Global Journal of Statistics
Vol. 1 No.1 2026 Page 40-48
E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX, DOI: 10.XXXXX/XXXX

The Application of Statistical Learning and Machine Learning in Supporting Organizational Strategic Decision-Making

Ahmad Ramadhan[1]*, Budi Fauzi[2], Citra Yunita[3]
[1,2] Department of Educational Technology, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
[3] Department of Physical Education, Faculty of Sports Science, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Received : 6 February 2026
Revised : 6 April 2026
Accepted : 26 April 2026

Keyword:

Statistical learning;
Machine learning;
Strategic decision-making;
Data-driven decision-making;
Human-ai collaboration.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to explore how statistical learning and machine learning support organizational strategic decision-making, with a focus on how organizational actors interpret, trust, and use algorithmic outputs in strategic contexts. The study used a qualitative case study approach because the research examined meanings, experiences, and decision processes within real organizational settings. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, non-participant observation, and document analysis involving senior managers, strategic planning officers, data analysts, IT managers, and operational decision-makers from selected organizations that had applied predictive analytics, dashboards, or machine learning-based decision support tools. The data were analyzed using reflexive thematic analysis. The findings reveal four main themes: data as a strategic language, trust and interpretation of model outputs, negotiation between human judgment and algorithmic recommendation, and organizational readiness for data-driven decision-making. The study shows that statistical learning and machine learning improve strategic decision-making when organizations combine analytical capability with human interpretation, transparent communication, and collaborative decision routines. These findings contribute to the literature on data-driven decision-making, dynamic capabilities, and human-AI collaboration by showing that machine learning creates strategic value through socio-technical interaction rather than technical accuracy alone. The study implies that organizations need stronger data governance, data literacy, explainability mechanisms, and ethical guidelines to support responsible and effective use of machine learning in strategic decisions.

***) Corresponding Author:**

Ahmad Ramadhan,
Department of Educational Technology, Faculty of Education, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
Email: ahmad.ramadhan060@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Organizations increasingly rely on statistical learning and machine learning to support strategic decision-making in complex and uncertain environments. These methods allow organizations to detect patterns, estimate risks, classify alternatives, and predict possible outcomes from large and diverse data sources. Dwivedi et al. (2021) explained that artificial intelligence has become a multidisciplinary force that affects policy, management, technology, and organizational practice. Borges et al. (2021) showed that AI has become a strategic resource in the digital era because it helps organizations connect data, automation, and competitive action. Sarker (2021) also emphasized that machine learning enables systems to learn from data and improve prediction across real-world domains. In this context, statistical learning and machine learning no longer function only as technical tools. They shape how leaders define problems, compare alternatives, and justify strategic choices.

At the organizational level, the rise of data-driven decision-making reflects a shift from intuition-based judgment toward evidence-based strategy. Mikalef et al. (2020) found that big data analytics capability can improve competitive performance when organizations develop dynamic and operational capabilities. Li et al. (2022) showed that big data analytics usage can improve decision-making quality through stronger data analytics capabilities. Chatterjee et al. (2023) added that analytics-based decision processes can strengthen forecasting and firm performance. However, the use of statistical learning and machine learning does not automatically create better decisions. Organizations still need reliable data, skilled analysts, supportive leaders, and a culture that values critical interpretation.

In many organizations, the main problem does not lie only in the availability of technology. It also lies in how organizational actors understand, trust, and use algorithmic outputs in strategic discussions. Raisch and Krakowski (2021) described this condition as a tension between automation and augmentation, where AI may replace certain human tasks but may also strengthen managerial capacity. Puranam (2021) argued that human-AI collaboration should be treated as an organization design problem because decision quality depends on how tasks are divided between people and algorithms. Sturm et al. (2023) found that machine learning advice affects managerial decisions through the way decision-makers use and interpret the advice. These findings indicate that strategic decisions remain social and interpretive, even when supported by advanced models.

The application of statistical learning and machine learning also raises issues of transparency, accountability, and trust. Many machine learning models produce accurate predictions, but users may struggle to understand how the model reaches its recommendation. Yu et al. (2022) showed that transparency in AI decision-making influences employee trust because users need to assess both effectiveness and discomfort. Aysolmaz et al. (2023) found that public perception of algorithmic decision systems relates to fairness, explainability, accountability, and privacy. Berente et al. (2021) argued that managing AI requires attention to coordination, control, leadership, and organizational routines. These issues are important because strategic decisions often involve high consequences, such as investment allocation, workforce planning, market expansion, and institutional transformation.

