MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, Jan-June 2026, Pages: 402-411

Artificial Intelligence and Bounded Rationality in Managerial Decisions: Evidence from Smart Organizations in Digital Economies

Dr. R. C. Dharmik[1], Dr. Mosses A[2], Love Kumar Mittal[3], Dr.Keerrhipati Kumar[4], Dr Sowmya Gali[5], Dr. Sarabjot Singh[6]

[1]Assistant Professor, Information Technology, YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN COLLEGE OF ENGINEERING, Nagpur, Maharashtra, raj_dharmik@yahoo.com

[2]Professor, Electronics & Communication Eng, Saveetha School of Engineering,Saveetha Institute of Medical and Technical Science (SIMATS), Saveetha University, Kancheepuram, Chennai, Tamil Nadu, simatsmosses@gmail.com

[3]Associate Professor, Department of Computer Engineering and Applications, Mangalayatan University, Aligarh, Uttar Pradesh, 202146, love.mittal@mangalayatan.edu.in, https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0951-6196?lang=en

[4]Associate Professor, Department Of CSE(Data Science), Sri Venkateswara College of Engineering, Tirupati, Andhra Pradesh,kumar.k@svce.edu.in

[5]Associate Professor, Electronics and Communication Engineering, Santhiram Engineering College, Nandyal, Andhra Pradesh, sowmya1046@gmail.com

[6]Assistant Professor, Department of School of Business, Shri Mata Vaishno Devi University, Katra, Jammu, Jammu and Kashmir, singhsjot@gmail.com

Abstract

Artificial intelligence (AI) has emerged as a defining force in managerial decision-making within digital economies, fundamentally altering how organizations process information, evaluate strategic alternatives, and respond to environmental uncertainty. Drawing on Herbert Simon's theory of bounded rationality, this study examines how AI-enabled decision systems interact with managerial cognition, organizational structures, and digital infrastructures in smart organizations. The paper develops a comparative conceptual framework that integrates behavioral decision theory, management science, and digital governance to analyze how AI both alleviates traditional cognitive constraints and introduces new forms of bounded rationality. By synthesizing interdisciplinary literature, the study demonstrates that while AI enhances analytical capacity, reduces information asymmetry, and supports predictive foresight, it simultaneously generates challenges related to algorithmic opacity, automation bias, data dependency, and accountability displacement. The findings suggest that managerial rationality in digital economies is no longer purely human or machine-driven but emerges as a hybrid construct shaped by the interaction between AI capabilities, human judgment, organizational routines, and governance mechanisms. The paper contributes to management and digital strategy literature by articulating a structured model explaining when AI augments managerial rationality and when it creates new decision limitations in smart organizations.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence; Bounded Rationality; Managerial Decision-Making; Smart Organizations; Digital Economy; Algorithmic Governance; Decision Support Systems; Behavioral Management*

I. INTRODUCTION

Managerial decision-making has long been understood as a cognitively constrained process rather than a fully rational optimization exercise. The concept of bounded rationality, introduced to explain why decision-makers rely on heuristics, satisficing behavior, and simplified mental models, remains central to organizational theory. Managers operate under conditions of limited information, finite cognitive capacity, time pressure, and environmental uncertainty, all of which restrict their ability to evaluate all possible alternatives and outcomes. In traditional organizational contexts, these constraints were managed through routines, hierarchies, and experiential learning. However, the rise of digital economies has fundamentally transformed the nature, scale, and speed of decision environments.

Digital economies are characterized by data abundance, algorithmic mediation, platform-based competition, and continuous technological disruption. Smart organizations those that strategically integrate digital technologies, analytics, and adaptive capabilities increasingly depend on artificial intelligence to support managerial decisions across strategic, operational, and tactical levels. AI systems are deployed for demand forecasting, risk assessment, resource allocation, talent analytics, customer personalization, and strategic planning. These systems promise to overcome human cognitive limits by processing massive datasets, identifying complex patterns, and generating real-time insights. As a result, AI is often portrayed as a tool that eliminates or significantly reduces bounded rationality in managerial decision-making.

This narrative, however, is incomplete. While AI expands information-processing capacity, it does not eliminate decision constraints; instead, it reshapes them. AI systems operate within data limitations, model assumptions, algorithmic architectures, and organizational governance structures. Moreover, AI outputs are interpreted, accepted, modified, or ignored by human managers, whose cognitive biases, experience, and incentives continue to shape final decisions. Consequently, bounded rationality does not disappear in AI-enabled organizations but evolves into a hybrid form involving both human and algorithmic constraints.

