Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

Artificial Intelligence-Augmented Decision-Making: Examining the Interplay Between Machine Learning Algorithms and Human Judgment in Organizational Leadership

Turki Al Masaeid[1], Marwan Mohamed Alkhalidi[2], Ahmed Abdulla Ahmed Al Ali[3], Saeed Mohamed Ghuloum Aldoobi Almaazmi[4], Rachid Alami[5]

Abstract

The paper discusses the bright and dark sides of the relationship between human judgment and AI-driven machine learning (ML) algorithms. While discussing important issues, such as algorithm aversion, automation bias, and trust, it probes into how AI improves decision-making efficiency through predictive accuracy, resource optimisation, and data-driven insights. Even as AI can revolutionise decision-making, its effective integration must balance algorithmic output and human judgment. The most critical challenges include automation bias resulting from over-reliance on advice given by AI and algorithm aversion driven by concerns related to AI failures. Open systems, explainable AI (XAI) frameworks, and user-centered design can help to engender confidence in AI systems and alleviate these issues. Accountability, equity, and prejudice concerns raise further ethical considerations with AI. The study proposed several tactics that might mitigate such challenges: audits of ethics, adherence to legal policy, and integration of the AI systems with the company's values. It underlines the human-AI collaboration that will be increasingly necessary, as well as hybrid models for decision-making that bring algorithmic accuracy to human intuition. It follows the case study review and empirical findings with practical lessons for organisational leaders on ethics, best deployment practices for AI, and tactical ways to engender better collaboration and trust. The conclusion outlines the need to enhance the explainability features of AI, study cognitive dynamics in decision processes, and work out ethical schemata guiding leading positions for AI. Beyond providing a roadmap for organisations to leverage the interaction of human judgment and machine intelligence to drive and achieve more ethical and effective leadership outcomes, this paper tries to contribute to the ongoing debate on AI-augmented decision-making.

Keywords: *Explainable AI (XAI), Ethical AI, Hybrid Decision-Making Models, Cognitive Bias, Data-driven insights, strategies of leaders, ethical frameworks, human-AI collaboration, algorithm aversion, human judgment, algorithm machine learning (ML) algorithms, AI-augmented decision-making, and human-AI collaboration.*

Introduction

Context and Relevance

Artificial Intelligence (AI) has completely encompassed organisational leadership and decision-making, for which traditional management techniques are irrelevant. In a fast-moving business environment characterised by complexity, ambiguity, and uncertainty, traditional approaches to decision-making may not always allow for the much-needed agility and precision. AI-powered decision-making assures higher efficiency and objectivity by processing volumes of data and providing actionable insights (Judkins et al., 2024). In such a volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous (VUCA) world of business, most of the conventional mechanisms for decision-making lack the required agility and precision to combine and respond to emerging challenges. Pathirannehelage et al. (2024), Jarrahi (2018), and Shrestha et al. (2019) highlight that AI systems, especially those driven by algorithms of machine learning, bridge these gaps by providing real-time data-driven decision-making and predictive analytics.

While AI has the potential to be transformational, it interacts with human judgment in a very complex way. Integrating AI into decision-making processes has substantial opportunities for industries regarding

[1] Abu Dhabi School of Management, Abu Dhabi, t.almasaeid@adsm.ac.ae.
[2] Canadien University Dubai, UAE, marwan.alkhalidi@gmail.com.
[3] Canadian University Dubai, UAE, ahmed.alali@cud.ac.ae.
[4] University Mohamed V, Rabat Morocco, aldoubi23@gmail.com.
[5] Canadian University Dubai, Dubai, UAE, rachid.alami@cud.ac.ae.

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364
efficiency, accuracy, and scalability. AI provides strategic enhancements that allow for identifying patterns beyond human cognitive capabilities, and management leaders face algorithm aversion and even automation bias (Asiabar et al., 2024). For example, by reducing errors and facilitating evidence-based treatment, AI has improved diagnostic precision in healthcare (Pumplun et al., 2021). Similarly, AI-driven innovations promote accountability and transparency in organisations, especially when strategic decisions are made on resource investments (Schildt, 2017). Despite these benefits, the interlinking of human judgement and machine learning algorithms is neither easy nor direct. Business executives are concerned with accountability and transparency and often reject AI recommendations (Smeets et al., 2021). Of most concern for the bar to successful implementation, algorithm aversion is when decision-makers avoid using AI due to mistakes being witnessed and automation bias in which people put too much reliance on AI recommendations (Bader & Kaiser, 2019; Dietvorst et al., 2015; Skitka et al., 1999). Understanding these dynamics is key to harnessing the benefits of AI while retaining those salient aspects of human intuition, ethics, and strategic supervision in decision-making.

Purpose of the Study

This study, therefore, investigates the dynamic interplay between human judgement in organisational leadership and AI-powered machine learning algorithms. According to Wisdom (2024), artificial intelligence should be regarded not as a replacement but as an auxiliary tool to assist human judgment. The research, therefore, has been conducted with the aim to:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of machine learning algorithms in improving decision accuracy and efficiency.
- Identify the psychological and organisational barriers to AI adoption by leadership due to issues of trust and cognitive biases.
- Assess ethical and strategic issues related to the integration of AI into leadership practices.
- Devise actionable recommendations to help achieve human-AI collaboration in decision-making.

These focus areas sum up the important results of the research by underlining how AI can support leadership choices that best align with organisational objectives and moral obligations.

Significance of AI-Augmented Decision-Making

The heightened reliance on AI-driven insights by organisational leadership drives home the need for AI-augmented decision-making. AI enhances managerial decision-making through large-scale data set analysis, which reduces biases and optimises strategic planning (Bankins et al., 2024). In this regard, AI has outdone human judgment in detecting fraud in finance and medical diagnosis in healthcare, reducing human error and enhancing efficiency (Pumplun et al., 2021). AI-driven tools in research and development (R&D) decisions have increased the sophistication of resource allocation and risk assessment for investment analysis, hence yielding better investment outcomes (Keding & Meissner, 2021). However, AI alone can never replace the subtle judgment that may be called for by situations in ethical and strategic decision-making. According to Glikson & Woolley (2020), leadership decisions generally call for contextual understanding, emotional intelligence, and moral reasoning, qualities AI lacks. For instance, AI-powered hiring tools have come under fire, as they solidify partialities through defective training data and prove to need human judgment while making ethical choices, according to Rodgers et al. (2023). Because of that, AI should play a complementary role in empowering human judgment rather than supplanting the judgments altogether, which enables responsible leadership decisions.

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

Challenges and Barriers

While there are several positive potential applications that AI may offer in decision-making, a significant set of barriers hinder the acceptance of AI. The most significant thing influencing the acceptance of AI depends on trust issues; most leaders have maintained scepticism over the whole affair mainly due to a lack of transparency among AI-generated decisions (Dzindolet et al., 2003). For example, black-box models, which are used for assessing financial risk, accountability and compliance issues, add several layers of issues hindering their acceptance among top-level executives (Wang et al., 2019). Another critical barrier is algorithm aversion. Decision-makers often reject AI tools after witnessing a single error, even when these tools consistently outperform human judgment on average (Dietvorst et al., 2015). In a case study involving supply chain management, managers went back to making decisions after an AI model had once incorrectly predicted a fluctuation in demand despite overall gains in forecasting accuracy (Prahl & Van Swol, 2017). All of these issues will need to be overcome through AI model transparency, concise explanation of suggestions, and iterative training to develop executive confidence in the insights provided by AI.