Recent studies have examined AI, big data analytics, and machine learning in relation to firm performance, innovation, and decision quality. Enholm et al. (2022) explained that AI creates business value when organizations align technology with processes, people, and strategy. Wamba-Taguimdje et al. (2020) showed that AI-based transformation projects can influence firm performance when they are embedded in organizational capability. Ram and Desgourdes (2024) found that big data analytics can improve project decision-making by providing timely insight during the project lifecycle. Csaszar et al. (2024) further showed that AI can support strategic decision-making by improving search, representation, and aggregation in strategic analysis. Even so, much of the existing literature still focuses on measurable outcomes, adoption factors, and performance effects.

This study addresses that gap by examining how organizational actors make sense of statistical learning and machine learning in strategic decision-making. Prior research has explained the technical and performance value of analytics, but fewer studies have explored how managers, analysts, and decision-makers negotiate trust, interpret model outputs, and integrate algorithmic recommendations into strategic judgment. Kitsios and Kamariotou (2021) called for further research on the relationship between AI, business strategy, and digital transformation. Guedes and Oliveira Júnior (2024) showed that AI adoption in organizations requires contextual understanding of institutional, managerial, and operational conditions. Neumann et al. (2024) also highlighted that AI adoption develops through organizational readiness, learning, and governance. Therefore, this study aims to explore the experiences, meanings, and decision processes of organizational actors who use statistical learning and machine learning to support strategic decisions. The study contributes theoretically to data-driven decision-making, dynamic capabilities, and human-AI collaboration. It also offers practical insight for organizations that seek to build transparent, responsible, and human-centered analytics governance.

2. Materials and Methods

This study used a qualitative case study approach to explore how statistical learning and machine learning support organizational strategic decision-making. A qualitative design was appropriate because the study focused on meaning, experience, interpretation, and organizational process rather than statistical measurement. Priya (2021) explained that case study methodology allows researchers to examine a phenomenon within its real-life context. Guedes and Oliveira Júnior (2024) used a case study approach to understand AI adoption in public organizations, which shows the relevance of this design for studying technology implementation in institutional settings. Neumann et al. (2024) also showed that AI adoption must be understood through organizational readiness, actor involvement, and implementation stages. This study therefore treated machine learning adoption as a situated organizational practice, not only as a technical intervention.

The research was conducted from January to April 2025 in selected medium and large organizations that had already used statistical learning, machine learning, or big data analytics in strategic decision-making. The research sites included organizations in business services, public administration, education, and financial management. These sectors were selected because they commonly use dashboards, prediction models, classification systems, forecasting tools, and algorithmic recommendations in planning and evaluation. Campbell et al. (2020) stated that purposive sampling is useful when researchers need participants who have direct experience with a specific phenomenon. Li et al. (2022) showed that analytics capability affects decision quality, so this study selected organizations that had visible analytics practices. Ram and Desgourdes (2024) also supported the use of qualitative inquiry to examine how analytics contributes to decision performance in organizational projects.

Participants were selected through purposive sampling and then extended through snowball sampling. The main participants included senior managers, strategic planning officers, data analysts, IT managers, business intelligence officers, and operational decision-makers. Participants had to meet three criteria. First, they had direct involvement in strategic or semi-strategic decisions. Second, they had experience using statistical learning, machine learning, predictive analytics, or dashboard-based evidence. Third, they could explain how analytical outputs influenced organizational choices. Campbell et al. (2020) emphasized that purposive sampling requires clear inclusion logic so that selected participants can provide rich and relevant data. Puranam (2021) showed that human-AI collaboration depends on how tasks and judgment are distributed across organizational actors. Sturm et al. (2023) further demonstrated that decision-makers' use of machine learning advice plays a central role in managerial decision outcomes. These arguments guided the participant selection process.

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, non-participant observation, and document analysis. Semi-structured interviews explored participants' experiences in using machine learning outputs, assessing model credibility, resolving disagreement between human judgment and algorithmic recommendation, and translating data insights into strategy. Observation focused on meetings, dashboard review sessions, planning discussions, and decision forums where analytical outputs were discussed. Document analysis included strategic plans, dashboard screenshots, analytical reports, decision memos, data governance guidelines, and internal evaluation documents. Braun and Clarke (2021) stressed that qualitative research should generate rich and meaningful data that can support interpretive analysis. Ayre and McCaffery (2022) explained that thematic analysis can work with interview and textual data when researchers examine patterns of meaning. Christou (2023) also noted that qualitative analysis requires careful movement from data familiarity to theme development.

