

Review of: "Mitigating organizational decision making amidst the dragging effect"

Yankuo Qiao¹

¹ Rutgers University

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

Overview

It is my pleasure to review the article entitled "Mitigating Organizational Decision Making Amidst the Dragging Effect." The article is very well written and I enjoy reading the article. The rationale of the article is well-streamlined, and thus it is very easy to follow. In addition, the arguments made by the author in the article are largely supported by studies in the prior literature of business economics, organizational management, and administrative sciences. Overall, it's no doubt that this is an interesting paper discussing an important topic in the field of strategic management, i.e., organizational decision making. Therefore, the article does have value in its current form. With that being said, there does exist substantial space for further improvement. As such, I would like to first conduct an in-depth summary of the article and then further discuss my recommendations for the author to consider in the future development of the project.

In-depth Summary of the Article

Revolving around the topic of organizational decision making, the author discusses the importance of organizational decision making, types of organizational decision making, barriers against efficiently and effectively making organizational decisions, and organizational decision making methods, whereby thoroughly reviewing the previous studies in the literature of organizational management, business economics, and administrative sciences. In particular, building upon the previous studies (see, for example, Aboudahr and Olowoselu, 2018, Certel, Aksoy, Çalışkan, Lapa, Özçelik, and Çelik, 2013, and Shahid, Rappon, and Berta, 2019), the author defines organizational decision making as a course of action centered at selecting the most rational option among all the strategic alternatives to render the desirable outcomes in regards to a certain subject. Resonating with the prior literature (see, for example, Kumar and Gautam, 2018, Al-Khamis, 2011, and Bursalioğlu, 2013), the author argues that making strategic organizational management decisions is the single most important component and the main action in all the organizational operations, because it is the source of all other activities, from which efforts and actions at different levels of the organization are guided and motivated.

Striving to delineate and dissect the nature of organizational decision making, the author synthesizes previous studies (see, for example, Fang, Hsu, and Lin, 2019, Hussien Ahmad Al-Tarawneh, 2012, and Zell, Glassman, and Duron, 2007) and classify different types of organizational decision making according to a varied cross-section of standards. In particular, organizational decision making could be classified as structured decisions, semi-structured choices and

unstructured decisions, in accordance with the degree to which the decision to be made is considered regular, recurrent, and of less novelty and uncertainty. Depending on whether or not the potential ramifications of the decision making have a profound impact upon an organization's missions and critical policy issues, leading to large financial or investment commitments, organizational decisions could be dichotomized into strategic decisions and non-strategic decisions. In spite of numerous criteria for classifying organizational decisions, the author argues that one inclusive approach is to dichotomize those decisions into programmed decisions and non-programed decisions, depending on whether the decisions are closely associated with an organization's routine operations.

Based on the prior literature (see, for example, Jungwon Park and Keon-Hyung Lee, 2020, and Negulescu, 2014), the author points out that albeit regarded as the most important organizational component, organizational decisions are often made without required resources and knowledge of the underlying background, leading to biased and irrational decision making behaviors in the face of situations of risk, danger, and uncertainty. Accordingly, the author argues that it is crucial for managers to take into consideration all the environmental variables that could support or hinder organizational decision making. Nevertheless, provided that the human brain might be misled, when functioning under pressure and higher degrees of ambiguity and complexity (see, for example, Bearden, Hardesty, and Rose, 2001, and Obi, 2014), thereby undermining our rationality and judgment, the author admits that sometimes it is the decision maker's mindset to blame, rather than the organizational process, and that there exists a wide variety of emotional, egotistical, and political factors influential to organizational decision making, including culture, self-awareness, moral judgment, and political conduct (see, for example, Al-Yahya, 2008, Craft, 2013, and Dawson and Napper, 2020), as well as psychological biases such as subjective prejudices, exaggerated confidence and levels of anxiety (see, for example, Clemenand Reilly, 2001, and Bachkirov, 2015).

