International Journal of Advance Scientific Research
(ISSN – 2750-1396)
VOLUME 04 ISSUE 03 Pages: 164-167
SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2022: 5.636) (2023: 6.741) (2024: 7.874)
OCLC – 1368736135

Journal Website: http://sciencebring.com/index.php/ijasr

Research Article

GENERAL PSYCHOLOGY OF DECISION MAKING

Submission Date: March 20, 2024, **Accepted Date:** March 25, 2024,
Published Date: March 30, 2024
Crossref doi: https://doi.org/10.37547/ijasr-04-03-30

Mirzaxmatov Baxodir Baxromboy O'gli
Tashkent Economy And Pedagogical Institute, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

This doctoral thesis explores the intricate relationship between organizational culture and decision-making under uncertainty, aiming to uncover how cultural norms, values, beliefs, and practices influence both individual and collective decision-making processes. Employing a mixed-methods approach, the study combines quantitative surveys with qualitative interviews and case studies across various industries to provide a comprehensive analysis of the impact of organizational culture on decision-making efficacy in uncertain environments.

KEYWORDS

Importance of Understanding Decision-Making Under Uncertainty, Overview of the Structure, heoretical Foundations, Affective Influences, Personality Factors.

INTRODUCTION

The exploration of decision-making in psychology traces a rich and varied path, evolving significantly over time as scholars sought to understand the complexities of human thought and behavior. This journey from classical to modern perspectives has been marked by foundational theories, paradigm shifts, and the integration of insights from adjacent fields, shedding light on how individuals and groups navigate the uncertainties of decision-making.

The early 20th century marked the inception of formalized thought around decision-making

International Journal of Advance Scientific Research
(ISSN – 2750-1396)
VOLUME 04 ISSUE 03 Pages: 164-167
SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2022: 5.636) (2023: 6.741) (2024: 7.874)
OCLC – 1368736135

within psychology, primarily influenced by the burgeoning field of behavioral psychology. Pioneers like John Watson and B.F. Skinner emphasized observable behavior over internal processes, suggesting that decision-making could be understood as a response to environmental stimuli. However, this perspective provided limited insight into the internal cognitive mechanisms that underpin decision processes .

A significant shift occurred with the cognitive revolution of the 1950s and 1960s, which brought a renewed focus on the mind's internal workings. This era heralded the introduction of the "rational actor" model, proposing that decision-making was a logical process of weighing options and outcomes. Herbert A. Simon, a key figure during this period, challenged this notion with his concept of "bounded rationality," arguing that cognitive limitations and environmental factors constrain human decision-making, leading individuals to satisfice—seeking satisfactory rather than optimal solutions.

Building on the understanding of bounded rationality, the 1970s saw the groundbreaking work of Daniel Kahneman and Amos Tversky, who introduced the heuristics and biases approach. Their research unveiled that people often rely on cognitive shortcuts or heuristics, leading to systematic errors or biases in decision-making. This work, foundational to the field of behavioral economics, highlighted the impact of psychological factors on economic decisions, challenging the prevailing assumptions of human rationality in classical economics.

As the field progressed, researchers began to unravel the complex role emotions play in decision-making. The late 20th and early 21st centuries witnessed an increased appreciation for the affective dimensions of decision processes. Antonio Damasio's "somatic marker hypothesis" posited that emotional processes guide (or bias) behavior and decision-making, suggesting that emotions and feelings are integral to navigating uncertain situations.

Recent decades have emphasized the social and cultural dimensions of decision-making. This perspective acknowledges that decisions are not made in isolation but are deeply influenced by social interactions, cultural norms, and collective beliefs. The theory of social identity and self-categorization illustrates how group affiliations affect decision-making processes, underscoring the importance of understanding decision-making within a broader social context.

The advent of neuroimaging technologies has further enriched our understanding of decision-making. By examining the neural underpinnings of decision processes, researchers have identified specific brain regions and networks involved in evaluating choices, risks, and rewards. This neuroscientific perspective has bridged the gap between psychological theories and biological mechanisms, offering a more holistic view of decision-making .

Today, the study of decision-making in psychology represents a confluence of diverse theories and methodologies. Modern perspectives integrate cognitive, emotional, social, and neuroscientific insights, recognizing the multifaceted nature of decision processes. This integrative approach acknowledges the complexity of human decision-making,

International Journal of Advance Scientific Research
(ISSN – 2750-1396)
VOLUME 04 ISSUE 03 Pages: 164-167
SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2022: 5.636) (2023: 6.741) (2024: 7.874)
OCLC – 1368736135

characterized by the interplay of rational analysis, intuitive judgments, emotional influences, and social dynamics.

