorithmic outputs. Lee and See (2004) argue that appropriate trust in automation involves calibrating reliance according to the system's actual capabilities and limitations.

Trust can be influenced by system performance, transparency, previous experience, perceived reliability, and the degree to which users understand the technology. Explainability can contribute to trust by providing users with information about how recommendations are generated, although transparency alone does not guarantee appropriate reliance. Organizations therefore need to develop processes that encourage managers to critically evaluate AI outputs rather than either automatically accepting or systematically rejecting them.

7.6 Organizational Adoption

The successful integration of AI into business decision-making depends on more than technological capability. Organizations must also consider leadership support, employee skills, organizational culture, data infrastructure, governance mechanisms, and readiness for technological change. Davenport and Ronanki (2018) note that organizations often begin AI adoption through specific applications such as process automation, customer engagement, or insight generation before expanding their use across broader business functions. Organizational adoption can also be influenced by employees' perceptions of AI and concerns about changes to existing roles. Jarrahi (2018) emphasizes that AI can alter rather than simply eliminate human responsibilities, potentially shifting employees toward tasks involving interpretation, communication, and judgment. Successful adoption therefore requires appropriate training and role redesign alongside technical implementation.

Overall, Human–AI collaboration represents a shift from viewing intelligence as exclusively human or computational toward understanding decision-making as a **socio-technical process**. AI can expand the speed and analytical capacity available to organizations, while humans remain important for contextual interpretation, ethical reasoning, creativity, and accountability. The organizational challenge is consequently to determine where AI should operate autonomously, where human oversight is necessary, and how both can be integrated into decision processes that are effective, transparent, and responsible.

8. Industry Applications

Artificial intelligence has moved from experimental applications to increasingly integrated uses across major business functions. However, the nature and maturity of AI adoption differ substantially between industries. The value of AI depends on factors including data availability, task structure, regulatory requirements, organizational capabilities, and the consequences of incorrect decisions. Recent systematic reviews indicate that AI implementation is occurring across finance, marketing, logistics, human resources, healthcare, manufacturing, and other organizational functions, although the evidence base is more mature in some sectors than in others (Lee et al., 2023).

8.1 Finance

Finance is one of the major areas in which AI has been applied to business decision-making. Financial institutions use machine learning and related analytical techniques for fraud detection, credit assessment,

risk management, customer service, forecasting, and investment-related analysis. AI can process large volumes of transactional and financial information and identify patterns that may be difficult to detect through manual analysis. A systematic review of 157 studies by Singh et al. (2025) identified applications across financial operations, customer service, financial inclusion, regulation, and explainability. AI-supported financial decisions can improve processing speed and consistency, but they also create concerns about data quality, model bias, transparency, and regulatory compliance. Human oversight remains important where financial decisions have significant consequences for customers or institutions. The finance sector therefore illustrates the broader Human–AI model in which computational analysis can support, but does not necessarily eliminate, professional judgment.

8.2 Marketing

Marketing has increasingly adopted AI for customer segmentation, recommendation systems, sentiment analysis, demand prediction, personalized communication, advertising optimization, and customer-service automation. AI systems can analyze behavioral and transactional information to identify patterns in customer preferences and support more targeted marketing strategies. Generative AI has further expanded these applications by assisting with content generation, campaign development, market research, and communication. Recent systematic research on AI adoption in marketing indicates that organizational outcomes depend not only on the technology itself but also on factors such as organizational capabilities, implementation practices, and the specific context in which AI is deployed. (Ly Cam Thu et al.; 2026) Human marketers remain important because effective marketing requires interpretation of cultural trends, brand identity, consumer emotions, and strategic positioning. AI can therefore increase analytical and operational capacity while human professionals retain responsibility for broader strategic decisions.

8.3 Healthcare

Healthcare combines AI-enabled decision support with highly consequential human decision-making. AI applications include medical image analysis, disease prediction, clinical decision support, patient-risk assessment, drug discovery, and administrative optimization. Machine learning can identify patterns in medical data and support professionals in evaluating large quantities of information.

However, healthcare also demonstrates why AI effectiveness cannot be assessed solely through technical accuracy. Decisions may affect patient safety, privacy, and access to treatment, creating substantial requirements for transparency and human oversight. The importance of these concerns means that AI generally functions as a support mechanism within broader professional decision processes rather than as an independent decision-maker. Recent research also shows that AI applications within healthcare supply chains remain less empirically mature than their potential might suggest, with a substantial proportion of existing research still based on theoretical models and simulations rather than real-world implementation (Espinosa et al., 2026).

8.4 Supply Chain

Supply chain management is particularly suited to AI applications because organizations must continuously make decisions involving demand, inventory, transportation, suppliers, production, and disruptions. AI can support demand forecasting, inventory optimization, supplier evaluation, route planning, predictive maintenance, and disruption detection. A systematic review by Toorajipour et al. (2021) identified several areas in which AI can contribute to supply chain management, including demand management, logistics, purchasing, and supply chain planning. More recent empirical research continues to examine whether the expected benefits of AI translate into measurable improvements in actual supply chain environments. (Reza Toorajipour et al.; 2020) AI can process changing operational information

rapidly, while supply chain managers provide contextual knowledge about suppliers, geopolitical conditions, organizational priorities, and exceptional circumstances. This makes supply chain management an important setting for hybrid decision-making.

