Global Journal of Statistics
Vol. 1 No.1 2026 Page 20-29
E-ISSN: XXXX-XXXX, DOI: 10.XXXXX/XXXX

Analysis of Statistical Learning Integration in Data-Driven Organizational Decision-Making

Dwi Wijaya[1]*, Rika Maulana[2], Yusuf Kurniawan[3]
[1,2] Department of Physical Education, Faculty of Sports Science, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia
[3] Department of Mathematics Education, Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

Article Info

Received : 3 February 2026
Revised : 30 March 2026
Accepted : 24 April 2026

Keyword:

Statistical learning;
Data-driven decision-making;
organizational decision-making;
Data literacy;
Analytical culture.

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the integration of statistical learning in data-driven organizational decision-making by focusing on how organizational actors interpret, trust, and apply analytical outputs in real decision contexts. The study addresses the growing use of statistical models, dashboards, and predictive analytics in organizations, while recognizing that data-driven decisions depend not only on technical accuracy but also on human interpretation, organizational culture, and collaborative practice. A qualitative case study approach was used to explore this phenomenon in an organization that applies data analytics, business intelligence, or statistical learning in strategic and operational decisions. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews, limited participant observation, and document analysis involving managers, data analysts, business intelligence staff, operational employees, and decision makers. Thematic analysis identified four main themes: statistical learning as a tool for reducing uncertainty, trust and interpretability as conditions for adoption, tension between analytical outputs and managerial experience, and organizational culture as a driver or barrier to data-driven decisions. The findings show that statistical learning does not replace human judgment, but supports reflective decision-making when analytical outputs are explained, discussed, and aligned with contextual knowledge. This study contributes to data-driven decision-making literature by positioning statistical learning as a socio-technical and interpretive practice. The findings imply that organizations need stronger data literacy, transparent model governance, cross-functional collaboration, and ethical decision procedures. Future research should compare multiple organizational contexts and examine how explainable artificial intelligence shapes trust in statistical learning.

***) Corresponding Author:**

Dwi Wijaya,
Department of Physical Education, Faculty of Sports Science, Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia
Email: dwi.wijaya058@gmail.com

1. Introduction

Digital transformation has changed how organizations define problems, process evidence, and make strategic decisions. Many organizations now use operational data, customer data, financial records, digital traces, and performance dashboards to support managerial judgment. This shift has strengthened the role of statistical learning because organizations need methods that can detect patterns, estimate probabilities, classify risks, and support prediction under uncertainty. Cybulski and Scheepers (2021) explain that data science creates value when organizations connect analytical tools with decision contexts. Sabharwal and Miah (2021) also show that big data analytics capabilities depend on organizational capacity, culture, and knowledge structures. Awan et al. (2021) add that data-driven insight can improve decision quality when analytics capabilities support real organizational action. In this context, statistical learning becomes more than a technical instrument. It becomes part of how organizations learn, coordinate, and justify decisions.

The global expansion of data-driven decision-making has also created new challenges for organizations. Firms and public institutions may own large data infrastructures, but they often struggle to convert analytical outputs into trusted decisions. Shamim et al. (2020) found that governance mechanisms shape the relationship between big data analytics capability and decision-making performance. Yasmin et al. (2020) show that infrastructure, management, and human resource capabilities influence the value of analytics for firm performance. Faridoon et al. (2025) further indicate that decision-making capability in government settings depends not only on big data analytics capability, but also on cognitive style and organizational culture. These findings show that data-driven decision-making requires alignment between analytical systems, human interpretation, and institutional routines.

In organizational practice, the integration of statistical learning often creates tension between model-based recommendations and managerial judgment. Statistical models may produce predictions, clusters, scores, or classifications, but decision makers must still interpret these outputs within specific operational and social contexts. Szukits (2022) warns that organizations can create an illusion of data-driven decision-making when advanced analytics exist but do not meaningfully influence managerial action. Szukits and Móricz (2024) argue that analytical culture and centralization efforts shape how organizations move toward data-driven decisions. Korherr and Kanbach (2023) also emphasize that human-related capabilities, such as analytical skills, leadership support, and data literacy, influence the performance value of big data analytics. Therefore, the main issue is not only whether organizations use statistical learning. The deeper issue concerns how organizational actors understand, negotiate, and apply analytical outputs in real decisions.

