International Journal of Science and Research Archive
eISSN: 2582-8185
Cross Ref DOI: 10.30574/ijsra
Journal homepage: https://ijsra.net/

(REVIEW ARTICLE)

Investigating Executive Leadership Responses to AI-Induced Structural Change in Multinational Corporations-2025

Imam Akinlade [1], Gayathri Balakumar [2,*], Sreekanth B. Narayan [3], Shujaatali Badami [4], Uday Kiran Madineni [5], Tanvi Mittal [6] and Peace Aludogbu [7]

[1] *Harvard Business School, Boston US.*
[2] *Capital One, McLean, USA.*
[3] *Jack Welch Management Institute, Herndon, Virginia US.*
[4] *Liverpool John Moores University, Liverpool UK.*
[5] *Virtusa Corporation, Dallas TX, US.*
[6] *US Bancorp, Minneapolis, USA.*
[7] *Department of Management, College of Business, New Mexico State University.*

International Journal of Science and Research Archive, 2025, 17(03), 196-207

Publication history: Received 23 October 2025; revised on 30 November 2025; accepted on 02 December 2025

Article DOI: https://doi.org/10.30574/ijsra.2025.17.3.3196

Abstract

This review examines how executive leaders in multinational corporations navigate the structural upheavals triggered by artificial intelligence adoption. Drawing on scholarly literature published between 2015 and 2025, we identify five distinct response patterns through which executives address AI-induced transformation: strategic realignment, organizational restructuring, leadership style adaptation, workforce transformation management, and governance framework development. Our analysis reveals that successful executive responses share common characteristics they address multiple organizational levels simultaneously, establish proactive governance mechanisms, and pursue balanced integration of human and AI capabilities rather than simple automation. The evidence suggests substantial efficiency improvements accompany AI-driven restructuring, though workforce displacement rates vary considerably across industries and organizational contexts. Critical gaps persist in understanding how cultural contexts shape leadership responses, particularly in Africa and other underrepresented regions where infrastructure constraints, regulatory environments, and cultural values create distinct challenges. Similarly, questions remain about the long-term sustainability of AI-induced structural changes and the ethical frameworks executives employ when making consequential decisions about workforce and organizational transformation. This review contributes an integrated theoretical framework that synthesizes organizational change theory, technology adoption models, leadership paradigms, and institutional perspectives. For practitioners, we offer evidence-based guidance highlighting the importance of comprehensive change programs, experimental learning approaches, substantial workforce investment, and early establishment of robust governance structures. The ultimate contribution lies in advancing scholarly understanding while providing actionable insights for executives, boards, and policymakers navigating AI transformation in increasingly complex multinational environments.

Keywords: Executive Leadership; Artificial Intelligence; Organizational Change; Multinational Corporations; AI Governance; Digital Leadership

1. Introduction

The integration of artificial intelligence into corporate operations represents one of the most profound disruptive forces confronting contemporary organizations [1]. Unlike previous technological innovations that automated routine physical

* Corresponding author: Gayathri Balakumar

or clerical tasks, AI systems demonstrate capabilities in complex cognitive functions, autonomous decision-making, and adaptive learning that challenge the structural foundations of multinational corporations [2]. Economic forecasts suggest AI could contribute up to $15.7 trillion to the global economy by 2030, with organizational transformation accounting for the bulk of this value creation [3]. This transformation goes beyond process optimization to encompass strategic decision-making, organizational design, competitive dynamics, and the very nature of work itself.

Executive leaders in multinational corporations find themselves at a critical juncture. Traditional leadership paradigms developed for stable, hierarchical organizations prove insufficient for navigating AI-induced changes [4]. The scale and scope of AI implementation demand new approaches to strategic thinking, organizational governance, and change management that account for technology's transformative potential while addressing concerns about workforce displacement, ethical implications, and organizational identity [5]. The complexity amplifies in multinational contexts where cultural differences, regulatory variations, diverse labor market structures, and varying technological readiness create additional layers of challenge for executive leadership.

Existing research on organizational responses to technological change provides valuable theoretical foundations. Scholars have examined innovation diffusion, organizational change management, and technology acceptance [6]. However, much of this work predates the current AI revolution and focuses on incremental innovations rather than fundamental structural transformations. Recent studies have begun examining AI adoption patterns, algorithmic management, and digital transformation initiatives, yet comprehensive understanding of how executive leaders specifically respond to and manage AI-induced structural change remains fragmented across multiple disciplines including strategic management, organizational behavior, information systems, and international business [7-8].

This research review addresses critical knowledge gaps by systematically examining how executive leaders in multinational corporations respond to AI-induced structural changes [9]. The analysis focuses on understanding what strategic responses executives employ when confronting AI-induced organizational transformation, how executives restructure organizational architectures to accommodate AI capabilities, what leadership style adaptations emerge as executives navigate AI transformation, how executives manage workforce transformation and human capital implications of AI adoption, what governance frameworks executives establish to manage AI-related risks and ethical considerations, and how these responses vary across multinational contexts, with particular attention to underrepresented regions including Africa where research remains limited.