8.5 Human Resources

Human resource management increasingly uses AI for recruitment, candidate screening, workforce analytics, employee engagement analysis, performance management, and workforce planning. AI can process large quantities of employee and applicant information and automate repetitive administrative tasks. In recruitment, for example, algorithmic systems can assist in matching candidate profiles with job requirements. However, HR applications raise particularly important concerns about fairness and discrimination because algorithmic decisions can reproduce patterns contained in historical organizational data. Barocas and Selbst (2016) demonstrate how apparently neutral data-driven systems can produce discriminatory outcomes when the underlying data or decision processes reflect existing inequalities. Human review is therefore important when AI is used in employment-related decisions. HR professionals must also consider organizational culture, individual circumstances, interpersonal factors, and legal requirements that may not be adequately represented in an algorithmic model.

8.6 Retail

Retail organizations use AI to support demand forecasting, product recommendations, dynamic inventory management, customer segmentation, pricing, fraud detection, and personalized marketing. Recommendation systems are particularly significant because they can analyze previous purchases, browsing behavior, and other customer interactions to generate individualized product suggestions. AI can allow retailers to respond more rapidly to changes in customer demand and improve coordination between physical and digital channels. At the same time, personalization creates questions concerning customer privacy, data collection, transparency, and the extent to which automated systems influence consumer choices. Human managers therefore continue to play a role in determining pricing strategies, brand positioning, customer policies, and how AI-generated insights should be incorporated into broader business objectives.

8.7 Manufacturing

Manufacturing has become an important environment for AI-enabled operational decision-making, particularly through predictive maintenance, quality control, production scheduling, demand forecasting, robotics, and process optimization. Machine learning and computer vision can identify equipment abnormalities or product defects, while AI-based forecasting can support production and inventory decisions. The development of smart manufacturing has increased the integration of AI with sensors, industrial Internet of Things (IoT) systems, robotics, and real-time analytics. Recent systematic research identifies manufacturing as one of the major domains in which machine learning supports data-driven decision-making, including predictive maintenance and operational optimization. However, implementation requires reliable data, appropriate technical infrastructure, employee capabilities, and integration with existing production systems.

Across these industries, AI demonstrates substantial potential for improving the speed, scale, and analytical depth of organizational decision-making. Nevertheless, the evidence does not support treating AI as a universal substitute for human decision-makers. The appropriate balance varies according to the nature of the task, the quality of available data, the consequences of errors, and the degree of human judgment required. Recent organizational research similarly emphasizes that successful AI

implementation involves technological, organizational, information-system, and people-related factors rather than technology alone (Lee et al., 2023).

9. Challenges and Ethical Considerations

The integration of artificial intelligence into organizational decision-making creates opportunities for greater efficiency and analytical capability, but it also introduces risks that can affect individuals, organizations, and society. These risks arise from the data used to train AI systems, the design of algorithms, the way outputs are interpreted, and the organizational structures surrounding deployment. The National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) identifies validity and reliability, safety, security, accountability, transparency, explainability, privacy, and fairness as important characteristics of trustworthy AI (Tabassi, 2023). Similarly, the OECD AI Principles emphasize human agency, transparency, robustness, security, privacy, and accountability as important elements of responsible AI use (OECD, 2024).

9.1 Algorithmic Bias

Algorithmic bias occurs when an AI system produces systematically disadvantageous or unequal outcomes for particular individuals or groups. Bias can originate in historical training data, data collection methods, variable selection, model design, or the way outputs are subsequently used. Barocas and Selbst (2016) demonstrate that data-driven decision systems can reproduce existing patterns of discrimination even when protected characteristics are not explicitly included in a model. This is particularly significant in areas such as recruitment, lending, insurance, and customer evaluation. Importantly, replacing human decision-making with an algorithm does not automatically remove bias. Human decisions can themselves contain biases, while AI systems can reproduce those biases at a larger scale. Consequently, organizations need processes for examining datasets, evaluating model performance across relevant groups, and monitoring outcomes after deployment. The OECD identifies harmful bias and discrimination as important AI risks requiring appropriate safeguards and risk-management practices.

9.2 Transparency

Transparency concerns the extent to which stakeholders can understand how an AI system is developed, used, and applied to a decision. Some advanced AI models can be difficult to interpret because their internal processes involve large numbers of interacting computational parameters. This creates challenges when managers, employees, customers, or regulators need to understand the basis of an AI-generated recommendation. Transparency is particularly important when decisions have significant consequences. The OECD AI Principles recommend that AI actors provide meaningful information about an AI system's capabilities and limitations and, where appropriate, information concerning the data, factors, and processes contributing to predictions or decisions (OECD, 2024). Transparency can therefore support informed human oversight, although providing an explanation does not by itself establish that a decision is fair or accurate.

