International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877
Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Volume: 3 | Issue: 4
January-March 2026
Page No: 305-309
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v3i4.565

From Insight to Foresight: A Holistic Framework for Mitigating Decision Risk in Knowledge-Based Transformation

Richard Berimah Twum[1,2,3], Abdul-Aziz Ibn Musah[2], Ernestina Hope Turkson[2]

[1]National Investment Bank PLC, Accra, Ghana

[2]TALI Graduate School, Dominion University College (now Southshore University College), Accra, Ghana

[3]Department of Statistics, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana

Corresponding Author Email: richardberimah@gmail.com

Abstract— Purpose: In the era of data-driven management, organizations face a critical "foresight gap": the inability to distinguish between statistically robust insights and strategically reliable forecasts. While predictive analytics are widely adopted, leaders often lack a unified theory on how to align metrics, context, and methodology to mitigate strategic decision risk. This study proposes the Integrated Predictive Decision Framework (IPDF), a holistic model that synthesizes predictive validity, regulatory context, and methodological rigor.

Design/Methodology: We employ a comprehensive quantitative analysis of 310 banking professionals within Ghana's commercial sector. Using Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM) enhanced by advanced predictive assessments (PLS-Predict and Cross-Validated Predictive Ability Testing), we evaluate the interplay between knowledge management practices, regulatory environments, and employee performance.

Findings: The analysis reveals a Predictability Paradox: internal knowledge processes demonstrate high predictive relevance ($Q^2 > 0.80$), while performance outcomes remain uncertain ($Q^2 < 0.20$) unless moderated by supportive regulatory environments. Furthermore, decision risk is mitigated not by data volume alone, but by aligning validation tools with construct types using PLS-Predict for process optimization and Cross-Validated Predictive Ability Testing for outcome robustness.

Originality/Value: This study offers a unified framework that connects measurement quality, regulatory context, and methodological selection to strategic risk management. It provides leaders with a maturity model to distinguish between "zones of control" (processes) and "zones of influence" (outcomes), transforming analytics from a technical exercise into a strategic safeguard.

Keywords: Decision Risk, Predictive Framework, Knowledge Management, Analytics Maturity, Strategic Foresight, Emerging Markets.

I. INTRODUCTION

The holy grail of modern management analytics is to go from insight (understanding the past) to foresight (predicting the future). Companies spend a lot of money on Knowledge-Based Transformation (KBT) projects, hoping that data models will help them make smart decisions about how to use their resources. But there is still a big problem: models with high explanatory power (R^2) often don't accurately predict what will happen in the future, which leads to strategic overfitting and higher decision risk. Leaders frequently act on insights that are statistically significant but weak in terms of prediction, which puts the company at risk of failing to implement them.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Volume: 3 | Issue: 4
Page No: 305-309 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v3i4.565 January-March 2026

Current literature frequently dissects particular facets of predictive modelling, including the efficacy of specific metrics, the function of contextual moderators, or the evaluation of validation tools. These findings, however, remain isolated. There is no single theory that tells leaders how to combine measurement quality, contextual moderators, and validation tools to make safe strategic choices. This fragmentation results in blind spots where a model may exhibit statistical robustness yet lack contextual awareness, or possess methodological integrity while being influenced by subpar data quality. This study fills this gap by putting forward the Integrated Predictive Decision Framework (IPDF). Using real-world data from Ghana's commercial banking sector, we go beyond just using statistics to back up our claims and present a unified theory of Predictive Strategic Alignment. We answer a bigger question: How can organizations make predictive validity, contextual boundaries, and methodological rigor work together to turn analytics into reliable strategic foresight? We have three things to offer. First, we combine Predictive Modelling Theory, Institutional Theory, and the Ability-Motivation-Opportunity (AMO) framework into one model for decision-making and risk. Second, we propose a theory regarding the intrinsic contrast between process predictability and outcome uncertainty, presenting a novel perspective for analytics maturity. Third, we give leaders a way to sort variables into "zones of control" and "zones of influence," which helps them make better use of their resources and lower their risks.

II. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND: THE FRAGMENTATION OF PREDICTIVE THEORY

Current literature treats predictive validity as a statistical property rather than a strategic capability, creating blind spots for practitioners. Traditional management research prioritizes explanation (theory testing) over prediction (theory building). However, strategic decisions require the latter. Relying on explanatory metrics (R^2) hides "blind spots" where models fail to generalize to new data. This creates a Validity Gap where leaders believe they have foresight when they only have insight. Strategic risk emerges when models explain variance in the current sample but fail to predict individual outcomes in future periods.

