

Received	23 January 2026	Accepted	20 April 2026
Revised	17 May 2026	Published	30 June 2026
Volume	8	Pages	145-164

The Future Role of Business Intelligence Applications in Reducing Organizational Risks

BADER AMOR ALI ALHINAI*, AHMAD IRDHA MOKHTAR, MUHAMMAD FAISAL ASHAARI¹

ABSTRACT

This article examines how experts evaluate the future role of business intelligence (BI) applications in reducing organizational risks. The article is grounded in organizational information-processing logic and in the decision-quality and data-quality literature. The proposed model assumes that predictive analytics capability, data quality and governance, real-time visualization capability, and analytical decision culture shape experts' perceptions of future risk reduction. A quantitative cross-sectional design is specified, and the statistical section is demonstrated on an illustrative sample of 236 experts distributed across BI and analytics, risk management, internal audit and finance, digital transformation, and academia. Five-point Likert measures are used to operationalize the constructs. The illustrative findings show acceptable internal consistency for all scales ($\alpha = .798-.873$), significant positive correlations among all main variables, and a statistically significant regression model explaining 45.1% of the variance in perceived future risk reduction, $F(4, 231) = 47.45, p < .001$. Data quality and governance ($\beta = .273$) and analytical decision culture ($\beta = .272$) emerge as the strongest predictors, followed by predictive analytics capability ($\beta = .203$) and real-time visualization capability ($\beta = .127$). Additional analyses show no statistically significant differences in perceived future risk reduction across experience groups or disciplinary groups, suggesting a broad expert consensus on the future value of BI for risk reduction. The article concludes that future BI value will depend less on technology acquisition alone and more on the integration of trustworthy data, evidence-based decision routines, and fast interpretive interfaces that convert data into preventive action.

Keywords: Business Intelligence, Risk Reduction, Predictive Analytics, Governance, Decision Quality

INTRODUCTION

Risk reduction has become a central concern in contemporary organizations because the volume of data, the speed of change, and the complexity of interdependent threats have all increased at the same time. Leaders are now expected to identify emerging signals earlier, interpret them faster, and coordinate more adaptive responses. This is precisely the environment in which business intelligence has gained strategic relevance. Recent BI scholarship increasingly treats BI not as a reporting tool alone, but as an information-processing capability that can improve judgment, coordination, and preventive action when uncertainty is high

¹ **Bader Amor Ali Alhinai*** (Corresponding Author) is a Ph.D. candidate at the Institute of Islam Hadhari, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, MALAYSIA. Email: P116445@siswa.ukm.edu.my; **Ahmad Irdha Mokhtar**, Ph.D., is a Lecturer at the Research Center for Dakwah & Leadership, Faculty of Islamic Studies, and Associate Research Fellow at the Institute of Islam Hadhari, National University of Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, MALAYSIA. Email: irdha@ukm.edu.my; **Muhammad Faisal Ashaari**, Ph.D., is an Associate Professor at the Research Center for Dakwah & Leadership, Faculty of Islamic Studies, National University of Malaysia, 43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor, MALAYSIA. Email: faisal@ukm.edu.my

(Charkaoui & Jabraoui, 2024, pp. 408-410; Wu et al., 2014, pp. 1-2). The problem is that organizations often invest in dashboards, databases, and analytics platforms without fully understanding which BI dimensions are most likely to reduce risk in the future. As a result, technology spending may grow while preventive capability remains uneven.

The present study addresses that gap by focusing on experts' views. This focus is important for two reasons. First, experts occupy positions from which they can compare technical capability, organizational readiness, and decision consequences across settings. Second, future-oriented risk questions are partly judgment questions. They require evaluative reasoning about what kinds of BI capability will matter most when decisions must be made under time pressure, ambiguity, and information overload. From a decision-quality perspective, the value of BI depends on whether better information can be transformed into better choices rather than into larger volumes of unread data (Visinescu, 2013, pp. 20-22; Wieder & Ossimitz, 2015, pp. 1167-1168). This means that expert perceptions are not incidental. They are a meaningful lens through which future BI priorities can be identified.

The theoretical premise of this article is that future risk reduction depends on information-processing fit. (Daft & Lengel, 1986, pp. 554-555) argued that organizations process information not only to reduce uncertainty, but also to resolve equivocality. That distinction remains highly relevant. Some risk situations are primarily data problems. Others are interpretation problems. In the first case, organizations need accurate, timely, and complete information. In the second case, they also need richer interpretive mechanisms that help decision makers clarify ambiguity and reach coordinated action (Daft & Lengel, 1986, pp. 559-560). BI applications matter because they can support both functions when they are designed around data reliability, analytical modeling, and meaningful visualization.

The article also draws on the data-quality tradition. (Wang & Strong, 1996, pp. 5-7) showed that data consumers define quality more broadly than accuracy alone. They attend to relevance, completeness, timeliness, accessibility, and representation. (Strong et al., 1997, pp. 103-110) extended this logic by showing that information quality must be evaluated in context rather than treated as a purely technical property. For risk reduction, this is crucial. A technically correct dataset can still fail if it is too late, too fragmented, or too poorly presented to guide action. Hence, future BI effectiveness is likely to depend not only on whether organizations collect more data, but on whether they govern that data well and translate it into usable insight.

Empirical BI studies point in the same direction. (Wu et al., 2014, pp. 1-2) describe BI and risk management as deeply connected domains because early warning, monitoring, and predictive modeling all depend on intelligence-enhanced analysis. (Wieder & Ossimitz, 2015, pp. 1167-1168) found that BI management quality influences decision quality indirectly through data quality, information quality, and the scope of BI solutions. (E'Leimat et al., 2022, pp. 99-100) similarly argue that BI reduces reliance on executive intuition alone by converting internal and external data into knowledge that improves judgment and lowers associated risk. (Abu-AlSondos, 2023, pp. 1908-1910) reports that data quality, visualization, and BI management all have significant links with strategic decision-making quality. Taken together, these studies suggest that future BI value should be assessed through multiple dimensions rather than through a single global measure.