The purpose of this paper is to examine how artificial intelligence transforms bounded rationality in managerial decision-making within smart organizations operating in digital economies. The study argues that AI functions simultaneously as a rationality enhancer and a rationality reconfiguration. On one hand, AI reduces information overload, improves consistency, and supports evidence-based decision-making. On the other hand, it introduces new constraints related to algorithmic opacity, automation bias, overreliance on predictive systems, and weakened managerial accountability. By developing a structured conceptual framework, this paper seeks to explain how these opposing forces interact and under what conditions AI augments or undermines managerial rationality.

II. RELATED WORKS

Research on managerial decision-making has long emphasized that organizational choices are constrained by cognitive, informational, and temporal limitations rather than governed by perfect rationality. The foundational theory of **bounded rationality**, introduced by Herbert A. Simon, challenged the neoclassical assumption of optimal decision-making by demonstrating that managers operate under limited knowledge, finite computational ability, and contextual uncertainty [1]. According to Simon, decision-makers “satisfice” rather than optimize, selecting options that are good enough within cognitive and environmental constraints. This theoretical lens has profoundly shaped management science, organizational theory, and behavioral economics.

2.1 Bounded Rationality in Managerial and Organizational Contexts

Early empirical studies applying bounded rationality to organizations revealed that strategic decisions are shaped by heuristics, routines, and institutional norms rather than exhaustive analysis [2]. Cyert and March’s behavioral theory of the firm demonstrated that organizations rely on rules, standard operating procedures, and aspiration levels to manage complexity [3]. Subsequent research linked bounded rationality to phenomena such as incremental strategy formation, path dependence, escalation of commitment, and resistance to change [4].

In complex environments, bounded rationality intensifies due to information overload and uncertainty. March and Shapira showed that managerial risk perception is influenced more by experience and framing than by objective probabilities [5]. Similarly, Kahneman and Tversky’s prospect theory established that decision-makers systematically deviate from rational expectations due to loss aversion, reference dependence, and framing effects [6]. These cognitive distortions have been widely documented in strategic investment decisions, mergers and acquisitions, innovation management, and crisis response.

Empirical research in digital-era organizations further confirms that bounded rationality persists despite technological advancement. Managers often struggle to interpret large volumes of data, leading to reliance on simplified dashboards, intuition, or confirmation-biased analysis [7]. Thus, while digitalization increases information availability, it does not automatically translate into improved rationality.

2.2 Artificial Intelligence as a Decision-Support Mechanism

Artificial intelligence has been positioned in the literature as a technological response to bounded rationality. AI-based decision-support systems (DSS), machine learning models, and predictive analytics expand information-processing capacity and reduce computational limitations [8]. Studies in operations management show that AI improves forecasting accuracy, inventory optimization, and scheduling efficiency beyond human capability [9]. In finance and marketing, AI enhances credit scoring, customer segmentation, and demand prediction [10].

From a theoretical standpoint, AI can be interpreted as a **rationality-enhancing artifact** that extends human cognition. Formally, managerial decision quality Q_d can be represented as a function of information I, cognitive capacity C, and time constraints T:

$$Q_d = f(I, C, T)$$

AI systems increase I and effectively augment C, thereby improving Q_d under time pressure [11]. This has led scholars to argue that AI shifts organizations closer to procedural rationality rather than substantive rationality.

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, Jan-June 2026, Pages: 402-411

Empirical studies confirm that AI-supported managers make faster and more consistent decisions in structured environments such as pricing, logistics, and fraud detection [12]. In strategic planning, AI-driven scenario analysis enables exploration of a wider solution space than human cognition alone [13].

2.3 Limitations of AI and the Emergence of Algorithmic Bounded Rationality

Despite its advantages, growing literature cautions against viewing AI as a complete solution to bounded rationality. One major limitation is **algorithmic opacity**. Many machine learning models, particularly deep neural networks, function as "black boxes," making it difficult for managers to understand how outputs are generated [14]. This lack of explainability constrains managerial learning and accountability.

Another concern is **automation bias**, where decision-makers over-rely on algorithmic recommendations even when they conflict with contextual knowledge or ethical considerations [15]. Experimental studies demonstrate that managers are less likely to challenge AI outputs than human advice, particularly under time pressure [16]. This creates a new form of bounded rationality rooted not in cognitive scarcity but in **uncritical trust in automation**.

Data dependency also introduces structural constraints. AI systems inherit biases embedded in training data, which can systematically distort decisions related to hiring, lending, or performance evaluation [17]. Unlike human biases, algorithmic biases scale rapidly across organizations, amplifying their impact. Consequently, AI replaces some cognitive limits with **algorithmic limits**, a phenomenon increasingly referred to as *algorithmic bounded rationality*.

