Volume 11, Issue 3, March – 2026 International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology
ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1885

AI-Driven Experiential Learning in Business Education

Deep Kakkad[1]

[1]Independent AI Educator and Consultant Gandhinagar, Gujarat, India

Publication Date: 2026/04/24

Abstract: The case method has anchored business education for over a century. Yet the business environment it was designed for has fundamentally changed: decision cycles have compressed, AI tools are reshaping industries, and learners increasingly expect adaptive, interactive experiences. This paper presents an integrative review of the pedagogical evolution in business education, tracing four eras from traditional case studies through multimedia cases and rule-based simulations to the emerging frontier of AI-powered adaptive learning environments. Drawing on peer-reviewed literature, institutional reports, and practitioner observations from over 700 professional education sessions delivered across leading global institutions, this study maps the trajectory of pedagogical innovation and identifies where the next transition is underway. Practitioner observations are presented as reflective professional evidence and are clearly distinguished from empirical findings throughout. The paper introduces the AIDE Framework (Awareness, Integration, Deployment, Evolution), an original four-stage maturity model designed to help educators and institutions navigate the expansion from case-centric pedagogy toward AI-driven experiential learning. Critically, this paper goes beyond theory: it provides a practical implementation toolkit demonstrating how educators can build AI-powered simulations using widely accessible tools such as ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini, requiring no programming expertise. Findings suggest that while the case method retains significant value for foundational analytical reasoning, AI-powered simulations unlock capabilities that static methods cannot match, including real-time adaptivity, personalized difficulty calibration, and dynamic multi-stakeholder scenarios. The paper concludes with actionable recommendations for business schools and corporate training programs worldwide.

Keywords: *Generative AI, AI Simulations, Adaptive Learning, Business Pedagogy, Case Method, AIDE Framework*.

How to Cite: Deep Kakkad (2026) AI-Driven Experiential Learning in Business Education. *International Journal of Innovative Science and Research Technology*, 11(3), 4031-4039. https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1885

I. INTRODUCTION

A fundamental question confronts business educators today: has the way we teach kept pace with the world we are teaching about? For over a hundred years, the case method has been the signature pedagogy of management education. Pioneered at Harvard Business School in the 1920s, it was genuinely revolutionary, replacing passive lectures with active discussion and demanding that students wrestle with ambiguity, incomplete information, and competing stakeholder interests. The method scaled globally, becoming the backbone of business schools from Cambridge to Ahmedabad.

The case method still has enormous value. The ability to analyze a complex situation, structure an argument, and defend a position under pressure are skills it teaches exceptionally well. This paper does not argue that the case method is broken. It argues that the case method alone is no longer sufficient for developing the full range of competencies that contemporary business leadership demands.

Today's leaders operate in environments characterized by real-time data streams, algorithmic decision-making, and AI-augmented competition. They make high-stakes decisions in hours rather than weeks, often alongside machine intelligence. If the nature of leadership has changed this dramatically, it follows that the pedagogy of leadership development must evolve accordingly.

This observation emerges from the author's practitioner experience: over 700 professional education sessions delivered across leading global business schools and executive education programs, as well as corporate training environments spanning pharmaceuticals, technology, and financial services. Across these contexts, a consistent pattern has emerged: learners engage most deeply not when they analyze what someone else did in the past, but when they are placed inside dynamic, responsive environments that demand real-time choices and reveal immediate consequences [1], [2].

A growing body of research supports this observation. Studies have demonstrated that generative AI tools enhance learning across cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains [3]. Yet most institutions have responded to the AI revolution by permitting or restricting AI use rather than by fundamentally rethinking how they teach [4]. This paper proposes that AI-powered adaptive simulations represent not

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1885

merely a better tool, but a qualitative expansion in what business pedagogy can achieve.

The purpose of this study is fourfold. First, it provides an integrative review of the pedagogical evolution in business education. Second, it identifies the strengths and constraints of each pedagogical stage and synthesizes emerging evidence on AI-driven experiential learning. Third, it introduces the AIDE Framework (Awareness, Integration, Deployment, Evolution), a four-stage maturity model that offers educators and institutions a practical roadmap for expanding their pedagogical capabilities. Fourth, it provides a practical implementation toolkit demonstrating how educators can build AI-powered simulations and learning experiences using widely accessible tools, without requiring programming expertise. A methodological note: the practitioner observations referenced throughout this paper are presented as reflective professional evidence drawn from extensive field experience, and are clearly distinguished from peer-reviewed empirical findings.

