

# Agility in Making Strategic Decisions and the Organizational Performance

*Julian Miranda Torrez*

*(Center of Innovation, Competitiveness and Sustainability, Autonomous University of Guerrero, Mexico)*

**Abstract:** In the organization and strategy management theory, the adaptation or adjustment of the organization was studied within a highly dynamic environment. Strategic decision making plays the role of relating the environment with the organization. The purpose of the document was to investigate the relationships of agility in strategic decision making with the organizational performance. The dynamism of the environment is a factor that influences organizations and managers to be more agile in making strategic decisions in order to take advantage of opportunities, face risks, survive in the market and achieve high performances. It was based on the theoretical perspectives: strategic choice, “upper echelon”, organizational capabilities, organizational agility and dynamic capabilities. A methodology based on a systematic literature review was applied. As a result, the propositions that relate to the constructs under study, considering the dynamism of the environments and the attributes of the organizations. It is an important contribution to the decision-making theory, by incorporating the concepts of agility, strategies, dynamism of the environment and the adaptation of the organization to the environment. The document highlights that agility in making strategic decisions allows us to relate the environment with the organization, and the strategies allow to elaborate the set of variables and attributes (size, age, structure organizational, among others).

**Key words:** DYNAMISM of the environments, strategic decision making, organizational performance

**JEL code:** M15

## 1. Introduction

Modern approaches to business environments highlight that they are highly dynamic (Sharapov & Ross, 2019), high-intensity competitiveness and of permanent changes that generate uncertainty, opportunities to undertake new businesses, threats and risks of survival. From the perspectives of the strategy based on the Austrian economy these characteristics of the environments reflect unbalanced market conditions, which is contrasted with the perspective of the strategy based on the industrial organization that states that market conditions are in equilibrium, an expression of neoclassical theory (Jacobson, 1992).

This scenario affects organizations in achieving their development or survival, in which they have to achieve an adjustment or adaptation to the environmental conditions in which they operate. In the literature of strategical management and organizational theory raises an adjustment of the environment with the organization, Nath and Sudharshan (1994) identified three types of adjustments: (a) internal to the organization, of the strategy with the organizational structure, (b) external to the organization, an adjustment between strategy and environment (Nadkarni & Barr, 2008; Burgeois, 1980), and c) an integration and combination of both approaches, where the formulation

---

Julian Miranda-Torrez, Doctor of Administration, Center for Innovation, Competitiveness and Sustainability at the Autonomous University of Guerrero; research areas: strategy and organization theory. E-mail: [julianmt4@gmail.com](mailto:julianmt4@gmail.com).

and implementation of strategies allows adjustment or adaptation with the organization with the environment, and the interrelationship of the organizational structure, the capabilities, resources and organizational culture to achieve high performance (economic, market positioning, competitive advantage, among other results).

The document is based on the central approaches of the perspective of the strategy based on the Austrian economy (Jacobson, 1992). which highlights that companies must adapt and respond more quickly (agility) to the changing conditions to achieve profitability (organizational performance), using flexibility and agility as key strategies in highly competitive markets and dynamic environments.

Faced with the dynamism of the environments, is the agility in making strategic decisions related to the organizational performance, moderated by organizational attributes?

The objective of the investigation was to explain the relationships of agility in the making of strategic decisions with organizational performance considering the dynamism of the environments and the attributes of the organizations. For this purpose, an analysis and synthesis was of the theoretical perspectives was carried out: strategic choice, “upper echelon”, organizational capabilities, organizational agility and perspective of the dynamic capabilities.

The document is organized as explained below. First the research methodology is exposed, the second part presents a synthesis of the theoretical foundations on which the key constructs is sustained: dynamism of the environments, attributes of the organization, agility in making strategic decisions and the organizational performance; in the third part, the theoretical propositions that pose the relationships of the agility of the strategic decision making with organizational performance; It finalizes by presenting the conclusions and future studies that can be done to deepen the study of the subject.

## **2. Research Method**

We applied the method of systematic review of the literature (RSL) proposed by Tranfield, Denyer and Smart (2003) and by Crossan and Apaydin (2010). The RSL approach synthesizes the existing research in a systematic, transparent and reproducible way. In this article, the RSL has been carried out in three main steps: (1) objective and formation of the search string, (2) item location and selection, and (3) analysis of the articles and construction of the document.

Step 1: Objective and formulation of the search string. The objective has been to build the theoretical foundations that support the agility in the strategic decision making and its relationship with performance organizational. For this purpose, the most important cited articles were scanned, (according to the SCOPUS database) and more directly related to the subject of study in the Academy of Management and Strategic Management Journal, and in other high-impact magazines. An information base of 260 documents was created. The chain search terms included: decision making, agility, strategies, top managers, theories and related perspectives.