9.3 Accountability

AI creates complex questions about responsibility because the development and use of an AI system may involve multiple actors, including software developers, data providers, technology vendors, organizational managers, and end users. When an AI-supported decision produces an adverse outcome, determining who is responsible can therefore be difficult. Accountability requires organizations to establish clear responsibilities throughout the AI lifecycle. The OECD recommends traceability of datasets, processes, and decisions so that AI outputs can be examined and questioned when necessary (OECD, 2024). NIST

similarly identifies accountability and transparency as core components of trustworthy AI and recommends that organizations incorporate risk management throughout the design, deployment, and evaluation process (Tabassi, 2023). Human oversight is consequently important when AI is used in consequential organizational decisions.

9.4 Data Privacy

AI systems frequently depend on large quantities of personal, behavioral, financial, or organizational data. The collection and analysis of such information can create privacy risks when data are collected without sufficient safeguards, used beyond their original purpose, retained unnecessarily, or exposed to unauthorized parties.

Privacy concerns are particularly important in sectors such as finance, healthcare, retail, and human resources, where organizations may process highly sensitive information. The OECD's AI Principles explicitly include privacy and data protection among the human rights and values that AI systems should respect (OECD, 2024). Organizations therefore need appropriate data-governance practices, including access controls, secure storage, data minimization where applicable, and processes for determining how information may legitimately be used.

9.5 Cybersecurity

The increasing integration of AI into organizational systems also creates cybersecurity challenges. AI systems can be exposed to attacks involving training data, model inputs, software infrastructure, and generated outputs. Organizations must therefore consider both conventional cybersecurity threats and risks that arise specifically from AI systems. NIST identifies security and resilience as central characteristics of trustworthy AI and notes that AI systems face risks involving the confidentiality, integrity, and availability of systems and their training and output data (NIST, 2023). This means cybersecurity should be considered throughout the AI lifecycle rather than only after a system has been deployed. Regular monitoring, access controls, testing, incident-response mechanisms, and secure system design can help organizations manage these risks.

9.6 Regulatory Challenges

The rapid development of AI has created challenges for regulators because technological capabilities can evolve faster than existing legal and organizational frameworks. Organizations operating across countries may also encounter different regulatory requirements concerning data protection, automated decision-making, transparency, intellectual property, employment, and consumer protection. The OECD notes that AI is inherently cross-border and has consequently emphasized international cooperation and interoperability in AI governance (OECD, 2024). NIST's AI Risk Management Framework provides a voluntary, sector-independent approach for organizations seeking to manage AI-related risks, although it does not replace applicable laws or regulations (Tabassi, 2023). Regulatory uncertainty can therefore affect organizational investment decisions and requires managers to monitor changes in relevant legal and governance environments.

9.7 Workforce Transformation

AI adoption can change the nature of work by automating some routine activities while increasing demand for analytical, technological, interpersonal, and managerial capabilities. The effects are therefore not limited to job elimination. AI can also redistribute tasks within existing occupations and create new responsibilities involving AI supervision, data management, model evaluation, and technology governance. This transformation creates a need for organizations to invest in workforce development. Employees may require technical literacy to understand AI outputs as well as critical-thinking skills to

evaluate whether those outputs are appropriate. Human capabilities such as communication, creativity, leadership, and ethical judgment may become increasingly important in roles involving Human–AI collaboration. The OECD's AI Principles also recognize labour rights and human-centred values as relevant considerations in AI deployment.

Overall, the challenges associated with AI demonstrate that effective business adoption cannot be evaluated solely through measures such as accuracy or efficiency. Algorithmic bias, limited transparency, unclear accountability, privacy risks, cybersecurity vulnerabilities, regulatory uncertainty, and workforce transformation can influence whether AI creates sustainable organizational value. These concerns support the development of governance frameworks that integrate technological performance with human oversight and ethical considerations. NIST's AI Risk Management Framework, for example, organizes risk management around the functions **Govern, Map, Measure, and Manage**, providing a structured approach for addressing AI risks throughout the system lifecycle (Tabassi, 2023).

10. Critical Review and Research Gaps

10.1 Major Findings

The literature reviewed in this study indicates that human intelligence and artificial intelligence contribute different capabilities to business decision-making. AI demonstrates particular strengths in processing large datasets, identifying patterns, generating predictions, and performing repetitive analytical tasks at high speed and consistency (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015; Davenport & Ronanki, 2018). Human decision-makers, in contrast, contribute contextual knowledge, experience, creativity, interpersonal understanding, and ethical judgment. These capabilities become particularly important when decisions involve incomplete information, conflicting objectives, or circumstances that differ substantially from historical data (Jarrahi, 2018).

A major finding across the literature is therefore that AI effectiveness should be assessed according to the type and context of the decision, rather than through a general comparison between human and machine intelligence. Research on organizational decision-making increasingly emphasizes complementarity, in which AI performs computational and analytical tasks while humans retain responsibility for interpretation, contextual judgment, and consequential decisions (Shrestha et al., 2019). The literature also indicates that technological capability alone does not determine organizational outcomes. Data quality, employee skills, organizational culture, governance, and implementation practices influence whether AI produces meaningful business value (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018).

