Managerial approaches to decision-making can be distinguished on the basis of the follow up of the consequences of the decision taken and its repercussions on different people expressing some kind of reaction on the decision. Accordingly, we can come across -

1) Managers who want to reason out the decision. In other words, they have a conviction that their decision can always be supported by some kind of theory of decision-making or by some logic determining validity and consistency of the decision. In other words, the theoretical approach to decision-making though not necessarily pragmatic one insists on some kind of logic behind or scientific determination of cause and effect relationship of the decision. Thus, managers try to establish rationality behind their decisions by first convincing themselves at their decision is based on some kind of logical relationship between cause and effect. Once they have, thus, convinced themselves about rationality of their decisions they may take care to convince others interested, also, about the rationality
in their decisions. This approach may be described as theoretical because it insists on proving the logical reasoning behind the thought process which is the basis of rational decisions.

ii) On the other hand, the practical or pragmatic approach to decision-making is always oriented to results at the spur of the moment. In most of the cases, such decisions there is no scope for the thought process to influence and modify decisions. In other words, this type of decision-making is always intuitive. The decision-maker may not even appreciate the propriety of reasoning out the rationality or appropriateness of their decisions. The propriety of their decisions will be determined not by any logical formality but by the results or consequences of the decisions.

Thus, the actual decision-making process oscillates between two approaches insisting on the one hand rationality and the other results of the extempore process. Whatever may be the approach one can always suspect whether decision is based on the knowledge of the whole truth. In real life the whole truth can never be known and most of the decisions are based on only the knowledge of the partial truth.
It is quite interesting to enquire whether the process of reasoning out logically, the thought behind decisions or the extempore method totally devoid of any logical reasoning lead to decisions which are most rational. In the real world, things cannot really be explained by supernatural causation. In actual practice, if one tries to convince others about the rationality behind his decisions and actions which are based on his understanding of the super-natural causation, he may totally fail because whatever is understood as most rational and logical because of super-natural causation may appear to be highly paradoxical because people try to understand the cause and effect relationship between events and things by their place and function in the environment. Moreover, ignorance and prejudices and other inter-personal value judgments come in the way of knowing whether a decision is rational or not. Therefore, the ultimate choice of decision lies between the two types of decisions -

1) Decisions as a result of thought process which can be reasoned out by a decision-maker.
ii) Extempore or adhoc or result-oriented, pragmatic decisions where the process of logical reasoning has no scope to play its role.

This process of clash and confusion gets more and more subtle and complicated because of the dynamic situation, creating new challenges in management. As a result, the knowledge of the whole truth and nothing but the truth which should be the basis of any rational decision gets completely obscured. Under the circumstances, logical methods of reasoning can only enable a decision-maker to know the consistency in the thought process but by itself it will never enable a decision-maker to know the truth. The limitations for rational decision-making are, thus, created by two types of factors -

i) the humane notions.

ii) human freedom

In the process of decision-making the human action must be free and at the same time determined. Human action as an event in nature must be governed by natural determinations. However, natural determination is not always based on knowledge, which arises out of experience. The empirical knowledge is made up of what
we receive through impressions and what our own faculty of knowledge supplies from itself. The realm of knowledge, propositions beliefs, concepts and sensible impressions should be distinguished from the realm of objects which are conceived in terms of real objects, phenomena, experience, sense-data the given and so on. The dynamic conditions around do not permit genuine knowledge to exist. Thus, existence of genuine knowledge which should be the basis of rational decision-making, becomes problematic. Therefore, the central problem of decision-making is that the problem itself has been largely misconstrued and therefore mishandled as a specimen of scientific problem. Major decision-making is empirical. It is based on sensible impressions of the objects (sensory experience) and whatever is supplied by the cognitive faculties.

Basic decision-making is not based on genuine or intuitive knowledge but on empirical knowledge derived from sensible impressions and the information supplied by cognitive faculties. Therefore, one is compelled to conclude whether one could be in a position to take a rational decision or an action. Intuitive knowledge is the result of perception of things in their eternal aspects and relations. But very few decision-
makers are gifted with the transcendental faculty which enables a decision-maker to understand the totality of sensible objects and such an intuitive knowledge cannot be obtained by any system of thought. For example Logic or Mathematics. Actually, the things which decision-makers have been able to know by intuitive knowledge so far have been very few. This implies that rational decision-making is not possible unless a decision-maker tries to find behind the things and events, their laws and eternal relations.

