

Essay on rational decision making process

[Business](#), [Decision Making](#)



Abstract

This paper is going to assess the analysis reviews decision theory, the political and rational models and their impacts, financial or otherwise to the various levels of government. Rational decision theory holds that decisions are made on their financial impacts. When a decision is deemed financially hazardous to the situation at hand then such is not made while if it financially safeguards the interests of a certain department or any level of government the decision holds. Political model on the other hand reiterates the making of decisions based on their political impacts: political correctness. Decisions made on such basis are always having negative long term impacts to the subjects bearing that no critical reasoning was done to evaluate the impacts of the decision while it was done to please others. This paper is going to zero in to these two models of reasoning with a key consideration on how they impact on the various levels of government. It however, worth saying that political decisions in most cases have impacts in almost all levels of government. Considering that it tries to reach a compromise between two sides without reckoning the essence of such decisions. This paper will also, as the main point of focus, try to unravel the in-depth application of the two models at the different government levels.

The rational approach to decision making process is clear in evaluation, logical in selection of available options as well as straight forward in nature. This is majorly contributed by the manner in which the model is handy in the selection of cost beneficial and satisfactory alternatives among many that might exist.

This is made possible by a thorough evaluation of available options based on its cost effectiveness. Therefore rational decision making will try to determine which alternative amongst the available is best suited to address a given issues, the cost to be incurred in the selection of an option as well as the benefits that can be derived from an alternative.

This approach is very handy in the making of decisions by the government especially where financial issues are core. It can be used to examine key programs so as to critically evaluate on the basis of cost-benefit whether they are worth of implementation or not.

Any program that negatively influences the financial capability of a nation is thus considered as an ill option that will have devastating effects on the country's economy.

Pron's of this model

- It is economical in approach, and can this be used while drafting budgets at the various levels of government.
- It is a straight forward model, which limits ambiguity in the evaluation of alternatives hence making selection of the best option much easier.
- The approach facilitates an in-depth understanding of a range of alternatives as it allows for specification of alternatives that are relevant to solving a particular problem.
- It use enables choice of an option that guarantees maximum value both in the present as well as in the future.
- Its major focus on the beneficial cost of an option ensures that self interests are kept at bay while making decision in all the levels of

government. As a result the government's efficiency in service provision is greatly improved.

Con's of the model

- The model's greatest undoing is its complex nature. A lot of financial calculations have to come into play before a decision is arrived at.
- The models evaluates options on cost benefit basis alone, without the inclusion of other factors tends to weaken the decision making process since other humanitarian factors might be critical in the evaluation of an option and should not be ignored.

POLITICAL MODEL

The course of action of agreeing with others consequences on finding the middle ground position not based on scrutiny of expenses and reimbursement. On this statement upon making of any decision, the process that it undergoes is not the same as the political model where reached where the few individuals who the citizens elected to represent them make decisions on behalf of the people who chose them. This makes it easy for a person who never had any ill will to exploit on this divine opportunity to make decision that will suit their needs which is not fair compared to the political model.

For the reason that of the parleying process, ultimate situation are practicable now but are not enduring solutions. These manners of resolution are not always those of enduring to the reason behind the enactment or the adoption of the various decisions made. Upon the representation of personal interest without the interest of people at heart the possibility of the

resolutions arrived at is not likely to enjoy an enduring value to the problem that lead to its adoption.

Persons whose pose botched anticipate the subsequently subject to a chance to renegotiate their stand. This though some aspect of democracy is considered where there is always another chance, but this does not always favor everybody because not the interest of everybody is represented. This leads to some aspect of demoralization because one upon presentation of his arguments upon something that will favor the majority, if disputed by the base formed and a loss is not a guarantee that the next time you will present the same there are some adjustments are embrace to suit your predicaments. Which is not the case; because the system is one and the obvious procedure is what is always being pursued when coming up with critical decisions based on facts suiting the interest of the few.

Merit

The evidential advantage of this model is that it is quite favorable in solving problems that need immediate resolutions.

Demerits

The major demerit of this case is that upon evaluation of facts that they have to reach upon an agreement, the manipulation of the facts among the few individuals is evident by the model adopted by the system. This will not favor the long-term issues that are likely to occur.

Conclusion

As has been discussed above, it is evident that though both models are applied at almost all, if not all, levels of government with the national level having the most interesting mixture. Different interests come to play while decisions are being made considering that the rule of democracy ought to apply. This is ensured by the leaders who are more politically inclined than rationally ready to analyze the situations. On the other hand, the economic situation of the country is equally important. The leaders are put in check by the public to account for any economic disability arising during their reign. This provides a rather complex situation to the leaders; the bid to please their electorate and to make decisions based on the common good of the country.

Recommendations

Though the two decision making models should be considered while coming up with decisions affecting the country, it would be rational for the leaders to concentrate more on the rational model as in most cases the decisions based on political agendas favor only the political elites. Though it solves the current political problems but it doesn't give a lasting solution that will benefit the entire society e. g. the entire country.

References

Mintz, A. (2002). Intergrating cognitive and rational theories of foreign policy decision making. New York: Palgrave.