

Mind the Doubt

"You doubt your value. Don't run from who you are." (CS Lewis, 1951)

The chronicles of Narnia are captivating and influential fantasy literature. This series transcends cultures, generations and is passed as a reference read to all. In the series, the readers get on a quest breaking out all codes. In the same series, characters range from humans to lions, including witches, a beaver and Father Christmas. As he breaks codes, standards and norms of usual associations, CS Lewis directly touches the reader's imagination. After a period of being surprised by the apparent lack of coherence, the reader gets to experience through words the journey that the author designed the series for.

Taking Aslan as an example. The Lion. He is a central character. His name is a translation of Lion in Turkish. As McGrath, Alister indicates in his review of the author's life, CS Lewis studied the Ottoman Empire. So we can assume that he made the deliberate choice in using the symbolism of the lion for this character and reinforced the choice in naming him as such. Aslan in his essence, representation and designation is coherent. Beyond the animal, it is a symbol that all collectively and individually have a perspective on. So the Chronicles of Narnia are far from a random series of tales. They serve the mere purpose of tales, they educate.

CS Lewis had a message, a series of teaching that he used tales as a way to do so. After all, he was of the opinion that Tales were a underutilised artefact to cast wisdom. This is not surprising given that Lewis at the time was an educator. As a result, the quote in epitaph when attributed to him makes sense. It is consistent with the posture of Aslan, talking to us all via his stories with Peter, Susan, Edmund and Lucy. The quote reflects so much Aslan's wisdom that it is rarely discussed. It is so private that it demands and commands a pause to reflect on our behaviours.

CS Lewis could be delighted for having achieved the objective of passing wisdom to its reader. Alas, it is not the case, at least not in that quote. This quote is not found in any of the 7 books of the chronicle of Narnia and as such cannot be attributed to CS Lewis. It comes from the 2010 movie adaptation of the series "The Voyage of the Dawn Treader" (Apted, 2010). This anecdote is far from trivial, The same way we should doubt the credibility of this quote on doubt. Doubt is a concept that cannot be left as such. Doubt must be doubted. Doubt can't just be. It is a call for exploration, questioning, positioning, updating.

In this article we will explore the concept of doubt, from one of its possible origins, to its representation and manifestation in organisations.

A genesis of doubt

"Did God really say, 'You must not eat from any tree in the garden'?" (Genesis 3: 1)

The chapter is called the Fall. Prior to that, are just "*The Beginning*", where all is Good (Genesis 1) and "*Adam and Eve*" living in no shame (Genesis 2). God, after creating Adam spoke to him for the first time. He explained what Adam could do (eat from any tree) and not do (eat from the tree of knowledge of good and evil). It was simple, seems fair, and certainly clear in rules along with consequences. Yet, when the Snake came and asked the first question in the bible, because Adam and Eve listened, and acted they ate the fruit of the forbidden tree. This led to the end of Good and the start of shame. This is how they died. They died not a physical death, but a figurative one, their hope died. As is the allegory of heaven itself. This is the story of how one bad decision, made by Adam and Eve's exerting their will, motivated by a question which instigated a doubt led to a devastating loss. So the first account of doubt teaches us that when you doubt you lose.

Following this chapter, this bible continues with multiple stories and accounts of the consequences of doubt. For instance, in the gospel of Matthew, the disciples are on a boat and Jesus appears. Peter challenges him : "*Lord, if it's you,*" Peter replied, "*tell me to come to you on the water.*" When Jesus tells him to come, Peter, a human,

walks on water, then doubts, then drawn. As Jesus Rescued him he said “*You of little faith,*” “*why did you doubt?*” (Matthew 14:28-31). So with this instance, we learn that when we doubt we face death.

And, finally, in the Gospel of James, the believer is warned that should he/she/they doubt, a person would not see their wishes granted by God. As “*Such a person is double-minded and unstable in all they do.*” (James 1:6-8). So, if we doubt should we ask we will not get.

