The Impact of AI in Reducing Biases in Managerial Decision-Making: Towards Organizational Agility and Evidence-Based Leadership

Zakaria Elhabti[1,*], Said Assal[2]

[1]Kenitra National School of Business and Management, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco

[2]Research Laboratory in Organizational Management Science, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco

*Corresponding author's email: zakaria.elhabti@uit.ac.ma

Abstract

Cognitive biases, such as confirmation bias, anchoring and overconfidence, represent major challenges for managerial decision-making by impairing rational judgment and leading to suboptimal organizational outcomes. Artificial intelligence (AI) systems are emerging as a transformative tool for mitigating these biases through objective, transparent, data-driven analysis. Leveraging machine learning, predictive analytics and explainable artificial intelligence (XAI), Decision-making can be improvise by these systems reducing reliance on heuristics and offering transparent alternatives that promote evidence-based leadership. Empirical studies demonstrate the effectiveness of AI in a variety of areas, including recruitment, strategic forecasting and supply chain management, where it corrects bias and improves efficiency. Despite this potential, challenges remain, such as algorithmic bias and ethical dilemmas relating to accountability. AI adoption could be this successful as it requires ethical frameworks, hybrid decision models and organizational readiness, including robust data governance and AI literacy. This article synthesizes existing literature to assess the role of AI in reducing managerial bias, its practical applications and implications for promoting an evidence-based leadership culture in dynamic business environments.

Keywords

Organizational Agility, Artificial Intelligence, Managerial Decision-Making, Evidence-based Leadership, Explainable AI, Decision Intelligence, Organizational Culture

1. Introduction

Cognitive biases including confirmation bias, anchoring and overconfidence distort managerial decisions and often lead to inefficiencies. Kahneman have shed major light on the impact of these biases by showing how judgments based on heuristics can impede rational evaluations [1]. These cognitive distortions are particularly harmful in complex, dynamic and data-rich environments, where human limitations in information processing exacerbate decision-making errors.

Organizational agility becomes a strategic tool for reducing the impact of these biases in this situation. The ability to quickly identify weak signals, continuously adjust to changes in the external environment that promote collaborative, learning-centered, iterative decision-making processes are, characteristics of an agile business. As without a proper collaboration, the agility may become poor if it does not adapt much of the flexibility. By introducing mechanisms like quick experimentation, decentralized decision-making, and continuous feedback, agility lessens the influence of cognitive biases on strategy and execution and enables the questioning of presumptions. Agile businesses are better able to handle uncertainty, steer clear of the traps of biased judgments, and promote more informed decision-making based on current, shared data by fostering a culture of flexibility, constructive questioning, and continuous development.

Thus, the combination of a heightened awareness of cognitive biases and the implementation of agile principles represents an effective way to improvise the quality of managerial decisions, particularly in the context of innovative public projects faced with unstable environments and high demands for responsiveness.

2. A Synthesis of the Literature: AI in Reducing Managerial Decision Bias and Organizational Agility

2.1 AI in Reducing Managerial Decision-Making Bias

The integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into managerial decision-making has become an increasingly important area of research, due to its potential to overcome cognitive biases that impair human judgment. Cognitive biases such as confirmation bias, overconfidence and anchoring distort managerial decisions, often leading to unexpected outcome or the results that does not want to been seen. These biases stem from the use of heuristics and limited cognitive abilities to process complex and dynamic information. The rising complexity of modern decision environments—characterized by rapid technological advancement, globalization, and data saturation—has only intensified the urgency of developing methods that surpass human limitations. This reality makes AI not just a useful tool but a critical strategic partner in modern management science.

AI's ability to process large datasets, identify patterns and provide objective analysis makes it an effective tool for mitigating these biases. Dietvorst explored how algorithmic decisions often outperform human judgment in various domains, despite the phenomenon of "algorithm aversion," where managers are reluctant to rely on AI after observing errors [2]. However, this aversion is diminishing with the adoption of explainable AI (XAI), which offers transparency in the decision-making process [3]. By justifying their results, XAI tools boost user confidence and encourage the adoption of evidence-based practices whereby they become more firm when comes to any decision making. Moreover, as organizations gain more experience in integrating AI into core workflows, familiarity breeds trust. Explainable AI not only clarifies "how" a decision was reached but also enables decision-makers to evaluate the logic, test alternative assumptions, and trace potential weaknesses in model reasoning. This transparency transforms AI from a "black box" into a collaborative advisor.

