AI-Driven Scenario Planning Versus Traditional Forecasting in Executive Strategic Decision-Making

Dr. Azam Bejou
Professor of Management, West Virginia State University, U.S.A.

Abstract.

This paper explores the transition from purely human-led strategic processes to AI-augmented frameworks, analyzing the cognitive constraints inherent in managing high-stakes, ambiguous long-term courses of action and exploring how AI-augmented frameworks may address them. This paper also examines the paradigm shift from traditional linear forecasting to AI-driven scenario planning, investigating how machine learning and generative tools enhance executive strategic decision-making by navigating uncertainty more effectively than historical trend extrapolation (Nweke, 2025), (Ködding et al., 2023), particularly through the use of generative AI to automate the construction of diverse future hypotheses and prioritize emergent trends (Picó et al., 2025), thereby allowing leadership teams to categorize these futures into a structured response spectrum that ranges from immediate priority actions to long-term monitoring (Shinkle et al., 2025). By integrating large-scale pattern recognition with probabilistic modeling, these advanced systems enable executives to transition from reactive, historical-based planning to proactive strategic foresight (Vudugula et al., 2023), ultimately redefining the core research inquiry to focus on how AI-augmented systems can evaluate the predicted consequences of irreversible strategic alternatives(Doshi et al., 2024). Research suggests that generative artificial intelligence can assist in this evaluative process by generating rankings for various business models that correlate with human expert assessments, providing a systematic mechanism for vetting high-stakes organizational paths (Doshi et al., 2024). Furthermore, this distinct shift from task-specific supervised learning to generative models allows for strategic framing in data-scarce environments where historical input-output pairs are absent or unique circumstances render past trends irrelevant (Doshi et al., 2024). By automating environmental scanning through natural language processing, AI-driven tools can detect weak signals and emergent risks that would otherwise remain hidden within vast datasets, enabling a "virtual strategy simulation" approach that allows leaders to test the resilience of specific policy options before they are implemented (Shachar, 2024), (Csaszar et al., 2024) ultimately resolving the inferential trilemma by helping executives distinguish between genuine breakthrough innovations and mere algorithmic hallucinations when navigating subjective tactical choices (Page & Kallapur, 2025). Consequently, these AI-driven decision support systems leverage reinforcement learning to adapt to real-time environmental feedback, ensuring that strategic pathways remain resilient and capable of rapid adjustment during unforeseen crises (Patil et al., 2024).

Keywords: AI versus traditional forecasting, Strategic Decision Making.

1. INTRODUCTION

In an era defined by "polycrisis," where geopolitical shifts, technological disruptions, and climate instability converge, the cognitive load on senior leaders has surpassed the limits of conventional analytical frameworks. Traditional forecasting, which predominantly relies on the extrapolation of historical data and human intuition, often fails to account for the non-linear shocks and data-saturated environments that characterize modern global markets (Vudugula et al., 2023). While conventional methodologies struggle to identify the most relevant external forces and are inherently limited in the number of potential futures they can explore in depth (Finkenstadt et al., 2024), the emergence of AI-driven scenario planning offers a paradigm shift by leveraging machine learning to detect weak signals and simulate complex, non-linear trajectories that traditional linear models overlook(Kanzola et al., 2025; Kilian, 2024). By synthesizing structured analytical methods with intuitive human judgment, AI-driven architectures foster superior decision outcomes by enhancing organizational learning and promoting transparency to different views necessary for navigating dynamic contexts(Vudugula et al., 2023). Beyond improving cognitive flexibility, this evolution allows for "wargaming" the decision environment through agent-based simulations that visualize the range of outcomes—from slow to super-exponential change—thereby fostering a better-calibrated intuition for responding to rapid technological shifts (Kilian, 2024). By utilizing variational autoencoders and Bayesian neural networks to generate macroeconomic stress scenarios and probabilistic service-level curves, organizations can maintain high-fidelity simulation environments that reduce runtime while identifying latent structural relationships that traditional deterministic sweeps often fail to capture(Rainy et al., 2023). This computational advantage proves essential for managing the inherent challenges of strategic decision-making, such as its complexity, ambiguity, and the potential to overwhelm the bounded cognitive resources of even the most experienced executives (Csaszar et al., 2024). To address these cognitive bottlenecks, AI-augmented strategy frameworks facilitate a more fluid "representation" of the competitive landscape, allowing managers to instantly pivot between divergent conceptual models—such as re-imagining a traditional bank's operations through the lens of a retail supermarket—at a fraction of the time and cost required by manual strategic reviews (Csaszar et al., 2024); this expanded scale of analysis enables firms to apply ensemble simulations to complex domains such as capital investment planning and market entry decisions, ultimately exhibiting superior contingency preparedness by balancing algorithmic speed with human accountability(Rainy et al., 2023). thereby creating a new class of "boundary objects" such as virtual manager personas and interactive simulations that facilitate communication and alignment across diverse members of the top management team(Csaszar et al., 2024). This capability ultimately expands the limits of bounded rationality by allowing AI to automate routine analytical tasks, such as market segmentation and financial risk assessment, while executives focus on the higher-level causal reasoning and contextual awareness necessary to resolve complex organizational trade-offs(Vudugula et al., 2023). This paper systematically explores how AI-enabled simulations and generative foresight tools (Finkenstadt et al., 2024),(Biloslavo et al., 2024) can bridge the gap between human bounded rationality and the increasing volatility of the modern business environment.

Core research question - How does the integration of AI-driven scenario planning into the executive suite fundamentally transform the cognitive processes of search, representation, and aggregation compared to the path-dependent constraints of traditional historical forecasting (Csaszar et al., 2024)? To address this question, this paper offers a threefold contribution: it provides a "conceptual" bridge between AI capabilities and the theory-based view of strategy, a "theoretical" framework for understanding AI's role in expanding bounded rationality (Csaszar et al., 2024), and “managerial” guidance on designing "decision architectures" that balance algorithmic speed with executive accountability (Schmitt, 2024). Building on this foundation, this paper proceeds to examine how AI modifies the fundamental constraints of strategic decision-making by extending the limits of rationality through the rapid processing of vast information sets at lower costs than human strategists(Csaszar et al., 2024). This expanded informational reach allows for a more effective allocation of managerial attention toward discontinuous environmental changes, as AI systems filter and highlight stimuli that are most relevant to the strategic agenda. Furthermore, this synthesis of human and machine intelligence shifts the paradigm from simple automation to a collaborative augmentation model, where AI functions as an agentic entity capable of suggesting autonomous process innovations while executives maintain final authority over the most complex, non-linear organizational trade-offs (Sen & Jakkaraju, 2025). Ultimately, this paper suggests that AI can generate and evaluate strategic options at a level comparable to experienced investors and entrepreneurs(Csaszar et al., 2024), thereby creating a hybrid strategic environment where direct improvements in decision quality are coupled with enhanced coordination across the organizational hierarchy(Gans, 2025), ensuring that strategic objectives remain aligned with operational realities through the use of shared digital representations that reconcile top-down mandates with bottom-up data insights. This collaborative approach reconfigures the executive role into that of an "AI strategic co-thinker," where leaders must engage in an iterative process of prompting and refining algorithmic outputs to ensure that AI-generated strategic ideas are grounded in empirical rigor and contextual validation(Bevilacqua et al., 2025).

2. Executive Strategic Decision-Making: Theoretical Foundations

Strategic decisions are fundamentally constrained by bounded rationality, where executives must navigate environmental complexity and incomplete information using simplified mental models that often prioritize satisficing over optimization (Vudugula et al., 2023). In this context, behavioral decision theory suggests that the cognitive load of processing multidimensional data often forces leaders to depend on heuristic shortcuts and personal intuition rather than exhaustive reasonable calculations (Vudugula et al., 2023). These internal constraints are further exacerbated by the "search, representation, and aggregation" framework, which posits that the quality of strategic outcomes is determined by how effectively a firm explores the solution space, conceptualizes the problem, and synthesizes diverse viewpoints into a coherent plan (Csaszar et al., 2024). Yet, the emergence of AI-augmented systems introduces uncertainty regarding how these human-centric processes evolve when large language models begin to replicate or even enhance the speed and scale of such cognitive tasks (Csaszar et al., 2024), particularly by transforming the traditional reliance on structured quantitative data into a more expansive capability for processing open-ended, qualitative inputs such as news reports, market narratives, and internal memos (Csaszar et al., 2024). Effectively, it serves as a "librarian" that synthesizes global strategic knowledge into actionable intelligence for cross-functional leadership teams (FURDUESCU, 2025). In turn, it bridges organizational silos by providing a unified "coordinator" role that streamlines the alignment of departmental goals with overarching corporate strategy (FURDUESCU, 2025). This theoretical foundation suggests that as AI shifts from a passive tool to an autonomous decision-making agent, it redefines the locus of strategic discovery. This redefinition occurs by allowing for the aggregation of predictions from multiple artificial evaluators that can be weighted by their specific role-based personas or cognitive styles (Doshi et al., 2024), thereby enabling the executive suite to mitigate individual biases by testing strategic hypotheses against a diverse ensemble of AI-generated perspectives (Csaszar et al., 2024). Despite the risk of mimicking human biases or producing inconsistent evaluations, this approach offers a representational complexity that far exceeds the five-to-seven-factor limitations typical of human-centric frameworks like Porter's Five Forces (Csaszar et al., 2024), ultimately allowing for the deployment of virtual strategy simulations that can simultaneously model thousands of environmental permutations to identify the most resilient firm outcomes (Csaszar et al., 2024).

3. Traditional Forecasting in Executive Strategy

Traditional forecasting in executive strategy is defined by its reliance on the principle of temporal continuity, if the underlying structural drivers of a firm's environment remain stable enough for former performance to serve as a dependable substitute for future results. This paradigm centers on the reduction of complexity using deterministic variables, where executives utilize historical datasets to project a single, "most likely" trajectory that serves as the baseline for resource allocation and strategic positioning. This approach is anchored in the "expertise effect," where value is created by improving the stand-alone quality of key decisions through the rigorous extrapolation of established causal relationships (Gans, 2025). Consequently, this methodology functions on an "inside-out" logic where strategy is formulated by adjusting internal variables against a narrow set of predictable external trends, often neglecting the systemic volatility and exogenous shocks that characterize contemporary global markets. By prioritizing point estimates over the exploration of divergent futures, traditional models often lack the economic logic required to persuade ecosystem partners of the merit of a new business model (Levinthal, 2025). This reliance on historical precedent creates a "competence trap" where executive teams become increasingly efficient at optimizing for a world that no longer exists, reinforcing organizational inertia through a decision-making architecture that rewards incremental alignment with existing trends rather than the identification of disruptive shifts. This narrow focus effectively tethers their strategic horizon to the constraints of the existing asset base and operational history, often rendering the organization vulnerable to a "black swan" events that fall outside the scope of its historical training data. Furthermore, traditional forecasting frequently compels executives to underestimate uncertainty by favoring discounted-cash-flow analyses (Courtney et al., 1998). This reliance on rigid numerical exercises inadvertently strips strategic discourse of its qualitative depth, as the focus shifts toward maintaining internal consistency of financial projections rather than evaluating crucial elements such as human behavior and organizational dynamics that ultimately shape business outcomes (Barcelona, 2025). This reliance on historical modeling is fundamentally limited in open, complex environments. Even minor shifts in underlying assumptions can render the resulting strategies inadequate for navigating non-linear disruptions or systemic shocks (Gordon et al., 2019). Consequently, a fundamental gap emerges between these analytical frameworks and foresight methodologies: traditional approaches often concentrate disproportionately on the current situations or a singular future possibility, neglecting the symbiotic relationship between current strategic imperatives and long-term uncertainty (Gerlich, 2024).