In other words, based on the fundamental Christian tradition, doubting leads to loss, death and lack. Doubting leads to suffering.

Yet, in the Bible itself, suffering is necessary, for more than a self-sacrificial false humility rooted in victimhood.

Not only so, but we also glory in our sufferings, because we know that suffering produces perseverance; perseverance, character; and character, hope. And hope does not put us to shame, because God's love has been poured out into our hearts through the Holy Spirit, who has been given to us. (Romans 5:3-5).

So, through perseverance, one's suffering can be transcended in hope and make shame, and all other associated feelings like guilt, sadness, anger and fear disappear. The believer is encouraged to persevere in faith in multiple places in the Bible.

For instance, the journey of Doubtful Thomas is common knowledge. He doubted and had to be proven of the foundation of the teaching of his master, and his prophesies. He had to be presented with evidences. Tradition focuses on his doubts, on his defiance in asking to be proven before he could believe. But tradition also ignores an equally fundamental element of his journey. He is the only disciple that said “*My Lord and my God!*” (John 20:24-29). Through perseverance in his doubt, through acceptance of his reality, through seeking evidence to form is the belief, Thomas reached a level of faith that surpassed that of his co-disciples. So when mobilised positively doubt can lead to positive transformation. In a society that roots its ethos in Judeo-Christian tradition, the paradoxical experience of doubt is both central and complex to grasp.

The words of doubts

Discourse matters. As described in his work, Foucault shows how essential discourse, words and associated concepts are in shaping our understanding of the world. Words matter. How words are used matter. How words are not used equally matters. How words are associated, combined matters. How words are not associated, not combined equally matters. Our institutions rely on their structure, their routines and their order, often materialised or made visible through the associated discourse. In “The order of things” (Foucault, 1966) shows the need for structure to materialise in its systematic rules, practices, justified by history and influences. Looking at the concept of doubt requires to look carefully at the words associated with it via its idioms. This can show us the taken for granted, the shared beliefs and structural realities associated with the concept of doubt. (Oxford Dictionary, 2019)

If we take the Oxford dictionary's idioms of doubt, 3 attributes of the concept appear by clustering the different expressions and consolidating their meanings. First appears the fact that doubt is a polarised: “Have a doubt”, “give a doubt”. Then, doubt (or rather the absence of doubt) as a power source, reinforcing the argument “no doubt”. The dynamic and contagious nature of the concept also emerges with the idioms : “cast a doubt” and “spread a doubt”. Finally, via an common expression “be in doubt” and “beyond (any) doubt” Doubt is finite state that can simultaneously be and be surpassed. Doubt prompts action. The additional complexity of the concept emerges. It is a finite yet contagious, it gives both power and polarises.

Doubt is polarised.

The expressions “Have a doubt” or “give a doubt” provide an even transactional nature to the concept. Doubt can be given. Doubt can be exchanged, it can be triggered. Something gives a doubt to someone. That someone ends up having a doubt where prior no such experience existed. Doubt is a paradoxical experience which produces paradoxical outcomes.

[the absence of] doubt give power to an argument.

Regularly, in research articles, in debate, in interviews, the credibility, or the strength of an argument is often referenced by being preceded by the words “no doubt”. In science, the absence of doubt indicates that proof of the argument was obtained or is unnecessary. In some organisations, typically bureaucracies, the empirical observation of discourse points distinguishes the decisiveness of the leader: “One doubt is no doubt”. This can be used to support a risk assessment of a situation where no formal argument against a certain course of action can be found. The absence of Doubt gives validity, credibility and peace of mind.

Doubt is dynamic and contagious

Doubt is not a static experience. Doubt evolves. Doubt is cast. Doubt is spread. Doubt is dynamic. The examples in history are multiple. Red tape and political ramifications aside, why else would Alfred Dreyfus have taken 12 years from 1894 to prove his innocence from the treason allegations that arose against him. This was despite evidence brought to all. People were polarised, spread on either side of doubt or belief.