The research question guiding this study is: How is the pedagogical landscape of business education evolving from traditional case-based methods toward AI-powered experiential learning, and what framework can guide educators and institutions through this transition?

II. HISTORICAL CONTEXT

Understanding where business pedagogy is headed requires understanding how it arrived here. The evolution can be mapped across four eras, each defined by a dominant instructional approach and a set of assumptions about how professionals learn best.

- *The First Era: The Case Method (1920s-1990s)*

The case method was borrowed from Harvard Law School and adapted for business education in the 1920s [5]. Rather than lecturing students on management theory, faculty presented detailed narratives of real business situations and asked students to deliberate, debate, and defend decisions. The pedagogical logic mapped directly onto Kolb's experiential learning cycle: concrete experience, reflective observation, abstract conceptualization, and active experimentation [6].

The method developed analytical reasoning, comfort with ambiguity, oral argumentation, and the ability to synthesize complex information under pressure. Educators such as C. Roland Christensen and David Garvin built an institutional philosophy around it [5]. The case method was brilliantly suited to its era: relatively stable industries, predictable competitive dynamics, and a business environment where strategic decisions unfolded over months or years.

- *The Second Era: Multimedia and Digital Cases (2000s-2010s)*

The first meaningful evolution came with digitization. Business schools supplemented paper cases with video interviews, interactive dashboards, and non-linear digital formats [7]. Cases became more engaging and offered richer contextual information. However, the fundamental instructional model remained unchanged. Students still analyzed a pre-authored narrative in a facilitated classroom. Technology enhanced the delivery of case-based pedagogy, but enhancing delivery is not the same as expanding capability.

- *The Third Era: Rule-Based Business Simulations (2010s-2020s)*

A more substantive leap arrived with business simulations. Platforms such as CESIM, Markstrat, Capsim, and Stukent allowed students to operate virtual companies, making interconnected decisions across functional areas and observing the consequences in a competitive marketplace [8]. For the first time in mainstream business education, learners moved from analyzing past decisions to making present ones.

However, rule-based simulations operated on fixed algorithms with deterministic outcomes. Scenarios did not adapt to individual learner needs. Students could eventually reverse-engineer the underlying model. Feedback was quantitative but generic, lacking the nuanced qualitative coaching that complex leadership development requires [9].

- *The Fourth Era: AI-Powered Adaptive Simulations (2024-Present)*

The convergence of large language models, generative AI, and adaptive learning algorithms has created a qualitatively different category of learning environment. In an AI-powered simulation, the scenario evolves based on learner behavior. A student negotiating with a simulated supplier encounters an AI agent that adjusts strategy based on the student's approach. A crisis management team faces escalation pathways that branch based on communication decisions [10].

Educators at institutions such as Queen Mary University of London have piloted AI-integrated simulations where students use tools like Microsoft Copilot and ChatGPT alongside competitive business scenarios, developing what researchers describe as the capacity to co-create with AI [11]. Observers have noted that AI-powered simulations are beginning to redefine the educator's role from content deliverer to facilitator of experiential learning [12].

III. CONSTRAINTS OF THE CASE METHOD IN CONTEMPORARY CONTEXTS

This section does not argue against the case method. It offers an honest examination of where the method's design assumptions encounter the realities of contemporary business and contemporary learners. Acknowledging constraints is the prerequisite for evolution.

- *The Retrospective Bias*

The case method is, by design, backward-looking. Students analyze decisions that have already been made, in contexts that have already resolved. In the author's experience across 700+ executive education sessions, senior professionals consistently note that their real challenge is making decisions in real time with incomplete data, not analyzing what someone else did with the benefit of hindsight. This represents a gap between the competency the method develops (retrospective

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1885

analytical reasoning) and the competency the market increasingly requires (real-time adaptive judgment).

➢ *The Personalization Ceiling*

A case discussion is fundamentally a one-to-many experience. Every student reads the same narrative and operates within the same constraints. In contemporary executive education, where a single session might include participants with fundamentally different frames of reference and learning needs, this becomes a meaningful constraint. A meta-analysis of AI-enabled adaptive learning systems found a medium to large positive effect on cognitive outcomes (g = 0.70), precisely because adaptive systems identify individual knowledge gaps and adjust content delivery accordingly [13], [14].

➢ *The Feedback Latency*

In a case discussion, feedback is social rather than systematic. A student learns whether their analysis was strong through peer reactions and facilitator questions. This social feedback is valuable but imprecise, inconsistent, and difficult to scale. In an AI-driven simulation, a student who makes a suboptimal decision receives immediate market feedback along with AI-generated analysis of the specific reasoning gap that led to the decision [12].