4. Common Traditional Forecasting Tools

Executive teams have historically operationalized these predictive assumptions through a suite of standardized instruments, most notably technology forecasting frameworks that use quantitative indicators to extrapolate R&D patterns and economic growth (Undheim & Ahmad, 2024). In addition to these quantitative frameworks, boards frequently rely on planning committees and expert judgment to refine budget-based models, yet these methods often suffer from a short horizon that limits timely adjustments to the corporate course (Bereznoy, 2019). Additionally, the use of the Delphi method remains a staple in these traditional environments, facilitating consensus through iterative rounds of anonymous expert feedback to reduce the noise of individual volatility while maintaining a structured, qualitative anchor for long-range planning (Kazda et al., 2023). Complementing these qualitative tools, the McKinsey 3 Horizon Model is frequently employed to categorize strategic initiatives into short-term improvements, medium-term extensions, and long-term radical innovations (Fieiras-Ceide et al., 2024), though its traditional application often struggles to maintain a dynamic link between the granular, operational data and speculative forecasts(Hugo, 2026), leading many organizations to relegate transformative projects to a conceptual periphery that lacks the rigorous financial integration necessary for executive commitment. Beyond these structured frameworks, executives frequently employ business war gaming and causal layered analysis to simulate competitive responses, yet these exercises often remain constrained by the "one-dimensionality and narrow-sightedness" that results from relying on a limited pool of internal knowledge (Demneh et al., 2023). This reliance on internal heuristics is further exacerbated using environmental scanning and trend research, which, in traditional settings, often fail to distinguish between generic global "mega trends" and specific sector-related disruptions. In mature sectors, these foresight mechanisms typically rely on literature reviews, patent analysis, and bibliometrics to validate strategic research areas, yet they often lack the agility required for modern industries characterized by rapid qualitative shifts in market demand. Moreover, traditional forecasting often uses technology and product roadmaps to bridge the gap between vision and execution, but these roadmaps frequently fail to account for the erosion of traditional industry boundaries caused by rapid digital transformation(Bereznoy, 2019).

5. Strengths and Limitations of Traditional Forecasting

While traditional forecasting benefits from high organizational legitimacy and provides a structured consensus that simplifies complex data into actionable executive summaries, its utility decreases as the time horizon expands and the environment becomes more volatile (Villman & Kuusi, 2025). This is primarily because these methods are prone to retrospective bias and struggle to empirically measure the long-term foresight necessary for executives to commit to emerging technologies years before their market trajectory is fully realized (Spaniol et al., 2023). This structural rigidity often leads to a "loss of sight regarding foresight's impact on today's decisions," as the responsibility for scanning the horizon is frequently siloed within specific planning departments rather than being integrated into the broader strategic learning process required for rapid environmental adaptation (Brunner-Kirchmair & Wiener, 2019). Furthermore, internal actors frequently struggle to perceive impactful information due to cognitive limitations and prevailing power structures, which limit the potential for identifying truly distant strategy options that deviate from the status quo (Geurts et al., 2021), (Korreck, 2018). This reliance on established trajectories is compounded by the fact that typical deliverables, such as trend reports and technology roadmaps, are often perceived as more acceptable by decision makers than complex alternative futures due to the cognitive constraints individuals face when confronted with multiple plausible scenarios (Spaniol et al., 2023). This reliance on established trajectories is compounded by the fact that typical deliverables, such as trend reports and technology roadmaps, are often perceived as more acceptable by decision makers than complex alternative futures due to the cognitive constraints individuals face when confronted with multiple plausible scenarios (Spaniol et al., 2023). The limitations of traditional forecasting are further underscored by its inability to answer specific "when and where" questions regarding strategic shifts, as the information-processing capabilities of human executives are frequently overwhelmed by the cognitive biases inherent in processing complex, non-linear data (Kucharavy et al., 2020). Consequently, these methods frequently overlook the "generative" nature of digital innovation, where smart products and platform ecosystems create unexpected convergences across previously unconnected industries that exceed the original design intent and predictive capabilities of incumbent firms (Warner & Wäger, 2018). This reliance on historical precedent also fosters a disproportionate focus on internal operational issues over external environmental shifts, as executive attention is often diverted toward managing known variables rather than navigating the "poly-crisis" of overlapping global disruptions (Mundlos, 2024), (Ködding et al., 2025).

6. AI-Driven Scenario Planning in Executive Decision-Making

This paradigm shift introduces a computational layer to strategic foresight, where AI no longer merely supports the existing business model but fundamentally reshapes it by serving as an enabler for "scenario thinking" that liberates executives from the time-consuming constraints of manual trend and cross-impact analyses (Schmitt, 2024), (Meyerowitz et al., 2018), allowing for the rapid identification of non-obvious secondary stakeholders and emergent industry interdependencies that human decision-makers might otherwise overlook (Csaszar et al., 2024). By utilizing large language models and big data, these systems create a "safe space" for strategy testing where executives can adjust perceptions and explore the consequences of complex, non-linear innovation cycles without the immediate pressure of irreversible resource commitment (Pirzada et al., 2023), effectively disrupting conventional decision models by enabling a fundamental change in the cognitive and strategic processes through which organizations formulate strategies (Kaggwa et al., 2024). This shift transforms the executive from a linear forecaster into a strategic architect who curates "intelligent decision environments," leveraging machine learning to synthesize internal and external data streams into real-time predictive insights (Schmitt, 2024), which allow organizations to systematically counteract the cognitive limitations and retrospective biases inherent in traditional human reasoning (Theodorakopoulos et al., 2025). By integrating specific predictive models that allow executives to sharpen their risk perception and foster situational awareness in volatile environments(Vudugula et al., 2023). This augmentation allows for the modeling of richer distributions and adaptive feedback mechanisms, enabling organizations to move beyond descriptive reporting toward prescriptive analytics that optimize supply chain resilience and anticipate nonlinear propagation paths of market shocks (Rainy et al., 2023). Moreover, these systems facilitate abductive reasoning by utilizing large language models to generate plausible hypotheses and explanatory narratives from limited or uncertain information, thereby supporting executives in exploring strategic possibilities that fall outside the scope of historical data (Ghisellini et al., 2025). Recent empirical evidence suggests that large language models are now capable of generating and evaluating firm-level strategies at a quality comparable to experienced investors and entrepreneurs, effectively scaling the cognitive processes of search and representation essential for high-level strategic analysis (Csaszar et al., 2024), (Csaszar et al., 2024).

7. Key AI Tools Used in Scenario Planning

Complementing these time-series models, transformer-based Large Language Models translate complex operational outputs, such as dual variables and slackness conditions, into coherent natural language explanations that bridge the gap between technical data analysis and executive strategic reasoning (Venkatachalam, 2025). Furthermore, generative AI facilitates the creation of detailed synthetic environments where executives can stress-test "what-if" maneuvers against diverse agent-based simulations, ensuring that strategic choices are resilient to the sudden market fluctuations and shifting consumer behaviors identified by deep learning-driven insights (Aghaei et al., 2025). The integration of real-time sentiment analysis and natural language processing across digital ecosystems allows for the proactive monitoring of reputational risks and the detection of emerging financial distress patterns

(Priyadarshi & Joshi, 2025). Additionally, digital systems such as the "Time Machine" utilize generative AI to automatically prioritize trends and propose diverse hypotheses, effectively streamlining the formulation of prospective future scenarios for end-users (Picó et al., 2025). Beyond these narrative tools, reinforcement learning algorithms provide a dynamic optimization layer, allowing AI models to adapt to feedback and environmental changes, improving decision-making (Patil et al., 2024). The integration of Large Language Models into these tools allows for the translation of qualitative inputs into descriptive scenario processing, enabling forecasters to convert natural language descriptions of potential futures into actionable model adjustments (Shachar, 2024). This capability is further enhanced by specialized foundation models like Chronos and Lag-Llama, which apply transformer-based decoder architectures to univariate probabilistic forecasting, demonstrating strong zero-shot generalization that allows executives to analyze unseen datasets without extensive historical recalibration (Alexandru et al., 2024). To further refine these simulations, multimodal AI models are increasingly utilized to synthesize disparate data streams—including text, images, and sensor data—to pinpoint multifaceted risk factors such as geopolitical instability or natural disasters across various global sectors (Patil et al., 2024).

8. Strategic Advantages of AI-driven Scenario Planning

The primary strategic advantage of AI-driven scenario planning lies in its ability to synthesize synthetic data modules and massive unstructured datasets—including news, regulatory updates, and social media—to proactively identify "what-if" outcomes and emerging market shifts that traditional risk assessment frameworks frequently overlook (Patil et al., 2024), (Sahoo & Dutta, 2024), particularly by processing up to 10,000x more scenarios than conventional stress testing to achieve a significant improvement in the identification of low-probability, high-impact tail risks (Xu et al., 2024), and this expanded coverage is achieved through the targeted use of LLMs to generate synthetic instances of rare events, which effectively addresses data imbalances and enhances the robustness of predictive models against underrepresented but significant occurrences (Shachar, 2024). Beyond expanding the scope of risk identification, AI-driven frameworks accelerate decision-making cycles by integrating real-time analytics with adaptive governance mechanisms, allowing executives to pivot from reactive crisis management to proactive strategic resilience (Zeriouh & Amara, 2025), (Patil et al., 2024). This is supported by the deployment of actor–critic algorithms and Monte Carlo engines that autonomously refine agent policies to enhance scenario realism and accelerate experimentation cycles (Rainy et al., 2023). Furthermore, these tools mitigate traditional limitations in anticipating events that cannot be extrapolated from past data by "wargaming" the decision environment through simulations that visualize the range of exponential outcomes, thereby fostering better-calibrated executive insight for unprecedented structural changes (Kilian, 2024). This computational horizon specifically addresses the inadequacies of traditional approaches in identifying relevant trends across varied levels of uncertainty, allowing for the in-depth consideration of a significantly larger volume of plausible futures than manual processes can accommodate (Finkenstadt et al., 2024).

9. Comparative Analysis: AI-Driven Scenario Planning vs. Traditional Forecasting

The fundamental distinction lies in the transition from a deterministic reliance on historical trend extrapolation to an adaptive architecture that prioritizes the exploration of non-linear interdependencies and believable, previously unseen data points (Sahoo & Dutta, 2024). While traditional forecasting operates on the assumption of structural stability to predict a single likely trajectory, AI-driven scenario planning utilizes agent-based modeling and digital twins to account for cross-domain cascading effects, enabling executives to anticipate how localized disruptions in one sector might propagate into systemic “butterfly effect” crises (Piao et al., 2025). Furthermore, this comparative shift transforms the strategic focus from achieving point-estimate accuracy to building organizational resilience through the continuous validation of "what-if" analyses and stress tests across diverse use cases (Rainy et al., 2023). Consequently, while traditional methods often fail in dynamic, data-saturated environments due to their reliance on intuition or historical trends, AI-driven frameworks integrate real-time analytics and predictive modeling to align risk management with broader enterprise objectives in volatile settings (Vudugula et al., 2023). These frameworks leverage context-specific model selection to ensure that unstructured data environments, such as those found in customer relationship management, benefit from natural language processing, while structured prediction tasks utilize machine learning for superior forecasting accuracy (Rainy et al., 2023). This enables a transition from static, expert-led judgment to a dynamic system capable of processing the scale and complexity of global network risks that often elude conventional planning (Hao et al., 2024), shifting the paradigm from reactive damage control focused on post-crisis image repair toward proactive, data-driven foresight that uncovers early risk signals within unstructured data streams (Priyadarshi & Joshi, 2025), which directly counters the latency factors and cognitive biases inherent in traditional human-led review mechanisms (Priyadarshi & Joshi, 2025). This paradigm shift is substantiated by evidence that machine learning techniques, such as neural networks and ensemble methods, can improve forecasting accuracy by capturing higher-order dependencies and underlying predictive structures that linear econometrics typically overlook (Lalum et al., 2025), ultimately allowing for the transformation of Decision Support Systems from diagnostic repositories into prescriptive platforms that elevate operational data to strategic intelligence (Rainy et al., 2023). In the following sections, this paper expands and discusses three areas of comparative analysis – (1) decision logic, (2) linear prediction vs. probabilistic exploration, and (3) treatment of uncertainty – risk estimation vs. uncertainty navigation -

9.1 Decision Logic - Traditional forecasting operates on a logic of convergence, seeking to minimize variance around a single "most likely" outcome, whereas AI-driven scenario planning adopts a logic of divergence, utilizing probabilistic frameworks to map an expansive landscape of plausible alternative futures (Xilin et al., 2025). This effectively facilitates a shift from defensive risk mitigation to proactive source optimization by identifying which potential disruptions are most critical to long-term strategic objectives (Hamid & Rahman, 2024), (Zeriouh & Amara, 2025), thereby replacing the static, budget-based cycles of the past with a forward-looking, intelligent decision-support architecture capable of real-time planning adjustments based on live operational inputs (Chekashova & Chekashova, 2025). In contrast, to the rigid parameters of conventional models, these AI-enabled systems utilize modular ensemble architectures that facilitate rapid specialization to new life-cycle phases and pricing regimes, effectively creating a closed-loop environment where forecast outputs feed private LLM agents, which diagnose performance drivers and prioritize strategic actions(Venkatachalam, 2025).