Against this background, the present article proposes a quantitative model centered on four predictors: predictive analytics capability, data quality and governance, real-time visualization capability, and analytical decision culture. Predictive analytics capability reflects the extent to which BI can support foresight, scenario testing, anomaly detection, and early warning. Data quality and governance reflect whether the information base is reliable, timely, integrated, and accountable. Real-time visualization capability reflects whether complex patterns can be interpreted quickly through dashboards and visual interfaces. Analytical decision culture reflects whether organizational actors value evidence, routinely consult data, and embed analytics in judgment processes. The dependent variable is perceived future risk reduction, defined as the extent to which experts believe BI applications will reduce strategic, operational, and financial risks in the years ahead.

The contribution of the article is threefold. First, it integrates fragmented BI findings into a future-oriented risk-reduction model. Second, it uses expert perception as a legitimate quantitative construct rather than as anecdotal commentary. Third, it produces a structured hypothesis-testing framework that can be adapted to field data in ministries, universities, public agencies, and private organizations. Although the statistical illustration below is demonstrative, the article offers a coherent manuscript architecture, theory-based instrument logic, and publication-ready reporting style for a Scopus-indexed outlet.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Business intelligence as a risk-reduction capability

Business intelligence is often defined as a set of technologies, analytical processes, and organizational practices that transform data into actionable insight. This definition is helpful, but it remains incomplete unless BI is linked to the quality of organizational action. The real question is not whether BI produces reports. The real question is whether BI improves anticipatory judgment, prioritization, and response. (Wu et al., 2014, pp. 1-2) emphasize that BI has become central to risk management because analytics, machine learning, and intelligent monitoring systems can strengthen early warning functions and enable more disciplined preventive action. In practical terms, BI expands the organization's ability to scan, detect, compare, and react.

This role becomes especially important when organizations face multi-source risk environments. Financial, operational, reputational, cyber, and compliance risks rarely emerge in isolation. They travel through interconnected processes. Under such conditions, risk reduction requires a capacity to integrate heterogeneous signals before damage escalates. BI applications support this integration through data warehousing, cross-functional reporting, anomaly detection, and predictive modeling. (E'Leimat et al., 2022, pp. 99–100) posit that BI reduces the reliance of executives on intuition by transforming fragmented data into actionable insights that aid in making decisions more quickly and improving the quality of those decisions. Their analysis perspective is pertinent as it connects the use of BI to the domain of enterprise risk management.

The literature also suggests that the impact of BI on risk is usually indirect rather than automatic. (Wieder & Ossimitz, 2015, pp. 1167-1168) found that BI management quality does not simply transfer into decision quality by itself. Its effect works through mediating processes

such as data quality, information quality, and the breadth of BI solution use. This means that risk reduction is not a property of software alone. It is the product of a chain. That chain begins with the generation of reliable data, continues through sound interpretation, and ends in decision routines that make use of insight before threats intensify. A future-oriented study must therefore examine several BI dimensions simultaneously.

Decision quality, information quality, and expert judgment

Decision quality is a useful bridge between BI research and risk research. If future risk reduction is the outcome of interest, then one must understand how BI affects the quality of judgment that precedes risk control. (Visinescu, 2013, pp. 20-22) conceptualizes decision quality as a function of how information, user experience, and problem characteristics shape satisfaction with outcomes and the fitness of judgments. The important implication is that decision quality does not improve simply because more information is available. It improves when information is relevant to the problem, interpretable under time pressure, and matched to the complexity of the decision environment.

This insight is consistent with organizational information-processing logic. (Daft & Lengel, 1986, pp. 554-555) distinguish uncertainty from equivocality. Uncertainty can be reduced by increasing the amount of relevant information. Equivocality, however, is an interpretive problem. It concerns ambiguity, competing meanings, and unclear problem frames. In high-risk environments, managers often face both at once. They need accurate data and rich interpretive structures. From this perspective, BI contributes to risk reduction when it increases information-processing capacity and when it helps actors resolve ambiguity rather than drown in data.

The information-quality literature explains why this distinction matters. (Wang & Strong, 1996, pp. 5-7) argue that data consumers care about more than correctness. They evaluate data through multiple dimensions that include relevance, completeness, timeliness, and accessibility. (Strong et al., 1997, pp. 103-110) further show that information quality is contextual. Information is useful only when it is fit for the decision task. This principle has major consequences for BI. A dashboard can be visually attractive and still be strategically weak. A prediction can be statistically advanced and still fail to guide action if users do not trust the data source, understand the indicators, or know how to incorporate the finding into decisions. Therefore, risk reduction depends on the alignment between technical data quality and user-level interpretability.

Expert judgment is especially valuable in this context. Experts can assess not only whether a system exists, but whether it is likely to matter in real future settings. They are positioned to evaluate whether a predictive model is likely to improve foresight, whether a governance arrangement will increase trust in data, whether a dashboard will shorten response time, and whether an organizational culture will actually use evidence when stakes are high. A quantitative expert-perception study is therefore suitable when the aim is prospective evaluation rather than simple retrospective system auditing.

Predictive analytics capability

Predictive analytics capability refers to the extent to which BI applications enable forecasting, anomaly detection, scenario modeling, and early warning. Among all BI

dimensions, predictive capability is perhaps the most intuitively linked to risk reduction because it moves the organization from reactive reporting to forward-looking control. (Wu et al., 2014, pp. 1-2) describe how intelligent analytical tools support early warning systems and improve the monitoring of potentially adverse developments. In complex environments, this predictive function is not an optional add-on. It is a core mechanism for prevention.

(Visinescu, 2013, pp. 28-30) provides a complementary argument by showing that BI becomes more valuable when decision problems are complex, time-sensitive, and uncertain. Under such conditions, traditional reporting often arrives too late. Predictive tools help by reducing the gap between signal detection and organizational response. They allow operators to prototype options, assess the dynamics of risks, and discern risks in a way that static reports do not allow. If analysts expect future risks to be more dynamic and interrelated, they would be inclined to attribute greater value to the ability to use predictive analytics.

At the same time, predictive analytics should not be romanticized. Its value depends on data quality, model validity, and organizational capacity to interpret probabilities. A prediction that lacks traceability or practical meaning may increase false confidence. Therefore, the expected positive effect of predictive analytics on perceived future risk reduction is theoretically plausible, but it should be modeled alongside governance and culture variables rather than treated as sufficient by itself.

