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Abstract
The emergence of the Enterprise 2.0 technologies indicates that they can provide value to different types of users and potentially different types of value. Many published research explored what these E2.0 tools and applications can offer to organizations, such as collaboration platforms, social networking and user-created content, enhancing their productivity and management among employees. However, little research was devoted to study the effect these tools and applications have on the decision making process. Decision 2.0 has received little attention in literature, especially from the standpoint of making use of the “crowd”. Therefore, this paper focuses on this research gap with a case study in an attempt to elucidate and extract knowledge to answer this question “How does decision 2.0 make use of the crowd to support the traditional decision making process and hence add value to organizations through collaboration and collective intelligence?”

1. Introduction
Nowadays, within the highly automated information technology, organizations are forced to cope with the new trends in technology to remain competitive [36]. There is no question about how important information is for any organization to function. Especially being within the era of globalization, organizations are in constant search for competitive edges, resulting in more and more complex processes that require better tools to effectively manage these complexities [20].

One of today’s corporations core needs is to improve competitive performance and exploit new business opportunities through fast and efficient decisions before they are adopted and executed by competitors [3]. Accordingly, organizations need to develop and produce a variety of information products, sources and means to meet the changing needs of its decision making processes [29].

Moreover, organizations are facing several challenges in reaching out to both their employees and customers better [5] [25]. The need to deal with each differently while keeping the business activities running smoothly, it becomes essential to weave these diversities into an integrated and collaborative platform to support the organization’s strategy. This is where Enterprise 2.0 (E2.0) importance rises. Thanks to its tools and applications, gathering and sharing information inside and outside companies, locating of expertise and tapping them into collective intelligence for better collaborative decisions is now possible [25].

This paper presents a case study that seeks to elucidate and extract knowledge on the impact of the E2.0 tools and applications on the decision making process within organizations, and their likelihood to add value to organizations. The purpose of this paper is to explore how decision 2.0 makes use of the crowd to support the traditional decision making process and hence add value to organizations through collaboration and collective intelligence.

This paper is organized as follows: The next section discusses the relevant literature that includes an overview on traditional decision making in organizations by referring to the different decision making needs in complex environments and the reason why some of these decisions might cause failures. This section is followed by an overview on the Web 2.0 characteristics and applications, addressing the emergence of E2.0 with a focus on social networks. Thereafter, a core discussion focuses on the collaborative aspect of decision 2.0 clarifies its impact and benefits to organizations, in comparison to the traditional decision making approach. Afterwards, a research gap will be defined.
Subsequently, a case study is conducted to elucidate and extract knowledge to help answer the research questions, followed by the results and discussion. This is followed by a conclusion, some limitations and insights for future research.

2. Theoretical Considerations: Decision Making

In this section, more information regarding definitions, decision structures and types, processes and causes of failures will be provided.

2.1 Decisions in a Complex Context

Decision making has been long considered as an intrinsic aspect of business activities and a critical building block in management [33]. More recently, studies have made it clear that the availability of information, knowledge, and support systems are crucial to handling sound and practical decision making. It allows work to progress smoothly given the available information within the context of any resources and time constraints [40].

Well informed decisions can have far reaching consequences, affecting almost all business aspects. Accordingly, it is assumed that decisions rely on the right information, at the right time, in the right place [38]. However, considering what information might be “right” varies from one decision to the other. Some decisions require only brief information, some require more in-depth investigations and evidence base, some use tacit expertise, while others require creative insight, intuition and judgment [4] [35].

Deciding on what level of information and knowledge is needed when making decisions is a critical organizational responsibility [27].

Decision making situations can sometimes become chaotic. Yet, in fact, they are rather complex. With all the uncertainties, ambiguities and insufficient learning, decision makers are faced with a very challenging task [7].

Decision makers use a number of decisional heuristics and rules to help them with their judgments and guide them to more reliable decisions [7] [29] [38]. However, different decision structures and types may require different decision making approaches.

Traditional managerial decision making approaches might be highly beneficial when structured decisions are needed. Such as deciding on the daily work assignments or scheduling for production [29]. On the other hand, when more complex unstructured decisions are needed, decision makers must be able to successfully pursue both exploration and exploitation [7].