➢ *The Static Scenario Problem*

A case study is a fixed artifact. Students cannot probe for additional data, test hypotheses by taking actions, or experience cascading second-order consequences. The most critical business competencies, including strategic pivoting and crisis management, are inherently dynamic [15]. A 2025 scoping review of innovations in case method teaching identified five broad classes of modifications that educators have introduced, each attempting to address the method's structural constraints, a pattern that itself evidences the method's limitations in its original form [16].

➢ *The Assessment Paradox*

When students can use generative AI to prepare case analyses that are articulate and analytically sound, traditional markers of strong case performance become less reliable as indicators of genuine learning. A study at a UK business school found that students predominantly use generative AI for writing and rephrasing rather than for developing critical thinking, with only about one-tenth reaching advanced levels of independent sensemaking [17]. It is important to note that findings linking AI use to reduced critical thinking are correlational rather than established causal relationships [18]. Simulations sidestep this problem: when learning happens through real-time decision-making, the performance is the assessment.

IV. AI-POWERED ADAPTIVE SIMULATIONS AS A PEDAGOGICAL COMPLEMENT

This section examines the emerging generation of AI-powered learning environments that address the constraints identified above. The argument is not that these technologies are mature or solve every challenge, but that they represent a qualitative expansion in what business education can deliver.

➢ *Architectural Differences*

AI-powered adaptive simulations differ from their predecessors in four fundamental ways: (1) dynamic scenario generation using large language models rather than fixed algorithms; (2) real-time difficulty calibration based on continuous performance assessment; (3) multi-modal feedback at scale combining quantitative results with natural language explanations; and (4) role-play with intelligent agents that behave with contextual intelligence [10], [12], [19].

➢ *Evidence Assessment*

The evidence base, while growing, is not yet definitive. From the adaptive learning literature, a 2024 meta-analysis published in the Journal of Educational Computing Research examined 45 independent studies of AI-enabled adaptive learning systems and found a medium to large positive effect size (g = 0.70) on cognitive learning outcomes compared to non-adaptive interventions, with significant moderation by student level, discipline, and duration [13]. A scoping review of 69 studies on personalized adaptive learning in higher education found that 58 percent of included studies were published between 2020 and 2024, reflecting rapid growth in this research area [14].

From the generative AI in education literature, a systematic review of 71 empirical studies found that GenAI enhances student learning across cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains [3]. However, important cautions accompany these findings: frequent AI tool use has been found to correlate with lower critical thinking ability, though this finding is correlational and should not be interpreted as establishing a direct causal relationship [18]. This underscores the importance of designing AI-enhanced experiences that build cognitive muscle rather than bypass it.

➢ *Implementation in Practice*

Three examples drawn from the author's practice illustrate how these capabilities translate into real educational settings. First, in executive education, the author developed an AI-powered strategic advisor integrated into a CESIM competitive business simulation. The AI assistant analyzes each team's current market position, financial health, and competitive dynamics, then provides tailored strategic guidance calibrated to where the team stands in the simulation. Rather than replacing the facilitator's role, the AI augments the simulation experience by giving every team access to on-demand strategic consultation, a capability previously available only when the facilitator happened to be working with that particular group.

Second, in MBA education, the author built an AI-driven pricing simulator where students input product characteristics, cost structures, and competitive positioning, and the system generates market response scenarios across different pricing strategies, allowing students to test and iterate before committing to a strategy. In the same program, AI-generated audio and video summaries of each session's key concepts were provided to students, enabling spaced repetition and reinforcing learning between sessions.

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1885

Third, in corporate professional development, the author created two AI-powered tools. The first is a brand voice discovery system: an AI that conducts a structured conversation with the user to identify, articulate, and codify their organization's distinctive communication style, which then serves as a calibrated writing assistant for all subsequent brand communications. The second is a business process automation builder: an AI that interviews the user about their operational workflow, maps the process, identifies automation opportunities, and guides the user step by step through creating an automated agent to handle that process, effectively turning domain expertise into operational infrastructure without requiring technical skills.

➢ *Ethical Considerations*

The deployment of AI-powered learning environments raises ethical concerns that educators must address proactively. These include algorithmic bias in AI-generated scenarios that may embed cultural, gender, or socioeconomic assumptions; data privacy concerns regarding the collection and analysis of granular learner performance data; surveillance risks inherent in continuous behavioral monitoring during simulations; and algorithmic opacity that makes it difficult for learners to understand why AI counterparts responded in particular ways [21], [22]. The AIDE Framework, introduced in Section VI, positions the educator's role as ethical steward as a primary safeguard against these risks.