Step 2: Location and selection of items. Overall, it was considered that the SCOPUS and “Web of Science” databases covered articles including journals from multiple publishers. It established limitations to the fields of title, abstract and keywords, published in peer-reviewed journal articles on the subject of study. Articles published until 2021 were added. In the process of selection of articles, the titles, abstracts and all the content of the documents, 65 were selected that contributed to the object study.

Step 3: Analysis of the articles and construction of the document. To make a valuable contribution, an analysis of the reviewed articles should offer significant new insights into the domain of interest. The analysis was carried

out in two phases. First, two variables were identified inductively (agility in the decision-making strategies and organizational performance) using a process analysis and coding of each document. These encodings allowed abstraction, and synthesis. The second phase of analysis focused on grouping the fundamental information of the documents around the specific topics of study and the construction of interrelationships of concepts expressed in a conceptual map, which allowed to build the document maintaining the logical relationships between all the concepts.

### 3. Theoretical Foundation

The research was generally based on the theory of organization, strategy and strategic management (Durant, Grant & Madsen, 2017). Felin, Foss and Ployhart (2015) synthesized the central aspects of both. In the organization theory Astley and Van de Ven (1983) raised central debates and perspectives, they highlight two levels of analysis of the environment, the macro level in which is included in the populations and communities of organizations, and the micro level that corresponds to individual organizations, the research was oriented to second level and focused on the strategic choice perspective, in which it was also based on the theory of action. This theory was applied in decision-making situations (Child, 1972) in which managers (organizational actors) play a proactive role in choosing the strategies and actions to promote changes in the organization and in the environment.

The theory of strategy and strategic management from its beginnings have been multidisciplinary areas of research. Their eclecticism has been extended to the development of its own concepts, theories and multiple topics of study including, among others, the dynamics and evolution of the industry and its environments, dynamics competitive strategy, strategic change, strategy as practice and as strategic process; industrial economic organization, the vision based in resources, and transaction costs (Markman, Gianiodis & Buchholtz, 2009). Durant, Grant, and Madsen (2017) highlighted the important contribution of Alfred Chandler “the theory of the firm”, the relationship of strategy and organizational structure and capabilities, defined as the set of human skills in the use of the physical resources incorporated in the necessary operating units to compete in national and international markets and to continue their growth, highlighted the relationship of these capacities with economic performance that provides competitive power for the expansion of industrial capitalism.

Snow, Miles and Miles (2005) proposed the integration of the strategy and the organization. The organization is analyzed as a system in dynamic interaction with their environments, is conceptualized as configurations of resources and capabilities, which has strategies, structure, human resources, rewards and congruent administrative processes, internally and externally aligned between the strategy — the organizational structure — and the environment. In these settings, the organizational and dynamic capabilities play an important role (Tece, Pisano & Shuen, 1997).

In the revised literature, the strategy, environment, and performance organization are core constructs, the decision-making strategies are the elements that link the organization with the general and specific environments or task (Bourgeois, 1980).

Jacobson (1992) argued that traditional research theories and strategic thinking were grounded in the classical microeconomics theory and in the industrial organization that market conditions in equilibrium, its premises have been criticized since it ignores the changes, the uncertainty and imbalances in the business environments, an example of application are the models of Porter (1980), an alternative to these approaches is the strategy based on the Austrian economy that highlights: the conditions of the market are in disequilibrium because they are continually changing which generates constant profit opportunities. The competition is considered as a process rather than a

static notion. The economic problem of the companies is mainly the adaptation to rapid changes in the environment. The management styles and organizational structure have to respond quickly to the changing circumstances. Earnings can fall when there are high levels of competitiveness and by the capacities of imitation of the competitors who innovate faster. In summary, it raises the dynamism of the environments and the rapid responses that companies must apply in order to achieve high levels of performance.

Next, we will present a summary of the characteristics of the environments and the attributes of the organization, factors that moderate the relationships of agility in strategic decision making with the organizational performance.

### **3.1 Characteristics of the Environments and Attributes of the Organization**

The environment is a multidimensional construct (Tan & Litschert, 1994). The empirical and conceptual studies highlight the dynamism of environments. The contextual dynamism is closely related to the perspective of the uncertainty of information (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967).

Astley and Van de Ven (1983) raised central debates and perspectives in the organization theory, they highlighted two levels of analysis of the environment: macro or general and of the task (Nadkarni & Barr, 2008; Child, 1997), in which companies compete. Specific aspects of the environment and the participation of organizational actors that interact with the company are included in the assignment: competitors, suppliers, and customers. Companies that participate in strategic group are also included in this level, which is defined as a set of companies that follow the same, or a strategy along the strategic dimensions (Porter, 1980; Marcel, Barr & Duhaime, 2010; Iriyama, Kishore & Tolukdar, 2016). The general environment includes macroeconomic resignation, such as social, technology, economy, and politics, which indirectly affect organizations (Business). This level includes the industrial sectors (Nadkarni & Barr, 2008).