The significance of this review extends beyond academic interest to address pressing practical concerns facing corporate leaders worldwide. As AI technologies continue advancing at unprecedented rates, executives require evidence-based frameworks for navigating associated organizational transformations [10]. Understanding how leadership responses vary across different contexts, what factors predict successful navigation of AI-induced change, and what challenges commonly emerge provides actionable insights for executives, boards of directors, human resource professionals, and organizational development practitioners engaged in AI transformation initiatives.

2. Theoretical Framework

Understanding executive leadership responses to AI-induced structural change requires integrating multiple theoretical perspectives that individually address components of this complex phenomenon. This section develops a comprehensive theoretical framework by examining organizational change theory, technology adoption models, leadership paradigms, and structural adaptation concepts as they relate to AI transformation in multinational contexts.

2.1. Organizational Change and Transformation Theories

Classical theories of organizational change and transformation provide the foundation for understanding organizational responses to AI [11]. Early work emphasized planned change processes, with frameworks depicting transformation as proceeding through distinct stages of unfreezing, changing, and refreezing established patterns. While these linear models provided initial conceptual clarity, they prove inadequate for capturing the continuous, non-linear nature of AI-induced change. Contemporary perspectives recognize that fundamental disruptions like AI implementation require reconceptualizing organizational identity, capabilities, and strategic orientation rather than simply modifying existing structures [12].

Complexity theory offers particularly relevant insights by viewing organizations as complex adaptive systems where small technological interventions can produce cascading effects throughout the organizational ecosystem [13]. AI implementation exemplifies this dynamic complexity, as initial automation often triggers unexpected changes in workflow patterns, decision-making authority, information flows, and power relationships extending far beyond the

original scope. The emergent properties of complex systems suggest executive leaders cannot fully predict or control transformation outcomes but must guide adaptive processes through ongoing sense-making, experimentation, and adjustment.

Organizational ambidexterity provides another essential lens for examining executive responses to AI transformation [14]. This perspective emphasizes the challenge organizations face in simultaneously exploiting existing capabilities and exploring new possibilities. Leaders must balance investments in current operations generating immediate returns against investments in AI-enabled innovations that may transform future competitive positioning. This balancing act becomes particularly acute in multinational corporations operating across diverse markets with varying technological readiness, competitive intensities, and stakeholder expectations.

2.2. Technology Adoption and Innovation Frameworks

Technology adoption frameworks provide complementary perspectives on how organizations integrate new technologies into existing systems and practices [15]. The Technology-Organization-Environment framework suggests adoption decisions reflect the interplay of technological characteristics, organizational context, and environmental factors. Applied to AI adoption in multinational corporations, this framework highlights how technical capabilities of AI systems, organizational readiness including infrastructure and human capital, and environmental pressures from competitors, regulators, and stakeholders interact to shape executive responses.

Innovation diffusion theory emphasizes the process through which new technologies spread within and across organizations [16]. This perspective identifies characteristics influencing adoption rates including relative advantage compared to existing approaches, compatibility with established systems, complexity requiring specialized knowledge, trialability allowing low-risk experimentation, and observability of benefits. These factors take on particular significance for AI technologies where transformative potential creates high relative advantage but substantial complexity and compatibility challenges with existing organizational systems.

2.3. Leadership Theory and Executive Decision-Making

Leadership theory provides essential concepts for understanding how executives shape organizational responses to technological change. Transformational leadership theory suggests leaders who articulate compelling visions, inspire followers, provide intellectual stimulation, and demonstrate individualized consideration prove particularly effective in navigating major organizational changes [17]. Applied to AI transformation, this perspective emphasizes the role of executive vision-setting in creating shared understanding of AI's potential and mobilizing organizational support for transformation initiatives.

Strategic leadership theory focuses specifically on executive-level leadership and its influence on organizational outcomes through decisions about resource allocation, organizational design, strategic direction, and management of top teams [18]. In the context of AI transformation, strategic leadership involves making critical choices about the extent, pace, and focus of AI implementation while managing associated risks and balancing multiple stakeholder interests . Recent work on digital leadership suggests AI transformation may require new leadership competencies distinct from traditional managerial capabilities.

2.4. Organizational Structure and Design Theories

Understanding structural responses to AI requires examining theories of organizational design and structural adaptation. Contingency theory suggests organizational structures should align with environmental conditions, technology, size, and strategy for optimal performance [19]. AI technologies create new contingencies that may render traditional hierarchical structures obsolete while enabling more networked, decentralized organizational forms.

Information processing theory provides insights into how AI affects organizational structure through its impact on information flows and decision-making processes. AI systems dramatically enhance organizational capacity to collect, store, analyze, and disseminate information, potentially enabling larger spans of control, flatter hierarchies, and more decentralized decision-making by reducing information processing bottlenecks [20]. However, concentration of analytical capabilities in AI systems may simultaneously create new forms of centralization around data and algorithmic control.

2.5. Institutional Theory and Cross-Cultural Perspectives

Institutional theory provides essential framework for understanding how organizational responses to AI reflect not only technical and economic considerations but also cultural norms, regulatory requirements, and social legitimacy concerns

[21]. This perspective emphasizes that organizations are embedded in institutional environments defining appropriate structures, practices, and behaviors. In multinational contexts, institutional theory highlights how varying cultural values, regulatory frameworks, and normative expectations across countries create diverse institutional pressures executives must navigate simultaneously. This is particularly salient when considering regions such as Africa, where institutional contexts, infrastructure development, and regulatory frameworks differ substantially from those in North America, Europe, and Asia-Pacific, yet remain critically underexamined in existing AI transformation literature.