10.2 Areas of Agreement

Several areas of agreement emerge across existing research. First, AI is particularly valuable when decision problems involve large quantities of structured data, repeated processes, and identifiable patterns. Machine learning and predictive analytics can support forecasting, classification, anomaly detection, and optimization in ways that extend the analytical capacity of individual managers (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015). Second, the literature broadly recognizes that human involvement remains important in complex organizational decisions. Jarrahi (2018) argues that AI and human decision-makers possess complementary strengths, while Shrestha et al. (2019) demonstrate that different organizational arrangements can distribute decision authority between humans and AI according to task characteristics. This suggests that the most relevant question for organizations is not simply whether AI should be adopted, but how decision responsibilities should be allocated.

Third, researchers consistently identify concerns relating to bias, transparency, accountability, and privacy. Algorithmic systems can reproduce or amplify patterns of discrimination present in historical data, meaning that automation does not necessarily produce objective outcomes (Barocas & Selbst, 2016). Similarly, explainability and appropriate human oversight become increasingly important as AI systems are applied to consequential decisions (Rudin, 2019).

10.3 Contradictory Findings

Although substantial agreement exists, the literature also contains contradictory findings regarding the circumstances under which AI improves decision quality. Some research emphasizes the ability of AI to reduce human error and improve prediction, whereas other studies demonstrate that people may make better decisions when they possess contextual knowledge that is not represented in the available data (Jarrahi, 2018). Consequently, AI performance observed in controlled or narrowly defined tasks cannot necessarily be generalized to all organizational decisions.

There are also contrasting findings concerning human reliance on AI recommendations. AI can provide decision-makers with valuable analytical support, but users may either under-rely on algorithmic recommendations or place excessive confidence in them. Lee and See (2004) emphasize the importance of appropriately calibrated trust in automation, while research on automation bias indicates that users can sometimes accept automated recommendations without sufficient independent assessment (Goddard et al., 2012).

The literature also presents an unresolved relationship between model complexity, accuracy, and explainability. Highly complex AI models can capture sophisticated patterns but may be difficult to interpret, while simpler models can provide greater transparency in certain contexts (Rudin, 2019). This creates an important organizational trade-off rather than a universally applicable solution.

10.4 Current Research Limitations

Several limitations characterize the existing literature. First, AI is a rapidly changing field, meaning that research can become outdated as new technologies and organizational applications emerge. The recent development of generative AI illustrates this challenge because much of the established literature predates the widespread organizational adoption of large language models (Dwivedi et al., 2023).

Second, a substantial proportion of research examines AI performance within specific technical tasks rather than evaluating long-term organizational outcomes. Technical accuracy does not necessarily translate into improved profitability, employee performance, strategic decision quality, or stakeholder outcomes. More longitudinal research is therefore needed to determine whether the benefits observed during initial AI implementation persist over time.

Third, existing research is concentrated in particular industries and technologically advanced organizational environments. Findings from finance, technology, or highly digitized organizations may not necessarily apply to small businesses, traditional industries, or organizations with limited data infrastructure. Differences in organizational size, culture, geography, regulation, and managerial capabilities also require greater consideration.

Finally, Human–AI collaboration remains comparatively difficult to evaluate because outcomes depend on both the technical performance of the AI system and the behavior of its human users. More empirical research is required to understand how managers actually interact with AI recommendations during complex, uncertain, and high-stakes decisions.

10.5 Emerging Research Opportunities

The identified gaps create several opportunities for future research. One important area is the development

of human-centered AI, which focuses on designing systems around human capabilities, needs, limitations, and decision-making responsibilities. Future studies could examine how different levels of automation influence managerial judgment and organizational performance.

Another emerging area concerns generative and agentic AI in organizational environments. As AI systems become capable of performing increasingly complex sequences of tasks, research will need to examine how organizations should determine appropriate levels of autonomy, supervision, and accountability. The question extends beyond whether AI can perform a task to how decision authority should be distributed between humans and increasingly autonomous systems.

Further research could also investigate the relationship between explainability and actual decision quality rather than assuming that greater explanation automatically produces better outcomes. Comparative studies across industries could examine whether particular Human–AI configurations are more appropriate for finance, healthcare, marketing, supply chains, or human resources. Longitudinal studies could additionally assess how employee trust, skills, organizational culture, and decision processes change as AI becomes embedded within everyday management.

Overall, the literature suggests that the future research agenda should move beyond simple human-versus-AI comparisons toward the study of decision systems involving humans, algorithms, organizational structures, and governance mechanisms. Such an approach would provide a more realistic understanding of how AI affects business decision-making and organizational outcomes.

11. Managerial Implications

The increasing use of artificial intelligence (AI) in business decision-making has implications not only for technology adoption but also for strategy, leadership, governance, workforce development, and organizational design. The literature indicates that AI is most effectively understood as part of a broader decision-making system in which computational capabilities and human judgment can be combined according to the characteristics of a particular task (Jarrahi, 2018; Shrestha et al., 2019). Consequently, managers need to consider not only whether AI can perform a task, but also how responsibility, oversight, expertise, and organizational objectives should be distributed between humans and AI systems.

