When we talk about the managerial styles in decision-making we have to take up for discussion of the following important points in consideration:

1) Are managers capable to taking decisions?
2) How frequently they take decisions?
3) Are they in a position to justify their decisions by undertaking the follow up of the decision.
4) Operational aspect of decision i.e. the operational environment affected by politics, the personality factors, traditions, the cost of decision-making, crisis created by decisions and politics, confusion and contradictions created by the value system, the various pressures created.
5) The level of sophistication in decision-making as created by typical hierarchical patterns, ownership patterns, family traditions, and the role of consultants.

The new challenges have been created by the social, economic and political factors and managers have
to face these challenges and resultant crisis by taking most appropriate decisions at the most appropriate hour. They have also to take decisions by anticipating problems. Given the necessary competence, skill and proper attitude to decision-making the basic proposition about decision-making role would be that decision-making role is performed within the organisational or institutional framework. Ultimately, organisation is an aggregate of human beings and therefore the major areas of decision-making is human-relations management. In a permissive society the basic problem before any organisation, whether social or economic is, how to survive and then grow. Modern society is full of clusters of complex organisations, interacting and inter-dependent. These organisations are, inevitable for economic growth, and affluence in a developing economy. These organisations are instruments of economic, technical, social, and cultural change. Efficiency and effectiveness of organisations is the key to economic prosperity through industrialisation.

However, improvement in the quality of management as reflected in appropriate decision-making capabilities, is the crux of the success in running organisations. Decision-making role of a manager has many facets. It is
highly technical and specialist in nature. It may be supervisory or non-supervisory but one common characteristic is that decisions are taken for managing systems and sub-systems. These systems are made-up of managing individual behaviour, group behaviour and other resources. Managers' role would be to contribute individually as a decision-maker to facilitate smooth functioning of the system. His contribution as a decision-maker is indirect and his role is that of a multiplier. His role is that of a trustee but he has to be basically result-oriented and he must solve problems for survival and growth.

Though one comes across different classifications of managerial decision-making styles the basic two categories in the context of environment, in which decisions are taken are -

1) decision-making styles that mould and remould the environment.

2) where environmental factors and the constraints created by them make a decision-maker helpless.

Thus, managers have to assess their performance in decision-making and decide as to which category they belong. The most important quality which the decision-makers are required to cultivate in modern times is that they must have awareness about the reality they are facing at the spur of
the moment. It is very difficult to entertain loyalties
to certain ideologies. It is also not desirable to
approach problems with most sensitive and delicate mind.
Modern manager as a decision-maker must be thick-skinned.
In other words, modern decision-making must be tough-
minded and most pragmatic. Modern decision-maker has to
face reality in which controversies and contradictions
are bound to be created. But this is inevitable. Nobody
in the World has understood reality completely and the
darkness of ignorance always comes in the way of under-
standing the whole reality. Reality is like a sphere,
whole of which cannot be seen at one time and therefore
ignorance about the reality is the inseparable part of
human life.

This observation is quite relevant in the context
of the specific role the managers have to play under the
Indian conditions. The role of a decision-maker is growth
oriented and creative. A decision-maker has very little
time to anticipate, react and wait for the desirable change
in environment. In the area of human management crisis
can be faced and resolved by those decision-makers who
understand the inter-personal problems and have the nece-
ssary awareness.
As the investigations in the Transactional Analysis point out there are three ego-stages in so far as human beings are concerned.

1) The childhood stage.
2) The adult stage
3) The parent stage and

In so far as each human being passes through or is at different ego stages a manager has to take a very compassionate view of human behaviour in critical situations. A part from compassion he has to develop a cosmic approach. It is a 'worldly approach' though not necessarily 'a saintly approach'. Only such an approach in decision-making would enable managers to come out of crisis. To this there is no exception whether he is a manager in a private multi-national corporation or a family business organisation or a public sector organisation or small scale organisations. The implication is that the cult of individualism has no place in the Indian value systems and business philosophy. Similarly, imitation and adoption of any management technique or style developed elsewhere than in India is of no relevance at all. The empirical studies conducted in England, America, Australia reached a very important conclusion regarding the value profiles of Indian managers. As a
group, Indian managers were found to be more morally
mentally oriented and less pragmatically oriented. Indian
managers had bureaucratic humanism orientation as
opposed to the economic and organisational competence
orientation of the Western managers. Personalism in
Indian managers attaches more importance to 'job satis-
faction', 'dignity', 'prestige', 'security', and 'power'.
Another striking observation was that 'groups of people'
did not play a significant part in the value system of
Indian Managers. In other words, Indian managers
accorded significantly less importance to formal and
informal groups such as customers, subordinates,
employees, co-workers, workers with different skills,
white-collar workers etc.