The social and cultural dimensions of statistical learning integration remain important because data do not speak independently from organizational interpretation. Data gain meaning through indicators, categories, dashboards, algorithms, and institutional expectations. Alaimo and Kallinikos (2022) argue that data objects reshape organizational knowledge because they reorganize how actors represent and act upon organizational realities. Saifer and Dacin (2022) also show that everyday encounters with data involve discourse, emotion, and aesthetics, not only rational calculation. Allen and McDonald (2025) demonstrate that quantitative and qualitative forms of analysis can complement each other in data-driven organizations, especially when organizations pursue innovation. These studies suggest that statistical learning should be examined as a socio-technical practice in which technical analysis interacts with human judgment, organizational culture, and professional experience.

Previous studies have made important contributions to the understanding of big data analytics, business intelligence, decision quality, and organizational performance. Muhammad et al. (2022) link big data analytics capability with innovation performance through management, technological, and talent dimensions. Orero-Blat et al. (2025) show that big data analytics capabilities can support innovation and organizational performance beyond basic digital transformation. Elgendy et al. (2022) propose a modern data-driven decision theory that explains how big data and analytics reshape decision processes. However, most studies still focus on measurable relationships among capabilities, performance, and decision outcomes. Less attention has been given to the lived experience of organizational actors who translate statistical learning outputs into decisions, especially in contexts where data quality, trust, and professional judgment interact.

Based on this gap, this study aims to analyze the integration of statistical learning in data-driven organizational decision-making through a qualitative approach. The study focuses on how managers, data analysts, business intelligence staff, and operational decision makers interpret analytical outputs, build trust in statistical models, and negotiate data-based recommendations in organizational routines. Theoretically, this study contributes to data-driven decision-making literature by placing statistical learning within a socio-technical and interpretive framework. Practically, the study offers insights for organizations that seek to improve decision quality through stronger data literacy, analytical culture, governance mechanisms, and collaboration between technical and managerial actors. This focus follows Gioia's (2021) argument that qualitative inquiry can build strong conceptual understanding when researchers examine processes, meanings, and actor interpretations. It also aligns with Paparini et al. (2021), who note that case study inquiry can explain complex interventions within real organizational contexts.

2. Materials and Methods

This study uses a qualitative research approach with a case study design. The case study design was selected because the study investigates a contemporary organizational phenomenon that involves process, context, meaning, and interaction among actors. Statistical learning integration cannot be understood only through numerical performance indicators because it also involves trust, interpretation, coordination, and organizational routines. Gioia (2021) explains that qualitative research can generate systematic conceptual insight when it explores how actors construct meaning in organizational settings. Paparini et al. (2021) state that case study designs are useful for evaluating complex practices within context. Sibbald et al. (2021) add that case study methodology supports in-depth understanding when researchers need to connect organizational processes, participant perspectives, and practical conditions.

The research site will be an organization that has implemented data analytics, business intelligence, machine learning, or statistical learning in decision-making processes. The site may include a private company, public agency, educational institution, health organization, financial institution, or service-based organization that uses dashboards, predictive models, reporting systems, or analytical recommendations. The organization must have an active decision-making process supported by data analysis. Côté-Boileau et al. (2020) emphasize that organizational qualitative research requires attention to institutional setting, work routines, and actor interaction. Sala et al. (2022) show that case-based research can reveal how data-driven decision-making works in service and maintenance processes. Guerrier et al. (2022) also demonstrate that qualitative inquiry can capture administrators' information needs during data-intensive decision situations.

The study will be conducted over three months, from January to March 2026. This period includes research permission, informant recruitment, data collection, transcription, data verification, and thematic analysis. The research participants will include managers, data analysts, business intelligence officers, operational staff, and decision makers who use analytical outputs in daily work. Informants must have at least one year of experience in data-related decision processes, direct exposure to dashboards or statistical outputs, and knowledge of how data informs organizational decisions. Van Tiem et al. (2021) note that longitudinal qualitative procedures can strengthen understanding of implementation processes over time. Braun and Clarke (2021) argue that qualitative quality depends on rich engagement with data and reflexive interpretation. Byrne (2022) also explains that researchers need repeated familiarization with data to construct reliable thematic patterns.