At each level of the environment the impacts of the factors affect differently the organizational structure, the internal process and the making of strategic and managerial decisions, the organizations implement different strategies to achieve the adjustment between the organization and environments, which depends on the administrators in perceive and identify opportunities, detect and interpret areas of problems (Daft, Sormunen & Parks, 1988). Therefore, the environment-strategy-organization relationships are of different intensity in the macro and task environments, they generate internal alignments in organization and adjustments with their environments (Nath & Sudharshan, 1994). From the perspective of strategic choice (Child, 1997) the environments are made up of organizational actors who negotiate and take strategic and operational decisions.

#### **3.1.1 Dynamism of the Environments**

Baum and Wally (2003) argued that there are positive relationships between dynamism of the environment and organizational adaptation (Aldrich, 1979). As the dynamism increases, the company needs to quickly adapt its strategies and structure to avoid obsolescence and failure (Stieglitz, Knudsen & Becker, 2016). The dynamism of the environments are important concepts in decision-making strategies (Baum & Wally, 2003). Hough and Whitete (2003) raised the relationships of the dynamism of the environment and the rationality of the decision making.

#### **3.1.2 Organization Attributes**

In the literature of organization and management theory, it extensively explains the conceptual aspects of the attributes of the organizations, resources, and capabilities that are used to respond to the dynamism of the environment (Iriyama, Kishore & Tolukdar, 2016), among others, it is proposed, for example: size, formalization, seniority, organizational structure, performance, product lines. Rahmandad, Denrell and Prelec (2020) raised the incidence of centralization, decentralization and formalization in the speed of strategic decisions and organizational

performance (Schilke, 2014). It focused on the analysis of administrative capacities and development of new products to achieve competitive advantage considering the moderating effect of the dynamism of the environment.

### **3.2 Theoretical Perspectives That Support Agility in Making Strategic Decisions**

In the literature of the organization theory and management different perspectives have been proposed to explain the strategic environment-strategy-organization relationships. A synthesis was made of the central approaches of the perspectives: 1) strategic choice, 2) “upper echelon” perspective, 3) organizational capabilities theory, 4) organizational agility, and 5) perspective of the dynamic capabilities. These perspectives were isolated in the mentioned theories, the objective of the document was to relate them in order to explain and theoretically base the agility in making strategic decisions and their impact on performance organizational.

#### **3.2.1 Strategic Choice Perspective**

Astley and Van de Ven (1983) present the central perspectives in the organization theory and the assumptions, deterministic and voluntary of the human nature. The organizations are determined by exogenous forces or are chosen and created autonomously by the human resources. The deterministic orientation does not focus on individuals, but on the structural properties of the environment in which individual behavior is determined and organizational life is stable and controlled by external forces; for example, the contingency theory (Lawrence & Lorsch, 1967). In the voluntarist orientation, individuals and their organizations created are autonomous, proactive, self-directed; the individuals are seen as the basic unit of analysis and source of change in the organizational life; the perspective of strategic choice is located in this voluntarist orientation (Silverman, 1970).

The action theory poses that organizations are continuously constructed, sustained, and changed by the definitions of situation by the organizational actors. The theory of action has been applied in the strategic choice perspective “Strategic choice” in decision-making situations (Child, 1972), has also spread its application to the organizational environment. In the administration it is assumed that the environment is not seen as an intractable set of constraints, that can be changed and manipulated through the political negotiation to adjust the objectives of the administration (Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978). In the strategic choice, attention is given to individuals, their interactions, the social construction, their autonomy and choice.

In this perspective, Child (1997) highlighted the active role of leaders or organizational actors, who have the capabilities to influence organizational structures considering their own preferences (voluntarism), through political processes, they have the capacities and the power in deciding organizational strategies such as pro-action and reaction in its relationship with the environment in which organizations are operating.

The strategic choice implies a process, in the first stage it is evaluated the position of the organization, it is considered: the expectations of the external resource providers, the trend of relevant external events, the recent performance of the organization, and the level of satisfaction of decision makers regarding the internal configuration. Subsequently, the objectives to be achieved are defined and the strategic actions are decided, these stages of the process are negotiated. The environment-oriented actions include, for example, entering or exiting a market or areas of activity ensuring the high demand of the products or services of the organization and their impact on the environment. Internally, the actions are oriented towards using its resources and capabilities. An internal and external adjustment is proposed with the requirements of the environment, which is a process of a circular relationship between the environment and organization (Child, 1997). This model highlights the capabilities or skills of decision makers in the realization of a choice of strategies and actions. The term strategy has greater importance when referring to the organization as a whole and it is applied in response to the dynamism of the environments.