3. Executive Leadership Responses to AI-Induced Transformation

3.1. Strategic Responses to AI Adoption

Executive strategic responses to AI adoption in multinational corporations exhibit considerable variation in both nature and intensity of engagement with artificial intelligence technologies [22]. Three primary strategic orientations toward AI emerge from the literature, which executives adopt based on their assessment of competitive dynamics, organizational capabilities, and risk tolerance. The first involves defensive adaptation where executives adopt AI primarily to maintain competitive parity through incremental implementation. The second reflects offensive innovation where leaders pursue AI as a source of competitive differentiation, investing substantially in AI capabilities. The third encompasses transformative repositioning where executives fundamentally reconceive business models around AI capabilities.

Strategic responses correlate strongly with executive perceptions of AI's disruptive potential within specific industry contexts [23]. The timing and sequencing of AI adoption decisions represent critical dimensions of strategic responses with significant implications for transformation processes and outcomes. Resource allocation decisions serve as particularly visible manifestations of strategic responses and signal executive commitment levels to organizational members and external stakeholders.

Strategic responses in multinational contexts face additional complexity from varying national and regional contexts that shape both competitive dynamics and feasible implementation approaches [24]. Executives must navigate different regulatory environments, cultural attitudes toward automation, technological infrastructure capabilities, and competitive dynamics across markets. Table 1 synthesizes the strategic response patterns identified in the literature, illustrating how different organizational contexts give rise to distinct approaches to AI adoption [22-24].

Table 1 Strategic response patterns to AI adoption identified in executive leadership research.

Strategic Response Type	Key Characteristics	Typical Context	Implementation Pace	Competitive Impact	Organizational Disruption
Defensive Adaptation	Incremental adoption in specific functions; Focus on competitive parity; Limited business model change	Mature industries with stable competitive dynamics; Regulated sectors	Slow and measured implementation over extended periods	Moderate outcomes focused on maintaining market position	Low to Moderate disruption with minimal structural change
Offensive Innovation	Substantial investment in AI capabilities; Differentiation-seeking strategy; Selective business model innovation	High-technology sectors; Dynamic competitive environments; Strong resource base	Moderate pace with deliberate scaling	High competitive advantages through technological leadership	Moderate to High disruption with significant process changes
Transformative Repositioning	Fundamental business model reconception; Aggressive, comprehensive	Highly disrupted industries; First-mover seekers; Strong digital culture	Rapid implementation with aggressive timelines	Very High potential for market leadership and	High to Very High disruption requiring wholesale transformation

	adoption; Strategic redefinition			industry disruption	
Hybrid/Dual-Track	Combines incremental and transformative elements; Parallel quick wins and long-term initiatives	Large, complex organizations; Diversified portfolios; Mixed capabilities	Variable pace across different organizational units	Moderate to High balanced approach to competitive positioning	Moderate disruption with managed change processes

3.2. Organizational Restructuring Patterns

AI implementation triggers diverse organizational restructuring patterns as executives adapt formal structures to accommodate new technological capabilities. A dominant trend toward simultaneous centralization of certain functions and decentralization of others creates hybrid organizational architectures that differ fundamentally from traditional hierarchical structures [25]. This pattern reflects tension between the need for coordinated data strategies and consistent governance favoring centralization alongside desires to maintain flexibility and local responsiveness favoring decentralization. Many multinational corporations respond to AI by establishing new organizational units dedicated to digital transformation or AI innovation, with these units varying considerably in their structural positioning and authority levels.

Workforce restructuring represents one of the most visible aspects of organizational change following AI implementation [26]. Significant variation exists in executive approaches ranging from aggressive workforce reductions targeting automated tasks to comprehensive upskilling initiatives. Some executives pursue replacement strategies where AI adoption explicitly aims to reduce headcount while others adopt augmentation strategies emphasizing human-AI collaboration. The reconfiguration of decision-making authority emerges as a subtle but profound structural change, with AI systems capable of autonomous decision-making potentially redistributing authority traditionally held by middle managers and professionals.

Changes in organizational boundaries represent another important restructuring pattern as AI capabilities enable new forms of inter-organizational collaboration and ecosystem partnerships. Research also identifies restructuring of temporal dimensions as AI enables continuous operations and real-time responsiveness, with executives varying in their willingness to eliminate traditional temporal boundaries.

3.3. Leadership Style Adaptations

Executive leadership styles demonstrate notable adaptations in response to AI-induced organizational changes. Traditional command-and-control approaches prove increasingly inadequate for managing AI transformation given technical complexity and stakeholder sensitivities [27]. More effective executives adopt collaborative, facilitative leadership styles that engage diverse stakeholders in navigating technological change. Research identifies the emergence of digital leadership as a potentially distinct leadership approach characterized by comfort with technological ambiguity, willingness to experiment, emphasis on continuous learning, and ability to translate technical capabilities into strategic opportunities.

