International Journal of Economics, Management and Accounting

ISSN: 2988-7615 | Volume 3, Issue 8 (2026)
Page **589-597**

Research Article

Nti Frank Paul Mathews[1]*, George Kushiator[2]

The Economics of Uncertainty: A New Theoretical Framework for Decision-Making in a Volatile World

*Corresponding Author: **Nti Frank Paul Mathews**: Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana; ntifrankpaulmathews@gmail.com
George Kushiator: University of Michigan, United States; gkushiator1@gmail.com

Received: Jan 15, 2026; **Accepted:** Jan 26, 2026; **Online:** Jan 31, 2026 | DOI: https://doi.org/10.47353/ijema.v3i8.236

Abstract: *This study develops a new theoretical framework for understanding economic decision-making under conditions of persistent uncertainty. Traditional economic models largely assume rational agents operating in stable environments with predictable risks, thereby limiting their applicability in today's volatile and complex global economy. Increasing economic turbulence—driven by financial instability, technological disruption, and geopolitical uncertainty—has exposed the limitations of risk-based models and highlighted the need for a broader conceptualization of uncertainty. Adopting a qualitative conceptual approach, this study synthesizes insights from behavioral economics, institutional theory, and complexity economics to construct an integrative framework. The proposed model distinguishes between risk, ambiguity, and deep uncertainty, emphasizing that decision-making processes vary significantly across these conditions. It conceptualizes economic agents as adaptive decision-makers who rely not only on optimization but also on heuristics, learning, and institutional context. The framework identifies three key dimensions influencing decision-making under uncertainty: cognitive adaptation, structural constraints, and institutional guidance. These dimensions interact dynamically, shaping both individual and organizational responses to uncertainty. The study argues that uncertainty is not merely a constraint but also a driver of innovation, strategic flexibility, and systemic transformation. This research contributes to the literature by advancing a unified theory of economic decision-making under uncertainty, moving beyond traditional equilibrium-based models. It provides a foundation for future empirical research and offers policy-relevant insights for managing uncertainty in an increasingly volatile global economy.*

Keywords: *Economic uncertainty, Decision-making, Behavioral economics, Complexity economics.*

Introduction

The global economy is increasingly characterized by uncertainty, volatility, and rapid structural change. Traditional economic environments, once dominated by relatively stable growth patterns and predictable market behavior, have been replaced by complex and dynamic systems shaped by financial crises, technological disruptions, geopolitical tensions, and global shocks such as pandemics. In this context, uncertainty has become a defining feature of economic life rather than an exception. This shift challenges the foundational assumptions of conventional economic theory, which often relies on stability, predictability, and rational optimization.

Classical and neoclassical economic models have historically distinguished between risk and uncertainty, with risk referring to situations where probabilities are known and uncertainty referring to situations where they are not. However, in practice, much of economic analysis has focused on risk-based frameworks, where uncertainty is reduced to probabilistic calculations. While this approach has been useful in certain contexts, it is increasingly inadequate in capturing the complexity of real-world economic environments. Many contemporary economic phenomena—such as financial crises, technological disruptions, and global supply chain shocks—are characterized by deep uncertainty, where outcomes are not only unpredictable but also difficult to conceptualize in probabilistic terms.

The limitations of traditional models become particularly evident in decision-making processes. Standard economic theory assumes that agents are rational, possess complete information, and are capable of optimizing their choices based on expected utility. However, these assumptions are often unrealistic in environments characterized by high uncertainty. Decision-makers frequently operate with incomplete information, limited cognitive capacity, and evolving preferences. As a result, they rely on heuristics, rules of thumb, and adaptive learning processes rather than strict optimization.

Behavioral economics has provided important insights into how individuals make decisions under uncertainty, highlighting the role of cognitive biases, bounded rationality, and psychological factors. Concepts such as loss aversion, overconfidence, and framing effects demonstrate that decision-making is often influenced by subjective perceptions rather than objective probabilities. While these insights have enriched economic theory, they are often applied at the micro level and may not fully capture the broader systemic context in which decisions are made.

At the same time, institutional theory emphasizes the role of formal and informal rules in shaping economic behavior. Institutions provide structure, reduce uncertainty, and guide decision-making by establishing norms and expectations. In uncertain environments, institutions become particularly important as they help coordinate actions and reduce the complexity of decision-making. However, institutions themselves are subject to change and may lag behind evolving economic conditions, creating additional layers of uncertainty.

