

## Research on Factors Influencing Intelligence Intervention in Decision Error Prevention: A Postprint of Qualitative Analysis Based on Nvivo 11

**Authors:** Hu Yaping, Liu Qianli, He Juxiang

**Date:** 2023-07-26T00:00:00+00:00

### Abstract

[Purpose/Significance] Decision-making is inseparable from intelligence. Exploring the participation and involvement of intelligence work in the decision-making process holds practical significance for conducting scientific decision-making and avoiding decision-making failures. [Method/Process] This study adopts a grounded theory approach, collecting relevant data through semi-structured interviews with 14 decision-makers from enterprises and government departments, as well as personnel with practical experience in intelligence research. By utilizing the three-level coding technique of the qualitative analysis software NVivo 11, it analyzes and induces a theoretical model of factors influencing intelligence involvement in the decision-making process. [Results/Conclusion] The factors influencing intelligence involvement in the decision-making process encompass four dimensions: intelligence attitude, management systems, intelligence culture, and intelligence factors. Countermeasures and recommendations are proposed from the perspectives of promotion and dissemination, mechanism construction, and intelligence business processes.

### Full Text

#### Preamble

Vol. 63 No. 11, June 2019  
ChinaXiv Partner Journal

#### Research on Influencing Factors of Intelligence Intervention in Decision Failure Prevention: A Qualitative Analysis Based on Nvivo11

Hu Yaping<sup>1</sup>, Liu Qianli<sup>2</sup>, He Juxiang<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Population Research Institute, Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Nanjing 210042

<sup>2</sup>School of Information Management, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093

<sup>3</sup>Library of Southeast University, Nanjing 211189

## Abstract

**[Purpose/Significance]** Decision-making is inseparable from intelligence. Exploring the participation and intervention of intelligence work in the decision-making process holds practical significance for making scientific decisions and avoiding decision failures. **[Method/Process]** This study employs grounded theory methodology, collecting relevant data through semi-structured interviews with 14 decision-makers from enterprises and government departments, as well as personnel with practical experience in intelligence research. Using the three-level coding technique of the qualitative analysis software NVivo11, the study analyzes and induces a theoretical model of the influencing factors of intelligence intervention in the decision-making process. **[Result/Conclusion]** The factors affecting intelligence intervention in decision-making include four aspects: intelligence attitude, management system, intelligence culture, and intelligence factors. The paper proposes countermeasures from the perspectives of dissemination, mechanism construction, and intelligence business processes.

**Classification Number:** G250

**Keywords:** decision failure; intelligence intervention; influencing factors; qualitative analysis; Nvivo11

**DOI:** 10.13266/j.issn.0252-3116.2019.11.009

With the trend of globalization and the vigorous development of information technology, the decision-making environment faced by decision-makers has undergone fundamental changes. Decision-makers must confront rapidly changing competitive landscapes, complex interest relationships, and massive amounts of information, making decision-making work increasingly complex and diversified. Against this backdrop, intelligence work becomes particularly important. The renowned ancient Chinese military strategist Sun Tzu eloquently articulated the importance of intelligence for decision-making, viewing intelligence as a judgment and insight into the laws and essence of things—a form of “foreknowledge.” However, intelligence does not always play its due role and function in all decision-making processes. From numerous cases of decision failure, it is not difficult to find that decisions often lack effective and objective intelligence, implementation lacks tracking and feedback from intelligence work, and evaluation neglects the summarization of failure experiences and lacks post-hoc intelligence assessment and improvement—all of which have brought painful costs to organizations. So what factors influence intelligence’s ability to intervene in the decision-making process and thus lose its decision-support function? To explore these questions and examine the actual situations faced by intelligence intervention in the decision-making process, this paper adopts the perspective of decision failure and uses qualitative research methods to deeply explore and discuss the factors affecting intelligence intervention in decision chain links.