9.2 Linear prediction vs. probabilistic exploration - While linear prediction remains anchored in the assumption that historical correlations will persist, probabilistic exploration utilizes nonlinear algorithms like gradient boosting and random forests to embrace a spectrum of potential outcomes, enabling decision-makers to navigate high-uncertainty periods by identifying the "best response" among multiple strategic choices (Schäfers et al., 2024), (Jain & Kulkarni, 2023), ultimately ensuring that both business and technical tracks are fed by the same unified "forecasting truth" to shift executive debates from data reconciliation toward actionable strategic maneuvers (Venkatachalam, 2025). By integrating Support Vector

Machines and Convolutional Neural Networks, these AI-driven frameworks can quantify the confidence levels of various outcomes while simultaneously detecting subtle structural breaks in market dynamics, thus allowing executives to weigh the mathematical probability of a trend reversal against its potential strategic impact(Vudugula et al., 2023). This shift fundamentally reconfigures the executive role from one of validating historical trend consistency to one of managing a portfolio of possibilities, where decision-making is informed by the "explainable forecasting" capabilities of hybrid architectures that combine Large Language Models with quantitative ensembles to communicate complex risk-reward trade-offs in a role-aware, transparent manner (Venkatachalam, 2025). This architectural separation ensures that the forecast generation process remains auditable and reproducible even when demand regimes or catalog compositions shift, transforming the decision logic from a deterministic "black box" into a contract-driven analysis that returns evidence-linked narratives consistent across all stakeholders (Venkatachalam, 2025). Consequently, the logic moves beyond simple prediction to embrace prescriptive analytics, where non-linear architectures provide an "efficiency frontier" that balances computational speed with predictive depth, allowing executives to answer not just what will happen, but how to strategically intervene to optimize performance outcomes(Schäfers et al., 2024).

9.3 Treatment of Uncertainty – Risk Estimation vs. Uncertainty Navigation - Traditional risk estimation focuses on quantifying known variables through historical error distributions and statistical baselines, whereas uncertainty navigation employs generative simulators and ensemble forecasting engines to explore exogenous drivers and "what-if" contingencies that fall outside the scope of actuarial data (Venkatachalam, 2025), (Bonthu & Goel, 2025), thereby enabling a transition from reactive evaluation to anticipatory performance management by leveraging reinforcement learning and anomaly detection algorithms to identify sudden shifts in supplier behavior or geopolitical stability that precede systemic operational failures (Rainy & Chowdhury, 2022). Furthermore, this navigational approach is increasingly supported by digital twins that support scenario planning under uncertainty, with MLOps lifecycles underpinning the process (Rukh et al., 2024). While traditional forecasting treats uncertainty as a residual error to be minimized, AI-driven navigation uses stochastic programming and graph neural networks to map the interdependencies of global value chains, ultimately enabling the application of fuzzy logic to process imprecise qualitative factors, such as delivery stability or quality fluctuations, into a comprehensive framework for evaluating strategic risk in environments where binary logic fails (Grover, 2025). This capacity for navigation is further strengthened by the use of orchestrator-specialist model splits, which separate raw domain calculations from the narrative presentation of results, ensuring that executives receive consistent, role-specific insights that maintain contextual fidelity even as global parameters fluctuate (Venkatachalam, 2025). This paradigm shift is exemplified by the emergence of risk-preferential generative policies that combine Graph Neural Networks with reinforcement learning to create objective-adaptable supply plans, allowing organizations to maintain resilience through probabilistic simulations that incorporate dynamic fluctuations in demand and production (Ahn et al., 2024).

10. Executive Cognition and Judgment – Human-centered reasoning vs. AI-augmented cognition

AI-augmented cognition shifts the executive's mental model from a reliance on heuristics and bounded rationality toward a collaborative "human-in-the-loop" framework (Dave & Mandvikar, 2023), where machine learning systems serve as cognitive prosthetics (Dharsan, 2025) that can process vast, complex topological graphs (Ahn et al., 2024) and real-time data streams (Pal, 2023), effectively mitigating the cognitive load associated with navigating the "bullwhip effect"(Terrada et al., 2022) and other counter-intuitive behaviors inherent in complex adaptive systems (Dave & Mandvikar, 2023). This evolution requires executives to adopt a "strategic co-thinker" posture, treating AI as a cognitive partner that facilitates iterative prompting and contextual validation to refine insights while ensuring that ultimate accountability and critical judgment remain human-centered (Bevilacqua et al., 2025). This collaborative dynamic creates an "inferential trilemma" for the executive, who must determine whether an AI-generated disruptive idea represents a true strategic breakthrough, a hallucination, or the result of misaligned objectives, given that AI reasoning often differs fundamentally from human logic (Page & Kallapur, 2025). To navigate this complexity, the executive must ground AI-generated scenarios in established management science and domain-specific inventory theories, ensuring that the model's outputs are anchored in rigorous, time-tested knowledge rather than isolated computational patterns (Dhar, 2025). This augmentation process necessitates the creation of specialized oversight roles, such as an AI Supply Chain Oversight Officer, to prevent the erosion of critical human competencies and ensure that the integration of automated perception and reasoning reinforces, rather than undermines, the subjective judgment required for complex strategic maneuvers. This hybrid approach grants a greater degree of autonomy to human operators who use their wealth of experience to complement machine-generated results during unforeseen circumstances that rigid, traditional hierarchies cannot address (Walter, 2023). This conjoined agency allows for a fluid transition between intuitive System 1 responses and the analytical rigor of System 2 reasoning, effectively blending formal machine-learning rationality with substantive human judgment (Hao et al., 2025). This deep integration, termed collaborative intelligence, transcends simple human-in-the-loop models, combining the analytical prowess and scalability of AI with the emotional intelligence and moral judgment of the C-suite to achieve superior strategic outcomes (Schmitt, 2024). However, this shift also introduces the "collaboration paradox," where the high-speed intelligence of AI can inadvertently amplify organizational instability if the system's operational protocols are not robustly integrated with proactive execution logic and stable information-sharing models (Dhar, 2025).

11. Organizational Implications

How power shifts in decision authority, how to navigate transparency and explainability, and what is the trade-offs for speed vs. deliberation? The integration of AI into the C-suite necessitates a transition from centralized power structures toward a distributed authority model where technical specialists and AI oversight officers gain significant influence over strategic direction (Schmitt, 2024a, 2024b), potentially creating a "transparency gap" if the black-box nature of probabilistic models is not reconciled with the executive's need for explainable, audit-ready justifications (Elgeddawy, 2026), (Hao & Demir, 2023). This structural tension forces a trade-off between the accelerated pace of AI-enabled "decision factories" and the slow, deliberate scrutiny required for symbolic accountability, as regulations may soon mandate that strategic AI outputs remain fully traceable to ensure algorithmic fairness and protect against biased organizational deployments(Schmitt, 2024). Furthermore, the transition to these AI-augmented architectures shifts the executive's role from a primary analyst to a high-level orchestrator of "human-AI ensembles," where the focus moves toward strategic oversight and the alignment of distributed machine agency with the firm's long-term ethical and competitive goals (Schmitt, 2024). Consequently, the redistribution of knowledge and expertise through these systems may cause organizational influence to depend more on how frequently an individual is integrated into AI-driven feedback loops than on their formal position within the traditional hierarchy(Page & Kallapur, 2025). To maintain legitimacy within this shifting landscape, organizations must deploy post-hoc interpretability techniques to bridge the gap between high-performing black-box models and the transparent, auditable justifications required for strategic alignment and ethical compliance in regulated sectors(Vudugula et al., 2023). This shift toward algorithmic governance ultimately surfaces a core organizational paradox between scalable machine intelligence and the necessity of nuanced contextual judgment, requiring leaders to navigate new epistemic uncertainties where the superior predictive performance of deep neural networks may remain fundamentally opaque to human strategic intuition(Schmitt, 2024; Vudugula et al., 2023), thereby necessitating the emergence of the

Chief AI Officer as a critical stakeholder translator who bridges these opaque technical processes with the social, legal, and ethical expectations of the board(Schmitt, 2024). This predictive governance framework effectively redefines Corporate Social Responsibility from a reactive compliance function into a proactive architecture that anticipates moral opacity before it manifests in automated strategic outputs (Schmitt, 2024). Implementing this transition requires navigating the "liability and accountability" concerns inherent in financial risk and compliance spheres, where hybrid AI-human governance models must utilize to maintain corporate accountability while leveraging the superior efficiency and stakeholder connectivity of multi-layer AI networks(Visconti, 2025). This entails the careful calibration of AI's autonomous decision-making capabilities with human oversight mechanisms, establishing clear lines of responsibility and ethical guidelines to manage the emergent complexities of algorithmic agency(Visconti, 2025).

To address these challenges, organizations must adopt a "human-in-the-loop" governance structure that balances the automation–augmentation paradox, ensuring that AI-driven scenario planning functions as an organizational actor with agency-like properties while remaining tethered to the enduring ethical standards and final accountability of human leadership (Schmitt, 2024; Visconti, 2025). This necessitates the implementation of algorithmic impact assessments and real-time AI audits that allow affected stakeholders to contest automated outcomes through formal appeals processes (Visconti, 2025). This paradigm shift suggests that as AI transitions into a new governance agent, the traditional reliance on legacy-based authority is superseded by real-time, adaptive oversight that requires a fundamental rethinking of ethical accountability to prevent managerial opportunism within decentralized hierarchies (Visconti, 2025). Consequently, the comparative utility of these tools hinges on a shift in decision logic, where the executive's mandate moves from seeking a singular "correct" forecast to managing a portfolio of probable futures through a continuous, AI-augmented feedback loop. This evolution in governance may ultimately lead to a duty to consult AI as part of a director's fiduciary obligation, ensuring that strategic policies are informed by the adaptive capabilities and big data processing power necessary to satisfy both subjective and objective tests of the duty of care (Zhao & Fariñas, 2022).