Predictive accuracy does not exist in a vacuum. Institutional Theory suggests that external pressures, such as regulation, shape organizational behavior. In emerging markets, regulatory environments do not just constrain behavior but moderate the effectiveness of internal knowledge practices. Ignoring this context leads to models that are internally consistent but externally invalid. A model might predict performance accurately in a stable regulatory environment but fail completely when policies shift. Furthermore, there is no "silver bullet" for validation. Different constructs require different validation tools. Recent advancements suggest that while some methods excel for internal processes, others offer robustness for external outcomes. A one-size-fits-all approach to validation introduces methodological risk into strategic planning. Using a single metric for all constructs assumes homogeneity in predictability, which theoretical evidence suggests is false.

These fragmented views lead to suboptimal decision-making. The Integrated Predictive Decision Framework (IPDF) seeks to reconcile these dimensions into a unified strategy for risk mitigation. It posits that true analytics maturity is not about having more data, but about knowing what is predictable, where the boundaries lie, and how to validate accordingly.

III. THE INTEGRATED PREDICTIVE DECISION FRAMEWORK (IPDF)

We propose the IPDF as a conceptual model that guides organizations from data collection to strategic decision. The framework consists of four interconnected layers that function as a cohesive system rather than isolated steps.

The foundation of the IPDF is the Predictability Spectrum, which recognizes that not all variables are equally predictable. We propose a spectrum based on construct heterogeneity. Zone A comprises Zones of Control, such as internal processes like Knowledge Creation, Retention, and Codification. These are internal organizational behaviors. Empirical evidence suggests these have high predictive relevance and are driven primarily by Measurement Quality. Zone B comprises Zones of Influence, such as External Outcomes like Employee Performance and Job Satisfaction. These are influenced by exogenous factors. Evidence shows these have lower predictive relevance and are driven primarily by Data Structure and Context. Leaders must classify initiatives

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Page No: 305-309 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v3i4.565
Volume: 3 | Issue: 4
January-March 2026

into these zones. Investments in Zone A are low-risk forecasts; investments in Zone B are high-risk bets requiring hedging strategies.

Zone B variables cannot be predicted accurately without accounting for the institutional environment. The IPDF posits that the Regulatory Environment acts as a catalyst. When regulatory support is high, it amplifies the link between knowledge inputs and performance outputs. Conversely, low regulatory support attenuates the link, increasing decision risk. Predictive models for performance outcomes must include regulatory variables as mandatory moderators. Ignoring this context renders performance forecasts invalid.

To mitigate overfitting, the validation method must match the Predictability Spectrum. The IPDF prescribes a Contingent Validation Protocol. For Zone A processes, organizations should use PLS-Predict, focusing on minimizing Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) and maximizing Q^2. Precision is key for process optimization. For Zone B outcomes, organizations should use Cross-Validated Predictive Ability Testing (CVPAT), focusing on statistical superiority over naive benchmarks. Robustness is key for performance forecasting. Analytics teams should not use a single validation metric for all models. A hybrid protocol reduces the risk of deploying overfitted models.

The ultimate output of the IPDF is not a prediction, but a Risk Assessment. By integrating the previous three layers, organizations can calculate a Decision Risk Score. Low Risk is characterized by high measurement quality, Zone A constructs, and supportive regulation. High Risk is characterized by low data structure quality, Zone B constructs, and ambiguous regulation. Leaders should only commit significant capital to initiatives classified as Low Risk. High-risk initiatives require pilot testing or external hedging.

IV. EMPIRICAL EVIDENCE AND ANALYSIS

To validate the IPDF, we conducted a comprehensive analysis using data from 310 banking professionals across ten commercial banks in Ghana. The following analysis demonstrates how the empirical evidence supports the framework's components.

The analysis confirms the existence of the Predictability Spectrum. Knowledge Creation demonstrated substantial predictive relevance ($Q^2 = 0.834$), while Employee Performance showed weak relevance ($Q^2 = 0.191$). This statistical disparity validates the need to separate Zone A and Zone B variables in strategic planning. Furthermore, factor-analytic investigation revealed that Zone A accuracy is driven by measurement quality ($\beta = 0.67$), while Zone B accuracy depends on data structure ($\beta = 0.54$). This confirms the distinct drivers proposed in the first layer of the framework. Knowledge processes are well-defined by model variables, whereas performance outcomes contain significant unexplained variance due to external factors.

The moderating role of regulation was empirically established. The Regulatory Environment positively moderates the Knowledge Management–Performance link ($\beta = 0.101$, $p = 0.049$). Crucially, regulation alone did not drive performance (direct effect non-significant); it only acted as a catalyst. This supports the IPDF's assertion that context is a boundary condition, not a direct input. When perceived government policy support is high, the positive impact of knowledge management on performance is amplified. Conversely, when policy support is low, the efficacy of knowledge practices is attenuated.

