

Short Communication

Reality of human decision-making: A leadership and management platform

Ojo Emmanuel Ademola

BCS and CMI Subject Matter Expert Principal Consultant Power-Age, United Kingdom.

Decision-making as an essential leadership and management is an inescapable part of life whether done deliberately or intuitively. A few researchers have embraced the idea of discernment in primary leadership. As it were, the procedure of what is central in leadership and management ought to be legitimate regardless of the coveted result. As a rule, be that as it may, the balanced procedure might not factor in individuals' choice. For a few reasons, individuals might settle on nonsensical choices regardless of the thought of sanity. In this paper, author conceptualised decision-making as a leadership and management platform where an individual could settle on an unexpected outcome.

Key words: Humans, decisions, leadership, management and platform.

INTRODUCTION

The uncertainty that surrounds decision-making environment increasingly gaining a generalized and globalized traction (Abell, 1991; Das, 2016; Hastie and Dawes, 2010; Plous, 1993; Stevenson, 2014). It could be a summed-up vulnerability, a phenomenon that scholars and practitioners of today manage as part of their expert life. It is imposing an unimaginable thread of intuition and rationality to decision-making in projects. The trend could typify how the decision environment will create or what results the potential choices may have. It always constitutes managerial challenges for leaders and managers who are attempting to ensure that their business could create robust competitive advantages as well as be active as social change agents. As leaders and managers aspire to make sure that their business maintains sustainability through organizational growth, there is a trend that underpins the practice of decision-

making (Das, 2016; Stevenson, 2014).

Strategic choice

The business decision-making process continues to show a more and faster tendency for both continuity and change. The pace of integrating intuition and rationality in strategic choice provides evidence for a common thread where intuition and rationality interplays (Calabretta et al., 2017; Sloan, 2017). With globalization, the time has turned out to be even more valuable, overpower more typically (Ademola, 2017; Solari, 2012). In fact, in strategic choice, synergizing ideas on decision-making process show patterns towards speedier choices and automated decision procedures (Sloan, 2017). Leaders and

*Corresponding author. E-mail: ademola eo@p-acc.co.uk.

managers depending on the tools available to them need to keep pace with the development of decision-making approaches and the trend in research and practice. The decision makers must be up-to-date with choices dynamic; when a choice has not been made, or a date or point of confinement surpassed. There is even a term for it now, 'management by exception' (Chartered Management Institute [CMI], 2015).

In the understanding of the current trend in the decision-making process, one question could be pervasive as to ask, do we know where the field is heading? Scholars and practitioners could, in fact, acknowledge the development in neuroscience, emotion, and dynamic decision tasks. Undoubtedly, these are playing an increasingly important role in the immediate future of judgment and decision-making research (Abell, 1991; Hastie and Dawes, 2010; Plous, 1993; Sloan, 2017). It is intriguing that these new bearings are interrelated and strengthen each other, neuroscience adding to the deep comprehension of what feeling is and what it does. A lot of what the mind does reflects in passionate experience arguably (Hastie and Dawes, 2010; Morgan, 2006; Senge et al., 1994).

NORMALITY AND DECISION-MAKING

The dynamic errands and models for behaviour in such pattern could help researchers and practitioners in relating non-research material that centres on choice conduct to its neural substrates. Researchers and professionals could expect that these improvements will all catalyse changes in the use of decision models. The idea of normal, ideal conduct is likewise liable to be altered by a more profound comprehension of the physical systems that underlie the intellectual and enthusiastic procedures, which are the essential subject of current speculations, and by investigations of achieving behavioural objectives in unique, transiently expanded situations rather than on single choice trials (Das, 2016; Hastie and Dawes, 2010; Plous, 1993; Sloan, 2017).

The pattern of operations that exist between decision dynamisms, between individual approaches to decision-making and the group dynamic could as well provide decision-makers with a unique perspective into how the field is evolving and impacting the leadership and management commitments (Abell, 1991; Aldag, 2012; Sloan, 2017). As researchers are developing effective debiasing tools that impact the decision-making process, uncertainty becomes increasingly manageable. It is a pattern of imperative accentuation in decision-making (Hastie and Dawes, 2010; Plous, 1993).

The control of who has what information or who should have it that exist in group decision process could help to de-escalate any malfunction input in the

process. In other words, as a fundamental understanding of decision situations prevail, it could potentially be sufficient to avoid traps and biases as the uncertainty of today could indeed be a certainty in the future (Plous, 1993). Organizations that blossomed with top-down control, consistency and a tolerant work drive are understanding that this does not operate anymore. Thus, the need for an innovative approach to management (Hamel, 2007). It implies that the world is changing at a perpetually expanding rate. Markets fall and redesign.

