UDC 159.947.2:351.74 doi: https://doi.org/10.33270/03223001.14

Masian A. – Postgraduate Student of the Department of Legal Psychology of the National Academy of Internal Affairs of Ukraine
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6661-2585

Theoretical Fundamentals of the Rational Decision-Making Process by Representatives of Law Enforcement Authorities

*The **purpose** of the article is to determine the theoretical foundations of the rational decision-making process in the professional activities of law enforcement authorities. The **methodological basis** of the study is the general theory of decision-making, based on differentiation and integration of the axiomatic theory of utility and maximization of the rationality of scientific heuristics for decision-making process. The **scientific novelty** of the article is to highlight the basic concepts of behavior in decision-making process with various types of explanations of factors and mechanisms of behavior of law enforcement officers. Factors and mechanisms of group decision-making are analyzed in order to optimally rationalize it and overcome uncertainty. It has been proven that a rational decision-making process based on group dynamics is effective in reducing risk and decrease the number of errors in the professional activities of law enforcement officers. The **conclusions** of the article are to substantiate the effectiveness of decision-making process based on team and individual approaches in the professional activities of law enforcement officers. The article describes the starting point of decision-making in complex, time-limited, uncertain, ambiguous and changing situations faced by law enforcement officers in the course of their professional activities. It has been proven that a team approach reduces the risk that a decision may lead to undesirable consequences. Cognitive distortions of "mind traps" (heuristics) are described, which force to deviate from optimal strategies in decision-making due to subjective inferences. The role of an authority person (group leader) and professional experience in the rational decision-making process in the team, as well as the role of the team itself as a resource for decision-making process is the main.*

Keywords: uncertainty; problem solving; difficult situations; organization; control; team decisions; cognitive biases.

Introduction

In an era of dynamic social change and military conflicts, social processes in the state are becoming increasingly unpredictable. In such multi-level institutional systems, accountability for the decision-making process plays a key role and requires high accountability. Decision-making is an integral part of any organizational function, which is an act of choice between two or more areas of action. Most decisions are often not logically explained and are made intuitively. At the same time, in some types of professional activity, in particular, law enforcement officers, there are certain specifics due to the fact that the legal structure has certain regulations of subordination, execution of orders that are not subject to appeal. Therefore, the decision-making process of law enforcement officers should be free of subjectivity and bias, guided, above all, by rational calculation. Moderate risk appetite, security and logical thinking are the main factors that are effectively combined in the decisions of law enforcement officers.

The purpose

The purpose of the article is to determine the theoretical foundations of the rational decision-making process in the professional activities of law enforcement officers. The goal is realized through the following tasks: 1) coverage of mechanisms and factors of decision-making; 2) presentation of problems that necessitate decision-making in conditions of uncertainty; 3) disclosing the role of team decisions that reduce uncertainty and share risks.

This article presents an extension of previous work in the field of decision-making; this study is a continuation of previous work, with testing at the following scientific events: I International Scientific and Practical Conference «Problems of Modern Science and Practice» (Boston, USA, 2021) [1]; IV International Scientific and Practical Conference «Science, Theory and Practice» (Tokyo, Japan, 2021) [2]; XV International Scientific and Practical Conference «Interdisciplinary Academic Records. Research and Practice» (Madrid, Spain, 2022) [3]; the monograph «Methodological bases of studying the processes of general mental laws in human interaction with the environment» (Boston, USA, 2022) [4] on the decision-making process has been undertaken in this article.

Methodological framework

Various aspects of the activities of law enforcement officers in decision-making have been studied by Ukrainian scientists, in particular: on the organizational activities of operational units (N. Bakaianova, A. Kubaienko & O. Svyda, 2020); on the preparation of management decisions in the activities of the National Police of Ukraine (B. Kalinichenko, 2017); on psychological readiness for innovation with decision-making factors by police (N. Aleksieienko, 2021); on the basics of management in the National Police (I. Kravchenko, 2020); on cognitive styles in decision-making in police officers (D. Shvets, 2021), etc. Despite all the

research, the phenomenon of decision-making is practically not disclosed and requires a scientific basis for its further study.

Psychological decision theory performs the functions of explaining predicting the behavior of the individual in situations of choice. The decision-making process takes place without a clear emphasis on the possibility of making a decision. This leads us to determine the decision-making process is the fact that there must be at least two available alternatives for decision-making. Thus, the decision-making process consists of choosing between alternative actions, which corresponds to the result (Heuvel, L. Alison & N. Power, 2014). The decision-making process cannot begin until the problem is explicitly acknowledged and resolved. From this point on, there is no fixed way to choose the best alternative, as problems can very rarely be solved in a consistent, linear way, requiring a more complex process.