The crux of the problems under modern conditions
is such a value system in which managers ascribe highly
ethical and desirable values to themselves rather than to
their colleagues and subordinates is relevant. This
value system and business philosophy is certainly not
relevant for decision-making under the present circum-
stances. The cult of individualism has to give place to
the cult of nationalism. A manager cannot be an idealist.
He cannot always be security-oriented and power-minded.
He has to entertain higher goals or values namely
creativity, social welfare and internal-personal values. They must be more willing to take more risk than that taken by the managers of earlier generation. They must be aware of the inevitability in decision-making - whether it (inevitability) be for problem-solving or for the postponement of the crisis. There is a pressure for better performance and greater public accountability than in the past. The decision-making power is being shared. There is corrosion of authority at all levels. This will have to be compensated by improvement of skills, knowledge, competence and decision-making styles and strategies.

The future genre of managers will have to cultivate tolerance and compassion against the ambiguous and uncertain human behaviour within and outside the organisation. The managerial style and the decision-making approach will have to be based on certain newly emerging cause and effect relationships between phenomena. These relationships are logically illogical. For e.g., the relationship between reward and effort, between loyalty and appreciations, between dash and survival, between decency and humiliation, between arrogance, insubordination, threat, violence and the self-interest served. A manager comes across various types of
contradictions and inconsistencies and cannot just blindly apply the formal stereo-typed approaches to decision-making. He has to rely on his own value-judgment, his diplomacy, his pragmatism, and must be prepared for compromises (though undesirable) with his value system, ideals of life, competence, calibre, and qualities. He has to forget his ego in approaching human problem because ego, in addition to the hallucinations (which he already has because of his inability to understand the reality as a whole) are going to aggravate the problem and blur his vision completely. Under the circumstances, his intuitive knowledge (which is not derived from any logical system) would enable him take most appropriate decision at the spur of the moment. Moreover, he has to be aware of the supplementary processes of inductive and deductive reasoning.

Most of the decisions in modern management are based on subjective judgments or beliefs. Of course, these beliefs must be distinguished from knowledge and superstition because knowledge consists of justified beliefs supported by sufficient evidence. Moreover, knowledge or justified beliefs of man consists of two types of judgments -
1) Intuitive judgments based on the sense perception of a person for e.g. a decision-maker in the area of personnel management may "smell" that there would be labour unrest today and take the appropriate measures against the situation. This is a decision based on intuitive judgment, which may not necessarily conform to any logical system. However, perceiving or gathering knowledge about the objects and events around us may be the result of "intuitive judgment" or "derived judgments" which are beliefs or judgments derived from the process of consultation or reliance on certain precedents. In other words, derived judgments have their roots in the existing body of knowledge, which is ever growing.

Major problem of decision-making in any area of management is to justify decisions taken in respect of objects and events around us. A decision-maker before finalising a decision draws certain conclusions or inferences on the basis of his own value judgments or beliefs expressed in clear terms or words. In logic they are called propositions. These propositions have to be supported by enough reasons and evidence so that they are made acceptable to those who are concerned with implementation of the decision. In a dynamic situation, the basic problem before a manager is to justify his
propositions and the decisions based thereon, with the existing knowledge as well as the knowledge potential in the environment. This knowledge potential has to be keenly explored and exploited by the manager by developing his own awareness of the new dimension to the knowledge. For example, if a decision regarding investment of funds may be capable of being justified against the background of the existing knowledge. It cannot be justified against the background of a new economic theory revising the existing knowledge. Therefore, justifiability of a decision is relative to the dynamic changes in the phenomena and objects around. This would imply that a truly efficient manager will be required to justify how he is going out of the way and taking a decision which apparently irrational or illogical to others. In this case, logic with its inductive and deductive methods of reasoning can come to his help. However, manager must remember that logical methods can prove consistency of managers thought. But not necessarily, the knowledge about the truth which is realised through intuition. In actual practice, managers cannot avoid justifying rationality of their decisions through reason and evidence.
2) Most of the decisions may be based on derived judgments. Logical methods of reasoning come to managers help for clearly formulating and testing his theories. This is necessary because inferences are drawn from knowledge through observation with the help of sensory organs, which does not enable a decision-maker to understand whole reality. Therefore, validity of the inferences drawn must be proved. Persistent application of logic is the common feature of all reasoned knowledge and decisions based thereon. Therefore, decision-makers resort to the scientific methods of observation, inference, analysis, and synthesis. The various steps of the scientific method of reasoning are -

   a) Observation -
      making use of the mind and the senses to collect facts, to count or measure the phenomena under investigation. The sense perceptions and experience which reveal certain cause and effect relationships require precise description and explanation.