In order to efficiently and effectively making organizational decisions in the face of various dragging effects, the author discusses the influential roles of the caliber of the judgments, clearly defining the goals, offering choices for resolving issues, and considering and balancing values and interests in making quality organizational decisions. On top of all the aforementioned factors and beyond, the author argues that the increase in the likelihood of making quality strategic decisions for modern organizations stems from the adoption and development of state of art foresight techniques including trend analysis, change driver identification, road mapping, and so on, which are embraced and utilized by organizations as tools for decision making (see, for example, Ngussa and Gabriel, 2017). Centered around the notion of foresight, some organizations employ qualitative and quantitative methodologies to predict the outcome of potential situations, whereas other organizations use the quality management framework as a decision-making tool. The author also mentions that Delphi methods, analytical techniques to prioritize scenarios, mapping future trajectories, and Mintzberg and Carnegie decision-making models are often involved in support of foresight practices.

In summary, the author conducts an extensive review of the greater literature on organizational decision making, and organizes relevant studies to support the arguments in regard to various aspects of the topic, including the importance of organizational decision making, the different classifications of organizational decision making, the challenges and barriers against making efficient and effective organizational decisions, and finally the organizational decision making methods. Building upon previous studies, the author advocates that adopting and developing the notion of foresight and relevant

techniques to forecast future outcomes are of paramount importance for organizations to make efficient and effective organizational decisions. My main critique of the article is centered at the ambiguity of the article's genre. In essence, after reading this article, it is not clear to me if it is a scientific research article aiming to propose new organizational decision-making approaches to mitigate concerns about the dragging effects or a review paper that synthesizes previous studies in the literature in a systematic and insightful way. Nevertheless, many important components are lacking for either article type.

Comments and Recommendations

• Scientific Research Article

If the ultimate goal is to develop the project into a publishable research paper, then the current version of the article doesn't follow the formality of a typical scientific research paper and some important components are missing such as hypotheses development/ analytical framework, methodology, and results and analysis. The study is not well motivated in that albeit discussing the importance of organizational decision making, it doesn't point out the gap in the literature and thus fails to highlight the novelty of the theory developed and methods suggested in this study. The article is not well-developed to justify the important topic suggested by the title. In particular, there is no full-fledged theoretical framework developed by the article to identify, present, and dissect dragging effects. Indeed, in the article, the author mentions several barriers against efficient and effective decision making, such as behavioral biases, political conduct and cultural variables; however, a structured conceptual model is lacking and further conceptualization is needed. Specifically, the author should refer to papers such as Orlitzky and Swanson (2002), Good, Hughes, Kirca, and McGrath (2022), and Bande, Kimura, Fernández-Ferrín, Castro-González, and Goel (2023) for developing theoretical frameworks and conceptual models.

Moreover, as suggested by its title, this research article, presumably, should strive to develop new or examine less researched methods to facilitate organizational decision making in the face of all the dragging effects. However, after reading this article for several times, it is still not clear to me what is the major approach proposed and tested in the article, and whether and how such an approach could lead to efficient and effective decision making. Although the authors argue that the developing notion of foresight shall impact organizational decision making, the arguments are too generic and need further elaboration. Therefore, to a large extent, the article merely paraphrases arguments and summarizes implications from the previous literature, thereby hardly making any significant contributions to the greater literature of organizational decision making or generating managerial implications to guide practitioners in fulfilling their daily duties.

Hence, if the goal is to write up a scientific research paper aiming to dissect dragging effects confounding the organizational decision-making process, to develop innovative decision making through synthesizing theories and methods in the prior literature, and to offer practical implications and guidance to facilitate efficient and effective organizational decision making, the author shall consider rewriting the article and making major revisions to improve on the aforementioned deficiencies. Specifically, the author should consider restructuring the original manuscript. The content in the current version of the article shall primarily constitute sections of introduction and motivation, and partially

the section of concluding remarks. The author should also further motivate the study in the section of introduction, whereby articulating the novelty of the study. For example, the author could outline the relevant literature and point out that a unique approach that could mitigate all the dragging effects in the face of organizational decision making is less researched. In addition to motivation, the author should explicitly discuss various potential contributions that could be made by this study, including the contributions to the greater literature of organizational decision making and the practical implications for managers to formulate strategic organizational management decisions.

Next, the author should focus on developing the theoretical framework to dissect the dragging effects undermining effective organizational decision making and to explain whether and how the proposed method could mitigate the concerns about those negative effects accordingly. The author might want to have a dedicated section of hypothesis and theory development, which is often the most important section for a scientific research paper and guides the further tests and investigations in the following sections. Once the theoretical framework is fleshed out, the author should examine the effectiveness and limitation of the proposed approaches. Depending on the research purpose and the availability of resources, the author might opt to use secondary data and perform statistical analysis, or the author might want to collect primary data through surveys or interviews with managers. Finally, in the section of concluding remarks, the author should resonate the findings in the article with the most extant literature. In addition, it is always recommended to talk about the limitations of the study and how future research would improve on the current deficiencies, which in turn illustrates promising directions for future research and potentially enhances citations and visibility of the study.