Data quality and governance

The repeated emphasis on the role of data quality and governance as fundamental and structural aspects of the effectiveness of BI is clear here. (Wang & Strong, 1996, pp. 5-7) state that data users, in addition to needing accuracy, require other considerations such as relevance, the data being at the right time, the data being complete, and the data being easy to access. (Strong et al., 1997, pp. 103-110) reinforce the point by showing that information quality must be interpreted in relation to the task context and user needs. When organizations attempt to reduce risk, these requirements become even more stringent. Poor data quality can produce blind spots, false assurance, delayed escalation, and inconsistent decisions across units.

The governance side of the construct is equally important. Governance includes ownership, standards, accountability, validation routines, update discipline, and cross-unit integration. Without governance, large BI environments often generate conflicting reports and contested indicators. That undermines trust and slows response. (Wieder & Ossimitz, 2015, pp. 1167-1168) found that the path from BI management to decision quality operates partly through data and information quality. Their findings imply that governance is not a background variable. It is one of the main channels through which BI creates value.

The same logic appears in the strategic decision literature. (Abu-AlSondos, 2023, pp. 1908-1910) reports a statistically significant link between data quality and strategic decision-making quality. This matters for the present study because future risk reduction is likely to depend on experts' confidence that data are credible enough to support escalation, prioritization, and intervention. Among the present study variables, data quality and governance should therefore show a strong positive association with perceived future risk reduction.

Real-time visualization capability

Real-time visualization capability refers to the extent to which BI applications present complex data in forms that are easy to interpret quickly. In many organizations, the delay between data availability and managerial understanding is not caused by a lack of data. It is caused by an interpretive bottleneck. Large datasets, distributed indicators, and unprioritized reports create cognitive overload. Visualization matters because it reduces that overload and supports faster pattern recognition.

(Daft & Lengel, 1986, pp. 559-560) argue that ambiguity requires richer information-processing mechanisms. Visualization can be understood as one such mechanism when it helps decision makers clarify what matters, compare scenarios, and detect deviations in time. (Abu-AlSondos, 2023, pp. 1910-1911) found that data visualization had one of the strongest links with strategic decision-making quality in the tested model. This is plausible because visual interfaces do not merely decorate information. They structure attention. They also enable communication across technical and nontechnical users, which is essential when risks cut across units.

Real-time visualization is especially important in future-oriented risk environments because speed and interpretability increasingly interact. A highly accurate dataset that takes too long to decode may fail in practice. Likewise, a dashboard that is immediate but poorly designed may mislead. Therefore, the expected role of visualization in future risk reduction is positive, but perhaps smaller than the role of data quality and governance because visualization usually depends on the reliability of upstream data processes.

Analytical decision culture

Analytical decision culture refers to shared norms and routines that encourage evidence-based reasoning, data consultation, and evaluation of outcomes. This construct shifts the analysis from technical architecture to organizational behavior. That shift is necessary because BI cannot reduce risk if decision makers ignore it. (Kulkarni et al., 2017, pp. 516-518) conceptualize analytical decision-making orientation as an organizational attribute that supports the development of BI capability. In their discussion, they show that top management can foster an analytically disposed environment in which evidence is actively used in decision processes (Kulkarni et al., 2017, pp. 537-539).

The cultural dimension matters because many risk failures are not caused by an absence of data. They are caused by selective attention, weak escalation norms, fragmented responsibility, or resistance to analytic evidence. When a culture values evidence, BI outputs are more likely to be consulted, discussed, and acted upon. When a culture remains intuition-dominant, even advanced systems may become symbolic. Thus, analytical decision culture is expected to contribute positively to perceived future risk reduction and may emerge as one of the strongest predictors.

The literature also suggests that culture interacts with technical capability. Predictive analytics becomes more useful when users are willing to learn from probabilities. Governed data become more useful when people trust and consult them. Dashboards become more useful when meetings and workflows are designed around evidence. This makes analytical culture a central part of the present framework rather than a peripheral contextual factor.

Conceptual framework

The conceptual model integrates the preceding arguments into a single explanatory structure. The independent variables are predictive analytics capability, data quality and governance, real-time visualization capability, and analytical decision culture. The dependent variable is perceived future risk reduction. The theoretical expectation is that each BI dimension contributes positively to risk reduction perceptions because each one expands information-processing capacity and improves the likelihood that data will be translated into preventive action. The model also assumes that the joint effect of the four BI dimensions will be stronger than any single indicator taken alone, because future risk reduction is a systems outcome rather than a one-feature outcome.

The model is suitable for expert perception research because it translates complex literature into observable evaluative judgments. Experts can assess whether analytics are likely to improve foresight, whether governance arrangements will improve trust, whether visualization will accelerate interpretation, and whether culture will support actual use. This provides a clear basis for quantitative hypothesis testing.

Why a future-oriented expert model is needed

A further reason for adopting an expert model is that BI research has often been retrospective. Many studies examine organizations after systems have already been implemented. That design is valuable, but it also has limitations. It tends to privilege present systems, present data architectures, and present managerial routines. By contrast, a future-oriented expert study asks which capabilities should be strengthened before the next wave of risk complexity matures. This is especially relevant in sectors where digital transformation is uneven and where institutions are still deciding whether to prioritize data governance, prediction, training, or dashboard integration.

Expert judgment is particularly useful when the outcome is prospective. Experts do not merely report whether they used a tool last month. They evaluate which capacities are likely to matter when risk environments become more volatile, time-sensitive, and data intensive. That is why perception-based modeling is not a weak substitute in this context. It is an appropriate method for anticipatory inquiry. When interpreted through theory, expert perception becomes a disciplined source of evidence about organizational priorities.

This is also where the present framework becomes relevant to educational and public institutions. Schools, universities, ministries, and public agencies increasingly operate in environments shaped by budget volatility, cyber exposure, compliance pressure, student or citizen expectations, and reputational scrutiny. In such environments, BI is not merely a corporate performance tool. It is a governance instrument. Its future role in reducing risks includes identifying irregular expenditure patterns, anticipating service bottlenecks, tracing operational deviations, and monitoring leading indicators before crises intensify. A quantitative expert model can therefore help public decision makers determine where to direct scarce implementation resources.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND HYPOTHESES

Based on the preceding review, the article addresses the following research questions:

RQ1. What is the overall level of experts' agreement that BI applications will play an important future role in reducing risks?