11.1 Strategic Decision-Making

AI can strengthen strategic decision-making by enabling organizations to process large volumes of structured and unstructured data, identify patterns, generate forecasts, and support scenario analysis. Business intelligence and analytics systems have progressively moved from descriptive reporting toward predictive and prescriptive applications, allowing managers to incorporate more evidence into strategic planning (Chen et al., 2012). Predictive analytics can similarly improve the ability of organizations to anticipate outcomes and evaluate alternative courses of action (Shmueli & Koppius, 2011). However, the availability of sophisticated analytical tools does not eliminate the need for managerial judgment. Strategic decisions frequently involve incomplete information, competing objectives, stakeholder interests, and uncertain future conditions that may not be represented adequately in historical data. Jarrahi (2018) therefore emphasizes the complementary relationship between human and machine intelligence, in which AI contributes analytical and computational capabilities while humans provide contextual interpretation and judgment. Managers should consequently determine which decisions are suitable for greater automation and which require substantial human involvement.

Strategic implementation should also account for the quality and relevance of organizational data. AI systems can produce systematically misleading outputs when training data are incomplete, biased,

outdated, or poorly matched to the decision environment (Barocas & Selbst, 2016). Strategic AI adoption therefore requires managers to evaluate data infrastructure, model performance, uncertainty, and potential unintended consequences alongside expected efficiency gains.

11.2 Leadership

AI adoption changes the responsibilities of organizational leaders. Rather than treating AI solely as an operational technology, leaders increasingly need to establish how employees interact with AI systems, how decisions are reviewed, and where final accountability resides. Shrestha et al. (2019) argue that the organizational structure of decision-making can change when authority is distributed between humans and AI, making the design of these relationships an important managerial consideration. Leadership also influences employee acceptance and trust. Research on automation indicates that inappropriate reliance can occur in both directions: individuals may place excessive confidence in automated recommendations or fail to use potentially useful automated assistance (Lee & See, 2004; Goddard et al., 2012). Leaders therefore need to encourage calibrated trust based on the demonstrated capabilities and limitations of particular systems rather than assuming that AI outputs are inherently objective or accurate.

A further leadership responsibility concerns organizational culture. Employees may perceive AI as a source of surveillance, job displacement, or reduced autonomy if implementation is poorly communicated. Transparent communication about the purpose of AI adoption, changes in responsibilities, and mechanisms for human oversight can help organizations manage these concerns. Leadership should consequently focus on designing effective human–AI collaboration rather than framing AI adoption exclusively as workforce replacement.

11.3 AI Governance

AI governance is necessary to ensure that AI-supported decisions remain consistent with organizational responsibilities, legal requirements, and ethical principles. Major concerns identified in the literature include algorithmic bias, transparency, privacy, accountability, security, and explainability (Barocas & Selbst, 2016; Mittelstadt et al., 2016). These concerns are particularly significant when AI systems influence decisions involving employees, customers, credit, recruitment, healthcare, or other areas with substantial consequences for individuals. Managers should establish clear accountability mechanisms covering the development, deployment, monitoring, and modification of AI systems. The NIST AI Risk Management Framework emphasizes governance, mapping, measurement, and management of AI-related risks throughout the system lifecycle (Tabassi, 2023). Similarly, the OECD AI Principles highlight transparency, explainability, robustness, security, accountability, and human-centred values as important elements of responsible AI development and use (OECD, 2024).

Explainability is particularly relevant when AI recommendations affect high-stakes decisions. Although explanations can support understanding and oversight, Rudin (2019) notes that highly complex models should not automatically be preferred when interpretable approaches can provide adequate performance. Managers therefore need to consider the relationship between model complexity, decision consequences, interpretability, and the practical requirements of oversight.

11.4 Workforce Skills

The integration of AI is likely to alter the composition of skills required within organizations. Employees increasingly need to understand how to interpret AI-generated information, evaluate its reliability, identify limitations, and incorporate it appropriately into professional decisions. Consequently, AI literacy extends beyond technical programming knowledge and includes data literacy, critical thinking, analytical reasoning, and an understanding of AI risks. The continuing importance of human capabilities is also

highlighted by research on human–AI complementarity. Creativity, contextual reasoning, communication, ethical judgment, and interpersonal skills can remain important even when analytical tasks become increasingly automated (Jarrahi, 2018; Shrestha et al., 2019). Organizations may therefore need to invest in reskilling and upskilling programmes that combine technical competencies with human-centred capabilities.

Managers should also develop role-specific AI skills rather than assuming that identical competencies are required across the organization. Data scientists may require advanced technical expertise, whereas managers may need stronger capabilities in interpreting models, questioning assumptions, and evaluating AI-supported recommendations. Employees responsible for governance may additionally require knowledge of privacy, fairness, security, documentation, and regulatory requirements.

11.5 Organizational Readiness

Successful AI adoption depends on more than acquiring technological tools. Organizational readiness includes data infrastructure, employee capabilities, leadership support, organizational culture, governance structures, and the ability to integrate AI into existing workflows. Davenport and Ronanki (2018) identify implementation and organizational integration as important considerations in moving from AI experimentation toward practical business applications. Organizations should therefore assess their readiness before introducing AI into critical decision processes. This assessment can include the availability and quality of data, compatibility with existing information systems, employee preparedness, cybersecurity controls, governance mechanisms, and clarity regarding decision authority. Organizations should also determine whether the problem being addressed is sufficiently well-defined for AI to provide meaningful value.