Drawing a range of experiments, researchers have proposed that sticking to linear, analytical approaches when tackling complex and rather unstructured decisions, may sometimes not lead to the desired outcomes [7] [38]. Hence, the development of a new approach and other methods becomes extremely crucial to lead to higher decision-making satisfaction, better judgement, and increase the reliability and predictability of decision outcomes for both organizations and their members [6] [7] [38].

2.2 Managerial Decision Making Process

A set of decision making functions, logically connected, constitute the managerial decision-making process. There are many decision making models, notable among them is Simon’s decision making model [39]. Starting with the intelligence phase, the design phase, the choice phase followed by the implementation phase. A decision implementation is only considered successful when it actually solves its intended problem and fulfills the objectives that were initially set for it [19] [39]. However, it is worth mentioning that in a research accomplished by Paul C. Nutt’s (2002) over 50% of the decisions made by individual decision makers were found to be a failure [6], despite effectively following the decision making process.

2.3 Why Some Decisions May Result in a Failure?

There are several decision traps that might lead to taking the wrong decisions, resulting in less than optimal outcomes. While following traditional decision making processes may streamline decision making, its limitations at some situations might overweight the benefits [6].

Several research efforts highlighted the need for decision makers to expand their frame of references. That is by the exploration of multiple perspectives and viewpoints derived from the involvement of the relevant stakeholders [6] [35].

Following such an approach would allow decision makers to see things from new views, help simplify complex concepts, provide better understanding to the context in which they are operating in and address real world problems and opportunities. Doing so will not only make better decisions but will also avoid the problems that might arise when following
traditionally preferred management styles [6] [18] [35].

Hence, to succeed in businesses today, it becomes essential for organizations to use and encounter new methods and approaches that can support their critical need for successful decision making.

3. Theoretical Considerations: Emergence of Enterprise 2.0

In a highly dynamic world, new stages of technologies and applications are being represented everyday. This section will be addressing Web 2.0, the emergence of E2.0 and their breeding of better innovation, collaboration, communication and decision making within the workplace [22] [26].

3.1 An Introduction to Web 2.0

The term "Web 2.0" was coined in January 1999 by Darcy DiNucci, but in 2003 the term began its rise in popularity when O’Reilly Media and MediaLive hosted the first Web 2.0 conference. However, it is noticeable that there is a lack of consensus on its meaning. Consider the fact that Web 2.0 applications are by large based on user-generated content, which might be anonymous or lacking qualitative credentials, the subject has been found to be controversial [11]. According to Anderson (2007), defining Web 2.0 is not a simple task due to the multilevel character of it. However, Web 2.0 has been mostly defined as a set of economic, social, and technology trends that collectively form the basis for the next generation of the Internet. A more mature, distinctive medium characterized by user participation, openness, and network effects [28]. Based on this definition, Web 2.0 can be seen as an issue combining different aspects of application types, social effects and enabling technologies.

3.2 Characteristics and Applications of Web 2.0

Although Web 2.0 may sometimes confront businesses with new challenges, more and more opportunities and prospects are being presented everyday. Businesses can now stay in touch with their markets, learn about the needs and opinions of their customers as well as better interact with them in a direct and personalized ways [11]. The following is a brief explanation of a number of common Web 2.0 tools.

- **Blogs:** A term introduced by John Barger (1997), short for web logs [16], is now the most well-known and fastest growing of the Web 2.0 applications [1]. Blogs are online journals or diaries hosted on a Web site and often distributed to other sites or readers using RSS [9] [16]. Moreover, having millions of readers, blogs have become very influential sources of information. Additionally, they are sometimes combined with Podcasts or Videocasts [9] [11].
  - **Wiki(s):** Such as Wikipedia, is a webpage or set of web pages for collaborative publishing that facilitates the production of group work [9]. Wikis allow many authors to contribute to an online document or discussion. They can be easily edited by anyone who is allowed access [1].
  - **Social Networks:** Refers to systems that allow members to build personal websites for exchange of personal content, learn about other members’ skills, knowledge, or preferences as well as allow for communication [9] [11]. Commercial examples of social networks include Facebook and LinkedIn. Moreover, some companies their own social networks that used internally within an organization to help identify its experts [9].
  - **Podcasts:** Those are digital audio or video recordings. They are a multimedia form of a blog or other content that can be streamed or downloaded to portable devices, often through content aggregator, such as iTunes [1] [9] [11].
  - **RSS:** Short for Real Simple Syndication or Rich Site Summary, are content aggregators that syndicate and customize online content [1] [11]. RSS allows for online subscription of news, blogs, podcasts, or other information [9].
  - **Mashups:** are aggregations of content from different online sources to create a new service that combines both [9] [11].
  - **Collective Intelligence & Collaboration:** refers to any system that attempts to generate ideas by harnessing the power of the crowd and tapping the expertise of a group rather than an individual to make decisions [1] [11]. Collaborative publishing and common databases are technologies that contribute to collective intelligence and knowledge sharing [9] [10].