Data validation used triangulation, member checking, and an audit trail. Source triangulation compared the views of managers, analysts, IT staff, and planning officers. Method triangulation compared interviews with observation notes and organizational documents. Member checking asked selected participants to review short summaries of their interviews and confirm whether the researcher's interpretation reflected their intended meaning. Johnson et al. (2020) explained that rigor in qualitative research depends on credibility, consistency, and transparent documentation. Byrne (2022) showed that reflexive thematic analysis requires researchers to make coding and theme construction visible. Aysolmaz et al. (2023) also highlighted that algorithmic decision systems raise issues of transparency and accountability, which made careful validation important in this study. An audit trail documented interview guides, field notes, coding decisions, analytical memos, and theme revisions.

Data analysis used reflexive thematic analysis. The process began with repeated reading of interview transcripts, observation notes, and documents to build familiarity with the data. Initial codes were developed around data availability, model interpretation, trust, explainability, managerial judgment, organizational resistance, strategic accountability, and analytics governance. The codes were then grouped into categories and developed into broader themes. Braun and Clarke (2021) argued that themes are actively developed through researcher engagement with data, not simply found in the dataset. Byrne (2022) provided a practical model for moving from codes to themes in a systematic and transparent way. Christou (2023) emphasized that thematic analysis helps researchers connect participant meanings with broader theoretical interpretation. This study used those principles to identify how organizational actors made sense of machine learning in strategic decision-making.

The final interpretation linked the empirical themes with theories of data-driven decision-making, dynamic capabilities, and human-AI collaboration. Dynamic capabilities helped explain how organizations sense data signals, seize analytical opportunities, and reconfigure decision routines. Mikalef et al. (2020) showed that analytics capability supports competitive performance through dynamic and operational capabilities. Enholm et al. (2022) explained that AI creates business value when technology, people, processes, and strategy are aligned. Raisch and Krakowski (2021) clarified the tension between automation and augmentation in AI-based management. Csaszar et al. (2024) added that AI can influence strategic decision-making by improving the cognitive processes of search, representation, and aggregation. These theoretical lenses allowed the study to explain not only whether machine learning supported decisions, but also how actors interpreted, negotiated, and institutionalized its role in strategic practice.

3. Results and Discussions

The analysis identified four main themes that explain how statistical learning and machine learning support organizational strategic decision-making. These themes were: data as a strategic language, trust and interpretation of model outputs, negotiation between human judgment and algorithmic recommendation, and organizational readiness for data-driven decision-making. These themes emerged from interview transcripts, observation notes, and internal documents such as dashboard reports, strategic planning memos, and data governance guidelines. The findings show that statistical learning and machine learning did not function only as technical instruments. They shaped how organizational actors discussed problems, justified decisions, and evaluated future risks.

The first theme, data as a strategic language, shows that machine learning changed how managers explained organizational problems. Participants stated that strategic meetings became more structured after the organization adopted predictive dashboards and analytical reports. Decisions that were previously based on seniority, personal experience, or informal assumptions began to include evidence from data models. One strategic planning officer explained, “Before we used the dashboard, discussion often depended on who had the strongest opinion. Now we must explain why the data supports or rejects a proposal.” This statement indicates that statistical learning tools helped create a shared language for discussing uncertainty, risk, and opportunity. Observation during planning meetings also showed that managers used terms such as trend, probability, prediction, and scenario more frequently when presenting strategic options.

The second theme, trust and interpretation of model outputs, reflects participants’ mixed responses toward machine learning recommendations. Some participants trusted model outputs because they believed the system could process larger datasets than human analysts. Others remained cautious because they did not always understand how the model produced its recommendation. A data analyst stated, “The model can show the risk score, but not every manager understands the logic behind that score.” A senior manager also noted, “I trust the model when the result matches field experience, but when it contradicts what we know, we need more explanation.” These findings show that trust did not depend only on model accuracy. Trust also depended on explainability, communication, and the ability of analysts to translate technical outputs into managerial language.

The third theme, negotiation between human judgment and algorithmic recommendation, shows that strategic decisions were rarely made by following machine learning outputs directly. Participants described the model as a decision support tool, not a final decision-maker. One manager explained, “The system gives us a signal, but the final decision still depends on context, policy, and organizational priorities.” This pattern appeared clearly in observations of decision meetings. When the model suggested a high-risk classification, managers asked whether the result reflected real market conditions, data quality problems, or temporary anomalies. In this process, human judgment remained important. Machine learning provided evidence, but organizational actors still interpreted that evidence based on institutional goals, stakeholder interests, and practical constraints.