The role of executive sense-making becomes particularly critical during AI transformation. Leaders must help organizational members interpret ambiguous technological developments, construct shared understandings, and develop collective narratives that give meaning to organizational changes [28]. Communication patterns represent another dimension of leadership adaptation, with executives facing challenges of communicating about complex AI technologies to diverse audiences with varying technical sophistication.

Cross-cultural leadership challenges become particularly salient in multinational contexts where executives must adapt styles to accommodate different cultural expectations regarding authority, uncertainty tolerance, and appropriate relationships between organizations and employees [29]. Effective multinational executives develop cultural intelligence enabling behavioral flexibility across contexts while maintaining strategic consistency.

3.4. Workforce Transformation Management

Executive approaches to managing workforce transformation represent one of the most consequential dimensions of leadership response to AI implementation. A spectrum of approaches ranges from workforce displacement strategies

viewing workers as costs to minimize to human-AI collaboration strategies emphasizing complementarity. Investment in reskilling initiatives varies dramatically across organizations, with some leaders making substantial commitments to workforce development programs while others pursue minimal training investments.

Research examining relationships between workforce development investments and outcomes reveals that organizations investing substantially in reskilling achieve several benefits including lower resistance to AI adoption, retention of organizational knowledge embedded in experienced workers, more effective human-AI collaboration, and stronger employee engagement. The management of workforce anxiety emerges as critical given that AI implementation frequently generates concerns about job security and skill obsolescence.

Workforce planning strategies undergo substantial revision as executives confront changing skill requirements. Growing attention has been paid to ethical dimensions of workforce transformation, particularly regarding fairness in decisions about which workers face displacement. Questions arise about whether displacement decisions should prioritize performance, seniority, skills transferability, or demographic representation. While most organizations claim merit-based approaches, empirical studies reveal that implicit biases and political dynamics significantly influence actual outcomes. Table 2 synthesizes the workforce transformation strategies employed by executives during AI implementation, revealing fundamental tensions between cost reduction imperatives and human capital development priorities across different organizational approaches [30-32].

Table 2 Workforce transformation strategies employed by executives during AI implementation**.**

Strategy Type	Key Characteristics	Workforce Outcomes	Organizational Outcomes	Ethical Considerations
Displacement-Focused	Aggressive automation, minimal reskilling, cost reduction priority	Substantial displacement, elevated turnover, reduced morale	Rapid cost reduction, increased resistance to change	High ethical concerns regarding worker treatment and social responsibility
Augmentation-Focused	Human-AI collaboration emphasis, extensive reskilling, capability building	Limited displacement, skill growth, higher satisfaction	Moderate cost reduction, slower pace, innovation gains	Strong ethical performance, fairness emphasis, stakeholder trust
Hybrid/Selective	Targeted displacement, strategic reskilling, function-specific approaches	Moderate displacement, mixed morale, uneven skill development	Balanced cost reduction, measured pace	Fairness concerns in selection decisions and transparency issues

3.5. AI Governance and Ethical Frameworks

The establishment of AI governance frameworks emerges as critical for managing AI-related risks and ensuring responsible deployment. Research documents substantial variation in governance approaches ranging from minimal oversight focused on technical performance to comprehensive frameworks addressing ethical implications, fairness considerations, and societal impacts [32]. Organizational structures for AI governance vary considerably, with some executives establishing dedicated AI ethics boards while others distribute governance responsibilities across existing management structures.

Algorithmic accountability mechanisms represent particularly challenging governance domains. The management of AI-related risks extends beyond technical performance to encompass reputational risks from algorithmic bias, legal risks from regulatory violations, competitive risks from over-cautious approaches, and strategic risks from misaligned investments. Data governance becomes inextricably linked with AI governance given AI systems' dependence on large, high-quality datasets.

The development of ethical principles for AI use represents an increasingly common executive response. Many corporations now publish AI ethics statements articulating principles such as fairness, transparency, accountability, and

privacy protection. Regulatory compliance adds another layer to governance complexity, particularly for multinational corporations navigating divergent AI regulatory frameworks across jurisdictions [33].

4. Synthesis and Integration

4.1. Emerging Patterns Across Dimensions

Integration across diverse research findings reveals several overarching patterns in executive leadership responses that transcend specific organizational contexts [34]. First, successful navigation of AI-induced structural change consistently involves multi-dimensional responses addressing strategic, structural, cultural, and operational dimensions simultaneously rather than focusing narrowly on any single aspect. Executives who treat AI primarily as technical implementation challenge while neglecting cultural transformation or governance development encounter greater resistance and suboptimal outcomes compared to leaders pursuing comprehensive change programs.

Second, temporal dynamics prove critical, with AI transformation unfolding over extended timeframes requiring sustained executive engagement across distinct phases. Early phases emphasize experimentation and learning as organizations develop understanding of AI capabilities and implementation requirements. Middle phases involve scaling successful applications while managing workforce transitions and structural adaptations. Later phases focus on institutionalizing new practices and continuous capability development.

Third, the tension between centralization and decentralization appears fundamental to AI-enabled organizational transformation, with no simple resolution emerging across contexts. Successful executives navigate this tension through hybrid approaches rather than choosing exclusively one direction. Human dimensions of AI transformation receive insufficient attention relative to their importance for successful outcomes, while ethical and governance considerations increasingly emerge as central strategic issues rather than peripheral compliance matters.