Three key issues are raised in the strategic choice analysis: (1) nature (personality) of the agent or decision maker (organizational agent, managers, administrator, senior management team), referring to the factors in the processes of strategic choice, (2) the characteristics of the environment, dynamism and competitive intensity, and (3) the nature of the relationships between the organizational agent and the environment (Child, 1997).

In the analysis of strategic choice both aspects are recognized, proactive and reactive in decision making in the interaction of the environment with the organization, that is, adapt the organization to the external requirements, and also make internal adaptations. In these analysis, the organizational actors must have the abilities to interpret, analyze information from the environment and their own organization in the process of strategic choice, the selection of the environments in which the organization operates is important, that is, to focus attention on the relevant environments than those in which can influence and facilitate interaction between internal and external actors.

This perspective considers objective and subjective analysis of the environment and of the organization; Astley and Van de Ven (1983) only considered the subjective aspects and did not take into account the participation of the organizational actors. Therefore, the contribution of Child (1997) to the organization theory and decision making, by incorporating the actors or organizational agents in the environments. The organizational environment relationship is an alliance between organizational actors that negotiate resources and cooperate (Pfeffer and Salancik, 1978), it is also an interrelation between organizations. Dushnitsky, Piva, and Rossi-Lamastra (2020) presented empirical evidence of the application of the strategic choice perspective. This perspective has occupied a central position in the literature of strategic management (Nadkarni & Barr, 2008).

### 3.2.2 “Upper Echelon” Perspective

Child (1972) highlighted the participation of organizational actors (managers, administrators, senior management teams) in the interrelationship between the environment and the organization. Hambrick and Mason (1984) also propose the participation of the “CEO” directors and the management teams in the interpretation of the environment to take strategic decisions in response to the dynamism of the environment. They synthesized the various approaches of senior managers and raised the “upper echelons perspective” strengthening relations of strategic choice with organizational performance. Their central approaches: organizational results — strategies and effectiveness — are reflections of the values and cognitive foundations of powerful actors in the organization. They use the terms choice strategy in the same way that Child (1972) used, the term is distinct of the operational choice, for example, decisions of inventories.

In the approaches of Hambrick and Mason (1984), behavioral components, values, cognitive foundations, and idiosyncrasy of decision makers, which filters and/or distorts their perceptions of the dynamism of the environment and of information from the organization were incorporated; they argue that strategic choice is under conditions of the limited rationality of organizational actors. The limited rationality implies that the participants of the decisions cannot scan every aspect of the organization and the environment, that is, they can selectively perceive information; This topic was analyzed by Simon (1978).

In the “upper echelons perspective of the organization, highlights the following elements: objective situation (environment, organization), psychological characteristics of senior managers, strategic and operational decision makers (cognitive and knowledge based) values), observable characteristics of administrators (age, functional tasks, experience in other careers, education, socioeconomic aspects, education, financial position), elections and strategic decision-making (product innovation, diversification, acquisition, intensive capital, new equipment and plants, vertical integration, financial leverage, administrative complexity, agility, speed and response time), organizational performance (financial profitability, economic growth, survival) (Vaniala, Tikkanen, Aspara, & Mattila, 2015).

The central premises of the perspective: the experiences, values and the personality of top managers influences their interpretation of the situations they face, which affects the choice of strategies. This theory was built on the premise of the bounded rationality of the decision maker (Cyert & March, 1963; March & Simon, 1958). This theoretical framework has been widely used in numerous investigations published by the Academy of Management (Hamrick, 2007).

### 3.2.3 Organizational Capabilities Theory

Chandler was the forerunner in planting the theory of capabilities organizations in the administration, he highlighted his close relationship with the strategy, structure and organizational performance, this theory has had a strong influence on the theory of strategy, on the theory of the organization and innovation of companies (Lazonick, 2010), the organizational capabilities resides in the members of the organization (Ghoshal, Hahn & Moran, 1999), are learned within a specific organizational context which is why it is difficult to transfer from one organization to another. Learned capabilities are units of analysis that allow to explain the beginning and the growth of modern organizations.

Organizational capabilities are: skills, knowledge, individual and collective experiences essential to exploit and exchange resources efficiently and effectively, allows problem solving, one of these capabilities in decision making decisions at different levels of the organizational structure, which allows administrative competition, exploration and exploitation of opportunities in the market and respond to changes in the environment (Chandler, 1992 cited in Lazonick, 2010; Ghoshal, Hahn & Moran, 1999; Ritala, Heiman & Hurmelinna-Laukkamen, 2016).