The fourth theme, organizational readiness for data-driven decision-making, highlights the importance of culture, skills, infrastructure, and leadership support. Participants stated that the use of statistical learning and machine learning worked better when leaders encouraged evidence-based discussion and allowed staff to question model results. However, some units still treated analytics as an administrative requirement rather than a strategic resource. One IT manager said, “The technology is available, but not all departments are ready to use it as part of decision-making.” Document analysis also showed gaps between formal digital transformation policies and actual decision routines. Some departments had clear data governance procedures, while others still relied on fragmented spreadsheets and manual reporting. This finding suggests that machine learning adoption requires organizational change, not only technical installation.

The findings also reveal a social and cultural dimension in the use of machine learning. In some cases, participants felt that algorithmic recommendations challenged established authority. Senior managers who were used to experience-based decision-making sometimes felt uncomfortable when younger analysts questioned their assumptions using model outputs. One participant stated, “Data gives junior staff a stronger voice because they can show evidence, not just opinion.” This condition changed the internal power dynamic of strategic meetings. Machine learning tools gave technical staff greater influence in decision forums, but they also created tension when model-based evidence conflicted with managerial intuition. Therefore, the adoption of statistical learning and machine learning produced not only technical transformation, but also cultural negotiation inside the organization.

Overall, the results show that statistical learning and machine learning supported strategic decision-making by improving data visibility, strengthening evidence-based discussion, and helping organizations anticipate future risks. However, the findings also show that model outputs gained strategic value only when organizational actors could interpret, question, and contextualize them. The most effective decisions emerged when managers and analysts worked together. Analysts explained the model, managers evaluated the organizational context, and both groups discussed the strategic implications. This pattern shows that machine learning created value through collaboration between technical systems and human interpretation.

Discussion

The findings support the argument that statistical learning and machine learning can improve strategic decision-making when organizations have strong analytical capability and clear decision routines. This result aligns with Mikalef et al. (2020), who found that big data analytics capability strengthens organizational performance through dynamic and operational capabilities. It also supports Li et al. (2022), who showed that analytics usage improves decision-making quality when organizations develop adequate data capabilities. The present study adds a qualitative perspective by showing how this process occurs in daily organizational practice. Analytics capability does not only mean having data infrastructure. It also means having people who can interpret model outputs, communicate findings, and connect analytical results with strategic priorities.

The study also confirms that machine learning changes the relationship between human judgment and algorithmic recommendation. The findings are consistent with Raisch and Krakowski (2021), who described the automation-augmentation paradox in AI-based management. In this study, organizations did not fully automate strategic decisions. Instead, they used machine learning to augment human judgment. This finding also supports Puranam's (2021) view that human-AI collaboration is an organization design issue. Strategic decision-making required a clear division of roles between analysts, managers, and technical systems. The model identified patterns and risks, analysts explained the results, and managers evaluated the broader implications. This arrangement shows that machine learning can strengthen decision-making when the organization designs collaborative routines around it.

The issue of trust became central in the findings. Participants trusted machine learning recommendations when they could understand the logic, compare the output with field experience, and receive clear explanations from analysts. This finding supports Yu et al. (2022), who argued that transparency influences trust in AI decision-making. It also aligns with Aysolmaz et al. (2023), who found that explainability, fairness, accountability, and privacy shape public perception of algorithmic systems. The present study extends these arguments by showing that trust is not a fixed attitude. Trust develops through interaction, explanation, and repeated use. Managers did not simply trust or reject the model. They assessed the model through organizational experience, data quality, and the credibility of the people who explained it.

The findings also reveal that machine learning adoption reshapes organizational culture. Data became a new form of authority in strategic meetings. This finding connects with Berente et al. (2021), who argued that managing AI requires attention to coordination, control, and organizational routines. It also supports Enholm et al. (2022), who stated that AI creates business value when it becomes aligned with people, processes, and strategy. In the present study, machine learning increased the influence of data analysts and technical staff in decision forums. This created a more evidence-based discussion, but it also produced tension with traditional managerial authority. This tension shows that AI adoption is not only a technological process. It is also a cultural and political process within organizations.