Empirical studies demonstrate the effectiveness of AI in reducing bias. Binns showed that AI systems deployed in recruitment reduced bias by objectively analyzing candidates' skills, avoiding subjective assessments influenced by gender or ethnicity [4]. Similarly, Agrawal highlighted how AI-based predictive analytics improved strategic decisions by neutralizing overconfidence and anchoring bias in forecasts. These systems enable managers to simulate multiple scenarios and propose alternatives that challenge existing assumptions. That which they don't have to think much for some circumstances to handle some of the scenarios. These examples underscore the importance of aligning AI models with managerial contexts. The value of AI is amplified when its recommendations are not only accurate but also actionable—providing managers with justifications, scenario options, and decision boundaries that complement human judgment rather than override it [5].

The literature also identifies specific applications of AI to mitigate bias. Shrestha reviewed AI-powered intelligent decision platforms integrating predictive and prescriptive analytics, enabling data-driven strategic planning. These platforms prove particularly effective in volatile environments where human biases often lead to reactive or inconsistent decisions. In supply chain management, Wang illustrated how AI systems provided unbiased recommendations for inventory optimization, countering the availability heuristic that leads managers to overestimate demand for frequently used items. Additionally, such platforms can be continuously updated with new data streams, enabling real-time adaptation to volatile conditions. This dynamic responsiveness gives managers the confidence to act decisively even amid uncertainty, knowing that AI insights are current, data-backed, and context-sensitive [6].

However, challenges remain in fully exploiting AI for bias reduction. One key issue is algorithmic bias, where AI systems unintentionally reinforce biases present in training data. For example, systems trained on historically biased datasets are likely to perpetuate systemic discrimination unless carefully monitored. Studies such as Mitchell highlight the importance of combining human supervision with AI ethical frameworks to remedy this problem. Algorithmic bias often stems from historical or structural inequalities embedded in data. For instance, training an AI system on past hiring data takes more time but that reflects discriminatory practices will likely replicate those biases. Hence, active auditing, data cleaning, and inclusion of fairness criteria in model design are essential steps toward ethical AI deployment [7].

Ethical considerations also play a central role in the debate. Binns has argued that, although AI reduces bias, the lack of accountability for AI-influenced decisions poses ethical dilemmas. Responsibility for AI-guided decisions remains ambiguous, particularly in sensitive contexts such as healthcare or finance. As a solution, researchers advocate hybrid decision-making models, where AI supports but does not replace human judgment as human's perspective keep on improvise time by time then only will transfer it to AI. Furthermore, the distributed nature of AI development—often involving multiple stakeholders such as developers, data scientists, and managers—makes it difficult to pinpoint responsibility. This fragmentation necessitates governance frameworks that define accountability roles and decision audit trails, particularly in high-stakes industries.

The adoption of AI for evidence-based leadership highlights broader implications for organizational culture. Agrawal proposed that AI fosters a culture of data-driven decision-making, where evidence supplants intuition. This cultural shift, while beneficial, requires significant investment in employee training and change management to overcome resistance to AI adoption. As Dietvorst observed, human skepticism towards AI often stems from a lack of understanding or fear of obsolescence, underscoring the need for transparent communication about AI's role in enhancing, not replacing, managerial capabilities. Creating a data-driven culture requires more than technology—it requires mindset shifts. Managers must learn to accept AI-generated contradictions to their own judgments, while organizations must reward evidence-based action over instinct or seniority. This culture shift is gradual but pivotal to realizing AI's full benefits.

Thus, the literature establishes AI as a transformative tool for reducing cognitive biases in managerial decision-making. Although challenges such as algorithmic bias, ethical concerns and organizational resistance remain, advances in XAI and hybrid decision-making models offer promising prospects for promoting evidence-based leadership. Further research is needed to explore the long-term impact of AI integration on decision-making processes and organizational outcomes, particularly in dynamic and culturally diverse environments.

