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Business Problem and Peer Review of Journal Study: Organizational Ambidexterity through global strategic partnerships: A cognitive computing perspective

Introduction

A single research study on cognitive computing was reviewed. While the concept sounds nice, it requires interpretation and application as well as a significant amount of explanation that it is an ongoing research area that has been being reviewed for years. The goal was to create a human-like robot or decode the human thinking process with the use of computers. After review, the suggested research paper is seen as compiled information about the status of the creation of a computer that can think on its own. It is poorly organized and does not follow the standard scientific research process, nor does it explain well its background, applicability, specific part, or capability it sought to study or seek public opinion on. First, seeking public opinion on an intangible product that has not been tested in an actual business environment is of no value, especially if the research study does not explain its selected participants beyond education level and job role. A more valuable study would’ve presented the problem more specifically, but it asks a simple question of using both hands in a thinking computer, not explaining at all that computers do not have hands, showing the writer is unable to explain or differentiate a business computer, software designed for business, and robotic software, of which they are in fact different systems.

IT Business Problem

Referring to or calling this an IT business problem is incorrect, in that it is not a simple software malfunction in a test phase of a product, nor it is a ‘global’ problem of market readiness or social and public perception that has specific potential to change operations, economics, and society. Countless hours are wasted reading about IT problems that are disordered and summarized as convoluted discussions on information problems, where the researcher in the referenced study thinks they can generalize the subject and study IT systems, when no IT systems are physically observable, and people are not anywhere that can realistically comment on the technology. The study is more than an information technology problem, or an information processing problem, but causes confusion and irritation because it’s a foreign attempt to study or evaluate American-made business products in global environments. America is free to study whatever they want, but many products and creations are proprietary intellectual capital products and there are better presentation formats or research designs for product and capability evaluation. Further, it is so generalized and poorly organized on various levels that an attempt to explain ‘computerized thinking’ as a potential and actual capability is no longer just a concept, but an actual system that has been tested by a specific government agency. There is no proof presented, only generalizations and it causes sickness just reading the disorganized approach to a non-specific problem – a common resource waste of good time and valuable money. Discussions of “IT Business Problems” presented or disguised as a peer review of some odd presentation of a ‘computerized thinking product’ which is a simple product evaluation is too oddly formed to be considered acceptable for higher learning because it lacks proper formatting and referential components that show actual proof or ability to solve complex global problems with a specific product or the experimentation and new invention. It is not a good fit for the information technology field because it is multi-disciplinary, computer science, biologically related experimental concepts attempting to evaluate a product that has never been formally tested, therefore cannot be well understood and then simplified by a single function of ‘hands’ and its use, purpose, intent, and applicability in multiple disciplines where a new discovery can be accepted as valuable and a scholarly contribution.

The researchers do not clearly state their objective, along with the specific problem as it relates to a specific area of information technology and it’s safe to say, the research study was written by foreigners attempting to explain or study an American-made system that enables thinking on many levels on non-presented awareness. It’s not a cultural problem, nor is it a government leak of classified material, attempting to commercialize a new automated thinking product and it is also not a matter of low quality or dysfunctional presentation of foreign intelligence, but it does play a part in evaluating the study because it assumes that all educational institutions that publish with foreign writers in American education institutions are credible and create valuable work. It is unknown if it is an automated reporter or compiler, and although it is a nice concept, overall, it is a terribly written paper, wrongly presented as a technology study. 125 cited references makes any research study look automated or oddly formed, excessive, and shows an inability to effectively present information and even worse is trying to categorize it as an IT related business problem. It can be explained that the marketing and commercialization of artificial intelligence is an IT related business problem with advantages, benefits, risks, and socio-economic value, those facts were not effectively presented and cannot be if far too much information is provided of referential value than of its own gathering, methodical design, and way of showing proof of an existing or new theory or specific product evaluation.

Technology journals should be able to combine several disciplines, such as biology and robotics to explain their endeavors in such research studies or experiments to replicate the human brain for use in business environments. There is a specific way to present the research problem or area of science, as well as a specific way to evaluate business systems in relation to information theories. In such research studies, surveys are not appropriate for intangible products unless the specific system and its capabilities can be effectively organized, and the problem seeks to understand or solve public perception and opinion. By doing so, it creates a bias for the actual system that is planned for design or is already designed and released, tainting future efforts of actual product creators and evaluators. Since the system has never actually been personally seen in use, it is conceptual and marketed as if it exists, when there has been no actual proof presented. The same is true for artificial intelligence and machine learning. It appears to be fictional and the associated test instruments or research model does not fit the selected title or research area.

The concept is better classified or categorized as a basic brain function that can be applied to computer science for advancement in the creation or implementation and commercialization of a human-like robot. It seems that while attempts are made to narrow the scope of research to a specific area where information technology plays a part in the stated problem, the studies fail to adequately address the issue to create a solution. First, just the title: Organizational ambidexterity through global strategic partnerships: A cognitive computing perspective, sounds scholarly and requires simplification or interpretation. The title is saying “a perspective on the act of knowing” or a known perspective on a biological ability to use both hands effectively is applicable to organizations. The title leads the reader to believe they are going learn more or find the information necessary to solve a problem related to cognitive awareness of ambidexterity, which is a simple test to find out if a person or device has awareness it can use both hands effectively and it is expected that test instruments will be presented that show they can or can’t. It is as remedial as asking if a person is aware they can use both of their hands.

