www.revistaft.com.br

RevistaFT | ISSN 1678-0817 | v.30, n. 159, 2026 | DOI: 10.69849/mgdpyb72

Cognitive infrastructure for decision systems: structuring decision formation in complex organizational environments

Infraestrutura cognitiva para sistemas de decisão: estruturando a formação de decisões em ambientes organizacionais complexos

Aquiles Peres Casabona

ABSTRACT

Decision-making in complex organizational environments is frequently treated as a consequence of execution capacity, supported by data, operational processes, and analytical systems. However, persistent inconsistencies in organizational outcomes indicate that many limitations may originate not at the execution level itself, but in the absence of a formal structure governing how decisions are formed, interpreted, validated, and adapted over time.

This study introduces the concept of Cognitive Infrastructure for Decision Systems (CIDS), a structural model that formalizes decision-making as a continuous organizational system rather than as isolated operational events.

The model integrates data, contextual interpretation, and explicit decision criteria within a unified structural framework capable of supporting consistency, adaptability, and alignment across complex environments.

This study aims to formalize the conceptual foundations of CIDS and examine its implications for organizations operating under dynamic, non-linear, and context-dependent conditions.

The findings indicate that organizational performance limitations may be more closely associated with fragmented decision structures than with insufficient execution capacity alone.

Keywords: decision systems; organizational decision-making; complex environments; cognitive infrastructure; decision architecture.

RESUMO

A tomada de decisão em ambientes organizacionais complexos é frequentemente tratada como consequência da capacidade de execução, apoiada por dados, processos operacionais e sistemas analíticos. No entanto, inconsistências persistentes nos resultados organizacionais indicam que muitas limitações podem ter origem não no nível da execução em si, mas na

ausência de uma estrutura formal que regule como as decisões são formadas, interpretadas, validadas e adaptadas ao longo do tempo.

Este estudo introduz o conceito de **Infraestrutura Cognitiva para Sistemas de Decisão (Cognitive Infrastructure for Decision Systems – CIDS)**, um modelo estrutural que formaliza a tomada de decisão como um sistema organizacional contínuo, e não como eventos operacionais isolados.

O modelo integra dados, interpretação contextual e critérios explícitos de decisão em uma estrutura unificada, capaz de sustentar consistência, adaptabilidade e alinhamento em ambientes complexos.

Este estudo tem como objetivo formalizar os fundamentos conceituais da CIDS e examinar suas implicações para organizações que operam sob condições dinâmicas, não lineares e dependentes do contexto.

Os resultados indicam que as limitações no desempenho organizacional podem estar mais associadas a estruturas decisórias fragmentadas do que apenas à insuficiência da capacidade de execução.

Palavras-chave: sistemas de decisão; tomada de decisão organizacional; ambientes complexos; infraestrutura cognitiva; arquitetura de decisão.

1. INTRODUCTION

Over the last decades, organizations have significantly expanded their execution capabilities through advances in data systems, automation, analytics, and artificial intelligence. Despite these developments, decision-making remains a recurring source of organizational inconsistency.

Different teams operating under similar conditions and often with access to the same information continue to produce divergent interpretations, conflicting priorities, and inconsistent outcomes. Strategic initiatives are frequently reformulated, operational alignment fluctuates, and execution variability persists even in environments supported by sophisticated technological infrastructures.

Traditional approaches generally interpret these limitations as consequences of insufficient execution capacity, inadequate processes, or lack of data availability. As a result, organizations continue investing heavily in operational optimization, automation systems, and analytical capabilities.

Although these interventions may improve efficiency, many inconsistencies remain structurally unresolved.

This study argues that such limitations may originate from a more fundamental issue: the absence of a formal structure capable of organizing how decisions are formed, interpreted, validated, and adapted over time.

Decision-making has long been recognized as a central organizational function (SIMON, 1997). However, in most operational environments, decisions continue to emerge through fragmented combinations of individual interpretation, contextual assumptions, partial information, and informal coordination mechanisms.

As organizational environments become increasingly dynamic, distributed, and context-dependent, interpretative fragmentation tends to intensify (SNOWDEN; BOONE, 2007). In these conditions, access to information alone becomes insufficient to guarantee decision consistency.