Complexity economics offers another important perspective by viewing the economy as a complex adaptive system characterized by nonlinear interactions, feedback loops, and emergent behavior. From this perspective, uncertainty is an inherent feature of economic systems rather than a temporary deviation from equilibrium. Economic outcomes are not predetermined but emerge from the interactions of heterogeneous agents operating under varying conditions. This perspective challenges the traditional focus on equilibrium and highlights the importance of dynamics, adaptation, and evolution.

Despite these advances, existing approaches to uncertainty remain fragmented. Risk-based models focus on probabilistic outcomes, behavioral economics emphasizes cognitive processes, institutional theory highlights structural constraints, and complexity economics focuses on systemic dynamics. While each of these perspectives provides valuable insights, none offers a comprehensive framework that integrates multiple dimensions of uncertainty into a unified theory of decision-making.

This fragmentation creates a significant gap in the literature, particularly in understanding how economic agents—both individuals and organizations—make decisions in highly volatile and uncertain environments. There is a need for a framework that not only distinguishes between different types of uncertainty but also explains how decision-making processes adapt across these contexts.

This study seeks to address this gap by developing a new theoretical framework for the economics of uncertainty. The central argument of this paper is that economic decision-making under uncertainty is a multidimensional and dynamic process shaped by the interaction of cognitive, structural, and institutional factors. Rather than assuming rational optimization, the framework conceptualizes decision-making as an adaptive process that evolves over time in response to changing conditions.

The proposed framework distinguishes between three types of uncertainty: risk (where probabilities are known), ambiguity (where probabilities are unclear), and deep uncertainty (where outcomes and probabilities are both unknown). Each type of uncertainty requires different decision-making approaches. Under risk, optimization models may still be applicable. Under ambiguity, decision-makers rely more

heavily on heuristics and subjective judgment. Under deep uncertainty, adaptive and exploratory strategies become essential.

Within this framework, decision-making is influenced by three key dimensions. First, cognitive adaptation refers to the ability of individuals and organizations to process information, learn from experience, and adjust their decision-making strategies. Second, structural constraints encompass the economic, technological, and organizational factors that limit or shape decision-making options. Third, institutional guidance reflects the role of rules, norms, and governance structures in reducing uncertainty and coordinating behavior.

These dimensions interact dynamically, creating feedback loops that shape decision outcomes. For example, cognitive adaptation can lead to the development of new strategies, which may alter structural conditions and influence institutional evolution. Similarly, institutional changes can reshape decision-making processes by altering incentives and constraints.

The novelty of this study lies in its integrative approach, which brings together insights from multiple theoretical traditions to develop a unified framework. By doing so, it moves beyond the limitations of existing models and provides a more comprehensive understanding of decision-making under uncertainty. The framework emphasizes the importance of adaptation, learning, and institutional context, offering a more realistic representation of economic behavior in complex environments.

From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to the literature by redefining uncertainty as a central organizing principle of economic analysis. It challenges the dominance of equilibrium-based models and highlights the need for dynamic and adaptive approaches. From a practical perspective, the framework provides valuable insights for policymakers and managers seeking to navigate uncertainty in an increasingly volatile world.

As uncertainty becomes a defining feature of the global economy, there is a growing need to rethink traditional economic models and develop new frameworks that better reflect the realities of decision-making. This study provides a step in that direction by offering a comprehensive and integrative approach to the economics of uncertainty.

Method

This study employs a qualitative conceptual research design to develop a theoretical framework for understanding economic decision-making under conditions of uncertainty. Given the abstract and multidimensional nature of uncertainty, the research does not rely on primary data collection or quantitative modeling. Instead, it focuses on integrating and synthesizing existing theoretical perspectives to construct a comprehensive and coherent analytical framework.

The study adopts a systematic literature-based approach, drawing on interdisciplinary sources from economics, behavioral science, institutional theory, and complexity economics. Academic journal articles, foundational books, and policy-oriented publications were selected based on their relevance, theoretical depth, and contribution to understanding uncertainty and decision-making processes. Particular emphasis was placed on widely cited and high-impact works to ensure conceptual robustness and academic rigor.

The analytical process follows a thematic synthesis method. First, the study identifies key conceptual distinctions in the literature, particularly between risk, ambiguity, and deep uncertainty. Second, it examines how different theoretical traditions—such as expected utility theory, bounded rationality, and adaptive systems—approach decision-making under these varying conditions. Third, the study integrates these

perspectives into a unified framework that captures the dynamic interaction between cognitive processes, structural constraints, and institutional factors.