Organizations include a broad set of capabilities, skills, learning and experiences focused on the human factor, as well as routines and processes in the use and transformation of resources; these concepts are closely related. Their applicability is limited by the human resources located in the Organizational structure. These approaches have their foundations in the resource-based theory and in the theory of contingency (Andrews, Beynon & McDemott, 2016).

The organizational capabilities are related to the concepts organizational structure and strategy. The capabilities can be located at all levels of the organizational structure; on the cusp of the organization has strategic characteristics as they encompass the entire organization and maintain an interrelation with the environment; the intermediate level refers to functional capabilities (marketing, finance, human resources, and production), the lower structure levels have operational capability characteristics. The managers located at the top of the organization have capabilities to make strategic decisions in response to the movements of the competitors to achieve a fit with the dynamism of the environment. At the intermediate and operational levels of the organizational structure, the organizational capabilities are the routines that allow the transformation of supplies into products. Kemper, Schilke and Brettel (2013) associate these capacities with the social capital of the organization.

### 3.2.4 Organizational Agility Perspective

The dynamism of environments influences organizations to be more agile in adapting to changes, uncertainty, and complexity of industrial sectors and local macro environments, regional, national and international. The organizational agility is conceptualized as: the organization's ability to quickly identify opportunities, understand and predict the changes that occur in business environments, respond to changes and generate internal transformations in organizations. The agility in decision making, flexibility and adaptation of human resources are the capacities of the organization that can quickly respond to changes in the market. It is a key factor for success and survival in environments highly dynamic. Flexibility allows quick adjustments to the design and process in the shortest possible time as a response to changing the needs in the environments.

The constant and permanent adaptability are important characteristics of organizational agility, which can be affected by the attributes: the size and age of the organization, as well as the culture of innovation, decentralization of power, tolerance of ambiguity, vision and strategic management, leadership, administration of the change, the abilities to explore information from the environment and the application in the administrative and strategic processes to achieve an adjustment with changes in the environments (Harraf, Wanasika, Tate & Talbott, 2015).

### 3.2.5 Dynamic Capabilities Perspective

Teece, Pisano, and Shuen (1997) defined dynamic capabilities: “they are the company's abilities to integrate, build and rebuild internal and external competencies aimed at changing environments rapidly” (page 516), in this proposal it is identified that the skills are performed by the actors of the organization (managers, senior management teams and human resources), the skills to integrate, build and rebuild are the strategies and actions that are carried out as a response, adjustment or adaptation of the organization to rapidly changing environments. The authors highlight that the dynamic capacities reflect how the ability of the organization to achieve new and innovative ways that allows to achieve competitive advantage and position in the market (Wilden, Devinney & Dowling, 2016).

The dynamic capabilities are strategic when being made by managers and senior management teams (Upper echelons) in response to the changes in environments and the dynamics of competitive intensity (Barnett, 1997), who scan the environment to obtain information (Daft, Sormunen & Parks, 1988; Vaniala, Tikkanen, Aspara, & Mattila, 2015).), make strategic decisions that affect the organizational performance (Nielsen, 2016)

Miranda (2017) raised the following conceptualization of the dynamic capacities: they are the abilities of the organizational actors (managers, senior management teams, administrators means and human resources) to create, transform and reconfigure resources, business models, processes, abilities, technologies, implementing strategies and actions in a quick way to respond to dynamic environments or make changes, in order to meet the needs of the market and face competition, maintain competitive advantage, create value and high performance (Ambrosini & Bowman, 2009; Kuuluvainen, 2012; Teece, 2007).

## **4. Agility in Making Strategic Decisions and Its Relationship With the Organizational Performance**

The decision making and organizational performance have been main topics of study in the theory of organization and management. We highlight the contribution of Simón (1978), he is one of the forerunners of the study in the decision making in the administrative process , he analyzed the facts, values and rationality in the administrative behavior, the psychology of decisions, also he studied the attributes of the organization, efficiency, formality, among others. Cyert and March (1965) proposed the theory of economic decisions in the company. These topics are widely documented in the organization and management theory.

The strategic decision making deepened its study in the theory of strategy and its application in the administration and strategic direction (Rivas-Tobar, 2016). The five theoretical perspectives presented give the theoretical foundation. The strategies allow to relate the organization to the environment, achieve external and internal fit, which affect the organizational performance.

The decisions are made by senior managers and the higher management teams (Upper echelons) or organizational actors (strategic election) involved in flexible organizations; the agility in strategic decision making is a type of organizational capacity and dynamic.