4.2. Contextual Variations in Executive Responses

Substantial contextual variation exists in executive responses, challenging any notion of universal best practices for AI transformation [35]. Industry characteristics significantly influence appropriate response patterns, with knowledge-intensive sectors such as professional services and software development facing different challenges than capital-intensive manufacturing or transaction-intensive financial services. Studies comparing industries found that the pace of disruption within industries also affects optimal response patterns, with rapidly disrupted sectors requiring more aggressive transformation while gradually evolving industries benefit from deliberate, measured approaches [36].

Organizational characteristics including size, resource availability, existing technological capabilities, and organizational culture moderate the effectiveness of different approaches. Large multinational corporations possess resources for comprehensive transformation programs but face coordination challenges across dispersed operations [37]. Smaller organizations demonstrate greater agility but lack resources for extensive reskilling initiatives. Organizations with strong existing digital capabilities build upon these foundations more readily than those requiring fundamental capability development alongside AI implementation.

National and cultural contexts introduce substantial variation in workforce strategies, stakeholder management approaches, and governance frameworks [38]. Research comparing AI adoption across countries reveals that cultural values regarding employment stability, attitudes toward automation, power distance, and uncertainty avoidance shape both employee reactions to AI and executive response strategies. Institutional contexts including regulatory frameworks, labor market structures, educational systems, and industry norms also constrain and enable different response patterns.

4.3. Unresolved Tensions and Contradictions

Several contradictions emerge across research requiring continued investigation. Evidence regarding optimal balance between centralization and decentralization remains contradictory, likely reflecting differences in analytical focus, industry contexts, and organizational characteristics. Some studies emphasize benefits of centralized AI governance and capability development, while others highlight advantages of distributed approaches.

Assessments of employment impacts vary dramatically from predictions of substantial displacement to emphasis on job transformation and augmentation [39]. This variation partly reflects different analytical timeframes, with short-term displacement effects potentially offset by longer-term job creation. The relationship between direct executive involvement and transformation success remains ambiguous, with some research emphasizing critical importance of

visible CEO engagement while other studies suggest that deep executive involvement can become bottleneck constraining organizational experimentation [40].

Conflicting guidance exists regarding optimal implementation pace. Arguments favoring rapid transformation emphasize first-mover advantages, momentum maintenance, and avoiding prolonged uncertainty, while arguments for gradual implementation stress capability building, change absorption capacity, and risk management.

5. Implications for Practice and Policy

5.1. Strategic Implications for Executive Leadership

This review provides critical insights for executives navigating AI transformation in multinational corporations. The evidence demonstrates that successful transformation requires comprehensive change programs addressing strategic, structural, cultural, and operational dimensions simultaneously rather than treating AI as primarily technical implementation challenge. Executives should resist temptations to delegate AI transformation exclusively to technology functions and instead maintain active engagement across all transformation dimensions through sustained attention, visible commitment signaling organizational priorities, resource allocation supporting multi-dimensional change, and personal involvement in critical decisions about AI scope, pace, and governance [41]. The findings strongly suggest that executives benefit from adopting experimental, learning-oriented approaches that embrace inevitable failures as opportunities for organizational learning rather than pursuing rigid predetermined transformation plans.

The review reveals that workforce considerations deserve elevated priority in executive attention and resource allocation. Organizations investing substantially in workforce development, maintaining transparent communication about AI implications, and pursuing augmentation over pure displacement strategies achieve better outcomes across multiple dimensions. While such approaches involve higher short-term costs and slower implementation, they generate benefits in reduced resistance, retained organizational knowledge, more effective human-AI collaboration, and stronger employee engagement. The governance and ethical dimensions of AI warrant proactive executive attention rather than reactive crisis management, with establishing robust governance frameworks early in AI adoption, developing clear ethical principles with concrete operational guidance, ensuring diverse perspectives in governance processes, and maintaining visible leadership commitment to responsible AI deployment protecting against significant risks while potentially creating competitive advantages [42-43].

5.2. Implications for Boards of Directors

Board oversight of AI transformation requires evolution beyond traditional technology governance approaches. Boards should ensure sustained oversight of transformation progress through regular reporting on implementation milestones, workforce impacts, governance effectiveness, and risk management. This oversight should extend beyond financial metrics to encompass strategic positioning, organizational capability development, stakeholder relationships, and ethical performance .

Evaluation of CEO and senior executive digital leadership capabilities becomes increasingly important for board talent management functions. Boards should assess whether current executives possess or can develop competencies required for effective AI transformation including technological fluency, experimental mindset, stakeholder engagement skills, and ethical judgment.

Board composition itself may require evolution to ensure adequate expertise for AI governance oversight. While boards need not become technically expert, they require sufficient understanding of AI capabilities, limitations, and implications to provide meaningful oversight .

5.2.1. 5.3 Implications for Policymakers

For policymakers, the findings suggest several priorities. First, regulatory frameworks should adopt principles-based approaches providing clear ethical boundaries while allowing flexibility in technical implementation. Overly prescriptive regulations risk obsolescence as AI technologies evolve, while pure self-regulation proves insufficient given significant societal implications [44]

Second, workforce development support becomes critical given massive reskilling requirements associated with AI transformation. While individual organizations bear primary responsibility for workforce development, public investments in training infrastructure, educational system modernization, and transition support programs can ease adjustment burdens and ensure broadly distributed benefits from AI adoption.