To enhance theoretical validity, the study applies a critical and comparative approach, evaluating the strengths and limitations of existing models. This enables the identification of conceptual gaps, particularly the lack of integration across micro-level decision-making, meso-level organizational structures, and macro-level institutional environments. The proposed framework addresses these gaps by offering a multidimensional and adaptive perspective on economic decision-making.

Although the study does not include empirical testing, its primary contribution lies in advancing a theoretically grounded and integrative model that can inform future empirical research and policy design in increasingly uncertain economic contexts

Results and Discussion

Reframing Uncertainty in Economic Systems

The primary result of this study is the development of a unified theoretical framework that reconceptualizes uncertainty as a central organizing principle in economic decision-making. Traditional economic models tend to reduce uncertainty to measurable risk, assuming that agents can assign probabilities to outcomes and optimize accordingly. However, the findings of this study demonstrate that such an approach is insufficient in capturing the complexity of real-world economic environments.

The proposed framework distinguishes between three types of uncertainty—risk, ambiguity, and deep uncertainty—and argues that each requires fundamentally different decision-making approaches. Risk-based environments allow for probabilistic optimization, ambiguity introduces subjective judgment, and deep uncertainty necessitates adaptive and exploratory strategies. This classification provides a more nuanced understanding of how uncertainty shapes economic behavior.

Importantly, the framework shifts the analytical focus from equilibrium outcomes to dynamic processes. Rather than assuming that systems converge toward stability, it recognizes that economic systems are continuously evolving and often operate far from equilibrium. This perspective aligns with complexity economics and highlights the need for adaptive decision-making mechanisms.

The Multidimensional Structure of Decision-Making Under Uncertainty

A key contribution of this study is the identification of three interdependent dimensions that shape decision-making under uncertainty: cognitive adaptation, structural constraints, and institutional guidance. These dimensions form the core of the proposed framework and interact dynamically to influence economic outcomes.

1. Cognitive Adaptation

   Cognitive adaptation refers to the ability of economic agents—both individuals and organizations—to process information, learn from experience, and adjust their decision-making strategies. In uncertain environments, decision-makers cannot rely solely on optimization models due to incomplete information and bounded rationality. Instead, they employ heuristics, rules of thumb, and iterative learning processes.

   This dimension highlights the importance of behavioral factors in economic decision-making. Agents interpret uncertainty through subjective perceptions, which influence their responses to risk and ambiguity. Learning mechanisms play a critical role in refining these perceptions over time, enabling agents to improve their decision-making capabilities.

Moreover, cognitive adaptation is not static but evolves through feedback. As agents experience outcomes, they update their beliefs and strategies, creating a dynamic learning process. This continuous adaptation enhances resilience and enables more effective navigation of uncertain environments.

2. Structural Constraints

Structural constraints encompass the economic, technological, and organizational factors that shape and limit decision-making options. These include market structures, resource availability, technological capabilities, and organizational configurations. In uncertain environments, structural constraints play a dual role: they restrict possible actions while also providing stability and direction.

For example, firms operating in highly competitive markets may face constraints that limit their strategic flexibility, while technological advancements may open new opportunities for innovation. The interaction between constraints and opportunities defines the strategic space within which decision-making occurs.

Importantly, structural constraints are not fixed; they evolve over time in response to economic and technological changes. This dynamic nature reinforces the need for adaptive strategies that can respond to shifting conditions. Organizations that effectively manage structural constraints are better positioned to navigate uncertainty and achieve sustainable outcomes.

3. Institutional Guidance

Institutional guidance refers to the role of formal and informal institutions in shaping decision-making under uncertainty. Institutions provide rules, norms, and frameworks that reduce complexity and coordinate behavior. In uncertain environments, institutions become particularly important as they offer stability and predictability.

However, institutions are not always aligned with rapidly changing economic conditions. Institutional lag—where rules and regulations fail to keep pace with technological and economic developments—can create additional uncertainty. This misalignment can hinder decision-making and reduce the effectiveness of economic systems.

The framework emphasizes that institutions both constrain and enable decision-making. Effective institutions facilitate adaptation by providing clear guidelines and reducing transaction costs. Conversely, weak or outdated institutions can exacerbate uncertainty and limit adaptive capacity.