V. METHODOLOGY

This study employs an integrative literature review methodology, an approach suited to synthesizing diverse streams of research across a rapidly evolving field [23].

➢ *Search Strategy and Sources*

The literature search was conducted across Google Scholar, Scopus, ScienceDirect, ERIC, and the ACM Digital Library. Search terms included combinations of: case method business education, AI simulations management education, adaptive learning business school, generative AI pedagogy, experiential learning business, and business school curriculum innovation. Additional sources were identified through backward citation tracking and targeted searches of AACSB, Harvard Business Publishing, and ABSEL publications.

➢ *Inclusion and Selection*

Sources were included if: (a) published between 2015 and 2026, with emphasis on post-2022 publications; (b) focused on pedagogy in business, management, or executive education; (c) addressed the case method, business simulations, AI in education, adaptive learning, or experiential learning; and (d) written in English. Sources focused exclusively on K-12 education, clinical simulation without business relevance, or purely technical AI research without pedagogical application were excluded.

The initial search yielded approximately 180 results. After screening for relevance and removing duplicates, 71 sources were retained for detailed analysis: 22 in the case-based pedagogy stream, 19 in the simulation-based pedagogy stream, and 30 in the AI-augmented pedagogy stream. The final reference list of 30 sources represents the most directly relevant and frequently cited works across these streams.

➢ *Practitioner Observation*

The author's experience delivering professional education across leading global business schools, executive education programs, and corporate training environments is presented as complementary evidence. Observations are drawn from approximately 700 sessions delivered over a multi-year period, with cohort sizes ranging from 20 to 200 participants. This approach aligns with the reflective practice tradition in education research [24].

VI. LITERATURE SYNTHESIS AND GAP ANALYSIS

➢ *Stream One: Case-Based Pedagogy*

The case method literature affirms its effectiveness in developing analytical reasoning, oral argumentation, and comfort with ambiguity [5], [16]. Recent scholarship has focused on innovation within the method, including video-enhanced cases, team-based approaches, student-authored cases, and AI-assisted preparation [15], [16]. However, a notable gap is the absence of rigorous comparative studies measuring the case method's effectiveness against simulation-based or AI-augmented alternatives for specific learning outcomes.

➢ *Stream Two: Simulation-Based Pedagogy*

The simulation literature demonstrates consistent evidence that experiential methods produce stronger engagement, deeper skill transfer, and more durable learning than purely analytical approaches [8], [9]. A systematic review found growing institutional interest in experiential methodologies as business education moves toward a more participatory paradigm [8]. The constraint is that most studies evaluate pre-AI simulations, and coverage of AI-powered simulations in executive education contexts remains limited.

➢ *Stream Three: AI-Augmented Pedagogy*

The AI in education literature has expanded rapidly since late 2022. A systematic review of 71 empirical studies found positive impacts across cognitive, affective, and behavioral domains [3]. At the same time, research has found correlations between frequent AI tool use and reduced critical thinking [18], and evidence that students default to using AI for surface-level tasks rather than genuine sensemaking [17]. The critical gap in this stream is the lack of frameworks specifically designed for business education contexts.

➢ *The Critical Gap*

Across all three streams, one gap stands out: the absence of a transition framework. No existing framework answers the question educators are actually asking: How do I move from a case-centric classroom to a pedagogically richer environment that leverages AI-powered experiential learning? What are the stages, what changes at each stage, and what are the risks? This is the gap the AIDE Framework is designed to fill.

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1885

VII. THE AIDE FRAMEWORK

The AIDE Framework (Awareness, Integration, Deployment, Evolution) is a four-stage maturity model designed to help educators and institutions navigate the transition from case-centric pedagogy toward AI-driven experiential learning. It is not a prescription for abandoning the case method; it is a roadmap for expanding the pedagogical toolkit.

- *Stage A: Awareness*

Educators recognize that the pedagogical landscape is shifting but have not yet integrated AI into their teaching. AI's role is peripheral: educators may use ChatGPT personally for class preparation, but AI is not part of the student experience. The educator's role remains that of subject matter expert and discussion facilitator. Assessment follows conventional models: written case analyses and participation grades. The primary risk is stasis, as institutions that remain at this stage too long risk a growing disconnect between what they teach and how they teach it.