The findings are also relevant to dynamic capabilities theory. Organizations that used machine learning effectively showed the ability to sense changes, seize analytical opportunities, and reconfigure decision routines. This supports Mikalef et al. (2020), who linked big data analytics capability with dynamic and operational capabilities. It also aligns with Csaszar et al. (2024), who argued that AI can support strategic decision-making by improving search, representation, and aggregation. In this study, statistical learning helped organizations detect patterns, machine learning helped predict possible outcomes, and strategic meetings helped translate those outputs into action. The contribution of the study lies in showing that dynamic capability is not only built through technology. It is built through interpretation, communication, and organizational learning.

The findings partly differ from studies that emphasize the direct performance impact of AI and big data analytics. Chatterjee et al. (2023) and Ram and Desgourdes (2024) showed that analytics can improve forecasting, performance, and project decision-making. The present study does not reject those findings, but it shows that performance gains depend on social and organizational conditions. Machine learning outputs did not automatically produce better strategic decisions. Some participants hesitated to use model outputs when they lacked explanation, when the data seemed incomplete, or when the recommendation conflicted with field knowledge. This means that the value of machine learning depends on the organization's ability to combine technical accuracy with human sense-making.

The theoretical implication of this study is that data-driven decision-making should be understood as a socio-technical process. Statistical learning and machine learning provide analytical power, but strategic value emerges only when organizational actors can interpret and negotiate the meaning of model outputs. This study strengthens the literature on human-AI collaboration by showing that strategic decisions involve interaction between data, technology, expertise, authority, and institutional context. It also contributes to dynamic capabilities theory by showing that analytics capability requires continuous learning, not only investment in digital tools. Organizations need to develop routines that allow managers and analysts to question data, revise assumptions, and connect predictions with strategic action.

The practical implication is that organizations should not treat machine learning adoption as a purely technical project. Leaders need to build data literacy, improve model explainability, strengthen data governance, and create cross-functional decision forums. Managers should receive training that helps them understand model limitations, while analysts should learn how to communicate technical results in strategic language. Organizations also need clear procedures for validating model outputs before they influence high-impact decisions. These steps can reduce blind trust, prevent algorithmic overreliance, and support responsible data-driven decision-making.

Future research can expand this study by comparing organizations from different sectors, ownership types, or levels of digital maturity. Further studies may also examine how organizational hierarchy, professional background, and national culture influence trust in machine learning recommendations. Quantitative research can test the relationship between explainability, data literacy, trust, and strategic decision quality. Longitudinal studies may also explore how organizational reliance on statistical learning and machine learning changes over time. Such research can deepen understanding of how organizations move from early adoption to mature and responsible analytics governance.

4. Conclusions

This study concludes that statistical learning and machine learning support organizational strategic decision-making by strengthening data visibility, improving evidence-based discussion, and helping organizations interpret risks and opportunities more systematically. The findings show that these technologies do not replace managerial judgment. Instead, they work as decision-support mechanisms that require human interpretation, contextual understanding, and organizational negotiation. The main contribution of this study lies in showing that the value of machine learning in strategic decision-making emerges through interaction between data, technology, managerial experience, and organizational culture. This finding strengthens the literature on data-driven decision-making, dynamic capabilities, and human-AI collaboration by emphasizing that strategic value depends not only on model accuracy, but also on trust, explainability, data literacy, and collaborative decision routines.

The study has theoretical, practical, and policy implications. Theoretically, it expands the understanding of machine learning adoption as a socio-technical process rather than a purely technical intervention. Practically, it suggests that organizations need to improve data governance, build data literacy, and create cross-functional forums where managers and analysts can interpret model outputs together. From a policy perspective, organizations should develop clear guidelines for the ethical and accountable use of algorithmic recommendations in high-impact strategic decisions. Future research can compare organizations across sectors, examine the role of leadership and organizational hierarchy in shaping trust in machine learning, or use longitudinal designs to explore how data-driven decision-making develops over time.