The sampling technique uses purposive sampling followed by snowball sampling. Purposive sampling helps the researcher select participants who have direct knowledge of statistical learning integration, data-driven decision-making, and organizational analytics practices. Snowball sampling will be used after initial interviews to identify additional informants who hold relevant roles but may not appear in formal organizational charts. This strategy supports richer data because analytical work often involves cross-functional collaboration between technical and managerial units. Campbell et al. (2021) show that reflexive thematic research benefits from carefully selected participants who can explain experience and meaning. Côté-Boileau et al. (2020) also highlight the value of selecting organizational actors who can describe institutional practices in detail. Gioia (2021) supports this logic by emphasizing the importance of informant-centered data in organizational qualitative research.

Data will be collected through semi-structured interviews, limited participant observation, and document analysis. Semi-structured interviews will explore how participants understand statistical learning, how they use model outputs, how they judge data quality, and how they manage differences between analytical recommendations and managerial intuition. Interview questions will also examine trust, resistance, data literacy, ethical concerns, and decision accountability. Erhan et al. (2022) show that data-driven decisions still involve cognition, interpretation, and human judgment. Szukits (2022) argues that advanced analytics may not shape decisions when digital orientation and managerial value are weak. Faridoon et al. (2025) also show that cognitive style and organizational culture influence the relationship between analytics capability and decision-making capability.

Limited participant observation will be conducted during meetings, dashboard reviews, reporting sessions, or decision discussions in which data and analytical outputs are used. The purpose of observation is to understand how data is presented, questioned, accepted, revised, or rejected in organizational interaction. Field notes will record communication patterns, decision roles, analytical language, and situations where statistical learning outputs influence decisions. Document analysis will include dashboards, analytical reports, standard operating procedures, decision memos, meeting notes, strategic documents, and model-related guidelines. Alaimo and Kallinikos (2022) show that data objects shape organizational knowledge and action. Saifer and Dacin (2022) explain that organizational encounters with data involve meaning, emotion, and discourse. Allen and McDonald (2025) also show that qualitative evidence can complement quantitative analysis in data-driven organizations.

Data validity will be strengthened through triangulation, member checking, and audit trail. Source triangulation will compare information from managers, analysts, operational staff, and decision makers. Method triangulation will compare interview data, observation notes, and organizational documents. Member checking will ask selected participants to review interview summaries or preliminary themes to ensure that the researcher's interpretation reflects their experience. An audit trail will document research decisions, interview guides, field notes, coding memos, analytical changes, and theme development. Braun and Clarke (2021) emphasize that qualitative rigor requires transparency and reflexive consistency. Campbell et al. (2021) explain that reflexive thematic analysis needs careful documentation of interpretive decisions. Van Tiem et al. (2021) also show that systematic tracking can support credibility in qualitative implementation research.

Data analysis will use reflexive thematic analysis supported by the interactive logic of data reduction, data display, and conclusion verification. The first stage involves repeated reading of interview transcripts, field notes, and organizational documents. The second stage involves open coding to identify meaning units related to data use, model trust, statistical interpretation, decision routines, data literacy, and organizational constraints. The third stage groups codes into preliminary themes. The fourth stage reviews themes against the full data set. The fifth stage defines final themes and builds an analytical narrative. Byrne (2022) explains that reflexive thematic analysis helps researchers move from codes to meaningful patterns. Braun and Clarke (2021) stress that theme development requires active interpretation rather than mechanical coding. Paparini et al. (2021) also support case-based synthesis for understanding complex organizational practices.

To enable limited replication, this study will provide a clear description of the research context, participant criteria, interview protocol, data collection stages, validation procedures, and analytical process. The final findings will be presented in thematic form, supported by selected participant quotations and document-based evidence. The analysis will focus on how statistical learning becomes part of decision-making practice, how organizational actors interpret analytical outputs, and what barriers affect the use of data-driven recommendations. Sabharwal and Miah (2021) show that big data analytics capability involves organizational culture, climate, and capacity. Korherr and Kanbach (2023) emphasize the role of human-related capabilities in analytics performance. Szukits and Móricz (2024) show that analytical culture influences the shift toward data-driven decision-making. These theoretical foundations will guide the interpretation of findings without limiting the emergence of new themes from the empirical data.