Doubt is a finite prompt to action

The idioms to “Have a doubt” or “give a doubt”, as doubt can be passed provide the sense of a finite albeit fuzzy border to doubt. This fact as we will explore later in this paper is manifested on a taken for granted that doubt is limited to the choice step of the decision making process. Doubt is contained. Because it can lead to action, there is a perspective that the boundaries are clear. This has led a fields like medicine and psychology to develop scales to assess doubt.

All idioms perspective show that there is in collective wisdom a sense of a scale, ranging from “having a doubt” to “giving a doubt”; From “no doubt” to “ full of doubt”. Yet on that scale, the concept carries no positive connotation in full. For all humans, reflected in organisations, the consistent quest is that of the state of “no doubt”. “beyond any doubt” shows the active nature of the concept. It is a threshold that must be passed to reach certainty. In case there is a doubt, “if in doubt” then the agent is prompted to decision or action to remediate. After all, there is no idiom nor association that carries the meaning of “blissful doubt” or “happy doubt”. The concept of doubt is not just complex to grasp, it is also an multifaceted (Spicer, 2023; Locke et al., 2008).

The fact that doubt is perceived as finite by psychology, and psychiatry has implications for Management studies. It can be observed, it can be assessed so it is possible to research. In other words, doubt can be an object for social research in organisations.

Doubt’s definition is held in common wisdom

“Doubt is the beginning of wisdom” Aristotle.

Like all great philosopher, Aristotle’s fascination for our psyche led him to ponder what can be done to improve our humanity. Because as human beings we are on a life long journey towards wisdom and according to his teaching, that were also passed to him, Doubt is key. But at the same time, his quote is an injunction towards two especially important aspects that define Doubt. First comes *action*. He clearly states Doubt as a beginning which implicitly indicates the existence of an after. Doubt ignites action; but Doubt with no action is insanity. That would be paralysis. (Reindorp, 2021). Paralysis is not progress. Paralysis is status quo. So, Doubt without action, or the appropriate actions, is an attempt of challenging the status quo resulting in status quo. It is insanity. Inefficient and confrontational without meaning. Doubt resulting in paralysis is meaningless given it is both damaging to others and to self. It is waste. Second comes *wisdom*. Maybe Aristotle was early for his time, already holding the power of the serenity prayer. Or perhaps fellowship already existed in ancient Greece... “God give me the serenity to accept the things I cannot change, the courage to change the things I can and the wisdom to know the difference.” (Alcoholics Anonymous World Services, 2002). So, wisdom is held in discernment of tangible evidence and FEAR – “False Evidence Appearing Real” (Anonymous).

Only active Doubt hold as productive power (Reindorp, 2021) can allow this difference hence wisdom as a result. “Doubt is questioning whether the status quo is good enough that becomes a thirst for innovation or a push for major social change. Is this the best we can do or be?” (Reindorp, 2021). So only through beholding our Doubts both at the individual level and at the collective societal level can we achieve social change ... for the better. This last point seems implicit to Reindorp but in the age of the smart machine as per (Shoshanna Zuboff, 1988) it is paramount to clarify. As a society we want social change for sustainable enhancement. When it comes to technology (Halbertstam, 1991) it is often assumed that change is for the better. In her essay, Judith Halbertstam indicates how even apple’s logo is a bitten apple, positioning technology as the answer to the fall from heaven. Only through technology can humankind be restored into salvation. Note how the apple logo evolved with its success from being a pure representation of science to conveying an ideology about technology. But with the now after effect of social media, as we knowingly adopt AI, we must ensure that we, individuals are aligned with “these tools that are done to us” (US senate committee hearing channel, session on Big Tech and online child sexual exploitation crisis).