The agility in strategic decision making has been recognized as a critical determinant of firm performance in the company (growth and profitability), particularly in dynamic environments (Kownatzki, Walter, Floyd, & Lechner, 2013). Baun and Wally (2003) analyzed the incidence of the dynamism of the environment, the centralization, the decentralization, formalization and information in the agility of the decision making, and its positive impact on performance. Shepherd, Mooi, Elbanna and Rudd (2020) analyzed the incidence of attributes of the organization: size, age, type of decision, cognitive diversity of senior management teams — in the relationship of decision-making and performance.

Proposition 1: The flexibility in strategic decision making has a positive impact on the organizational performance (profitability and growth) this relationship is affected by the attributes of the organization (Hawk, De Almeida & Yeung, 2013).

The dynamism of the environment, the emerging economy and the emergence of new markets generates greater competitiveness in business, in this panorama strategic decision makers are more agile in exploring, scanning and evaluating and the information of the environment and the competitive actions that implement rival companies to stay in the market. The ability to make quick decisions on economic performance (Iriyama, Kishore & Talukdar, 2016; Hawk, de Almeida, & Yeung, 2013).

Proposition 2: The exploration of the information of the environment allows strategic streamline decision-making that affects the organizational performance (economic), this relationship is affected by the attributes of the organization.

Proposition 3: The analysis of the internal information will allow to take quick strategic decisions that impact the organizational performance (economic), this relationship is affected by the attributes of the organization.

## 5. Conclusions

In the modern theories of organization, strategy and Austrian school of economics pose a dynamic interaction of the environment with the organization, the strategy dynamizes these relationships, allows the adaptation of the organization in highly competitive environments and of permanent changes; the organizational performance depends on agility in decision-making by organizational actors. These approaches are contrasted with the organizational paradigm industry that considers the environment stable and in equilibrium (Young, Smith & Grimm, 1996).

Simon (1978) argued that “a general theory of management must include organizational principles that ensure the correct decision-making that falls on people who are at the highest level of administrative hierarchy” (p. 3 and 4), in this document this affirmation is confirmed in the perspectives “Upper Echelons” and the strategic action. Simón's approach was enriched by including the following approaches: 1) the agility in the strategic decision-making process considering the dynamism of the environment and the organizational attributes; 2) the concept of the bounded rationality by including the perspective of strategic choice; 3) the decisions are made by organizational actors or “Upper Echelons”, 4) the strategic decision making is oriented towards the achievement of goals and high levels of organizational performance (Simon, 1978, Khurana & Spender, 2012). These approaches are a preliminary innovation to the decision theory, and a contribution to the organizational theory and strategic management.

The agility construct was built in strategic decision making considering the theoretical perspectives analyzed. Astley and Van de Ven (1983) and Child (1972) raised the strategic choice and participation of the organizational

actor in the decision-making process, the “upper echelon” perspective highlighted the participation of senior managers of the organization and the limited rationality that restricts or facilitates decision making, which is also an important capacity of the organization. The organizational agility and the perspective of dynamic capacities is allowed to consider the agility in the taking of strategic decisions. In short, all the perspectives analyzed give the theoretical foundation to the central theme of study considering the dynamism of the environment.

The agility in the decision-making process is a type of organizational capacity that generates multiple processes that facilitate multiple relationships of the organization with the environments, it is an innovation and contribution to the theory of decision making by considering the dynamism of changes in environments. These approaches require deeper analysis of the coevolution of changes in the environments and organizations, to understand how organizations survive and/or achieve economic performance in unstable, unpredictable, high uncertainty and complex environment (Hard & Banbury, 1994).

Topics for future research: What factors restrict the agility in decision making? How to speed up the exploration of the environment and quickly analyze the information of the organization to make decisions? How are decisions made in micro and small businesses in Mexico? How do the little companies survive in highly dynamic environments? What is the participation of managers in decision making?

