ICFAI UNIVERSITY NAGALAND

IUN Research Journal

Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal

Volume 1, Issue III (July 2026)
Page no. 17-27

Leadership Entropy and Decision-Making Deceleration in Scaling Organisations

Nitinn Sagarr
Strategic HR and Transformation Leader
Certified Independent Director (IICA)

Abstract

Organisational growth is conventionally associated with enhanced capability, improved systems, and superior managerial control. This narrative suggests that as an enterprise scales its operations, market presence, and human capital, its decision-making should become more informed, efficient, and rapid. However, empirical observation across diverse industries—including manufacturing, construction, information technology, gems and jewellery, and human resource strategy—suggests a paradoxical outcome: as organisations scale, decision-making velocity often undergoes a systemic deceleration. This paper undertakes a critical enquiry into this pervasive phenomenon through the conceptual lens of *Leadership Entropy*. Leadership Entropy describes the cumulative, invisible structural, procedural, and behavioural decay that emerges in expanding organisations, eroding their capacity for timely action. The study draws on qualitative interviews with senior leaders across multiple industries, interrogating the mechanisms by which decision velocity deteriorates despite simultaneous investments in talent acquisition, digital technology, and formal governance.The paper advances the Leadership Entropy Model (LEM) as an integrative theoretical construct. This model synthesises insights from foundational theories in organisation studies: organisational inertia, bureaucracy theory, information-processing theory, behavioural decision-making, and systems entropy. Six principal drivers of leadership entropy are examined: structural overload, excessive hierarchical layers, information decay, diffused accountability, process friction, and risk-averse leadership behaviour. Rather than treating organisational slowdown as an episodic crisis or individual failure, this study conceptualises entropy as a cumulative process of decay embedded within the structures designed to manage scale. The paper contributes to leadership literature by reframing decision velocity as a designable strategic variable and offering a unified framework for diagnosis and intervention.

Keywords: *Leadership Entropy, Decision Velocity, Organisational Complexity, Bureaucratic Inertia, Accountability Structures*

1. Introduction

Contemporary organisations navigate operational and strategic environments characterised by extreme volatility, uncertainty, complexity, and ambiguity (VUCA). Accelerated technological change, intricate global supply chains, heightened regulatory oversight, and rising stakeholder expectations collectively intensify the demands placed on organisational leadership. Within this hyper-dynamic context, the pursuit of scale is treated as a core strategic imperative to secure market dominance, achieve economies of scale, and ensure long-term financial sustainability. Growth is treated as both an unmistakable signal and a vital source of organisational strength. Yet, despite this optimistic framework, empirical realities reveal a recurring paradox: as organisations successfully scale, they frequently experience a pronounced slowdown in decision-making speed and quality. Strategic and operational decisions that were once executed swiftly within founder-led or early-stage enterprises become progressively encumbered. This slowdown manifests through prolonged deliberation cycles, redundant approval layers, extensive documentation, and escalated risk reviews. Crucially, this deceleration persists even after making substantial investments in professional management teams, enterprise digital systems (such as ERP and CRM), and formal governance frameworks. This contradiction between increased resources and reduced decision velocity raises fundamental questions about how leadership systems function at scale.

Prevailing literature often attempts to explain decision delays through narrow, siloed lenses, such as individual skill deficits, isolated inefficient processes, or misaligned incentives. While these explanations offer localized insight, they individualise what is, at its core, a systemic architectural phenomenon. By focusing disproportionately on discrete failures, such approaches overlook the cumulative, interconnected forces that erode organisational responsiveness. This paper posits that decision-making deceleration in scaling organisations cannot be adequately diagnosed or corrected without deeply engaging with the concept of organisational entropy.

Entropy, originally formulated in classical thermodynamics, denotes the irreversible tendency of closed systems to move spontaneously toward a state of disorder and stasis unless a sustained external energy input is applied. When applied to complex social systems, entropy manifests not as sudden chaos, but as the progressive degradation of core organisational properties: clarity of purpose, accountability, information accuracy, and procedural efficiency. Paradoxically, many leadership decisions that appear rational in isolation—such as adding financial controls, hierarchical layers, or formal processes—collectively generate greater long-

term friction. This study introduces the concept of Leadership Entropy to capture the managerial, structural, and behavioural dimensions of this systemic decay.