2.4 Smart Organizations and Hybrid Decision Architectures

The concept of **smart organizations** integrates AI, digital platforms, and adaptive governance to enable continuous learning and responsiveness [18]. Smart organizations do not merely automate decisions but redesign decision architectures to combine human judgment with algorithmic intelligence. Research indicates that the highest decision quality emerges when AI augments, rather than replaces, managerial cognition [19].

Table 1 contrasts traditional bounded rationality with AI-enabled hybrid rationality.

Table 1: Evolution of Bounded Rationality in Digital Organizations

Dimension	Traditional Bounded Rationality	AI-Enabled Hybrid Rationality
Information	Scarce, delayed	Abundant, real-time
Cognitive Constraint	Human limits	Human + algorithmic limits
Decision Style	Heuristics and routines	Analytics + judgment
Risk	Judgment errors	Automation and data bias
Accountability	Human-centered	Distributed human–AI

Studies in digital strategy show that organizations with strong governance mechanisms clear accountability, explainable AI, and ethical oversight are better able to manage hybrid rationality [20]. Conversely, firms that adopt AI without governance experience decision fragility, strategic misalignment, and erosion of managerial autonomy [21].

2.5 AI, Managerial Cognition, and Digital Economies

Digital economies intensify decision complexity through platform competition, rapid innovation cycles, and global interdependence. Managers must make high-stakes decisions under extreme uncertainty, increasing reliance on AI systems [22]. However, cognitive adaptation to AI is uneven. Research shows that prolonged AI use can reduce analytical engagement, leading to skill atrophy and dependence effects [23].

Behavioral studies further indicate that managers reinterpret their role when AI is introduced from decision-makers to decision validators [24]. This shift alters responsibility perception and risk-taking behavior, reinforcing the need for governance frameworks that preserve human agency.

2.6 Research Gap and Contribution

While existing studies separately examine bounded rationality, AI decision systems, and smart organizations, **integrated frameworks explaining their interaction remain limited**. Most empirical research focuses on performance outcomes rather than cognitive dynamics. Moreover, few studies explicitly theorize how AI reshapes bounded rationality rather than eliminating it.

This study addresses this gap by synthesizing behavioral decision theory and AI governance literature to conceptualize **bounded rationality as**

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, Jan-June 2026, Pages: 402-411

an evolving, hybrid construct in smart organizations operating in digital economies.

III. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

This study adopts a **conceptual–analytical research design**, grounded in theory synthesis and integrative modeling, to examine how artificial intelligence reshapes bounded rationality in managerial decision-making within smart organizations operating in digital economies. Given the heterogeneity of AI applications, managerial roles, organizational contexts, and industry-level digital maturity, a purely empirical approach risks oversimplification and limited generalizability. Conceptual research is therefore appropriate for theory development where phenomena are emergent, multidimensional, and institutionally embedded [1], [2]. The methodology draws on **behavioral decision theory**, **management science**, **information systems**, and **digital governance literature** to construct a structured explanatory framework. The study does not test hypotheses statistically; instead, it develops analytically grounded propositions and interaction mechanisms that can guide future empirical research. This approach aligns with established methodological practices in organizational theory, strategic management, and AI governance studies [3]. The unit of analysis is **managerial decision-making processes** in AI-enabled smart organizations, with specific focus on strategic and semi-structured decisions rather than fully automated operational tasks.

3.2 Theoretical Foundations and Methodological Anchors

The methodology is anchored in four complementary theoretical lenses:

1. **Bounded Rationality Theory** – explaining cognitive and informational constraints in decision-making [4].
2. **Behavioral Decision Theory** – capturing heuristics, biases, and satisficing behavior [5].
3. **AI Decision-Support Theory** – examining algorithmic augmentation of human judgment [6].
4. **Digital Governance Theory** – addressing accountability, transparency, and control in AI systems [7].

These lenses collectively enable examination of **hybrid rationality**, where decisions emerge from the interaction between human cognition and algorithmic intelligence rather than from either in isolation.

3.3 Analytical Framework Development

To operationalize the interaction between AI and bounded rationality, the study constructs a **four-layer analytical framework** that captures the cognitive, technological, organizational, and institutional dimensions of managerial decision-making.

Layer 1: Managerial Cognition

This layer represents human cognitive processes, including heuristics, experience, intuition, and biases. Bounded rationality manifests here through limited attention, framing effects, and satisficing behavior.

Layer 2: AI Capability Layer

This layer includes AI functionalities such as machine learning, predictive analytics, optimization algorithms, and decision-support systems. AI expands information-processing capacity but introduces algorithmic constraints.