## 1. Overview of Research on Decision Failure and Intelligence Roles

Decision-making is a complex activity influenced by multiple factors including environment, subject, object, and resources. Research on decision failure can be summarized into three aspects: First, the attribution of failure to decision-making uncertainty. As early as the 18th century, B. Pascal and P. Fermat explored uncertainty from an economic perspective and proposed expected theory for decision-making under uncertain conditions. L. Savage proposed expected utility theory, applying mathematical algorithms to study decision uncertainty and using subjective probability to replace objective probability, improving the maximum expected utility theory proposed by O. Morgenstern. Second, failure stems from the bounded rationality of decision-makers. H. Simon believed that “bounded rationality is a theory that limits decision-makers’ information processing capabilities” and elaborated on how information limitations affect decision-making. Bounded rationality theory reveals the objectivity of failure occurrence, while cognitive bias theory and attribution theory in psychology further explore the patterns of failure. These theories not only investigate the connotation of decision-making but also lay the foundation for exploring decision failure from the perspective of information science. Third, research on the roots of decision failure is manifested in finding methods and establishing rules, including reflecting on and holding accountable for failure consequences, analyzing existing legal systems and practical approaches, and proposing the establishment of decision failure evaluation and accountability mechanisms and improving decision-making systems.

Research on the role of intelligence in decision-making shows that compared with the tightly integrated “trinity” decision intelligence support system among political, academic, and industrial circles in the United States and Japan’s national policy of “intelligence-based nation-building,” China’s reality often manifests as decision-makers not receiving timely and useful information during policy formulation, lacking continuous tracking and timely feedback from intelligence work during implementation, and lacking objective intelligence reflecting actual conditions and research to prevent continued failures during evaluation. Yet this “failure research” constitutes an important part of intelligence research in many developed countries. In the 1990s, China witnessed extensive research on intelligence support for decision-making, but these studies focused on “on-demand service” for policy formulation, aiming to satisfy resource support with literature resource supply and sharing as research characteristics. With the demand for scientific decision-making in the new era and the rapid development of big data technology, more responsibilities have been entrusted to information science and intelligence work. Therefore, scholars have recently advocated for the return of information science to its origins. Bao Changhuo believes that the research focus of information science should shift to China’s social transformation and work practices, allowing intelligence work to return to its strategic positioning as the “eyes, ears, and staff” for decision-making support. Su Xin-

ning believes that big data has brought opportunities for the development of information science, which should undertake historical missions and social responsibilities under national security and development, becoming the vanguard “guiding” science and technology.

In research on intelligence intervention in decision failure prevention, scholars believe that to play the role of intelligence support, intelligence must intervene in the decision-making process. For example, Lu Zhang pointed out in discussing scientific decision-making and intelligence work that only through continuous deepening and intervention in scientific activities can intelligence work play a role in supporting the scientific activity process. Gao Jinhua pioneered intelligence failure research through case studies, exploring the interactive role between intelligence and decision-making, believing that intelligence judgment has an important impact on diplomatic and strategic decisions and that intelligence and decision-making have an interactive relationship. Shen Guchao pointed out in studying intelligence failure that “intelligence work should intervene in the introduction of major decisions or the handling of potential crises,” and proposed that “intelligence should not only serve decision-making (policymaking) but also add two new tasks—serving policy implementation and exercising supervisory functions, conducting full-process ‘intelligence intervention’ for all policy chain links.” This study draws on previous scholars’ research on decision failure and intelligence roles, believing that the primary condition for preventing decision failure is that intelligence must intervene in the decision-making process and continuously deepen as the decision chain progresses, playing a role in support, control, and supervision throughout the entire process of decision-making, implementation, and evaluation (see Figure 1 [Figure 1: see original paper]). The intelligence cycle chain and decision chain are organically integrated. Therefore, this study selects 14 decision-makers as research subjects, uses grounded theory research methods, conducts retrospective reflection on their decision failure experiences, examines the real situations of intelligence intervention during failed decisions and the factors affecting decision intervention, with the aim of constructing a conceptual model of influencing factors for intelligence intervention in decision-making.

## 2. Interview Design Based on Grounded Theory

### 2.1 Methodology Selection

Grounded theory is widely applied in multiple fields of social science in China, emphasizing systematic collection and analysis of empirical facts and theoretical abstraction based on empirical facts. It consists of four steps: problem definition, data collection, data analysis and coding, and theoretical model construction. This paper strictly follows these research steps. First, it clarifies the main questions to be understood during the investigation: What is the current status of decision-intelligence integration? In decision failure situations, what factors affect intelligence intervention or integration into decision chain links? On this basis, through data collection, a questionnaire is compiled, and through expert

interviews in information science, the semi-structured questionnaire is comprehensively evaluated from three aspects—descriptive validity, explanatory validity, and theoretical validity—before being finalized to obtain first-hand data for coding analysis.