However, the major cause of automation bias pertains to instances of over-reliance on AI systems or failure and inadequacies in critically considering their conclusions. Often, major decisions are overly relied on to result from a recommendation from AI results (Skitka et al., 1999). For instance, Shrestha et al. (2019) argue that sentences produced by an AI-assisted sentencing tool solely relied on AI-calculated assessments rather than more contextual sentencing analysis, contributing to sentence disparity problems that result in unfair-natured sentences. However, training leaders in AI literacy would enable them to critique algorithmic output while applying human judgment critically in a manner that overcomes automation bias. Besides, embracing AI in decision-making is tougher due to ethical concerns. For example, if anything goes wrong when AI mechanisms are making judgments, who is responsible–the computer or the programmer? Indeed, such a case happens, especially within police and medical practice (Rodgers et al., 2023). For instance, predictive policing algorithms have been faulted because they are based on biased training data, making them appear to target disadvantaged communities (Parry et al., 2016). Thus, of the essence, at all levels of processing, AI decision-making remains under ethical governance frameworks involving human intervention procedures that ensure justice and accountability.

Scope of the Paper

Due to the process of leadership decision-making, the following topics defined in this research explain and present the prism of AI relations to human judgment:

- Role of Machine Learning Algorithms: Machine learning algorithms' potential role is to assess how AI may enhance effectiveness in decision-making by identifying patterns and predictive analytics (Rodgers et al., 2023; Silver et al., 2016).

- Human Judgment in Leadership: AI insights complement the leader's decision-making cycle when deconstructing human intuition, ethics, and experience (Kahneman & Klein, 2009; Logg et al., 2019).

- Trust as a Mediator: Analysing aspects that predispose people to the use of AI, such as interpretability, transparency, and techniques for overcoming automation bias and algorithm aversion (Glikson & Woolley, 2020; Dzindolet et al., 2003).

- Ethical and Strategic Implications: Research on the strategic advantages of AI adoption and its ethical risks to leaders that comply with social responsibility and organisational principles (Bankins et al., 2024; Parry et al., 2016).

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

Research Implications

The study advocates for a balanced approach to integrating machine learning into leadership and adds to the growing conversation about AI-enhanced decision-making. There is a need for more transparent and interpretable models to build trust among end users in AI (Burton et al., 2020). AI governance frameworks should also be established to ensure ethical judgment concerning human resource management (Prikshat et al., 2023). With the knowledge that AI acts as an augmentative tool rather than a replacement for human judgment, this paper underlines the prime importance of strategic AI integration while further reiterating the need for ethical oversight and leadership adaptability for the AI-driven era.

The Role of Machine Learning (ML) in Decision-Making

With the introduction of efficiency, accuracy, and foresight, ML has emerged as one of the most important instruments for organisational leadership today, shifting the course of decision-making. Judkins et al. (2024) state that ML is essential in facilitating data-driven decision-making processes and ultimately providing better, more informed decisions with much greater precision. With machine intelligence embedded in human judgment, an organisation can use the strengths of both parties to its advantage by manoeuvring around cognitive biases to develop better decision outcomes.

Functions and Features of ML in Decision-Making

ML systems are advanced decision support mechanisms that automatically analyse data, identify patterns, and generate predictive insights. According to Asiabar et al. (2024), ML factors in superior computational models to traditional methods for making decisions by giving objective, data-driven recommendations at any time. This advantage is essential in high-stakes settings where leaders must assess vast data under deadline pressure. For example, in finance, ML models optimise investment portfolios based on market patterns to reduce risks related to volatile economic environments. Among the most crucial applications of ML in decision-making is predictive analysis. Silver et al. (2016) affirm that ML models analyse past data to predict future patterns, thus helping organisations seize proactive strategies. For instance, retail firms apply ML-based demand forecasting in their inventory management operations. In this respect, they experience minimum stockouts and lower surplus stocks that inflate costs. Besides, optimisation and resource allocation are other vital activities. Keding and Meissner (2021) affirm that ML helps leaders identify the best solutions for efficiently using resources. In health care, ML models help hospital administrators optimise staff distribution, reduce waiting time, and improve operations efficiency.

Another critical feature that ML brings into decision-making may include detecting anomalies. As Pumplun et al. (2021) observe, ML algorithms are very efficient in detecting deviations from expected patterns and, therefore, provide detection of fraudulent activities and operational inefficiencies. For instance, ML-based intrusion detection systems identify intrusion threats and proactively take mitigation steps as part of cybersecurity to avoid many data breach incidents and fiscal loss. Thus, ML will enhance efficiency and accuracy in decision-making when dealing with organisational information in a complex environment. Also, organisational domains for which ML has been approved are varied. Applications concerning collaborative human-AI decision-making have proved effective in strategic planning, mainly mission-critical, such as military operations (Kase et al., 2022). AI-aided decision support systems reduce military commanders' mental overload, enhancing operational effectiveness. In R&D, ML screens project proposals to match risk with reward for resource allocation. Keding and Meissner (2021) add that AI-driven advisory systems permit much more sophisticated and complex decision-making in R&D investment situations, thus resulting in strategic betterment. Besides that, ML has completely revolutionised human resource management (HRM). Rodgers et al. (2023) state that ML facilitates talent acquisition, employee evaluation, and retention strategies. AI-powered recruitment tools minimise bias in hiring because candidates are onboarded based on objective criteria, not human judgment. For instance, AI-powered application tracking systems (ATS) keep the number of candidates selected during the recruitment process at a minimum. The use of ML in HRM has been indicative of changes in the approach to organisational decision-making.

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

Limitations of Machine Learning in Decision-Making

Despite the advantages, the decision-making of machine learning has several disadvantages. Bader and Kaiser (2019) underline that the serious deficiency of ML depends on training data, which may not let one reveal situational shades or fast conditions of organisations. In leadership contexts, human interaction is needed, and emotional intelligence becomes quite necessary; this is what machine learning can hardly capture. For instance, artificial intelligence-based performance reviews can make poor decisions since they do not consider interpersonal aspects such as collaboration and workplace culture. Another major issue with ML in decision-making has to do with algorithmic bias. Bankins et al. (2024) state that ML sometimes amplifies biases associated with the training data, often producing discriminatory outcomes. For example, if trained on biased historical data, AI recruiting algorithms penalise certain demographic groups and maintain systemic injustices. This challenge underlines the need for ethical oversight in applying AI so that algorithms are developed and tested to minimise bias.

The "black box" problem, however, exacerbates ML-based decision-making. According to Hoffman et al. (2018), such complex ML models make it hard for decision-makers to explain how particular outputs were generated. A lack of openness like this might undermine trust in AI-driven suggestions and prevent them from being used in key decision-making processes. For example, AI models used for penalty recommendations must be at least intelligible and explained so that sentences would be considered responsible in a court of law. Other challenges include automation bias, whereby leaders tend to overuse the insights provided by ML without being critical of their accuracy. Skitka et al. (1999) posit that automation bias leads to flawed decisions in areas where AI systems fail to consider unique situational factors. For instance, overdependence on ML-driven credit scoring models in financial risk management may lead to erroneous loan approvals or denials that affect financial stability. To this end, organisations must engender a culture whereby humans critically engage with the recommendations made by AI to depress that risk and ensure human oversight at the point of final decision-making.