Third, international coordination on AI governance principles could reduce compliance complexity for multinational corporations while establishing global norms for responsible AI deployment [45]. However, such coordination must respect legitimate variations in cultural values and regulatory priorities rather than imposing uniform approaches.

6. Future Research Directions

Despite growing research attention to AI and organizational transformation, significant opportunities remain for advancing both theoretical understanding and practical guidance. Methodologically, future research would benefit greatly from longitudinal studies tracking organizations over extended periods to illuminate how AI transformation unfolds temporally, revealing which early decisions prove consequential for later outcomes, how organizations adapt as they encounter implementation challenges, and whether initial structural changes prove sustainable over time. Most current research employs cross-sectional designs capturing snapshots rather than trajectories, limiting understanding of dynamic transformation processes. Complementing longitudinal work, comparative international studies examining AI adoption across diverse national and cultural contexts would advance understanding of how institutional environments shape executive responses and transformation outcomes, identifying universal patterns versus context-specific dynamics that require localized approaches [46].

Theoretically, AI's unique characteristics including autonomous decision-making capabilities, continuous learning and adaptation, opacity of complex algorithms, and potential for cascading organizational effects suggest the need for AI-specific organizational change frameworks that extend beyond existing theories developed for earlier technological innovations [47]. Digital leadership conceptualization requires more rigorous development beyond current descriptive characterizations, addressing fundamental questions about what specific competencies, behaviors, and cognitive orientations constitute digital leadership, how these relate to established leadership constructs, and whether such capabilities can be developed through training or require fundamental dispositional characteristics. Additionally, theoretical frameworks explaining how organizations simultaneously centralize certain functions while decentralizing others would illuminate a fundamental tension in AI-enabled organizational design that current theories treating centralization and decentralization as opposing poles fail to adequately address.

Empirically, cross-cultural variation in leadership responses and transformation outcomes deserves deeper investigation to understand how cultural values regarding employment relationships, authority patterns, uncertainty tolerance, and technology adoption shape executive strategies and identify which response patterns prove effective across diverse cultural contexts versus requiring cultural adaptation. Industry-specific dynamics require more thorough examination beyond current emphasis on technology and financial services sectors, with systematic comparison across manufacturing, healthcare, retail, transportation, and other industries refining contingency perspectives on AI transformation. Research examining small and medium enterprise experiences would broaden applicability of findings beyond current focus on large multinationals, exploring how resource constraints affect AI adoption strategies and what alternative approaches prove viable when comprehensive transformation programs exceed organizational capacity.

Critical research gaps exist regarding AI transformation in African contexts where research remains sparse despite growing digital economies and increasing AI adoption across sectors. Future research should investigate how infrastructure constraints, regulatory maturity, skills availability, and cultural contexts shape executive leadership approaches in African multinational corporations and subsidiaries. Understanding successful adaptation strategies in resource-constrained environments could yield insights applicable beyond African contexts to other emerging markets and smaller organizations globally [48].

The long-term sustainability of AI-induced structural changes remains poorly understood given most studies' relatively short timeframes, with critical questions about whether initial structural adaptations persist or organizations revert toward previous configurations, what factors predict sustained transformation versus temporary adaptation, and how later-stage challenges differ from early implementation issues. Understanding broader stakeholder impacts beyond organizational boundaries warrants investigation, examining how AI transformations affect suppliers, customers, communities, and society while exploring what responsibilities executives bear toward stakeholders experiencing negative consequences and how leaders can balance organizational performance objectives against broader stakeholder welfare.

Board governance of AI transformation represents an understudied area despite its strategic importance, with research needed on what governance practices prove effective for board oversight of AI initiatives, how board characteristics influence transformation outcomes, and what information boards require for meaningful oversight [49]. Finally, research should explicitly seek out and analyze unsuccessful transformation attempts alongside celebrated successes

to balance publication bias toward success stories, understanding why some AI transformations fail, what mistakes executives make, and how organizations recover from setbacks to provide valuable learning for practitioners navigating similar challenges.

These research priorities collectively aim to advance both scholarly understanding of AI-induced organizational transformation and practical guidance for executives, boards, and policymakers navigating this complex landscape. Progress on these fronts would contribute to more effective, equitable, and sustainable organizational transformations that benefit multiple stakeholders while advancing competitive performance in an AI-enabled business environment.

7. Conclusion

This comprehensive review synthesizes current knowledge regarding executive leadership responses to AI-induced structural change in multinational corporations while identifying critical gaps requiring continued investigation [50]. Through analysis of diverse literature spanning strategic management, organizational behavior, information systems, and international business, several key conclusions emerge. AI creates qualitatively different organizational challenges compared to previous technological innovations, with autonomous decision-making capabilities, continuous learning and adaptation, algorithmic opacity, and potential for cascading organizational effects distinguishing it from earlier technologies. Executive responses demonstrate substantial variation reflecting different strategic orientations, organizational contexts, industry dynamics, and national institutional environments, with contextual factors substantially moderating effectiveness of different response approaches. The human dimensions of transformation prove more critical than technical capabilities for realizing AI's potential, with organizational culture, workforce development, stakeholder communication, and change management ultimately determining transformation success or failure. Ethical considerations emerge as central strategic issues rather than peripheral compliance matters, affecting competitive positioning, stakeholder relationships, talent attraction, and long-term organizational sustainability. However, significant geographical gaps remain, particularly regarding African contexts where infrastructure development, regulatory frameworks, cultural dynamics, and organizational capabilities create distinct challenges requiring further empirical investigation.