## References

- Aldrich H. E. (1979). *Organizations and Environments*, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Ambrosini V. and Bowman C. (2009). “What are dynamic capabilities and are they a useful construct in strategic Management?”, *International Journal of Management Review*, Vol. 11, No. 1, pp. 29-49, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2370.2008.00251.x>.
- Andrews R., Beynon M. J. and McDemott A. M. (2016). “Organizational capability in the public sector: A configuration approach”, *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, pp. 239-258, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/muv005>.
- Astley W. G. and Van de Ven A. H. (1983). “Central perspectives and debates in organization theory”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 28, No. 2, pp. 245-273, available online at: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2392620>.
- Barnett W. P. (1997). “The dynamics of competitive intensity”, *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 128-160, available online at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2393811>.
- Baun J. R. and Wally S. (2003). “Strategic decision speed and firm performance”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 11, pp. 1107-1129, doi: 10.1002/smj.343.
- Bourgeois L. J. (1980). “Strategy and environment: A conceptual integration”, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 25-39, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/257802>.
- Child J. (1972). “Organization structure, environment and performance: The role of strategic choice”, *Sociology*, Vol. 6, pp. 1-22, doi: 10.1177/003803857200600101.
- Child J. (1997). “Strategic choice in the analysis of action, structure, organizations and environment: Retrospect and prospect”, *Organization Studies*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 43-76, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/017084069701800104>.
- Crossan M. M. and Apaydin A. (2010). “A multi-dimensional framework of organizational innovations: A systematic review of literature”, *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 47, No. 6, pp. 1154-1191, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2009.00880.x>.
- Cyert R. M. and March J. G. (1965). “Teoría de las decisiones económicas en la empresa”, Herrero Hermanos, Ciudad de México, México.
- Cyert R. M. and March J. G. (1963). *A Behavioral Theory of the Firm*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Daft R. L., Sormunen J. and Parks D. (1988). “Chief executive scanning, environmental characteristics, and company performance: An empirical study”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 123-139, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250090204>.
- Durant R., Grant R. M. and Madsen T. L. (2017). “The expanding domain of strategic management research and the quest for integration”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 38, pp. 4-16, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2607>.
- Dushnitsky G., Piva E. and Rossi-Lamastra C. (2020). “Investigating the mix of strategic choices and performance of transaction platforms: Evidence from the crowdfunding setting”, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 263-598, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3163>.
- Felin T., Foss N. J. and Ployhart R. E. (2015). “The microfoundations movement in strategy and organization theory”, *The Academy of*

- Management Annuals*, Vol. 9, No. 1, pp. 575-632, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2015.1007651>.
- Ghoshal S. Hahn M. and Moran P. (1999). "Management competence, firm growth and economic progress", *Contribution to Political Economy*, Vol. 18, No. 1, pp. 121-150, doi: 10.1093/cpe/18.1.121.
- Hambrick D. C. and Mason P. A. (1984). "Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 9, No. 2, pp. 193-206, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.1984.4277628>.
- Hambrick D. C. (2007). "Upper echelons theory: An update", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 334-343, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2007.24345254>.
- Hard S. and Banbury C. (1994). "How strategy-making processes can make a difference", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 4, pp. 251-269, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250150402>.
- Hawk A., Pacheco-De-Almeida G. and Yeung B. (2013). "Fast-mover advantages: Speed capabilities and entry into the emerging submarket of Atlantic basin LNG", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 34, No. 13, pp. 1531-550, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2085>.
- Harraf A., Wanasika I., Tate K. and Talbott K. (2015). "Organizational agility", *The Journal of Applied Business Research*, Vol. 31, No. 2, pp. 675-686, doi: <https://doi.org/10.19030/jabr.v31i2.9160>.
- Hough J. R. and Whitete M. (2003). "Environmental dynamism and strategic decision-making rationality: An examination at the decision level", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 24, No. 5, pp. 481-489, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.303>.
- Iriyama A., Kishore R. and Talukdar D. (2016). "Playing dirty or building corruption and HR training as competitive actions to threats from informal and foreign firm rivals", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 37, pp. 2152-2173, doi: 10.1002/smj.2447.
- Jacobson R. (1992). "The Austrian school of strategy", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 17, No. 4, pp. 782-807, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/258808>.
- Kemper J. K., Schilke O. and Brettel M. (2013). "Social capital as a microlevel of organizational capabilities", *Product Development & Management Association*, Vol. 30, No. 3, pp. 589-603, doi: 10.1111/jpim.12004.
- Kownatzki M., Walter J., Floyd S. W. and Lechner Ch. (2013). "Corporate control and the speed of strategic business unit decision making", *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 56, No. 5, pp. 1295-1324, doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0804>.
- Khurana R and Spender J. C. (2012). "Herbert A. Simon on what ails business schools: More than a problem in organizational design", *Journal of Management Studies*, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 619-639, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2011.01040.x>.
- Kuuluvainen A. (2012). "How to concretize dynamic capabilities? Theory and examples", *Journal of Strategy and Management*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 381-392, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1108/17554251211276353>.
- Lawrence P. and Lorsch J. W. (1967). "Differentiation and integration in complex organizations", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, Vol. 12, No. 1, pp. 1-47, doi: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2391211>.
- Lazonick W. (2010). "The Chandlerian corporation and the theory of innovative enterprise", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 317-349, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtq005>.
- Markman G. D., Gianiodis P. T. and Buchholtz A. K. (2009). "Factor-market rivalry", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 34, No. 3, pp. 423-441, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2009.40632072>.
- Marcel J. J., Barr P. S. and Duhaime I. M. (2010). "The influence of executive cognition on competitive dynamics", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 32, No. 2, pp. 115-138, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.870>.
- March J. G. and Simon H. A. (1958). *Organizations*, New York: Wiley.
- Miranda J. T. (2017). "Las teorías y la conceptualización de las capacidades dinámicas estratégicas y organizacionales", Ponencia en el *XXII Congreso Internacional de Contaduría, Administración e Informática*, Asociación Nacional de Facultades y Escuelas de contaduría y Administración, Ciudad de México, México.
- Nath D. and Sudharshan D. (1994). "Measuring strategy coherence through patterns of strategic choices", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 43-61, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250150104>.
- Nadkarni S. and Barr P. S. (2008). "Environmental context, managerial cognition, and strategic action: An integrated view", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 39, No. 13, pp. 1395-1427, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.717>.
- Nielsen S. (2016). "Upper echelons nationality diversity and compensation: Implications for firm performance", *Proceeding Academy of Management*, No. 1, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2016.14884abstract>.
- Pfeffer J. and Gerald R. Salancik (1978). *The External Control of Organizations: A Resource Dependence Perspective*, New York: Harper and Row.
- Porter M. E. (1980). *Competitive Strategy*, Free Press: New York.
- Rahmandad H., Denrell J. and Prelec D. (2020). "What makes dynamic strategic problems difficult? Evidence from an experimental study", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 42, No. 5, pp. 865-897, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3254>.