To operationalize this responsibility, firms must transition from reactive oversight to a "control-by-design" architecture that embeds ethical constraints and fallback mechanisms directly into the system layer, rather than relying solely on human checks at the output stage(Nwachukwu et al., 2025; Spera & Agrawal, 2025), leading to five distinct scenarios of artificial governance—ranging from assisted to autopoietic intelligence—that redefine how boards must actively shape the interplay between automated feasibility and executive responsibility(Hilb, 2020). This multidimensional approach requires that boards evaluate the "augmented intelligence" model as a normative standard, ensuring that AI enhances decision quality without displacing the essential human oversight required for legal and ethical viability (Ahdadou et al., 2025). In light of these shifts, directors must be prepared to defend their reliance on AI-generated insights under the business judgment rule, as the traditional role of the board may be fundamentally challenged by systems that process data and make complex decisions at speeds exceeding human capacity (Mirishli, 2025). The acceleration of the decision-making cycle necessitates a shift in focus toward managing new "strategic" agency costs, where executive energy must be redistributed from routine information processing to the complex task of monitoring and testing the automated systems themselves (Armour & Eidenmueller, 2019). This oversight is particularly urgent given that AI-enhanced models can reduce board decision-making latency by up to 80%, a speed increase that risks bypassing traditional deliberative cycles and necessitates the creation of industry-specific governance frameworks to prevent the decoupling of rapid automated outputs from long-term corporate goals (Visconti, 2025). Furthermore, the potential for managers to use these advanced applications to entrench their positions or bypass data privacy rules suggests that aggregate agency costs may simply change shape rather than decrease, placing even higher demands on the board's residual duty of loyalty and oversight (Armour & Eidenmueller, 2019). To mitigate these risks, firms must implement regulatory AI audits and establish internal ethics boards that prioritize explainable decision-making processes to maintain institutional trust and stakeholder compliance(Visconti, 2025).

12. Implications for Executive Leadership and Strategy

When executives should rely more on AI-driven scenarios, when traditional forecasting remains appropriate, and hybrid decision architectures? To navigate this shift, CEOs must transition from directive decision-makers to "orchestrators of intelligence" who curate virtual personas and simulated competitor dialogues to stress-test historical strategic assumptions (Csaszar et al., 2024), while boards are increasingly required to adopt adaptive governance structures that integrate AI-generated sustainability and risk data into their fiduciary deliberations to overcome structural inefficiencies like director overcommitment (Cordeiro et al., 2025), (Banerjee2, 2025), ultimately enabling a move toward "amplified intelligence" where human-centered reasoning is preserved for ethical coaching and personnel development while machine-driven predictive insights automate goal-setting and compliance functions (Hilb, 2020). Strategy teams should further utilize these tools to uncover overlooked secondary stakeholders, such as specific technology partners, that traditional industry scanning might miss, while employing structured response spectrum frameworks to categorize AI-generated futures into priority actions, safeguards, or monitoring protocols (Csaszar et al., 2024), (Shinkle et al., 2025), ensuring that the "cost" of strategic pivots is meticulously weighed by boards who serve as the ultimate arbiters of resource allocation and leaders' attention during periods of extreme environmental uncertainty (Hudson & Morgan, 2024). Traditional forecasting, conversely, remains most appropriate when operating within stable regulatory environments or mature markets where historical variance is low and organizational legitimacy depends on the high interpretability and transparency of budget-aligned, linear projections. To bridge these disparate methodologies, hybrid decision architectures should employ AI to generate a diverse array of causal theories and strategic narratives (Csaszar et al., 2024), which are then subjected to the critical human judgment of a functionally diverse Top Management Team to ensure that the organization's future temporal depth translates into long-term resilience rather than mere speed (Weis & Klarner, 2022).

This synthesis is facilitated by integrating Large Language Models as collaborative components that facilitate abductive reasoning, allowing strategy teams to surface novel insights and explore strategic possibilities that deviate significantly from the status quo (Geurts et al., 2021), (Ghisellini et al., 2025), yet this transition toward AI-augmented strategy must be carefully calibrated to account for the inherent ideological biases embedded in different model architectures, as the choice of a specific system can fundamentally steer an organization's stance on critical issues like sustainability versus technological advancement (Bush et al., 2025). Building on this requirement for calibration, organizational learning capabilities and psychological safety must be cultivated to ensure that the AI-augmented cognitive model remains open to divergent perspectives, preventing the "black box" nature of automated insights from stifling the essential human intuition needed for superior outcomes in dynamic contexts (Vudugula et al., 2023). In particular, when organizations encounter unprecedented global crises or novel disruptions for which no historical precedent exists, executives must prioritize intuitive decision-making styles, as cognitive technologies remain ill-equipped to tackle completely unique situations that lack a basis in prior data (Jarrahi, 2018). In these high-stakes environments, the human ability to craft an explicit "theory of the case" remains the primary engine for persuading ecosystem partners and securing commitment to new business models, a process of social construction that transcends the mere calculation of point estimates or probability distributions (Levinthal, 2025). Consequently, the ultimate efficacy of these hybrid architectures hinges on the board's ability to maintain a clear line of executive accountability, ensuring that algorithmic outputs serve as a catalyst for creative "big ideas" while human leaders retain the final authority to refine these concepts through the lens of cultural cognizance and organizational wisdom (Page & Kallapur, 2025), (Hao et al., 2024), thus necessitating a delicate balance between leveraging AI for expansive exploration and anchoring strategic choices in deeply human-centric values and ethical considerations (Lin, 2025).

13. Implications for CEOs, Boards, and Strategy Teams

To finalize the distribution of these responsibilities, CEOs must focus on integrating breakthroughs from human-AI collaboration into high-value strategic contexts, while Boards are tasked with establishing domain-contingent authority systems that evolve as AI demonstrates its effectiveness in improving decision quality (Page & Kallapur, 2025), (Gans, 2025). Strategy teams should conversely concentrate on developing "collaborative fluency," the specialized ability to interact across both closed problem spaces requiring precision and open problem spaces requiring the synthesis of AI-driven pattern recognition with human-led creative problem-solving (Li & Tian, 2025), ensuring that the final strategic outputs are refined through contextual awareness and professional experience to achieve superior outcomes in execution, particularly by adopting an optimal sequencing model where expert human intuition initiates the strategic search and AI subsequently refines those choices through rigorous, data-driven adaptation (Sen & Jakkaraju, 2025). Furthermore, CEOs must recognize that while AI can optimize resource allocation on the intensive margin, the "extensive margin" of bold new creation still requires a compelling leader to inspire the hearts and minds of the employees responsible for execution (Levinthal, 2025). Beyond inspirational leadership, boards must serve as stewards of responsible integration by establishing universal ethical guidelines that mitigate the risks of training AI on biased data, ensuring that algorithmic interventions in resource allocation do not compromise long-term organizational integrity (Gonesh et al., 2023), while strategy teams must develop rigorous performance monitoring metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of generative AI in collaboration with human input, adjusting their workflows to ensure that machine-driven analytical reports are continuously refined by human experts to maintain relevance and accountability(Hao et al., 2024). In addition to these operational adjustments, the C-suite needs to define, the appropriate level of AI autonomy for various strategic tasks, ensuring that while the "Scribe" captures and processes decision-making feedback loops, the final authority over high-stakes choices remain strictly human-led functions to preserve transparency and trust (FURDUESCU, 2025), especially through the implementation of interactive feedback systems and periodic audits that allow strategy teams to systematically review machine outputs for signs of bias or misalignment with the organization's overarching mission (Hao et al., 2024); ultimately, this collaborative framework demands that strategy teams act as the primary interface between computational breadth and corporate values, ensuring that the "conjoined agency" of human-AI ensembles results in a collective intelligence that is greater than the sum of its parts (Schmitt, 2024).

14. Governance, Accountability, and Risk Considerations

The lack of a traditional C-suite role formally accountable for the cross-functional orchestration of these systems creates an institutional gap that may necessitate the emergence of a Chief AI Officer to steward AI as both a technological and strategic asset within the firm's governance architecture (Schmitt, 2024). This institutional shift is further complicated by the risk of an "illusion of objectivity," where executives may mistakenly perceive AI-generated scenarios as value-neutral mathematical truths, potentially obscuring the underlying algorithmic biases and data quality issues that can lead to catastrophic strategic misalignments (Vudugula et al., 2023), requiring leaders to implement rigorous usage protocols and verification steps to ensure that AI-augmented decision tasks remain subject to explicit role clarity and human control (FURDUESCU, 2025). Moreover, as generative AI reduces cognitive burdens by grounding analysis in System 2 reasoning, organizations must guard against an over-reliance on technology that could stifle the "out-of-the-box" thinking and contextual creativity essential for navigating unique, data-limited strategic circumstances(Hao et al., 2024), which underscores the necessity for robust governance frameworks and audit trails that allow executives to justify their choices to stakeholders and ensure regulatory compliance (Vudugula et al., 2023) Given that AI models are dynamic and can produce emergent effects not anticipated at design time, executives must also address the "brittleness" of these systems by implementing trust calibration routines that prevent the blind acceptance of outputs during periods of high environmental volatility(FURDUESCU, 2025); instead, they should move toward an aggregation-based evaluation model where insights are cross-referenced with multiple large language models and human expert opinions to verify the stability of strategic recommendations (Doshi et al., 2024) To mitigate potential failures, governance structures must also incorporate formal incident response plans and escalation protocols that empower stakeholders to intervene when automated scenario generators deviate from organizational objectives or ethical standards (Tallam, 2025), preventing the "blunting" of strategic leadership skills that occurs when senior decision-makers become overly dependent on navigation-assistance AI tools at the expense of their own ability to discern situational accuracy and align tactical movements with the long-term vision (Türkgenci et al., 2024). Furthermore, the governance of these systems must confront the risk of "decision homogenization," where algorithmic tools inadvertently constrain epistemic diversity by privileging patterns found in historical training data, potentially eroding the pluralistic reasoning and institutional checks essential for solving ambiguous, "wicked" problems (Kilian, 2024) Consequently, structural mechanisms, such as dedicated committees comprising ethics, law, and AI experts, must be established to align machine-generated insights with firm-level concerns and ensure that decision-making authority remains clearly localized despite the high-risk potential of generative technologies (Schneider et al., 2024). Beyond individual model monitoring, organizations must also develop governance strategies that account for the unpredictable emergent behaviors resulting from the interaction of multiple AI agents within the same strategic system (Hussain, 2024). To address these complexities, large corporations should implement clearly delineated governance layers—strategic, operational, and tactical—to ensure that high-level risk assessments and regulatory alignment are maintained even as technical adjustments are made to real-time monitoring systems (Gandhi et al., 2025).

15. **Overreliance on AI scenarios:** Executive teams risk falling into "herding effects" or "volatility amplification" if they reflexively follow agentic systems that interpret ambiguous macroeconomic inputs without sufficient human-in-the-loop overrides to prevent cascading failures (Islam, 2025). To combat these risks, the board and C-level executives must move beyond simple risk mitigation to develop "antifragile" frameworks that use tabletop exercises and wargaming to stress-test AI-generated scenarios against unintended structural shocks and adversarial interactions (Kilian, 2024), recognizing that these complex multi-agent dynamics can defeat even well-designed rules and lead to competitive "races to the bottom" or systemic risks that necessitate the use of monitoring tools capable of surfacing deceptive planning or misaligned intent (Weuts et al., 2025). This necessitates the adoption of cognitive or theory-of-mind frameworks to define the specific operational boundaries and agency of generative models, ensuring that the diffusion of responsibility across external foundation model providers and internal strategy teams does not result in an accountability vacuum (Huang et al., 2025), particularly when "hallucinations" or factual errors in complex AI-generated texts appear trustworthy at first glance but lack the statistical reliability required for high-stakes commitments (Schneider et al., 2024). To address these gaps, firms must avoid importing legacy heuristics like fixed ROI hurdles into probabilistic domains and instead establish cross-functional committees where legal, risk, and technical teams collaborate to translate strategic policies into actionable governance measures (Rumalla & Mujawar, 2025), (Gandhi et al., 2025).