The literature further suggests that AI implementation should be treated as an iterative organizational process rather than a one-time technological investment. AI systems may require continuous monitoring because changes in data, business conditions, user behaviour, or external environments can affect their performance over time (Sculley et al., 2015). Periodic evaluation can therefore help managers identify model degradation, unexpected outcomes, or changes in organizational requirements.

Overall, the managerial implications of AI extend across the entire decision-making architecture of an organization. Managers must consider where AI can enhance speed, scale, consistency, and analytical capacity while preserving human involvement where contextual interpretation, creativity, ethical reasoning, and accountability remain important. The evidence reviewed in this study therefore supports a strategic approach in which AI adoption is accompanied by appropriate leadership, governance, workforce development, and organizational preparedness rather than being evaluated solely on technological performance.

12. Future Directions

The development of artificial intelligence is likely to further transform organizational decision-making as AI systems become more capable, interactive, autonomous, and integrated into business processes. The literature reviewed in this study suggests that future research should move beyond comparisons between human and artificial intelligence and examine how decision-making can be designed as a human–AI socio-technical process (Jarrahi, 2018; Shrestha et al., 2019). Several emerging areas are particularly relevant to management and entrepreneurship.

12.1 Human-Centered AI

Human-centered AI is likely to become an important direction for organizational research. Rather than

designing systems solely around computational performance, human-centered approaches emphasize usability, human oversight, transparency, safety, and alignment with organizational and societal objectives. This perspective is consistent with research emphasizing the importance of appropriate human involvement and calibrated trust in automated systems (Lee & See, 2004).

Future studies can examine how AI systems should be designed around different managerial roles, levels of expertise, and decision contexts. Greater attention is also required to understand how employees interpret AI recommendations, when they challenge automated outputs, and how organizations can prevent both excessive reliance and unnecessary rejection of AI-supported decisions. Such research would strengthen understanding of AI as an augmentation technology rather than simply an automation mechanism.

12.2 Agentic AI in Enterprises

The emergence of increasingly autonomous or agentic AI systems introduces a new area of research. Unlike conventional decision-support systems that primarily provide information or recommendations, agentic systems can potentially plan tasks, interact with software, execute workflows, and respond dynamically to changing conditions. This may increase the role of AI from analytical support toward partial execution of organizational processes. For management research, this development raises questions concerning the appropriate boundaries of AI autonomy. Future research should examine how organizations can allocate authority between employees and autonomous AI agents, establish escalation procedures, monitor agent behaviour, and assign responsibility when automated actions produce unintended consequences. The question of autonomy is particularly significant because greater operational independence may increase both the potential value and the governance requirements of AI systems.

12.3 AI Ethics Frameworks

As AI becomes increasingly embedded in organizational decisions, ethical frameworks will need to evolve alongside technological capabilities. Existing discussions emphasize principles such as fairness, transparency, accountability, privacy, security, and human oversight (Mittelstadt et al., 2016; OECD, 2024; Tabassi, 2023). However, translating broad principles into practical organizational procedures remains an important research challenge. Future research can investigate how ethical principles can be incorporated into AI development, procurement, deployment, auditing, and monitoring. Comparative studies across industries and jurisdictions could also examine how differences in regulatory environments influence organizational AI governance. Greater empirical attention is required to determine which governance mechanisms are effective in reducing bias and improving accountability rather than relying primarily on high-level ethical principles.

12.4 AI-Assisted Executive Decision-Making

AI is likely to become increasingly relevant to executive-level decisions involving forecasting, market analysis, scenario development, risk assessment, and strategic planning. Advanced analytical and generative systems may provide executives with rapid access to large amounts of information and alternative scenarios. However, strategic decisions often involve ambiguity, organizational values, stakeholder relationships, and long-term consequences that cannot be reduced entirely to historical patterns or quantitative indicators (Jarrahi, 2018). Future research should therefore examine how senior managers interact with AI-generated recommendations and how AI affects strategic reasoning. Important questions include whether AI changes the way executives evaluate alternatives, whether exposure to machine-generated recommendations influences managerial intuition, and how executives balance AI outputs with experience and contextual knowledge. Research should also distinguish between AI assisting

executives and AI effectively determining strategic choices, as these represent different organizational arrangements.

12.5 Real-Time Decision Intelligence

The increasing availability of connected devices, cloud computing, streaming data, and advanced analytics is creating opportunities for organizations to make decisions using continuously updated information. Real-time decision intelligence can potentially support dynamic pricing, demand forecasting, inventory management, fraud detection, customer engagement, and operational monitoring. The development of business intelligence has already demonstrated a progression from historical reporting toward predictive and prescriptive analytics (Chen et al., 2012). Future research should investigate how organizations can prevent information overload and ensure that real-time decisions remain aligned with strategic objectives. Rapid decision cycles may improve responsiveness but can also encourage excessive short-term optimization if organizations focus too heavily on continuously changing indicators. Research should therefore consider the balance between real-time responsiveness and longer-term strategic planning.