Moreover, the performance of ML depends on the type and relevance of data. As Wisdom (2024) comments, ML models must be constantly updated and retrained to remain accurate in dynamic environments. Of course, organisations that operate in dynamic industries such as technology and finance will have to invest in proper data governance frameworks to keep their ML systems relevant. For instance, those financial institutions using AI in fraud detection must develop new models to help balance emerging cyber threats for continued reliability. The table below summarises some of the significant applications and limitations of ML in decision-making:

Table 1: Applications and Limitations of Machine Learning in Decision-Making

Application Area	Description	Advantages	Limitations
Medical Diagnostics	AI analyses patient data for accurate disease detection	High accuracy, reduced diagnosis time	Potential bias in datasets, lack of contextual nuance
Research and Development	AI supports resource allocation in innovation projects	Enhanced precision in decision-making	Over-reliance on AI outputs
Human Resource Management	AI optimises hiring and retention strategies	Reduces human bias, improves efficiency	Concerns over fairness, transparency
Mission Planning	AI assists in strategy and resource allocation	Reduces cognitive load, increases efficiency	Ethical dilemmas, challenges in accountability
Predictive Analytics	Forecasts of market trends and risks	Proactive decision-making capabilities	Vulnerability to changes in data trends

Although ML has changed the landscape for how organisations make decisions, getting predictive insights, optimising resources, and improving operational efficiency are essential capabilities that come with some

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

limitations and thus require a balanced approach that incorporates human inputs. Pathirannehelage et al. (2024) postulate that AI-augmented decision-making should be designed in ways that are highly explainable to augment peoples' ability to hold someone accountable for mistakes. At the same time, accountability and ethics oversight are integral to organisations' AI-driven decision-making, allowing those capabilities to be maximised and risks mitigated. The future of organisational leadership will be shaped by the extent to which human-AI collaboration is designed to secure ethical, transparent, and contextually relevant decision-making.

Human Judgment in AI-Augmented Decision-Making

As AI-augmented decision-making algorithms become increasingly capable, human judgment remains integral. According to Judkins et al. (2024), AI can process enormous volumes of data, identify patterns, and create recommendations; however, it cannot bring together contextual, ethical, and strategic considerations like a human leader can. While AI may be able to suggest an optimal distribution of resources for the expansion of a company, human leaders have to consider geopolitical risks, employee morale, and long-term strategic objectives. In short, integration with human judgment ensures that AI-driven decisions meet organisational values and complex real-world challenges.

The Balance Between Human Expertise and Machine Insights

Sound decisions can only be made if the balance between human expertise and machine insights is well balanced. As Asiabar et al. (2024) and Jarrahi (2018) pointed out, AI systems are better in tasks that demand statistical accuracy and pattern recognition, while human expertise is irreplaceable in areas that demand intuition and ethical considerations. For instance, AI can select the best candidates based on qualifications and experience, but human recruiters must consider cultural fit and leadership potential in talent acquisition (Keding & Meissner, 2021). Leaders are more collaborators than single decision-makers who must critically assess AI recommendations for alignment with strategic priorities (Bader & Kaiser, 2019; Smeets et al., 2021). The collaborative approach will enable the organisation to harness AI efficiency while mitigating the risks of over-reliance on automation.

Algorithm Aversion

One of the most significant challenges associated with AI-based decision-making is algorithm aversion, as people do not like to follow AI recommendations due to a lack of trust in the system, particularly when they find the system commits a mistake. As Dietvorst et al. (2015) state, people overestimate their judgment while underestimating the reliability of AI. For example, a manager would not consider the AI-generated prediction for financial forecasting because the algorithm made a mistake with one thing, despite the algorithm performing better than the human analyst. The transparency of the errors caused by AI aggravates this negativity. As the user will cross-examine more with the AI algorithms when made through some other human, the critical eye to see errors makes AI errors detested (Prahl & Van Swol, 2017). Second, often, it becomes a bit non-explicable, which raises issues as it starts recommending but then gives no reasoning; the outcome remains suspect by the user of the credibility aspect of such output (Hoffman et al., 2018). Organisations can therefore reduce algorithm aversion by proposing AI literacy programs that create trust and familiarity with the working of AI systems (Pathirannehelage et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2019). Moreover, trust in AI must consider openness about how decisions are arrived at to engender users' trust and acceptance.

Algorithm Appreciation

Whereas some decision-makers generally distrust AI, others reveal algorithm appreciation by preferring AI-generated recommendations. Glikson & Woolley (2020) and Logg et al. (2019) provide evidence that people like the consistency and objectivity of AI in tasks involving numerical precision. For example, AI systems in medical diagnosis are preferred over and above human radiologists when detecting X-ray anomalies because of their high accuracy and reliability (Pumplun et al., 2021). On the other hand, overconfidence in AI leads to automation bias, a phenomenon whereby individuals uncritically accept the outputs of

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

algorithms even in the presence of errors (Skitka et al., 1999). To that end, leaders have to achieve a delicate balance between capitalising on the strong points of AI and being critical of its outputs to introduce human oversight with machine efficiency to make the decision-making framework robust.

Cognitive Biases in Human-AI Interaction

Perception about AI-generated recommendations is significantly biased by cognitive biases on their part. As Dzindolet et al. (2003) note, automation bias leads decision-makers to just refinery AI outputs in a no-question manner, ignoring any chance of errors. In cybersecurity, for example, the AI-driven threat detection apparatus can misclassify some benign activities as security threats, and operators trusting in it would fail to verify that with human intelligence. Furthermore, confirmation bias might lead leaders to interpret AI-generated insights selectively to support their preconceived beliefs at the expense of objectivity (Shrestha et al., 2019). There is also an overconfidence bias, whereby leaders may feel too confident in their ability to understand and correctly apply AI recommendations, leading to judgmental errors (Dzindolet et al., 2003). Organisations can facilitate feedback mechanisms that may reduce these biases and thus provide a constant evaluation of the performance of AI (Bankins et al., 2024). Moreover, including bias awareness training will educate leaders about common biases and improve their ability to better interact with AI (Samuel et al., 2022). Establishing structured decision protocols means that the insights developed through AI are critically analysed, hence highly improving effective human-AI collaboration.

The Role of Explainable AI (XAI)

Explainability ensures trust and effective collaboration between AI and human decision-makers. According to Hoffman et al. (2018), users will trust and be able to use recommendations derived from AI if these recommendations are interpretable. For example, mission planners in military command and control systems need AI-driven risk assessments to validate recommendations and make decisions appropriate to the strategic context of the mission at hand (Kase et al., 2022). The development of the XAI framework improves interpretability by giving insight into how AI comes up with those conclusions, which may result in greater use or understanding of an algorithm as more straightforward algorithms improve decision-making (Pathirannehelage et al., 2024). Thus, XAI helps leaders understand the output of various algorithms and critically promotes the responsible adoption of AI.

Practical Implications for Organisational Leadership

The integration of human judgment and AI systems has immense ramifications for leadership. Jarrahi (2018) and Shrestha et al. (2019) identified that hybrid models that combine the efficiencies of AI with human expertise provide superior outcomes. For example, AI may provide real-time data analytics in crisis management, but the political and ethical complexities of devising strategic responses rest with human leaders. Further, the training and development programs will also allow the leaders to critically assess the insights being generated by AI (Bankins et al., 2024). Iterative feedback mechanisms have been instrumental in allowing organisations to fine-tune artificial intelligence systems based on real-world applications and user experience (Samuel et al., 2022). Evading various obstacles, like algorithm aversion, cognitive biases, and explainability issues, leaders are at a point where they can create an environment which has both AI and human judgment working in tandem for better and more ethical decision-making.

Trust as a Mediator in AI Adoption

The success of the adoption of an AI-augmented decision-making system in an organisational setting rests on one factor – trust. According to Glikson and Woolley (2020), trust in AI can be defined as one where there is an allowance to believe in the process by which outputs are given and that the latter is ethical and aligns with the organisation's values. The role of trust stretches further than acceptance to mediate the degree to which decision-makers effectively leverage AI for strategic outcomes. Trust dynamics in AI adoption are multivariate, where leaders might fall into automation bias, over-relying on AI outputs, algorithm aversion, and scepticism toward algorithmic recommendations (Dzindolet et al., 2003). Both factors tend to stand in the way of better collaboration between AI and humans, and there is a need to

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

approach this issue to engender appropriate levels of trust. For instance, too much automation bias will lead to unscrutinised endorsement of AI-generated forecasts in financial risk assessment. Algorithm aversion may also decrease decision-making effectiveness and even underuse the prediction insight that arises (Asiabar et al., 2024). This factor, therefore, presents the importance of strategically building trust between AI and human judgment as it will improve decision-making synergy between them.

Building Trust in AI Systems

Transparency, with its requirement for decision-makers to understand how AI systems work and provide their output, is probably the most important of these factors when it comes to building trust in AI. Hoffman et al. (2018) indicate that transparency solves machine learning models' "black box" character, allowing for greater confidence in an AI's advice. As Rodgers et al. (2023) put it, leaders who perceive that AI is aligned with organisational goals and values are more likely to base strategic decisions on its output. For instance, in HR recruitment, dashboards for visualising AI-driven ranking criteria enhance transparency, allowing HR managers to verify that candidate evaluations are nondiscriminatory (Prikshat et al., 2023). In addition, explainability extends transparency with interpretable reasons for AI-generated decisions. According to Wang et al. (2019), explainability frameworks stand to give users the ability to critically question algorithmic outputs as a means to fill the gap between technical complexity and actionable insights. AI can classify projects concerning financial viability and expected return on R&D investment (Keding & Meissner, 2021). If AI reasons are explainable, decision-makers will review recommendations, eventually building confidence in AI as an enhancement, not a dictating tool.

Besides, there is the perspective of accuracy and reliability, with coherence and freedom from errors instilling confidence in the output. According to Sturm et al. (2023), decision-makers develop confidence and view AI as a trusted tool through repeated exposure to correct AI recommendations. This element can be seen in AI systems like IBM Watson in the medical diagnostics space, which proves to be many times more accurate in detecting certain diseases, thereby boosting clinician trust and, thus, greater adoption (Pumplun et al., 2021). Where AI is reliable, leaders are more willing to incorporate its insights into decision-making structures. In addition, ethical integrity lays the foundation for trust in AI because fairness, accountability, and transparency are guaranteed. According to Rodgers et al. (2023), ethical design reduces biases and engenders confidence in AI recommendations. Ethical controls in AI-powered recruitment systems, such as bias detectors, make HR professionals confident in AI's ability to make equitable hiring decisions, as Prikshat et al. (2023) point out. Without ethical guardrails, AI adoption risks amplifying biases and eroding organisational trust in automation.

Overcoming Automation Bias

While trust is essential for adopting AI, over-reliance on AI creates automation bias, whereby decision-makers uncritically accept whatever outputs the AI generates. Indeed, Skitka et al. (1999) established that automation bias develops when users trust AI to the extent that they stop taking the initiative to verify its output. This tendency is very dangerous in life-and-death situations, such as medical and military applications. Diagnosis errors have happened in automated medical diagnosis because of blind obedience by doctors to AI recommendations (Pumplun et al., 2021). For that reason, in addition to using AI, an organisation should also have a culture of critical review. AI literacy training is one approach to overcoming automation bias. According to Shrestha et al. (2019), decision-makers can objectively assess AI's suggestions only if they understand its advantages and disadvantages. AI literacy workshops assist organisational leaders in separating insights produced by AI that are acceptable for a given environment and those that are not.

Furthermore, embedding feedback mechanisms within AI systems continuously enhances their outputs. Samuel et al. (2022) present that an adaptive AI model, which learns from human feedback, enhances a decision-maker's ability to validate the recommendations made by AI and create a balance between trust and oversight. For instance, AI-driven financial forecasts with integrated managerial feedback enhance predictive accuracy and diminish the risk of automation bias in investment decisions (Wisdom, 2024). Also, the simulated AI failure stories further consolidate critical oversight. According to Pathirannehelage et al. (2024), it is a question of letting the leaders see limitations in AI resiliency and allowing them to resist blind

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

adherence to the outputs AI makes in the decisions they will be called on to make. For example, in cybersecurity threats, training leadership to recognise places where AI classifies benign activity as threats form more discerning engagement with the recommendations of the AI. Besides, education and integration of feedback and scenario-based training are ways an organisation could overcome automation bias.

Designing AI Systems for Trust

Designing AI for trust means the user must be at the centre of the approach, with transparency and ethical integrity at the forefront. As Bader and Kaiser (2019) explain, intuitive interface design supports fluid interaction and comprehension, ultimately fostering trust in AI outputs. User-friendly AI dashboards should let leaders drill into AI-generated recommendations and add human intuition to decision-making. Meanwhile, the interactive dashboard showing AI-generated forecasts against contextual data enables leadership in supply chain management to make more informed decisions regarding logistics (Shrestha et al., 2019). Besides, accountability within the AI system creates even more trust. For example, according to Kase et al. (2022), AI must clearly explain how an error occurred to provide users with knowledge of underlying logic tied to incorrect outcomes. For example, suppose an AI system misallocates resources in mission planning. In that case, that should be a point it indicates through data inconsistencies or limitations in the input, thus calling for the revision of parameters. Accountability is developed in light of ensuring that AI systems are reliable, building further on user confidence. See Table 2 below.

Table 2: Factors Influencing Trust in AI Systems

Factor	Description	Impact on Trust	Example of Strategy
Transparency	Clear communication of AI processes and decision-making logic.	Enhances user confidence and understanding.	Dashboards visualising AI-driven ranking criteria for HR decisions (Rodgers et al., 2023).
Explainability	Providing human-interpretable explanations for algorithmic outputs.	Reduces scepticism and promotes acceptance.	Explainable AI frameworks for R&D investment decisions (Keding & Meissner, 2021).
Accuracy and Reliability	Delivering consistent and error-free outputs.	Reinforces positive user experiences and strengthens trust.	Regular validation of medical diagnostic AI systems (Pumplun et al., 2021).
Critical Training	Educating users on the strengths and limitations of AI systems.	Mitigates over-reliance and fosters informed usage.	AI literacy workshops for organisational leaders (Skitka et al., 1999).
Ethical Guardrails	Embedding ethical principles to ensure fairness and accountability.	Builds trust by addressing biases and ensuring ethical compliance.	Implementing bias detection in recruitment algorithms (Prikshat et al., 2023).
User-Centric Interfaces	Designing intuitive interfaces that facilitate interaction and feedback.	Improves user engagement and trust in AI outputs.	Interactive dashboards for supply chain forecasting (Bader & Kaiser, 2019).

Furthermore, the ethical safeguards in AI design ensure fairness in regulatory adherence and build trust among organisational stakeholders. AI-powered HR systems assure fairness in recruitment processes that were consistently criticised for discrimination, according to Rodgers et al. (2023). When the ethical adoption of AI coincides with the values of a role and the legitimacy of an organisation, long-term confidence in AI-enhanced decision-making increases. Ultimately, trust is the potent mediator in adopting AI and is reflected in leaders' moves to balance critical supervision with faith in AI. Better transparency, explainability, and ethical alignment support cooperation between man and AI for decision-makers (Prikshat et al., 2023; Judkins et al., 2024). The ability of organisations to explore the role AI plays in their leadership choices

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

rests on how effective they are at building trust between themselves and consumers of their decisions and services if strategies are identified to build up that trust and achieve strategic aims effectively and efficiently.

