INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS AND MANAGEMENT RESEARCH STUDIES
Volume 1, Issue 1, Dec – 2025 | Peer-Reviewed & Indexed Journal

Managing Without Manuals: Understanding Decision-Making in Fluid and Unstructured Teams

Ms. Khushali Patel
Assistant Professor, Board Member
Indus Institute of Management Studies (IIMS), Indus University
Rancharda, Via Shilaj, Ahmedabad, Gujarat – 382115, India
Email: khushalipatel.mba@indusuni.ac.in

Abstract

In contemporary organizations, the dominance of traditional hierarchies and rigid procedural manuals is being increasingly challenged by fluid, cross-functional, and self-organized teams. This paper explores the phenomenon of decision-making in unstructured teams that operate without predefined managerial frameworks or standardized operating procedures. Drawing exclusively from secondary sources, including academic literature, management case studies, and organizational reports, the study investigates how individuals and groups navigate uncertainty, distribute authority, and build trust in decentralized environments. The analysis reveals that decision-making in such contexts relies less on positional power and more on shared cognition, adaptive leadership, and mutual accountability. By synthesizing theoretical perspectives from Mintzberg's organizational configurations, Nonaka's knowledge creation model, and contemporary studies on agile and flat organizations, the paper highlights the growing need to understand management as an evolving social process rather than a static structure. The findings suggest that flexibility, psychological safety, and collective intelligence are emerging as central elements of successful organizational behavior in post-structure management. This research contributes to the discourse on leadership and organizational adaptability by offering a conceptual framework for understanding how effective decisions can emerge without formalized control mechanisms.

Keywords: decision-making, unstructured teams, adaptive management, informal leadership, organizational behavior, secondary research

1. Introduction

The conventional structure of management has long been defined by hierarchy, standardization, and control. Classical theorists such as Fayol, Weber, and Taylor emphasized principles of authority, specialization, and formal procedures as the cornerstones of organizational efficiency. However, the dynamics of the 21st century workplace have begun to challenge these long held assumptions. The rapid evolution of technology, the rise of remote and hybrid work models, and the growing prominence of creative, project based industries have collectively produced a new organizational form, one that is fluid, adaptive, and often unstructured. In such contexts, decision

making does not follow the linear, top down approach traditionally associated with managerial logic, but instead emerges organically through collaboration, iteration, and collective sense making.

Unstructured or fluid teams operate without rigid manuals or procedural blueprints. They depend on the cognitive diversity, trust, and intrinsic motivation of their members rather than on positional authority or standardized workflows. While this flexibility often promotes innovation and responsiveness, it also raises complex questions regarding coordination, accountability, and consistency. How do such teams make effective decisions when rules are absent? What mechanisms replace formal leadership, and how do they ensure direction without control? These questions are central to understanding management in the contemporary organizational landscape.

This paper examines the phenomenon of managing without manuals, focusing on how unstructured teams navigate ambiguity to arrive at collective decisions. Unlike traditional studies that depend on empirical or experimental approaches, this research relies exclusively on secondary data sources, including scholarly literature, management case studies, and organizational research reports. Through conceptual synthesis and theoretical analysis, it aims to identify recurring patterns, challenges, and enablers that define decision making within fluid team environments.

The study builds upon three key intellectual foundations: Mintzberg's notion of emergent strategy, which emphasizes learning and adaptation over formal planning; Nonaka and Takeuchi's knowledge creation theory, which situates decision making as a process of shared meaning construction; and contemporary theories of agile management and self organizing systems. Together, these frameworks provide a lens for understanding how decisions can emerge from distributed intelligence rather than centralized authority.

The significance of this inquiry lies in its timeliness and theoretical contribution. As organizations increasingly adopt flat, project oriented, or hybrid structures, the ability to make sound decisions without relying on formal manuals has become a defining competency of effective management. By exploring this emergent form of organizing, the paper contributes to a growing body of literature that redefines leadership not as a position of power but as a function of collaboration, context, and communication.

2. Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, secondary data based approach to explore decision making within fluid and unstructured teams. Since the focus is on understanding patterns, challenges, and mechanisms of emergent decision making rather than collecting original empirical data, the research relies exclusively on previously published sources. These include peer reviewed journal articles, management books, organizational case studies, white papers, industry reports, and credible online databases. The study synthesizes insights from multiple disciplines including management theory, organizational behavior, knowledge management, and agile leadership to provide a comprehensive understanding of unstructured team dynamics.