The problem is that it is applied to an organization and again, organizations don’t have only two hands, and ‘computerized thinking’ is generalized and not clearly explained. Organizations are often defined as Nonprofits; personal sites; open-source projects; some government websites; mostly used by non-commercial entities, but there is no classification or known categorization or understanding of an organization’s ability to use its right and left hands, therefore, the study begins in error and convolution in just the title alone. Understanding is sought because it appears to be a valid study, with a real research goal and methodology, but the more that is read, the more it is realized the concepts are compilations of the latest trends in recent technology research, related to artificial intelligence, which might show true as faulty and wasteful data gathering. While some information can be gleaned from the study and applied somewhere, the study is not correctly organized and does not use the correct terms in the right disciplines with the specificity of biology, technology, and specifically robotics, and the area of the problem being hardware, software, and how it affects society, and all the many other important areas where causation is used.

The use of hands in an organizational context and what area of technology is being experimented with or studied is bizarre at best. This is important because technology, much like neurology and biology, covers a wide range of functions and abilities, as well as problems, depending upon what area is under review and how large the data samples are. Now matter how many big words are used to categorize the awareness of what one person is doing and it’s applicability, use, or replication and use in ‘global market’s as technology, is a terrible way to evaluate and experiment, as well as present and well crafted understanding of a research project that is useful to and for humanity.

Firstly, cognitive computing is a concept that must be introduced gently, since it is an area of science where biology and technology merge, focused mostly on thinking and learning. This is still a large area of experimental psychology, and the abstract suggests cognitive computing has considerable potential for holistic data interpretation, as if cognitive computing devices are in the marketplace, as available solutions capable of performing such tasks. Secondly, holistic concepts, as defined by the medical community, relate to all parts of the problem and not symptom-based treatments, yet the study is limited to the function of hands, not defined by human or robotic hands, or clarified for the use of metaphorical reference related to communication of one side speaking or working effectively and as well as the other. There is no excuse for this type of research paper and no solution for the problem as it is presented.

It suggests this technology or practice, which is not presented as a theory, concept, functionality, system, or solution can act as an enabler for organizational ambidexterity. The intent is unknown, as is its applicability, whether it is to be applied to robotics, used metaphorically to describe a common business problem, or is an explanation of how a person or device knowingly uses one hand or both hands, with a certain level of awareness. Cognitive ambidexterity in information technology is either in relation to human functioning of biological subject matter where technology can be used to test, but the presentation is focused on ‘awareness.’

There is such a concept of cognitive ability, without publicized test instruments to determine levels of cognition related to ambidexterity and cannot be applied to organizations because organizations do not have hands. Even if a robot was created that represented an organization, cognitive ambidexterity is a small part of the functionality of a robot and should never be considered a global function or even available to represent an organization.

The main problem is that while the problem might seem real and creatively written, might be another attempt to drain the resources of hard-working students and businesspeople with no purpose other than with or without their own cognitive ability, as well as their ability to apply neurological or psychological concepts of awareness to organizational business matters published in a technology journal. The only option is to dissect it and point out its flaws, rather than to read with an open mind that the topic, subject, and written work can be accepted as viable, scholarly, and worthy of investment in time and more research.

To accept the ideas or understand cognitive technologies, the study or researchers must have a clear understanding of cognitive science and know exactly what it means when applying it to technology and it must be specified as to where and how before it can be even considered valuable for public opinion and economic forecast. The researcher announces the use of ‘cognitive technologies’ for use in global market data analysis and customer service positions. Directly following the mention of a specific IT solution, it mentions another area, called Decision Support Systems; a completely different area of brain functioning and IT solutions. It doesn’t try to explain choice, free will, or reference philosophy or how vast choice is and how necessary specific tests are in evaluating human or robotic choice and right or left-hand preference or specific automatic functions as written by its creator and latest influencer or choice, which is a critical part of any evaluation test. It sounds more like a curated article and updates on what the industry is doing, marketing, or researching, without a specific and real problem statement that can be effectively researched, where a real solution can be created, designed, tested, and actually implemented, or to show the effectiveness and use of an existing system as it relates to the problem or function of ambidexterity with no useful comparisons provided of human and computer or robot, or metaphorically and creatively described as communications in a two-part business organization or political organization, such as ‘right-wing and left-wing politics’ or even more advanced to present right brain and left brain functioning as it relates to hand use, preference, and accuracy in specific tests.

It directly states there are limited studies that explore the role of cognitive computing technology in an organizational context and then dive right into global operations to discuss the scope. This is not how science, technology, biology, psychology, and business are experimented with or revolutionized, nor is it how it is best presented as a business, organizational, technology, biology, political, or social problem, or a way to gain public opinion and technology acceptance.

The data analyzed in the review of this research study were the Title, explanation of data collection methods, and tables that only partially reflect data, and while it effectively summarizes the use of cognitive computing, it does not scientifically assess a specific product, its planned or current use, nor does it provide what questions were asked in the survey, making any survey related data useless. The study provided 125 cited references, which is far too much information, showing the study is unoriginal and ineffectively or improperly organized.

Conclusion

Brain functionality and designing a replica using a computer software system is an actual project and area of research called robotics. If the capability or products are not effectively presented and organized correctly with its related parts, then it is ineffective research. Research that builds upon other research or furthers the understanding of science and solves problems should be connected by more than just citing and references, but quality research that can be brought back to the product owner or other funded researchers to group the findings and work together. There is no evidence of that in the research paper and it’s clearly just another paper written to try to answer a scientific robotic question about how a computer system can make hands work, without specifying which set of hands, where, how, and why. It is unknown that scholarly journals can be expected to be connected to original problem area owners or product creators and owners, making the whole area of research questionable, without a specific route to design, test, and evaluation, with governmental oversight and extensive efforts to work with ‘real’ property, not fake or artificial concepts that don’t do anything more than take up space on a server or hard drive. Without knowing the use or environmental areas the research area relates to, the answers are ambiguous and generalized, oddly repetitive with nothing resolved, only evidence of more compiler or research and doctorate-level educational dysfunction.
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The original study, as referenced includes 125 references on the subject; far too many are already used