   b) Classification -
      i.e. arrangement of observations and their classification by comparing their traits - This would enable the decision-maker to acquire scientific knowledge in his field of enquiry.
c) **Verification** -

Checking the truth of his hypothesis i.e. the decision taken by him or the answer suggested by him through observation, experimentation or reasoning.

d) **Generalisation** -

The suggested decision or the answer pertaining to a problem is given the status of a generalisation - pertaining to facts observed and their relationships.

e) **Analysis, synthesis and Explanation** -

After discovering a general tendency or a trait in the phenomena and their relations, a manager is required to analyse, synthesize and explain his decision. Analysis is concerned with ascertainment of the accuracy of decisions - it is a kind of follow up of the consequences of decisions when implemented. Synthesis is a kind of reasoning from principles to a conclusion.

Explanation of justifiability of decision taken in a particular situation has to be logical. In other words, the explanation should be based on either -
1) Deductive method of reasoning i.e. the formal logic and/or

2) Inductive method of reasoning or inductive logic.

Formal logic or deductive logic is concerned with the study of the various kinds of inferences, that may be drawn from given propositions as against formal logic, inductive logic enables a manager to draw conclusions based upon observation or experience and in this method the premises cannot be treated as being given and true. Inductive logic insists on ascertaining whether the statements contained in the premises is supported by sufficient observation or experience before conclusions are drawn. Therefore, inductive logic constitutes a major part of the logical method of sciences. Since, scientific knowledge is empirical, it arises out of observation and experience and when a decision-maker makes an attempt to reason from the proposition based upon observation or experience, the use of inductive logic becomes necessary. This is quite inevitable because a decision-maker, before finalising his decision has to begin his investigation of the problem by observing certain instances of the occurrence of a phenomena. He measures and records the occurrences. Then he examines the concrete data collected and makes a
statement or proposition concerning the characteristics of the class as a whole. However, the sweeping generalizations of the class as a whole may create difficulties. For e.g. such a proposition in the 'Theory X' of management - "The average human being has an inherent dislike of work and will avoid it if he can. Because of this human characteristic of dislike of work most people must be coerced, controlled, directed, threatened with punishment to get them to put forth adequate effort towards the achievement of organisational objectives. The average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibility, has relatively little ambition wants security above all". must be supported by formal or deductive logic. In other words, inductive logic is often followed by deductive logic in the scientific process of justifying inferences drawn and decisions based thereon. This supporting and supplementary nature of deductive and inductive logic in decision-making can be shown by the following chart -
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A decision-maker in modern times cannot ignore this supplementary and supporting relationship between inductive and deductive logic.

However, the modern situation is characterised by such unexpected and unforeseen turns, that any logic would fail and managers’ instead of making a deliberate attempt to justify their decisions would just say -

'I know not how I make decision's ...........
'I do not know how I do it'.......
'I just do it'.......
'I am damned it I know how I am able to choose the right course'.....

As is revealed in the answers given by different executives, the decision-making styles and strategies are only appropriate to a particular situation only. Decisions are appropriate or pertinent at a particular moment only. Every time the experience is new and a manager as a decision-maker has to harp a new note for facing a new type of music and he must go on taking decisions with a new blending of different styles and he has to just see that the show must go on. Thus, the whole logical process itself gets lost in the turbulence and turmoil resulting into violence, commotion, disorder
and resistance. Decision which must "serve certain purpose" must be taken and a manager has no time to apply logical system to ascertain the propriety of such a decision. There is nothing moral or immoral about it and the usual criteria of up-gradation and degradation lose their relevance. The dynamic situation demands the decisions must be taken and logic behind them should not be insisted upon. Logic, if any, is proved by new events and new experience about the results. Under the challenges and constraints created by dynamic situation logic behind decision is proved not by persons but by urgency in the situation. The problems of survival and growth of individuals and organisations become paramount and provided the objectives of survival and growth are achieved and emergency-type of solutions are found. Decisions which are apparently illogical and which do not have any theoretical justification become logical. A manager has, therefore, to switch on from one approach and style of decision making to another and one comes across the most pragmatic but not necessarily logical approach preferred by decision-making executives. It is characterised by the blending of one or two of the following ways of decision-making.
1. **Resort to 'rules of thumb'** - e.g. a notion that a company ought to keep 30 days inventory on hand or 'a manager may expect an investment to pay out in three years' period. These are the examples of conventional simplifications.