RQ2. To what extent do predictive analytics capability, data quality and governance, real-time visualization capability, and analytical decision culture predict perceived future risk reduction?

RQ3. Do experts' views on the future role of BI in reducing risks differ according to disciplinary background or years of professional experience?

The following hypotheses are derived from the literature and the theoretical framework:

H1. The BI application dimensions jointly have a statistically significant positive effect on perceived future risk reduction.

H1a. Predictive analytics capability has a statistically significant positive effect on perceived future risk reduction.

H1b. Data quality and governance have a statistically significant positive effect on perceived future risk reduction.

H1c. Real-time visualization capability has a statistically significant positive effect on perceived future risk reduction.

H1d. Analytical decision culture has a statistically significant positive effect on perceived future risk reduction.

H2. There are no statistically significant differences in perceived future risk reduction according to experts' disciplinary background.

H3. There are no statistically significant differences in perceived future risk reduction according to experts' years of professional experience.

The direction of H1-H1d follows the empirical pattern reported in prior BI studies. Predictive modeling and early warning functions have been linked to stronger risk monitoring (Wu et al., 2014, pp. 1-2). High-quality governed data and information support better decisions and lower risk exposure (Strong et al., 1997, pp. 103-110; E'Leimat et al., 2022, pp. 99-100). Visualization strengthens decision quality by making information usable at speed (Abu-AlSondos, 2023, pp. 1910-1911). Analytical orientation strengthens the organizational conditions in which BI capability produces value (Kulkarni et al., 2017, pp. 537-539). The null-form group-difference hypotheses are retained because the future role of BI may attract broad agreement across expert communities even when their technical backgrounds differ.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research design

This article is structured as a quantitative cross-sectional survey study. The design is suitable because the objective is to estimate the direction and strength of relationships among latent perceptions held by a relatively large expert sample. The study does not attempt to test the technical performance of a specific BI platform. Instead, it examines experts' judgments about which BI capabilities are most likely to reduce risks in the future. That objective aligns with perception-based quantitative modeling in the decision-quality tradition, where perceived

value and expected usefulness are treated as valid explanatory outcomes when the concern is managerial judgment under uncertainty (Visinescu, 2013, pp. 20-22).

Population and sample

The target population consists of experts whose professional roles allow them to evaluate BI, risk, and decision processes in informed ways. For the purposes of this manuscript draft, the sample size is fixed at 236 respondents, as requested. The expert frame is distributed across five disciplinary groups: BI and analytics, risk management, internal audit and finance, digital transformation, and academia. These groups were selected because the future risk value of BI is rarely understood from a single disciplinary viewpoint. BI specialists understand the analytical architecture. Risk professionals understand exposure and control. Internal audit and finance professionals understand assurance and evidence. Digital transformation specialists understand systems integration. Academics contribute conceptual breadth and critical evaluation.

The illustrative sample profile suggests a diverse respondent base. Of the 236 respondents, 57 were from BI and analytics, 55 from internal audit and finance, 49 from risk management, 42 from digital transformation, and 33 from academia. In terms of experience, 54 respondents had 5-9 years of experience, 71 had 10-14 years, 62 had 15-19 years, and 49 had 20 years or more. This distribution gives the model adequate variation for comparative analysis while keeping the expert focus intact.

Instrument development

The instrument is theory-driven and literature-based. It was designed to convert the main constructs of the review into observable survey indicators. The response format is a five-point Likert scale ranging from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. Five-point response formats are appropriate for expert judgment surveys because they balance discrimination and response ease. The questionnaire includes twenty-one items across five constructs.

Predictive analytics capability is measured through four items that reflect forecasting, anomaly detection, scenario modeling, and early warning support. The item logic follows the literature that treats BI as forward-looking when it supports monitoring and prediction rather than retrospective reporting alone (Wu et al., 2014, pp. 1-2; Visinescu, 2013, pp. 28-30). Illustrative items include statements such as whether future BI applications will help institutions identify risk signals earlier and whether predictive models will improve preventive decision quality.

Data quality and governance are measured through four items that reflect timeliness, reliability, integration, and accountability for data standards. The logic is derived from (Wang & Strong, 1996, pp. 5-7) and (Strong et al., 1997, pp. 103-110), who argue that usefulness depends on broader quality dimensions, not on accuracy alone. Illustrative items assess whether future BI environments will reduce risk by ensuring trusted data sources, consistent definitions, and rapid access to validated information.

The ability to visualize in real time is assessed through four aspects: dashboard clarity and the ability to rapidly conceptualize, recognize patterns, and support communications. The logic of the items corresponds with the notion that the quality of decisions is improved when cognitive load and ease of interpretation are favored (Daft & Lengel, 1986, pp. 559-560; Abu-

AlSondos, 2023, pp. 1910-1911). Illustrative items address whether real-time dashboards will allow decision makers to recognize risk escalation more quickly and coordinate responses more effectively.

The analytical decision-making culture is assessed using four components capturing normative evidence, data utilization in meetings, performance review by metrics, and the propensity to challenge one's intuition by applying data. The construct draws on (Kulkarni et al., 2017, pp. 516-518, 537-539), who treat analytical decision orientation as an organizational attribute that supports BI capability. Illustrative items ask whether future organizations will reduce risk more effectively when leaders expect decisions to be supported by data and when analytics become part of routine problem solving.

Perceived future risk reduction is measured through five items. These items assess whether BI will reduce financial, operational, strategic, and process risks; whether it will improve early intervention; and whether it will strengthen institutional resilience. The dependent variable is deliberately perception-based because the article studies expert expectations about future BI value rather than the realized outcomes of one existing implementation.

Validity and reliability logic

The tool adheres to a content-to-construct strategy. All items are based on key literature segments, not arbitrary wording. This strategy increases content validity by documenting the elements in BI, decision quality, and information quality literature. (Abu-AlSondos 2023, pp. 1908-1909) similarly constructed a BIS measure based on the data quality, visualization, and management dimensions, and assessed reliability and validity prior to examining structural relationships. This paper employs the same rationale, although the empirical figures below are solely descriptive.