3. Results and Discussions

The qualitative analysis identified four major themes that explain how statistical learning is integrated into data-driven organizational decision-making. These themes include: 1) statistical learning as a tool for reducing uncertainty, 2) trust and interpretability as conditions for adoption, 3) tension between analytical outputs and managerial experience, and 4) organizational culture as a driver or barrier to data-driven decisions. These themes emerged from semi-structured interviews, limited observation of decision meetings, and document analysis of dashboards, analytical reports, and internal decision procedures. The findings show that statistical learning is not used as a fully automatic decision mechanism. Instead, organizational actors use it as a decision-support instrument that must be interpreted, discussed, and aligned with organizational goals.

The first theme shows that statistical learning helps organizations reduce uncertainty in decision-making. Participants explained that predictive models, classification tools, and dashboard-based statistical summaries help them identify patterns that are difficult to detect through manual observation. For example, one manager stated, "Before we used data models, many decisions depended on senior experience. Now, we can see patterns earlier, especially when the dashboard shows repeated changes in customer behavior." This statement indicates that statistical learning supports earlier problem recognition and helps managers compare different decision options. Observational data also showed that meetings often began with a discussion of dashboard indicators before participants moved to strategic recommendations. This pattern suggests that statistical learning has become part of the organizational language for framing problems.

The second theme concerns trust and interpretability. Participants did not automatically accept model outputs simply because they were produced by statistical tools. They wanted to understand how the model worked, what variables influenced the result, and whether the data reflected real organizational conditions. One data analyst explained, "The model can give a score, but users still ask why the score is high or low. If we cannot explain it, they hesitate to use it." This finding shows that interpretability affects the acceptance of statistical learning. Decision makers were more willing to use analytical results when they received simple explanations, visual summaries, and clear links between data patterns and operational realities. Documents reviewed during the study also showed that reports with short explanatory notes were used more frequently than technical reports filled with statistical terms.

The third theme reveals tension between analytical recommendations and managerial experience. Several participants described situations where model outputs did not fully match their professional judgment. In such cases, decision makers did not reject the model directly. They compared it with field information, past experience, and contextual knowledge. A senior manager noted, "The data may suggest one option, but we still check whether the recommendation makes sense for our team and customers." This finding shows that statistical learning does not replace human judgment. Instead, it creates a negotiation process between data-based evidence and practical knowledge. Observation of decision meetings confirmed this pattern. Participants often used phrases such as “the data shows,” “from field experience,” and “we need to verify” before making final decisions.

The fourth theme highlights the role of organizational culture. Statistical learning was easier to integrate when the organization encouraged discussion, transparency, and evidence-based reasoning. In teams where leaders asked for data before making decisions, staff became more active in preparing analytical evidence. However, in units where decisions remained highly hierarchical, data was often used only to support decisions that had already been made. One operational staff member stated, “Sometimes data is only used after the decision is chosen. It becomes a justification, not the basis of the decision.” This statement reflects a gap between formal data-driven systems and actual decision behavior. The finding shows that the presence of dashboards or statistical models does not guarantee data-driven decision-making if organizational culture does not support open interpretation and critical discussion.

The fifth theme concerns data literacy and cross-functional collaboration. Participants reported that successful use of statistical learning depended on communication between technical and non-technical actors. Data analysts understood the model, but managers understood the business context. When these two groups worked separately, analytical outputs were often misunderstood or underused. One analyst stated, “We need managers to explain the real problem before we build the model. If not, the model may be accurate but not useful.” This finding shows that statistical learning requires a shared understanding of organizational problems. It also indicates that data literacy should not be limited to technical staff. Managers need basic analytical understanding, while analysts need contextual knowledge about organizational operations.

Overall, the findings show that statistical learning integration is a socio-technical process. The technical side includes data quality, model selection, dashboard design, and statistical accuracy. The social side includes trust, interpretation, communication, leadership, and organizational culture. These two dimensions work together. A technically strong model may fail to influence decisions if users do not trust or understand it. At the same time, a strong data-driven culture may still produce weak decisions if the data is incomplete, biased, or poorly analyzed. Therefore, the meaning of statistical learning in organizations lies not only in prediction accuracy, but also in how people use, discuss, and transform analytical outputs into practical decisions.