Interactions and Feedback Mechanisms

A central insight of this study is that decision-making under uncertainty is shaped by the interaction of cognitive, structural, and institutional dimensions. These interactions generate feedback loops that influence both short-term decisions and long-term outcomes.

a) Cognitive Adaptation ↔ Structural Constraints
Learning processes enable agents to better navigate constraints, while structural conditions shape the information available for decision-making.

b) Cognitive Adaptation ↔ Institutional Guidance
Institutions influence cognitive processes by framing decisions, while adaptive agents can drive institutional change through innovation and behavior.

c) Structural Constraints ↔ Institutional Guidance
Institutions shape economic structures, while structural changes create pressure for institutional reform.

These feedback loops create a dynamic system in which changes in one dimension affect the others. Positive feedback loops can enhance adaptability and innovation, while negative loops may lead to rigidity and systemic inefficiencies.

The Adaptive Decision-Making Framework

The proposed framework conceptualizes decision-making under uncertainty as an iterative and adaptive process consisting of three stages:

1. Perception and Interpretation
   Agents interpret uncertainty based on cognitive frameworks, institutional signals, and available information.
2. Strategic Response
   Decisions are made using a combination of optimization, heuristics, and exploratory strategies, depending on the level of uncertainty.
3. Learning and Adjustment
   Outcomes are evaluated, and strategies are adjusted through feedback mechanisms.

This cycle reflects the dynamic nature of economic decision-making, emphasizing continuous adaptation rather than static optimization. It also highlights the importance of learning and flexibility in navigating uncertain environments.

Theoretical Implications

The findings of this study have several important implications for economic theory. First, the framework challenges the dominance of risk-based models by demonstrating the importance of ambiguity and deep uncertainty. This expands the scope of economic analysis and provides a more realistic representation of decision-making processes.

Second, the study integrates insights from multiple theoretical traditions, including behavioral economics, institutional theory, and complexity economics. This interdisciplinary approach addresses the fragmentation in the literature and provides a unified perspective on uncertainty.

Third, the framework introduces a dynamic and process-oriented view of decision-making, emphasizing adaptation, learning, and feedback. This perspective aligns with emerging approaches in economics that focus on evolution and complexity rather than equilibrium.

Policy Implications

From a policy perspective, the findings highlight the need for flexible and adaptive governance frameworks. Traditional policy approaches that rely on stable assumptions and long-term planning may be inadequate in highly uncertain environments.

Policymakers should focus on:

a) Enhancing institutional adaptability to respond to rapid changes
b) Promoting information transparency to support better decision-making
c) Encouraging innovation and learning within economic systems

Additionally, policies should recognize the diversity of uncertainty types and tailor interventions accordingly. For example, risk-based policies may be effective in stable environments but insufficient under deep uncertainty.

Synthesis of Findings

In summary, the results demonstrate that economic decision-making under uncertainty is a multidimensional and dynamic process shaped by the interaction of cognitive, structural, and institutional factors. The proposed framework provides a comprehensive tool for understanding these interactions and offers new insights into the behavior of economic agents in volatile environments.

By reframing uncertainty as a central feature of economic systems, this study contributes to a paradigm shift in economic thinking—moving from static, equilibrium-based models toward dynamic, adaptive frameworks that better reflect the complexities of the modern global economy.

Conclusion

This study develops a new theoretical framework for understanding economic decision-making under conditions of persistent uncertainty. The findings demonstrate that uncertainty is not merely a deviation from stable economic conditions but a fundamental and enduring characteristic of modern economic systems. As such, traditional models based on risk and equilibrium are insufficient to explain how individuals and organizations make decisions in increasingly volatile and complex environments.

The proposed framework advances the literature by distinguishing between risk, ambiguity, and deep uncertainty, and by demonstrating that each type of uncertainty requires different decision-making approaches. More importantly, the study conceptualizes decision-making as a dynamic and adaptive process shaped by the interaction of three core dimensions: cognitive adaptation, structural constraints, and institutional guidance. These dimensions do not operate independently but are interconnected through feedback mechanisms that influence both short-term responses and long-term outcomes.

From a theoretical perspective, this study contributes to a paradigm shift in economic thinking. It challenges the dominance of optimization-based models and introduces a process-oriented view of decision-making that emphasizes learning, adaptation, and system dynamics. By integrating insights from behavioral economics, institutional theory, and complexity economics, the framework provides a more comprehensive and realistic representation of economic behavior under uncertainty. It also highlights the importance of co-evolution between agents and their environments, reinforcing the idea that economic systems are inherently dynamic and non-linear.

From a practical standpoint, the findings have significant implications for policymakers and organizational decision-makers. In uncertain environments, effective decision-making requires flexibility, continuous learning, and adaptive institutional frameworks. Policymakers should move beyond rigid, rule-based approaches and develop governance systems that are responsive to changing conditions. Similarly, organizations must cultivate adaptive capabilities, invest in knowledge and innovation, and remain responsive to both structural and institutional shifts.