References

Awan, U., Shamim, S., Khan, Z., Zia, N. U., Shariq, S. M., & Khan, M. N. (2021). Big data analytics capability and decision-making: The role of data driven insight on circular economy performance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 168*, 120766. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120766

Ayre, J., & McCaffery, K. J. (2022). Research note: Thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Physiotherapy, 68*(1), 76–79. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jphys.2021.11.002

Aysolmaz, B., Müller, R., & Meacham, D. (2023). The public perceptions of algorithmic decision-making systems: Results from a large-scale survey. *Telematics and Informatics, 79*, 101954. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2023.101954

Berente, N., Gu, B., Recker, J., & Santhanam, R. (2021). Managing artificial intelligence. *MIS Quarterly, 45*(3), 1433–1450. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/16274

Borges, A. F. S., Laurindo, F. J. B., Spínola, M. M., Gonçalves, R. F., & Mattos, C. A. (2021). The strategic use of artificial intelligence in the digital era: Systematic literature review and future research directions. *International Journal of Information Management, 57*, 102225. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2020.102225

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in reflexive thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 18*(3), 328–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & Quantity, 56*, 1391–1412. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. *Journal of Research in Nursing, 25*(8), 652–661. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206

Chatterjee, S., Chaudhuri, R., Gupta, S., Sivarajah, U., & Bag, S. (2023). Assessing the impact of big data analytics on decision-making processes, forecasting, and performance of a firm. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 196*, 122824. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2023.122824

Christou, P. A. (2023). How to use thematic analysis in qualitative research. *Journal of Qualitative Research in Tourism, 3*(2), 79–95. https://doi.org/10.4337/jqrt.2023.0006

Csaszar, F. A., Ketkar, H., & Kim, H. (2024). Artificial intelligence and strategic decision-making: Evidence from entrepreneurs and investors. *Strategy Science, 9*(4), 322–345. https://doi.org/10.1287/stsc.2024.0190

Dwivedi, Y. K., Hughes, L., Ismagilova, E., Aarts, G., Coombs, C., Crick, T., Duan, Y., Dwivedi, R., Edwards, J., Eirug, A., Galanos, V., Ilavarasan, P. V., Janssen, M., Jones, P., Kar, A. K., Kizgin, H., Kronemann, B., Lal, B., Lucini, B., & Williams, M. D. (2021). Artificial intelligence: Multidisciplinary perspectives on emerging challenges, opportunities, and agenda for research, practice and policy. *International Journal of Information Management, 57*, 101994. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2019.08.002

Enholm, I. M., Papagiannidis, E., Mikalef, P., & Krogstie, J. (2022). Artificial intelligence and business value: A literature review. *Information Systems Frontiers, 24*, 1709–1734. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-021-10186-w

Guedes, L., & Oliveira Júnior, M. (2024). Artificial intelligence adoption in public organizations: A case study. *Future Studies Research Journal: Trends and Strategies, 16*(1), e860. https://doi.org/10.24023/FutureJournal/2175-5825/2024.v16i1.860

Johnson, J. L., Adkins, D., & Chauvin, S. (2020). A review of the quality indicators of rigor in qualitative research. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education, 84*(1), 7120. https://doi.org/10.5688/ajpe7120

Kitsios, F., & Kamariotou, M. (2021). Artificial intelligence and business strategy towards digital transformation: A research agenda. *Sustainability, 13*(4), 2025. https://doi.org/10.3390/su13042025

Li, L., Lin, J., Ouyang, Y., & Luo, X. (2022). Evaluating the impact of big data analytics usage on the decision-making quality of organizations. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 175*, 121355. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121355

Mikalef, P., Krogstie, J., Pappas, I. O., & Pavlou, P. A. (2020). Exploring the relationship between big data analytics capability and competitive performance: The mediating roles of dynamic and operational capabilities. *Information & Management, 57*(2), 103169. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2019.05.004

Neumann, O., Guirguis, K., & Steiner, R. (2024). Exploring artificial intelligence adoption in public organizations: A comparative case study. *Public Management Review, 26*(1), 114–141. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2022.2048685

Priya, A. (2021). Case study methodology of qualitative research: Key attributes and navigating the conundrums in its application. *Sociological Bulletin, 70*(1), 94–110. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038022920970318

Puranam, P. (2021). Human-AI collaborative decision-making as an organization design problem. *Journal of Organization Design, 10*, 75–80. https://doi.org/10.1007/s41469-021-00095-2

Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation-augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review, 46*(1), 192–210. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2018.0072

Ram, J., & Desgourdes, C. (2024). Using big data analytics for improving decision-making performance in projects. *Journal of Engineering and Technology Management, 74*, 101849. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jengtecman.2024.101849

Sarker, I. H. (2021). Machine learning: Algorithms, real-world applications and research directions. *SN Computer Science, 2*, 160. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42979-021-00592-x

Sturm, T., Pumplun, L., Gerlach, J. P., Kowalczyk, M., & Buxmann, P. (2023). Machine learning advice in managerial decision-making: The overlooked role of decision makers' advice utilization. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems, 32*(4), 101790. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2023.101790