Some American major players of their industry hold embedded in their culture of domination that “one Doubt is no Doubt”. Quick and sharp decisiveness hold as a virtue. But is it? As if the only way to cope with Doubt was to keep it at bay. “Doubt is an unpleasant experience” (Beattie, 2022). “Doubt is uneasy” (Locke et al, 2009). We established that “there is another side to Doubt is a productive and powerful. This is not the destructive Doubt of paralysis and pain but a productive form of questioning and discovery. This is the Doubt that lies at the heart of self-awareness and humility. [...] So maybe, when a corporate culture keeps Doubt at bay, rather than dominion it is showing its deeply rooted inability to change. Maybe, rather than dominion, it is the conformity of practices across the given field that allows a key player in an industry to avoid to question and certainly not explicitly Doubt. Exerting Doubt would send a negative message to the key stakeholder it is accountable for: the shareholders resulting in detrimental, immediate penalty in the form of share value loss. (CEO report, 2023).

To survive in this broken Nash Equilibrium, or even be considered to have a seat at the table, Leaders have no choice but to keep Doubt at bay. Privately expressed when in public act with confidence or at least pretend and then fall into addiction to numb the cognitive dissonance. “But our leadership myths and narrative are yet to catch up. The result: too many of the Doubtful do not step up to lead, get hired, promoted, or elected. Leadership remains disproportionately in the hands of those that fit our leadership norms – of certain men – even as the evidence builds that this is not solely or even – where leadership talent lies (Reindorp, 2023).

Doubt is a natural and intuitive process

In the UK, the criminal court and legal system provides a fascinating perspective on Doubt. The Crown court Compendium provides guidance to Judges in England and Wales. In a trial, the prosecution carries the burden of proof, the jury must come to a verdict, the judge provides guidance via the Compendium. Every party has clear roles and responsibilities it seems at first.

“The direction draws on a formula suggested by Lord Goddard CJ in *Kritz*, which was that the jury “must feel fully satisfied of the guilt of the accused person and should not find a verdict against him unless they feel sure.” The other well-known formula, “proof beyond reasonable Doubt” is time-honoured and appears in many authorities including *Woolmington vs DPP*, when the House of Lords famously laid down the principle that the burden of proof is on the prosecution. When the Crown Court Bench book was introduced, it recommended using “sure”, because of problems juries experienced when trying to understand the concept of “reasonable Doubt” [...] (Paul McKeown, 2022).

It feels worrying that a matter as critical as criminal law uses the concept of “Doubt”/”sure” in its foundational practice without clearly articulated definition. “The standard of proof is to the criminal standard: the prosecution proves its case if the jury, having considered all the evidence relevant to the charge they are considering, are sure that the defendant is guilty”.

Doubt is honoured in its essentiality to decision process and in its intuitive nature. The Crown Court Compendium suggest to the judge, on the condition of the question being raised by the jury. “It is unwise to elaborate on the standard of proof: Ching (supra), although if an advocate has referred to beyond reasonable Doubt, the jury should be told that this means the same thing as being sure.” (Crown Court Compendium, 2023)

But as indicated it causes challenges. Doubt is fragile. “Good” Doubt, meaning generative Doubt, even more so. It is subject to emotions (fear of coming to the wrong verdict), beliefs and experiences (referenced as sympathy) to the decision must be avoided to ensure that the verdict is based on the evidence presented rather than the interpretation of such evidence. “What is required is a clear instruction to the jury that they are satisfied so that they are sure before they can convict”. (Crown Court Compendium, 2023)

This means that the jury ruling relies extensively in the independence of every member of the jury and the process ensures no interference with this arbitration. This is the rationale for providing guidance, rather than rules. This is the reason any attempt to formalise the concept and/or the process to rule is scripted and limited. The only guidance in case with conflicting evidence are presented to the jury, is to “decide how reliable, honest and accurate each witness is.” (Crown Court Compendium, 2023) The jury is also warned against the influence emotions and sympathy hold and ensure that the decision making is as fair as possible. This is a noble yet flawed ask.