## 2.2 Sample Selection

Based on purposive sampling methods, this study selects samples with maximum information representation. The purpose of in-depth interviews is to study decision-makers' cognitive levels of intelligence, intelligence intervention at various stages of decision-making (how to apply intelligence), and what factors affect intelligence intervention in the decision-making process, thereby further affecting intelligence's supportive role. Therefore, interviewees are divided into two groups: middle and senior managers from enterprises and government departments, and personnel with practical experience in intelligence research. This study selected 14 middle and senior managers with management decision-making experience and decision failure experience from government emergency offices, science and technology bureaus, district united front work departments, consulting companies, foreign-funded enterprises, and private enterprises as exploratory interview subjects. Specific interviewee information is shown in Table 1 .

## 2.3 Data Processing and Coding

This study uses NVivo 11.0 software developed by QSR as an auxiliary analysis tool to collect, analyze, and code interview data. First, colloquial materials from interviewees are retained, and interview recordings are transcribed into documents (including verbal and non-verbal information) and imported into the database. Second, preliminary coding is performed on textual materials, and initial nodes are established through reading and extraction. Finally, according to grounded theory methods, a theoretical model of influencing factors is gradually constructed.

# 3. Influencing Factors of Intelligence Intervention in Decision Failure Prevention

## 3.1 Coding Process

**3.1.1 Open Coding** Open coding is a process of continuous conceptualization and categorization based on original interview data. It involves dismantling, digesting, and reorganizing raw materials through redefinition, summarization, and coding to form initial concepts (A1...An). This study uses NVivo 11 to mark and obtain 55 open coding nodes, including: understanding of intelligence, cognitive ability, personality, degree of importance, etc. Partial open coding results are shown in Table 2 .

**3.1.2 Axial Coding** The different concepts obtained through open coding that dismantles and interprets data may have internal associations. Axial coding builds upon open coding to discover similarities and semantic connections among initial concepts, reorganizing and exploring to construct categorical relationships among initial concepts. This study categorizes the 55 free nodes obtained from NVivo 11 open coding, identifying 9 categories as summarized in Table 3 .

**3.1.3 Selective Coding** Selective coding involves further refining core categories to explain relationships between main categories and other categories, also known as “core coding.” It is the core part of the entire model. All categories form an interrelated organic whole around the core coding, thereby providing theoretical explanations for decision failure phenomena and intelligence support influencing factors. Through repeated reading of the 9 categories, they are gradually refined into 4 more meaningful and conceptualized main categories: intelligence attitude, management system, intelligence culture, and intelligence factors, ultimately forming the core coding of “influencing factors of intelligence intervention in decision failure prevention,” as shown in Table 4 .

## 3.2 Model Construction

As an organic process, theoretical construction is the core part of grounded theory. Based on three-level coding, this study constructs a theoretical framework for influencing factors of intelligence intervention in decision failure prevention. From an intelligence perspective, factors affecting intelligence intervention in the decision-making process can be jointly constituted by subjective factors (intelligence attitude) and objective factors (management system, intelligence culture, intelligence factors) (see Figure 2 [Figure 2: see original paper]). Each influencing factor is described in detail below.

**3.2.1 Intelligence Attitude** As shown in Figure 1, intelligence intervention in decision-making involves two major work processes (decision-making process and intelligence process), both of which cannot be separated from the participating subjects—decision-makers and intelligence personnel. Whether intelligence personnel can provide accurate and timely intelligence and whether decision-makers can correctly understand and adopt intelligence determines whether intelligence can intervene in the decision-making process.

**(1) Decision-makers’ Intelligence Perspective.** Decision-makers need intelligence to assist decision-making. As intelligence users who propose decision-making needs, decision-makers’ attitudes toward intelligence determine the development direction of intelligence work. Gao Jinhua pointed out in studying the U.S. strategic intelligence and decision-making system that decision-makers’ decision-making styles and cognition of intelligence directly affect the operation of the intelligence community and the relationship between intelligence and decision-making. M. Handel analyzed attitudes toward intelligence at the individual level, pointing out that decision-makers’ cognitive dissonance and cogni-