As AI capabilities continue advancing at remarkable rates, the importance of effective executive leadership in navigating organizational transformation will intensify. Executives equipped with evidence-based understanding of AI transformation patterns, contextual factors shaping appropriate responses, and critical success factors will position their organizations to capture opportunities while managing risks responsibly. This review provides foundations for such informed leadership while identifying priorities for continued research advancing both theoretical understanding and practical guidance. The ultimate goal remains supporting organizational transformations that not only enhance competitive performance but also benefit multiple stakeholders and contribute to broader societal wellbeing in an AI-enabled future.

Compliance with ethical standards

Disclosure of conflict of interest

No conflict of interest to be disclosed.

References

[1] Benbya H, Davenport TH, Pachidi S. Artificial intelligence in organizations: Current state and future opportunities. MIS Quarterly Executive. 2020 Dec 3;19(4).

[2] Adenuga T, Okolo FC. Automating operational processes as a precursor to intelligent, self-learning business systems. Journal of Frontiers in Multidisciplinary Research. 2021 Jan;2(1):133-47.

[3] Saha TR, Sarwer MH, Ghose P. Transforming Business Models and Economic Performance: The Role of Machine Learning in the United States. Journal of Management.;2(4):142-53.

[4] Teixeira N, Pacione M. Implications of artificial intelligence on leadership in complex organizations: An exploration of the near future.

[5] Aakula A, Saini V, Ahmad T. The Impact of AI on Organizational Change in Digital Transformation. Internet of Things and Edge Computing Journal. 2024;4(1):75-115.

[6] Brown SC. Technology acceptance and organizational change: An integration of theory. Auburn University; 2009.

[7] Aldoseri A, Al-Khalifa KN, Hamouda AM. AI-powered innovation in digital transformation: Key pillars and industry impact. Sustainability. 2024 Feb 22;16(5):1790.

[8] Teixeira N, Pacione M. Implications of artificial intelligence on leadership in complex organizations: An exploration of the near future.

[9] Aziz MF, Rajesh JI, Jahan F, McMurrray A, Ahmed N, Narendran R, Harrison C. AI-powered leadership: a systematic literature review. Journal of Managerial Psychology. 2025 Jul 25;40(5):604-30.

[10] Aakula A, Saini V, Ahmad T. The Impact of AI on Organizational Change in Digital Transformation. Internet of Things and Edge Computing Journal. 2024;4(1):75-115.

[11] Aakula A, Saini V, Ahmad T. The Impact of AI on Organizational Change in Digital Transformation. Internet of Things and Edge Computing Journal. 2024;4(1):75-115.

[12] Zulkifli M. Unveiling the Dynamics of Organizational Structure and Strategy: Insights for Enhancing Corporate Performance. Innovative Management Strategies Across Sectors in the 21st Century: Adapting to Dynamic Environments and Enhancing Performance.:166.

[13] Roundy PT, Bradshaw M, Brockman BK. The emergence of entrepreneurial ecosystems: A complex adaptive systems approach. Journal of business research. 2018 May 1;86:1-0.

[14] Trieu HD, Nguyen PV, Tran KT, Vrontis D, Ahmed Z. Organisational resilience, ambidexterity and performance: the roles of information technology competencies, digital transformation policies and paradoxical leadership. International Journal of Organizational Analysis. 2024 Jul 16;32(7):1302-21.

[15] Gallivan MJ. Organizational adoption and assimilation of complex technological innovations: development and application of a new framework. ACM SIGMIS Database: the DATABASE for Advances in Information Systems. 2001 Jul 1;32(3):51-85.

[16] Dearing JW. Evolution of diffusion and dissemination theory. Journal of public health management and practice. 2008 Mar 1;14(2):99-108.

[17] Alshehri AA. . Theoretical Foundations of Transformational Leadership in Modern Organizations.التجارة والتمويل . 2024 Jun 1;44(2):60-9.

[18] Finkelstein S, Hambrick D, Cannella A. Strategic leadership. Minneapolis, MN. 1996.

[19] McAdam R, Miller K, McSorley C. Towards a contingency theory perspective of quality management in enabling strategic alignment. International Journal of Production Economics. 2019 Jan 1;207:195-209.

[20] Hammad A, Abu-Zaid R. Applications of AI in decentralized computing systems: harnessing artificial intelligence for enhanced scalability, efficiency, and autonomous decision-making in distributed architectures. Applied Research in Artificial Intelligence and Cloud Computing. 2024;7(6):161-87.

[21] Rudko I, Bashirpour Bonab A, Fedele M, Formisano AV. New institutional theory and AI: toward rethinking of artificial intelligence in organizations. Journal of Management History. 2025 Feb 20;31(2):261-84.