12.6 AI and Boardroom Governance

AI is also likely to influence corporate governance and the role of boards of directors. As organizations increasingly depend on AI for financial analysis, risk monitoring, forecasting, cybersecurity, and strategic intelligence, boards may need greater understanding of how AI systems affect organizational risks and decision processes. This does not necessarily require directors to become technical specialists, but it increases the importance of AI literacy and effective communication between technical teams, executives, and governance bodies. Future research can examine how boards should oversee significant AI deployments, evaluate AI-related organizational risks, and ensure that accountability remains clearly assigned. Questions surrounding responsibility become particularly important when decisions involve multiple layers of developers, vendors, managers, employees, and autonomous systems. Research could also investigate whether existing corporate governance structures are sufficiently equipped to address risks associated with increasingly autonomous AI systems.

Taken together, these directions suggest that the future of business decision-making is unlikely to be adequately explained through a simple human-versus-AI framework. Research is increasingly likely to focus on the design of integrated decision systems in which humans and AI perform different but interconnected functions. The central managerial challenge will involve determining appropriate levels of automation, human oversight, accountability, and organizational control as AI capabilities continue to develop. Longitudinal and cross-industry research will be particularly valuable for understanding whether these emerging models produce sustained improvements in organizational performance, decision quality, employee outcomes, and responsible business practice. The conclusion below synthesizes the review findings without introducing new arguments or evidence, while retaining the academic focus on management and entrepreneurship.

13. Conclusion

This systematic review examined the comparative effectiveness of human and artificial intelligence in business decision-making, with particular attention to their respective capabilities, limitations, strategic integration, and organizational implications. The literature indicates that human and AI decision-making are characterized by different strengths rather than being directly interchangeable. AI systems can process large volumes of information rapidly, identify patterns, generate predictions, and perform repetitive analytical tasks with a high degree of consistency (Jordan & Mitchell, 2015; Chen et al., 2012). Human

decision-makers, in contrast, contribute contextual understanding, experience, creativity, interpersonal awareness, ethical reasoning, and the ability to interpret ambiguous situations (Jarrahi, 2018; Shrestha et al., 2019).

The review also demonstrates that neither human nor AI decision-making is universally superior across all organizational contexts. Human judgment can be affected by cognitive biases, bounded rationality, incomplete information, and inconsistency (Simon, 1955; Tversky & Kahneman, 1974). AI systems can similarly produce unreliable or inappropriate outcomes when trained on poor-quality or biased data, when models are applied outside suitable contexts, or when their outputs are accepted without adequate human scrutiny (Barocas & Selbst, 2016; Rudin, 2019).

The comparison across decision speed, accuracy, consistency, creativity, risk assessment, ethical reasoning, adaptability, uncertainty management, and crisis decision-making suggests that the effectiveness of a decision-maker depends substantially on the nature of the task. AI has particular advantages in data-intensive, repetitive, structured, and pattern-based activities, whereas human judgment remains important when decisions involve ambiguity, competing values, interpersonal considerations, and novel circumstances (Jarrahi, 2018).

The findings therefore support a shift from viewing AI primarily as a replacement for human decision-makers toward understanding it as a component of hybrid decision-making systems. Human-in-the-loop arrangements, augmented intelligence, and other collaborative models can allow organizations to combine computational scale with human contextual and ethical judgment (Shrestha et al., 2019). At the same time, effective collaboration requires appropriate levels of trust, oversight, explainability, and clearly defined responsibility (Lee & See, 2004; Goddard et al., 2012).

The review concludes that the future of business decision-making is better understood as an evolving relationship between human and artificial intelligence than as a competition between the two. AI can expand organizational analytical capacity through speed, scale, pattern recognition, prediction, and automation, while humans continue to contribute contextual interpretation, creativity, ethical reasoning, interpersonal understanding, and accountability. The effectiveness of either depends on the decision environment, available information, system design, and organizational context.

References

1. Amabile, T. M. (1997). Motivating creativity in organizations: On doing what you love and loving what you do. *California Management Review*, 40(1), 39–58. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41165921>
2. Barocas, S., & Selbst, A. D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review*, 104(3), 671–732. <https://doi.org/10.15779/Z38BG31>
3. Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
4. Brynjolfsson, E., Hitt, L. M., & Kim, H. H. (2011). Strength in numbers: How does data-driven decisionmaking affect firm performance? *ICIS 2011 Proceedings*, 1–40.
5. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2017). *Machine, platform, crowd: Harnessing our digital future*. W. W. Norton & Company.
6. Chen, H., Chiang, R. H. L., & Storey, V. C. (2012). Business intelligence and analytics: From big data to big impact. *MIS Quarterly*, 36(4), 1165–1188. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41703503>
7. Davenport, T. H., & Harris, J. G. (2007). *Competing on analytics: The new science of winning*. Harvard Business School Press.