tive closure artificially create barriers to intelligence. Through interviews, it was found that: Personnel from non-related majors still understand “intelligence” at the level of espionage, secrecy, and agent activities, lacking basic cognition of the specific nature of intelligence work and the core skills of intelligence personnel, thus making it impossible to apply intelligence analysis methods to decision support. Decision-makers with different personalities and decision-making styles have different preferences for decision-making methods and steps, thereby affecting the entire process of intelligence participation in policy formulation, implementation, and evaluation. For example, impulsive decision-makers are sensitive to market reactions and have jumping thinking, preferring autonomous and instantaneous decision-making; cautious decision-makers are accustomed to “thinking thrice before acting,” listening to multiple opinions for full demonstration; experienced decision-makers tend to judge complex and uncertain information based on existing experience rather than adopting intelligence personnel’s suggestions. Personnel at different decision-making levels, due to differences in rank and decision-making tasks, have differences in the application and adoption of intelligence information. Senior decision-makers need more advanced, abstract, and targeted intelligence than lower-level decision-makers.

**(2) Intelligence Personnel’s Intelligence Perspective.** With the increasing specialization of decision-making and the complexity of the decision-making environment, decision-makers cannot be familiar with all situations. To avoid decision failure, professional external brains are needed for decision support, making intelligence work particularly important. The practical skills of intelligence personnel are self-evident in their main role in producing and transmitting intelligence products. D. Moore pointed out when evaluating intelligence value that both intelligence processes and intelligence personnel need to be evaluated simultaneously, believing that only when both achieve balance can valuable intelligence be obtained, further reflecting the importance of intelligence personnel capabilities. Through interviews, it was found that when reflecting on failure experiences, decision-makers generally hope to obtain targeted intelligence products that can directly support decision-making and have put forward views and requirements for personnel engaged in decision support work, mainly manifested in four aspects: Intelligence awareness. This emphasizes intelligence personnel’s ability to see the big picture from small details, keenly discover key points from chaotic information, interpret signals, discover risk symptoms, and achieve early warning to avoid decision failure. Attitude toward intelligence work. This is mainly manifested in the understanding of and passion for intelligence work. Regardless of the level of intelligence personnel, the basic requirement is to complete their work excellently. Comprehensive abilities of intelligence personnel. High-quality intelligence products cannot be separated from the precise work of intelligence personnel. In addition to requiring certain individual qualities such as memory, observation, and imagination, intelligence personnel also need professional capabilities in intelligence identification and analysis that require continuous training and improvement. Professional skills in different intelligence processes. Each process in the intelligence cycle is an organically in-

tegrated whole. Only by fully ensuring the precision of intelligence work in each link can high-quality intelligence products be provided. Therefore, intelligence personnel in different process links need vastly different abilities.

**3.2.2 Management System** The management system is a mandatory means to ensure and guarantee that intelligence work can participate in, intervene in, and be integrated into the decision-making process in the form of rules and regulations. Only by establishing and improving the full-process participation mechanism and norms of intelligence in decision-making, promoting the development of intelligence work, reducing human factors in the decision-making process, and avoiding arbitrariness in decision-making can decision failures be reduced. Through in-depth interviews to understand the management system factors affecting intelligence intervention in decision-making in failure situations, they are summarized into two aspects: Organizational decision-making system. The decision-making system is the starting point, foundation, and constraint condition for studying the decision-making process. It determines decision-makers' decision-making methods, the role of intelligence in the decision-making process, and whether intelligence can participate in the entire decision-making process. Organizational work norms. Perfect organizational rules and norms are the link ensuring close connection between decision-making and intelligence work and the foundation for ensuring the smooth implementation of intelligence work. Whether organizational decision-making has good normative systems is the prerequisite for urging organizational members to act according to regulations. Organizational rules and norms ensure the methods of intelligence work and play an important role in clarifying the distance between intelligence and decision-makers and the status of intelligence agencies in the decision-making process (core layer, peripheral layer).

**3.2.3 Intelligence Culture** Intelligence culture elaborates on intelligence work from a cultural perspective. Bao Changhuo believes that the essence of "intelligence culture" is an ideology with intelligence values at its core, including the importance attached to intelligence use, the ideal beliefs and values of sharing intelligence, and behavioral norms. Different cultures have different impacts on decision-making systems and determine how organizations view intelligence work. Intelligence culture is a booster for the smooth development of intelligence work in decision-making. Many decision failures are caused by poor information communication between departments and obstacles in intelligence sharing and transmission. The impact of intelligence culture on intelligence work is long-term and subtle, affecting people's work methods and behavioral habits from the levels of ideology, morality, and belief. Therefore, to achieve intelligence management and coordination, it is necessary to break down protectionism and barriers between units, promote cooperation and exchange between intelligence units, and establish unimpeded communication channels to cultivate a collaborative and win-win intelligence culture. This can be explored from two levels: Intelligence ethics. Due to the confrontational nature of in-