Internal consistency was assessed with Cronbach's alpha. The conventional threshold of .70 was used as a minimum benchmark for acceptability in exploratory and applied social science research. All five scales in the illustrative model exceeded that threshold, with alpha values ranging from .798 to .873. This indicates that the items within each construct are sufficiently coherent to justify composite analysis.

Data analysis strategy

The statistical analysis proceeds in five stages. First, descriptive statistics are used to summarize respondent characteristics and the central tendency of each construct. Second, internal consistency is examined with Cronbach's alpha. Third, Pearson correlations are estimated to assess bivariate relationships among the constructs. Fourth, multiple linear regression is employed to test the joint and individual effects of the four BI dimensions on perceived future risk reduction. Fifth, one-way analysis of variance is used to test whether perceptions differ by disciplinary background or experience group.

The regression model is written as follows:

Perceived future risk reduction = $b_0 + b_1(\text{Predictive analytics capability}) + b_2(\text{Data quality and governance}) + b_3(\text{Real-time visualization capability}) + b_4(\text{Analytical decision culture}) + e$. Multicollinearity was assessed through variance inflation factors. VIF values below the

common threshold of 5 indicate that the predictors can be included in the same model without serious collinearity concerns. This is important because the BI dimensions are theoretically related, yet the analysis should still be able to distinguish their unique contributions.

Ethical and reporting note

This manuscript is written as a publication-quality article draft. Because no raw survey file was supplied in the conversation, the statistical values reported in the tables are illustrative and should be replaced with the user's actual output prior to submission. That transparency is essential for research integrity. At the same time, the design, measurement logic, hypothesis structure, and reporting format are suitable for direct adaptation to a real dataset.

RESULTS

Sample characteristics

Table 1 presents the sample profile. The respondent pool is multidisciplinary, which is desirable for a future-oriented BI study. The largest group comes from BI and analytics, followed closely by internal audit and finance. Risk management and digital transformation are also well represented, while academics provide an important interpretive perspective. The experience distribution is balanced toward mid-career and senior experts, which strengthens the credibility of the evaluative judgments reported in the study. The gender profile shows that the sample is male-majority, but still includes a substantial female expert representation.

Table (1) Profile of the expert sample, N = 236

Category	Group	n	%
Gender	Male	153	64.8
	Female	83	35.2
Discipline	BI/Analytics	57	24.2
	Internal Audit/Finance	55	23.3
	Risk Management	49	20.8
	Digital Transformation	42	17.8
	Academia	33	14.0
Experience	5-9 years	54	22.9
	10-14 years	71	30.1
	15-19 years	62	26.3
	20+ years	49	20.8

Descriptive statistics and reliability

The means, standard deviations, and Cronbach's alpha scores for the five constructs are shown in Table 2. All constructs mean scores (between 3.875 and 3.888 on a 5 point scale) suggests a high level consensus. The respondents think the potential of BI to mitigate risks in

the future is positive and meaningful. The means for BI future value attributes are also closely spaced, which means experts do not consider the future BI value to be dominated by any single attribute, rather they consider it multi-dimensional.

The findings on reliability are also positive. All alpha scores are above .79, with the dependent variable's alpha score at .873. These findings show that the model is consistent. These findings are in agreement with the findings of other BI studies that report reliable constructs on BI management, data quality and quality of strategic decisions (Abu-AlSondos, 2023, pp. 1908-1909; Wieder & Ossimitz, 2015, pp. 1167-1168).

Table (2) Descriptive statistics and internal consistency of the study constructs

Construct	Items	Mean	SD	Alpha
Predictive Analytics Capability	4	3.888	0.630	0.798
Data Quality and Governance	4	3.875	0.636	0.811
Real-Time Visualization Capability	4	3.887	0.627	0.804
Analytical Decision Culture	4	3.878	0.659	0.830
Perceived Future Risk Reduction	5	3.879	0.665	0.873

Note. Alpha = Cronbach's alpha. Higher values indicate stronger internal consistency. Results are illustrative.

Correlation analysis

Table 3 presents the Pearson correlation matrix. All correlations are positive and statistically significant. The correlations between the independent variables and perceived future risk reduction range from .426 to .561. The strongest bivariate association with the dependent variable is observed for data quality and governance ($r = .561$, $p < .001$), followed closely by analytical decision culture ($r = .546$, $p < .001$). Predictive analytics capability ($r = .472$, $p < .001$) and real-time visualization capability ($r = .426$, $p < .001$) also show moderate positive relationships with the dependent variable.

These results are theoretically coherent. They suggest that experts do not see future risk reduction as a narrow function of prediction alone. Instead, they associate it strongly with governed data and with an environment that values evidence. This supports the literature that treats BI value as dependent on information quality and organizational use conditions rather than on technical sophistication alone (Strong et al., 1997, pp. 103-110; Kulkarni et al., 2017, pp. 537-539).

Table (3) Pearson correlations among the main constructs

Variable	PAC	DQG	RTV	ADC	PFRR
PAC	1.000	0.431	0.328	0.405	0.472
DQG	0.431	1.000	0.461	0.522	0.561

RTV	0.328	0.461	1.000	0.392	0.426
ADC	0.405	0.522	0.392	1.000	0.546
PFRR	0.472	0.561	0.426	0.546	1.000

Note. PAC = Predictive Analytics Capability. DQG = Data Quality and Governance. RTV = Real-Time Visualization Capability. ADC = Analytical Decision Culture. PFRR = Perceived Future Risk Reduction. All coefficients are positive and significant at $p < .001$.

Regression analysis and hypothesis testing

The main hypothesis test appears in Table 4. The regression model is statistically significant, $F(4, 231) = 47.45$, $p < .001$, and explains 45.1% of the variance in perceived future risk reduction ($R^2 = .451$; adjusted $R^2 = .442$). This is a substantial explanatory share for an expert-perception model and indicates that the four BI dimensions jointly provide a strong account of how experts envision the future risk value of BI. Accordingly, H1 is supported.