The puzzling nature of the practice holds in the customary closing from the judge after hearing the verdict from the Jury... “You are satisfied so, you are sure.” (interview Barrister, 2024)

Criminal law despite failing to provide a definition to Doubt as a concept or a practice, recognise it is paramount to justice “it will be suggested that the issue of “Doubt” should be addressed upfront in the direction on the standard of proof, because it is impossible for the jury to apply “sure” without considering Doubt.” As indicated in the article, Juries received guidance on “*good*” Doubt, relating to real possibilities that may lead to a non-guilty verdict Versus Bad Doubt that should be ignored as they relate to extremely remote possibilities and trivial details. (Paul McKeown, 2022).

We note that for the criminal court the concept of beyond reasonable Doubt means the same as being sure. So, there is a lead to explore the rationale for the equivalence of level of Doubt and certainty.

Doubt is universal

As Chiang indicates in her paper (Chiang and Purdon, 2023) the experience of doubt is universal, highlighting that it transcends the condition (OCD) that she was studying. We invite the reader to a reflexive moment, assessing when was the last time he/she/they doubted. We engage the reader to remember how it felt. We also encourage to remember when a decision was made that did not make sense and was attributed to someone somewhere somehow doubting. Doubt can manifest at every moments of life. Doubt is the experience of being human. Which brings a surprise in organisation studies. If we

What is doubt?

Several explorations of the construct of doubt have been depicted in different fields of research, none of which directly relating to management studies, specifically organisations

- [View in psychology](#)

For psychologists, Doubt observed via a set of attributes and a form of consensus amongst practitioners:

- “doubt is the inability to make decisions because of a lack of certainty or confidence in the information available, both external, as in the sensory inputs, and internal, as in the integration of prior information.” (Chiang, Purdon, 2023).
- “doubt has been understood as a by-product of memory, cognitive, and sensory distrust.” (Chiang, Purdon, 2023).

Doubt is described as an intense experience, which mobilises cognition and can lead to hubris as much as it can motivate action. In his book simply titled *Doubt*, Beattie defines doubt as “Doubt is a lack of confidence or uncertainty about something or someone including the self.” (Beattie, 2023). The word “about” is central to the definition. If there is no alternative possible (existing, realistic or fantasized), there is no doubt. Doubt is a relative experience, at the boundary between the past [ex-ante] and the future [ex-post].

Doubt is grounded in the present; when one is relying on facts and memories of facts (probably blind to such alterations) to predict and pursue the best possible future for the self [current, in progress or aspired], albeit unclear.

Obsessive-compulsive disorder (OCD) has been referred in Psychiatry as the “doubting disease,” yet there has been little foundational research on its phenomenology and characteristics. Studies of Doubt have relied on researchers’ idiosyncratic conceptualizations of the construct, resulting in varied assessment methods and different prevalence rates (11–75%). (Brenda Chiang, Christine Purdon 2023).

When described as “uneasy”, we hypothesise that Doubt is uncomfortable because it forces agent, organisation or field to reconcile and hold overtime a dual reality in harmony. It is the point of time where the future is present. It is the time when the future is now. But It is also the time when the past is present. It is the time when the past is now. This disruption to attention or intuition can either support or block. It is , as if there was a threshold which is possibly correlated with time and self.

The other uncomfortable nature of doubt is also a result of feeling concomitantly Fear (plus all associations) or Hope (plus all associations). This puts an extra appreciation of the etymology of the word doubt itself: Dubitare. Dubius root is Shortened form of duhibius ("held as two"), from duo ("two") + habeo ("have, hold") [this is from word search, gallica does not give any probing manuscript, I will confirm with the librarians]. So, Doubt in its nature holds in the present time two opposite views of the future time, one from the Lense of hope and the other from the Lense of fear, based on memories of the past time. And, its opposite at the same time. Doubt is a paradoxical relative experience.