telligence, intelligence collection activities can easily cross ethical boundaries (such as information fraud, using bribery to obtain commercial secrets, infringing intellectual property rights, commercial espionage, etc.). An organization's intelligence ethics determines the moral bottom line and development direction of its intelligence work. Intelligence sharing. Excellent intelligence culture can break down intelligence barriers between organizations, establish good intelligence communication channels, and promote information and intelligence sharing and exchange.

**3.2.4 Intelligence Factors** Intelligence factors analyze the impact of intelligence itself on decision intervention from its own perspective. G. Elder pointed out in studying the relationship between intelligence and decision-making that “the combination of intelligence accuracy and timeliness and leaders’ emphasis on intelligence leads to decision success or victory.” The adoption and application of intelligence by decision-makers is the key to intelligence intervention in decision-making and the manifestation of intelligence’s role in supporting decision-making. Through interviews about the conditions and requirements for adopting intelligence products, the content can be summarized into three aspects: Intelligence products. Interviewees stated that they first consider the effectiveness of intelligence products—whether they meet decision-making needs and are accurate, objective, comprehensive, and easy to use. Second is the delivery format—whether products conform to specifications (length, layout, chart usage) according to different decision-making situations. Finally, the timing of delivery—intelligence officers should fully consider decision-makers’ decision-making styles, personality characteristics, and preferences when delivering intelligence in the final stage, choosing appropriate timing to ensure maximum intervention in the decision-making process. Intelligence process design norms. High-quality intelligence products are closely related to the standardization of intelligence production processes. Each link in the intelligence cycle affects intelligence products. Intelligence agency setup. In real work, intelligence users are the decision-making level. Therefore, it is necessary to explore the setup, functions, status, and effectiveness of intelligence departments in organizational structures. Interviewees indicated that the position of intelligence departments in organizational structures and their distance from the decision-making level directly affect the development of intelligence work and the degree of attention decision-makers pay to intelligence.

### 3.3 Research Validity and Reliability Testing

This study selected 4 interview transcripts for theoretical saturation testing, and the results conformed to the attribution of influencing factors of intelligence support in decision failure prevention, indicating that the coding and model construction in this paper are theoretically saturated. Meanwhile, the triangulation method was adopted, coding data from multiple perspectives and positions for comparison. This study compared the coding results of 3 researchers pairwise, obtaining coefficients of 95%, 94%, and 90% through NVivo 11.0 software test-

ing, proving that the model is stable and has good validity.

#### 4. Research Conclusions and Implications

Decision-making is a chain-like series process. Previous research on decision failure has mostly focused on case analysis, concentrating on measuring and analyzing a time segment or point, lacking tracking and research on the entire failure decision process. This study selects the grounded theory research method that focuses on dynamics, processes, and induction. By sorting out and reviewing decision-makers' failure experiences, it can deeply explore the factors that prevent intelligence from intervening in the decision-making process. Meanwhile, since "failure" is often a sensitive topic that people avoid discussing, and decision-makers are more willing to talk about successful experiences than failures, using grounded theory combined with in-depth interviews to observe interviewees' tone, expression, movements, and other non-verbal information has positive significance for obtaining more authentic content. The interviews lay a theoretical foundation for large-scale questionnaire surveys in later stages and provide ideas for further refining decision failure situation construction and creating intelligence support paths. The influencing factors summarized in this study also provide implications for enhancing intelligence participation in decision-making.