In practice, this looks like an educator who uses Claude to draft discussion questions or explore alternative case analyses the night before class, but whose students have never interacted with an AI tool as part of the course.

- *Stage I: Integration*

AI tools are introduced into the existing pedagogical framework as enhancements. Students might use ChatGPT to prepare for case discussions, analyze data with AI-powered tools, or receive AI-generated feedback. The educator becomes a facilitator and AI literacy coach, guiding students in using AI critically. Assessment becomes hybrid, incorporating AI-literacy components. The central risk is cognitive outsourcing: students using AI to produce polished outputs without developing underlying analytical skills [17], [18].

In practice, this looks like a class where students are asked to generate three competing analyses of the same case using an AI tool, then present and defend the one they believe is strongest, turning AI output into raw material for human judgment.

- *Stage D: Deployment*

AI-powered adaptive simulations become a primary learning environment for specific competencies. AI generates dynamic scenarios, serves as negotiation counterparts and stakeholder voices, and provides personalized feedback. The educator's role shifts to experience architect and debrief coach, arguably more demanding than traditional facilitation. Assessment becomes performance-based and data-rich, drawing on decision patterns, adaptation strategies, and outcome trajectories. Two risks dominate: over-reliance on AI environments with imperfect transfer to unstructured real-world contexts, and technological dependency on specific platforms [9], [12].

In practice, this looks like a 90-minute session where the first 60 minutes are spent inside an AI-powered negotiation or pricing simulation, with each student facing a different scenario, followed by a 30-minute facilitator-led debrief comparing decision patterns across the cohort.

- *Stage E: Evolution*

AI-driven systems continuously learn from learner data across cohorts and refine simulation designs automatically. The pedagogical system itself becomes adaptive. The educator's most critical function becomes ensuring that the AI-driven ecosystem remains aligned with educational values and the development of genuinely human capabilities: judgment, empathy, and ethical reasoning. Assessment becomes continuous and longitudinal. The primary risk is the dehumanization of education, the possibility that efficiency crowds out the generative human elements of learning [21], [22].

In practice, this looks like a program where the AI simulation platform automatically adjusts next cohort's scenarios based on aggregate performance data from the previous one, surfacing competency gaps that the educator then addresses through targeted interventions.

Table 1 Aide Framework Summary

Stage	Dimension	Description
A: Awareness	AI Role	Peripheral
	Educator	Expert & facilitator
	Method	Case studies
	Assessment	Written analysis
	Key Risk	Stasis
I: Integration	AI Role	Supplementary
	Educator	Facilitator & AI coach
	Method	Cases + AI tools
	Assessment	Hybrid
	Key Risk	Cognitive outsourcing
D: Deployment	AI Role	Central
	Educator	Architect & coach
	Method	AI simulations
	Assessment	Performance-based
	Key Risk	Over-reliance

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1885

E: Evolution	AI Role	Self-improving
	Educator	Strategist & steward
	Method	Evolving ecosystems
	Assessment	Continuous tracking
	Key Risk	Dehumanization

The framework is deliberately non-prescriptive about pace. An institution may spend years at Stage I before moving to Stage D. A corporate training program may leapfrog from A to D. The framework provides orientation, not mandated speed.

VIII. A PRACTICAL TOOLKIT FOR EDUCATORS

A framework without implementation guidance risks remaining theoretical. Research on pedagogical innovation adoption consistently shows that educators are far more likely to integrate new approaches when provided with concrete, actionable examples and ready-to-use resources rather than abstract recommendations [24], [30]. This section bridges that gap by demonstrating how educators can begin building AI-powered simulations and learning tools using platforms that are already widely accessible, at no or low cost, and without requiring programming expertise. The examples below are mapped to the AIDE stages, allowing educators to start where they are and build progressively. Several of these tools have been developed and tested by the author in live educational settings.

- *Tools for Stage I: Integration*

At the Integration stage, the goal is to enhance existing case-based teaching with AI, not replace it. Three immediately actionable approaches are available to any educator with access to a large language model such as ChatGPT, Claude, or Gemini.

First, generating branching case variations. An educator can take an existing case study and prompt the AI to generate three to five alternative versions with different market conditions, competitive dynamics, or stakeholder configurations. For example, one might instruct the model: You are a business case author. Take the following case summary and create three variations, each with a different macroeconomic environment, a different competitive response, and a different regulatory constraint. Keep the core decision dilemma intact. This produces multiple discussion tracks from a single case, enabling comparative analysis across scenarios within the same session.

