INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ECONOMIC SOCIAL SCIENCE AND MANAGEMENT LAW
E-ISSN: 3070-0558
VOL. 6, NO. 1 (2025)

WHEN AI TAKES INITIATIVE: MANAGERIAL AUTHORITY, ACCOUNTABILITY, AND DECISION QUALITY IN AGENTIC AI SYSTEMS

Jabin Prince
Research Author, Jerusalem,Israel

ABSTRACT

The deployment of agentic artificial intelligence systems reached a critical inflection point in 2025 as organizations increasingly allowed AI systems to initiate actions, make recommendations, and execute decisions with limited human intervention. While such systems promise efficiency, scalability, and enhanced decision quality, they also raise fundamental questions regarding managerial authority, accountability, and governance. This study examines how the growing autonomy of agentic AI systems reshapes managerial roles and decision-making structures in organizations during 2025. The research analyzes shifts in authority allocation, accountability mechanisms, and perceived decision quality arising from AI-initiated actions. By integrating managerial, ethical, and operational perspectives, the study contributes to understanding how organizations can harness agentic AI while maintaining responsible oversight and strategic control.

I. INTRODUCTION

Advances in artificial intelligence have moved organizational applications beyond decision support toward systems capable of autonomous initiative. Agentic AI systems are designed to set goals, plan actions, and execute tasks within defined parameters, often interacting dynamically with complex organizational environments. By 2025, such systems were increasingly deployed across domains including operations management, finance, customer engagement, and supply chain coordination.

The delegation of initiative to AI challenges traditional conceptions of managerial authority. Historically, managers exercised control through direct decision-making and supervision. As agentic AI systems assume greater operational autonomy, managerial roles shift toward oversight, exception handling, and strategic alignment. This transition raises questions about who holds decision rights when AI systems act independently.

Accountability represents a central concern in the adoption of agentic AI. When AI-initiated decisions lead to undesirable outcomes, determining responsibility among developers, managers, and organizations becomes complex. Existing governance structures often lack clear mechanisms to assign accountability for autonomous system behavior, increasing legal and ethical risk.

Decision quality is another critical dimension influencing organizational acceptance of agentic AI systems. While AI autonomy can enhance consistency and speed, concerns persist regarding bias, contextual judgment, and alignment with organizational values. Evaluating whether agentic AI improves or undermines decision quality is essential for informed managerial adoption.

This study aims to examine the implications of agentic AI systems for managerial authority, accountability, and decision quality in 2025 organizations. By analyzing organizational experiences and governance responses, the research seeks to identify conditions under which AI initiative can be effectively integrated without eroding managerial responsibility or organizational trust.

II. LITERATURE SURVEY

Research on artificial intelligence in organizational decision-making has evolved from decision support systems toward autonomous and agentic applications. Russell

Received: 25-01-2025 | Accepted: 08-03-2025 | Published: 15-03-2025 | www.ijeml.com

and Norvig (2021) conceptualized intelligent agents as systems capable of perceiving environments and taking actions to maximize goal achievement, laying foundational theory for agentic AI in organizations.

Davenport and Ronanki (2018) examined early enterprise AI adoption and noted that most implementations initially augmented managerial decisions rather than replacing them. However, subsequent work by Davenport, Guha, Grewal, and Bressgott (2020) documented a shift toward AI systems capable of initiating actions, particularly in analytics-driven functions such as pricing and risk assessment.

From a governance perspective, Floridi et al. (2018) introduced ethical principles for AI, emphasizing accountability, transparency, and human oversight. Their framework remains influential in debates over assigning responsibility for AI-driven decisions, particularly when systems operate with partial autonomy.

Raisch and Krakowski (2021) analyzed human–AI collaboration and argued that increasing AI autonomy reshapes managerial authority by redistributing decision rights between humans and machines. They emphasized the need for new governance mechanisms to manage tensions between control and delegation.

In examining accountability, Martin, Shilton, and Smith (2020) highlighted that organizational accountability structures often lag behind technological capabilities. Their research suggested that unclear accountability for AI decisions can undermine trust and expose firms to legal and reputational risks.

Empirical studies by Kellogg, Valentine, and Christin (2020) explored algorithmic management and found that algorithmic decision-making alters power dynamics within organizations. While efficiency gains were observed, workers and managers reported reduced clarity regarding authority and responsibility.

Recent research focusing specifically on agentic AI includes studies by Brynjolfsson and McElheran (2023), who found that firms adopting more autonomous AI systems experienced productivity improvements alongside increased demand for managerial judgment and oversight. Their findings suggest that decision quality depends on how autonomy is balanced with human governance.

The reviewed literature indicates growing scholarly attention to AI autonomy, authority, and accountability, yet empirical analysis of agentic AI systems in organizational contexts remains limited. Few studies focus explicitly on decision quality outcomes and managerial accountability in 2025, when agentic AI adoption accelerated. This study addresses this gap by examining how organizations manage authority and accountability when AI takes initiative.

III. METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a descriptive and analytical research design to examine the implications of agentic artificial intelligence systems for managerial authority, accountability, and decision quality in organizations during 2025. The research focuses on understanding how organizations govern AI systems that are capable of initiating actions with limited human intervention. Both primary and secondary data sources were employed to ensure analytical depth and contextual validity.