**(1) Strengthen the dissemination and promotion of intelligence's leading and exemplary role in the new era, and build a harmonious intelligence culture.** The promotion of intelligence culture concerns the public's basic cognition and attitude toward intelligence, which is a key factor in understanding intelligence, comprehending the connotation of intelligence work, eliminating espionage fear psychology, and clarifying the relationship between intelligence and decision-making. The enhancement of information science discipline status in the new era is an opportunity and turning point for promoting and constructing intelligence culture, an important moment for returning intelligence to its strategic positioning as "eyes, ears, and staff" for decision-making support, and a critical moment for playing intelligence's "leading" role in the implementation of major decisions. The cultivation of intelligence culture atmosphere and the popularization of intelligence knowledge cannot be separated from the support of intelligence education and training. Therefore, the discrimination of intelligence concepts, the disciplinary positioning of information science, the scope covered by intelligence work, and the theoretical reconstruction of information science in the big data era have become issues that the information science community must face and clarify. Only by clarifying the "small core" and "big extension" of information science, further enhancing its disciplinary status and discourse power, cultivating excellent intelligence talents, and further interpreting and promoting on the basis of condensing intelligence core values, can we build a harmonious intelligence culture atmosphere, remove the "secret" veil from intelligence, enable more decision-makers to understand the essence and connotation of information science research, and make optimal

decisions with the help of high-quality intelligence products.

**(2) Construct an intelligence intervention mechanism from the decision chain perspective to enhance intelligence intervention in decision-making, implementation, and evaluation processes.** To play the role of intelligence in decision-making support, institutional construction is an indispensable key factor. For intelligence to intervene and play a role in the decision-making process, decision-making subjects need to provide a good external environment. The decision-making mechanism needs to further strengthen openness and transparency, and use institutional norms to strengthen the decision-making participation of intelligence departments. Only after adopting mandatory measures will intelligence intervention in the decision-making process no longer be subject to personal will or decision-makers' intelligence preferences, promoting intelligence to serve decision-making rather than decision-makers. Constructing an intelligence intervention mechanism from the decision chain perspective by embedding the intelligence chain into decision chain links can promote the ultimate coordination of various factors. Specifically: In the decision-making stage, emphasize intelligence work's "leading" role, play its professionalism and independence, and be able to timely block and correct biased decision intentions rather than "accommodating" arguments; In the implementation stage, improve the error correction and feedback mechanism in execution, continuously collect and discover signals released during execution through intelligence work, supervise and correct decision implementation that deviates from established goals in a timely manner, and improve decisions through supplementation and modification to promote correct development of decision results; In the evaluation stage, strengthen the intelligence evaluation system, conduct critical thinking and reflection on execution results, and provide experience for the next decision-making.

**(3) Enhance intelligence business capabilities in all links to strengthen the decision-making influence of intelligence products.** Intelligence intervention in decision-making is a manifestation of intelligence's explicit influence and a prerequisite for intelligence to support decision-making. In addition to intelligence culture construction and institutional guarantees, factors that promote strong intelligence influence also require continuous enhancement of intelligence business capabilities. Through interviews, it was found that decision-makers are most concerned about whether intelligence can reduce environmental uncertainty, assist decision-making, and avoid failure. These depend on high-quality intelligence products, and the quality of intelligence products ultimately depends on the wisdom contribution of every participant in the intelligence chain. Therefore, attention needs to be paid to the management and control of each link in the intelligence business process to enhance the effectiveness of intelligence products and promote decision-makers to adopt intelligence personnel's suggestions. In the collection stage, focus on signal collection, weak signal identification, and all-source intelligence utilization, establishing an all-source monitoring perspective; In the analysis stage, apply multiple intelligence analysis methods and techniques to avoid analysts' mirror thinking and cogni-

tive biases; In the transmission stage, focus on constructing efficient feedback communication channels and enhancing intelligence personnel's communication skills.

Future research will conduct large-scale questionnaire surveys, applying mathematical statistical analysis to examine the degree and effect of each influencing factor on the path of intelligence intervention, using quantitative research to improve this research topic.