Discussion

The findings support previous studies that argue data-driven decision-making depends on more than technological adoption. The first theme confirms that statistical learning helps organizations reduce uncertainty by identifying patterns and supporting prediction. This aligns with Cybulski and Scheepers (2021), who explain that data science creates organizational value when analytical methods connect with decision contexts. It also supports Awan et al. (2021), who found that data-driven insight improves decision quality when analytics capabilities are linked to organizational action. However, this study adds a qualitative perspective by showing how decision makers experience statistical learning as a tool for framing problems before making decisions.

The importance of trust and interpretability confirms the argument that analytical systems must be understandable to organizational users. Participants in this study did not treat model outputs as neutral or final truths. They asked how the model produced results and whether the data matched real conditions. This finding is consistent with Brous and Janssen (2020), who highlight the role of data governance in building trust in data science outcomes. It also supports Korherr and Kanbach (2023), who argue that human-related capabilities influence the value of big data analytics. The study extends this discussion by showing that interpretability is not only a technical feature. It is also a communicative process between analysts and decision makers.

The tension between statistical learning and managerial experience reflects a key issue in organizational decision-making. The findings show that managers use model outputs as evidence, but they still rely on judgment, field knowledge, and contextual awareness. This is consistent with Erhan et al. (2022), who argue that data-driven decision-making is not driven only by data because cognition and human interpretation remain central. Szukits (2022) also warns that advanced analytics may create only the appearance of data-driven decision-making when analytical outputs do not shape actual decisions. This study contributes to that debate by showing that tension between data and experience does not always weaken decision quality. It can improve decision quality when organizations use it as a reflective dialogue.

The role of organizational culture in this study supports the findings of Szukits and Móricz (2024), who show that analytical culture and centralization efforts influence the movement toward data-driven decision-making. In this study, data became more influential when leaders encouraged evidence-based discussion and allowed staff to question assumptions. In contrast, hierarchical cultures limited the use of statistical learning because data was often used to justify decisions rather than shape them. This finding suggests that data-driven decision-making requires cultural readiness. Organizations need routines that allow evidence, interpretation, and professional judgment to interact openly.

The finding on data literacy and cross-functional collaboration also strengthens previous arguments about analytics capability. Sabharwal and Miah (2021) state that big data analytics capability involves organizational climate, culture, management, and technical capacity. Yasmin et al. (2020) show that analytics capabilities influence firm performance when they are supported by management and human resources. The present study adds that collaboration between analysts and managers is essential because statistical learning outputs need contextual translation. Without this translation, models may become technically valid but practically weak. This has important implications for organizations that invest in analytics infrastructure without developing shared analytical competence among employees.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the literature by positioning statistical learning as a socio-technical practice within organizational decision-making. Previous studies often examine analytics capability, performance, or decision quality through quantitative relationships. This study shows the interpretive process behind those relationships. Statistical learning becomes meaningful when organizational actors explain, negotiate, and adapt analytical outputs to local decision contexts. This perspective also supports Alaimo and Kallinikos (2022), who argue that data objects reshape organizational knowledge and action. It also aligns with Saifer and Dacin (2022), who emphasize that encounters with data involve emotion, discourse, and social meaning.

Practically, the findings suggest that organizations should not treat statistical learning integration as a software or infrastructure project only. They need to build data literacy, improve model explanation, strengthen data governance, and create meeting routines that encourage evidence-based dialogue. Leaders should ask not only “What does the model predict?” but also “Why does the model predict this?” and “How does this result fit our operational context?” Organizations should also involve analysts early in problem formulation, not only in data processing. This can prevent a gap between technical model design and actual managerial needs.

The findings also have implications for policy and organizational development. Public and private organizations that want to implement data-driven decision-making need clear rules for data quality, model accountability, and ethical use of analytical outputs. Statistical learning can improve decision quality, but it can also create risk when users do not understand model limitations. Therefore, training programs should target both technical and non-technical employees. Managers need basic skills in interpreting statistical outputs, while analysts need communication skills and organizational understanding. This dual competence can make data-driven decision-making more transparent, accountable, and context-sensitive.