2.2 Organizational Agility

Organizational agility, a concept originally derived from the industrial sector and agile software development methods, has gradually been extended to all organizational structures faced with a turbulent environment. It refers to an

organization's ability to rapidly perceive changes in its external environment, react effectively to them, and adapt its resources, processes and structures to maintain its performance and strategic relevance. This agility is not only about speed, but also about sensing and anticipating disruptions before they fully unfold. In this sense, agility requires an organization to be not only reactive but also proactively attuned to weak signals that indicate potential changes in market, customer behavior, or technology trends. In fast-paced environments, these signals can offer vital windows of opportunity or serve as early warnings of potential risk, depending on how they are interpreted and acted upon [8].

Several researchers have identified key dimensions of organizational agility, such as sensing, responding, strategic flexibility and continuous organizational learning. These dimensions are fostered by adaptive leadership, decentralized structures, a culture of innovation, and flexible information systems enabling rapid data flow [9]. An agile organization also depends on decision-making processes that are decentralized and transparent, allowing knowledge and authority to flow to where they are most needed. Rather than relying solely on top-down direction, agile organizations empower employees at multiple levels to take initiative, experiment, and share learning across boundaries. This empowerment not only shortens response times but also builds a resilient organizational memory that accumulates from ongoing trial-and-error experiences.

Empirically, organizational agility is positively correlated with performance, particularly in contexts of uncertainty and rapid change, as it enables proactive adaptation, strengthens resilience and stimulates innovation. Agility helps organizations to pivot strategically without losing coherence. During periods of crisis or market disruption, agile firms demonstrate the ability to reconfigure resources quickly and redeploy capabilities toward emerging needs. The agility-performance link is particularly strong in high-tech, service, and public sectors, where customer needs, regulatory pressures, and competitive conditions evolve rapidly. Moreover, agility acts as a buffer against the cognitive traps that often emerge under pressure, such as tunnel vision or overreliance on past success formulas. By promoting openness to change and shared sense-making, agility supports clearer thinking and more balanced decision processes.

In the public sector, it is increasingly seen as a strategic imperative, enabling administrations to respond more flexibly to societal expectations, regulatory constraints and crisis situations. Governmental and public institutions have historically been structured around stability and hierarchy, but the 21st century demands a new operating model, one that is iterative, citizen-centered, and digitally enabled. Agility in public administration entails rethinking traditional bureaucratic practices in favor of cross-functional collaboration, policy experimentation, and real-time feedback from stakeholders. Especially during emergencies such as pandemics or natural disasters, agile capabilities allow public organizations to reallocate resources, adopt digital tools, and communicate transparently. All of these contribute to strengthening public trust and institutional legitimacy.

Today, organizational agility is a key lever for any organization wishing to combine efficiency, responsiveness and sustainability in a world of perpetual transformation. In the era of digital disruption and heightened global uncertainty, agility is not merely a competitive advantage but a condition for survival. The interplay between technological systems, human capabilities, and organizational culture becomes central to agility. For example, digital platforms enable faster knowledge dissemination, while collaborative tools facilitate remote teamwork and rapid iteration. However, these tools must be accompanied by a mindset shift, one that supports learning from failure, accepts ambiguity, and continuously refines goals based on real-world evidence. Thus, agility is as much a cultural trait as it is an operational practice.

When linked with artificial intelligence and decision augmentation tools, agility further evolves into a learning ecosystem. In such a setting, data flows support insight generation, and insight drives action in near real-time. In this sense, AI can be seen as a natural extension of organizational agility, enhancing the organization's capacity to process environmental feedback and adjust its direction accordingly. The convergence of agile principles and AI capabilities marks the emergence of truly intelligent organizations, those capable of sensing, reasoning, and adapting through both human and machine intelligence working in tandem.