Second, creating AI debate partners. Educators can configure a large language model to argue a specific stakeholder position during class preparation or live discussion. By setting the system prompt to something like: You are the CFO of this company. You believe the proposed expansion is financially reckless. Argue your position vigorously using the financial data provided. Students then practice defending their recommendations against a challenging, data-informed counterargument. This can be done live in class or assigned as preparation.

Third, AI-assisted case analysis feedback. After students submit written case analyses, educators can use AI to generate first-pass feedback on analytical structure, identification of key issues, and quality of evidence use, freeing the educator to focus feedback on higher-order reasoning and judgment. Tools like Claude Projects or custom GPTs allow educators to create reusable feedback environments with consistent evaluation criteria.

- *Tools for Stage D: Deployment*

At the Deployment stage, AI becomes the learning environment itself. While purpose-built simulation platforms exist, educators can prototype surprisingly effective simulations using accessible tools.

Custom AI simulation environments can be built using ChatGPT's custom GPT builder, Claude Projects, or Google Gemini Gems. An educator creates a persistent AI persona with defined objectives, constraints, and behavioral rules. For a negotiation simulation, one might configure: You are the procurement head of a major hospital chain. Your budget has been cut by 15 percent. You need to renegotiate contracts with pharmaceutical suppliers. You have a hidden constraint: you cannot switch suppliers for oncology drugs due to a three-year exclusivity agreement. Be tough but fair. Respond to the student as if they are the supplier's account manager. Each student then enters the environment and conducts a live negotiation with the AI, receiving a unique experience based on their approach.

For crisis management simulations, an educator can use a multi-turn conversation where the AI generates escalating crisis events based on the student's responses. The prompt structure might begin with: You are a crisis simulation engine. Present a product recall scenario for a consumer electronics company. After each student response, escalate the crisis realistically based on their decisions. Generate simulated news headlines, social media reactions, and board member questions. If the student communicates proactively, de-escalate slightly. If they delay, escalate sharply. The educator monitors multiple student sessions simultaneously and conducts a comparative debrief afterward.

For market strategy simulations, Google Gemini's multimodal capabilities allow educators to feed real company financial data, market reports, and competitor information into the model alongside a simulation prompt. Students interact with a dynamic market environment that references actual industry data rather than fictional scenarios.

- *Tools for Stage E: Evolution*

At the Evolution stage, simulations become more sophisticated and self-improving. This requires some technical capability but remains accessible to educators willing to work with lightweight development tools.

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1885

Claude Code and similar AI-assisted development tools allow educators or their technical support staff to build lightweight web-based simulation applications without deep programming expertise. An educator can describe the desired simulation in natural language, and the AI coding assistant generates a functional prototype: a web interface where students log in, face a dynamic scenario, make decisions, and receive AI-generated feedback and scoring.

Workflow automation platforms such as Make.com or Zapier can connect AI models to data sources and feedback mechanisms. For example, an automated pipeline might take student simulation decisions from a Google Form, feed them to an AI model for evaluation, generate personalized feedback, log performance data in a spreadsheet, and send the student a customized debrief email, all without manual intervention. This creates the beginning of the continuous, data-driven learning loop that characterizes Stage E.

Connecting AI simulations to real-time data through APIs represents the frontier of this approach. An AI-powered market simulation can pull live stock prices, currency exchange rates, or commodity data to create scenarios grounded in current market reality rather than hypothetical conditions. While this requires more technical setup, the tools to do so are increasingly accessible and well-documented.

➢ *Implementation Principles*

Three principles should guide educators implementing these tools. First, start with existing pedagogy and enhance it rather than attempting to replace everything at once. A single AI-powered case variation exercise is a better starting point than a full simulation rebuild. Second, focus on the debrief rather than the technology. The learning happens not during the AI interaction but during the reflection and sense-making that follows. Third, iterate rapidly. AI tools allow educators to prototype, test with a single cohort, gather feedback, and refine within days rather than the months or years that traditional simulation development requires.

IX. PRACTITIONER VALIDATION

➢ *The Engagement Pattern*

Across executive education programs, a consistent pattern is visible: case discussions generate strong engagement in the first 20-30 minutes, then plateau. Students who prepared well dominate while the middle majority participates sporadically. When the same cohorts are placed in simulation-based environments, the pattern inverts. Students who were quietest during case discussions often become the most animated during simulations. The experience of making decisions with real consequences activates a different kind of learning energy [8], [9].