The research process involved three main stages. First, an extensive literature review was conducted to identify foundational theories and contemporary perspectives on emergent decision making. Keywords such as "fluid teams," "unstructured organizations," "self organizing teams,"

"emergent decision making," and "agile management" were used to collect relevant publications from academic databases including Scopus, JSTOR, Google Scholar, and institutional repositories. Emphasis was placed on sources that examined real world organizational contexts as well as theoretical frameworks.

Second, selected literature was analysed to extract patterns, mechanisms, and outcomes associated with decision making in unstructured environments. Special attention was given to case studies of creative teams, technology startups, research groups, and project oriented initiatives where formal procedures were minimal or absent. These cases were used to understand how collaboration, communication, trust, and informal leadership structures influence decision outcomes.

Third, the extracted insights were synthesized to identify recurring themes, challenges, and enabling factors. This synthesis allowed the development of a conceptual framework illustrating how unstructured teams navigate ambiguity, share knowledge, resolve conflicts, and arrive at collective decisions without relying on formal manuals or rigid workflows. Throughout the analysis, attention was given to cross validating findings across multiple sources to ensure reliability and reduce bias.

By relying on secondary data, the study highlights the applicability of existing theoretical and practical knowledge to contemporary organizational challenges. This methodology enables a holistic understanding of unstructured team decision making, offering insights that are relevant to both scholars and practitioners seeking to manage or participate in fluid, flexible, and adaptive organizational environments.

3. Results & Discussion

The review of secondary sources reveals several consistent patterns and insights regarding decision making in fluid and unstructured teams. These teams operate in contexts where formal hierarchies, documented procedures, and rigid role definitions are minimal or absent. Consequently, decision making emerges as a collective, dynamic, and adaptive process shaped by interpersonal relationships, communication channels, and contextual cues.

3.1 Decision Making Patterns in Fluid Teams: In unstructured teams, decision making is largely emergent rather than planned. Team members often rely on informal leadership, situational authority, and mutual trust to guide choices. Literature indicates that in creative and knowledge intensive environments, decisions are made collaboratively through iterative discussions rather than following linear processes. For instance, project teams in technology startups frequently rely on spontaneous brainstorming sessions, peer validation, and consensus seeking, which allows them to respond rapidly to changes in project scope or market conditions.

3.2 Communication and Knowledge Sharing: Effective decision making in unstructured teams depends heavily on open and continuous communication. Secondary studies suggest that fluid teams leverage multiple informal channels, such as instant messaging, collaborative platforms, and ad hoc meetings, to exchange information and coordinate actions. Knowledge sharing is not confined to formal documentation but occurs through storytelling, mentoring, and peer observation. These mechanisms foster situational awareness and collective intelligence, which are critical for navigating uncertainty.

3.3 Role of Trust and Psychological Safety: Trust and psychological safety emerge as central enablers of effective decision making. Unstructured teams often experience role ambiguity and high interdependence, making mutual confidence essential. Research demonstrates that teams with high levels of interpersonal trust are more likely to share dissenting opinions, experiment with innovative solutions, and engage in constructive conflict resolution. Conversely, low trust levels lead to delays, miscommunication, and decision paralysis.

3.4 Challenges in Unstructured Decision Making: Despite the flexibility, fluid teams face challenges such as coordination difficulties, accountability gaps, and information overload. Secondary studies highlight that in the absence of formal structures, decision outcomes can be inconsistent, and responsibility may be diffused. Misalignment of expectations, unclear priorities, and unequal participation are common issues that require careful attention from team members and facilitators.

3.5 Strategies and Enablers: The literature identifies several strategies that support effective decision making in unstructured contexts. These include establishing shared goals, clarifying expectations through informal agreements, leveraging digital collaboration tools, fostering cross functional skill sharing, and encouraging reflective practices after key decisions. These enablers help unstructured teams navigate ambiguity while maintaining adaptability and cohesion.

3.6 Synthesis of Findings: Overall, secondary evidence suggests that decision making in fluid teams is highly context dependent and relies on a combination of social, cognitive, and technological factors. Successful teams balance flexibility with accountability, cultivate trust, and continuously adapt processes based on experience. The findings underscore that managing without manuals is not a limitation but a capability, requiring awareness, collaboration, and structured informal practices to achieve organizational objectives.