• Bibliographic Review Paper

On the other hand, if the goal of the article is to conduct a thorough literature review revolving around the topic of making organizational decisions, then the author should consider adopting widely used bibliographic research methods by review papers in the extant literature such as meta-analysis and other quantitative literature review methodologies rather than simply conduct in-text citations to support the author's own arguments. In general, a solid review paper starts with a summary of methods and standards utilized in search of relevant articles to be used in the study. Namely, the author should develop a universe of papers for further discussions in the study. Specifically, the author could refer to review papers such as Habib, Hasan, and Jiang (2018), Liu, Mai, and MacDonald (2019), and You, Srinivasan, Pauwels, and Joshi (2020) for how to implement solid bibliographic research methodologies to compose a complete set of important studies lying in the topic of organizational decision making.

Accordingly, the author should restructure the article to first talk about the search process for relevant articles pertaining to organizational decision making according to bibliographic research methodologies. Then the author could elaborate on different aspects of organizational decision making such as the importance of organizational decision making, types of organizational decision making, barriers to efficient and effective decision making, and effective decision making methodologies and so on, whereby conducting in-depth discussions of previous studies in regards to each aspect. In addition, looking through the reference list of the study, I notice that some articles, though quite interesting and important, are considered out-of-date. To avoid biased interpretations based on obsolete findings, I strongly recommend the author, for the purpose of writing an insightful review paper, should search for the most extant studies in the greater literature of

making organizational decisions, especially those published since 2020, incorporating the most recent technological advancement in big data analytics, artificial intelligence, and deep learning (see, for example, Harfouche, Quinio, Saba, 2023, Keding and Meissner 2021, Roundy, 2022, and Shrestha, Krishna, and Krogh 2021). One thing the author should keep in mind while reworking the article is that the most important task of an insightful review paper is to point out the gap in the literature and illustrate promising directions for future research. Based on the in-depth analysis and discussion of the extant literature, the author should highlight the areas in regards to which less research is accumulated to date, thereby calling attention from researchers to those under-researched questions.

Concluding Remarks

All in all, this is an interesting paper that discusses various aspects of organizational decision making, an important topic lying at the intersection of business economics, strategic management and administrative sciences. However, despite the fact that extensive studies in the prior literature are cited in support of the arguments, neither the scholarly contribution of the article to the literature, nor its managerial implications for practitioners is clear due to the lack of important analytical and methodological components. I suggest that the author should decide on the genre of the article, namely, scientific research paper or bibliographic review article, and revise accordingly, which is key to developing the project into a publishable paper. I wish the author the best of luck in the future development of the article.

Reference

- Aboudahr, S. M. F. M., & Olowoselu, A. (2018). Analysis of principals' decision making styles on teachers performance in selected secondary schools of Gharbia Governorate, Egypt. *Academic Journal of Economic Studies* 4(4), 91-95.
- Al-Ghamdi, Ali bin Mohammed (2015). The reality of the decision-making process of the principals of public education schools in Madinah. University of Taibah, *Journal of the Arabian Gulf Message* 369(137), 69-88.
- Al-Khamis, Abdulaziz bin Mohammed. (2011). *Participation in administrative decision making and its role in reducing resistance to organizational change from the point of view of the officers working the National Guard Headquarters*. Unpublished Master Dissertation, Naif Arab University for Security Sciences, College of Graduate Studies, Department of Administrative Sciences.
- Al-Tarawneh, H. A. (2012). The main factors beyond decision making. *Journal of Management Research* 4(1), 1-23.
- Al-Yahya, K. O. (2009). Power-influence in decision making, competence utilization, and organizational culture in public organizations: The Arab world in comparative perspective. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 19(2), 385-407.
- Bachkirov, A. A. (2015). Managerial decision making under specific emotions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(7), 861-874.
- Bande, B., Kimura, T., Fernández-Ferrín, P., Castro-González, S., & Goel, A. (2023). Are self-sacrificing employees liked

by their supervisor?. *Eurasian Business Review*, 1-28.