➢ *The Corporate Training Gap*

In corporate training contexts, the gap between case-based pedagogy and real-world skill requirements is particularly visible. Senior professionals with 15 to 25 years of experience consistently find case discussions intellectually interesting but professionally insufficient. Their feedback amounts to: the ability to analyze situations is already developed; what is needed is practice making decisions faster, with better tools, under realistic pressure. This maps directly onto the AIDE Framework's argument for Stage D capabilities.

➢ *Where the Case Method Remains Superior*

For foundational analytical reasoning, teaching students to structure messy problems and build coherent arguments, the case method remains unmatched. Similarly, for developing oral argumentation under peer challenge, the social dynamics of case discussions create conditions no simulation currently replicates. The AIDE Framework accounts for this: it proposes that institutions develop the capacity to operate across stages, using cases for the competencies cases develop best and simulations for those cases cannot reach.

X. IMPLICATIONS

➢ *For Business School Faculty*

The educator's role is evolving, not diminishing. Each AIDE stage requires more pedagogical skill, not less. Designing effective AI-powered simulation experiences, conducting meaningful debriefs, and stewarding ethical dimensions of AI-augmented learning are demanding professional capabilities. Faculty should recognize that the transition does not require technical AI expertise; an effective educator at Stage D needs to understand what AI systems can do and design learning experiences that leverage those capabilities [11], [12].

➢ *For Institutional Leaders*

The AIDE Framework should be used as a diagnostic tool. Institutions should resist the temptation to skip stages: moving directly from Stage A to Stage D without building AI literacy and pedagogical experimentation capacity at Stage I risks both faculty resistance and poor learning design.

➢ *For Corporate Training Programs*

Corporate L&D programs may be the fastest adopters of Stage D capabilities due to direct ROI pressure, experienced learner populations, and fewer governance constraints. The evidence from meta-analyses of adaptive learning suggests meaningful performance gains [13], and the competitive advantage of offering personalized, adaptive, simulation-based training is significant [19].

XI. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This study has several limitations. First, as an integrative review supplemented by practitioner observations, it does not provide controlled empirical evidence for definitive causal claims about the superiority of AI-powered simulations over case-based methods. The AIDE Framework is a conceptual model, not a tested empirical instrument.

Second, practitioner observations reflect the experience of a single educator. Multi-educator, multi-institutional studies would strengthen the evidence base. Third, the AI-powered simulation landscape is evolving rapidly; specific capabilities described may shift significantly within months. Fourth, this

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1885

study does not address cost and resource implications of transitioning across AIDE stages in depth.

Future research directions include: (a) empirical validation of the AIDE Framework across institutional contexts; (b) comparative effectiveness studies for specific competencies; (c) longitudinal studies tracking learning transfer to professional performance; (d) faculty development models for Stage D and E roles; and (e) cost-benefit analyses across institutional types.

XII. CONCLUSION

The case method was built for a world that moved slowly enough for retrospective analysis to be the dominant mode of leadership learning. That world has not disappeared, but it has been joined by one that demands real-time adaptive judgment, AI-augmented decision-making, and the ability to navigate complexity that no pre-written narrative can fully capture.

This paper has traced the pedagogical arc of business education across four eras, examined the constraints where the case method encounters contemporary demands, reviewed emerging evidence on AI-powered adaptive simulations, and introduced the AIDE Framework as a structured roadmap for institutional transition.

The central argument is not that the case method should be replaced. It is that the case method should be joined by a new generation of AI-driven experiential learning environments that develop competencies it was never designed to reach. Business education needs analysis and action, retrospection and real-time decision-making, individual reasoning and adaptive collaboration with AI. No single method delivers all of these. The AIDE Framework offers educators a way to navigate this expansion, stage by stage, with clarity about what each stage requires and what it risks.