Layer 3: Organizational Context Layer

This layer captures structural and cultural elements—organizational routines, hierarchy, digital maturity, and learning mechanisms—that shape how AI outputs are interpreted and implemented.

Layer 4: Digital Governance Layer

This layer addresses transparency, explainability, ethical oversight, accountability allocation, and regulatory compliance that mediate human–AI interaction.

Table 1: Multi-Layer Framework of AI-Enabled Managerial Decision-Making

Framework Layer	Key Components	Methodological Role
Managerial Cognition	Heuristics, experience, biases	Source of bounded rationality
AI Capability	Prediction, learning, analytics	Rationality augmentation
Organizational Context	Culture, routines, structure	Decision coordination
Digital Governance	Transparency, ethics, control	Constraint regulation

3.4 Formal Representation of Hybrid Rationality

To conceptually formalize AI's impact on bounded rationality, managerial decision quality Q_d is modeled as a function of human cognition and AI augmentation:

$$Q_d = f(C_h, I_a, G, T)$$

Where:
C_h= Human cognitive capacity (bounded)
I_a= AI-augmented information and analytics
G= Governance strength (transparency, accountability)
T= Time and environmental pressure

AI increases I_a, partially compensating for limits in C_h. However, weak governance Greduces $Q_d$by amplifying automation bias and opacity. This formulation highlights that AI does not remove bounded rationality but **reallocates constraints** between human and algorithmic domains [8].

3.5 Conceptual Constructs and Measurement Proxies

Although the study is non-empirical, it introduces **conceptual indicators** that can guide future measurement and operationalization.

Table 2: Conceptual Indicators for AI–Bounded Rationality Analysis

Indicator	Construct Focus	Interpretive Meaning
Cognitive Load Reduction Index (CLRI)	Human cognition	Degree of AI mental relief
Algorithmic Transparency Score (ATS)	Explainability	Managerial understanding
Decision Augmentation Ratio (DAR)	Human–AI balance	Net rationality gain
Automation Bias Risk (ABR)	Behavioral distortion	Overreliance likelihood
Governance Alignment Index (GAI)	Institutional fit	Stability of accountability

These indicators align with prior behavioral and AI governance studies and provide a foundation for empirical testing using surveys, experiments, or organizational data [9], [10].

3.6 Analytical Procedure

The analytical procedure follows a **theory-driven synthesis approach** consisting of five stages:

1. **Literature Mapping** – Identification of dominant themes in bounded rationality, AI decision systems, and smart organizations.
2. **Conceptual Decomposition** – Separation of human, algorithmic, and institutional constraints.
3. **Interaction Mapping** – Identification of reinforcing and countervailing effects between AI and cognition.
4. **Threshold Analysis** – Examination of points where AI shifts from augmentation to distortion.
5. **Framework Integration** – Consolidation into a unified hybrid rationality model.

This procedure ensures internal consistency and cross-domain integration, consistent with methodological standards in conceptual management research [11].

3.7 Validation Logic

Given the conceptual nature of the study, validation follows **non-statistical rigor criteria**, commonly accepted in theory-building research.

- **Theoretical Consistency:** Alignment with foundational bounded rationality and behavioral decision theories.
- **Cross-Disciplinary Convergence:** Agreement between management, AI, and governance literatures.
- **Behavioral Plausibility:** Consistency with experimentally observed automation bias and cognitive adaptation effects.
- **Organizational Applicability:** Relevance across industries in digital economies.

This triangulation approach mirrors validation logic used in behavioral economics and strategic management research [12].

3.8 Assumptions and Methodological Limitations

The methodology rests on several assumptions. First, it assumes that organizations possess minimum digital infrastructure enabling AI deployment. Second, it assumes managerial interaction with AI systems rather than full automation. Third, it presumes that governance mechanisms can meaningfully influence decision behavior. Limitations include absence of empirical testing, potential contextual variation across industries, and evolving AI technologies that may alter decision dynamics over time. These limitations are inherent to conceptual research but do not undermine the framework's explanatory value.

IV. ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Artificial Intelligence as a Constraint-Relaxation Mechanism under Bounded Rationality

The analysis confirms that artificial intelligence functions as a **constraint-relaxation mechanism** within bounded rationality rather than a substitute for human judgment. In smart organizations

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, Jan-June 2026, Pages: 402-411

operating in digital economies, AI systems significantly expand the informational and computational boundaries within which managerial decisions are made. Predictive analytics, machine learning, and optimization algorithms reduce search costs, compress decision cycles, and enhance pattern recognition under uncertainty. These capabilities directly address the informational and computational limits central to bounded rationality theory [1].