To make the right decision, a team or individual creates an enabling environment. In the middle of the organizational structure, teamwork helps to develop talents and skills, through the group all members are free to take the initiative on various tasks (even the most difficult), take risks and face the consequences [5]. In this way, the team helps to build confidence in the skills and competencies of its members, to set key common goals that meet the goals of the organization, through guidelines for all discussions and decision-making processes.

A problem can be defined as a situation in which a law enforcement representative («solver») wants to move from a given state (problem) to a desired one (solution), but cannot do so through instinctive actions or learned behavior. Therefore, the term of problem solving is a cognitive process that is used to analyze this situation / problem and find a solution. Leading scientists in this field (W. Ewards, 1954, E. Galanter, 1965, D. Kahneman, 1992, Sadowski, 1965, Slovic, & Tversky, 1982, etc.) define the solution of the problem as the most difficult of all cognitive functions, because it is the ability to find solutions to any problems. Thus, an effective problem solver must be able to cope with any situation and overcome the difficulties he may face in achieving his goal. This can be done through several approaches, depending on the nature of the problem and the type of people or groups involved. Among them, the most common approach is to perform seven operations: problem description; analysis of causes; identification of alternative solutions; checking the validity of various alternatives; choice of solution; development of an implementation plan; monitoring the implementation of the plan to obtain the desired result [5].

In other words, this process involves the following sequence: problem identification; data and information collection; formulating hypotheses of possible causes in order to test the validity of various alternatives, finding the most effective solutions and corrective actions, and finally, after the implementation of the action plan there is a need to verify the results with the collection of data monitoring.

However, the correct process of analyzing the problem to be proposed has at its core certain features. When collecting information, a law enforcement officer should never take the information provided about the situation for the truth if he does not know it perfectly (Omand, 2022). Next it is necessary to divide each problem under consideration into as many small parts or sub-problems as possible in order to better deal with them and then solve them. Another guideline to follow is to keep your thoughts in order, from the simplest and easiest elements to learn, gradually rising step by step to learning the most complex. Finally, issues need to be addressed with a general and integrated approach to ensure that nothing is missed. With the right approach to problem solving, it is equally helpful to realize that there are no easy ways to solve complex problems.

Each problem requires decision-making according to logical procedures:

– deduction «but-then» – a logical procedure by which the general truth (rule) can be derived from the specific, implicit in it: the rice in the bag-white (rule), this rice from the bag (case), this figure is white (result);

– induction «therefore» – a logical procedure in which the establishment of specific facts leads to statements or general rules: this feature of the bag (case), this feature is white (result), all the rice in the bag is white (rule (until proven otherwise));

– abduction «maybe» – a logical process that uses only a limited set of elements for which the decision-maker creates connections and relationships between them, which may also be incorrect: this figure is white (result), the whole figure in that bag is white (rule), this figure from that bag (maybe) [5; 6].

In contrast to the classical learning process, which involves the use of schematic and automatic procedures obtained earlier and simply for re-application to similar problems, scientists argue (C. Heuvel, L. Alison & N. Power, 2014) that the solution is instead based on cognitive operations that can offer an unexpected solution that has not been reached before. This approach involves structured reasoning aimed at resolving a complex situation that cannot be obtained either through the automatic application of already known procedures or through an instinctive or intuitive approach. Problem-solving activities are closely linked to decision-making a process that leads to a decision made by an individual or group.

The decision made by the individual or the group, as well as the choice not to make a decision, involves voluntary and arbitrary behavior that follows the reasoning. Usually the decision is made in order to solve the problem. However, there is a difference between decision and solving a problem. In the process of solving a problem, the decision-making act is always related to the goal we want to achieve, while when making a decision, the decision-making act is presented as a justification for choosing the most appropriate alternative – within a number of options. The decision-making process can be seen as the result of mental processes (cognitive and emotional), which determine the choice of course of action among the various alternatives. Given that each decision-making process leads to a final choice and that decision-making usually requires the evaluation of at least two options that differ in different characteristics and elements, the choice of option requires the individual to make an overall assessment of the different alternatives, using: specific ways of searching and processing information; decision-making strategies [5–7].

However, in most cases, decision-making means thinking in uncertainty, in fact, it is impossible to predict with certainty the future outcome of possible alternatives, but at best, we can only estimate the probability of such outcomes [4; 5]. Many studies of decision theory in various fields have identified the magnitude of uncertainty and risk more specifically. Therefore, we can define uncertainty as a lack of certainty, as a limited state of knowledge, in which it is impossible to accurately describe the existing state, future results or more than one possible result. However, uncertainty can still be measured, and this is identified with a number of possible states in which results or probabilities are assigned to each possible state or result.

