

# **Agentic AI: Expanding the Algorithmic Frontier of Creative Problem Solving**

Anirban Mukherjee  
Principal, Avyayam Holdings  
[anirban@avyayamholdings.com](mailto:anirban@avyayamholdings.com)

Professor Hannah Hanwen Chang  
Associate Professor, Marketing  
Lee Kong Chian School of Business  
Singapore Management University  
[hannahchang@smu.edu.sg](mailto:hannahchang@smu.edu.sg)

1 February, 2025

## Abstract

Agentic Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems are capable of autonomously pursuing goals, making decisions, and taking actions over extended periods. Unlike traditional generative AI, which responds reactively to prompts, agentic AI proactively orchestrates complex workflows—as exemplified by travel-planning agents that autonomously book flights, negotiate hotel rates, curate brand-aligned experiences, and adapt to real-time disruptions. We posit that this transition from advisory roles to proactive execution challenges existing legal, economic, and marketing frameworks. We highlight gaps in liability attribution, intellectual property ownership, and informed consent when agentic AI systems enter into binding contracts or generate novel solutions. Central to this analysis is the tension between novelty and practicality: although agentic AI can craft unconventional and highly original experiences, these outputs may conflict with user preferences or logistical constraints. Furthermore, algorithmic coordination among AI systems risks distorting competitive dynamics through tacit collusion or market concentration, particularly if diverse AI systems converge on similar solutions due to shared underlying data or optimization logic. Addressing these challenges will necessitate interdisciplinary collaboration to redefine legal accountability, align AI-driven choices with consumer values, and maintain ethical safeguards. We advocate for frameworks that balance autonomy with accountability, ensuring stakeholders can harness agentic AI's potential while preserving trust, fairness, and societal welfare in an increasingly automated ecosystem.

*Keywords:* Agentic Artificial Intelligence, Algorithmic Collusion, Autonomous Decision-Making, Creative Problem-Solving, Liability and Informed Consent, Intellectual Property, Novelty–Usefulness Trade-Off.

*JEL:* D83, L86, K12, M31, O33.

Agentic Artificial Intelligence (AI) refer to AI systems capable of autonomously pursuing goals, making decisions, and taking actions over extended periods (Durante et al., 2024). Traditional generative AI systems generate content in response to user instructions (Huang, Rust, and Maksimovic, 2019; Mukherjee and Chang, 2024a). In contrast, agentic AI can proactively initiate actions, adapt to changes, and coordinate with other agents or humans to achieve complex objectives (Russell and Norvig, 2020). This higher degree of autonomy and persistence represents a novel form of digital agency.

To illustrate, consider planning a trip to Vietnam. A conventional travel chatbot might answer questions about flight schedules or recommend prominent tourist spots. By contrast, an agentic AI travel assistant could autonomously construct a complete itinerary: booking flights aligned with the traveler’s preferences and budget, reserving accommodations consistent with prior choices, scheduling tours to major sites such as the My Son Sanctuary, and even arranging dining at restaurants known for authentic cuisine. This agent could also monitor weather forecasts to optimize outdoor activities, negotiate with local operators for better rates, and dynamically update the itinerary in response to real-time events, such as flight delays or seasonal festivals.

Such proactive, multi-turn engagement exemplifies the shift from reactive interactions to robust autonomy, extending well beyond enhanced convenience to reshape entire operational workflows. Beyond travel, agentic AI could orchestrate sophisticated supply chains by negotiating with suppliers, optimizing logistics, and adapting to volatile market conditions.

Yet the advancement of agentic AI raises critical questions about balancing automation with human oversight, particularly regarding the ethical dimensions of autonomous decision-making and the evolution of new collaborative paradigms between humans and increasingly capable AI entities. As AI systems gain genuine autonomy—negotiating, purchasing, and executing contracts—the once-clear boundaries among buyers, sellers, and intermediaries begin to blur, exposing gaps in existing legal, economic, and marketing frameworks.

For instance, if an autonomous AI enters into a contract that runs counter to a user's best interests, who bears liability? In the absence of direct human intervention, how should informed consent be defined? Moreover, the opacity of AI decision-making processes complicates accountability and dispute resolution, as users may struggle to contest or reverse AI-driven transactions made on their behalf. This phenomenon has been characterized as creating a 'moral crumple zone,' wherein accountability becomes increasingly diffuse as automation advances (Elish, 2019), and raises urgent concerns about due process and recourse in AI-mediated interactions.