2. **Appeal to a system of categories** - Often policy categories are used to place decisions in broad classes. For example, breakdown in production is a problem which may be considered as pertaining only to the production area of management and other departments such as purchases, personnel, finance may be treated as related to it.

3. **Suppressing uncertainty** - Ignoring unlikely events, considering only a single possible set of future conditions, considering average values or some such device to avoid the complexity of dealing with uncertainty. A conservative person deals only with the worst events that may happen, the optimist with the best, and some deal with only the most probable events and so on.

4. **Adopt a near planning horizon** - Events are considered and the implications of decisions are
studied only for a short period. Similarly, one might simplify by limiting the consideration of past experience to only the rather recent past.

5. **Illegitimate resolution of value conflicts.** — Simplification may be sought by restricting consid­eration of the values of consequences to those dimensions which are most easily measurable or most 'tangible'. Thus, one may consider profit and output while suppress­ing the complexity of human attitudes, and social and moral values.

6. **Need-determined distortions** — Habitual ways of viewing a decision situation arise because a conception which meets the needs of one situation is uncritically applied to others. If a question is asked to the manager, "Why did you choose this way?" his answer would be; "Well, I guess because we always do it this way."

These blendings simplify the process of decision-making which must solve problems at the "spur of the moment". No logical proof appropriateness of such decision-making styles be insisted upon and so long as managers decision-making has facilitated problem solving, indulgence in justification of decision through any logical system is unwanted, and managers need not
entertain such a demand. They should speak in terms of results rather than logic behind their decisions. No other justification is necessary when the results and the new experiences have justified the decisions.

The necessity of such a pragmatism in decision-making arises out of the most important characteristics of modern industrial society. Prof. R.H. Tawney* speaks of "the straight-forward hatred of a system which stunts personality and corrupts human relations by permitting the use of man by man as an instrument of pecuniary gain."

One feels that Prof. R.H. Tawney is describing the characteristics of the modern industrial society in India. Prof. E.F. Schumacher has given his interpretation of Prof. Tawney's remark namely - that modern industrial society stunts the personality by making most forms of work - manual and white collared - utterly uninterested and meaningless. Modern industrialism in India cannot make work satisfying because there is no worthy challenge in the work. There is no stimulus to self-perfection, no chance of development and the elements of beauty, truth or goodness are totally lost sight off. Work which is

* Quoted by Prof. E.F. Schumacher in his book 'Good work'
only productivity oriented cannot confirm dignity. If the working life of a labourer is without dignity it creates a spirit of sullen irresponsibility. The resultant irresponsible behaviour is the consequence of a particular temperament or a mood which is gloomily, angry and silent, malignant, dark and dull. Worker with such a spirit of irresponsibility refuses to be softened by higher wages. On the contrary, such benefits as job security and higher wages have stimulated workers to be more irresponsible. Decision-makers have to face this crisis often and often and cannot but adopt just a short-sighted adhoc approach to decision making because there is the problem of survival created by irresponsible behaviour.

Modern industrial society in India is democratic in the context of political institutions but autocratic in its methods of management. As a result, it is pervaded by distorted scheme of values. For e.g. Introduction of such a concept as workers participation in management creates difficulties for the decision-makers. One is really doubtful whether more and more say given to the workers in the organisation of their work would restore some interest in the work. Such phrases as workers participation in management,
changing priorities enabling preferential treatment to a particular class of people have only generated consciousness about the rights but not necessarily about the responsibilities. Then, will modern decision-makers in a position to reject the admiration of productivity and ensure that every job is worthy of a man? If he so rejects he will have to fear that this kind of managerial style would not enable him to pay the expected wages and if he pays such wages such a policy would land him in a bankruptcy court. At the same time a decision-maker has to remember that modern days are not the days of autocratic management which treats men as factors of production instead of responsible human persons. Thus, a decision-maker has to play his role in a situation characterised by a dilemma between autocratic values (implying coercion and self-centred approach) and democratic values (respecting dignity of human being and insisting upon participative type of management but creating distortions in the value systems. The dilemma is created by two possibilities -

1) Fully democratic structures falling into disorder and
2) Structures with involvement of more people wherein order cannot be preserved without authoritarianism and one can only make a wishful thinking about democracy.