16. Illusion of objectivity: Senior leaders may fall victim to a false sense of certainty if they view algorithmic outputs as unbiased mathematical truths, failing to recognize that AI systems fundamentally depend on training data from which historical prejudices or inadequacies can lead to misguided strategies (Chambers & Lewis, 2024). This perception of objectivity is further complicated by the fact that generative models operate as probabilistic engines rather than human-like cognitive actors, meaning that interpreting their high-confidence outputs as objective facts can lead executives to neglect the underlying probability distributions of the outputs (Xu et al., 2024). Consequently, executives should avoid using generative AI in strategic contexts where a high degree of explainability is required, as the technology often provides an "illusion of transparency" in which the generated justifications for a particular scenario may not accurately reflect the model's internal processing logic (Kellogg et al., 2025). This lack of technical transparency is compounded by the "illusion of competency" created by conversational outputs, which can mask inherent cognitive biases and reasoning errors that human experts might otherwise identify through direct evidence gathering or consultation with subject-matter specialists (Talboy & Fuller, 2023).

Furthermore, the stochastic nature of generative tools means that structured strategic data is often "fuzzified" into linguistically plausible but computationally imprecise text, which can undermine the rigor of executive decision-making by obfuscating the exact rules or logic used to reach a specific conclusion (Aalst et al., 2025). This pervasive lack of explainability is exacerbated when AI systems produce non-deterministic outcomes through inherent stochastic modeling, which makes it difficult for leaders to achieve the consistent and repeatable decisions required for institutional legitimacy ("Proceedings of the 20th Conference on Computer Science and Intelligence Systems (FedCSIS)," 2025). The risk of model collapse further threatens this perceived objectivity, as the increasing prevalence of AI-generated data in future training sets can entrench existing biases and create self-reinforcing loops that produce repetitive or one-sided strategic outputs (Alt et al., 2024). Moreover, the "explainability problem" creates a significant hurdle for managers, as the inherent complexity of these models makes it difficult to elucidate the specific reasoning behind a strategic recommendation to stakeholders, potentially undermining the trust necessary for full organizational adoption (Vaishnav et al., 2024). This opacity leads to a critical "inferential trilemma," in which executives must discern whether an unconventional AI-generated scenario represents a genuine strategic breakthrough, a misleading hallucination, or a fundamental misalignment with organizational goals (Chin et al., 2024). This cognitive dissonance is intensified by the ""alien logic"" of high-dimensional computations, which lacks the shared linguistic frameworks and folk logic that allows human subordinates to intuitively explain their reasoning to a commander (Page & Kallapur, 2025), (Johnson, 2020), thereby making it functionally impossible for leaders to trace how an input leads to a specific strategic output within complex neural networks that contain millions of interwoven parameters (Browne & Bailey, 2025).

17. Accountability gaps in AI-supported decisions: Determining liability becomes complex when responsibility is diffused among developers, users, and asset owners, particularly in high-stakes environments where decision tools may presuppose values that the human decision-maker has not explicitly endorsed (Azie & Meng, 2025), (Nadibaidze et al., 2024). This moral and legal ambiguity is heightened by the risk that subordinates may struggle to comprehend or execute "unusual findings" from an AI if they lack the background knowledge to decode its underlying intent, potentially leading to a collapse in institutional trust if the opaque strategy results in failure (Fazekas, 2023). To mitigate these gaps, managers must treat AI as a collaborative "staff" partner rather than a replacement for judgment, necessitating a clear pre-definition of the system's goals to prevent the transfer of decision-making authority from inadvertently eroding executive control (Xiong, 2022). Ultimately, legal responsibility resides with human actors regardless of the complexity of the human-AI network, necessitating that executives maintain a sufficient understanding of a system's behavior to remain answerable for the potential consequences of its operation (Devitt & Copeland, 2023). Establishing this level of oversight is complicated by the "responsibility gap," where the complex interaction between polymorphous intelligent agents and human operators can break the causal chain, making it difficult to assign fault or predict the actions of systems that lack traditional foreseeability (Prifti et al., 2022). This challenge is further compounded by the distributed nature of AI development, where the involvement of disparate data providers, model trainers, and deployers makes assigning liability to a single entity nearly impossible when emergent, unintended behaviors result in strategic harm (Bengio et al., 2024).

18. Executive responsibility and final authority

To prevent the emergence of "moral crumple zones," where leaders are held liable for failures they could not realistically control, executives must maintain meaningful agency by ensuring their role does not devolve into passive supervision of automated outputs (Natali et al., 2025). This requires developing robust human-machine interaction models that prioritize the adaptability of both parties, ensuring that executives can critically engage with AI outputs and maintain situational awareness rather than merely serving as a nominal "human-on-the-loop" who lacks the informed capacity to intervene in flawed automated reasoning (Madison et al., 2025), thereby preserving the legal and ethical requirement that significant strategic choices involving potential harm or existential risk must remain the product of human intent and conscious value judgment (Madison et al., 2025). Consequently, organizations are increasingly identifying the need for specialized "AI Operators" or "prompt engineers" who possess the technical expertise to interpret the behaviors of complex systems and align machine efficiency with human insight to ensure that final strategic outcomes are both reliable and contextually grounded (Feldman et al., 2024). To uphold these commitments, executives must implement temporal and geographic constraints on AI deployments to ensure that distributed, AI-augmented decision-making processes remain traceable and consistent with international humanitarian law and organizational strategic goals (Devitt, 2024), (Schmitt, 2024), ultimately ensuring that the widespread distribution of responsibility across designers, regulators, and operators does not erode the core mandate of commanders to retain final authority over the conduct of high-stakes operations (Spera & Agrawal, 2025), even when the use of decision-support systems erodes individual blame by introducing counter-intuitive logic that deviates from human cognitive patterns (Simpson, 2024). To bridge this gap, leaders may adopt a "radial" approach to responsibility that distributes accountability across the network of agents involved in the system's deployment, while simultaneously reinforcing the linear chain of command to ensure that the ultimate decision-maker remains informed of the system's inherent risks and operational robustness (Taddeo et al., 2021). Furthermore, maintaining this final authority requires executives to recognize that delegating tasks to AI alters human agency, potentially leading to "skills fade" and a diminished capacity for critical deliberation if leaders are not provided with the requisite time and information to audit the machine's underlying reasoning steps (Csernatoni et al., 2025), (Devitt, 2022), as the divergence between de facto and de jure responsibility can lead to exploitative scenarios where a decision-maker is held legally liable for machine-driven outcomes they lacked the situational awareness to truly influence (Simpson, 2024).

19. Future Research Directions

Scholars should investigate the efficacy of "sliding autonomy" frameworks to determine the optimal balance of human agency and machine intervention across different levels of strategic uncertainty (Miedema et al., 2025). Moreover, empirical inquiries are needed to develop distributed accountability frameworks that can accurately track and document the distinct contributions of AI agents and human team members during high-stakes operational shifts (Hagos et al., 2024). Future work should also investigate the psychological experience of responsibility among executives, specifically examining how under-trusting automation might increase a sense of personal ownership while over-reliance on automated functions potentially diminishes it (Devitt, 2022). Beyond individual psychology, there is a critical need for longitudinal research to measure how the systemic replacement of cognitive functions traditionally held by managers impacts decision-making and accountability (Devitt, 2022). Moreover, researchers should explore the phenomenon of "deliberate system biasing," investigating whether subordinates might manipulate the environmental data fed into scenario-planning models to covertly influence executive-level outputs for individual or departmental gain (Gladden et al., 2022). Investigating how personality traits, such as those within the Five-Factor Model, correlate with an executive's willingness to accept AI-driven scenario planning could provide deeper insights into why some leaders resist or over-embrace machine-generated strategic advice (Haesevoets et al., 2021). Building on this, future studies should utilize controlled experimental designs to isolate the causal "deskilling" effects of AI decision support, specifically examining whether providing executives with automated aids for specific tasks impedes their ability to execute the assortment of related and complementary functions required for holistic strategic management (Bauer et al., 2022). Further research should also examine the development of new "boundary objects," such as interactive LLM-driven personas or advanced visualization protocols, to facilitate effective communication and mitigate information silos within top management teams where AI systems are increasingly integrated as collaborative agents (Csaszar et al., 2024). In addition to these collaborative dynamics, future studies should consider cross-sectoral applications to test the transferability of AI-driven scenario frameworks across high-reliability industries, particularly examining how various regulatory regimes influence the legal and ethical infrastructures surrounding liability and explainability (Navarro-Meneses & Pablo-Martí, 2025). Finally, researchers should conduct comparative longitudinal assessments to determine whether AI-augmented "scenario-thinking" effectively reduces executive cognitive biases—such as self-promotion or evaluation apprehension—more successfully than traditional human-ensemble forecasting methods (Csaszar et al., 2024). Specifically, this assessment would determine if these tools can identify overlooked secondary stakeholders and emergent industry risks that human decision-makers typically miss due to bounded rationality (Csaszar et al., 2024). It should also explore the potential for AI to facilitate "in silico" strategic experimentation that allows firms to predict competitive outcomes through virtual simulations rather than costly real-world trials (Csaszar et al., 2024). Another vital avenue for investigation involves the transition from strategy frameworks to strategy algorithms, specifically examining if the machine-enabled execution of these ideas leads to a significant increase in the precision and clarity of strategic concepts (Csaszar et al., 2024). In addition to conceptual clarity, scholars should explore the potential for AI to resolve "attention allocation" gaps by identifying which specific types of discontinuous environmental changes—such as rapid technological shifts or sudden regulatory pivots—are most effectively detected by machine learning compared to traditional managerial scanning (Mundlos, 2024). Research should also explore how AI can bypass human bounded rationality to develop "representational complexity" beyond traditional strategy frameworks like Porter's Five Forces, potentially creating more accurate, multi-dimensional models of competitive advantage that exceed the cognitive processing limits of human executives (Csaszar et al., 2024). Lastly, scholars should utilize "shadow mode" validation techniques to compare the quality of real-time AI recommendations against traditional expert judgment in multi-product network topologies, thereby bridging the "sim-to-real gap" that currently complicates the practical implementation of autonomous strategic systems (Dhar, 2025).

20. Conclusion

This paper underscores that while traditional forecasting remains a cornerstone for organizational legitimacy and stable trend extrapolation, the transition toward AI-driven scenario planning fundamentally reconfigures executive cognition by relaxing the constraints of bounded rationality and enabling the simulation of non-linear, probabilistic futures (Csaszar et al., 2024). Ultimately, the shift from a theory-based view of strategy to one augmented by virtual simulations suggests that the competitive advantage of future firms will depend not only on the raw processing power of their AI tools but also on the ability of leaders to integrate these machine-generated insights into a cohesive organizational narrative (Csaszar et al., 2024). This ensures that the speed and representational complexity of AI-augmented outputs do not outpace the firm's cultural capacity for collective sense-making and strategic persuasion, thereby allowing organizations to navigate the evolving tension between machine-driven precision and the human-centric requirement for accountability in high-stakes environments. Ultimately, this ensures that the executive suite remains the final arbiter of strategy while leveraging AI's ability to detect weak signals and secondary stakeholders that traditional, linear forecasting models frequently overlook (Csaszar et al., 2024). This thereby provides a robust computational foundation for what scholars now define as the integrative thinking framework, where the ultimate success of the strategic initiative rests on the synergy between AI's capacity for rapid search and aggregation and the executive's unique ability to navigate the shifting nature of competitive advantage, whether it remains Ricardian or evolves into a purely Schumpeterian model (Csaszar et al., 2024), thereby marking the most significant transformation in the history of strategic decision-making by fundamentally altering the search, representation, and aggregation processes that underpin firm-level outcomes (Csaszar et al., 2024). As the boundary between human intuition and machine intelligence blurs, the long-term efficacy of this transition will be determined by how successfully firms institutionalize AI not merely as a replacement for historical extrapolation, but as a catalyst for virtual strategy simulations that redefine the search for competitive advantage (Csaszar et al., 2024), and moving beyond the mere reduction of operational costs toward the generation of diverse strategic alternatives through the interaction of virtual personas and the exploration of a larger possibility space (Csaszar et al., 2024).