From a behavioral perspective, AI improves procedural rationality by enabling managers to evaluate a larger solution space than would be feasible through human cognition alone. Strategic decisions such as market entry, dynamic pricing, and resource allocation benefit from AI's capacity to process multidimensional data in real time. This aligns with prior research demonstrating that AI-supported decision systems improve consistency and accuracy in structured and semi-structured decisions [2]. However, these gains are conditional rather than universal, depending critically on organizational governance and managerial interpretation.

4.2 Emergence of Algorithmic Bounded Rationality

While AI alleviates traditional cognitive constraints, the findings indicate the emergence of **algorithmic bounded rationality** a new form of limitation rooted in model opacity, data dependence, and automation bias. Managers often lack full visibility into how AI systems generate recommendations, especially in deep learning and ensemble models. This opacity constrains learning, reduces explainability, and weakens the feedback loop necessary for adaptive decision-making [3].

Automation bias further exacerbates this limitation. Under time pressure and performance scrutiny, managers tend to overweight algorithmic recommendations, even when contextual or ethical considerations suggest caution. Experimental evidence shows that decision-makers are significantly less likely to challenge AI outputs than human advice [4]. This behavior reintroduces bounded rationality through **over-delegation** rather than information scarcity.

Importantly, algorithmic bounded rationality is systemic rather than individual. Errors embedded in data or model assumptions propagate across organizational decisions, amplifying their impact. Unlike human biases, which vary across individuals, algorithmic constraints scale uniformly, increasing organizational risk [5].

4.3 Hybrid Rationality in Smart Organizations

The central analytical insight of this study is that managerial decision-making in digital economies is governed by **hybrid rationality**, combining human cognition and artificial intelligence. Neither humans nor AI act as autonomous decision-makers; instead, outcomes emerge from their interaction. This hybrid rationality is most effective when AI augments human judgment without displacing accountability.

Smart organizations that explicitly design hybrid decision architectures where managers retain interpretive authority while leveraging AI for analytical depth achieve superior decision quality. In these settings, AI acts as a cognitive amplifier rather than a cognitive replacement. Conversely, organizations that delegate decisions excessively to AI systems experience erosion of managerial agency and increased vulnerability to model error.

Table 4: Decision Rationality Regimes in AI-Enabled Organizations

Decision Regime	Dominant Agent	Primary Constraint	Decision Stability
Human-Dominant	Manager	Cognitive bias	Moderate
AI-Dominant	Algorithm	Model opacity	Low
Hybrid Rationality	Human + AI	Governance quality	High

This table illustrates that **hybrid rationality**, when supported by governance, offers the most stable and resilient decision outcomes.

4.4 Governance as a Moderating Variable

Governance quality emerges as the **critical moderating variable** in the AI–bounded rationality relationship. Digital governance mechanisms such as explainability requirements, auditability, ethical oversight, and accountability frameworks determine whether AI reduces or amplifies bounded rationality. Strong governance mitigates automation bias by encouraging managerial scrutiny and preserving interpretive discretion [6].

Organizations with transparent AI systems and clearly defined responsibility structures exhibit higher trust without blind reliance. In contrast, weak governance environments allow algorithmic outputs to dominate decision-making without sufficient oversight, increasing strategic fragility. This finding aligns with governance research emphasizing that technological capability without institutional control produces unstable outcomes [7].

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, Jan-June 2026, Pages: 402-411

4.5 Threshold Effects and Non-Linear Decision Degradation

The analysis identifies **non-linear threshold effects** in AI-enabled decision-making. Up to a certain level of automation, AI enhances decision quality by reducing cognitive load. Beyond this threshold, additional automation leads to rapid declines in decision robustness due to loss of situational awareness and overreliance.

This phenomenon can be represented conceptually as:

$$Q_d = f(A) \quad \text{where} \quad \frac{dQ_d}{dA} > 0 \text{ for } A < A^*, \quad \frac{dQ_d}{dA} < 0 \text{ for } A > A^*$$

Where Arepresents the degree of automation and A^*denotes the optimal automation threshold. Beyond A^*, algorithmic bounded rationality dominates, resulting in decision degradation. This non-linearity explains why fully automated decision systems often underperform hybrid models in complex, uncertain environments [8].

4.6 Sectoral Implications within Digital Economies

The impact of AI-bounded rationality interaction varies across sectors. In data-rich, stable environments such as logistics, supply chain optimization, and fraud detection, AI's benefits dominate due to well-defined objectives and feedback loops. In contrast, in strategic domains involving ambiguity, ethics, or long-term innovation, excessive reliance on AI increases decision risk.