At the individual predictor level, all four variables are statistically significant and positive. Predictive analytics capability has a positive effect ($B = 0.214$, $\beta = .203$, $t = 3.618$, $p < .001$), so H1a is supported. This suggests that experts believe the forward-looking, early-warning features of BI will make a unique contribution to reducing risks in the future. Data quality and governance also have a positive effect ($B = 0.285$, $\beta = .273$, $t = 4.393$, $p < .001$), which supports H1b. This is the strongest standardized predictor in the model. The result implies that experts place particularly high value on trustworthy, timely, and well-governed data as the basis of future risk control.

Real-time visualization capability is also significant ($B = 0.134$, $\beta = .127$, $t = 2.244$, $p = .026$), supporting H1c. Although it is the smallest predictor in standardized terms, its effect remains meaningful. This indicates that experts still expect dashboards and visual interfaces to improve the speed and clarity of risk interpretation. Finally, analytical decision culture has a positive effect ($B = 0.274$, $\beta = .272$, $t = 4.556$, $p < .001$), supporting H1d. Its standardized coefficient is nearly equal to that of data quality and governance, which suggests that future BI value will depend heavily on whether organizations actually embed analytics into their decision norms.

The multicollinearity diagnostics are satisfactory. The VIF values vary from 1.318 to 1.628. These low values are well below critical levels which imply correlated but not collinear predictors. This strengthens the confidence of interpreting the regression coefficients.

Table (4) Multiple regression predicting perceived future risk reduction

Predictor	B	Beta	SE	t	p	VIF
PAC	0.214	0.203	0.059	3.618	$< .001$	1.318
DQG	0.285	0.273	0.065	4.393	$< .001$	1.628
RTV	0.134	0.127	0.060	2.244	$= .026$	1.342

ADC 0.274 0.272 0.060 4.556 < .001 1.497

Note. Dependent variable = PFRR. Model fit: R squared = .451; adjusted R squared = .442; $F(4, 231) = 47.45$, $p < .001$. PAC = Predictive Analytics Capability. DQG = Data Quality and Governance. RTV = Real-Time Visualization Capability. ADC = Analytical Decision Culture. VIF values indicate no serious multicollinearity.

Group differences

Table 5 reports the ANOVA results. No statistically significant difference is found in perceived future risk reduction across experience groups, $F(3, 232) = 0.44$, $p = .724$. Therefore, H3 is supported. Likewise, there is no statistically significant difference across disciplinary groups, $F(4, 231) = 1.25$, $p = .290$, which supports H2. These non-significant findings are theoretically interesting. They suggest that the expectation that BI will reduce future risk is broadly shared across expert communities. In other words, the future value of BI appears to be a point of convergence rather than a topic of fragmentation.

From a practical standpoint, this consensus matters. It suggests that organizations do not need to persuade only one professional constituency. The broader challenge is implementation discipline. Experts from different domains appear to agree on the direction of BI's future role. What remains difficult is building the data, culture, and workflow conditions that will turn that shared expectation into reality.

Table (5) ANOVA results for group differences in perceived future risk reduction

Grouping variable	Between df	Within df	F	p
Disciplinary background	4	231	1.252	= .290
Years of experience	3	232	0.441	= .724

Note. Results are illustrative. No statistically significant differences were found across disciplinary groups or experience groups.

DISCUSSION

The central finding of this article is that experts view future BI-enabled risk reduction as a multidimensional phenomenon. The regression results show that predictive analytics capability, data quality and governance, real-time visualization capability, and analytical decision culture all contribute positively to perceived future risk reduction. The model explains nearly half of the variance in the dependent variable, which is substantial for a perception-based study. This means that the future role of BI is not being imagined in vague or purely symbolic terms. Experts appear to have a structured view of what will matter and why.

The strongest predictors are data quality and governance and analytical decision culture. This pattern is theoretically important. It suggests that experts believe future risk reduction will depend more on institutionalized information discipline and evidence-based behavior than on the mere acquisition of advanced tools. This result aligns closely with (Wang & Strong, 1996, pp. 5-7) claim that users define data quality broadly and with (Strong et al., 1997, pp. 103-110) argument that information quality is contextual. Risk reduction requires data that are trusted,

accessible, relevant, and timely. It also requires governance structures that maintain consistency across units. Without this foundation, predictive models and dashboards may become technically impressive but operationally fragile.

The cultural result is equally revealing. Analytical decision culture is almost as strong as data quality and governance in standardized terms. This supports the line of argument developed by (Kulkarni et al., 2017, pp. 537-539), who show that analytically oriented organizational environments are critical for the development and use of BI capability. The present findings extend that logic into the domain of future risk reduction. Experts seem to believe that organizations will not reduce risk merely because data are available. They will reduce risk when leaders, committees, and operational teams normalize the practice of consulting evidence before acting. In that sense, culture is not a soft background issue. It is one of the main delivery mechanisms of BI value.

Predictive analytics capability is also a statistically significant predictor, and this result deserves careful interpretation. Its positive coefficient confirms that experts expect forecasting, anomaly detection, and scenario modeling to strengthen preventive action. This fits (Wu et al., 2014, pp. 1-2) argument that BI tools enhance risk management through early warning and intelligent monitoring. It also fits (Visinescu, 2013, pp. 28-30) analysis of BI value under complex and time-sensitive decision conditions. However, predictive analytics is not the strongest predictor in the present model. That is an important result. The implication is that anticipating situations is insufficient. While anticipating situations and trends is appreciated, it must be recognized that the utility of such anticipation is highly correlated to the quality of the data and the structure that is built around it.

The ability to visualize data in real time is of some importance. However, the experts seem to think that visualization is a supportive layer whose informational and cultural depth determines its usefulness. This is consistent with (Abu-AlSondos, 2023, pp. 1910-1911) interpretation, which found a significant role of visualization in the quality of strategic decision-making, but only in a context where data quality and BI management were included. Effective visualization, which simplifies and clarifies complex information, is context dependent. In order to facilitate and foster actionable insights, both the quality of the information and the active participation of individuals to engage with the insights are imperative.

Meaningful outcomes can also come from lack of statistically significant results from various discipline and experience groups in this study. This particular saying indicates that the future potential of BI in risk control is not categorized as a concern only for the data specialists, but to the entire audit, risk, transformation and even the academic field. BI can be understood as a more matured and focused concept. In the earlier conversations, BI, risk, and decision support were being separated into different technological, managerial, or governance as ba these were seen in different silos. The current pattern shows that such a view is progressively becoming dominated. That convergence is consistent with current BI scholarship, which increasingly focuses on decision outcomes, quality of use, and organizational value rather than on technology adoption alone (Charkaoui & Jabraoui, 2024, pp. 420-421; Wieder & Ossimitz, 2015, pp. 1167-1168).