The defining purpose of this paper is to undertake a systematic enquiry into the mechanisms of leadership entropy and establish its causal role in decision-making deceleration. Drawing on qualitative insights gathered across multiple industries and synthesising established organisational theories, the paper advances the Leadership Entropy Model (LEM) as a robust analytical framework to interrogate architectural flaws rather than merely blaming individual performance.

2. Conceptual Background: Entropy and Organisations

The notion of entropy finds its intellectual origin in classical thermodynamics, describing the universal, irreversible tendency of closed physical systems toward maximum disorder, minimum differentiation, and equilibrium. Claude Shannon later extended the concept to information theory, defining entropy as the measure of uncertainty, loss, or distortion inherent in a communication system. This conceptual transfer provided a powerful metaphor for examining loss and uncertainty in social systems.

Organisational theorists have adapted entropy to explain decay, rigidity, the ossification of routines, and the loss of adaptive capacity within complex social systems. Katz and Kahn, pioneers in the open systems approach, conceptualised organisations as dynamic systems requiring continuous energetic inputs—such as proactive leadership attention, accurate information, and effective incentives—to resist inevitable entropic decline [1]. Without these continuous inputs, routines ossify into unthinking rituals, communication channels degrade into noise, and the core purpose of the organisation dissipates. In complex enterprises, entropy accumulates gradually through incremental, seemingly rational additions of structure and control mechanisms.

Leadership entropy, as defined in this paper, refers specifically to the progressive accumulation of decision-inhibiting forces generated by leadership choices and organisational design architecture. Unlike simple technical inefficiency, leadership entropy is embedded in formal authority structures, prevailing behavioural norms, and risk perceptions. It is therefore less visible, frequently normalised as "the cost of scale," and highly resistant to conventional interventions like basic process re-engineering or personnel changes.

3. Literature Review: Foundations for the Leadership Entropy Model

The phenomenon of organisational slowdown has been examined across diverse theoretical traditions, including organisational ecology, bureaucracy theory, information-processing theory, and behavioural decision-making. Crucially, these distinct intellectual strands have largely evolved in parallel, offering fragmented explanations. This section synthesises these foundational literatures to establish the underpinnings of the proposed Leadership Entropy Model.

3.1 Organisational Inertia and Structural Complexity

Organisational inertia theory, prominently associated with Hannan and Freeman, posits that as organisations mature and scale, they develop stable, self-reinforcing patterns of structure and behaviour that resist fundamental change [2]. This inertia emerges directly from the formalisation of routines, roles, and rigid hierarchies—mechanisms initially designed to ensure reliability and accountability. While these structural features enhance predictability, they systematically reduce adaptability in high-velocity environments, representing an inherent trade-off between stability and responsiveness.

Subsequent scholarship provides a more nuanced understanding by distinguishing between specific forms of rigidity. Gilbert differentiates between *resource rigidity* (the failure to reallocate financial and human assets effectively) and *routine rigidity* (the stubborn persistence of entrenched practices despite environmental shifts) [3]. In rapidly scaling organisations, routine rigidity is exceptionally salient; complex decision pathways become institutionalised, manualised, and insulated from critical scrutiny.

Structural complexity inherently amplifies this inertia. As organisations expand their functional scope, product lines, or geographical footprint, they add new layers and specialized departments to manage coordination. Puranam observes that while such architectural differentiation may be operationally necessary, it dramatically increases the information-processing requirements of the entire system [4]. When coordination demands exceed processing capacity, systemic decision delays and communication errors become normalised, often rationalised internally as unavoidable consequences of scale.

3.2 Bureaucracy and Process Formalisation

Max Weber's classical formulation of bureaucracy identified formal rules, clear hierarchical authority, and impersonality as rational mechanisms for achieving technical efficiency, fairness,

and predictability [5]. Over time, however, scholars have documented the debilitating consequences of excessive bureaucratisation. Robert Merton noted that rigid adherence to rules could result in *goal displacement*, where the means (the rule) supplants the original organisational end (the goal) [6].