Several additional concerns manifest. From a marketing perspective, aligning an AI's autonomous actions with consumer preferences and brand values—rather than optimizing purely for efficiency—poses significant challenges. Economically, the widespread adoption of agentic AI may reshape competitive dynamics through continuous algorithmic negotiation, dynamic pricing, and automated resource allocation. Finally, the continuous data tracking and exchange that power agentic AI generate significant privacy and security risks, underscoring the need for new forms of regulatory oversight. Despite these growing risks, such questions remain inadequately examined in existing economics, law, and marketing research.

Central to these concerns is the trade-off between novelty and usefulness in creative problem-solving (Mukherjee and Chang, 2024b), a concern explored in prior research on generative AI (Boussioux et al., 2024), that is amplified in agentic AI. For example, in the travel planning scenario, traditional chatbots might propose options, but the ultimate decision to adopt and implement these suggestions remains with the human user. Conventional AI offers suggestions but leaves the final decision—and thus accountability—squarely with the user. Agentic AI, however, disrupts this dynamic by autonomously executing decisions: instead of a human choosing to implement a travel recommendation, the system itself books flights or makes purchases, reducing human oversight at the point of execution.

Novel solutions generated by agentic AI could inadvertently conflict with practical constraints or user preferences. Returning to the travel planning example, while an agentic AI might propose a highly novel itinerary, this itinerary may be impracticable. In such scenarios, the balance should rightly shift toward “usefulness.” There may even be cases where no truly practical solutions exist; some problems may simply lack feasible resolutions. Conversely, in other contexts, the pursuit of novelty may be paramount for user engagement and satisfaction (Holgerson et al., 2024). While practicality remains a baseline, solutions that lack originality may fail to capture user interest, especially when seeking unique or differentiated experiences. Consider, for example, a social media influencer seeking an unforgettable culinary adventure in Hanoi. While logistical feasibility is still necessary, the AI's value stems from its ability to suggest truly novel and exciting dining experiences beyond typical tourist recommendations.

It is precisely this ability to autonomously generate such novel and valuable products and experiences that raises another critical question amplified in agentic AI systems: who owns the creative output (Zeilinger 2021)? Returning to our social media influencer, with conventional generative AI, they might retain creative agency—curating suggestions, refining itineraries, and selectively implementing ideas. Intellectual property (IP) claims here might reasonably reflect this collaborative creative process.

Agentic AI, however, fundamentally alters this dynamic: the AI system autonomously executes and finalizes decisions—booking flights, reserving niche accommodations, and securing exclusive experiences without requiring iterative human approval. If the AI alone crafts and locks in a uniquely novel itinerary, a novelty that would have been crucial for attracting the influencer's audience, does the IP belong to the influencer (as the commissioning party) or the AI service provider (as the de facto creator)? This challenge is exemplified by the U.S. Copyright Office's 2023 policy affirming that AI-generated works lacking human authorship cannot be copyrighted, leaving ownership ambiguities for fully automated outputs (U.S. Copyright Office, 2023, 88 FR

16190), and highlighted in scholarship examining the applicability of traditional copyright frameworks to algorithmically generated works (Bridy, 2012), which prefigures today's debates over the ownership of agentic AI outputs.

Put simply, unlike generative tools where users “co-author” outputs through iterative refinement, agentic systems risk reducing human stakeholders to passive beneficiaries of fully automated creativity. This shift challenges existing IP frameworks, which presuppose intentional human authorship at critical decision points (Abbott 2020). When an influencer's branded content derives entirely from AI-orchestrated experiences—with no curation or adjustment—claims to creative ownership may become tenuous, potentially transferring credit (and royalties) to the agentic AI's operators. Thus, this shift not only challenges the core assumptions of intellectual property law—echoing longstanding debates over allocating ownership rights in computer-generated works (Samuelson, 1985)—but also underscores the inadequacy of existing frameworks to address the machine-as-author paradigm (Gervais, 2019), demanding a comprehensive reevaluation of accountability and transparency in autonomous systems.

Moreover, the potential for algorithmic coordination to result in tacit or explicit collusion remains a significant concern (Calvano et al., 2020; Ezrachi & Stucke, 2016). In a scenario with a single vendor of AI travel solutions, traditional industrial organization economics theory could be applied to analyze AI-driven market outcomes and ensure fair competition. However, the presence of multiple AI providers introduces complexities. While diverse AIs could, in theory, generate distinct solutions and enhance competition, the reality may differ. If AI decision-making relies on similar or identical underlying data, optimizations in data patterns—akin to search engine optimization today—could lead to convergent rather than divergent solutions, thereby mitigating competitive pressures. This convergence, driven by identical data inputs and similar optimization logic, could foster tacit collusion, as AI systems independently arrive at near-identical pricing or service strategies without explicit coordination.