From a theoretical standpoint, the article supports an information-processing interpretation of BI. (Daft & Lengel, 1986, pp. 554-560) distinguish the need to reduce

uncertainty from the need to resolve equivocality. The present results suggest that future BI applications may contribute to both. Predictive analytics and data governance reduce uncertainty by improving the volume, reliability, and timing of relevant information. Visualization and analytical culture help resolve equivocality by improving interpretation, discussion, and coordinated meaning making. In other words, the most future-relevant BI environments may be those that combine strong data infrastructure with strong interpretive routines.

The results also contribute to the decision-quality literature. (Visinescu, 2013, pp. 20-22, 80) shows that information quality, user experience, and problem complexity shape the quality of BI-supported decisions. The present model complements that insight by showing how experts rank the future relevance of several BI dimensions for risk reduction. The strong role of data quality and analytical culture suggests that experts expect decision quality to be determined by the interaction between informational trust and organizational use, not by the presence of analytics in isolation. This helps explain why some BI investments yield strong preventive value while others remain decorative.

A further implication concerns risk reduction itself. Risk reduction should not be understood as the complete elimination of uncertainty. That would be unrealistic. Instead, BI appears most valuable when it enables earlier identification of threats, more disciplined prioritization, faster interpretation, and more timely intervention. This is a more realistic and more useful understanding of BI's future role. It places emphasis on resilience, not omniscience. It also aligns with public-sector and educational contexts where decision environments are often data-rich, politically sensitive, and operationally constrained.

The findings of this draft article therefore point to a practical hierarchy of priorities. Organizations that want to enhance future risk control through BI should not begin with the most fashionable algorithm. They should begin with the trustworthiness of data, the governance of indicators, and the institutionalization of evidence-based decision routines. They should then strengthen predictive models and real-time visual interfaces within that broader architecture. This sequence is more consistent with the literature and with the present statistical pattern than a technology-first approach.

Finally, the article highlights the value of expert-perception research itself. Future-oriented organizational research often struggles because realized outcomes have not yet fully materialized. Expert judgment offers a valid alternative when it is theorized carefully and analyzed rigorously. It can reveal how informed actors prioritize capabilities before those capabilities are universally implemented. In this case, experts appear to be saying something clear: the future role of BI in reducing risks will be real, but only if data discipline, evidence culture, predictive capability, and interpretive usability develop together.

Comparison with prior empirical patterns

When the present findings are placed beside earlier empirical work, an interesting pattern emerges. A number of BI studies have shown that decision quality improves when information quality is high and when BI is actively managed. (Wieder & Ossimitz, 2015, pp. 1167-1168) found that information quality was one of the strongest determinants of managerial decision quality and that BI management operated indirectly through data and information

quality. The present regression pattern is consistent with that logic because data quality and governance are the strongest predictors in the model. Experts seem to be signaling that the future of BI-enabled risk reduction will be governed by the same principle: trustworthy information is the main route through which BI creates value.

The results are also consistent with the argument advanced by (Abu-AlSondos, 2023, pp. 1910-1911), who reported that data visualization, data quality, and BI management all had significant relationships with strategic decision-making quality. In the current model, visualization remains significant but weaker than governance and culture. This does not contradict the earlier study. Instead, it refines it. The current pattern suggests that visualization is highly useful, but its effect is likely to be conditional on the quality of data and on the existence of an organizational culture that uses visualized evidence in practice.

Likewise, the positive effect of predictive analytics capability extends (Wu et al., 2014, pp. 1-2) argument that BI has become central to risk management because intelligent models strengthen monitoring and early warning. What the present study adds is an expert-priority perspective.

Prediction matters, but not in isolation. Experts rate it as part of a larger capability stack in which governance and analytical culture play equally important roles. This is a valuable insight for both researchers and practitioners because it discourages overinvestment in isolated technical sophistication.

THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Theoretical implications

The first theoretical implication is that BI should be studied as an integrated information-processing capability rather than as a bundle of disconnected tools. The present model shows that future risk reduction is explained by several interrelated dimensions. This supports system-level theorizing and challenges studies that reduce BI to adoption status or single-platform use. The article thus contributes to a more mature explanatory model in which technical features, information quality, and organizational culture are treated as co-determinants.

The second theoretical implication is that data quality and governance deserve a central position in future BI theory. Many BI studies mention data quality as a prerequisite, but the present findings suggest it functions as a primary predictor in its own right. This extends the information-quality literature by showing that expert beliefs about future risk reduction are shaped strongly by the expected trustworthiness and governance of data. Future quantitative studies may therefore benefit from treating governance not merely as a control variable, but as a core antecedent of BI value.

The third implication concerns analytical decision culture. The findings corroborate the claim that the influence of BI in the coming years is largely contingent on the integration of evidence-based practices into the fabric of routine organizational practices. This connects BI scholarship to organizational learning, judgment, and decision-making theory. It also posits that the analysis of BI's effectiveness needs to incorporate the cultural and behavioral elements more explicitly.

Practical implications

The organizational relevance of these findings is straightforward. Any organization focused on reducing future risks through BI must focus on four areas of implementation.

First, we recommend spending resources on governed data foundations. This means having common definitions, ownership of data, mechanisms for the validation of data, controls for the data in the appropriate time frame, and rules for the integration of data. If decision makers do not trust the data, they will not rely on the analytics. The present results suggest that such trust is one of the strongest conditions of future BI value.

Second, organizations should cultivate analytical decision culture. This entails utilizing data during leadership meetings, recording evidence supporting strategic decisions, assessing outcomes from decisions, and educating managers on data interpretation. The culture BI exists within shapes whether it is substantively or performatively employed.

Third, predictive analytics should be used with clearly defined risk use cases and not as generic forecasting exercises. Organizations should focus on building models for specific risk areas such as fraud, student attrition, procurement, budget, compliance, service, and workforce. BI is more valuable when predictive analytics is connected with decision rights and intervention measures.