Table 5: Sectoral Sensitivity to Algorithmic Bounded Rationality

Sector	AI Benefit	Risk of Automation Bias	Optimal Decision Mode
Operations & Logistics	High	Low	AI-Augmented
Finance & Risk	High	Moderate	Hybrid
Strategic Planning	Moderate	High	Human-Led Hybrid
HR & Ethics	Low–Moderate	Very High	Human-Dominant

This variation underscores the necessity of **context-specific AI governance** rather than uniform automation strategies.

4.7 Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study make several important theoretical contributions to the literature on bounded rationality, managerial cognition, and artificial intelligence in organizational decision-making. First, the results extend classical bounded rationality theory by demonstrating that cognitive constraints are **not eliminated by advances in artificial intelligence**, but rather **redistributed across human and algorithmic domains**. While traditional bounded rationality emphasized limitations in human attention, memory, and computational capacity, the present analysis shows that AI relocates these constraints into new forms, including algorithmic opacity, data dependency, and model rigidity. This redistribution challenges the long-standing assumption that increasing computational power necessarily translates into greater organizational rationality.

Second, the findings contest **techno-deterministic perspectives** that frame AI as an autonomous rational agent capable of superseding human judgment. Instead, rationality in digital economies emerges as a **relational and governed construct**, shaped by the interaction between managerial cognition, AI capabilities, organizational context, and institutional governance. This aligns with emerging theoretical work that views rationality as procedurally and institutionally embedded rather than purely computational. By demonstrating that AI-induced rationality gains are contingent on governance quality, the study reframes rationality as an outcome of system design rather than technological sophistication alone.

Third, the concept of **hybrid rationality** advanced in this study contributes to organizational theory by bridging behavioral decision-making and digital strategy research. Hybrid rationality recognizes that decision outcomes are co-produced by humans and algorithms, each operating under distinct but interdependent constraints. This perspective resolves a key theoretical tension between behavioral theories, which emphasize cognitive bias, and AI-centric models, which emphasize optimization. The findings show that neither framework is sufficient in isolation; rather, bounded rationality in smart organizations must be understood as dynamically negotiated between human judgment and algorithmic logic.

Finally, the study contributes to the growing literature on AI governance by theorizing governance not as a peripheral control mechanism but as a **core determinant of rationality itself**. Governance structures such as explainability standards, accountability allocation, and ethical oversight function as meta-cognitive regulators that determine whether AI amplifies or distorts decision quality. This insight expands the theoretical scope of governance research by

MSW MANAGEMENT -Multidisciplinary, Scientific Work and Management Journal
ISSN: 1053-7899
Vol. 36 Issue 1, Jan-June 2026, Pages: 402-411

positioning it as central to decision theory in digital economies.

4.8 Managerial and Policy Implications

From a managerial perspective, the findings offer clear guidance for how AI should be integrated into organizational decision-making. The analysis demonstrates that AI is most effective when treated as a **decision partner rather than a decision authority**. Managers who delegate decision responsibility entirely to AI systems risk diminishing situational awareness, weakening accountability, and increasing exposure to systemic error. In contrast, organizations that design decision processes where AI provides analytical input while managers retain interpretive and ethical judgment achieve more resilient outcomes.

Managers should therefore prioritize investments not only in AI technologies but also in **organizational capabilities that support hybrid decision-making**. These include training programs that enhance AI literacy, institutional mechanisms that encourage critical engagement with algorithmic outputs, and decision protocols that require human validation in high-stakes contexts. Explainability tools, model documentation, and scenario-testing interfaces play a crucial role in enabling managers to understand and challenge AI recommendations rather than accepting them uncritically.

At the policy level, the findings reinforce the need for regulatory frameworks that recognize the **bounded rationality of both humans and algorithms**. Policymakers should avoid framing AI regulation solely in terms of technical performance or innovation incentives. Instead, regulatory interventions should focus on transparency, auditability, and human oversight, particularly in domains involving strategic, ethical, or societal consequences. Mandating explainable AI, assigning clear accountability for algorithmic decisions, and requiring human-in-the-loop mechanisms in critical applications are essential to preventing the institutionalization of algorithmic bounded rationality.

The implications extend beyond individual organizations to digital ecosystems and platforms that mediate large-scale decision processes. In such environments, weak governance can propagate algorithmic errors across markets and industries, amplifying their societal impact. Consequently, public policy plays a crucial role in shaping the conditions under which AI contributes to sustainable and responsible decision-making in digital economies.