3.3 E2.0: how to make it work?

A survey conducted by [9] indicated that the popularity of the Web 2.0 applications is rising among businesses. Throughout their survey, some managers were interviewed, who pointed out that investigating Web 2.0 applications is important for maintaining an organization’s market position, either
by providing it with a competitive edge or by matching its competitors and address its customer demands [9].

E2.0 is a term that refers to an act when smart organizations are embracing Web 2.0 technologies. Several researchers believe that, having E2.0 tools and applications, organizations can now pursue their goals of better collaboration, content creation and overall performance [23] [26].

E2.0 can be seen as social software that enables its stakeholders to connect, meet and collaborate through computer-mediated communication as well as form online communities [18] [26]. Offering digital environments, known as platforms, E2.0 allows all contributions and interactions by the users to be transparent and visible to everyone within the organization until deleted. Moreover, E2.0 is known to be emergent, that is, it contains mechanisms that let the inherent patterns and structures within the stakeholder’s interactions become evident and predictable over time [25] [42].

Unlike previous technologies that have predefined workflows, E2.0 emerged to make a profound shift in organizations [26]. Although most companies nowadays are using several application software like enterprise resource planning (ERP), enterprise content management (ECM), customer relationship management (CRM) and supply chain management (SCM) as agile tools to solve their niche problems, yet alone they might not fully utilize an organization’s workforce abilities and knowledge [10] [23] [25].

While these applications create cross-functional business processes, they allow for minimal flexibility as they include specifically set workflows, roles, responsibilities or interdependencies among the stakeholders that can never be overlooked [23] [26]. However, E2.0, in contrast, entails companies to adopt an opposite approach. E2.0 emphasizes “freeform”, that is, it does not predefine workflows and it is indifferent to formal hierarchies. Stakeholders get to create and refine content equally and with almost no, or very few, preconditions [10, 24] [26].

Using emergent social software platforms (ESSPs) enables stakeholders to meet via communities, social networks and virtual worlds, making it easier for them than before, to match their business requirements with available technology solutions [21] [23]. Frameworks, patterns and structures shape over time helping users find information and guidance quickly. In addition, innovation opens up, collective intelligence harnesses as well as collaboration [5] [22].

### 3.4 Social Networks

Millions of people are using social network sites (SNSs) to connect, meet, interact and share knowledge and information in many forms [15]. Moreover, seeing the emergence of specialized social network sites targeted towards specific user groups, such as professionals and consumers, strongly indicates that social networking can provide different types of value to many diverse users, and potentially provide organizations with several benefits [5] [14] [15] [34]. Given these indications, two types of social networks sites are further discussed.

#### 3.4.1 Enterprise Social Network Sites

Given that the next-generation employees use social software as their dominant communication means, companies need to bridge the gaps between its diverse workforce and employees by supporting them with new methods of communication, rather than e-mails and intranets that are considered to be no longer advanced enough to match up to today’s business needs [5] [15]. Accordingly, bringing a social network site inside the enterprise becomes increasingly important and urgent. By regenerating and possibly even reinventing the organizational cultures and the way companies do business; internal social networks can eventually lead to increased levels of workplace productivity along with more employee satisfaction [5] [15] [17] [41].

#### 3.4.2 Online Social Network Sites

With more than 100 million users each day, online social networking sites such as Facebook and MySpace are well established among the general population [37]. Although their initial purpose was to attract younger audiences, recently SNSs have been attracting large numbers of older users interested in professional networking. Day by day, they are becoming more visible within organizations, helping them to strategically connect and spread their message to a larger audience [14] [41].

### 4. Theoretical Considerations: Decision 2.0

This section will be focusing on the collaborative aspect of E2.0 and its effect on the organizational decision making process.
4.1 Definitions and Background
The disparate tools that E2.0 comprises, help employees collaborate, share and organize information, which in turn allows them to tap into collective wisdom [8]. Either this wisdom results from the project team, the global organisation or even partners and customers; they broaden horizons and flatten hierarchies even to the largest organisations that spread out across various offices and dissimilar time zones [2].