Most of the decision-making process is based on four factors -

1) Hearsay knowledge

2) Vague experience which is the result of "general impressions" which have "usually worked"

3) Deduction i.e. knowledge reached by reasoning. This kind of knowledge is superior to the above-mentioned two types of knowledge but it is dangerously subject to sudden refutation by direct experience. Moreover, deductive process of reasoning should also be supplemented by inductive type of
reasoning, concerned with drawing from particular cases-general conclusions. In other words, scientific method of enquiry is necessary for determining whether a particular decision is rational or irrational. In all decision-making, there remains simple experience when it is taken as it is, it becomes empirical. It is called accident. If such an accident is sought for, it becomes an experiment. The true method of experience, however, is to go to nature instead of books, traditions and authorities. Nature is the realm of scientific determination whilst man as the possessor of cognetic faculties is external to the realm of nature. Induction and deduction play the same kind of supplementary role as is played by theory and practice. One without the other is useless and dangerous, knowledge that does not generate achievement is a pale and bloodless thing, unworthy of mankind. This probably has made modern approach to decision-making result-oriented.

4. The highest kind of genuine or intuitive knowledge which is not bound by the so-called logical system of thought, because it is the knowledge of the eternal order the World of most intricate and subtle natural laws and structures. Certainly, the existence of particular things has no connections with their
essence and is not an eternal truth. Logic can prove consistency in the thought process which leads us to the eternal truth but cannot make a thinker know the eternal thinker. Therefore, decisions based on intuitive knowledge require no logical justification. Such decisions are sometimes described as pragmatic. Ultimately, the underground desires, the pulsation of the will to power determine our thoughts.

Decision-making is managers intellectual activity and the greater part of this intellectual activity goes on unconsciously and conscious thinking is the weakest. Operation of the will to power remains undisturbed by consciousness. Most of the decision-making is governed at the spur of moment by human instinct which is the most intelligent of all kinds of intelligence. It appears that in the case of a successful and pragmatic decision-maker role of consciousness has not been senselessly overestimated but is regarded as secondary indifferent and superflous, probably, destined to disappear and to be superseded by perfect automatism. In the case of successful decision-makers, there is very little attempt to conceal desire under the cover of reason. Their simple argument is "I want and I will". Satisfaction of the desire is the
only justification. Accordingly, they may either accept or reject philosophies according to their needs and their temperament, and not according to "objective truth". They do not ask which is logical and which is not logical. Then what would be the nature and justification of the actual practice of this philosophy and what would be its meaning for human lives and human interest. In fact, the basic question is - Is this pragmatic approach of rejecting or accepting philosophies according to needs and temperaments and logical.

It is logical because they feel -

*Logic and sermons never convince;
The damp of the night drives deeper into my soul.
Now I re-examine philosophies and religions.
They may prove well in lecture rooms,
yet not prove at all under the spacious clouds, and along the landscape and flowing currents.

Thus, the temperaments of the decision-makers and their leads would influence the selection of a particular philosophy. Decision-makers with tender-minded temperament are bound to be religious and would
like to have and to be loyal to definite and unchanging dogmas and a priori truths. *The tender-minded decision-makers would be taken to free will idealism, monism as opposed to dualism, and optimism. The tough-minded temperament (which is the need of the present day dynamic circumstances) is materialistic irreligious, empiricist (going only on facts i.e. believing in direct experience) pessimistic and sceptical, direct experience and not any super-natural or metaphysical causation system explains the things, to the tough-minded decision-makers. Things are explained to them by their place and function in the environment. Thus, pragmatic approach to decision-making is based on addiction to facts and reliance on the senses. Of course, they are required to be tender-minded in their horror of determinism. The kind of pragmatism which will harmonise these apparently contradictory demands of being "tough minded" and yet occasionally tender-minded is the need of decision-making in modern times.