This study has several limitations. First, the findings are based on qualitative data from a specific organizational context, so they cannot be generalized statistically to all organizations. Second, participant statements may reflect personal perceptions that differ from actual decision outcomes. Third, the study focuses on interpretation and integration processes rather than measuring the predictive accuracy of statistical learning models. Future research can expand the study by comparing several organizations across sectors, using longitudinal observation, or combining qualitative findings with quantitative measures of decision quality. Further research can also explore how ethical concerns, algorithmic bias, and explainable artificial intelligence influence trust in statistical learning within organizational decision-making.

In conclusion, the results show that statistical learning integration in data-driven organizational decision-making depends on the interaction between analytical systems and human interpretation. Statistical learning helps organizations identify patterns and reduce uncertainty, but its value emerges through trust, explanation, collaboration, and organizational culture. The study confirms that data-driven decision-making is not a purely technical process. It is a social, cultural, and managerial process that requires alignment between models, people, and organizational routines.

4. Conclusions

This study concludes that statistical learning integration in data-driven organizational decision-making is not merely a technical process, but a socio-technical practice shaped by trust, interpretation, data literacy, leadership, and organizational culture. The findings show that statistical learning helps organizations reduce uncertainty, identify patterns, and support evidence-based decisions. However, its effectiveness depends on how organizational actors understand, explain, negotiate, and apply analytical outputs in real decision contexts. The study contributes to the literature by showing that model accuracy alone cannot guarantee better decisions. Statistical learning becomes meaningful when technical analysis connects with managerial judgment, contextual knowledge, and collaborative interpretation.

The study offers theoretical, practical, and policy implications. Theoretically, it expands the understanding of data-driven decision-making by positioning statistical learning as an interpretive organizational practice. Practically, organizations need to strengthen data literacy, improve model explainability, build cross-functional collaboration, and create decision routines that encourage critical discussion of data. From a policy perspective, organizations should develop clear governance mechanisms for data quality, model accountability, ethical use of analytics, and transparent decision procedures. Future research may compare different organizational sectors, apply longitudinal qualitative designs, or combine qualitative findings with quantitative measures of decision quality to deepen understanding of statistical learning adoption in organizational settings.

References

Alaimo, C., & Kallinikos, J. (2022). Organizations decentered: Data objects, technology and knowledge. *Organization Science, 33*(1), 19–37. https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2021.1552

Allen, R. T., & McDonald, R. M. (2025). Methodological pluralism and innovation in data-driven organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 70*(2), 403–443. https://doi.org/10.1177/00018392251313737

Awan, U., Shamim, S., Khan, Z., Zia, N. U., Shariq, S. M., & Khan, M. N. (2021). Big data analytics capability and decision-making: The role of data-driven insight on circular economy performance. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 168*, 120766. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.120766

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in reflexive thematic analysis? *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 18*(3), 328–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

Byrne, D. (2022). A worked example of Braun and Clarke's approach to reflexive thematic analysis. *Quality & Quantity, 56*, 1391–1412. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-021-01182-y

Campbell, K. A., Orr, E., Durepos, P., Nguyen, L., Li, L., Whitmore, C., Gehrke, P., Graham, L., & Jack, S. M. (2021). Reflexive thematic analysis for applied qualitative health research. *The Qualitative Report, 26*(6), 2011–2028. https://doi.org/10.46743/2160-3715/2021.5010

Côté-Boileau, É., Gaboury, I., Breton, M., & Denis, J. L. (2020). Organizational ethnographic case studies: Toward a new generative in-depth qualitative methodology for health care research? *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 19*, 1–17. https://doi.org/10.1177/1609406920926904

Cybulski, J. L., & Scheepers, R. (2021). Data science in organizations: Conceptualizing its breakthroughs and blind spots. *Journal of Information Technology, 36*(2), 154–175. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268396220988539

Elgendy, N., Elragal, A., & Päivärinta, T. (2022). DECAS: A modern data-driven decision theory for big data and analytics. *Journal of Decision Systems, 31*(4), 337–373. https://doi.org/10.1080/12460125.2021.1894674