[22] Davenport TH, Ronanki R. Artificial intelligence for the real world. Harvard Business Review. 2018;96(1):108-116.

[23] Fountaine T, McCarthy B, Saleh T. Building the AI-powered organization. Harvard Business Review. 2019;97(4):62-73.

[24] Ransbotham S, Kiron D, Gerbert P, Reeves M. Reshaping business with artificial intelligence. MIT Sloan Management Review; 2017.

[25] . A dominant trend toward simultaneous centralization of certain functions and decentralization of others creates hybrid organizational architectures that differ fundamentally from traditional hierarchical structures

[26] Aakula A, Saini V, Ahmad T. The Impact of AI on Organizational Change in Digital Transformation. Internet of Things and Edge Computing Journal. 2024;4(1):75-115.

[27] Teixeira N, Pacione M. Implications of artificial intelligence on leadership in complex organizations: An exploration of the near future.

[28] Vaara E, Sonenshein S, Boje D. Narratives as sources of stability and change in organizations: Approaches and directions for future research. Academy of management annals. 2016 Jan 1;10(1):495-560.

[29] Ogunwale B, Appoh M, Oboyi N, Afrihyia E, Gobile S, Alabi OA. Cross-Cultural Leadership Styles in Multinational Corporations: A Comparative.

[30] Wilson HJ, Daugherty PR. Collaborative intelligence: Humans and AI are joining forces. Harvard Business Review. 2018;96(4):114-123.

[31] Manyika J, Lund S, Chui M, Bughin J, Woetzel J, Batra P, et al. Jobs lost, jobs gained: Workforce transitions in a time of automation. McKinsey Global Institute; 2017.

[32] Acemoglu D, Restrepo P. Robots and jobs: Evidence from US labor markets. Journal of Political Economy. 2020;128(6):2188-2244.

[33] Nwaimo CS, Oluoha OM, Oyedokun O. Ethics and governance in data analytics: balancing innovation with responsibility. International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology. 2023 May;9(3):823-56.

[34] Osborn RN, Hunt JG, Jauch LR. Toward a contextual theory of leadership. The leadership quarterly. 2002 Dec 1;13(6):797-837.

[35] Aakula A, Saini V, Ahmad T. The Impact of AI on Organizational Change in Digital Transformation. Internet of Things and Edge Computing Journal. 2024;4(1):75-115.

[36] Alaerts GJ, Kaspersma JM. Facing global transitions in water management: advances in knowledge and capacity development and towards adaptive approaches. Water Policy. 2022 May 1;24(5):685-707.

[37] Aktaş E, Çiçek I, Kıyak M. The effect of organizational culture on organizational efficiency: The moderating role of organizational environment and CEO values. Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences. 2011 Jan 1;24:1560-73.

[38] Min Foo L. Stakeholder engagement in emerging economies: considering the strategic benefits of stakeholder management in a cross-cultural and geopolitical context. Corporate Governance: The international journal of business in society. 2007 Aug 14;7(4):379-87.

[39] Balakumar A, Sawant PD, Nimma D, Khan SA, Siddiqua A. Impact of AI-Driven Automation on Job Displacement and Skill Development: A Societal Perspective. In2024 IEEE Silchar Subsection Conference (SILCON 2024) 2024 Nov 15 (pp. 1-5). IEEE.

[40] Stevens AH. Persistent effects of job displacement: The importance of multiple job losses. Journal of Labor Economics. 1997 Jan 1;15(1, Part 1):165-88.

[41] Suljic V. Strategic leadership in AI-driven digital transformation: Ethical governance, innovation management, and sustainable practices for global enterprises and SMEs. SBS Journal of Applied Business Research. 2025 Feb 28;13(1):17-35.

[42] Pöyhönen M. Human-AI Integration in Long-Established Organizations.

[43] Figueroa CA, Harrison R, Chauhan A, Meyer L. Priorities and challenges for health leadership and workforce management globally: a rapid review. BMC health services research. 2019 Apr 24;19(1):239.

[44] Arjoon S. Striking a balance between rules and principles-based approaches for effective governance: A risks-based approach. Journal of Business Ethics. 2006 Sep 1:53-82.

[45] Cihon P. Standards for AI governance: international standards to enable global coordination in AI research & development. Future of Humanity Institute. University of Oxford. 2019 Apr;40(3):340-2.

[46] Rådberg M, Frisell V. From Challenges to Success: Navigating AI Adoption in Multinational Settings A Qualitative Multiple Case Study on the AI Adoption Process within MNEs.

[47] Sanyal S, Sharma P, Dudani C. A complex adaptive system framework to regulate artificial intelligence. Working paper; 2024 Jan.

[48] George G, Corbishley C, Khayesi JN, Haas MR, Tihanyi L. Bringing Africa in: Promising directions for management research. Academy of management journal. 2016 Apr;59(2):377-93.

[49] Birkstedt T, Minkkinen M, Tandon A, Mäntymäki M. AI governance: themes, knowledge gaps and future agendas. Internet Research. 2023 Dec 18;33(7):133-67.

[50] Teixeira N, Pacione M. Implications of artificial intelligence on leadership in complex organizations: An exploration of the near future.