There are four main characteristics of modern industrial society which, in the light of the Gospels, must be accounted four great and grievous evils:

*1. Its vastly complicated nature.
2. Its continuous stimulation of, and reliance on the deadly sins of greed, envy and avarice.
3. Its destruction of the content and dignity of most forms of work.
4. Its authoritarian character, owing to organisation in excessively large units.

These great and grievous evils of modern industrial society are possessed by almost all the societies in the World and modern industrial society in India is no exception.

A decision-maker in modern times has to be aware of these great and grievous evils while adopting a

* Quoted by Prof. E. F. Schumacher - 'Good Work' P.29
particular decision-making approach and style. He must be aware of the fact that -

a) any activity is carried on for the purpose of private pecuniary gain

b) Societies dominated by the uncivilised tactics of big business (This is the result of) -

c) Operations of trade unions (Counter-vailing power) in conditions of rising unemployment.

d) modern industrial system has a built in tendency to grow and it cannot really work unless it is growing. However, in the process creation of built in stability demands attention of the decision-maker.

e) there are contradictions unprecedented in the growth process. These contradictions are reflected in the contradictory situations like poverty in the midst of twenty, stagflation etc. No decision-maker is in a position to know (or he may never care to enquire into it and know it) where the saturation point of such growth process is and what would be the final stage of events in future.

f) the system is characterised by one group of people imposing their values on others and disrupts the tuning of society for e.g. the industrial system creates
only those things which are technologically possible without having regard to what people really want. This would mean adding insult to injury. In this context, a decision-maker has to analyse and understand the relevance of such concepts as consumers sovereignty, democratic industrial management for the people, by the people and of the people.

g) both at the micro-level and macro level problems are solved by adopting inter-disciplinary approach. But one really wonders whether such an approach should be adopted if it is going to serve the vested interests serve and safeguard vested interests. Politics dominates decision-making in all the areas of industrial management. Under the circumstances, a decision-maker has either to sacrifice his self-respect or if he insists on being a self-respecting individual he cannot remain a decision-maker. Thus, inevitably a decision-maker has to indulge in compromises howsoever, ugly and unacceptable they may be, to a decision-maker. One cannot survive without these compromises. A person facing such a compulsion in respect of indulgence in compromises cannot talk about dignity, self-respect, morality, truth, good and beauty.
Under the circumstances are one comes across different strategies for decision-making and decision-making styles. Following can be mentioned:

1) Own decision without explanation to subordinate.
2) Own decision with explanation to subordinate.
3) Prior consultation with subordinates and colleagues before decision is taken.
4) Joint decision making with subordinates
5) Delegation to subordinates where matters are largely left to the subordinates.

The first two styles appear to be more prominent irrespective of the organisation. In adopting these styles there is no diplomacy. However, managers are tactful when they

1) avoid taking decision or delay the decision indefinitely. In so far the industrial situation in India is in a melting pot such a decision may be justified.
2) getting 'somebody else' (a person or a committee) to avoid decision - such a strategy will effectively ensure decision avoiding and postponement of the crisis.
However, care must be taken - not to appoint those persons (experts) who are quite 'particular' and 'known' for 'reviewing', 'reporting' about the problem "on time". Several difficulties have to be created in the working of such 'experts' or 'committee of experts' e.g. appointing 'sick' persons, or persons geographically dispersed appointing persons who lose things and get lost, persons who have earned the reputation of notoriously saying 'no' to everything or are so cynic and fault-finding that they can never come to conclusion and themselves are to confused and make others confuse in such a way that everything is put in doldrum.

3) Skillfully avoiding decisions by stamping the problem as 'policy' matter pertaining to higher levels of management.

4) Decision in the form of a suggestion to conduct a survey at a 'macro' level.

5) the desperate move of appointing a consultant a step which raises the level of sophistication in decision-making.

6) Decision avoiding for postponing the crisis may be reflected in several other personal 'moves' and 'strategies' - e.g. by affrighting the trouble-shooter (leader), trapping the 'counterpart' (the opponent) in
technical matters, 'hushing' up the matter, conferring honour by giving additional work of thoroughly analysing the problem and reporting to the management, dodging, denying the existence of the problem, or throwing it on to the shoulders of the opponent saying that it is within his 'pervue' or jurisdiction.... and so on.