The Cognitive Infrastructure for Decision Systems (CIDS) model is proposed as a structural response to this gap. Rather than treating decision-making as isolated operational events, the model formalizes decision formation as a continuous organizational system integrating data, contextual interpretation, validation mechanisms, and explicit decision criteria.

This study aims to formalize the conceptual foundations of CIDS and examine its implications for organizations operating in complex and non-linear environments.

2. DECISION-MAKING AS AN IMPLICIT PROCESS

In most organizational environments, decision-making is not formally structured as an explicit operational system. Instead, decisions typically emerge through fragmented combinations of individual experience, partial data interpretation, contextual assumptions, and informal coordination mechanisms.

Although this implicit structure may operate adequately in relatively stable environments, its limitations become progressively more visible as organizational complexity increases.

Under dynamic and context-dependent conditions, the absence of explicit decision structures tends to generate:

• interpretative variability across operational layers

• inconsistent application of decision criteria

• excessive dependence on individual judgment

• difficulty in scaling decision consistency across teams and environments

• delayed identification of structural sources of operational misalignment

As a consequence, execution frequently becomes disconnected from strategic intent, even when operational processes remain formally aligned.

Importantly, these inconsistencies are not necessarily caused by insufficient technical capability or lack of operational effort. In many cases, they emerge because organizations rely on implicit decision formation mechanisms that remain structurally undefined.

Organizational interpretation depends not only on information availability, but also on how meaning is collectively constructed and operationalized within specific contexts (WEICK, 1995).

As environments become increasingly distributed and adaptive, the absence of formal structures capable of organizing contextual interpretation and decision validation tends to amplify operational fragmentation.

This condition creates a structural limitation that cannot be fully resolved through execution optimization alone.

3. THE STRUCTURAL GAP BETWEEN DATA AND ACTION

A recurring pattern in complex organizational environments is the existence of a structural gap between data availability and decision quality.

Contemporary organizational systems frequently operate under the implicit assumption that greater access to information naturally leads to better decisions. As a result, organizations continue expanding investments in data infrastructure, analytical tools, automation, and artificial intelligence.

However, information alone does not determine:

• how signals should be interpreted

• which contextual variables are relevant

• how environmental conditions should influence action

• which criteria should guide decision formation

• how decisions should be validated over time

Without a formal structure capable of integrating these elements, decision-making remains fragmented even in environments supported by advanced technological systems.

This condition produces a structural discontinuity between information and execution. Data becomes operationally available, but the mechanisms responsible for contextual interpretation, criteria alignment, and adaptive validation remain implicit or inconsistently distributed across operational layers.

As a consequence, organizations may improve execution speed while simultaneously amplifying interpretative inconsistency.

This distinction is particularly relevant in complex and non-linear environments, where the quality of decisions depends less on information volume and more on the coherence of contextual interpretation.

Decision quality therefore cannot be understood exclusively as a function of data availability or execution efficiency. It also depends on the existence of a structural layer capable of organizing how decisions are formed before operational action occurs.

This structural gap represents a frequently overlooked organizational layer positioned between information and execution, rarely formalized explicitly within existing operational models.

4. COGNITIVE INFRASTRUCTURE FOR DECISION SYSTEMS (CIDS)

The concept of Cognitive Infrastructure for Decision Systems (CIDS) is proposed as a structural response to the gap between information availability and decision coherence in complex organizational environments.

Rather than treating decisions as isolated operational events, the model formalizes decision formation as a continuous organizational system capable of integrating interpretation, validation, adaptation, and execution alignment over time.

CIDS is structured around three interconnected elements:

- Data — available informational signals and operational inputs

- Context — environmental conditions, situational variables, and interpretative conditions surrounding the decision

- Decision Criteria — explicit structures guiding interpretation, prioritization, and action selection

The relevance of the model does not emerge from the isolated existence of these elements, but from the continuous structural interaction between them.

Traditional organizational systems frequently process data without formalizing how contextual interpretation and decision criteria should dynamically interact prior to execution. As a result, organizations often achieve high operational capacity while maintaining fragmented decision coherence.

CIDS proposes a structural layer responsible for organizing this interaction continuously rather than episodically.

Within this framework, decision-making is no longer treated as a discrete event preceding action, but as an adaptive process capable of continuously validating interpretation, contextual conditions, and decision consistency throughout operational environments.