3. AI as a Tool for Reducing Bias

AI systems, through machine learning and predictive analytics, offer structured approaches to overcoming bias by providing objective, data-driven analyses. Dietvorst demonstrated that algorithms often outperform human judgment in a variety of contexts, but noted "algorithm aversion" as a major barrier. The adoption of Explainable AI (XAI), however, alleviates these concerns by offering transparency and justifications for the results produced by AI. XAI builds trust and encourages managers to rely on these systems for evidence-based decisions. The ability of XAI to clarify the rationale behind AI outputs plays a critical role in increasing user acceptance and reducing fear of technological ambiguity.

Empirical work on AI applications in management highlights specific applications of AI in managerial decision-making, as explained in the table below. These practical examples emphasize that AI is not a one-size-fits-all solution, but a flexible tool that can be tailored to specific business contexts and decision types. Each application reflects how targeted AI models can address particular cognitive challenges while improving decision efficiency and fairness.

In all of these areas, the objective nature of AI contributes to reducing the influence of personal judgment or emotion, allowing for more consistent decision-making. These outcomes are especially valuable in time-sensitive or high-volume environments where human attention is limited and prone to error. As the complexity of decisions increases, the role of AI in supporting clarity and focus becomes even more critical for strategic success.

3.1 AI Applications to Reduce Bias

Empirical work on AI applications in management highlights specific applications of AI in managerial decision-making, as explained in the table below.

Table 1 shows that AI contributions for each domain whereby the AI has their own usefulness.

Table 1. The AI Contributions for each Domain

Domain	AI Contribution
Recruitment and human resources management	AI systems reduce bias in recruitment by focusing on skills rather than subjective factors such as gender or ethnic origin.
Strategic forecasts	AI-based predictive analytics neutralize anchoring and overconfidence by presenting multiple data-driven scenarios.
Supply chain management	AI optimizes inventory decisions by counteracting availability heuristics, enabling unbiased demand forecasts.

4. Challenges in Using AI

Despite its potential, AI adoption faces challenges, not least algorithmic bias. Binns warned that systems trained on biased datasets risk perpetuating discrimination unless actively monitored. Mitchell highlighted the need for ethical frameworks and human oversight to address these risks. Algorithmic bias is often not obvious at the surface level, yet its consequences can be significant and far-reaching, especially when deployed at scale in sensitive decision-making environments.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) is transforming industries and enhancing decision-making processes, but it also faces significant challenges across technological, ethical, and societal dimensions. Addressing these challenges is crucial for maximizing AI's benefits while mitigating its risks. The success of AI integration depends not only on the sophistication of the technology itself, but also on the readiness of the organizations that implement it, including their internal governance and values.

One major challenge is ethical concerns, including privacy violations, algorithmic bias, and the social impact of AI decisions. For example, AI-powered surveillance systems raise privacy issues, while biased training data can lead to unfair outcomes in areas like hiring or criminal justice. Ensuring fairness and transparency in AI systems is essential to address these issues. This requires not only technical safeguards but also cross-functional collaboration between developers, ethicists, and domain experts to anticipate and correct potential harm.

Another critical issue is data privacy and security. AI systems rely on vast amounts of data, which increases the risk of breaches and misuse. Robust encryption, anonymization, and adherence to data protection regulations are necessary to maintain trust and safeguard sensitive information. Without proper controls in place, even the most advanced AI tools can become sources of vulnerability and legal exposure for organizations.

5. Ethical and Cultural Implications

AI's growing role in decision-making raises ethical concerns about accountability. Binns has questioned the responsibility of AI-influenced decisions, particularly in sensitive areas such as healthcare or finance. Hybrid decision-making models, combining AI analyses with human judgment, offer a balanced approach to addressing these concerns. These models recognize the value of AI-generated insights while maintaining human responsibility over final decisions, which is essential in high-impact contexts.

In addition, Agrawal pointed out that AI fosters a culture of evidence-based decision-making, but this requires significant organizational change and investment in training to overcome resistance. The integration of AI into existing decision structures often challenges long-held managerial habits, requiring both mindset transformation and procedural adjustment. Without adequate change management, even the most advanced AI systems may face skepticism or underutilization.