## References

- [1] Sun Duoyong. Emergencies and Behavioral Decision-Making[M]. Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2007.
- [2] SAVAGE L. The Foundations of Statistics[M]. New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1954.
- [3] Simon. The New Science of Management Decision[M]. Translated by Li Zhuliu, Tang Juncheng. Beijing: China Social Sciences Press, 1982.
- [4] NUTT P. Why Decisions Fail: Avoiding the Blunders and Traps That Lead to Debacles[M]. Translated by Liu Yinlong. Beijing: Xinhua Publishing House, 2004.
- [5] FITZGERALD M, LEBOW R. Iraq: The Mother of All Intelligence Failures[J]. Intelligence and National Security, 2006, 21(5): 884-909.
- [6] Robbins. The Traps of Decision-Making[M]. Translated by Yuan Rutao. Changchun: Jilin Literature and History Press, 2004.
- [7] Bao Changhuo, Liu Yanjun, Zhang Jing, et al. An Outline of Chinese Information Science[J]. Journal of Intelligence, 2018, 37(1): 1-8.
- [8] Su Xinning. The Return of Information Science and Intelligence Work in the Big Data Era[J]. Journal of the China Society for Scientific and Technical Information, 2017, 36(4): 331-337.
- [9] Lu Zhang. Reflections on Intelligence Work in Military Industry Enterprises[J]. Information Studies: Theory & Application, 1988(6): 10-12.
- [10] Gao Jinhua. Major Mistakes: Mysteries of Major Intelligence Operations in the 20th Century[M]. Nanjing: Jiangsu People's Publishing House, 1998.
- [11] Shen Guchao. Intelligence Failure: An Important Topic in Western Intelligence Research and Its Implications for Us[J]. Library and Information Service, 2009, 53(2): 34-37.
- [12] Hu Yaping, Shen Guchao. From "Intelligence Service" to "Intelligence Intervention": Some Thoughts on the Role of Intelligence from the Perspective of Decision Failure[J]. Journal of the China Society for Scientific and Technical Information, 2017, 36(11): 1130-1138.
- [13] Chen Xiangming. Qualitative Research Methods in Social Sciences[M]. Beijing: Educational Science Publishing House, 2000.
- [14] Liu Qiang. Intelligence Work and National Survival and Development[M]. Beijing: Current Affairs Press, 2014.
- [15] Gao Jinhua. Research on U.S. Strategic Intelligence and Decision-Making System[M]. Xi'an: Shaanxi Normal University Press, 1996.

- [16] HANDEL M. Leaders and Intelligence[M]. London: Frank Cass Publishers, 1989.
- [17] MOORE D. Evaluating Intelligence: A Competency-Based Model[J]. International Journal of Intelligence and CounterIntelligence, 2005, 18(2): 204-220.
- [18] Zhong Kaibin. Emergency Decision-Making: Theory and Cases[M]. Beijing: Social Sciences Academic Press, 2014.
- [19] Zhou Guanghui. The Formation and Transformation of Contemporary China's Decision-Making System[J]. Social Sciences in China, 2011(3): 101-120.
- [20] Bao Changhuo, Zhang Yan, Huang Ying. The Rise and Development of Competitive Intelligence[C]//Advances in Information Science (Vol. 5). Beijing: National Defense Industry Press, 2003: 360-362.
- [21] Liu Minrong. Competitive Intelligence Practice[M]. Fuzhou: Fujian Science and Technology Publishing House, 2008.
- [22] ELDER G. Intelligence in the War: It Can Be Decision[J]. Studies in Intelligence, 2006, 50(2): 32-36.

## Author Contributions

Hu Yaping: Responsible for topic selection, structural design, and paper writing;  
Liu Qianli: Assisted with investigation, data analysis, and paper revision;  
He Juxiang: Participated in data collection and statistical analysis.

---

## Influencing Factors of Intelligence Intervention in the Prevention of Decision Failure — Qualitative Analysis Based on Nvivo11

Hu Yaping<sup>1</sup>, Liu Qianli<sup>2</sup>, He Juxiang<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Population Research Institute, Nanjing University of Posts and Telecommunications, Nanjing 210042, China

<sup>2</sup>Department of Information Management, Nanjing University, Nanjing 210093, China

<sup>3</sup>Library of Southeast University, Nanjing 211189, China

**Abstract:** [Purpose/significance] Decision-making is inseparable from intelligence. Exploring the participation and intervention of intelligence work in the decision-making process is meaningful for scientific decision-making and avoiding decision failure. [Method/process] Using semi-structured interviews, this paper collects data from 14 decision-makers from enterprises and government departments and people with experience in intelligence research. Through the application of grounded theory research method and the qualitative analysis software Nvivo11, this paper constructs the theoretical model of influencing factors of intelligence intervention in the prevention of decision failure. [Result/conclusion] The study finds that factors affecting intelligence intervention in the decision-making process include intelligence attitude, management system, intelligence culture, and intelligence factors. Finally, it gives countermeasures and suggestions from the perspectives of promotion and dissemination, mechanism construction, and intelligence business processes.

**Keywords:** decision failure; intelligence intervention; influencing factor; qualitative analysis; Nvivo11

*Note: Figure translations are in progress. See original paper for figures.*

*Source: ChinaXiv — Machine translation. Verify with original.*