This structure enables:

- greater consistency in contextual interpretation

- alignment of decision criteria across operational layers

- adaptive validation of decisions over time

• reduction of interpretative fragmentation

• increased organizational coherence in dynamic environments

Importantly, the model does not replace operational systems or human judgment. Instead, it functions as a cognitive infrastructure underlying how organizational decisions are interpreted, coordinated, and sustained structurally.

This distinction positions decision-making not merely as a managerial activity, but as an explicit architectural component of organizational systems.

5. IMPLICATIONS IN COMPLEX ENVIRONMENTS

Dynamic and non-linear environments require continuous adaptation under conditions of contextual variability and distributed interpretation.

Traditional organizational models, particularly those centered on historical analysis, process optimization, and execution efficiency, often demonstrate limitations when environmental conditions change faster than operational structures can adapt.

In these contexts, organizational performance depends not only on execution capacity, but also on the coherence between interpretation, decision formation, and operational action.

The introduction of structured decision infrastructures enables organizations to:

• reduce interpretative variability across operational environments

• improve alignment between distributed teams and decision layers

• adapt operational responses without losing structural coherence

• increase the scalability of decision consistency

• sustain contextual interpretation under dynamic conditions

Importantly, these effects do not emerge from increased operational control, but from the explicit organization of how decisions are formed and validated structurally.

As complexity increases, the ability to continuously organize contextual interpretation and decision coherence may become more relevant than the optimization of isolated execution processes alone.

This distinction suggests that organizational adaptability depends not exclusively on operational flexibility, but on the existence of structures capable of sustaining coherent decision formation across changing environments.

6. DISCUSSION

The concept of Cognitive Infrastructure for Decision Systems introduces a structural perspective in which decision-making is treated not as an isolated managerial activity, but as a continuous organizational system.

This perspective challenges the traditional separation between data processing, decision-making, and execution by proposing a structurally integrated organizational system (SENGE, 2006).

While existing approaches frequently emphasize analytical capacity, process optimization, or execution efficiency, the findings discussed in this study suggest that operational variability may persist even in highly optimized environments when decision formation remains structurally fragmented.

The model therefore shifts the focus from improving isolated operational actions toward organizing the mechanisms through which decisions are interpreted, validated, and adapted over time.

This distinction becomes increasingly relevant in environments characterized by contextual instability, distributed operations, and continuous adaptation demands.

Importantly, the contribution of CIDS does not reside exclusively in technological integration or automation capacity. Its primary contribution lies in formalizing an organizational layer that frequently remains implicit within operational systems: the structural organization of decision formation itself.

As organizations continue integrating artificial intelligence and adaptive systems into operational environments, the ability to sustain coherent decision structures may become increasingly central to organizational reliability and adaptability.

7. CONCLUSION

Persistent organizational inconsistencies cannot be explained exclusively through execution limitations or insufficient access to information.

A significant portion of operational variability may originate from the absence of explicit structures capable of organizing how decisions are interpreted, validated, and adapted within complex environments.

This study introduced the concept of Cognitive Infrastructure for Decision Systems (CIDS) as a structural model that formalizes decision-making as a continuous organizational system rather than as isolated operational events.

By integrating data, contextual interpretation, and explicit decision criteria within a unified structural framework, the model contributes to reducing interpretative fragmentation and improving organizational coherence under dynamic conditions.

The findings discussed in this paper suggest that decision formation itself represents a critical organizational layer that remains insufficiently formalized within many contemporary operational systems.

As complexity, variability, and adaptive demands continue increasing across organizational environments, the ability to structure decision formation may become a determining factor in organizational consistency, reliability, and long-term adaptability.

The contribution of CIDS lies in making this structural layer explicit.

References

KAHNEMAN, Daniel. Thinking, Fast and Slow. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2011.

SENGE, Peter M. The Fifth Discipline: The Art and Practice of the Learning Organization. New York: Doubleday, 2006.

SIMON, Herbert A. Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organizations. 4. ed. New York: Free Press, 1997.

SNOWDEN, Dave; BOONE, Mary E. A Leader's Framework for Decision Making. Harvard Business Review, v. 85, n. 11, p. 68–76, 2007.

WEICK, Karl E. Sensemaking in Organizations. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications, 1995.