Risk also plays a fundamental role in measuring uncertainty, means that the state of uncertainty in which some possible outcomes have an adverse effect or significant loss, and even in this case we can measure possible losses. Thus, it can be argued that uncertainty is a fundamental dimension of modern society, which should be considered in a radically different sense of risk, but from which it cannot be properly separated, because it actually represents a lack of certainty, limited state of knowledge that cannot accurately describe existing condition, future results or more possible results and are the consequence of ignorance of the facts that can be obtained.

Thus, risk actually acquires the connotation of a condition of uncertainty in which some possible outcomes have undesirable effects or significant losses. There are areas of activity in which the effectiveness and success of the subject depends not on his learning and experience, but on the capabilities of our mind, especially - the ability to think rationally and usefully, avoid our evolutionary processes of irrationality or control them.

Research in this area is one of the areas of modern cognitive psychology - the study of decision-making and cognitive distortions (cognitive biases). A classic example of such errors is the so-called fundamental attribution error: individuals tend to attribute other people's failures to their personal qualities as successes-circumstances («he was lucky»); in relation to itself, the opposite is true.

Another illustration is the example of probability estimation: people tend to overestimate low probabilities and underestimate high probabilities [8]. Some of the cognitive distortions are called «heuristics» because the decisions they lead to are not, strictly speaking, wrong – they are approximate and incomplete. Recently, science (especially abroad) has accumulated vast amounts of knowledge about cognitive distortions and heuristics in decision making, expanding the list of known cognitive distortions, among which the most studied: confirmation error (congruence bias, confirmation bias), ignoring (neglect), representativeness heuristic, information bias, framing effect, etc. [8; 9].

B. Englich, T. Mussweiler & F. Strack F in 2006 [10] conducted a study of judges, which found that in making a judgment, the expert «calibrates» his assessments in relation to any available information, even irrelevant. The described effect refers to the phenomena of «anchoring heuristic». The same individuals make different decisions, depending on whether they act alone or in a group. Such phenomena are called «phenomena of collective decisions», it is common to distinguish the following phenomena of collective decisions: group thinking; polarization effect; the effect of «social facilitation»; the phenomenon of «committed dissonance»; volume and composition effects; the effect of «decision quality asymmetry»; the phenomenon of idiosyncratic credit; the phenomenon of false consciousness; the phenomenon of the virtual solver; the phenomenon of conformism. Group thinking causes unintentional suppression of critical thinking due to the assimilation of individual group norms. In other words, the individual unconsciously sacrifices his ability to critically evaluate alternatives for fear of displeasing other members of the group. The more cohesive the group, the stronger the desire of each of its members to avoid division, which leads to the tendency to believe that any proposal supported by the leader or the majority of group members is correct and true.

Exploring the causes of group thinking, English researcher J. Irving identified eight causes of group thinking: the illusion of invulnerability, false rationality, group morality, stereotypes, pressure, self-censorship, unanimity, gatekeeping or gatekeepers [11]. Previously, it was believed that

collective decisions are always less risky than individual ones. The discovery of the «shift to risk» effect was quite unexpected for researchers, as this phenomenon contradicted the prevailing notion that collective decisions, unlike individual ones, should be more accurate, balanced, rational and therefore less risky. However, experiments have shown that in many cases the group shows a greater risk appetite than each of the participants individually. A. Karpov (2009) proposed several explanations for this phenomenon: diffusion of responsibility (overall responsibility for the end result is shared among group members, and, as a result, for each of them it becomes smaller, which encourages them to make riskier decisions); risk as a positive value (risky behavior is valued higher by others than cautious behavior, which is usually associated with indecision).

Approaches to understanding the activity of a decision-maker may be different, but most of them in psychology in one way or another focus on the following stages, described by Polish scientist Yu. Kozeletskii. He presented the stages of choice as stages of human activity in decision-making, which includes: 1) creating a subjective attitude to the task; 2) assessment of the consequences of choosing each alternative; 3) forecasting the conditions that determine the consequences, 4) the actual choice of alternatives [12]. Assessing the consequences of alternatives also includes both the cognitive component and emotional and value relations (acceptance or rejection of possible consequences of the election). The consequences themselves unfold in forecasting activities; but even here it is difficult to separate the cognitive, intellectual «unfolding» of events as a result of choosing an alternative and the personal component of choice in thinking – as the very possibility to think or assume one or another consequence of the choice. The author calls the first three stages verdicts. In fact, the choice will mean that the situation of uncertainty has been resolved, completed by the choice, that is, the individual has decided in the choice. The question remains how to find out about it (to an external observer or to the subject of the decision), how to mark the point of final choice on the expected timeline of its preparation and adoption.