Ethical and Strategic Considerations

Adopting AI in corporate decision-making is an obstacle as much as it promises an opportunity. AI injects strategic and ethical problems while achieving productivity, precision, and predictability gains. Meeting such challenges is the only way to ensure that decision-making with the power of AI will help push the organisation's goals forward, ensure standards of ethics are upheld, and build stakeholder confidence.

Ethical Dilemmas in AI-Augmented Decision-Making

The most critical ethical issues for AI-driven decisions are bias, accountability, transparency, and privacy. According to Rodgers et al. (2023), most AI systems, which get trained with historical data, inherit preexisting biases and hence cause discrimination in essential sectors like hiring, lending, and resource allocation. For instance, due to biased training data, Amazon's AI-powered recruitment tool was biased toward male candidates over female applicants. These flaws show why fairness-aware algorithms and diversity in data sets are needed (Bankins et al., 2024). If left unaddressed, such biases may extend existing systemic inequalities as more and more people will lose trust in AI-assisted decision-making. Another key ethical consideration is accountability. According to Parry et al. (2016), AI systems are "black boxes", and ascribing responsibility is problematic when AI-driven decisions go astray. For example, if used in the financial markets, algorithmic trading systems have been responsible for flash crashes, which call for thorough regulatory accountability (Wisdom 2024; Shrestha et al. 2019). Such issues require clear governance structures and appropriate human oversight mechanisms that will ensure the responsible use of AI.

Similarly, transparency around AI decision-making also offers a great degree of ethical governance. Wang et al. (2019) point out that understanding the frameworks for XAI assists leaders in deciphering and offering valid explanations to support AI-backed decisions. Failure of transparency makes people and agencies resistant to embracing AI because suspicion sets in among employees and other stakeholders. For example, AI diagnostic tools employed in healthcare also need to yield interpretable output to win confidence among physicians for regulatory approval (Pumplun et al., 2021). It is evident that implementing principles in XAI enhances trust and facilitates ethical deployment. In addition, an ethical risk posed realistically involves privacy concerns. Usually, AI systems requiring vast amounts of personal data raise potential breaches of confidentiality. According to Asiabar et al. (2024), for a firm to ensure compliance with data protection regulations such as the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR), there is undoubtedly the need for data anonymisation and stringent security protocols. Examples include the now-famous Cambridge Analytica case, highlighting a critical justification for ethical data regulation when AI-driven data analysis was abused to influence political results (Glikson & Woolley, 2020). Enhanced data security lessens privacy risks and boosts public confidence in AI-driven decision-making. In mitigating ethical dilemmas in AI-augmented decision-making, proactive steps must be taken. Organisations could uphold ethics through fairness-aware algorithms, transparent accountability frameworks, XAI transparency, and strict data protection policies.

Strategic Implications for Leadership

Apart from the ethical issues, there is also a strategic requirement for applying AI in leadership decision-making to achieve corporate objectives. Since AI can effectively enable hybrid decision-making models, combining human intuition and contextual awareness with computational capabilities, Judkins et al. (2024) emphasise that AI should be considered as augmenting human decision-making rather than replacing it. For example, AI-supported financial forecasting enables managers to make data-driven investment decisions considering qualitative factors such as market sentiment and geopolitical risks (Bader & Kaiser, 2019). Moreover, complete reliance on AI generates operational hazards. According to Keding and Meissner (2021), managers who believe in AI recommendations might lose sight of vital contextual elements and end up with suboptimal solutions. A famous example is the Boeing 737 MAX crisis, where

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

overreliance on automated systems, with insufficient human checks, led to tragic failures. Rigorous testing and planning for contingencies, including balanced reliance on AI versus human expertise, would be crucial in mitigating such risks.

Additionally, strategic alignment with the organisational culture and values is crucial in integrating AI systems. Bankins et al. (2024) note that most AI adoption initiatives have been resisted because they were perceived to run counter to the existing workflow and employee roles. For example, in the retail sector, firms that implemented AI workforce scheduling encountered opposition from employees who felt threatened by the loss of jobs (Shrestha et al., 2019; Jarrahi, 2018). Stakeholder engagement through transparent communication and inclusive decision-making helps build an enabling culture of collaboration in AI use. AI literacy is another factor impacting strategic AI adoption. According to Prikshat et al. (2023), awareness gaps among leaders and employees at all levels deter AI implementation by underutilisation or misuse. AI literacy development programs, training through hands-on experience, and cross-functional sharing enhance organisational preparedness for this technology integration (Wisdom, 2024; Parry et al., 2016). A typical example is Google's training on AI, where the employees gain AI competencies to ensure maximum utilisation of the benefits of the technology (Smeets et al., 2021). Developing AI proficiency throughout all organisational levels enhances its adaptive capacity and innovation. AI adoption should thus be strategically managed at the leadership level in organisations. Developing hybrid decision-making models, strategies for mitigating risks, cultural alignment, and AI literacy initiatives will be essential to harnessing maximum potential while keeping human oversight and strategic coherence alive. Ethical and strategic challenges thrown up by AI-augmented decision-making must be approached from many angles. Key challenges and solutions are summarised in the table below:

Table 3: Ethical and Strategic Challenges and Solutions

Category	Challenges	Proposed Solutions
Ethical	Bias and discrimination in AI outputs	Diverse data collection, algorithm audits, fairness-aware algorithms
	Accountability for adverse AI-driven decisions	Clear governance structures, human oversight mechanisms
	Lack of transparency in AI decision-making	XAI frameworks, user-centric design
	Privacy concerns due to sensitive data usage	Data anonymisation, robust security protocols
Strategic	Over-reliance on AI undermining human judgment	Hybrid decision-making models
	Risks of operational failures and unintended consequences	Rigorous testing, contingency planning
	Misalignment of AI systems with organisational goals	Stakeholder engagement, alignment with strategic priorities
	Knowledge gaps and resistance to AI adoption	AI literacy programs, hands-on training

Bias, accountability, transparency, and privacy are some ethical issues that require mechanisms of proactive governance. In contrast, strategic issues must be carefully aligned with the organisational culture, mitigation strategies, and capacity-building efforts. Done ethically and strategically, AI would help transform the leadership of an organisation by furiously promoting data-driven decision-making yet maintaining human judgment and ethical integrity.

Enhancing Human-AI Collaboration

Human-AI collaboration has become critical in augmented decision-making within organisational leadership. While AI systems bring computational efficiency, pattern recognition, and data-driven insights, human leaders contribute ethical reasoning, intuition, and contextual understanding. According to Judkins

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

et al. (2024), effective collaboration between AI and human leaders results in superior decision outcomes because the strengths of both entities are utilised. However, organisations must develop structured approaches to human-AI collaboration to maximise AI's benefits while mitigating limitations.

Hybrid Decision-Making Models

Hybrid decision-making models manage to integrate human judgment and AI-driven insights for better value from decisions. These models leverage the analytical capabilities of AI while retaining human oversight to ensure ethical and strategic considerations remain central. Asiabar et al. (2024) highlight that hybrid models have been increasingly adopted in strategic management to optimise efficiency and assurances of accuracy in decision-making. With these models, the clarity of the roles ensures that AI deals with data-intensive tasks while human leaders will be working out the strategic way forward and ethical oversight (Jarrahi, 2018). Indeed, the application of hybrid decision-making occurs in financial investment firms where the responsibility of predicting market trends by AI-driven models exists. Yet, human analysts are responsible for making the final decisions based on their industry knowledge and assessing risk. More and more, integrating AI and human expertise in making investment decisions raises accuracy and reduces the exposition to risk (Steyvers & Kumar, 2024; Smeets et al., 2021).

Again, hybrid models are very instrumental in dynamic feedback loops, through which an AI system can get continuous updates by the input given by humans for improving recommendations regarding specific issues or facts, which, in turn, becomes very beneficial in situations where continuous learning and updating are necessary (Pathirannehelage et al., 2024). For instance, in healthcare, clinicians approve AI-generated diagnoses with clinical acumen to ensure precision and relevant context (Pumplun et al., 2021). Also, in the case of R&D investment, managers use AI-driven insights to evaluate which investments offer potential, but final decisions consider factors such as market dynamics and company values (Keding & Meissner, 2021). Such iterative processes help make AI learn the evolving needs of an organisation. Notwithstanding their advantages, Hybrid models have considerable drawbacks, such as an over-reliance on Artificial Intelligence. Keding and Meissner (2021) believed that managers place too much weight on AI-driven insights at the expense of humans' judgment coupled with critical thought. In tune with this observation, organisations must pursue policies establishing human responsibility at the level of final decision-making (Shrestha et al., 2019). The hybrid decision-making model is one structured approach whereby AI's computational power is mixed with human intuition to guarantee an overall holistic approach to organisational leadership.

Training and Development

Training and development programs are essential in building the required competencies of organisational leaders to work effectively with AI. According to Bankins et al. (2024), leaders need to understand how AI works, its limitations, and the issues it raises concerning ethics to make informed decisions about the technology. Without such training, leaders may overuse or underutilise AI, compromising the best decisional outcomes. Some aspects of training the AI involve the use of simulation. The interaction applied by a leader with artificial intelligence happens under controlled conditions whereby the character and confidence developed become applicable upon being presented later to the very same situations under practical conditions in life. Interactive simulation activities have been said to let the leader practice artificial intelligence suggestions with a complete understanding of consequences and implications during usage in various settings in realistic conditions (Rodgers et al., 2023). For example, the medical fraternity uses AI-aided diagnosis in training simulations where they need to verify AI suggestions with their knowledge and clinical judgments (Pumplun et al., 2021). This approach brings better results in decision output and improves patients' outcomes by increasing accuracy, as noted.

Moreover, third-party training programs also point out customised designs for different organisational roles. Meissner and Keding (2021) suggest that strategic managers, data analysts, and operation teams all require different design modules of artificial intelligence training which will relate them to their current job functions. Therefore, it is also imperative to provide regular education because AI technologies are changing very fast. According to Wisdom (2024) and Wang et al. (2019), such ongoing professional development

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

programs keep leaders up to date with continuous developments in new AI capabilities and best practices of the application-a guarantee long-term competence in AI-augmented decision-making. Ethical training is then another critical thing. Bader and Kaiser (2019) highlight that AI applications can mirror unfairness in training datasets and require human second-guessing to discover or reduce these potential biases. For instance, AI-powered hiring tools need to be vetted so they do not perpetuate algorithmic discrimination in hiring. Rigorous training and development programs would better position leaders to work effectively with AI in a way that improves organisational decision-making without compromising ethical judgment.

Feedback Mechanisms

Feedback mechanisms are essential in fine-tuning the performance of AI systems toward organisational goals. According to Pathirannehelage et al. (2024), a continuous feedback loop allows AI models to learn from human input and adjust to contextual decision-making. For recommendations through AI to remain relevant and reliable, organisations will need to establish structured feedback mechanisms. Among the most crucial design principles of effective feedback mechanisms is a user-friendly interface that allows for seamless feedback collection. Samuel et al. (2022) highlight that interfaces providing feedback solicitations embedded within workflows encourage active users to be engaged. In practice, for instance, many customer service AI-driven chatbots also have embedded, real-time options to let users provide feedback on how well the AI responded to expectations; thus, iterative improvements can be made.

Moreover, the other crucial role of feedback mechanisms is the introduction of real-time adjustments. Hoffman et al. (2018) indicate that an immediate feedback-embedded AI system enhances responsiveness to the correctness of the decisions made. For instance, AI-powered recommendation engines adjust product recommendations on e-commerce sites according to the interaction produced by a user to enhance personalisation continually. Similarly, in an organisational setting, AI-powered project management tools improve task prioritisation algorithms due to team feedback to achieve workflow efficiency. The mechanisms for feedback also bring forward challenges. Wang et al. (2019) note that there are biases in users that distort quality feedback; hence, methods of validation have to filter out the unreliable input. For instance, AI-powered performance evaluation systems within HR departments will receive subjective feedback from interpersonal biases and not objective employee performance assessments. Therefore, statistical methods and sentiment analysis should be employed by an organisation to identify biased patterns of feedback.

Similarly, feedback mechanisms also build trust in AI systems. Glikson and Woolley (2020) argue that more transparent AI adaptation based on user feedback enhances credibility and adoption rates. Workers who have witnessed the improvement of AI systems through their input will likely trust them and use them more frequently. Well-structured feedback mechanisms assist in the adaptability of AI so that its recommendations will align with the goals of organisations and the expectations created among users. See Table 4 below.

Table 4: Strategies for Enhancing Human-AI Collaboration

Strategy	Description	Benefits	Challenges
Hybrid Decision-Making Models	Frameworks that combine human intuition and AI-driven insights for optimal decision-making.	Balances cognitive biases and computational precision.	Hybrid Decision-Making Models
Improves decision accuracy in complex scenarios.	Requires clear role delineation.		Improves decision accuracy in complex scenarios.
Feedback Mechanisms	Processes for collecting and integrating user insights to refine AI systems and align them with organisational goals.	Improves AI adaptability and usability.	Feedback Mechanisms

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

Human-AI collaboration is now a new turn in organisational decision-making paradigms, which helps leaders negotiate complicated challenges with high precision and speed. Hybrid models embed AI analytics with human judgment on strategic oversight. Training and development programs invest the required competencies of AI in leaders to make informed and ethically responsible decisions. This factor is further used as feedback to fine-tune the AI systems to help build adaptability and trust. As suggested by Dzindolet et al. (2003), organisations that successfully implement these strategies have better accuracy of decisions, fewer errors, and greater acceptance of AI-powered insights. AI can pay off when the organisation develops effective, structured collaboration between AI and human leaders, ensuring appropriate human oversight over ethical, strategic, and effective decision-making in dynamic business environments.

Future Research Directions

AI-augmented decision-making in organisational leadership is one such fast-moving area that holds promises and challenges at the same time. Future studies should address certain lacunas in knowledge about collaboration between human and AI elements and devise means of optimising interactions between humans and AI. Firstly, explainability remains the touchstone to imbibe greater faith in the system among most decision-makers, who avoid acting upon suggestions provided by the AI without clear explanations regarding their logic and rationale. While progress has been made, significant challenges remain in designing AI systems that can provide actionable and interpretable insights for non-technical users. Current XAI techniques also often prioritise technical stakeholders, leaving organisational leaders who may not have technical expertise struggling to interpret algorithmic recommendations (Wang et al., 2019; Hoffman et al., 2018). Further research should be done on frameworks targeted for decision-makers, integrating visualisations and narratives into complex insights about data. XAI inherently involves a significant trade-off between the interpretability and predictive performance of the system (Hoffman et al., 2018). Besides, the personalisation of XAI approaches could further tailor explanations based on each user's specific cognitive style or expertise level (Herath Pathirannehelage et al., 2024). A senior executive may need only to know why an AI gave a particular recommendation. Still, a technical analyst may delve deeper into detail about the specifics of the algorithms.