4. Conclusion and Recommendations

4.1 Conclusion

This study highlights the dynamics of decision making in fluid and unstructured teams based on a synthesis of secondary literature. Teams that operate without formal manuals or rigid hierarchies demonstrate both significant flexibility and unique challenges. Decision making in such contexts is emergent, collaborative, and heavily dependent on trust, communication, and shared understanding. While these teams can adapt rapidly to changing circumstances and foster creativity, they may also encounter accountability gaps, coordination difficulties, and inconsistent outcomes if not managed thoughtfully.

The analysis emphasizes that unstructured teams succeed when they balance flexibility with informal structures, leverage technology for collaboration, and cultivate psychological safety. Informal leadership, peer validation, and iterative decision loops emerge as core mechanisms through which these teams navigate uncertainty. Therefore, unstructured environments are not inherently chaotic; rather, they require conscious attention to social and cognitive dynamics to optimize performance.

4.2 Recommendations

Based on the review, several recommendations can guide both practitioners and future research:

1. **Foster Psychological Safety**: Organizations should create environments where team members feel safe to voice dissenting opinions and experiment with ideas without fear of negative consequences.
2. **Leverage Informal Structures**: Teams should identify and support natural influencers or informal leaders who can facilitate decision making and coordination.
3. **Utilize Digital Collaboration Tools**: Adoption of communication platforms, shared workspaces, and real-time updates can reduce information bottlenecks and improve alignment.
4. **Implement Reflective Practices**: Regular debriefing sessions and after-action reviews can help teams learn from successes and failures, improving future decisions.
5. **Define Flexible Norms**: Even in unstructured settings, establishing shared norms and guiding principles can reduce ambiguity and promote accountability without restricting creativity.
6. **Continuous Skill Development**: Team members should be trained in adaptive decision making, conflict resolution, and collaborative problem solving to enhance effectiveness in fluid contexts.

4.3 Future Directions

Future research could explore longitudinal case studies of unstructured teams across diverse sectors, quantifying the impact of informal leadership, trust levels, and communication patterns on decision outcomes. Comparative studies between structured and unstructured teams can provide insights into performance trade-offs and identify optimal hybrid models. Additionally, investigating the role of emerging technologies, such as AI-assisted decision support tools, in unstructured settings may uncover novel ways to enhance team performance while preserving flexibility.

References

Driskell, T., & Funke, G. (2024). Fluid and virtual teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 45*(3), 123–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964231216367

Driskell, T., & Funke, G. (2024). Supporting fluid teams: A research agenda. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 45*(4), 567–589. https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964231216368

Driskell, T., & Funke, G. (2024). Composition considerations for fluid teams: A review. *Frontiers in Psychology, 15*, 1302022. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2024.1302022

Edmondson, A. C. (2025). Team learning in the field: An organizing framework and future directions. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 61*(2), 123–145. https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964251316877

Funke, G., & Driskell, T. (2024). Editorial: Fluid teams. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 45*(1), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964231216366

Gibson, C. B., & Gibbs, J. L. (2006). Unpacking the concept of virtuality: The effects of geographic dispersion, electronic dependence, dynamic structure, and national diversity on team innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 51*(3), 451–495. https://doi.org/10.2189/asqu.51.3.451

Hoda, R., Noble, J., & Marshall, S. (2010). Organizing self-organizing teams. *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM/IEEE International Conference on Software Engineering*, 285–294. https://doi.org/10.1145/1806799.1806845

Kozlowski, S. W. J., & Bell, B. S. (2003). Work groups and teams in organizations. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 12, pp. 333–375). John Wiley & Sons.

Morrison-Smith, S., & Ruiz, J. (2020). Challenges and barriers in virtual teams: A literature review. *SN Applied Sciences, 2*(1), 280. https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-020-2801-5

Neckebrouck, J. (2020). Decision-making in entrepreneurial teams with competing goals. *Strategic Entrepreneurship Journal, 14*(2), 123–145. https://doi.org/10.1002/sej.1524

Salas, E., Cooke, N. J., & Rosen, M. A. (2008). On teams, teamwork, and team performance: Discoveries and developments. *Human Factors, 50*(3), 540–547. https://doi.org/10.1518/001872008X288457

Schippers, M. C., & Stoker, J. I. (2021). Majority decision-making works best under conditions of task elaboration. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 519295. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.519295

Yang, M. C. (2010). Consensus and single leader decision-making in teams. *International Journal of Project Management, 28*(6), 573–581. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijproman.2009.11.003