The superiority of contingent validation was demonstrated through comparative analysis. PLS-Predict provided superior accuracy for knowledge processes, while CVPAT offered robustness for performance outcomes where PLS-Predict struggled against linear benchmarks. For performance outcomes, the loss differential between the complex model and a naive linear model was non-significant ($p = 0.975$), indicating that for Zone B variables, complex models do not always add predictive value over simple heuristics. This evidence mandates the hybrid validation protocol proposed in the IPDF. Finally, the analysis highlighted the risk of strategic overfitting when relying solely on explanatory metrics. The CVPAT results showed that for performance outcomes, the complex model was not significantly better than a naive benchmark. This validates the IPDF's core premise: without integrated validation, leaders face high decision risk despite high R^2 values. The disparity between explanatory power ($R^2 = 0.425$ for performance) and predictive power ($Q^2 = 0.191$) illustrates the "Validity Gap" that the IPDF is designed to close.

V. DISCUSSION: IMPLICATIONS FOR MANAGEMENT THEORY AND PRACTICE

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Volume: 3 | Issue: 4
Page No: 305-309 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v3i4.565 January-March 2026

Current maturity models focus on data volume and technology stack. The IPDF suggests true maturity is Predictive Strategic Alignment. An organization is not mature because it has big data; it is mature because it knows what is predictable and how to validate it. This shifts the focus from IT capability to managerial discernment. Leaders must understand that high R^2 does not equal high foresight. The IPDF challenges the notion of universal best practices in analytics. We argue that Construct-Level Heterogeneity requires different treatment for different variables. Treating performance outcomes with the same confidence as knowledge processes is a theoretical error that leads to strategic failure. A model that is excellent for forecasting knowledge retention may be dangerous for forecasting employee productivity.

Based on the IPDF, we offer a Decision Risk Checklist for executives to guide strategic implementation. First, leaders must classify the target variable as either a Process (Zone A) or an Outcome (Zone B). Second, they must contextualize the environment by determining if regulatory support is present; if not, performance forecasts should be discounted by 20-30%. Third, validation must be tailored by using PLS-Predict for processes and CVPAT for outcomes. Fourth, an audit of measurement quality is required, ensuring Average Variance Extracted (AVE) is greater than 0.60 for processes and Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measures are greater than 0.80 for outcomes. Finally, capital should only be allocated if the Decision Risk Score is low.

For policymakers in emerging markets, the findings suggest that regulatory clarity is a public good that enhances private sector efficiency. By reducing regulatory ambiguity, governments indirectly improve the predictive accuracy of corporate HR and knowledge models, leading to better economic outcomes. Supportive policies act as a force multiplier for private sector knowledge investments.

VI. CONCLUSION

The journey from insight to foresight is fraught with risk. This study proposes the Integrated Predictive Decision Framework (IPDF), a holistic model for mitigating decision risk in knowledge-based transformation. We demonstrate that predictive validity is not a single metric but a complex interplay of construct type, contextual moderation, and methodological fit. By distinguishing between zones of control and zones of influence, and by aligning validation tools with construct characteristics, organizations can avoid the trap of strategic overfitting. In emerging markets, where uncertainty is high, this framework offers a vital safeguard: it transforms analytics from a source of false confidence into a tool for genuine strategic foresight. The evidence suggests that integrated predictive thinking is the next frontier of management science, requiring leaders to be as proficient in validation logic as they are in strategic vision.

REFERENCES

1. Appelbaum, E., et al. (2000). High-performance work systems and organizational performance. Industrial & Labor Relations Review.
2. Bank of Ghana. (2021). Annual Report. Accra: BoG.
3. Davenport, T. H. (2019). The AI Advantage. MIT Press.
4. DiMaggio, P. J., & Powell, W. W. (1983). The iron cage revisited. American Sociological Review.
5. Hair, J. F., et al. (2019). When to use and how to report the results of PLS-SEM. European Business Review.
6. Henseler, J., et al. (2020). A new criterion for assessing discriminant validity in variance-based structural equation modeling. Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science.
7. Jiang, K., et al. (2012). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? Academy of Management Journal.
8. Liengaard, B. D., et al. (2021). Prediction: Covariance-based or Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling? Journal of Travel Research.
9. Shmueli, G. (2010). To explain or to predict? Statistical Science.

International Journal of Science and Social Science Research
ISSN: 2583-7877 Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal
Volume: 3 | Issue: 4
Page No: 305-309 DOI: https://doi.org/10.63671/ijsssr.v3i4.565 January-March 2026

10. Shmueli, G., et al. (2019). Predictive model assessment in PLS-SEM. European Journal of Information Systems.
11. Sharma, P. N., et al. (2023). Predictive model assessment and selection in composite-based modeling using PLS-SEM. European Journal of Marketing.