Contemporary organisations expand bureaucratic controls primarily in response to external regulatory pressure, compliance demands, and internal financial audit pressures. Every additional process or mandatory approval is internally justified as a safeguard against risk, yet collectively these mechanisms generate overwhelming procedural congestion. Gary Hamel characterises modern bureaucracy as a "tax on human initiative," arguing that the proliferation of excessive control systematically suppresses sound managerial judgement and catastrophically slows down execution [7]. Bureaucracy, when allowed to metastasise, becomes a primary contributor to leadership entropy by substituting compliance for decisive action.

3.3 Information Processing and Communication Decay

Information-processing theory provides insight into how organisational structures influence the quality and speed of decision-making. Jay Galbraith contended that organisations must constantly align their information-processing capacity with the uncertainty and turbulence of their environment [8]. While formal hierarchies are necessary for oversight, they systematically distort and filter critical information as messages pass sequentially through multiple levels.

Daft and Lengel's media richness theory demonstrates that complex, ambiguous, or equivocal information requires "rich" communication channels (e.g., face-to-face dialogue) to ensure accurate conveyance [9]. However, rapidly scaling organisations frequently over-rely on standardised reports, centralized dashboards, and structured digital communications. While seeking efficiency, these media strip away vital nuance, context, and equivocal detail. Eisenhardt's research on high-velocity environments illustrates that timely, accurate information is an absolute prerequisite for fast strategic choices [10]. When information decays through aggressive filtering or over-simplification, leaders hesitate, delay, and seek further verification, causing decision paralysis.

3.4 Behavioural Decision-Making and Cognitive Load

Behavioural theories challenge the assumption of perfectly rational decision-making by highlighting the innate cognitive limitations of human actors. Herbert Simon's concept of *bounded rationality* underscores that decision-makers operate within immutable constraints of

time scarcity, imperfect information, and limited attention [11]. Daniel Kahneman's dual-process theory explains that under high uncertainty and cognitive load, leaders increasingly rely on cognitive heuristics and conservative, risk-averse judgement, often leading to sub-optimal outcomes [12].

In large organisations, senior leaders are frequently burdened with an overwhelming volume of granular decisions that could be effectively decentralised. Roy Baumeister's work on *decision fatigue* demonstrates that the demands of repetitive decision-making degrade the quality of judgement and increase avoidance behaviours [13]. These behavioral dynamics intensify leadership entropy by encouraging the unnecessary escalation of issues, deliberate delays, and managerial over-control.

3.5 Accountability, Power Diffusion, and Governance

The adoption of matrix, hybrid, and complex networked structures is frequently rationalised as a means to enhance flexibility and cross-functional collaboration. While these designs promise agility, they almost invariably involve the diffusion of clear accountability. Galbraith notes that ambiguous decision rights generate uncertainty regarding ownership and execution responsibility [8]. This ambiguity leads individual actors to instinctively seek consensus or escalate decisions upward to mitigate personal risk.

Empirical research consistently identifies diffused accountability as a major source of executional delay and organizational drag. When decision responsibility is broadly shared or requires a committee consensus rather than being explicitly assigned to a single leader, decisions stall. Leadership entropy arises not merely from geometric structural complexity, but from governance philosophies that systematically prioritise consensus-building and risk-mitigation over clarity and speed.

4. Research Objective and Analytical Lens

The central research problem addressed in this study is the persistent, system-wide decline in decision velocity universally observed in successfully scaling organisations. Rather than simplistically attributing this decline to individual managerial incompetence or isolated process failures, this paper conceptualises it as a predictable architectural phenomenon.

The core objectives of the study are threefold:

1. To define and operationalise leadership entropy as a coherent, diagnostic organisational construct.

2. To identify and examine the principal, reinforcing drivers that collectively contribute to decision-making deceleration.
3. To develop an integrative theoretical model, the Leadership Entropy Model (LEM), linking these entropy drivers to the decline in organisational decision velocity.

The LEM serves as the governing analytical lens through which empirical observations and qualitative insights are systematically integrated into a coherent framework.