It is necessary to single out the psychology of risk when making decisions in a situation of uncertainty. According to the hypothesis of reversibility, T. Kornilova (2003) notes that in the phenomenal plan there is a process of understanding and evaluating alternatives, which is presented to man as an opportunity to accept (take) or reject each of the results under consideration [13]. The choice is made while the alternatives are subjectively in-verse for the decision maker. If the reversibility of the alternative in this internal plan is exhausted, it means its final acceptance or rejection. Legalization of your decision (for example, communicating it to others) or practical implementation – the behavioral choice is not entirely consistent with this view. When it comes to an intellectual decision or a deep personal choice, they may generally remain outside the scope of communication about them to other people or without behavioral fixation of the result of the choice.

In the works of A. Alhin, Yu. Kozeletskii, T. Riktor etc. [12; 13] noted that the environment of risk is objectively existing uncertainty, which is due to unpredictability of actions, spontaneity of phenomena occurring in nature and society, limited resources in decision-making and implementation, as well as lack of human knowledge of reality.

Risk is interpreted as an activity in the transition from uncertainty to certainty (or vice versa), when there is a reasonable choice in assessing the probability of achieving the expected result, failure and deviation from the goal, taking into account current moral and ethical standards [13; 14] .

Yu. Kozeletskii [12] determine that the most characteristic features of risky tasks is the presence of uncertainty, to the results that will be obtained by the decision-maker depends on events that cannot be predicted 100 %. Choosing an alternative that solves the problem, the subject takes risks, because there is a certain probability that his choice will lead to an undesirable result or loss. V. Petrovskii interprets risk as a situational characteristic of the activity, which consists of uncertainty of its outcome and possible adverse effects in terms of impression. T. Kornilova and G. Solntseva [13] provide a classification in which the sources of danger are divided into two groups: accidental coincidence and human actions. Scientists propose to differentiate dangerous situations into accidents (occurring by accident) and risk situations (occurring as a result of human actions). G. Solntseva also understands risk as the decision of the subject to act in a situation of danger and to choose between possible options. For sound structuring of the risk phenomenon it is expedient to determine the postulates of risk V. Otkydach & M. Rogov (2003):

– postulate 1 on the risk associated with assessments (expectations) and decisions of the entity and does not exist separately from them. It follows from this postulate that the attitude to risk is subjective and depends on social attitudes;

– postulate 2 on risk, which reflects the decision by which time is combined (although the future may not be sufficiently known);

– postulate 3 indicates that there is no danger-free behavior;

– postulate 4 indicates that a distinction should be made between risk and its measurement.

Even in basic works, the problem is never properly understood. Often the concept of risk is defined as a measure; but measurement problems

are conventional problems, in any case, measurement risk is nothing more than what is measured as risk [8; 14]. Thus, based on certain postulates, it should be noted that, according to these researchers, the risk is purely subjective.

The impact of uncertainty on the decision-making process has developed in various areas. Research generally agrees on the importance of two fundamental human motives, such as the desire to reduce uncertainty and the desire to gain an advantage; these motives are central to decision making. Unlike early theories that thought that decision-making was about rational choice, it is now well known that human decisions are based on hedonic (pleasure) and emotional motives, as well as rational ones.

The theory of decision-making can be divided into two relatively independent parts: descriptive and prescriptive. The descriptive component describes the real behavior and thinking of people in the decision-making process, and is called psychological decision theory. The prescriptive component, on the other hand, tells people how to make decisions and is called normative decision theory. The normative theory of decision-making is based on the classical concept of maximizing the expected utility, according to this concepts, a person always tries to make the optimal decision, which corresponds to the maximum expected utility. In other words, normative decision theory is a system of methods and procedures that support decision-making in problematic, complex situations. Psychological decision theory serves to explain and predict human behavior in situations of choice. Being relatively independent parts, decision theory, normative and psychological theory, in fact – two sides of the same coin. As is well known, the commonality of a theory can be measured by the range of phenomena that make up its subject. In the process of working on the theory, W. Edwards identified the postulates concerning rationality: the postulate of sequence and the postulate of maximization [12]. The postulate of consistency says that in order to make a rational decision it is necessary to organize a set of alternatives in terms of preferences of the decision-maker. Decisions must be transitive (binary), in our case transitivity means consistency of preferences. Contrary to expectations, these conditions are very difficult to meet. Psychological studies show that personal preferences are usually not transitive [5]. The postulate of maximization states that the final condition of a rational solution is the use of maximization, the choice of such an action that maximizes the objective function of the one who solves the problem. