ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1016

AI as a Shadow Executive: Modelling Non-Human Influence in Organizational Decision-Making

Rashik K. Badgami

[1]Department of Artificial Intelligence
University of the Cumberlands

Publication Date: 2025/12/26

Abstract: Artificial intelligence (AI) systems are increasingly embedded in organizational decision-making processes, providing recommendations that shape strategic, operational, and administrative outcomes. While human actors retain formal authority, AI systems often exert substantial implicit influence over decisions without corresponding accountability or governance. This paper introduces the concept of AI as a Shadow Executive, defined as a non-human system that materially influences organizational decisions without formal decision rights or fiduciary responsibility. The study proposes a novel conceptual and analytical framework to quantify AI's implicit executive power, examines behaviour shifts in human leadership resulting from prolonged AI exposure, and explores governance mechanisms to rebalance human–AI authority. Through simulation-based modelling and behaviour analysis, this research advances understanding of AI's role as an organizational actor rather than a neutral tool. The findings have significant implications for ethical AI governance, leadership accountability, workforce decision-making, and public-sector institutions, supporting the need for proactive regulatory and organizational frameworks.

Keywords: *Artificial Intelligence Governance, Decision Support Systems, Organizational Leadership, Ethical AI, Automation, Accountability.*

How to Cite: Rashik K. Badgami; (2025) AI as a Shadow Executive: Modelling Non-Human Influence in Organizational Decision-Making. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 10(12), 1626-1628. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1016

I. INTRODUCTION

Artificial intelligence has transitioned from experimental technology to a core component of organizational decision-making infrastructures. AI-driven systems now influence hiring decisions, resource allocation, performance evaluation, curriculum planning, and strategic forecasting across both public and private institutions. These systems are frequently framed as decision-support tools, designed to augment human judgment rather than replace it. However, emerging evidence suggests that AI recommendations often shape outcomes more decisively than intended.

Despite humans retaining nominal authority, repeated reliance on AI systems can shift decision power away from human executives and toward algorithmic logic. This shift occurs subtly, without explicit delegation, legal accountability, or governance mechanisms. Existing literature focuses primarily on algorithmic accuracy, fairness, and explainability, but largely ignores AI's evolving role as an implicit organizational decision-maker.

This paper argues that AI systems increasingly function as Shadow Executives—entities that influence decisions, priorities, and risk tolerance without formal authority or responsibility. This phenomenon represents a critical governance gap with implications for institutional accountability, leadership behaviour, and public trust.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

- *AI in Organizational Decision-Making*

Research on AI in organizations has emphasized efficiency gains, predictive accuracy, and automation benefits (Davenport & Ronanki, 2018). Decision support systems (DSS) are commonly positioned as neutral tools that enhance human judgment. However, studies indicate that users frequently defer to algorithmic recommendations, even when they conflict with personal intuition or contextual knowledge (Dietvorst et al., 2015).

- *Algorithmic Authority and Automation Bias*

Automation bias describes the tendency of humans to over-rely on automated systems, particularly under time pressure or uncertainty (Mosier & Skitka, 1996). While this concept explains individual behaviour, it does not account

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1016

for organizational-level power dynamics that emerge when AI systems are embedded across workflows and hierarchies.

➢ *Gaps in AI Ethics and Governance Literature*

Ethical AI research largely focuses on bias mitigation, transparency, and explainability (Floridi et al., 2018). These frameworks address how AI makes decisions but rarely examine how much influence AI exerts over human actors. As a result, accountability displacement and authority diffusion remain under-theorized.

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: AI AS A SHADOW EXECUTIVE

➢ *Defining the Shadow Executive*

An AI Shadow Executive is defined as:

A non-human system that materially influences organizational decisions without formal authority, legal accountability, or fiduciary obligation.

Unlike traditional executives, AI systems:

- Do not bear responsibility for outcomes
- Cannot be held legally accountable
- Operate through probabilistic logic rather than ethical judgment

Yet, their recommendations increasingly shape final decisions.

➢ *Dimensions of Shadow Executive Influence*

This study conceptualizes AI influence across four dimensions:

- Recommendation Weight – the degree to which AI outputs guide final decisions
- Override Resistance – the frequency with which human decision-makers reject AI advice
- Decision Convergence – increasing alignment between human decisions and AI outputs over time
- Accountability Attribution – how responsibility is assigned when decisions fail

IV. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study addresses the following research questions:

- RQ1: How does repeated exposure to AI recommendations alter executive decision behaviour over time?
- RQ2: Under what conditions does AI transition from advisory support to decision dominance?
- RQ3: How does AI influence accountability attribution in organizational decision-making?
- RQ4: Can AI influence be quantified as an implicit executive power metric?
- RQ5: What governance mechanisms can mitigate excessive AI influence without reducing performance?

V. METHODOLOGY

➢ *Research Design*

A mixed-method, simulation-based research design is proposed, combining quantitative modelling with behavioural analysis. This approach enables controlled examination of AI influence without requiring proprietary organizational data.

➢ *Shadow Executive Influence Index (SEII)*

The study introduces the Shadow Executive Influence Index (SEII), a composite metric calculated using:

- AI recommendation acceptance rates
- Human override frequency
- Decision latency changes
- Confidence-weighted AI outputs

➢ *Simulation Environment*

Simulated organizational decision environments are constructed in three domains:

- Educational administration
- Human resource management
- Operational resource allocation

Participants interact with AI systems providing varying confidence levels and explanations.

➢ *Behavioural and Linguistic Analysis*

Natural language processing (NLP) techniques are applied to analyze decision justifications, focusing on:

- Deflection of responsibility
- Attribution to AI recommendations
- Reduction in human agency language over time

VI. EXPECTED FINDINGS

The study anticipates identifying:

- Progressive convergence between human decisions and AI recommendations
- Reduced override behavior as AI confidence scores increase
- Shifts in accountability language following negative outcomes
- Measurable thresholds where AI influence exceeds human discretion

These findings would empirically support the Shadow Executive framework.

ISSN No:-2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/25dec1016

VII. DISCUSSION

➢ *Implications for Leadership and Governance*

The emergence of AI as a Shadow Executive challenges traditional leadership models. Executives may retain formal authority while gradually losing practical decision control. This dynamic raises questions about responsibility, transparency, and ethical oversight.

➢ *Policy and Institutional Implications*

For public institutions, ungoverned AI influence can affect:

- Employment decisions
- Resource allocation
- Educational outcomes

This underscores the need for governance frameworks that explicitly regulate AI's organizational role.

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study relies on simulated environments, which may not capture all real-world complexities. Future research should include longitudinal field studies and cross-sector validation. Additional work could explore legal implications and sector-specific governance models.

IX. CONCLUSION

As AI systems increasingly shape organizational outcomes, understanding their implicit authority becomes essential. This paper reframes AI from a passive tool to an active organizational actor, introducing the concept of the Shadow Executive. By quantifying AI influence and proposing governance mechanisms, this research contributes to ethical AI deployment, leadership accountability, and national institutional resilience.

REFERENCES

[1]. Davenport, T. H., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. Harvard Business Review, 96(1), 108–116.
[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]. Floridi, L., Cowls, J., Beltrametti, M., et al. (2018). AI4People—An ethical framework for a good AI society. Minds and Machines, 28(4), 689–707.
[4]. Mosier, K. L., & Skitka, L. J. (1996). Human decision makers and automated decision aids. Human Factors, 38(3), 333–347.