5. Methodological Note

This study adopts a focused, qualitative, and interpretive research approach consistent with its critical-theoretical orientation toward interrogating systemic dysfunction. Empirical data were collected through semi-structured, in-depth interviews with fifteen senior executive leaders. This purposive sample was drawn from five distinct sectors experiencing rapid scaling and complexity:

- Electric-vehicle (EV) manufacturing
- Construction and large-scale infrastructure projects
- Information technology (IT) services and product development
- High-value gems and jewellery manufacturing
- Human resource strategy and transformation

The participants included C-suite executives, Chief Operating Officers (COOs), Project Directors, and senior Functional Heads possessing verifiable experience in managing organizational scaling.

The interviews focused on the details of decision processes, the practical function of approval structures, accountability mechanisms, and leadership behaviours during periods of rapid growth. The methodological aim was not statistical generalisation across a large population, but the identification of recurring, cross-sectoral patterns that articulate the dynamics of leadership entropy. Interview data were supplemented and cross-referenced with organisational documents, process maps, and reflective field notes.

In adherence to interpretive research traditions, the accounts provided by these leaders are treated as rich empirical illustrations and context-bound perceptions rather than purely objective representations of reality. This approach allows for a deeper engagement with managerial perception and systemic context—dimensions often obscured in quantitative studies. A recognised limitation is the reliance on retrospective accounts, which may introduce recall bias

or post-rationalisation. However, the high degree of thematic consistency identified across five disparate sectors significantly enhances the analytical robustness of the central findings.

6. The Leadership Entropy Model (LEM)

The Leadership Entropy Model (LEM) conceptualises decision velocity—the speed and quality of organisational choice and execution—as a systemic, emergent outcome. This outcome is shaped by the dynamic interaction of structural, informational, and behavioural forces within the organisation's architecture. Rather than treating decision speed as a function of isolated individual competence, the model situates it within the broader architecture of authority, accountability, and information flow.

As leadership entropy accumulates, the model predicts that decision velocity declines in a non-linear, disproportional manner. This dynamic produces dramatic delays relative to incremental increases in objective organisational complexity (e.g., number of employees or product lines). The LEM identifies six interrelated drivers of leadership entropy, which interact dynamically to create positive feedback loops that intensify organisational slowdown:

Entropy Driver	**Core Architectural Impact**	**Behavioural / Operational Outcome**
6.1 Structural Overload	Outpaces systemic coherence; multiplies coordination vectors exponentially.	Ambiguity over ultimate authority; repeated, time-consuming consultations.
6.2 Excessive Hierarchical Layers	Shifts hierarchy from an enabling mechanism to a structural barrier.	Introduces sequential latency (A→ B → C approvals); extends cycle time.
6.3 Information Decay	Sequential filtering strips away vital nuance, context, and strategic urgency.	Sanitised reports obscure risks; leaders delay decisions to seek parallel verification.
6.4 Diffused Accountability	Ambiguous or distributed decision rights without clear individual ownership.	Individual risk avoidance; excessive consensus-seeking and upward escalation.

Entropy Driver	Core Architectural Impact	Behavioural / Operational Outcome
6.5 Process Friction	Proliferation of redundant formal reviews and rigid procedural requirements.	Controls transition into ritualised obstacles; reinforces structural inertia.
6.6 Risk-Averse Leadership	Punitive or audit-heavy cultures equate extreme caution with competence.	Systematic downward cascade of caution; deep-seated decision paralysis.

Crucially, leadership entropy is cumulative. Early signs of slowdown are frequently misclassified by management as transient "growing pains," an initial misdiagnosis that allows entropic decay to deepen and become architecturally embedded.

7. Discussion: The Invisible Accumulation of Entropy

The critical insight from this enquiry is that leadership entropy accumulates invisibly. Unlike an acute organisational crisis (such as a major product recall or a sudden financial loss), systemic entropy lacks a singular, easily identifiable triggering event. Instead, it subtly emerges through a continuous series of incremental, often seemingly rational, managerial decisions that consistently prioritise control and certainty over clarity and speed.

A central problem is that senior leaders frequently misdiagnose the resulting entropy-driven slowdown, incorrectly attributing it to a transient "capability gap" or an isolated personnel issue. Their typical, reflexive response—the introduction of even more processes, controls, or review layers—inadvertently exacerbates the fundamental problem by intensifying the structural and procedural friction already embedded within the system.