- Ritala P. Heiman B. and Humerlinna-Laukkamen P. (2016). "The need for speed-unfamiliar problems, capability rigidity, and ad hoc processes in organizations", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, Vol. 25, No. 5, pp. 757-777, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/icc/dtw028>.
- Rivas-Tobar L. A. (2016). "Dirección estratégica: Proceso de la organización en el siglo XXI", Trillas, ciudad de México, México.
- Sharapov D. and Ross J. M. (2019). "Whom should a leader imitate? Using rivalry-based imitation to manage strategic risk in changing environments", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 1-32, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.3120>.
- Shepherd N. G., Mooi E. A., Elbanna S. and Rudd J. M. (2020). "Deciding fast: Examining the relationship between strategic decision speed and decision quality across multiple environmental contexts", *European Management Review*, Vol. 18, No. 2, pp. 119-140, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/emre.12430>.
- Schilke O. (2014). "On the contingent value of dynamic capabilities for competitive advantage: The nonlinear moderating effect on environmental dynamism", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 35, No. 2, pp. 179-203, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2099>.
- Simón H. (1978). "El comportamiento administrativo: Estudio de los procesos decisivos en la organización administrativa", Aguilar, Ciudad de Mexico, México.
- Silverman D. (1970). *The Theory of Organizations*, Exeter, NH: Heinemann.
- Snow Ch. C., Miles R. E. and Miles G. (2005). "A configurational approach to the integration of strategy and organization research", *Strategic Organization*, Vol. 3, No. 4, pp. 431-439, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1476127005057965>.
- Stieglitz N., Knudsen T. and Becker M. C. (2016). "Adaptation and inertia in dynamic environments", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 37, No. 9, pp. 1854-1864, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.2433>.
- Tan J. J., and Litsschert R. J. (1994). "Environment-strategy relationship and its performance implications: An empirical study of the Chinese electronics industry", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 15, No. 19, pp. 1-20, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.4250150102>.
- Teece D., Pisano G. and Shuen A. (1997) "Dynamic capabilities and strategic management", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 18, No. 7, pp. 509-533, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1097-0266\(199708\)18:7<509:AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1097-0266(199708)18:7<509:AID-SMJ882>3.0.CO;2-Z).
- Teece D. J. (2007). "Explicating dynamic capabilities: The nature and microfoundations of (sustainable) enterprise performance", *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 28, No. 13, pp. 319-1350, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.640>.
- Tranfield D., Denyer D. and Smart P. (2003). "Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review", *British Journal of Management*, Vol. 14, No. 3, pp. 207-222, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.00375>.
- Vaniala L., Tikkanen H., Aspara J. and Mattila P. (2015). "Upper echelons perspective on search and competitive behavior", *Proceedings Academy of Management*, <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2015.16839abstract>.
- Young G., Smith K. G. and Grimm C. M. (1996). "Austrian and industrial organization perspectives on firm-level competitive activity and performance", *Organization Science*, Vol. 7, No. 3, pp. 243-254, available online at: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2635089>.
- Wilden R., Devinney T. M. and Dowling G. R. (2016). "The architecture of dynamic capability research", *The Academy of Management Annals*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 997-1076, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/19416520.2016.1161966>.