8. Davenport, T. H., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(1), 108–116.
9. Dwivedi, Y. K., Kshetri, N., Hughes, L., Slade, E. L., Jeyaraj, A., Kar, A. K., Baabdullah, A. M., Koohang, A., Raghavan, V., Ahuja, M., Albanna, H., Albashrawi, M. A., Al-Busaidi, A. S., Balakrishnan, J., Barlette, Y., Basu, S., Bose, I., Brooks, L., Buhalis, D., ... Wright, R. (2023). “So what if ChatGPT wrote it?” Multidisciplinary perspectives on opportunities, challenges and implications of generative conversational AI for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management*, 71, Article 102642. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102642>
10. Espinosa, O., Basto, S., Ordóñez, A., Arias, M.-L., Sepúlveda, D., & Bhutta, M. F. (2026). A review of artificial intelligence in healthcare supply chains: Untapped potential? *BMC Health Services Research*, 26, Article 742. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12913-026-14559-2>
11. Goddard, K., Roudsari, A., & Wyatt, J. C. (2012). Automation bias: A systematic review of frequency, effect mediators, and mitigators. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 19(1), 121–127. <https://doi.org/10.1136/amiajnl-2011-000089>
12. Gunning, D., Vorm, E., Wang, J. Y., & Turek, M. (2019). XAI—Explainable artificial intelligence. *Science Robotics*, 4(37), eaay7120. <https://doi.org/10.1126/scirobotics.aay7120>
13. Jordan, M. I., & Mitchell, T. M. (2015). Machine learning: Trends, perspectives, and prospects. *Science*, 349(6245), 255–260. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aaa8415>
14. Kahneman, D. (2003). Maps of bounded rationality: Psychology for behavioral economics. *American Economic Review*, 93(5), 1449–1475. <https://doi.org/10.1257/000282803322655392>
15. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
16. Kahneman, D., & Klein, G. (2009). Conditions for intuitive expertise: A failure to disagree. *American Psychologist*, 64(6), 515–526. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016755>
17. Kahneman, D., Sibony, O., & Sunstein, C. R. (2021). *Noise: A flaw in human judgment*. Little, Brown Spark.
18. Kitchenham, B., & Charters, S. (2007). Guidelines for performing systematic literature reviews in software engineering. EBSE Technical Report, EBSE-2007-01. Keele University and Durham University.
19. LeCun, Y., Bengio, Y., & Hinton, G. (2015). Deep learning. *Nature*, 521, 436–444. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nature14539>
20. Lee, M. C. M., Scheepers, H., Lui, A. K. H., & Ngai, E. W. T. (2023). The implementation of artificial intelligence in organizations: A systematic literature review. *Information & Management*, 60(5), Article 103816. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2023.103816>
21. Lee, J. D., & See, K. A. (2004). Trust in automation: Designing for appropriate reliance. *Human Factors*, 46(1), 50–80. https://doi.org/10.1518/hfes.46.1.50_30392
22. Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry*, 15(3), 197–215. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1503_01
23. Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2), 2053951716679679. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679>
24. Page, M. J., McKenzie, J. E., Bossuyt, P. M., Boutron, I., Hoffmann, T. C., Mulrow, C. D., Shamseer, L., Tetzlaff, J. M., Akl, E. A., Brennan, S. E., Chou, R., Glanville, J., Grimshaw, J. M., Hróbjartsson, A., Lalu, M. M., Li, T., Loder, E. W., Mayo-Wilson, E., McDonald, S., ... Moher, D. (2021). The

- PRISMA 2020 statement: An updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ*, 372, n71. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n71>
25. Power, D. J. (2002). *Decision support systems: Concepts and resources for managers*. Quorum Books.
 26. Rudin, C. (2019). Stop explaining black box machine learning models for high stakes decisions and use interpretable models instead. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1, 206–215. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0048-x>
 27. Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). *Artificial intelligence: A modern approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.
 28. Sculley, D., Holt, G., Golovin, D., Davydov, E., Phillips, T., Ebner, D., Chaudhary, V., Young, M., Crespo, J.-F., & Dennison, D. (2015). Hidden technical debt in machine learning systems. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28.
 29. Shmueli, G., & Koppius, O. R. (2011). Predictive analytics in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(3), 553–572. <https://doi.org/10.2307/23042796>
 30. Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & von Krogh, G. (2019). Organizational decision-making structures in the age of artificial intelligence. *California Management Review*, 61(4), 66–83. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0008125619862257>
 31. Singh, R. K., Mishra, R., Kumar, S., & Bag, S. (2025). Applications of artificial intelligence for optimizing banking and financial operations: A systematic literature review and future research agenda. *Journal of Economic Surveys*, 39(5), 2284–2302. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joes.12693>
 32. Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 69(1), 99–118. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852>
 33. Tabassi, E. (2023). Artificial intelligence risk management framework (AI RMF 1.0) (NIST AI 100-1). National Institute of Standards and Technology. <https://doi.org/10.6028/NIST.AI.100-1>
 34. Toorajipour, R., Sohrabpour, V., Nazarpour, A., Oghazi, P., & Fischl, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence in supply chain management: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Business Research*, 122, 502–517. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.09.009>
 35. Tranfield, D., Denyer, D., & Smart, P. (2003). Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. *British Journal of Management*, 14(3), 207–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375>
 36. Treviño, L. K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(3), 601–617. <https://doi.org/10.2307/258313>
 37. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124–1131. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.185.4157.1124>
 38. Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. *MIS Quarterly*, 26(2), xiii–xxiii.
 39. Salminen, J., Mustak, M., Sufyan, M., & Jansen, B. J. (2023). How can algorithms help in segmenting users and customers? A systematic review and research agenda for algorithmic customer segmentation. *Journal of Marketing Analytics*, 11, 677–692. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41270-023-00235-5>
 40. OECD. (2024). *OECD AI principles*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.