In recent years, attention to sustainability and corporate ethics has grown considerably. This highlights ethical codes as tools to promote ethical and honest actions and create greater employee motivation. Ethical codes help implement organizational control by enabling companies to represent both belief systems and boundary systems. In a business climate where transparency and integrity are increasingly expected by consumers and regulators alike, these codes also contribute to corporate legitimacy and public trust.

Despite the global importance of ethics, the drafting processes and content of codes of ethics differ considerably from country to country. This circumstance makes it interesting to analyze the influence of national culture on the quality of the code of ethics, a subject that has yet to be explored in the literature. Cultural values influence not only what organizations define as ethical, but also how such standards are communicated, enforced, and integrated into daily operations.

This study aims to fill this gap by analyzing the impact of Hofstede's dimensions, as an expression of national culture, on the quality of the code of ethics, from an organizational control perspective. Our analysis of 191 international

companies from 29 different countries and five continents shows that the quality of ethical codes is linked to five of Hofstede's six dimensions [10]. These findings offer valuable insight into how cultural context shapes ethical governance and highlight the need for culturally adaptive approaches when implementing global AI strategies. This study enriches the literature by broadening the scope of antecedents of code of ethics quality, which previously included only analyses of internal determinants.

6. Conclusion

The literature positions AI as a transformative tool for mitigating cognitive biases, enabling evidence-based leadership and improving decision-making processes. Although challenges such as algorithmic bias, ethical dilemmas and organizational resistance persist, advances in XAI and hybrid models offer promising solutions. These developments reflect the ongoing evolution of AI from a purely technical asset into a strategic partner in organizational design and governance.

Future research should explore the long-term impacts of AI integration on organizational outcomes, and examine its application in diverse cultural and industrial contexts. The dynamic interplay between AI capabilities and organizational adaptability deserves deeper investigation, particularly in environments where rapid decision-making is critical. Additionally, empirical case studies could provide more nuanced understanding of how different industries adopt AI for bias reduction and what contextual factors influence success or failure.

As organizations continue to navigate complexity and uncertainty, the ability to make fair, transparent and informed decisions becomes increasingly essential. By embracing AI not only as a tool but as part of a broader cultural and ethical shift, organizations can move toward more agile, inclusive and rational forms of leadership. This integration demands continuous learning, ethical foresight, and cross-disciplinary collaboration to ensure that AI systems serve human values while enhancing decision quality.

References

[1]   Kahneman, D., Lovallo, D., & Sibony, O. (2011). The big idea: Before you make that big decision. Harvard Business Review, 89(6), 50-60.
[2]   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), 114-126.
[3]   Shrestha, Y. R., Ben-Menahem, S. M., & von Krogh, G. (2019). Organizational decision-making structures in the age of artificial intelligence. California Management Review, 61(4), 66-83.
[4]   Binns, R. (2018). Fairness in machine learning: Lessons from political philosophy. Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency.
[5]   Agrawal, A., Gans, J., & Goldfarb, A. (2018). Prediction machines: The simple economics of artificial intelligence. Harvard Business Review Press.
[6]   Wang, G., Gunasekaran, A., Ngai, E. W. T., & Papadopoulos, T. (2020). Big data analytics in logistics and supply chain management: Certain investigations for research and applications. International Journal of Production Economics, 176, 98-110.
[7]   Mitchell, M., Wu, S., Zaldivar, A., Barnes, P., & Hutchinson, B. (2021). Model cards for model reporting. Proceedings of the Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency.
[8]   Wang, X., Lin, X., & Shao, B. (2022). How does artificial intelligence create business agility? Evidence from chatbots. International Journal of Information Management, 66, 102535. https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S026840122200069X
[9]   Woollacott, E. (2025). Organizations face ticking timebomb over AI governance. IT Pro. https://www.itpro.com/technology/artificial-intelligence/organizations-face-ticking-timebomb-over-ai-governance
[10] Hofstede, G. (2025). The 6 Dimensions Model of national culture by Geert Hofstede. Geert Hofstede. https://geerthofstede.com/culture-geert-hofstede-gert-jan-hofstede/6d-model-of-national-culture/