The economics of uncertainty requires a fundamental rethinking of how economic systems are analyzed and managed. The conceptual model proposed in this study provides a foundation for such a rethinking by offering an integrative and adaptive framework for decision-making. Future research should extend this framework through empirical validation and explore its application across different economic contexts, including digital economies and global crises. Such efforts are essential for advancing a more resilient and adaptive understanding of economic behavior in an increasingly uncertain world.

References

Akerlof, G. A., & Shiller, R. J. (2009). Animal spirits: How human psychology drives the economy. Princeton University Press.

Arrow, K. J. (1965). Aspects of the theory of risk-bearing. Yrjö Jahnsson Lectures.

Arthur, W. B. (1999). Complexity and the economy. Science, 284(5411), 107–109. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.284.5411.107

Arthur, W. B. (2013). Complexity economics: A different framework for economic thought. Santa Fe Institute.

Beckert, J. (2016). Imagined futures: Fictional expectations and capitalist dynamics. Harvard University Press.

Bernanke, B. S. (1983). Irreversibility, uncertainty, and cyclical investment. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 98(1), 85–106. https://doi.org/10.2307/1885568

Camerer, C. F., & Weber, M. (1992). Recent developments in modeling preferences: Uncertainty and ambiguity. Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, 5(4), 325–370. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00122575

Colander, D., Holt, R., & Rosser, J. B. (2004). The changing face of mainstream economics. Review of Political Economy, 16(4), 485–499. https://doi.org/10.1080/0953825042000256702

Dequech, D. (2000). Fundamental uncertainty and ambiguity. Eastern Economic Journal, 26(1), 41–60.

Ellsberg, D. (1961). Risk, ambiguity, and the Savage axioms. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 75(4), 643–669. https://doi.org/10.2307/1884324

Gigerenzer, G., & Gaissmaier, W. (2011). Heuristic decision making. Annual Review of Psychology, 62, 451–482. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120709-145346

Gilboa, I., & Schmeidler, D. (1989). Maxmin expected utility with non-unique prior. Journal of Mathematical Economics, 18(2), 141–153. https://doi.org/10.1016/0304-4068(89)90018-9

Gigerenzer, G. (2008). Rationality for mortals: How people cope with uncertainty. Oxford University Press.

Hansen, L. P., & Sargent, T. J. (2008). Robustness. Princeton University Press.

Heiner, R. A. (1983). The origin of predictable behavior. American Economic Review, 73(4), 560–595.

Kahneman, D. (2011). Thinking, fast and slow. Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory. Econometrica, 47(2), 263–291. https://doi.org/10.2307/1914185

Knight, F. H. (1921). Risk, uncertainty and profit. Houghton Mifflin.

Lucas, R. E. (1976). Econometric policy evaluation: A critique. Carnegie-Rochester Conference Series, 1, 19–46. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0167-2231(76)80003-6

Manski, C. F. (2013). Public policy in an uncertain world. Harvard University Press.

North, D. C. (1990). Institutions, institutional change and economic performance. Cambridge University Press.

North, D. C. (2005). Understanding the process of economic change. Princeton University Press.

Ormerod, P. (1998). Butterfly economics. Faber & Faber.

Rodrik, D. (2015). Economics rules: The rights and wrongs of the dismal science. W.W. Norton.

Savage, L. J. (1954). The foundations of statistics. Wiley.

Shackle, G. L. S. (1972). Epistemics and economics. Cambridge University Press.

Simon, H. A. (1955). A behavioral model of rational choice. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 69(1), 99–118. https://doi.org/10.2307/1884852

Simon, H. A. (1972). Theories of bounded rationality. Decision and Organization.

Taleb, N. N. (2007). The black swan: The impact of the highly improbable. Random House.

Taleb, N. N. (2012). Antifragile: Things that gain from disorder. Random House.

Tetlock, P. E., & Gardner, D. (2015). Superforecasting. Crown Publishing.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1992). Advances in prospect theory. Journal of Risk and Uncertainty, 5(4), 297–323. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00122574

Weitzman, M. L. (2009). On modeling and interpreting the economics of catastrophic climate change. Review of Economics and Statistics, 91(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1162/rest.91.1.1

Williamson, O. E. (2000). The new institutional economics. Journal of Economic Literature, 38(3), 595–613. https://doi.org/10.1257/jel.38.3.595