Table 6: Managerial and Policy Implications of AI-Enabled Decision-Making

Domain	Key Insight	Practical Implication
Managerial Design	AI augments but does not replace judgment	Maintain human interpretive authority
Capability Building	AI literacy is critical	Invest in training and governance skills
Decision Accountability	Automation dilutes responsibility	Define clear human ownership
Regulatory Policy	AI introduces systemic risk	Mandate transparency and oversight
Digital Ecosystems	Errors scale rapidly	Platform-level governance required

4.9 Discussion and Synthesis

Synthesizing the analysis across behavioral, technological, and institutional dimensions, this study argues that artificial intelligence transforms bounded rationality into a **dynamic and context-dependent phenomenon** rather than resolving it. In smart organizations, rationality is no longer a fixed cognitive attribute of individual decision-makers but an emergent property of socio-technical systems. The interaction between AI and managerial cognition produces outcomes that are highly sensitive to organizational design choices, governance quality, and environmental complexity.

The discussion highlights a critical trade-off at the heart of AI-enabled decision-making. On one hand, AI enables unprecedented analytical depth, speed, and consistency, allowing organizations to operate effectively in data-intensive digital economies. On the other hand, excessive reliance on algorithmic systems introduces new vulnerabilities, including strategic rigidity, ethical blind spots, and systemic failure modes. These vulnerabilities do not stem from human irrationality alone but from poorly governed interactions between humans and machines.

The concept of **hybrid rationality** offers a unifying framework for understanding this trade-off. It explains why neither purely human nor purely algorithmic decision systems are sufficient in complex organizational environments. Instead, sustainable decision advantage arises when organizations deliberately design hybrid architectures that balance computational intelligence with human judgment, supported by robust governance mechanisms.

Ultimately, the findings caution against simplistic narratives of AI-driven rationality. Smart organizations that recognize the evolving nature of bounded rationality and invest in governance, accountability, and human–AI collaboration are better positioned to achieve long-term strategic resilience. Those that pursue automation as an end in itself risk replacing familiar human errors with opaque and scalable algorithmic failures, thereby undermining the very rationality AI is intended to enhance.

V. CONCLUSION

This study set out to examine how artificial intelligence reshapes bounded rationality in managerial decision-making within smart organizations operating in digital economies. Drawing on behavioral decision theory, management science, and AI governance literature, the analysis demonstrates that AI does not eliminate bounded rationality; rather, it **reconfigures its locus and expression**. Traditional cognitive constraints related to limited information, attention, and computational capacity are partially alleviated through AI-enabled analytics and predictive systems. However, these gains are offset by the emergence of new algorithmic constraints, including opacity, data dependence, automation bias, and diluted accountability. As a result, managerial rationality in digital economies evolves into a **hybrid construct**, co-produced by human cognition and artificial intelligence.

The findings contribute to theory by extending bounded rationality beyond its human-centric origins and conceptualizing rationality as a **governed property of socio-technical systems**. Rather than viewing AI as an autonomous rational agent, the study demonstrates that decision quality depends critically on how AI is embedded within organizational structures, interpreted by managers, and constrained by governance mechanisms. These reframing challenges techno-deterministic narratives and highlights the central role of institutional design in shaping decision outcomes.

From a practical standpoint, the study underscores that sustainable decision advantage in smart organizations does not stem from maximal automation, but from **deliberate hybrid decision architectures** that balance analytical power with human judgment. Organizations that invest in explainability, AI literacy, and accountability structures are better equipped to harness AI's benefits while mitigating systemic risk. Conversely, firms that pursue automation without governance risk replacing familiar human errors with scalable and opaque algorithmic failures. In the context of digital economies characterized by volatility, complexity, and rapid innovation, such failures can have far-reaching strategic and societal consequences.

Overall, this research reinforces the view that artificial intelligence is not a neutral tool but a transformative force that reshapes the cognitive foundations of managerial decision-making. Understanding and governing this transformation is essential for achieving resilient, ethical, and effective organizational performance in the digital age.

VI. FUTURE WORK

While this study provides a robust conceptual framework for understanding AI-enabled bounded rationality, several avenues for future research emerge. First, empirical validation of the proposed hybrid rationality framework is needed. Future studies could employ survey-based instruments, behavioral experiments, or structural equation modeling to operationalize constructs such as automation bias, algorithmic transparency, and governance alignment. Longitudinal designs would be particularly valuable for examining how managerial cognition and decision quality evolve with sustained exposure to AI systems.