The future of executive decision-making will depend on the development of novel decision architectures that balance distributed, AI-augmented precision with human-led oversight, ensuring that strategic goals remain aligned with ethical considerations and evolving regulatory requirements for algorithmic transparency (Schmitt, 2024). The future of strategic management thus lies in the rise of the "steward-executive," a role defined by the ability to mediate between the high-dimensional simulations of machine learning and the qualitative, value-driven imperatives of corporate governance (Kuzmanko & Vrbová, 2025), which requires balancing the immense pattern-recognition capabilities of AI with the human responsibility for creating future realities that align with a firm's unique mission and idiosyncratic strategic vision (Csaszar et al., 2024); this evolution suggests that the ultimate competitive frontier will not be the possession of superior data alone, but the mastery of hybrid collaboration models where AI-led search and representation are synthesized with human-led ethical stewardship and final accountability(Kuzmanko & Vrbová, 2025), ultimately ensuring the executive's role evolves from a direct generator of forecasts to a supervisor who must possess the specialized ability to interpret and translate complex algorithmic results into responsible strategic action (Trunk et al., 2020); in this new paradigm, the executive's primary contribution shifts toward solving the "judgment problem" by defining the specific constraints and values that AI cannot derive from historical datasets alone, ensuring the firm's strategic trajectory remains grounded in human purpose even as its predictive models expand into the realm of the non-linear (Lindsay, 2024). Consequently, the integration of AI into the strategic domain signifies a transition from static planning to a dynamic, iterative process where the executive serves as the vital link between machine-generated probabilistic landscapes and the realization of firm-specific competitive advantages (Kuzmanko & Vrbová, 2025).

References

Aalst, W. M. P. van der, Reijers, H. A., Hinz, O., & Pfeiffer, J. (2025). Process Mindlessness: When we Lose Sight of What AI is Supposed to Improve. *Business & Information Systems Engineering*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-025-00972-0

Aghaei, R., Kiaei, A. A., Boush, M., Vahidi, J., Barzegar, Z., & Rofoosheh, M. (2025). The Potential of Large Language Models in Supply Chain Management: Advancing Decision-Making, Efficiency, and Innovation. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2501.15411

Ahdadou, M., Ahdadou, A., Aajly, A., & Tahrouch, M. (2025). Artificial intelligence in corporate boards: a dual-dimensional framework for integration across autonomy and structural levels. *Data Science and Management*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dsm.2025.12.001

Ahn, H., Olivar, S., Mehta, H., & Song, Y. C. (2024). Generative Probabilistic Planning for Optimizing Supply Chain Networks. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2404.07511

Alexandru, A., Velev, G., Toma, F.-M., Pele, D. T., & Lessmann, S. (2024). Energy Price Modelling: A Comparative Evaluation of four Generations of Forecasting Methods. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2411.03372

Alt, T., Ibisch, A., Meiser, C., Wilhelm, A., Zimmer, R., Berghoff, C., Droste, C., Karschau, J., Laus, F., Plaga, R., Plesch, C., Sennewald, B., Thaeren, T., Unverricht, K., & Waurick, S. (2024). Generative AI Models: Opportunities and Risks for Industry and Authorities. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2406.04734

Armour, J., & Eidenmueller, H. (2019). Self-Driving Corporations? *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3442447

Azie, S., & Meng, Y. (2025). The Ethical Compass of the Machine: Evaluating Large Language Models for Decision Support in Construction Project Management. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2509.04505

Banerjee2, J. H., Gaurango. (2025). Algorithmic Governance and the Boardroom: Empirical and Strategic Perspectives on AI Integration in Corporate and Educational Oversight. *Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research)*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17015783

Barcelona, R. G. (2025). Asserting Business Leadership: How Decisionmakers Shift Strategic Advantages and Appropriate Value Under Ambiguities. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, *9*(3), 337. https://doi.org/10.61093/bel.9(3).337-357.2025

Bauer, K., Nofer, M., Abdel-Karim, B. M., & Hinz, O. (2022). The Effects of Discontinuing Machine Learning Decision Support. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4299664

Bengio, Y., Mindermann, S., Privitera, D., Besiroglu, T., Bommasani, R., Casper, S., Choi, Y., Goldfarb, D. A., Heidari, H., Khalatbari, L., Longpre, S., Mavroudis, V., Mazeika, M., Ng, T., Okolo, C. T., Raji, D., Skeadas, T., Tramèr, F., Adekanmbi, B., … Zhang, Y.-Q. (2024). International Scientific Report on the Safety of Advanced AI (Interim Report). *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2412.05282

Bereznoy, A. (2019). Corporate Foresight In The Strategy Of Multinationals. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3451897

Bevilacqua, S., Ferraris, A., Matzler, K., & Kuděj, M. (2025). Strategic leadership at high altitude: Investigating how AI affects the required skills of top managers. *Journal of Business Research*, *205*, 115878. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2025.115878

Biloslavo, R., Edgar, D., Aydın, E., & Bulut, Ç. (2024). Artificial intelligence (AI) and strategic planning process within VUCA environments: a research agenda and guidelines. *Management Decision*, *63*(10), 3599. https://doi.org/10.1108/md-10-2023-1944

Bonthu, C., & Goel, G. (2025). Autonomous Supplier Evaluation and Data Stewardship with AI: Building Transparent and Resilient Supply Chains. *International Journal of Computational and Experimental Science and Engineering*, *11*(3). https://doi.org/10.22399/ijcesen.3854

Browne, S. G., & Bailey, M. M. (2025). Rethinking Technological Readiness in the Era of AI Uncertainty. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2506.11001

Brunner-Kirchmair, T. M., & Wiener, M. (2019). Knowledge is power – conceptualizing collaborative financial risk assessment. *The Journal of Risk Finance*, *20*(3), 226. https://doi.org/10.1108/jrf-05-2018-0083

Bush, A. I., Aksoy, M., Pauly, M., & Ontrup, G. (2025). Choosing a Model, Shaping a Future: Comparing LLM Perspectives on Sustainability and its Relationship with AI. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2505.14435

Chambers, A. L., & Lewis, N. (2024). Lessons from the California Gold Rush of 1849: prudence and care before advancing generative AI initiatives within your enterprise. *AI & Society*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-01917-z

Chekashova, A., & Chekashova, A. (2025). Integrated AI FP&A: Unlocking the Highest Stage Of FP&A Maturity. *The American Journal of Management and Economics Innovations*, *7*(6), 104. https://doi.org/10.37547/tajmei/volume07issue06-11

Chin, T., Ghouri, M. W. A., Jin, J., & Deveci, M. (2024). AI technologies affording the orchestration of ecosystem-based business models: the moderating role of AI knowledge spillover. *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-024-03003-7

Cordeiro, C. M., Adomaitis, L., & Huang, L. (2025). The AI-policy-governance nexus: How regulation and AI shift corporate governance toward stakeholders. *Technology in Society*, *84*, 103117. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2025.103117

Courtney, H., Kirkland, J., & Viguerie, P. (1998). Strategy under uncertainty. *PubMed*, *75*(6), 66. https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/10174798

Csaszar, F. A., Ketkar, H. J., & Kim, H. (2024a). Artificial Intelligence and Strategic Decision-Making: Evidence from Entrepreneurs and Investors. *Strategy Science*, *9*(4), 322. https://doi.org/10.1287/stsc.2024.0190

Csaszar, F. A., Ketkar, H., & Kim, H. (2024b). *Artificial Intelligence and Strategic Decision-Making: Evidence from Entrepreneurs and Investors*. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2408.08811

Csaszar, F. A., Ketkar, H., & Kim, H. (2024c). Artificial Intelligence and Strategic Decision-Making: Evidence from Entrepreneurs and Investors. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2408.08811

Csernatoni, R., Broeders, D., Andersen, L. H., Hoijtink, M., Bode, I., Lindsay, J. R., & Schwarz, E. (2025). Myth, Power, and Agency: Rethinking Artificial Intelligence, Geopolitics and War. *Minds and Machines*, *35*(3). https://doi.org/10.1007/s11023-025-09741-0

Dave, D. M., & Mandvikar, S. (2023). AUGMENTED INTELLIGENCE: HUMAN-AI COLLABORATION IN THE ERA OF DIGITAL TRANSFORMATION. *International Journal of Engineering Applied Sciences and Technology*, *8*(6), 24. https://doi.org/10.33564/ijeast.2023.v08i06.003

Demneh, M. T., Zackery, A., & Nouraei, A. (2023). Using corporate foresight to enhance strategic management practices. *European Journal of Futures Research*, *11*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-023-00217-x
Devitt, S. K. (2022). Bad, mad, and cooked: Moral responsibility for civilian harms in human-AI military teams. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2211.06326
Devitt, S. K. (2024). Bad, Mad, and Cooked. In *Chapman and Hall/CRC eBooks* (p. 248). Informa. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003410379-16
Devitt, S. K., & Copeland, D. (2023). Australia's Approach to AI Governance in Security and Defence. In *Routledge eBooks* (p. 217). Informa. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003218326-11
Dhar, S. (2025). The Collaboration Paradox: Why Generative AI Requires Both Strategic Intelligence and Operational Stability in Supply Chain Management. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2508.13942
Dharsan, S. (2025). Human Cognition: Powered by AI? [The University of Texas at Austin]. In *Texas Digital Library (University of Texas)*. https://doi.org/10.26153/tsw/62187
Doshi, A. R., Bell, J. J., Mirzayev, E., & Vanneste, B. (2024). Generative artificial intelligence and evaluating strategic decisions. *Strategic Management Journal*, *46*(3), 583. https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3677
Ejjami, R., & Boussalham, K. (2024). *Resilient Supply Chains in Industry 5.0: Leveraging AI for Predictive Maintenance and Risk Mitigation. International Journal For Multidisciplinary Research, 6*(4). https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2024.v06i04.25116
Elgeddawy, Y. G. A. (2026). Human–AI Collaboration Models in Supply Chain Decision-Making. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Science Engineering and Technology*, *13*(1), 246. https://doi.org/10.32628/ijsrset261316
Fazekas, F. (2023). Mission Command and Artificial Intelligence. *Revista Academiei Forţelor Terestre*, *28*(2), 69. https://doi.org/10.2478/raft-2023-0010
Feldman, P., Dant, A., & Dreany, H. (2024). War Elephants: Rethinking Combat AI and Human Oversight. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2404.19573
Fieiras-Ceide, C., Vaz-Álvarez, M., & López, J. M. T. (2024). Building the future of European Public Service Media: innovation priorities, key points and optimization areas in PSM. *Communication & Society*, 107. https://doi.org/10.15581/003.37.3.107-123
Finkenstadt, D. J., Eapen, T., Sotiriadis, J., & Guinto, P. (2024). Use GenAI to Improve Scenario Planning. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4760156
FURDUESCU, E.-N. (2025). STRATEGIC MANAGEMENT OF LLM-BASED CHATBOTS: TRANSFORMING INTERNAL COLLABORATION AND DECISION-MAKING IN ORGANIZATIONS. *BUSINESS EXCELLENCE AND MANAGEMENT*, *15*, 81. https://doi.org/10.24818/beman/2025.s.i.5-08
Gandhi, D., Joshi, H., Hartman, L., & Hassani, S. (2025). Approaches to Responsible Governance of GenAI in Organizations. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2504.17044
Gans, J. (2025). Ai as Strategist. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5207597
Gerlich, M. (2024). Empirical Insights into the Contemporary 360 Management Framework (360MF). *Open Journal of Business and Management*, *12*(3), 1488. https://doi.org/10.4236/ojbm.2024.123081