Primary data were collected through a structured questionnaire administered to senior managers, functional heads, and technology leaders in organizations that had deployed agentic AI systems. The questionnaire captured perceptions related to delegation of decision rights, clarity of accountability, trust in AI-initiated decisions, and perceived changes in decision quality. A purposive sampling technique was used to ensure respondents possessed direct experience with AI-enabled decision processes.

Secondary data were sourced from organizational reports, AI governance frameworks, regulatory guidelines, and academic literature on artificial intelligence and management. Industry case studies and policy documents provided contextual insight into evolving governance practices. The study period was restricted to 2025 to align with the research objectives and the accelerated adoption of agentic AI systems.

The collected data were analyzed using descriptive statistical techniques to identify patterns in authority allocation, accountability mechanisms, and decision quality perceptions. Percentage analysis and mean score evaluation were employed to interpret managerial responses. This approach facilitated systematic assessment of organizational adaptation to AI-initiated decision-making.

IV. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

The analysis indicated that organizations deploying agentic AI systems experienced a redistribution of managerial authority. Managers increasingly shifted from direct decision-making toward supervisory and exception-handling roles. While this transition enhanced operational efficiency, respondents reported ambiguity regarding final decision ownership in AI-initiated actions.

Accountability emerged as a significant concern among managers. Respondents indicated that existing governance structures were often insufficient to clearly assign responsibility for AI-driven outcomes. Organizations with formalized AI governance committees and escalation protocols reported greater clarity and reduced accountability risk.

Perceptions of decision quality were generally positive for routine and data-intensive decisions, where agentic AI systems demonstrated consistency and speed. However, managers expressed reservations regarding AI performance in complex, value-laden, or novel situations requiring contextual judgment.

The interaction between authority, accountability, and decision quality was evident, as higher trust in AI systems corresponded with clearer governance frameworks and defined human oversight. Organizations lacking such structures reported lower confidence in AI-initiated decisions.

Overall, the data analysis suggests that agentic AI systems in 2025 can enhance decision quality when supported by robust governance and clearly delineated managerial responsibility. Absent such mechanisms, AI initiative may introduce uncertainty and risk into organizational decision-making.

V. FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

The study finds that the adoption of agentic AI systems in 2025 significantly altered managerial authority structures within organizations. Decision initiation increasingly shifted to AI systems for routine and data-intensive tasks, allowing managers to focus on strategic oversight. However, this redistribution of authority created ambiguity regarding ultimate decision ownership, particularly in cross-functional and high-impact decisions.

Accountability emerged as a critical governance challenge. Organizations lacking clearly defined AI accountability frameworks experienced heightened legal, ethical, and operational risk. In contrast, firms that implemented formal oversight mechanisms, including AI governance committees and escalation protocols, reported improved clarity and greater organizational confidence in AI-initiated outcomes.

Based on the findings, it is suggested that organizations establish explicit accountability structures for agentic AI systems. Defining decision boundaries, documenting AI decision logic, and maintaining human-in-the-loop intervention points can preserve managerial responsibility while leveraging AI autonomy.

Managers are further advised to align AI initiative with organizational values and strategic objectives. Regular audits of decision quality, bias monitoring, and continuous training can ensure that agentic AI enhances rather than undermines trust and performance.

VI. CONCLUSION

The study concludes that agentic AI systems in 2025 represent a transformative development in organizational decision-making. While AI-initiated actions offer efficiency and consistency, they fundamentally challenge traditional notions of managerial authority and accountability. Decision quality improvements are contingent upon the presence of robust governance and clear human oversight.

Overall, the findings underscore that the successful integration of agentic AI depends not solely on technological capability but on managerial design and ethical governance. Organizations that proactively redefine authority and accountability structures are better positioned to harness AI initiative while maintaining responsible control. This research contributes to emerging scholarship on AI governance and offers practical guidance for managers navigating the future of autonomous systems.

REFERENCES

1. Brynjolfsson, E., & McElheran, K. (2023). The rapid adoption of data-driven decision-making. American Economic Review, 113(4), 899–933.
2. Davenport, T. H., & Ronanki, R. (2018). Artificial intelligence for the real world. Harvard Business Review.
3. Davenport, T. H., Guha, A., Grewal, D., & Bressgott, T. (2020). How artificial intelligence will change the future of marketing. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 48(1), 24–42.
4. 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.
5. Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work. Academy of Management Annals, 14(1), 366–410.
6. Martin, K., Shilton, K., & Smith, J. (2020). Business and the ethical implications of technology. Business Ethics Quarterly, 30(1), 51–75.
7. Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management. Academy of Management Review, 46(1), 192–214.
8. Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2021). Artificial intelligence: A modern approach. Pearson.
9. OECD. (2025). AI governance and accountability. OECD Publishing.
10. World Economic Forum. (2025). Governance of autonomous systems. WEF.
11. European Commission. (2025). AI Act and organizational compliance. EU Publications.
12. NIST. (2025). AI risk management framework. NIST.
13. Gartner. (2025). Agentic AI in enterprise decision-making. Gartner.
14. McKinsey & Company. (2025). The next frontier of AI autonomy. McKinsey.
15. Harvard Business School. (2025). Managerial implications of autonomous AI. HBS Publishing.
16. MIT Sloan Management Review. (2025). Accountability in AI-driven organizations. MIT SMR.
17. PwC. (2025). Responsible AI and governance. PwC.
18. Deloitte. (2025). Managing agentic AI systems. Deloitte Insights.
19. ISO. (2025). AI management systems standards. ISO.

20. UNESCO. (2025). Ethics of artificial intelligence. UNESCO.