8. Conclusion and Strategic Imperatives

The Leadership Entropy Model (LEM) developed in this paper reframes the persistent decline of decision velocity in scaling organisations. Rather than treating operational delays as episodic crises or isolated failures of individual management talent, the model demonstrates that deceleration is a predictable, systemic manifestation of leadership entropy. As enterprises expand, the very mechanisms designed to ensure control, stability, and risk mitigation—excessive hierarchical layers, dense process formalisation, and matrixed governance structures—

spontaneously generate structural overload, information decay, and diffused accountability. Left unmanaged, these forces shift organizational culture toward risk-averse behavior, institutionalising inertia and stalling execution.

To arrest entropic decay and recover strategic agility, scaling organisations must treat decision velocity as a designable and measurable strategic variable. This requires senior leadership to move away from reflexive bureaucratisation and instead implement three core architectural interventions:

- **Deliberate Decentralisation:** Actively push decision rights down to the lowest possible operational levels, stripping away redundant approval chains and shifting the corporate hierarchy from a restrictive barrier back into an enabling framework.
- **Radical Accountability Ownership:** Replace ambiguous, committee-heavy consensus structures with explicit, single-point accountability frameworks, mitigating the defensive tendency of actors to escalate choices upward to avoid personal risk.
- **Information Streamlining:** Protect the velocity and fidelity of communication channels by reducing reliance on hyper-sanitised, aggregated dashboards, ensuring that critical context and emergent market risks reach decision-makers without strategic decay.

Ultimately, achieving scale does not mandate the sacrifice of agility. By using the LEM as a diagnostic tool, organizational architects can actively audit, identify, and neutralise the hidden friction points of entropy, ensuring that growth genuinely translates into enhanced capability rather than systemic stagnation.

8.1 Directions for Future Research

While this study establishes a robust qualitative foundation for the Leadership Entropy Model across five distinct sectors, future research should focus on operationalising and quantifying the model's core variables. Empirical studies could develop a standardised "Entropy Index" to measure variables like decision cycle times, the ratio of approval layers to employee headcount, and levels of perceived accountability diffusion. Additionally, longitudinal quantitative studies could investigate the precise, non-linear correlation between objective organizational complexity indicators and the resulting rate of decision-making deceleration. Finally, comparative research is needed to evaluate the long-term efficacy of specific anti-entropic interventions—such as agile frameworks or flattened holacracy designs—in sustaining high-velocity execution at a global scale.

References

1. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The Social Psychology of Organizations* (2nd ed.). John Wiley & Sons.
2. Hannan, M. T., & Freeman, J. (1984). Structural Inertia and Organizational Change. *American Sociological Review*, 49(2), 149–164.
3. Gilbert, C. G. (2005). Unbundling Structure: Resource Rigidity and Routine Rigidity in Response to Digital Discontinuity. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(5), 741–763.
4. Puranam, P. (2018). *The Corporate Machine: Designing Organizations for Scaling and Agility*. Oxford University Press.
5. Weber, M. (1947). *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*. (T. Parsons, Ed. & Trans.). Free Press.
6. Merton, R. K. (1940). Bureaucratic Structure and Personality. *Social Forces*, 18(4), 560–568.
7. Hamel, G., & Zanini, M. (2020). *Humanocracy: Creating Organizations as Amazing as the People Inside Them*. Harvard Business Review Press.
8. Galbraith, J. R. (1974). Organization Design: An Information Processing View. *Interfaces*, 4(3), 28–36.
9. Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness and Structural Design. *Management Science*, 32(5), 554–571.
10. Eisenhardt, K. M. (1989). Making Fast Strategic Decisions in High-Velocity Environments. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32(3), 543–576.
11. Simon, H. A. (1997). *Administrative Behavior: A Study of Decision-Making Processes in Administrative Organization* (4th ed.). Free Press.
12. Kahneman, D. (2011). *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
13. Baumeister, R. F., Bratslavsky, E., Muraven, M., & Tice, D. M. (1998). Ego Depletion: Is the Active Self a Limited Resource? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(5), 1252–1265.