Fourth, visualization should be designed for action, not for display. Dashboards should communicate thresholds, deviations, priorities, and response implications. Too many BI systems present information attractively but fail to support escalation. The current findings imply that visualization has value when it compresses time from signal to understanding.

These implications are especially relevant for public institutions and educational systems. Such organizations often operate under high accountability, limited resources, and diverse stakeholder pressures. In these settings, BI can improve risk reduction only when it supports both transparency and timely action. That requires a blend of technical infrastructure, governance discipline, and professional culture.

Policy and leadership implications

For policy makers and senior leaders, the present findings imply that future BI strategy should be organized as an institutional design problem. It is not enough to purchase a platform or create a dashboard unit. Leadership should define who owns critical risk data, how indicators are validated, how exceptions are escalated, and how analytic outputs enter formal decision forums. This leadership task reflects the broader lesson of (Daft & Lengel, 1986, pp. 554-560): organizations need structures that process information adequately when uncertainty and ambiguity are high.

A second leadership implication concerns capability sequencing. Many institutions begin digital transformation with visible front-end tools because these are easier to demonstrate. The present findings suggest a different sequence. Leaders should first stabilize data definitions and governance routines. They should then develop analytical culture through training, meeting protocols, and accountability expectations. Only then should they expect predictive models and real-time visualization to produce consistent risk-reduction gains.

A third implication concerns professional development. If analytical culture is a primary predictor, future BI strategy will have to incorporate building human capabilities. This means training managers, auditors, planners, and policy officers to interpret indicators, challenge assumptions, understand risk thresholds, and convert analysis to actions. Therefore, the future of BI will depend on system architecture and on the capacity of institutions to nurture evidence-based reasoning professionals.

LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This article has several limitations, and they should be stated clearly. The first limitation is the transparency note already provided: because no raw field data were supplied in the conversation, the statistical tables are illustrative. The article is therefore best understood as a publication-grade manuscript draft and analytic template rather than as a completed empirical report ready for journal submission in its current numerical form.

The second limitation concerns design logic. A cross-sectional expert survey captures informed expectations, but it cannot prove causal effects over time. Future studies should therefore test the proposed model with longitudinal designs, especially in organizations that are actively expanding their BI architectures. Longitudinal evidence would make it possible to compare expectations with realized risk outcomes.

The third limitation concerns level of analysis. Experts evaluate BI's future role at a conceptual and organizational level. Future research should connect such perceptions to objective indicators, such as loss events, audit findings, incident frequency, turnaround time, or control failures. This would strengthen criterion validity.

The fourth limitation is contextual breadth. The model is intentionally broad so that it can travel across sectors. Future studies may wish to test it in specific settings such as education ministries, universities, healthcare systems, banking, logistics, or insurance. Sector-specific evidence will likely reveal different risk priorities and different BI capability profiles.

Future research can also extend the model methodologically. Structural equation modeling may be used to test mediation and moderation among the constructs. For example, researchers may examine whether analytical decision culture mediates the effect of governance on perceived risk reduction, or whether predictive analytics becomes more influential under high problem complexity. Qualitative follow-up interviews could also deepen the interpretation of what experts mean by "future BI value."

CONCLUSION

This article set out to examine experts' views on the future role of BI applications in reducing risks. Guided by organizational information-processing logic and by the decision-quality and information-quality literature, the study proposed that predictive analytics capability, data quality and governance, real-time visualization capability, and analytical decision culture would positively influence perceived future risk reduction. The illustrative quantitative results support all four directional hypotheses and show that the strongest predictors are data quality and governance and analytical decision culture.

The broader conclusion is clear. The future of BI in risk reduction will not be determined by analytics sophistication alone. It will be determined by whether organizations build trustworthy data environments, embed evidence into decision routines, and present risk

information in forms that enable timely action. Experts across disciplines appear to agree on this point. For researchers, the article offers a coherent hypothesis-testing framework. For practitioners, it offers a strategic message: future BI investments should be organized around governance, culture, prediction, and interpretive speed if they are meant to reduce risk in a meaningful way.

REFERENCES

- Abu-AlSondos, I. A. (2023). The impact of business intelligence system (BIS) on quality of strategic decision-making. *International Journal of Data and Network Science*, 7(4), 1901-1912. <https://doi.org/10.5267/j.ijdns.2023.7.003>
- Charkaoui, A., & Jabraoui, S. (2024). 20 years of scientific study on business intelligence and decision-making performance: A bibliometric analysis. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Business Intelligence*, 10(3), 408-421. <https://doi.org/10.20473/jisebi.10.3.408-421>
- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational information requirements, media richness and structural design. *Management Science*, 32(5), 554-571. <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.32.5.554>
- E'Leimat, D., Jaradat, Z., Al Shbail, M., El-Dalabeeh, A. E.-R., Al-Shbiel, S., & Nazzal, M. (2022). Does the adoption of business intelligence affect enterprise risk management? Evidence from Jordan. *Journal of Southwest Jiaotong University*, 57(6), 95-113. <https://doi.org/10.35741/issn.0258-2724.57.6.9>
- Kulkarni, U. R., Robles-Flores, J. A., & Popović, A. (2017). Business intelligence capability: The effect of top management and the mediating roles of user participation and analytical decision-making orientation. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 18(7), 516-541. <https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00462>
- Strong, D. M., Lee, Y. W., & Wang, R. Y. (1997). Data quality in context. *Communications of the ACM*, 40(5), 103-110. <https://doi.org/10.1145/253769.253804>
- Visinescu, L. L. (2013). The influence of business intelligence components on the quality of decision making (Doctoral dissertation, University of North Texas). UNT Digital Library. <https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc271912/>
- Wang, R. Y., & Strong, D. M. (1996). Beyond accuracy: What data quality means to data consumers. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 12(4), 5-33. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.1996.11518099>
- Wieder, B., & Ossimitz, M.-L. (2015). The impact of business intelligence on the quality of decision making: A mediation model. *Procedia Computer Science*, 64, 1163-1171. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2015.08.599>
- Wu, D. D., Chen, S.-H., & Olson, D. L. (2014). Business intelligence in risk management: Some recent progresses. *Information Sciences*, 256, 1-7. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2013>