4.2 Collaboration
Collaboration, from the term “co-labor,” is working together towards a common goal. Collaboration is a recursive process that can occur between two or more individuals or organizations [30]. Likewise, in an E2.0 context, it is the act of groups interacting, sharing knowledge, and learning from one another through the diverse tools of web2.0, such as blogs, wikis, podcasts and social networks, etc. [5] [10]. Moreover, collaboration is often applied to problem-solving and decision making as well. It implies a joint decision-making approach to problem resolution, where power is shared and stakeholders take shared responsibility for their actions and for the subsequent outcomes of them, developing a more integrated approach that can redesign the traditional decision making methods [8] [32].

4.3 Collective Intelligence
Collective intelligence, an expected outcome of collaboration, is not a new concept. Early research foresaw the possibility of applying cooperation in creative endeavors, by allowing large groups of dislocated people to share ideas and carry out complex tasks by collaborating and coordinating each others’ activities [12] [18].

However, over the last decade, this vision has become a reality that is gaining momentum as the interactive tools of Web 2.0 have become available [18] [37]. Crowds of expert and non-expert users, from diverse communities, are now capable of generating their own content, sharing it, and collectively organizing it. Resulting in collective wisdom, also known as the wisdom of the crowds, that can yield outcomes that are generally more creative, innovative, and often more complete [8] [30].

4.4 A Comparison: Decision 2.0 vs. Traditional Decision Making
The following comparison explores the difference between decisions 2.0 and traditional decision making approaches on basis of centralization vs. decentralization and different decision making schemes.

E2.0 fundamentally supports human interactions and decision making within organizations [8]. Unlike most traditional systems and applications, where the power of transmitting information is exclusively managed by system administrators, E2.0 tools and applications allow groups to work together and aggregate information that would have not been available solely to any individual member [18] [30] [42]. The following (Figure1), adopted from [42] illustrates the difference between both approaches in regards to information sharing and communication.

![Figure 1: Traditional vs. E2.0 sharing systems](image)

Using traditional applications, emphasis has been on improving the productivity and decision making of the individual user, while under E2.0 collective intelligence paradigms, the emphasis is on harnessing the intelligence of groups of people to enable greater productivity and better decisions [18]. Therefore, it is assumed that collaborative decision making can build consensus and lead to more informed decisions compared to those decisions made up by individual members working in isolation [18] [30].

5. Research Gap
Although several authors discussed the benefits offered by E2.0 tools and methods, very few tackled how those tools can change how companies make their decisions, make use of the wisdom of the crowd and enhance communication and collaboration with external stakeholders. Accordingly, based on the research gap, the research question this paper seeks to answer is:
“How does decision 2.0 make use of the crowd to support the traditional decision making process and hence add value to organizations through collaboration and collective intelligence?”

6. Methodology
In order to explore the above mentioned research question, a qualitative research approach was chosen seeking better and in-depth understanding of situations and behaviors. A quantitative research design that would provide numerical results that would not serve the purpose of the research question. This is because the aim of the research is exploring and investigating how decision 2.0 makes use of the external crowd to benefit organizations and support the decision making process. A convenience case study would be an appropriate approach to fulfill the research purpose, while using interviews as the research tool. Conducting unstructured individual in-depth interviews with a number of different interviewees would help to avoid bias as well as help in gaining as much detailed answers, which would add further value to the case study findings.

6.1 Case Background
The company selected for the case study is a branch of a multinational company located in Egypt. It is headquartered in New York with interests in the manufacturing, marketing and distribution of grain-based snack foods, beverages, and other products. For confidentiality purposes, the company will be called by the name SnacksCo throughout the paper to protect the company’s identity.

As of 2010, SnacksCo employed approximately 275,000 people worldwide. It is competing worldwide with 18 different product lines that generate retail sales of more than $1 billion each. The company’s products are distributed across more than 190 countries, resulting in annual net revenues of $42.3 billion. Based on its revenues, SnacksCo is the second largest food & beverage business in the world. Within North America, SnacksCo is ranked as the largest Food and Beverage Company.

As for the Egyptian branch of SnacksCo under study in this paper, it was initially founded in 1981 by a group of Egyptian investors, until acquired by SnacksCo International in 2002. The administration and headquarters of SnacksCo Egypt are located in Cairo, while running three production plants located in different areas of Egypt. With almost 3900 employees, SnacksCo Egypt is considered a large company taking the number of employees in mind.

