

## Oscillations in Organizational Attention: Resource Allocation Dynamics Under Multiple Objectives

Ning-Yuan Georgia Liu <sup>1</sup>  
Hesam Mahmoud <sup>2</sup>  
Maria Tomai <sup>3</sup>  
Konstantinos Triantis <sup>3</sup>  
Peter Madsen <sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Causena.co  
<sup>2</sup> Harvard University  
<sup>3</sup> Virginia Tech  
<sup>4</sup> Brigham Young University

**CONTACT INFORMATION**  
Maria Tomai  
Postdoctoral Associate  
Grado Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering  
System Performance Laboratory | Virginia Tech  
<https://www.spl.ise.vt.edu/>  
Alexandria, VA, USA  
+15713578597 | tomai@vt.edu



**PURPOSE**

**Problem**  
Organizations pursue multiple goals that may support or weaken each other. When resources shift toward the goal below aspiration, this adaptive response can either stabilize performance or generate oscillation and persistent underperformance.

**Approach**  
We model the organization as a learning agent that reacts to performance gaps by reallocating resources across goals. Through simple decision rules, the agent learns where investment is likely to improve performance, allowing us to examine how these adaptive choices generate oscillation, lock-in, or improvement over time.

**SCENARIOS**

|   |                  |                 |               |
|---|------------------|-----------------|---------------|
|   | Effect of B on A |                 |               |
|   | -                | 0               | +             |
| - | Mutual drag (4)  | A hurts B (2)   | Asymmetric    |
| 0 | B hurts A (3)    | Independent (1) | B helps A (6) |
| + | Asymmetric       | A helps B (5)   | Synergy (7)   |

Interdependence determines whether goal pursuit creates synergy, independence, or conflict.

**Model parameters**

- Initial resources for the two goals: A=120, B=80
- Resources mature through a two-stage accumulation delay before affecting performance.
- Softmax allocation set at 0.4: shifts investments toward the larger aspiration gap  
Low sensitivity → resources are shared more evenly.  
High sensitivity → resources quickly shift toward the goal with the larger gap.
- cAB and cBA range from -1 to 1: represent cross-goal effects

**RESULTS**

**Synergy stabilizes allocation**  
When goals reinforce each other, investment in one goal improves both. This reduces performance gaps and helps the system settle into a more stable allocation.

**Antagonism generates oscillation**  
When investment in one goal weakens the other, the organization keeps shifting resources between them. As one goal improves, the other falls behind, creating repeated cycles of attention and reallocation.

**Sc 5: One way gain (cAB=1)**

**Sc 2: A hurts B (cAB= -1)**

**Sc 7: Synergy (cAB, cBA =1)**

**Sc 4: Mutual drag (cAB, cBA =-1)**

**TAKE AWAYS**

- A simple learning agent can discover useful allocation patterns.**  
Even without knowing the interdependence structure, the agent adjusts investment toward goals that generate stronger overall performance gains.
- Antagonism generates oscillation.**  
When investment in one goal weakens the other, resources shift back and forth as each underperforming goal becomes salient.
- Synergy stabilizes allocation.**  
When goals reinforce each other, investment in one goal also helps the other, reducing performance gaps and limiting oscillation.
- Interdependence shapes when prioritization is needed.**  
When goals conflict, equal attention may sustain underperformance; when goals support each other, simultaneous pursuit becomes more feasible.

**NEXT STEPS**

- Add historical/endogenous aspirations based on past performance.
- Introduce explicit goal prioritization when both goals cannot be satisfied.
- Sweep interdependence parameters to identify where oscillations begin or disappear.

**References**

Ethiraj, S. K., & Levinthal, D. (2009). Hoping for A to Z while rewarding only A: Complex organizations and multiple goals. *Organization Science*, 20(1), 4-21.

Hu, S., & Bettis, R. A. (2018). Multiple organization goals with feedback from shared technological task environments. *Organization Science*, 29(5), 873-889.

Gaba, V., & Greve, H. R. (2019). Safe or profitable? The pursuit of conflicting goals. *Organization Science*, 30(4), 647-667.

Levinthal, D. A., & Rerup, C. (2021). The plural of goal: Learning in a world of ambiguity. *Organization science*, 32(3), 527-543.