DECISION-MAKING PROCESS AND SOCIAL CHANGE

The rivalry is hitting up as robust communicating and executing of decisions strategies continue to evolve. Business basic leadership patterns are going back and forth more rapidly. The understanding remains that organizations require individuals who are inventive, creative, versatile, and fast considering. Organizations are on high for creating robust competitive advantages and improvement in positive social change. The sociological perspective as the big picture regarding decision-making process becomes effusively productive due to the impact of globalization, stakeholder involvement, and technology. The business decision making trends that have lasted quite some time becomes diminished (Abell, 1991). The trend depicts a pattern that could be a platform for further theorizing. The idea is to create more accessible and open spaces so that people could communicate more efficiently and feel as an engaging part of the stakeholders when comes to decision-making (Hastie and Dawes, 2010; Laureate Education, 2014c).

The needs for stakeholders' engagement in communicating and executing decisions favour the human desire to experience their humanity. In other words, to predict the future, in this case, could be progressively troublesome as individuals need to encounter their lives, what it is to be human and to impart the delight of living with their related people.

Individuals need to encounter the profound in every way. Since many psychological phenomena even in decision-making can be demonstrated experimentally, to leadership and management, expected challenges should pave the way to further the current opportunity in research and development (Kahneman, 2011; Plous, 1993). Nonetheless, there exist the thought that if everybody and everything could be dealt with as equivalent and imperative, then things will be all right (Abell, 1991; Brockner, 1992; Staw, 1981).

The current dynamic in decision-making underscored in individual versus group decision as well as the evolution of automated decision process could further the approach in this predictive engagement. Attempting to

predict the future seems increasingly like a dangerous endeavour. Without the advantage of the knowledge of the past, how might individuals foresee the continued evolution and impact of computers and the web on leadership and management? The impact of automated decision technique could lead to a proliferation of the need for taking a real-time decision even in the larger corporations.

CONCLUSION

What is more? One could, therefore, conclude that the analysis of the future of decision-making in management and leadership should combine a big picture of contributions. The contributions of decision researchers, analysts, practitioners, and much more; as there is rapid convergence in the application of decision-making techniques as well as expert systems, artificial intelligence collaboratively helping to keep impacting the communication and execution of decisions. It is a concept that remains a platform for further theorizing (Calabretta et al., 2017; CMI, 2015; Conitzer et al., 2017; van Ginkel and van Knippenberg, 2009).

CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The author has not declared any conflict of interests.

REFERENCES

- Abell P (1991). Rational choice theory. Hants, England: Edward Elgar Publishing.
https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Ojo_Ademola/publication/319556350_Future_of_Decision-making_A_review/links/59b3e922458515a5b49091ef/Future-of-Decision-making-A-review.pdf
- Ademola EO (2017). A synergy for global forms of organizing. *Computing, Information Systems, Development Informatics Allied Research Journal*, 8(1):11-14. Retrieved from <https://emmanuelojoademola.academia.edu/research#papers>
- Aldag RJ (2012). Distinguished scholar invited essay behavioral decision making: implications for leadership and organizations. *Journal of Leadership Organizational Studies* 19(2):133-141. doi: 10.1177/1548051812442745
- Brockner J (1992). The escalation of commitment to a failing course of action: Toward theoretical progress. *Academy of Management Review* 17(1):39-61. doi:10.5465/AMR.1992.4279568
- Conitzer V, Sinnott-Armstrong W, Borg, JS, Deng Y, Kramer M (2017). Moral decision making frameworks for Artificial Intelligence. Retrieved from <https://users.cs.duke.edu/~conitzer/moralAAAI17.pdf>
- Calabretta G, Gemser G, Wijnberg N (2017). The interplay between intuition and rationality in strategic decision making: A paradox perspective. *Organization Studies* 38(2):225-261. doi:10.1177/0170840616655483
- Chartered Management Institute (CMI) (2015). <https://www.managers.org.uk/insights/research/current-research/2015/may/mapping-management-excellence>
- Das A (2016). *An Introduction to operations management: The joy of operations*. Oxon, England: Routledge.
- Hamel G (2007). *The future of management*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Hastie R, Dawes RM (2010). *Rational choice in an uncertain world* (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Kahneman D (2011). *Thinking, fast and slow*. London, England: Penguin Random House UK.
- Laureate Education (Producer) (2014c). *Future of decision making* [Video file]. Baltimore, MD: Author.
- Morgan G (2006). *Images of organization*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Plous S (1993). *The psychology of judgment and decision making*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Senge P, Kleiner A, Roberts C, Ross R, Smith B (1994). *The fifth discipline fieldbook: Strategies and tools for building a learning organization*. London, England: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Sloan J (2017). *Learning to think strategically* (3rd ed.). Oxon, England: Routledge.
- Solari L (2012). Globalization will make us all more different. *People and Strategy* 35(2):30-35. Retrieved from <http://ezp.waldenulibrary.org/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1498386669?accountid=14872>
- Staw BM (1981). The escalation of commitment to a course of action. *Academy of Management Review* 6(4):577-587. doi:10.5465/AMR.1981.4285694
- Stevenson W (2014). *Operations management* (12th ed.). New York, NY: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
- van Ginkel WP, van Knippenberg D (2009). Knowledge about the distribution of information and group decision making: When and why does it work? *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* 108(2):218-229. doi:10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.10.003