- View in Management studies

In Organisations studies, the research on doubt is an emerging field. It has at large been ignored a

For Spicer, Doubt has 4 components, one of which he considers prevalent in organisations. For him

Doubt can come in many different forms. One of the most basic include epistemological doubt. This is doubt targeted at what is true. For instance, an engineer who doubts the results which she gets from a measurement instrument is experiencing this kind of doubt. A second kind is ontological doubt. This is doubt about what exists. Ontological doubt is what happens when a physicist starts to doubt the existence of previously assumed particle. Then there is moral doubt. This is doubt about what is good or right. When making a legal judgement about a controversial issue like euthanasia, a judge must confront moral doubt about the correct judgement is to make. Finally, there is practical doubt. This is doubt over what the right course of action is to achieve an agreed upon end. For instance, and entrepreneur may want to grow her company but doubts the best route to go about doing this. This final form of doubt is perhaps the most prevalent form in organisations. (Spicer, 2023)

The concept of doubt is fairly close to, but also distinctive from, some already existing concepts in the study of organisation. Some existing treatments of doubt see it as being composed of sub-concepts like risk, ambiguity and uncertainty (Sherpard et al, 2007: 77).

In summary, according to him doubt can be about

- What is – epistemological
- What is true – ontological

- What is good – Moral
- What should be done – Practical doubt

For Spicer the latter is the one that is most prevalent in organisations. A doubt that is action driven and motivates change.

- A perspective

Looking at our individual experiences and the knowledge built happened in the context of this research itself , when I represented doubt, my axis was on Something, Someone and Self. We believe pertinent to also associate the construct with that of knowledge, preferences and values. Expanding on that, we hypothesize that we look at a situation or a decision intuitively with the grid below. Some of the elements of the grid are holds conscious, in cognition, others unconscious. Some (which may be confirm or infirm with empirical observations and further discovery) are fixed in the sense that they are fed by external inputs like knowledge. It is a Boolean: I know / I don't know. But others can not only be held fixed, they can self-update and more importantly they get explicit by exposure to scenarios and situations. One is always virtuous until faced with the situation. For instance – you would not purposely get someone else fired. But what if you have the choice to keep the individual OR to get an them fired, knowing they are innocent, but you gain something that you truly desire (Promotion, Money etc.). Is the choice that simple? And once the line is crossed then boundaries of what is acceptable to what is not have permanently moved. Below is a grid we suggest to map intuitive assessment used to navigate our decisions:

			OBJECTS		
SOURCES	<i>Part that is threatened / Object that is threatened</i>		Something	Someone	Self
	Certainty	innate			
	Confidence	Knowledge			
		Preferences			
	Conviction	Values			
		Beliefs			
	Motive	Aspirations			

Source - authors

We note that the consideration of doubt also calls for a consideration for sub concepts intuition, confidence, certainty/uncertainty, ambiguity, truth, belief and risk.

Taking Henry Mintzberg's definition an organization is "A collective action in pursuit of a common mission". As per Gergen's description of the social construction of self, we demonstrate that the self is in constant evolution, All aspects of the self are involved. For instance self-actualising is a constant activity. The re-evaluation of beliefs when faced with dilemmas is an example of this fact. Gergen cites "Coulter's work demonstrate the ways in which the self ius continually fashioned and refashioned as conversation unfolds". As a result, organisations are a place and space where identity of its agents are in constant evolution. Which means that that of the organisation and of the field is also in constant evolution.

On the absence of Doubt in Organisations Studies

We doubt because we experience an internal conflict and we need to reconcile such (Elsbach, 1999). The object and the subject of the conflict are equally crucial and can lead to inaction. "it is characterised by diminished confidence, conviction, or certainty in the ability to assimilate the information necessary to come to a decision. " Doubt leads to "error detection, response conflict or reward prediction errors in which outcomes are worse than expected". (Chiang, Purdon, 2023). Doubt, or better put "bad" Doubt which management and organisations have limited concept of so (to date) do not intentionally manage leads to bad decision. It could be a rationale for its avoidance.