While these issues are present even in current algorithmic marketing paradigms (such as algorithmic pricing), they are critically amplified when both the demand side (e.g., an agentic AI booking travel for a consumer) and the supply side (e.g., an algorithm setting prices for a provider) are governed by autonomous systems. Regulators will need to develop tools to detect and prevent such outcomes, including monitoring for algorithmic harmonization that suppresses market efficiency.

Additionally, preventing market power consolidation may require structural separation between agentic AI serving consumers and those serving suppliers—akin to conflict-of-interest barriers in finance. However, such measures also risk stifling AI innovation. Overly stringent regulations could prioritize market efficiency over technological advancement, given that economies of scale often favor a few key players in the AI field (such as OpenAI), reflecting the quintessential tension between fostering innovation and ensuring efficiency.

As AI systems increasingly negotiate, execute contracts, and adapt autonomously, traditional legal notions of liability, property rights, and informed consent will require reevaluation. Likewise, established economic and marketing theories—predicated on human-centric decision-making—will face novel challenges as AI-mediated transactions grow in scale and complexity. Addressing these developments will require a deeply interdisciplinary approach that unites legal scholars, economists, technologists, and ethicists in crafting frameworks—informed by global ethical guidelines (Jobin, Ienca, & Vayena, 2019)—to ensure accountability, fairness, and transparency. By proactively shaping policy, industry standards, and ethical guidelines, stakeholders can harness agentic AI’s transformative potential while upholding brand integrity, user values, and societal welfare, preserving the trust and agency of all participants in this rapidly evolving digital ecosystem.

### **Acknowledgements**

This research was supported by the Ministry of Education (MOE), Singapore, under its Academic Research Fund (AcRF) Tier 2 Grant, No. MOE-T2EP40221-0008.

## Bibliography

- Abbott, R. (2020). *The reasonable robot: Artificial intelligence and the law*. Cambridge University Press.
- Boussioux, L., Lane, J. N., Zhang, M., Jacimovic, V., & Lakhani, K. R. (2024). The crowdless future? Generative AI and creative problem-solving. *Organization Science*, 35(5), 1589–1607.
- Bridy, A. (2012). Coding creativity: copyright and the artificially intelligent author. *Stan. Tech. L. Rev.*, 5.
- Calvano, E., Calzolari, G., Denicolo, V., & Pastorello, S. (2020). Artificial intelligence, algorithmic pricing, and collusion. *American Economic Review*, 110(10), 3267–3297. <https://doi.org/10.1257/aer.20190623>
- Durante, Z., Huang, Q., Wake, N., Gong, R., Park, J. S., Sarkar, B., ... & Gao, J. (2024). Agent AI: Surveying the horizons of multimodal interaction (arXiv:2401.03568). *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.03568>
- Elish, M. C. (2019). Moral crumple zones: Cautionary tales in human-robot interaction. *Engaging Science, Technology, and Society*, 5(1), 40–60.
- Ezrachi, A., & Stucke, M. E. (2016). *Virtual competition: The promise and perils of the algorithm-driven economy*. Harvard University Press.
- Gervais, D. J. (2019). The machine as author. *Iowa Law Review*, 105, 2053–2106.
- Holgerson, M., Dahlander, L., Chesbrough, H., & Bogers, M. L. (2024). Open innovation in the age of AI. *California Management Review*, 67(1), 5–20.
- Huang, M. H., Rust, R., & Maksimovic, V. (2019). The feeling economy: Managing in the next generation of artificial intelligence (AI). *California Management Review*, 61(4), 43–65.
- Jobin, A., Ienca, M., & Vayena, E. (2019). The global landscape of AI ethics guidelines. *Nature Machine Intelligence*, 1(9), 389–399. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s42256-019-0088-2>
- Mukherjee, A., & Chang, H. H. (2024a). Silico-centric theory of mind (arXiv:2403.09289). *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2403.09289>
- Mukherjee, A., & Chang, H. H. (2024b). AI knowledge and reasoning: Emulating expert creativity in scientific research (arXiv:2404.04436). *arXiv*. <https://arxiv.org/abs/2404.04436>
- Russell, S., & Norvig, P. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence: A Modern Approach* (4th ed.). Pearson.
- Samuelson, P. (1985). Allocating ownership rights in computer-generated works. *University of Pittsburgh Law Review*, 47, 1185–1220.
- U.S. Copyright Office. (2023). Copyright registration guidance: Works containing material generated by artificial intelligence. *Federal Register*, 88(51), 16190–16194. <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/03/16/2023-05321/copyright-registration-guidance-works-containing-material-generated-by-artificial-intelligence>
- Zeilinger, M. (2021). *Tactical entanglements: AI art, creative agency, and the limits of intellectual property*. Meson Press.