6.2 Definition of Decision Under Investigation
As part of its deep belief of customers’ importance and significance, SnacksCo Egypt launched a huge marketing campaign with the name “Egypt will choose its New Chips Flavor” for the year 2010. The fully-fledged campaign that lasted almost 5 to 6 months long, aimed at empowering its consumers, within the Egyptian market, to choose their new potato chips flavor.

SnacksCo created a huge buzz in the market by being one of the first companies in Egypt to engage its customers in its decision making processes and giving them the freedom of choice. The new phenomenon attracted not only SnacksCo’s loyal customers, but also other potential consumers to join in the flavor choice process.

The campaign was devised into three phases. The invitation phase, the mobilisation phase and the winning flavour announcement phase.

To make the choice and the decision process more interesting and engaging, the campaign was totally supported by television channels, the radio and interactive media. SnacksCo Egypt was able to reach consumers all across the nation, mobilising Egyptians to share and cast their choices for SnacksCo’s new flavour to come.

6.3 Data Collection
Based on the research question, that aims on investigating the benefits of decision 2.0, while making use of the crowd, this exploratory research could as well be considered as a communication study, as the interviews and data collection is to be conducted in personal means that required face-to-face contact in order to clarify the purpose of the study and the meanings of the questions.

The target group of the research will include all project managers of all organizations that have recently adopted a collaborative decision making approach. This is because such organizations could clearly point out how decision 2.0 can benefit organizations, while making use of the crowd such as customers, to support the traditional decision making approach that this paper is willing to investigate. Furthermore, it would be more sufficient to the purpose of the research question to focus upon large fast moving consumer goods (FMCGs) organizations in Egypt; as in this scale of industry it is easier and more noticeable to conduct and measure a project’s time span, lifetime and success or failure, either from
an organizational point of view or from the customers’.

Derived from this intention and in an attempt to answer the research question, leading members of SnacksCo’s “Egypt will choose its New Chips Flavor” project have been interviewed. A non-probability, convenience sampling technique has been performed as the participant was selected upon readily available personal contact and convenience [13].

The data collection technique to be used would be face-to-face individual in-depth interviews. A sample of the project members have been interviewed individually to ensure honest replies, avoid biased opinions as well as gaining as much details from their own personal experiences [13]. As for the interview location, they took place at SnacksCo’s meeting room.

The interviews lasted for four hours, which gave sufficient time for in-depth discussions. Moreover, covered the questions needed to be tackled, as well as leaving room to explore the interviewees’ responses, such as asking them for clarifications and additional information that were very useful in such an innovative topic. In addition, open-end questions helped exploring uncovered and unidentified added values to SnacksCo and its customers, which would contribute a lot to the research question, as it will also help reach a solid ground regarding the literature gap within that area [13] [31].

The time plan of the procedures took 5 weeks in total. Within the first week, the interview was designed and reviewed. Moving on to the second week, the subject was contacted via email and telephone calls in order to schedule for the interview. Afterwards, one week duration include the data collection process from the subject that helped explore the how the traditional decision making process was supported by the E2.0 tools. During the remaining period of time, the data was described and analyzed based on the research focus, findings were presented and the research was finalized.

6.4 Data Analysis and Results
Conducting the interview, further information and insights with regards to SnacksCo’s collaborative decision making process have been revealed. The interviewee clearly identified that several parties and stakeholders were involved in the decision making process. At SnacksCo Egypt, cross functional collaboration was taking place. Six departments were involved in the process: The R&D department, the marketing department, the manufacturing department, the procurement department, the sales department as well as the finance department. However, SnacksCo found that this collaboration alone was not enough. Accordingly, the consumers have been added to be one of the stakeholders, in fact, they were considered the most significant stakeholders of the process. The campaign was built totally around consumer engagement and interactivity.

The interviewee further explained the process adopted by SnacksCo to reach its target audience went as follows. Beginning with the invitation phase on March 2010, TV advertisements and an online website was launched to enable the customers to suggest and participate in choosing their new chips flavors and vote for their most preferred ones. Fifteen days later, a radio spot was launched in addition to other advertisement copies on YouTube, Facebook and Twitter to boost the invitation phase and draw people’s attention.