Secondly, ethics have become increasingly crucial with the rise of AI in decision-making roles. Further research is needed to develop robust frameworks that can help address ethical challenges arising from the deployment of AI in organisational leadership. Algorithms often act out biases in training data, leading to unforeseen and inequitable outcomes (Rodgers et al., 2023). Research is expected to investigate or discuss how detection and measurement could be used to reduce algorithmic bias, particularly in recruitment, resource distribution, and promotion. A severe issue is determining responsibility for AI-driven decisions (Parry et al., 2016). Research could be done to establish clear lines of responsibility, especially in situations where AI errors lead to adverse outcomes. Such will be required for ethical accountability frameworks that essentially help maintain organisational integrity (Shrestha et al., 2019). To ensure sustained adoption, long-term studies regarding AI-driven decisions' impacts on employee morale, organisational culture, and stakeholder trust are needed.

Third, hybrid models of human intuition combined with AI insights epitomise the future of decision-making. Future research should address how to maximise this form of cooperation for the best results. There is a need to derive the most appropriate mix between human and artificial intelligence in making decisions. Steyvers & Kumar (2024) note that there is a need to establish what activities require human competencies, like ethical considerations or creative problems, and activities that are best done by AI, such as data processing. Thereafter, technological development capable of allowing human AI to cooperate, especially in real-time, in dynamic situations will enrich decision-making. Crisis management leaders could also use AI to run fast simulations of several "what-if" scenarios before deciding on the best action. Samuel et al. (2022) identify that integrating active human-user input into an AI system contributes to better system outputs that align with organisational goals.

Furthermore, the nature of the leader's interaction with the AI system is determined by cognitive processes. Better acquaintance with these will help in optimising AI-augmented decision-making. Cognitive biases, including algorithm aversion and automation bias, work against the most effective use of the AI system

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

(Dietvorst et al., 2015; Skitka et al., 1999). For instance, there is a dire need for intervention studies to reduce such biases, including training programs on AI's limitations and strengths. Most leaders must make quick decisions in high-pressure conditions where little time can be taken to deliberate. With this, future studies should now investigate exactly how stress and time pressure may influence the enjoyment of leaders when acting upon recommendations given by AIs and how effective decision-making can be supported under aversive states (Logg et al., 2019). Trust in AI systems should be calibrated so that it is not underutilised or overutilised (Glikson & Woolley, 2020; Dzindolet et al., 2003). Therefore, research needs to be directed toward how trust has evolved and can be optimised at appropriate levels for balancing human and AI inputs.

Additionally, training and adoption form another layer in the strategy with leaders who can use AI effectively. An ideal training framework should help provide insights into how to derive meaning from a given AI-based output, limit its applicability, and create a workflow for decision-making (Bankins et al., 2024). Simulators can help him practice staging real-world problems in a closely controlled environment that is conducive, non-threatening, and free to make mistakes when learning. Implementing gamification techniques may make such workouts more interesting, interactive, and effective. Organisational hurdles, such as resistance to change, lack of technical literacy, and inadequate resources, always tend to impede the adoption of AI (Samuel et al., 2022). These are areas where research should identify such barriers and develop appropriate interventions.

Similarly, different industries also have specific demands concerning AI-based decision-making, and thus, research should be conducted sector by sector. AI has much potential in diagnosing, planning treatment pathways, and managing resources in the healthcare sector, which opens many critical ethical and technical challenges that must be overcome with specially designed frameworks (Pumplun et al. 2021). Also, the finance sector may become more transparent and fair in lending and fraud detection with an AI system (Rodgers et al., 2023). Future research needs to consider how the risks of algorithmic bias may be mitigated while reaping the benefits of automation. High-stakes areas where operations are crucial, including defence, need AI systems that strike the right balance of speed, accuracy, and accountability (Johnson, 2023). Future research has to delve into how to create systems that can support human decision-makers during critical situations.

Lastly, the long-term implications of integrating AI in leadership will require sustained attention. Since AI reconfigures organisational hierarchies, team dynamics, and leadership structures, research on its adoption must be done (Shrestha et al., 2019). For example, will AI further support an organisation's hierarchical structure, or would it be the reason for flattering organisations when decision-making is taken away from central leadership? The uncurbed use of AI would affect the culture of organisations in terms of trust, openness, and creativity (Schildt, 2017). Further research is needed to understand how AI can align with any organisation's values to ensure a singular culture. Organisations must be pliable and ever-changing as aspiring capabilities expand with AI development (Steyvers & Kumar, 2024). Success over this long term would need to depend on research into resilience-enhancing strategies like iterative system design and continuous learning.

Conclusion

The promise of AI underlines a judicious balancing of human judgment and machine-learning algorithms. Compared to human intellect, the powers of AI go way beyond, making AI a game-changer in organisational decision-making. ML algorithms can analyse vast amounts of data, build patterns within those datasets, and deliver to leadership some very valid insight that, once leveraged, can offer a well-rounded, informed outcome more rapidly than by any previous means (Silver et al., 2016; Sturm et al., 2023). Realistically, AI's real strength is its ability to support human judgment. AI systems integrated thoughtfully and strategically into leadership processes can improve organisational efficiency, innovation, and adaptability (Jarrahi, 2018; Shrestha et al., 2019). Despite its efficacies, AI-augmented decision-making is facing various challenges. Generally speaking, trust is crucial for adopting and using AI systems, as was pointed out by Dzindolet et al. (2003) and Glikson & Woolley (2020). Leaders have to believe in the results emerging from AI but also be aware of the system's limitations.

Moreover, leaders can also show algorithm aversion when either an error has been witnessed, or a lack of transparency has occurred. On the other hand, automation bias leads to over-reliance on AI at the expense of critical human judgment (Dietvorst et al., 2015; Skitka et al., 1999). AI systems create ethical issues regarding fairness, accountability, and bias in decision-making. Organisations should ensure AI is used nondiscriminately and responsibly (Rodgers et al., 2023). Hybrid decision-making models combine the powers of AI with human judgment. Whereas AI excels in data processing and evidence-based recommendations, human leaders bring context-specific insights, ethical reasoning, and intuition (Kahneman & Klein, 2009; Steyvers & Kumar, 2024). It is here that leaders should look toward strategic frameworks incorporating AI into decision-making processes, training, and development, thereby equipping decision-makers with the skills to interface effectively with the AI systems. This approach will nurture confidence and reduce resistance to the adoption of XAI frameworks which would, in turn, would help engender trust in ensuring the decision-makers understand how AI systems arrive at their recommendations (Bankins et al., 2024; Wang et al., 2019; Hoffman et al., 2018). In this respect, Rodgers et al. (2023) and Parry et al. (2016) emphasise that XAI should typically develop ethical guidelines for realising potential risks to which AI systems may cause sensitivities among organisational values and society.

The bottom line is that AI-augmented decision-making enhances leadership effectiveness through increased insight from data. However, critical challenges such as ethical considerations, cognitive biases, and algorithmic transparency remain of concern. Various studies have identified that refining continuous AI models is necessary for better explainability and building trust in the models. For instance, intuitive AI interfaces can facilitate better adoption and reduce algorithm aversion. Future developments should include ethical AI models, methods of mitigating cognitive bias, and user-centered design principles in AI. These will ensure that AI is deployed responsibly and with a focus on leadership decision-making.

References

Ahdadou, M., Aajly, A., & Tahrouch, M. (2024). Unlocking the Potential of Augmented Intelligence: A Discussion on Its Role in Boardroom Decision-Making. International Journal of Disclosure and Governance, 21(3), 433–446.