Obviously, many of the decision-making styles and strategies have been evolved in a situation of turmoil which makes three types of demands on the decision-makers in modern times -

1) decisions must be taken - decision of not taking a decision must also be taken
2) decisions should to avoided if the situation so demands.
3) decisions must be delayed for maintaining 'status-quo' of the situation.

Against these demands and the pressures and tensions created by the dynamic situation decision-making responsibility of justifying his decision by resorting to any logical system of thought (whether inductive or deductive) is over. Fundamentally, decision-makers 'intuitive' knowledge would come to his help for
taking decisions - at the spur of the moment - which facilitate first survival and then growth later. The implication is that there is sufficient scope for creativity (which is the result of intuition and not of logic) in decision-making under the present day circumstances. A good decision-maker need not prove how logically he thinks about the problem. But he would be a good decision-maker whenever he 'feels', he 'smells', he 'anticipates' something and acts 'spontaneously' in times of crisis. There is very little time to think logically in most of the urgent and emergency type of problematic situations created by kaleidoscopic nature of objects - events persons and phenomena.

Apart from the kaleidoscopic nature of dynamic situation which blurs the vision of the decision-maker and keeps him away from knowing the ultimate truth. There are several other constraints against whose background decisions are taken and these constraints render redundant and superfluous any effort on the part of a decision-maker to be 'logical' - rather he is illogically logical against the following constraints -
1) A person, howsoever, knowledgeable, intelligent and well-read he may be is always in a confused state of mind. His personality is full of complexes and very little comes within the compass of his system of thought when things take unforeseen, unpredictable and abrupt turns. It is simply beyond one's reach to acquire knowledge and get proficiency in the skill of decision-making and other skills required by industrial management in modern times.

2) Time and the total life-span or total career of a person is shortened. There is basically genuine shortage of time against too much of work and responsibilities. There is no time to stand and stare. Shortages of time are created also as a result of inefficient and faulty use of time. Thus, every decision-maker is caught in a time trap.

3) Effective inter-personal communication (which is so necessary for avoiding misgivings, misunderstandings, confusion and commotion) is being rendered, day-by-day, difficult and sometimes impossible as a result of the 'generation gap'.

4) The system of formal education lacks any orientation to problem solving. It has become highly hypocritic and hypothetical. It has lost its relevance
because it lacks proper orientation. Therefore, decision-making capability has nothing to do with the formal qualification. A man cannot be a good decision-maker merely by possessing a Degree in Management by facing the situation on the spot and by thinking intuitively.

5) Interruptions (whether spontaneous or deliberate, meaningful or useless) observance of formalities, the inevitable entertaining others, lack of or inadequacy of informations, reluctance to define in clearcut terms the objectives of certain 'moves' and strategies, abrupt and frequent changes in priorities, excessive paper work need to defend oneself through procrastination, fear of victimisation, pressures and tensions created by secrecy requirements and the status complex - make decision-making utterly complex and the process of decision-making is governed not by any logical system of thought but by 'spontaneous out-burst' of feelings, or instincts. These feelings or instincts are reflected in a certain patterns of behaviour for decision-making. These patterns are just the reactions to stimuli from the external unpredictable situations which are beyond ones' control.

6) Effective industrial management of modern time demands that 'to say No' is an important and useful prerogative - a peculiar privilege of the decision-maker in modern times. To learn to say 'No' is invitable because
he can rarely spare time to have a logical discussion of the alternative solutions (situations) and then to arrive at the most appropriate conclusion to be the basis of his decision. Apart from this time trap the basic problem before the decision-maker is whether he could gather that much courage to frankly and bluntly say 'No' to people with whom he is dealing and about whom he is taking decisions. The choice would lie between 'saying No' (which appears to be simple apparently) and invite the wrath or a severe reaction and resistance - bringing even the 'life' of the decision-maker in danger apart from his career and the resultant demotion for saying 'No'...AND The indulgence in the diplomacy of hypocritical compromises by giving up all the high values or ideals and self-respect so far cherished.

The problem gets aggravated and almost insoluble when the decision-maker meets people who have little sense of proportion and propriety and those pervested people who take interest in manipulations, and manoeuvres and give every time political orientation to any kind of action - having no regard to sanctify ethical standards and basic values of human life viz. compassion, justice and truth.
Given that fundamental problem in management is that of human management. There cannot be any decision-making strategy which is not based on compassion and tolerance. These are the strategies of enlightened decision-makers most pragmatic, result oriented and therefore useful. They cannot be agreed about by resorting to any logical system. If at all logical system is to operate, it will operate with a continuous blending and alteration of inductive and deductive reasoning.