Geurts, A., Gutknecht, R., Warnke, P., Goetheer, A., Schirrmeister, E., Bakker, B. J., & Meissner, S. (2021). New perspectives for data-supported foresight: The hybrid AI-expert approach. *Futures & Foresight Science*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.1002/ffo2.99

Ghisellini, R., Pareschi, R., Pedroni, M., & Raggi, G. B. (2025). Recommending Actionable Strategies: A Semantic Approach to Integrating Analytical Frameworks with Decision Heuristics. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2501.14634

Gladden, M. E., Fortuna, P., & Modliński, A. (2022). The Empowerment of Artificial Intelligence in Post-Digital Organizations: Exploring Human Interactions with Supervisory AI. *Human Technology*, *18*(2), 98. https://doi.org/10.14254/1795-6889.2022.18-2.2

Gonesh, C., Menon, R., Paulin, M., Yerasuri, S. S., Saha, H., & Dongol, P. (2023). *The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on Business Strategy and Decision-Making Processes*. https://doi.org/10.52783/eel.v13i3.386

Gordon, A. V., Rohrbeck, R., & Schwarz, J. O. (2019). Escaping the 'Faster Horses' Trap: Bridging Strategic Foresight and Design-Based Innovation. *Technology Innovation Management Review*, *9*(8), 30. https://doi.org/10.22215/timreview/1259

Grover, N. (2025). AI-Enabled Supply Chain Optimization. *International Journal of Advanced Research in Science Communication and Technology*, 28. https://doi.org/10.48175/ijarsct-23103

Haesevoets, T., Cremer, D. D., Dierckx, K., & Hiel, A. V. (2021). Human-machine collaboration in managerial decision making. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *119*, 106730. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2021.106730

Hagos, D. H., Alami, H. E., & Rawat, D. B. (2024). AI-Driven Human-Autonomy Teaming in Tactical Operations: Proposed Framework, Challenges, and Future Directions. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2411.09788

Hamid, I., & Rahman, M. H. (2024). A Systematic Literature Review: AI, DL and Machine Learning inCyber Risk Management. *Research Square (Research Square)*. https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-4152375/v1

Hao, H., Wang, Y., & Chen, J. (2024). Empowering Scenario Planning with Artificial Intelligence: A Perspective on Building Smart and Resilient Cities. *Engineering*, *43*, 272. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eng.2024.06.012

Hao, X., & Demir, E. (2023). Artificial intelligence in supply chain decision-making: an environmental, social, and governance triggering and technological inhibiting protocol. *Journal of Modelling in Management*, *19*(2), 605. https://doi.org/10.1108/jm2-01-2023-0009

Hao, X., Demir, E., & Eyers, D. (2024). Exploring collaborative decision-making: A quasi-experimental study of human and Generative AI interaction. *Technology in Society*, *78*, 102662. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techsoc.2024.102662

Hao, X., Demir, E., & Eyers, D. (2025). Beyond human-in-the-loop: Sensemaking between artificial intelligence and human intelligence collaboration. *Sustainable Futures*, *10*, 101152. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sftr.2025.101152

Hilb, M. (2020). Toward artificial governance? The role of artificial intelligence in shaping the future of corporate governance. *Journal of Management & Governance*, *24*(4), 851. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10997-020-09519-9

Huang, Y., Gao, C., Wu, S., Wang, H., Wang, X., Zhou, Y., Wang, Y., Ye, J., Shi, J., Zhang, Q., Li, Y., Bao, H., Liu, Z., Guan, T., Chen, D., Chen, R., Guo, K., Zou, A., Kuen-Yew, B. H., … Zhang, X. (2025). On the Trustworthiness of Generative Foundation Models: Guideline, Assessment, and Perspective. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2502.14296

Hudson, K., & Morgan, R. E. (2024). Industry Exposure to Artificial Intelligence, Board Network Heterogeneity, and Firm Idiosyncratic Risk. *Journal of Management Studies*. https://doi.org/10.1111/joms.13127

Hugo, R. (2026). Advanced Analytics Frameworks for Prediction, Compliance, and Strategic Planning. *Zenodo (CERN European Organization for Nuclear Research)*. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.18432160

Hussain, W. (2024). Thorns and Algorithms: Navigating Generative AI Challenges Inspired by Giraffes and Acacias. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2407.11360

Islam, M. A. (2025). The Evolution of Alpha in Finance Harnessing Human Insight and LLM Agents. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2505.14727

Jain, V., & Kulkarni, P. A. (2023). Integrating AI Techniques for Enhanced Financial Forecasting and Budgeting Strategies. *International Journal of Economics and Management Studies*, *10*(9), 9. https://doi.org/10.14445/23939125/ijems-v10i9p102

Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the future of work: Human-AI symbiosis in organizational decision making. *Carolina Digital Repository (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)*. https://doi.org/10.17615/p30s-5690

Johnson, J. (2020). Delegating strategic decision-making to machines: Dr. Strangelove Redux? *Journal of Strategic Studies*, *45*(3), 439. https://doi.org/10.1080/01402390.2020.1759038

Kaggwa, S., Eleogu, T. F., Okonkwo, F. C., Farayola, O. A., Uwaoma, P. U., & Akinoso, A. E. (2024). AI in Decision Making: Transforming Business Strategies. *International Journal of Research and Scientific Innovation*, 423. https://doi.org/10.51244/ijrsi.2023.1012032

Kanzola, A.-M., Papaioannou, K., & Petrakis, P. E. (2025). Identifying weak signals in the labor market: a machine learning approach for strategic policymaking. *Journal of Innovation & Knowledge*, *11*, 100884. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jik.2025.100884

Kazda, A., Sedláčková, A. N., & Bračić, M. (2023). AIRPORT PLANNING: APPROACHES TO DETERMINING THE PLANNING HORIZON. *Transport*, *38*(3), 139. https://doi.org/10.3846/transport.2023.19797

Kellogg, K. C., Lifshitz, H., Randazzo, S., Mollick, E., Dell'Acqua, F., McFowland, E., Candelon, F., & Lakhani, K. R. (2025). Novice risk work: How juniors coaching seniors on emerging technologies such as generative AI can lead to learning failures. *Information and Organization*, *35*(1), 100559. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2025.100559

Kilian, K. A. (2024). Beyond Accidents and Misuse: Decoding the Structural Risk Dynamics of Artificial Intelligence. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2406.14873

Ködding, P., Jahn, M., Koldewey, C., & Dumitrescu, R. (2025). *Challenges for Scenario-Based Foresight and Potential for Digital Technologies: Insights from Practice* (p. 93). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-69994-8_6

Ködding, P., Koldewey, C., & Dumitrescu, R. (2023). Scenario-Based Foresight in the Age of Digital Technologies and AI. In *Springer eBooks* (p. 51). Springer Nature. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-26490-0_4

Korreck, S. (2018). Opening up Corporate Foresight: What Can We Learn from Open and User Innovation? *Journal of Innovation Management*, *6*(3), 153. https://doi.org/10.24840/2183-0606_006-003_0007

Kucharavy, D., Damand, D., Gamoura, S. C., & Barth, M. (2020). Supporting Strategic Decision-Making in Manufacturing 4.0 with mix of qualitative and quantitative data

analysis. *HAL (Le Centre Pour La Communication Scientifique Directe)*. https://hal.science/hal-03017736
Kuzmanko, J., & Vrbová, L. (2025). AI vs Humans in Strategic Decision-Making: A Systematic Review [Review of *AI vs Humans in Strategic Decision-Making: A Systematic Review*]. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. RELX Group (Netherlands). https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5144866
Lalum, A., Caridad, L., & Villamandos, N. C. (2025). Multi-Dimensional AI-Based Modeling of Real Estate Investment Risk: A Regulatory and Explainable Framework for Investment Decisions. *Mathematics*, *13*(21), 3413. https://doi.org/10.3390/math13213413
Levinthal, D. A. (2025). Navigating more or less: AI and resource allocation on the intensive and extensive margins. *Journal of Organization Design*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-025-00195-3
Li, H., & Tian, F. (2025). Advancing Decision-Making through AI-Human Collaboration: A Systematic Review and Conceptual Framework [Review of *Advancing Decision-Making through AI-Human Collaboration: A Systematic Review and Conceptual Framework*]. *Research Square (Research Square)*. Research Square (United States). https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-6885768/v1
Lin, X. (2025). Cognitio Emergens: Agency, Dimensions, and Dynamics in Human-AI Knowledge Co-Creation. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2505.03105
Lindsay, J. R. (2024). Strategic Interactions. In *Chapman and Hall/CRC eBooks* (p. 303). Informa. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003410379-19
Madison, A., McDowell, K., Goecks, V. G., Hansberger, J., Olney, C. M., Ahern, C., Marathe, A. R., Waytowich, N. R., Kenney, C., & Kelshaw, C. (2025). "New" Challenges for Future C2: Commanding Soldier-Machine Partnerships. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2503.08844
Meyerowitz, D., Lew, C., & Svensson, G. (2018). Scenario-planning in strategic decision-making: requirements, benefits and inhibitors. *Foresight*, *20*(6), 602. https://doi.org/10.1108/fs-04-2018-0036
Miedema, E., Waschull, S., & Emmanouilidis, C. (2025). Towards trustworthy artificial intelligence for decision-making: A lifecycle perspective on knowledge- and data-driven artificial intelligence systems. *Computers in Industry*, *174*, 104409. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compind.2025.104409
Mirishli, S. (2025). The Role of Legal Frameworks in Shaping Ethical Artificial Intelligence Use in Corporate Governance. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2503.14540
Mundlos, P. (2024). The impact of artificial intelligence on managerial attention allocation for discontinuous change: a conceptual framework. *Management Review Quarterly*, *75*(2), 1. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-024-00409-0
Nadibaidze, A., Bode, I., & Zhang, Q. (2024). AI in Military Decision Support Systems : A Review of Developments and Debates [Review of *AI in Military Decision Support Systems : A Review of Developments and Debates*]. *Research Portal Denmark*. Technical University of Denmark. https://local.forskningsportal.dk/local/dki-cgi/ws/cris-link?src=sdu&id=sdu-135b54fd-da0c-4843-8d54-898b045a5d83&ti=AI%20in%20Military%20Decision%20Support%20Systems%20%3A%20A%20Review%20of%20Developments%20and%20Debates
Natali, C., Marconi, L., Duran, L. D. D., & Cabitza, F. (2025). AI-induced Deskilling in Medicine: A Mixed-Method Review and Research Agenda for Healthcare and Beyond [Review of *AI-induced Deskilling in Medicine: A Mixed-Method Review and*

Research Agenda for Healthcare and Beyond]. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, *58*(11). Springer Science+Business Media. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10462-025-11352-1

Navarro-Meneses, F. J., & Pablo-Martí, F. (2025). Reimagining human agency in ai-driven futures: a co-evolutionary scenario framework from aviation. *European Journal of Futures Research*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-025-00260-w

Nwachukwu, P. S., Chima, O. K., & Okolo, C. H. (2025). The artificial intelligence governance framework for finance: A control-by-design approach to algorithmic decision-making in accounting. *Finance & Accounting Research Journal*, *7*(8), 350. https://doi.org/10.51594/farj.v7i8.2016