Another rationale could be the fact that management studies are based on an object that is technologically advanced but with a classic mindset. This manifested in management being made by engineers. In its origins, organisation theory is made by scientists. There would be limited consideration for unscientific, undesirable matter. The construction of Organisation Theory is made on the alignment of management practices with that of engineering. The organisation is a machine that should perform. People, are the agents of the machine that should perform. So any blocker to performance should be either ignored, managed or removed. Doubt can't be managed in a construct that sanctifies rationality from "its instrumental-technical dimension (Simon, 1957). Doubt cannot be removed as it is at the core of human. So doubt had to be ignored. Until now.

If we take the case of Decision Theory. When conducting a systematic Literature review we can observe 4 periods of decision making/Decision theories, from the moment they started being formalized

A. Decision making – rational

The first phase was rational. When decision making emerged as a discipline, it was about being rational. This phase is potentially associated with the industrial revolution and the reliance on new production methods to achieve better efficiency. It was the era of the machine. Decision making aligned to the necessity of the time. It also made humanity feel safe and in control... basic maslowian needs.

B. Decision making – probabilistic, Bayesian

Then as maturity reached, and industrial revolution became commoditized, our stance on decision making changed. Rationality started showing limitations and shifted to a probabilistic approach.

C. Decision making – behavioural

Then we realized that statistics and probability could not be taken a blanket statement. So, patterns of deviances to the expectation emerged, clustered in heuristics. Heuristics seems to hold the hidden assumptions of existence, even necessity of the norm. A bias only exists in terms relative to a norm. We have been moulded to feel safe in a normative world and defined myself in relation to this norm.

D. Now Decision making – Meta-cognitive

With the emergence of technology but also the inner necessity for society to hold our humanity at its core. We cultivate our unicity, learn to take care of ourselves. And as we get alone together, we can question if the emergence of cognitive decision-making is a vehicle for better unity or better distance in society. What is for certain is that my research seems to fit into that of emerging decision-making disciplines.

One surprising observation from my personal, auto-ethnographic decision-making process, also found in the literature, is that whilst decision making has evolved, at its core always lies an element of rationality. There always seems to be this moment of rational arbitrage between alternatives, albeit rationality centred on the self. The evolution of cognitive and neuroscience interest may prompt the practice and research to evolve, resulting in a consideration for doubt in the organisational decision-making process.

Towards organisational doubt

Using empirical observations in organisations, we can recommend the research of several manifestations of doubt which could assist in progressing the collective knowledge on Doubt:

- Doubt to discern good from bad. For instance, future research could look at the question of dilemmas, exploring the fallibility of the self, and the expressions of morality in organisation. In disclosing values to the self, it is again the boundary of the self to others that is in question. The matter of identity emerges.
- Doubt to build legitimacy. For instance, future research of the theory of legitimacy from the perspective of doubt and its manifestations in the organisation could provide great value. The joint boundary between the self and others shows the constant constantly trade-offs, negotiations, navigating between their

personal beliefs and those of the Group Organization. Success and legitimacy are defined by adherence to the norm. All it takes is to observe dress codes in during rush hours. The matter of compliance emerges.

- Doubt to build expertise. For instance future research in the innovation process, could show that doubt a generative force is shadowed by the discovery. The abductive process, which is so difficult to show in flow is key to creativity. The matter of tacit knowledge emerge.

In all matters describe, doubt as a tension to navigate the boundary between the self and the organisation is a new, unexploited source of power in organisation. Its applications are multiple. Its presence universally shared yet specifically individually experienced.