REFERENCES

[1]. D. A. Kolb, Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1984.
[2]. C. R. Christensen, D. A. Garvin, and A. Sweet, Eds., Education for Judgment: The Artistry of Discussion Leadership. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1991.
[3]. X. Liu and B. Zhong, "Integrating generative artificial intelligence into student learning: A systematic review from a TPACK perspective," Learning and Instruction, vol. 96, 2025.
[4]. Poets & Quants, "How Harvard Business School uses generative AI in its MBA classrooms," Mar. 2024. [Online]. Available: https://poetsandquants.com/2024/03/13/
[5]. T. Bridgman, S. Cummings, and C. McLaughlin, "Restating the case: How revisiting the development of the case method can help us think differently about the future of the business school," Academy of Management Learning & Education, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 724-741, 2016.
[6]. D. A. Kolb, "Experiential learning theory and the learning style inventory: A reply to Freedman and Stumpf," Academy of Management Review, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 289-296, 1981.
[7]. F. De Beule, A. Jaklic, and H. Voss, "Teaching international business through video case studies," AIB Insights, vol. 25, no. 1, 2024.
[8]. C. Crovini et al., "Enhancing business higher education through simulation-based learning, problem-based learning, and challenge-based learning," Preprints, 2024.
[9]. M. P. O'Brien, Y. Costin, and W. Hogan, "Beyond AI: How business simulations preserve human-centric learning," in Proc. European Conf. on e-Learning (ECEL), 2025.
[10]. Y. Xu and B. Zhong, "Exploring the impact of artificial intelligence on business talent development in higher education: A systematic literature review," The International Journal of Management Education, vol. 23, no. 1, 2025.
[11]. AACSB, "AI-driven simulations build decision-making skills," AACSB Insights, Feb. 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.aacsb.edu/insights/
[12]. AACSB, "Management or mastery: How important is AI for MBA students?," AACSB Insights, Mar. 2024. [Online]. Available: https://www.aacsb.edu/insights/
[13]. X. Wang, R. Huang, M. Sommer, B. Pei, P. Shidfar, M. S. Rehman, A. D. Ritzhaupt, and F. Martin, "The efficacy of artificial intelligence-enabled adaptive learning systems from 2010 to 2022 on learner outcomes: A meta-analysis," Journal of Educational Computing Research, vol. 62, no. 6, pp. 1568-1603, 2024.
[14]. Personalized adaptive learning in higher education: A scoping review of key characteristics and impact on academic performance and engagement," Heliyon, vol. 10, no. 21, 2024.
[15]. A. L. Wright, G. L. Irving, S. Pereira, and J. Staggs, "An instructional innovation that embeds group learning in case teaching: The TaBLE Case Method," Journal of Management Education, vol. 48, no. 2, pp. 203-234, 2024.
[16]. S. Puri, "Teaching with the case method to build and teach management theory in offline and online courses," Innovations in Education and Teaching International, 2025.
[17]. I. Fischer, S. Sweeney, and N. Gupta, "Making sense of generative AI for assessments: Contrasting student claims and assessor evaluations," The International Journal of Management Education, vol. 22, no. 3, 2024.
[18]. M. Gerlich, "AI tools and the erosion of critical thinking: A study on the correlation between generative AI use and cognitive skills," Societies, vol. 15, no. 1, 2025.
[19]. A. Ellikkal and S. Rajamohan, "AI-enabled personalized learning: Empowering management students for improving engagement and academic performance," VILAKSHAN - XIMB Journal of Management, vol. 22, no. 1, pp. 28-44, 2025.
[20]. M. P. O'Brien, Y. Costin, and W. Hogan, "Beyond AI: How business simulations preserve human-centric learning," in Proc. European Conf. on e-Learning (ECEL), 2025.

ISSN No: -2456-2165 https://doi.org/10.38124/ijisrt/26mar1885

[21]. L. Chen, P. Chen, and Z. Lin, "Artificial intelligence in education: A review," IEEE Access, vol. 8, pp. 75264-75278, 2020.
[22]. W. Holmes, M. Bialik, and C. Fadel, Artificial Intelligence in Education: Promises and Implications for Teaching and Learning. Boston, MA: Center for Curriculum Redesign, 2022.
[23]. R. Whittemore and K. Knafl, "The integrative review: Updated methodology," Journal of Advanced Nursing, vol. 52, no. 5, pp. 546-553, 2005.
[24]. D. A. Schon, The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action. New York, NY: Basic Books, 1983.
[25]. M. Schonewille, "Curating truth or simulating thought? The ethics of AI-generated case studies in business education," Journal of Ethics in Entrepreneurship and Technology, 2025.
[26]. J. Gosen and J. Washbush, "A review of scholarship on assessing experiential learning effectiveness," Simulation & Gaming, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 270-293, 2004.
[27]. F. Bellotti, R. Berta, A. De Gloria, and L. Primavera, "Enhancing the educational value of business simulation games," Computers & Education, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 129-141, 2012.
[28]. N. Phan, "Bridging the gap: A framework for experiential learning in higher education," Business and Professional Communication Quarterly, 2024.
[29]. F. De Beule, A. Jaklic, and H. Voss, "Teaching international business through video case studies," AIB Insights, vol. 25, no. 1, 2024.
[30]. University of South Florida, "How educators are using AI to enhance, not replace, experiential learning," 2025. [Online]. Available: https://www.stpetersburg.usf.edu/