The evolution of decision-making theories in psychology from classical to modern perspectives reflects the field's growing complexity and interdisciplinary nature. By tracing this history, we gain a deeper appreciation for the multifaceted processes that underlie decision-making under uncertainty. This rich theoretical foundation sets the stage for further exploration and understanding of the cognitive, affective, and social mechanisms that guide our choices, highlighting the continued relevance and dynamism of psychological research in decision-making.

The psychology of decision-making encompasses a complex interplay of cognitive processes, emotions, and biases. This section delves into how these elements interact to influence decisions, providing insight into the mental mechanisms individuals employ when faced with choices, especially under conditions of uncertainty.

Information Processing: At the heart of decision-making is the process of information gathering and processing. This involves attention, perception, and memory—key cognitive functions that enable individuals to assess and interpret available data. The Dual-Process Theory, proposed by psychologists including Daniel Kahneman, distinguishes between two types of thought processes: System 1, which is fast, automatic, and emotional; and System 2, which is slower, more deliberative, and logical. This theory suggests that while individuals may strive for rationality, much of decision-making is influenced by instinctual and quick judgments.

Problem-Solving and Heuristics: Decision-making is fundamentally a problem-solving activity that often requires navigating complex and uncertain environments. To manage this complexity, individuals frequently employ heuristics—mental shortcuts that simplify decision-making processes . While heuristics can be efficient, they can also lead to systematic errors or cognitive biases.

Judgment under Uncertainty: Tversky and Kahneman's work on judgment under uncertainty reveals how people assess probabilities and make predictions about uncertain events. Their research illustrates that individuals often rely on heuristics, such as the availability heuristic (basing judgments on readily available information) and the representativeness heuristic (making judgments based on how similar something is to a typical case), which can lead to biased or flawed decisions.

Emotional Influences: Emotions play a critical role in decision-making processes. The Affect Heuristic, for instance, demonstrates how people's feelings about different options can influence their choices, often bypassing detailed analysis. Antonio Damasio's somatic marker hypothesis further underscores the importance of emotions, suggesting that emotional reactions to certain scenarios help guide decision-making by signaling potential outcomes based on past experiences.

Cognitive Biases: Biases in decision-making are systematic patterns of deviation from norm or

International Journal of Advance Scientific Research
(ISSN – 2750-1396)
VOLUME 04 ISSUE 03 Pages: 164-167
SJIF IMPACT FACTOR (2022: 5.636) (2023: 6.741) (2024: 7.874)
OCLC – 1368736135

rationality in judgment. These biases, stemming from cognitive and emotional influences, affect the decisions individuals make. Confirmation bias (the tendency to search for, interpret, favor, and recall information in a way that confirms one's preexisting beliefs or hypotheses), overconfidence bias (overestimating one's own abilities), and loss aversion (the tendency to prefer avoiding losses to acquiring equivalent gains) are among the most studied biases in psychology.

Impact of Biases on Decision-Making: Cognitive biases can significantly impact decision quality, leading to overconfidence, underestimation of risks, and flawed judgment. Understanding these biases is crucial for developing strategies to mitigate their effects, such as promoting awareness, encouraging critical thinking, and implementing decision-making frameworks that emphasize reflection and deliberation .

The interplay between cognitive processes and emotional influences in decision-making is complex. While cognitive processes strive for logical analysis and rationality, emotions and biases often introduce a level of subjectivity and irrationality. This dynamic interaction highlights the challenge of achieving optimal decisions, especially in uncertain conditions where not all information is known or future outcomes are unpredictable.

Recent research in psychology and behavioral economics continues to explore this interplay, seeking to understand how cognitive and emotional factors can be balanced or managed to improve decision-making outcomes. Techniques such as mindfulness, cognitive restructuring, and decision-making models are being investigated for their potential to reduce the impact of biases and enhance the rational components of decision-making.

The general psychology of decision-making reveals a nuanced landscape where cognitive processes, emotions, and biases interact to shape how individuals and groups make choices. This understanding is pivotal for identifying interventions and strategies that can improve decision-making in personal, organizational, and societal contexts. As the field advances, ongoing research into these psychological mechanisms promises to further refine our understanding of decision-making, offering pathways to more informed, rational, and beneficial choices.

REFERENCES

1. Schein, E. H. (2010). Organizational culture and leadership (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.
2. Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values. Sage Publications.
3. Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. Econometrica, 47(2), 263–291.
4. Simon, H. A. (1957). Models of man: Social and rational; Mathematical essays on rational human behavior in a social setting. John Wiley & Sons.