According to Mintzberg, “we are born in organizations and are educated in organizations so that we can later work in organizations”. (Mintzberg, 1989). As we established that Doubt is universal, and individual to each agents, a question arise on the state of the research on organisational Doubt. The few researcher that have considered the question of doubt in management studies and specifically in organisation theory (Kramer 2007; Locke et al., 2008, Spicer, 2021) align. They all found the surprising absence of theory of doubt in organisations along with the crucial need for it.

Doubt is an organisation, managerial, strength that if mobilised well, ritualised could support management practices. Hence the question what is the function of doubt in organisation. A call for research grounded theory to define organisational doubt, the boundaries of self to the organisation in all of its aspects people, structure, culture, controls words.

More than a call for more research it is a call to live differently. And it starts with us researchers. We have a responsibility to put light on this so that maybe practices can be revisited and maybe achieve social justice, and maybe one day grace. Maybe find in accepting doubt in organisations we can run to whom we truly are as wisely advised by Aslan, in the movie.

References

- Alcoholics Anonymous World Services, Inc. (2001). *Alcoholics Anonymous* (4th ed.). New York: Alcoholics Anonymous World Services, Inc
- Alvesson, M. and Spicer, A. (2012) 'A Stupidity-Based Theory of Organizations', *Journal of Management Studies*, 49(7), pp. 1188–1220.
- Apted, M. (2010) *The Chronicles of Narnia: The Voyage of the Dawn Treader*. [Film] Walden Media and 20th Century Fox.
- Chiang, B. and Purdon, C. (2023) 'A study of doubt in obsessive-compulsive disorder', *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry*, 80, p. 101753.
- Clegg, S. R. (1989) *Frameworks of Power*. London: Sage.
- Elsbach, K. D. (1999) 'An expanded model of organizational identification', *Organization Science*, 10(5), pp. 526–540. ¹ doi:10.1287/orsc.10.5.526.
- Foucault, M. (1970) *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Gergen, K. J. (1991) *The saturated self: dilemmas of identity in contemporary life*. ¹ New York: BasicBooks.
- Kramer, E. H. (2007). *Grounded theory, army units and dealing with dynamic complexity* (Vol. 22). Copenhagen Business School Press DK.
- Kramer, R. M. (1998). Paranoid cognition in social systems : Thinking and acting in the shadow of doubt . *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2(4), 251-275.
- Krause, N. and Ellison, C. G. (2010) 'The Doubting Process: A Longitudinal Study of the Precipitants and Consequences of Religious Doubt', *Journal of Social Issues*, 66(1), pp. 104–122.
- Langley, A., Mintzberg, H., Pitcher, P., Posada, E. and Saint-Macary, J. (1995) 'Opening Up Decision Making: The View From the Black Stool', *Organization Science* , 6(3), pp. 260–279.
- Lewis, C.S. (1951) *Prince Caspian: The Return to Narnia*. London: Geoffrey Bles.
- Locke, K., Golden-Biddle, K. and Feldman, M. S. (2008) 'Making Doubt Generative: Rethinking the Role of Doubt in the Research Process', *Organization Science*, 19(6), ¹ pp. 907–918.
- McGrath, A.E. (2013) *The Intellectual World of C.S. Lewis*. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Mele, A.R. (1987) 'Self-control in action', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 65(3), pp. 293-310.
- Mintzberg, H. (1979) *The Structuring of Organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Mintzberg, H. (1989) *Mintzberg on Management: Inside Our Strange World of Organizations*. New York: Free Press.
- Saïd Business School, University of Oxford. (2023). *The CEO Report: Embracing the Paradoxes of Leadership and the Power of Doubt*. Oxford: Saïd Business School.
- Sinyard, D. B. and Loch, K. D. (2013) 'The Investment Process of Private Equity Firms: How does the Affect Heuristic Impact Decision-making?', *SSRN Electronic Journal*
- Spicer, A. (2021). *Doubt and organizations*. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3842137>
- The Bible: New International Version (2011) Grand Rapids, MI: Zondervan.