Moving on to the mobilization phase, SnacksCo launched 5 TV executions featuring real consumers to prove to its customers that their choices are being highly considered and that their votes count. This was supported simultaneously via heavy viral aid of Facebook groups, YouTube and Twitter. Weeks prior to the announcement, customers were called via TV media and SnacksCo’s official website to cast their choices before the end of June.

Finally, the announcement phase, after a pause of a couple of weeks that included sorting the votes and considered the most wanted and demanded flavors by customers, SnacksCo announced the winning chips flavor via several medias.

SnacksCo was literally the talk of the country. Not only has it gained business volume growth of 29%, but also earned the media’s attention. SnacksCo’s collaborative decision making campaign gained the highest level of participation in any active campaign in Egypt. Over one million submissions and over 39,000 pack designs were created by consumers on SnacksCo’s official website requesting their desired flavors. Moreover, SnacksCo’s fan pages on Facebook were the biggest and most interactive with over than 45,000 fans participating daily.

Furthermore, SnacksCo was granted over $1 million of free public relations. Egypt’s top newspapers were discussing the new phenomenon the company’s
campaign brought to life. Top magazines were exploiting the campaign’s name on their cover pages and the top internet blogs were covering the campaign details almost daily. Furthermore, several cartoons made special episodes based on the campaign’s idea of collaborative decision making.

7. Discussion

Giving its customers the power of word and empowering them to play a role in its market decisions, SnacksCo successfully followed a decision 2.0 approach that has definitely strengthened and fortified its decisions.

SnacksCo’s decision making involved different parties. Its employees and workforce were not exclusively taking the decision of the new potato chips flavor. However, in addition to its six involved departments’ cross-functional communications and research, customers were as well involved. As they are the actual aim and target of the business products, having them participate has definitely added a lot of value to the decision taken.

Reflected back to the research question that aimed at investigating the benefits of decision 2.0, while making use of the crowd, this case study has helped to explain the role the crowd made at SnacksCo. The collaborative decision making approach SnacksCo went through helped them across the decision making process and saved a lot of time, effort, and expenses. In fact, the final flavor chosen by the customers, using decision 2.0 approach, was not as the one SnacksCo had initially planned to submit to the market using its previous traditional decision making methods.

Table 1 shows how the crowd helped to extend SnacksCo by adding more into the intelligence, design, and choice phases.

With the support of Decision 2.0 and the crowd:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intelligence</th>
<th>Problem defined, objectives set, data collected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>Alternatives suggested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choice</td>
<td>Choice of the best alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation</td>
<td>Implementing the choice</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Value of the Crow across the decision making process

Additionally, SnacksCo Egypt was able to make a great social influence as well. The campaign positively impacted all the brands’ major key performance indicators (KPIs). SnacksCo’s potato chips was voted by the customers to be a favorite brand, a first choice, fun to eat as well as a brand with tradition. Not only that, but the successful campaign has positively influenced other products offered by SnacksCo as well. Product awareness of different SnacksCo’s brands took place as the consumers were eager to know what other fun products and goods the company had to offer.

Also, SnacksCo’s employees took great pleasure and benefits being part of the campaign. Using the collaborative tools of E2.0 felt totally familiar and enjoyable to the employees, resulting in increased communication and collaboration inside and outside the organization. Moreover, besides improved decision making, several business aspects such as product management and innovation, information exchange and customer relationship management were positively affected and gained added value.

Accordingly, a win-win situation was reached. Both SnacksCo Egypt and its customers ended up extremely satisfied with the final outcome. SnacksCo gained a competitive edge, a market break through and customers’ awareness and loyalty. While the consumers felt heard, had a wider range of choices and got their most desired chips flavor after all.
8. Conclusion
In accordance to [25-26], companies that succeed today are the ones that make the best decisions and are able to act upon them quickly. However, with the constant market alterations and changing needs of employees and customers, organizations need to be able to rely on technologies that can best serve their organizational decision making in order to thrive and satisfy stakeholders [5].

An overview on traditional decision making and on the reasons to why this approach might not always be optimal, or even cause failures, have been discussed. Researchers pointed out the need for organizations to expand their frame of information references and explore multiple viewpoints when making decisions [6] [35].

Based on this, the literature introduced the concept of E2.0. The impact of its tools and characteristics has been highlighted with an emphasis on its “freeform” and collaborative aspects. In addition, enterprise and online social networks have also been discussed, as they are fundamental when it comes to bridging the gaps between stakeholders, whether inside or outside an organization to match up to today’s business needs [5] [15].