Bearden, W. O., Hardesty, D. M., & Rose, R. L. (2001). Consumer self-confidence: Refinements in conceptualization and measurement. *Journal of consumer research*, 28(1), 121-134.

Certel, Z., Aksoy, D., Çalışkan, E., Lapa, T. Y., Özçelik, M. A., & Çelik, G. (2013). Research on self-esteem in decision making and decision-making styles in taekwondo athletes. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 93, 1971-1975.

Clemen R.T. and T. Reilly. 2001. *Making Hard Decisions with Decision Tools* Duxbury, Pacific Grove, CA.

Craft, J. L. (2013). A review of the empirical ethical decision-making literature: 2004–2011 *Journal of business ethics*, 117, 221-259.

Dawson, S., & Napper, V. (2020). Determining Educator Ethical Decision-Making Factors Using the Jones Model. *Journal of the International Society for Teacher Education*, 24(1), 23-35.

Fang, S.C., Hsu, Y.S., & Lin, S.S. (2019). "Conceptualizing socioscientific decision making from a review of research in science education," *International Journal of Science and Mathematics Education*, 17(3), 427-448.

Good, V., Hughes, D. E., Kirca, A. H., & McGrath, S. (2022). A self-determination theory-based meta-analysis on the differential effects of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on salesperson performance. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 50(3), 586-614.

Habib, A., Hasan, M. M., & Jiang, H. (2018). Stock price crash risk: review of the empirical literature. *Accounting & Finance*, 58, 211-251.

Harfouche, A., Quinio, B., Saba, M., & Saba, P. B. (2023). The recursive theory of knowledge augmentation: integrating human intuition and knowledge in Artificial Intelligence to augment organizational knowledge. *Information Systems Frontiers*, 25(1), 55-70

Jungwon Park & Keon-Hyung Lee (2020) Organizational politics, work attitudes and performance: the moderating role of age and public service motivation (PSM), *International Review of Public Administration*, 25:2, 85-105,

Keding, C., & Meissner, P. (2021). Managerial overreliance on AI-augmented decision-making processes: How the use of AI-based advisory systems shapes choice behavior in R&D investment decisions. *Technological forecasting and social change*, 171, 120970.

Kumar, S., & Gautam, N. (2018). Decision making styles among professor in central university of Bihar - An empirical study of predictors. *International Journal of Law and Society*, 1(2), 84-91.

Liu, Y., Mai, F., & MacDonald, C. (2019). A big-data approach to understanding the thematic landscape of the field of business ethics, 1982–2016. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 160, 127-150.

Negulescu, O. (2014). *The quality of decision making process related to organizations effectiveness* Elsevier, 11-23.

- Ngussa, B. & Gabriel, L. (2017). Participation in decision making and teachers' commitment: a comparative study between public and private secondary schools in Arusha Municipality, Tanzania. *American Journal of Educational Research*, 5(7), 801-807.
- Obi, J.N. (2014). *"Decision-making Strategy"*. In C.P. Maduabum (Ed.) Contemporary Issues on Management in Organizations of Readings (Chapter 6, p.63). Ibadan: Spectrum Books Limited.
- Orlitzky, M., & Swanson, D. L. (2002). Value attunement: Toward a theory of socially responsible executive decision-making. *Australian Journal of Management*, 27(1_suppl), 119-128.
- Roundy, P. T. (2022). Artificial intelligence and entrepreneurial ecosystems: understanding the implications of algorithmic decision-making for startup communities. *Journal of Ethics in Entrepreneurship and Technology*, (ahead-of-print).
- Shahid, N., Rappon, T., & Berta, W. (2019). Applications of artificial neural networks in health care organizational decision-making: A scoping review. *PloS one*, 14(2), e0212356.
- Shrestha, Y. R., Krishna, V., & von Krogh, G. (2021). Augmenting organizational decision-making with deep learning algorithms: Principles, promises, and challenges. *Journal of Business Research*, 123, 588-603.
- You, Y., Srinivasan, S., Pauwels, K., & Joshi, A. (2020). How CEO/CMO characteristics affect innovation and stock returns: findings and future directions. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 48, 1229-1253.
- Zell, D. M., Glassman, A. M., & Duron, S. A. (2007). Strategic management in turbulent times: The short and glorious history of accelerated decision making at Hewlett- Packard. *Organizational Dynamics*, 36, 93–104