

SYSTEMIC SUBSTANTIATION OF THE DECISION MAKING PROCESS

*EC. BĂNĂȚEANU OANA*¹

*ING. SARU TEODOR*²

*STD. CONSTANTIN ALEXANDRU*³

Abstract

Decision-making is an activity of logical thinking, it achieved a certain legal and organizational framework and in place for the management bodies, with the involvement of departments and specialists, in connection with the preparation, elaboration and control decisions.

Any decision at any level is the result of how the participants in the decision-making process understand the reality of how they interpret the information brought to their knowledge in different ways and how they filter through their own personalities values, beliefs, doctrines and ideologies. As a result, any decision is dependent on the image that participants in the decision-making process and do it on reality.

Area 46 of the human brain is thought to be responsible for the decision, the coordination of thoughts and tasks. In 2014 in "Nature Neuroscience" at the University of British Columbia researchers have published an article where they presented the results of experiments on mice, identifying to them the lateral habenula as the associated decision-making process. At the same time, studies from 2015 show that the three regions of the striatum - ventral, dorsomedial and dorsolateral - working coordinated and prioritized in the motivation, adaptation decisions and routine activities.

In general, we feel that we are aware of what we think, everything is orderly and rational seated, but this is not how we mind works. Maybe not too much I reflected on these experiences, impressions and thoughts but most of us get to experience consciousness is formed without realizing when or how this happened. We just can not explain what mechanisms we know that we are facing an object, or how I felt danger and we avoided without conscious rational and objective analysis of all the coordinates around us. The mental process that produces impressions, insights and conscious decisions take place, in silence, in our brains.

Primates, but especially men, have highly developed frontal lobes. The frontal lobe is hosting most of the cerebral cortex neurons sensitive to dopamine. Dopamine is associated with the attention, motivation and reward, activities involving short-term memory processes, conscious planning activities or

¹ Siemens SRL, România, oana.banateanu@siemens.com

² Siemens SRL, România, teodor.saru@siemens.com

³ Universitatea Politehnica Bucuresti, România, upb.alexander@gmail.com

processes that control our behavior. Correlating the above, one of the questions that we could answer in the near future is whether the frontal lobe is the seat of free will, of free choice.

William James (1842-1910) wrote in his diary on April 30, 1870, "I think yesterday was a crisis in my life. I completed the first part of the second (volume) of Renouvier and do not see no reason for the definition of free will - support a plan on the grounds that I choose this, when I could have other thoughts - must be the definition of an illusion. "My first act of free will shall be to believe in free will"

James was first defined two distinct stages of the decision process:

- a chance now offering alternatives random;
- free choice by agreeing a possibility.

Therefore credible and sustained existence of free will.

From the perspective physiological central nervous system is designed to survive then learn. Skills that we have in our intellectual treasure are shaped to act to avoid extinction. Animal world is the best example. In the wild, if an animal is in a continuous state of alert, or caution, has no chance of survival. When we create an environment of safety, start the training process, learning. What has allowed human beings to survive in addition to transmitting knowledge gained, followers, is that man always, knew how to create their security environment and to constantly eliminate factors that threaten its existence. This has positive and negative sides.

In everyday life, as the Nobel laureate Daniel Kahneman, an inadequate appreciation of the environment in which we operate uncertainty inevitably leads to taking risks that maybe you should avoid them. Optimism, as we perceive it, is valued and encouraged in society today.

Our perception is influenced not by objective factors but by emotions, feelings and impressions. The same is true of most things we intuit, or preferences that we have too few have an objective basis, we tend to exaggerate the positives and minimize the negatives.

Psychologists say there are distinct patterns, on systematic errors that people make business decisions that are predictable to a certain extent. Nothing in science we are not sure that a theory is correct or true, so all we know is true until appearing information that contradicts.

In an institutional environment that these patterns help us avoid errors in decision making is regulated to some extent through operational procedures and prioritized so that work does not suffer interruptions. People need to feel and notice that there are consequences to any action corresponding ago, our society and our value system is built on this recital.

In the book, "Thinking Fast and Slow" Daniel Kahneman tells how John Brokman, editor of Edge, asked scientists to communicate their favorite equation. Daniel Kahneman said success = talent + luck. Quality of management and leadership can be no factor to predict a company's success more than a coin toss.