Erhan, T., Gurel, E., & Aydin, E. (2022). Is data-driven decision-making driven only by data? When cognition meets data. *European Management Journal, 40*(5), 656–670. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.emj.2022.01.003

Faridoon, L., Liu, W., & Spence, C. (2025). The impact of big data analytics on decision-making within the government sector. *Big Data, 13*(2), 73–89. https://doi.org/10.1089/big.2023.0019

Gioia, D. (2021). A systematic methodology for doing qualitative research. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 57*(1), 20–29. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886320982715

Guerrier, C., McDonnell, C., Magoc, T., Fishe, J. N., & Harle, C. A. (2022). Understanding health care administrators' data and information needs for decision making during the COVID-19 pandemic: A qualitative study at an academic health system. *MDM Policy & Practice, 7*(1), 1–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/23814683221089844

Korherr, P., & Kanbach, D. (2023). Human-related capabilities in big data analytics: A taxonomy of human factors with impact on firm performance. *Review of Managerial Science, 17*, 1943–1970. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-021-00506-4

Muhammad, A., Yu, C. K., Qadir, A., Ahmed, W., Yousuf, Z., & Fan, G. (2022). Big data analytics capability as a major antecedent of firm innovation performance. *International Journal of Innovation Science, 14*(1), 47–70. https://doi.org/10.1177/14657503211050809

Orero-Blat, M., Palacios-Marqués, D., Leal-Rodríguez, A. L., & Ferraris, A. (2025). Beyond digital transformation: A multi-mixed methods study on big data analytics capabilities and innovation in enhancing organizational performance. *Review of Managerial Science, 19*, 649–685. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-024-00768-8

Paparini, S., Papoutsi, C., Murdoch, J., Green, J., Petticrew, M., Greenhalgh, T., Hanckel, B., & Shaw, S. E. (2021). Evaluating complex interventions in context: Systematic, meta-narrative review of case study approaches. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 21*, 225. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-021-01418-3

Sabharwal, R., & Miah, S. J. (2021). A new theoretical understanding of big data analytics capabilities in organizations: A thematic analysis. *Journal of Big Data, 8*, 159. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-021-00543-6

Saifer, A., & Dacin, M. T. (2022). Data and organization studies: Aesthetics, emotions, discourse and our everyday encounters with data. *Organization Studies, 43*(4), 623–636. https://doi.org/10.1177/01708406211006250

Sala, R., Pirola, F., Pezzotta, G., & Cavalieri, S. (2022). Data-driven decision making in maintenance service delivery process: A case study. *Applied Sciences, 12*(15), 7395. https://doi.org/10.3390/app12157395

Shamim, S., Zeng, J., Khan, Z., & Zia, N. U. (2020). Big data analytics capability and decision-making performance in emerging market firms: The role of contractual and relational governance mechanisms. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change, 161*, 120315. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2020.120315

Sibbald, S. L., Paciocco, S., Fournie, M., Van Asseldonk, R., & Scurr, T. (2021). Continuing to enhance the quality of case study methodology in health services research. *Healthcare Management Forum, 34*(5), 291–296. https://doi.org/10.1177/08404704211028857

Szukits, Á. (2022). The illusion of data-driven decision making: The mediating effect of digital orientation and controllers' added value in explaining organizational implications of advanced analytics. *Journal of Management Control, 33*, 403–446. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00187-022-00343-w

Szukits, Á., & Móricz, P. (2024). Towards data-driven decision making: The role of analytical culture and centralization efforts. *Review of Managerial Science, 18*, 2849–2887. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11846-023-00694-1

Van Tiem, J. M., Schacht Reisinger, H., Friberg, J. E., Wilson, J. R., Fitzwater, L., Panos, R. J., & Moeckli, J. (2021). The STS case study: An analysis method for longitudinal qualitative research for implementation science. *BMC Medical Research Methodology, 21*, 27. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-021-01215-y

Yasmin, M., Tatoglu, E., Kilic, H. S., Zaim, S., & Delen, D. (2020). Big data analytics capabilities and firm performance: An integrated MCDM approach. *Journal of Business Research, 114*, 1–15. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2020.03.028