Creeping in of such a pragmatism in the process of decision-making is (which is a kind of human response) quite inevitable and justifiable. The pragmatic theory of truth says that a statement is true if it is 'useful' for us to believe it. The doctrines derived by mathematicians, logicians and scientists are known as logical positivism or logical empirism.

According to these doctrines only statements which can be verified (shown to be true) by our looking about us, by the evidence of our senses, can be said to tell us anything to be meaningful. For facilitating communication of truth with the help of such statements there is the need for a 'perfect' language which would picture facts in a clear away. One is compelled to believe, as a matter of reality that actually human language is perfect.

Philosophic Problems arise because we are misled or worried in one way or the other, by our language. Therefore, philosophy changes nothing. The World around man changes itself without showing any loyalty to a philosophical proposition. The philosopher's business, therefore, remains confined to 'description' merely. Therefore, one might feel puzzled or worried about the nature of reality. 'Is it real? or am I dreaming' remains the oldest, unsolved famous and fundamental question of philosophy -
(The science of knowledge and wisdom) This question should be answered by carefully considering the actual use we make of words.

Therefore, the following frank and naturalistic observation (conclusion) made by Prof. Dewey appears to be most pertinent under the modern-day circumstances leading to specific problematic situations.

"to idealize and rationalize the universe at large is a confession of inability to master the courses of things that specifically concern us."

It is very unlikely that a manager in modern time could afford to make such a confession and worship a particular philosophy of human life. The modern era will begin only when the naturalist point of view shall be adopted in every field. This is because human mind (which can never be replaced by a computer whatever the technological advance) is an organ or organism in an environment, acted upon and reacting, moulded and moulding.

The human brain is primarily an organ of certain kind of behaviours, not of knowing the World. Thought is an instrument of readaptation. Ideas are imagined contacts (or imaginations about the course and effect relationships between Phenomena) They are experiments in adjustment. But this is no passive adjustment. Of course, complete adaptation to environment is death. Therefore, the essential point in all responses is the desire, to control the environment and such a desire is quite justifiable for the sake of survival of human beings and their social and economic organisations.

In so far as human relation management is the most important area of decision-making. These things will have to be borne by the decision-makers and to that extent pragmatism shall be the basis of future decision-making practices and styles in modern times.
Adhoc approach to Decision-making and empiricism and pragmatism in decision-making:

'Practical reason' dominates thinking in the modern world. The rule of the survival of the fittest and the utilitarianism which measures all goods in terms of use, dominate the different decision-making areas. The lust for movement and acquisition fills the sails of a decision-maker's style and thought. A decision-maker has to be materialistically-minded while advertising his product, recommending long-term investments with high dividends. The 'truth' must be tried by experience and experimentation and consequently decision-making styles and strategies must be changed. Personal utility is the test of truth and it is even necessary for a decision-maker to utter non-sense learnedly - it may be a useful error. This is because then is no "conclusion" or 'advice' which can be 'final'. Everything would depend on the purpose it serves.

Any thought behind any decision is a mirror of external and physical reality. Everything is 'seen' in a context. Decisions are backed by feelings of 'for' 'to' and 'against' and 'because' and 'behind' and 'after' as well as of matter and men. These transitive elements
in the flow of thought make decisions 'continuous' and 'adhoc'. There is consciousness about the 'purpose' and the results of a particular juncture. This consciousness is a point at which the sequence and relationship of thoughts coincide illuminatingly with the sequence of events and the relationship of things. In such moments whatever is felt is the 'reality' itself and it does not remain a mere 'phenomenon'. The passion for the immediate and actual and real leads to adhocism and pragmatism.

Thus in the decision making process in actual practice there is a queer blending of adhocism, pragmatism and empiricism. There is no scope for emotions or egoism but one's experience about the reality at a particular moment forms the basis of decisions which are most practical and successful. Most of the decisions are taken in the light of situation facing the decision-maker. The decision-maker acts with his instincts rather than with reason at the spur of the moment and decides - whether to do or not to do, to act or react, and to or not give decision. The tendencies to act, to react, to fight or seek escape, are the instincts. These tendencies are useful economies of behaviour, to meet, without the delays of deliberation recurrent exigencies and crises created by situations which are not stereotyped.
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