This, says Daniel Kahneman, can be seen in the first two days of a golf tournament, studying performance of players. He explains that we must educate forecasts of an event, taking into account the concept of regression to the mean.

This concept was introduced in the 19th century by Francis Galton, a psychometrician, in his "Regression Towards Mediocrity in Hereditary Stature" who work in children's height measured in successive generations and compared them with parental height. The trend height of children, has always been to medium. Extrapolating our ability to predict the effects of actions to be correlated with overall trends in the environment, which implies to consider the precedent, to be aware of the subjectivity of our assessments and take into account the unexpected.

Nassim Taleb, essayist and statistician continues the same point in his book "Antifragil". Taleb, supports the principle that we can not predict and control the future, understanding the past, classifying it as an illusion. These illusions are necessary and feed us, we create intricate new, as people, a sense of comfort, reduce anxiety we feel when we allow ourselves to acknowledge the existential uncertainty heart in it.

The very definition of "confidence" in DEX offers a subjectivity: "Putting the theme honor on someone's sincerity; a lean, count on someone or something.

◆ (Pop.) A trust too much in themselves; the bounce.

◆ To believe the words of someone, giving credence".

Confidence is so subjective. Confidence is a feeling. He believes in reasoning does not make it automatically right. We are willing to trust that reflect judgments do not contradict the things that we basically agree than to process events and new circumstances.

However, as Taleb says, it is wiser to accept recognition of uncertainties, but declarations of trust tell you that that person has built a coherent story in mind, and it's not necessarily true. People are often reluctant to interfere individuals in general.

Nassim Taleb says that tend to build up and to believe in our coherent narratives about the past, makes it difficult to accept that we have limited abilities to predict the future. We can not suppress that which makes sense today was predictable yesterday. As we gain more knowledge about a subject, the more we deluded us more about our capabilities and become unrealistically hopeful. Experts are simple people eventually.

When making decisions, always take them trying to assess future impacts, but I just said that people are not statisticians intuitive level.

The world is much less predictable than we want and we can accept.

Perhaps too little indeed succeed to control the effects of our choices, perhaps Leibniz was right when he said that mind and matter can not influence one another and that the apparent interaction must be due to a pre-established harmony.

God's plan must ensure that decisions are always conscious followed by appropriate physical movements and like trying to take a hot stone in hand, it is always followed by a pain consciousness. Some adherents of determinism excludes free will, others, like David Hume associate context, taking him to compatibilism. David Hume argued that it is possible that an individual may not lead to fulfillment desires and beliefs only through free will (the will of independence), but rather the free will refers to an individual's ability to translate those beliefs and desires in voluntary action.

In the book "23 Things You Do not Tell THEM About Capitalism" Ha-Joon Chang, South Korean economist, says: Supporters of free market economy works go on the principle that the personal purposefulness, people always take decisions on these considerations. Consequently, the correct behavior of people is conditioned by an invisible system of rewards and actions. People do not behave correctly under their system of values, or accede to a code of morality, but because such behavior maximizes the benefits and minimizes their losses or possible sanctions.

Chang shows, however, that this reasoning does not work in the end, since even when there is a hidden system of benefits and penalties, many of us behave correctly and honestly. In a world of selfish people the benefit system and sanctions can not exist. Rewarding and punishing people for their behavior constant cost time and energy. Morality is not an illusion, says Chng, when people do not act selfishly, is simply own system of values and the fact that we even feel it. This mechanism can explain these behaviors.

Personal interest is one of the basic motivations of man as a being; But if we apply these principles in economics, it is less effective results. If the agents do not behave properly it is necessary to allocate more resources to control and punish. Ni no way to know how is a person until you give them the opportunity to violate the provisions of the moral code.

Mathematicians have approached the decision-making process somewhat differently. Nicholas Bernoulli was one of the first scientists who dealt with the general idea of utility. Bernoulli's theory attempted to explain the choices that people make when results are dominated by uncertainty (eg, gambling). According to this theory, we prefer the version that lead to maximum environmental gain. Bernoulli showed, however, that this principle is not universally applicable.