Al-Zahrani, A.M. (2024). Balancing Act: Exploring the Interplay Between Human Judgment and Artificial Intelligence in Problem-solving, Creativity, and Decision-making. Igmin Research, [online] 2(3), pp.145–158.

Asiabar, M. G., Asiabar, M. G. and Asiabar, A. G. (2024). Artificial Intelligence in Strategic Management: Examining Novel AI Applications in Organizational Strategic Decision-Making.

Bader, V., & Kaiser, S. (2019). Algorithmic Decision-Making? The User Interface and Its Role for Human Involvement in Decisions Supported by Artificial Intelligence. Organisation, 26(5), 655–672.

Bankins, S., Ocampo, A. C., Marrone, M., Restubog, S. L. D., & Woo, S. E. (2024). A Multilevel Review of Artificial Intelligence in Organizations: Implications for Organisational Behaviour Research and Practice. Journal of Organizational Behavior, 45(2), 159–182.

Burton, J. W., Stein, M. K., & Jensen, T. B. (2020). A Systematic Review of Algorithm Aversion in Augmented Decision Making. Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, 33(2), 220–239.

Dietvorst, B. J., Simmons, J. P., & Massey, C. (2015). Algorithm Aversion: People Erroneously Avoid Algorithms After Seeing Them Err. Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 144(1), 114.

Dzindolet, M. T., Peterson, S. A., Pomranky, R. A., Pierce, L. G., & Beck, H. P. (2003). The Role of Trust in Automation Reliance. International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 58(6), 697–718.

Glikson, E., & Woolley, A. W. (2020). Human Trust in Artificial Intelligence: Review of Empirical Research. Academy of Management Annals, 14(2), 627–660.

Hoffman, R. R., Mueller, S. T., Klein, G., & Litman, J. (2018). Metrics for Explainable AI: Challenges and Prospects. arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.04608.

Jarrahi, M. H. (2018). Artificial Intelligence and The Future of Work: Human-AI Symbiosis in Organizational Decision Making. Business Horizons, 61(4), 577–586.

Johnson, J. (2023). Automating the OODA Loop in the Age of Intelligent Machines: Reaffirming the Role of Humans in Command-and-Control Decision-Making in the Digital Age. Defence Studies, 23(1), 43–67.

Judkins, J.T., Hwang, Y. and Kim, S. (2024). Human-AI Interaction: Augmenting Decision-Making for IT Leader's Project Selection. Information Development.

Kahneman, D., & Klein, G. (2009). Conditions for Intuitive Expertise: A Failure to Disagree. American Psychologist, 64(6), 515.

Kase, S. E., Hung, C. P., Krayzman, T., Hare, J. Z., Rinderspacher, B. C., & Su, S. M. (2022). The Future of Collaborative Human-Artificial Intelligence Decision-Making for Mission Planning. Frontiers in Psychology, 13, 850628.

Journal of Ecohumanism
2025
Volume: 4, No: 1, pp. 4683 – 4699
ISSN: 2752-6798 (Print) | ISSN 2752-6801 (Online)
https://ecohumanism.co.uk/joe/ecohumanism
DOI: https://doi.org/10.62754/joe.v4i1.6364

Keding, C., & Meissner, P. (2021). Managerial Overreliance On AI-Augmented Decision-Making Processes: How AI-Based Advisory Systems Shapes Choice Behavior in R&D Investment Decisions. Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 171, 120970.

Logg, J. M., Minson, J. A., & Moore, D. A. (2019). Algorithm Appreciation: People Prefer Algorithmic to Human Judgment. Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 151, 90–103.

Meissner, P., & Keding, C. (2021). The Human Factor in AI-Based Decision-Making. MIT Sloan Management Review, 63(1), 1–5.

Parry, K., Cohen, M., & Bhattacharya, S. (2016). Rise of The Machines: A Critical Consideration of Automated Leadership Decision Making in Organizations. Group & Organization Management, 41(5), 571–594.

Pathirannehelage, S.H., Shrestha, Y.R. and Krogh, G. von (2024). Design Principles for Artificial Intelligence-Augmented Decision Making: An Action Design Research Study. European Journal of Information Systems, pp.1–23.

Prahl, A., & Van Swol, L. (2017). Understanding Algorithm Aversion: When Is Advice from Automation Discounted? Journal of Forecasting, 36(6), 691–702.

Prikshat, V., Malik, A., & Budhwar, P. (2023). AI-Augmented HRM: Antecedents, Assimilation and Multilevel Consequences. Human Resource Management Review, 33(1), 100860.

Pumplun, L., Fecho, M., Wahl, N., Peters, F., & Buxmann, P. (2021). Adoption of Machine Learning Systems for Medical Diagnostics in Clinics: Qualitative Interview Study. Journal of Medical Internet Research, 23(10), e29301.

Rodgers, W., Murray, J. M., Stefanidis, A., Degbey, W. Y., & Tarba, S. Y. (2023). An Artificial Intelligence Algorithmic Approach to Ethical Decision-Making in Human Resource Management Processes. Human Resource Management Review, 33(1), 100925.

Samuel, J., Kashyap, R., Samuel, Y., & Pelaez, A. (2022). Adaptive Cognitive Fit: Artificial Intelligence-Augmented Management of Information Facets and Representations. International Journal of Information Management, 65, 102505.

Schildt, H. (2017). Big Data and Organizational Design: The Brave New World of Algorithmic Management and Computer-Augmented Transparency. Innovation, 19(1), 23–30.

Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & Von Krogh, G. (2019). Organisational Decision-Making Structures in the Age of Artificial Intelligence. California Management Review, 61(4), 66–83.

Silver, D., Huang, A., Maddison, C.J., Guez, A., Sifre, L., van den Driessche, G., Schrittwieser, J., Antonoglou, I., Panneershelvam, V., Lanctot, M., Dieleman, S., Grewe, D., Nham, J., Kalchbrenner, N., Sutskever, I., Lillicrap, T., Leach, M., Kavukcuoglu, K., Graepel, T. and Hassabis, D. (2016). Mastering the Game of Go with Deep Neural Networks and Tree Search. Nature, 529(7587), 484–489.

Skitka, L. J., Mosier, K. L., & Burdick, M. (1999). Does Automation Bias Decision-Making? International Journal of Human-Computer Studies, 51(5), 991–1006.

Smeets, M.R., Roetzel, P.G. and Ostendorf, R.J. (2021). AI and its Opportunities for Decision-Making in Organisations: A Systematic Review of the Influencing Factors on the Intention to use AI. Die Unternehmung, [online] 75(3), pp.432–460. Available at: https://www.jstor.org/stable/27284462.

Steyvers, M., & Kumar, A. (2024). Three Challenges for AI-Assisted Decision-Making. Perspectives on Psychological Science, 19(5), 722–734.

Sturm, T., Pumplun, L., Gerlach, J. P., Kowalczyk, M., & Buxmann, P. (2023). Machine Learning Advice in Managerial Decision-Making: The Overlooked Role of Decision Makers' Advice Utilisation. The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 32(4), 101790.

Tetlock, P. E., & Gardner, D. (2016). Superforecasting: The Art and Science of Prediction. Random House.

Wang, D., Yang, Q., Abdul, A., & Lim, B. Y. (2019, May). Designing Theory-Driven User-Centric Explainable AI. In Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (pp. 1–15).

Wisdom, I. (2024). AI-Augmented Leadership: Enhancing Human Decision-Making. [online] 06(12), pp.582–585.