Revisiting the research question, the case study elucidated knowledge which showed the value which decision 2.0 brought to the phases of the classical decision making process: 1. wider intelligence throughout the intelligence phase, more alternatives throughout the design phase, and customers’ influencing the choice(s) made at the choice phase. These additions were facilitated by the crowd collaborating and providing collective intelligence.

The case study conducted emphasized that information and high-quality data can be a powerful competitive tool to organizations. It was explained that if E2.0 tools were properly adopted and utilized, organizations will be in better positions to have access to more information from the crowd. They will be able to reach their stakeholders better, communicate and collaborate with them, allowing for faster decisions. Moreover, the case study demonstrated that not only can decisions 2.0 empower organizations to gain competitive edges when it comes to productivity, but also make great social influences in the society. Hence, benefit the organization itself, the industry as well as the surrounding community.

9. Limitations
Generally speaking, we found little research addressing the subject of Decision 2.0 and how it has the potentials to add value to organizations. So, more research is needed in this domain including longitudinal studies.

Due to the limitations of case studies, the findings of the research cannot be generalized, as it studies and tests specific elements related to a specific situation [13].

10. Future Research
More longitudinal studies could be conducted to further examine the effects of decisions 2.0 on the whole organization. Moreover, the scale of the research could expand to include a quantitative survey that includes a sample of several project members from different departments, customers and even some suppliers and competitors. Doing so would help further investigate the effect of decisions 2.0 on the organizational relationship with its stakeholders and further support the qualitative research findings. Furthermore, mathematical models of the survey findings could presented for better analyses.

In addition, it would be useful to examine decision 2.0 and the power of collective intelligence in different industries and countries. The Egyptian scenario of the multinational FMCGs might not fully express the needs of other organizations from different industries or that outside of the Egyptian market. The functional and cultural differences might affect the process differently.
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Appendix: The Interview

Project Related Questions:

1. What was your organization’s project that involved collaborative decision making?
2. What was the project’s purpose and intended outcome?
3. What was your decision making process like? (Steps)
4. Who were the people (stakeholders) responsible for the decision making process?
5. What were your methods of communication? (Can choose several)
   a. Telephone / Mobile Calls.
   b. SMS.
   c. E-mails.
   d. Messenger.
   e. Memos.
   f. Internal Employee Blogs.
   g. Internal Social Networks.
   h. External Social Networks (Facebook, Twitter, MySpace, etc.)
   i. Company’s website.
   j. Other. Please specify…..
6. How often did you communicate? 
   a. Daily.
   b. Several times a week.
   c. Several times a month.
   d. Per milestone.
   e. Whenever needed. Please specify…..
7. How long was the project planned time span? 
   a. 1 month or less
   b. 1-3 months
   c. 3-6 months
   d. 6 + months. Please specify…..
8. Did it exceed the assigned deadline? 
   a. Yes.
   b. No.
9. Why have you chosen collaborative decision making over traditional/individual decision making?
10. How different was the process?
11. How was the project’s final decision taken?
12. Did you have an outcome in mind before undergoing the collaborative decision making process? 
   a. Yes.
   b. No.
13. If yes, was it any different than the actual final outcome of the project?

General Questions:

14. Do you believe that undergoing the collaborative decision making process has added value to you and your organization? 
   a. Yes.
   b. No. 
   Please specify the reason to your answer.
15. Were your organization’s stakeholders, at first, resistant to using enterprise2.0 tools? 
   a. Highly resistant.
   b. Resistant.
   c. Familiar.
   d. Totally familiar and enjoyed using them.
16. Do you believe that there is a relationship between the enterprise2.0 tools being used at your organization and the ability to better communicate and collaborate? 
   a. Yes.
   b. No.
17. Using the above mentioned enterprise2.0 tools, has the organizational level of communication and collaboration changed? (Either addressing customers, suppliers, partners, etc.) 
   a. Increased communication and collaboration.
   b. No difference occurred.
   c. Confused stakeholders and as a result decreased communication and collaboration.
18. Finally, to which areas and business aspects have Web2.0 technologies added the most value? (Can choose several) 
   a. Information Exchange.
   b. Knowledge Management.
   c. Supply Chain Management.
   d. Customer Relationship Management.
   e. Collaborative Decision Making.
   g. Other. Please specify…..