A relative of his, Daniel Bernoulli introduced in S. Petersburg paradox whereby people cautious not always lead the principle of mathematical hope of gain. The utility Bernoulli says people's choices are based not on value but on the psychological values of results or their usefulness, but as was pointed out later and by other scientists, such as Daniel Kahleman lacks points of reference idea. Loss aversion refers to two reasons: we are inclined to avoid losses rather than to win and the point of reference is the status quo. Our point of reference can be a future tel: if you do not reach the goal we perceive as a loss, if you

touch, is a win. As we can expect, negativity tends to dominate when we are in such a context, the two reasons for not loss aversion weighed equally, leading to a mismatch and thus a difficulty in making a decision.

Popularly call it resistance to change. I think I felt a certain extent either as a first impulse, whether we notice it in others around us. This resistance to change is considered to be a conservative force, which unfortunately favors only small changes compared to the current state compared to our reference system.

People have stronger emotional reactions including regret the effect produced the same effect produced by action than inaction.

To make rational decisions, it is important to teach and educate our perceptions of everything that we observe. To do this Bayes introduced a very interesting concept. Thomas Bayes was an English mathematician and priest in the eighteenth century. Bayes probability defined as follows:

The probability of any event is the ratio between the value at which an expectation should be calculated depending on the occurrence of an event, and the amount of work expected after what happened. In the modern theory of utility, the utility may be considered to be awaited probability of an event multiplied by rewards received in his case.

This can make us more aware that things as we perceive them, are always relative and often exaggerated. My level of confidence on my perception on something fluctuate depending on things that I notice.

It follows the general trend is that we own reference system and the values that we believe and we are quite inflexible to adjust them until they are forced to change them if we are presented with an irrefutable argument. The question comes, if I can reconcile these arguments I present with what they believe to be true about the world.

Decisions at a time, we must. Important decisions, immediate; When we have too little information, we can rely on instinct, but recommended is the context and previous experience. An expert in a particular field, can understand the effects of immediate action, long before they realize them. It is known case of a fire chief US unit. He and his team were called to extinguish a fire started in the kitchen of a house.

The fire did not appear to present an immediate danger, but from the moment they entered the house, the boss was heard shouting to team unit to evacuate the house immediately.

When they came out, the floor collapsed, proving that the fire had started in the basement. The head unit could not explain how it felt and why. Previous experience has shown, however, that acquired the ability to process information and insight aware of danger before.

For decisions with a major impact on our advice to people it can not be neglected, but must also be aware of some principles evoked in the book "The psychology of persuasion" by Roberto Cialdinini. It says that we are willing to follow the suggestion of a person if:

1. seems a credible expert in accordance with the principle of authority;
 2. him as a trusted friend in accordance with the principle of sympathy;
 3. We feel that we owe something in accordance with the principle of reciprocity;
 4. if a follow promises and we are consistent with previous beliefs;
 5. choices that are popular in accordance with the principle of consensus;
 6. bring us a precious resource in accordance with the principle of rarity.
- Sometimes postponing a decision may be a good decision.

REFERENCES

- [1] “Cate ceva despre minte si creier” , Angus Gellatly, Oscar Zarate , Ed. Curtea Veche 2004;
- [2] <http://www.natureworldnews.com/articles/5062/20131125/brain-region-associated-with-decision-making-identified.htm>;
- [3] <https://www.oist.jp/news-center/news/2015/2/26/calling-shots-brain-decision-making-structure>;
- [4] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Frontal_lobe;
- [5] <http://www.informationphilosopher.com/solutions/philosophers/james/> (The Thought and Character of William James (Boston, Little, Brown, 1936) vol.1, p.323);
- [6] http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/William_James;
- [7] Thinking Fast and slow , Daniel Kahleman, Penguin Group , 2011;
- [8] <http://dexonline.ro/definitie/%C3%AEncrede>;
- [9] Cate ceva despre constiinta,David Papinenau si Howard Selina,2000, Editura Curtea Veche;
- [10] <http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Determinism>;
- [11] http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Thomas_Bayes;
- [12] Blink, The power of thinking without thinking, Malcom Gladwell, Ed. Penguin Group 2005.