Second, comparative industry-level analyses offer a promising direction for future work. The interaction between AI and bounded rationality is likely to vary across sectors with different levels of uncertainty, ethical sensitivity, and regulatory oversight. Empirical research comparing domains such as finance, healthcare, human resources, and strategic planning could reveal sector-specific threshold effects and governance requirements.

Third, future research should explore the **micro-level cognitive adaptation** of managers in AI-rich environments. Experimental and neuroscientific approaches could examine how reliance on AI alters attention, learning, intuition, and risk perception over time. Understanding whether prolonged AI use enhances or erodes managerial expertise remains a critical unanswered question.

Fourth, the growing role of public policy and regulation in shaping AI deployment warrants deeper investigation. Cross-country comparative studies could analyze how different regulatory regimes influence organizational governance practices and decision outcomes. This line of research would be particularly relevant for understanding AI adoption in global digital platforms and multinational enterprises.

Finally, future work should extend the framework to consider ethical and societal implications of AI-enabled managerial decisions. Issues such as fairness, bias amplification, and accountability distribution require integration with decision theory to ensure that organizational rationality aligns with broader social values. By addressing these directions, future research can move beyond descriptive accounts of AI adoption toward a more comprehensive understanding of how intelligent technologies reshape decision-making, governance, and responsibility in digital economies.

References

[1] H. A. Simon, *Administrative Behavior*, 4th ed. New York, NY, USA: Free Press, 1997.
[2] J. G. March, "Bounded rationality, ambiguity, and the engineering of choice," *Bell J. Econ.*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 587–608, 1978.
[3] R. M. Cyert and J. G. March, *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ, USA: Prentice-Hall, 1963.
[4] S. Gavetti, D. Levinthal, and J. Ocasio, "Neo-Carnegie: The Carnegie School's past, present, and reconstructing for the future," *Organ. Sci.*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 523–536, 2007.
[5] J. G. March and Z. Shapira, "Managerial perspectives on risk and risk taking," *Manage. Sci.*, vol. 33, no. 11, pp. 1404–1418, 1987.
[6] D. Kahneman and A. Tversky, "Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk," *Econometrica*, vol. 47, no. 2, pp. 263–291, 1979.
[7] T. Davenport and J. Kirby, "Beyond automation," *Harv. Bus. Rev.*, vol. 94, no. 6, pp. 58–65, 2016.
[8] E. Brynjolfsson and A. McAfee, *Machine, Platform, Crowd*. New York, NY, USA: Norton, 2017.
[9] M. Waller and S. E. Fawcett, "Data science, predictive analytics, and big data," *J. Bus. Logist.*, vol. 34, no. 2, pp. 77–84, 2013.
[10] S. Athey, "The impact of machine learning on economics," *Economics of AI*, Univ. Chicago Press, 2018.
[11] S. Russell and P. Norvig, *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach*, 4th ed. Pearson, 2021.
[12] A. Agrawal, J. Gans, and A. Goldfarb, *Prediction Machines*. Boston, MA, USA: HBR Press, 2018.
[13] G. George, M. R. Haas, and A. Pentland, "Big data and management," *Acad. Manage. J.*, vol. 57, no. 2, pp. 321–326, 2014.
[14] F. Doshi-Velez and B. Kim, "Towards a rigorous science of interpretable machine learning," arXiv:1702.08608, 2017.
[15] L. J. Skitka, K. L. Mosier, and M. Burdick, "Automation bias," *Int. J. Hum.-Comput. Stud.*, vol. 51, pp. 991–1006, 1999.
[16] M. Logg, J. Minson, and D. Moore, "Algorithm appreciation," *Manage. Sci.*, vol. 65, no. 2, pp. 789–809, 2019.
[17] C. O'Neil, *Weapons of Math Destruction*. New York, NY, USA: Crown, 2016.
[18] V. Sambamurthy, A. Bharadwaj, and V. Grover, "Shaping agility through digital options," *MIS Q.*, vol. 27, no. 2, pp. 237–263, 2003.
[19] T. Malone, *Superminds*. New York, NY, USA: Little, Brown, 2018.
[20] C. C. Snow, D. C. Håkonsson, and B. Obel, "A smart firm in a smart city," *J. Manage. Stud.*, vol. 53, no. 3, pp. 375–400, 2016.
[21] K. Raisch and S. Krakowski, "Artificial intelligence and management," *Acad. Manage. Rev.*, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 192–214, 2021.
[22] OECD, *Artificial Intelligence in Society*. Paris, France, 2019.
[23] P. Daugherty and H. Wilson, *Human + Machine*. Boston, MA, USA: HBR Press, 2018.
[24] J. Danaher, "The threat of algocracy," *Philos. Technol.*, vol. 29, pp. 245–268, 2016.