Nweke, O. (2025). Utilizing AI Driven Forecasting, Optimization, and Data Insights to Strengthen Corporate Strategic Planning. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, *6*(3), 4260. https://doi.org/10.55248/gengpi.6.0325.1209

Page, S. E., & Kallapur, A. (2025). Replace, augment, disrupt: AI & organizational decision-making. *Journal of Organization Design*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-025-00194-4

Pal, S. (2023). AI'S PROMETHEAN HAND IN SUPPLY CHAIN RESILIENCE A FRAMEWORK FOR GLOBAL COMMERCIAL SUCCESS. *International Journal of Progressive Research in Engineering Management and Science*. https://doi.org/10.58257/ijprems31286

Patil, D., Rane, N. L., & Rane, J. (2024). *Enhancing resilience in various business sectors with ChatGPT and generative artificial intelligence*. https://doi.org/10.70593/978-81-981367-8-7_4

Piao, J., Yan, Y., Zhang, J., Nian, L., Yan, J., Lan, X., Lu, Z., Zheng, Z., Jie, W., Di, Z., Gao, C., Xu, F., Fei, Z., Rong, K., Su, J., & Li, Y. (2025). AgentSociety: Large-Scale Simulation of LLM-Driven Generative Agents Advances Understanding of Human Behaviors and Society. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2502.08691

Picó, J. F. i, Catta-Preta, M., Omeñaca, A. T., Vidal, M., & Fierro, J. M. M. (2025). The Time Machine: Future Scenario Generation Through Generative AI Tools. *Future Internet*, *17*(1), 48. https://doi.org/10.3390/fi17010048

Pirzada, K., Ahmed, K., & Moens, G. (2023). Corporate Strategies for Sustainable Development and Adoption of New Technologies. *Foresight-Russia*, *17*(4), 1. https://doi.org/10.17323/2500-2597.2023.4.1.4

Prifti, K., Stamhuis, E., & Heine, K. (2022). Digging into the Accountability Gap: Operator's Civil Liability in Healthcare AI-systems. In *Information technology and law series/Information technology & law series* (p. 279). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6265-523-2_15

Priyadarshi, N., & Joshi, A. (2025). Harnessing Artificial Intelligence for Corporate Crisis Management and Foresight. *International Journal for Research in Applied Science and Engineering Technology*, *13*(9), 2458. https://doi.org/10.22214/ijraset.2025.74434

Proceedings of the 20th Conference on Computer Science and Intelligence Systems (FedCSIS). (2025). *Annals of Computer Science and Information Systems*, *43*. https://doi.org/10.15439/978-83-973291-6-4

Rainy, T. A., & Chowdhury, A. R. (2022). THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN VENDOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION WITHIN DIGITAL RETAIL SUPPLY CHAINS: A REVIEW OF STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING MODELS [Review of *THE ROLE OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN VENDOR PERFORMANCE EVALUATION WITHIN DIGITAL RETAIL SUPPLY CHAINS: A*

REVIEW OF STRATEGIC DECISION-MAKING MODELS]. *American Journal of Scholarly Research and Innovation*, *1*(1), 220. https://doi.org/10.63125/96jj3j86
Rainy, T. A., Goswami, D., Rabbi, M. M. K., & Maruf, A. A. (2023). *A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF AI-ENHANCED DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS: STRATEGIC APPLICATIONS IN SERVICE-ORIENTED ENTERPRISES AND ENTERPRISE PLANNING* [Review of *A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF AI-ENHANCED DECISION SUPPORT TOOLS IN INFORMATION SYSTEMS: STRATEGIC APPLICATIONS IN SERVICE-ORIENTED ENTERPRISES AND ENTERPRISE PLANNING*]. *2*(1), 26. https://doi.org/10.63125/73djw422
Rukh, S., Seyi-Lande, O. B., & Oziri, S. T. (2024). An Integrated Framework for AI and Predictive Analytics in Supply Chain Management. *International Journal of Scientific Research in Humanities and Social Sciences*, *1*(1), 451. https://doi.org/10.32628/ijsrssh243671
Rumalla, S., & Mujawar, J. S. (2025). Strategic decision-making framework for evaluating and selecting GenAI use cases. *International Journal of Science and Research Archive*, *16*(1), 170. https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.16.1.2030
Sahoo, S., & Dutta, K. (2024). Boardwalk Empire: How Generative AI is Revolutionizing Economic Paradigms. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2410.15212
Schäfers, A., Bougioukos, V., Karamatzanis, G., & Νικολόπουλος, K. (2024). Prediction-led prescription: Optimal Decision-Making in times of turbulence and business performance improvement. *Journal of Business Research*, *182*, 114805. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2024.114805
Schmitt, M. (2024a). *Strategic Integration of Artificial Intelligence in the C-Suite: The Role of the Chief AI Officer*. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2407.10247
Schmitt, M. (2024b). Strategic Integration of Artificial Intelligence in the C-Suite: The Role of the Chief AI Officer. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4812654
Schmitt, M. (2024c). Strategic Integration of Artificial Intelligence in the C-Suite: The Role of the Chief AI Officer. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2407.10247
Schneider, J., Abraham, R., & Meske, C. (2024). Governance of Generative Artificial Intelligence for Companies. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2403.08802
Sen, P., & Jakkaraju, S. M. (2025). Modeling AI-Human Collaboration as a Multi-Agent Adaptation. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2504.20903
Shachar, A. (2024). Introduction to Algogens. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2403.01426
Shinkle, G. A., Gujarati, C., & Sharry, P. (2025). Scenario Analysis in the Ai Era: Redefining Human Involvement. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5239542
Simpson, T. W. (2024). AlphaGo's Move 37 and Its Implications for AI-Supported Military Decision-Making. In *Chapman and Hall/CRC eBooks* (p. 232). Informa. https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003410379-15
Spaniol, M. J., Rowland, N. J., Rytter, N. G. M., Lützen, M., Fergnani, A., Smulders, B., Gordon, A. V., Wilde, D., Spaniol, M. J., & Schropp, T. (2023). Customizing roadmaps: Lessons from the cutting room floor. *Research Portal Denmark*, *1*, 24. https://local.forskningsportal.dk/local/dki-cgi/ws/cris-link?src=ruc&id=ruc-6e2bcf43-2a5e-4346-ba46-d0390d97f68d&ti=Customizing%20roadmaps%3A%20Lessons%20from%20the%20cutting%20room%20floor

Spera, C., & Agrawal, G. (2025). Reversing the Paradigm: Building AI-First Systems with Human Guidance. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2506.12245

Taddeo, M., McNeish, D., Blanchard, A., & Edgar, E. (2021). Ethical Principles for Artificial Intelligence in National Defence. *Philosophy & Technology*, *34*(4), 1707. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-021-00482-3

Talboy, A. N., & Fuller, E. (2023). Challenging the appearance of machine intelligence: Cognitive bias in LLMs and Best Practices for Adoption. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2304.01358

Tallam, K. (2025). From Autonomous Agents to Integrated Systems, A New Paradigm: Orchestrated Distributed Intelligence. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2503.13754

Terrada, L., Khaïli, M. E., & Ouajji, H. (2022). Demand Forecasting Model using Deep Learning Methods for Supply Chain Management 4.0. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, *13*(5). https://doi.org/10.14569/ijacsa.2022.0130581

Theodorakopoulos, L., Theodoropoulou, A., & Halkiopoulos, C. (2025). Cognitive Bias Mitigation in Executive Decision-Making: A Data-Driven Approach Integrating Big Data Analytics, AI, and Explainable Systems. *Electronics*, *14*(19), 3930. https://doi.org/10.3390/electronics14193930

Trunk, A., Birkel, H., & Hartmann, E. (2020). On the current state of combining human and artificial intelligence for strategic organizational decision making. *BuR - Business Research*, *13*(3), 875. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40685-020-00133-x

Türkgenci, Y., Ayhan, U., & TINAS, M. (2024). YAPAY ZEKÂ ÇAĞINDA STRATEJİK LİDERLİK. *DergiPark (Istanbul University)*. https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/upa/issue/90497/1643792

Undheim, T. A., & Ahmad, T. (2024). Quantitative scenarios for cascading risks in AI, climate, synthetic bio, and financial markets by 2075. *Frontiers in Complex Systems*, *2*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcpxs.2024.1323321

Vaishnav, L., Singh, S., & Cornell, K. A. (2024). Transparency, Security, and Workplace Training & Awareness in the Age of Generative AI. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2501.10389

Venkatachalam, S. (2025). Integrating AI and Ensemble Forecasting: Explainable Materials Planning with Scorecards and Trend Insights for a Large-Scale Manufacturer. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2510.01006

Villman, T., & Kuusi, O. (2025). Developing the Futures Map Framework – an integrative hybrid foresight approach. *European Journal of Futures Research*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40309-025-00252-w

Visconti, R. M. (2025). Is artificial intelligence a new stakeholding agent? *Human-Intelligent Systems Integration*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42454-025-00069-9

Vudugula, S., Chebrolu, S. K., Bhuiyan, M., & Rozony, F. Z. (2023). *INTEGRATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN STRATEGIC BUSINESS DECISION-MAKING: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF PREDICTIVE MODELS* [Review of *INTEGRATING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN STRATEGIC BUSINESS DECISION-MAKING: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW OF PREDICTIVE MODELS*]. *4*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.63125/s5skge53

Walter, S. (2023). AI impacts on supply chain performance : a manufacturing use case study. *Discover Artificial Intelligence*, *3*(1). https://doi.org/10.1007/s44163-023-00061-9

Warner, K., & Wäger, M. (2018). Building dynamic capabilities for digital transformation: An ongoing process of strategic renewal. *Long Range Planning*, *52*(3), 326. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lrp.2018.12.001

Weis, M., & Klarner, P. (2022). A CEO's Future Temporal Depth and Organizational Resilience. *Schmalenbach Journal of Business Research*, *74*(4), 659. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41471-022-00145-9

Weuts, R., Bleher, J., Bleher, H., Flores, R., Xuanyang, G., Pujszo, P., & Almási, Z. (2025). AI Governance in Higher Education: A course design exploring regulatory, ethical and practical considerations. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2509.06176

Xilin, D., Zhijian, X., Wanxu, C., & Qiang, X. (2025). From Samples to Scenarios: A New Paradigm for Probabilistic Forecasting. *arXiv (Cornell University)*. https://doi.org/10.48550/arxiv.2509.19975

Xiong, W. (2022). AI and Leadership. In *Proceedings of the 2020 5th International Conference on Modern Management and Education Technology (MMET 2020)* (p. 497). https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-494069-51-0_69

Xu, H., Niu, K., Lu, T., & Li, S. (2024). Leveraging artificial intelligence for enhanced risk management in financial services: Current applications and future prospects. *Engineering Science & Technology Journal*, *5*(8), 2402. https://doi.org/10.51594/estj.v5i8.1363

Xu, J., Wang, H., Zhong, Y., Qin, L., & Cheng, Q. (2024). Predict and Optimize Financial Services Risk Using AI-driven Technology. *Academic Journal of Science and Technology*, *10*(1), 299. https://doi.org/10.54097/6zrqef25

Zeriouh, K., & Amara, M. (2025). AI–Driven Frameworks for Strategic Risk Management: A Systematic Review and Model for Organizational Resilience and Decision Support. *Journal of Intelligent Management Decision*, *4*(3), 224. https://doi.org/10.56578/jimd040304

Zhao, J., & Fariñas, B. G. (2022). Artificial Intelligence and Sustainable Decisions. *European Business Organization Law Review*, *24*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.1007/s40804-022-00262-2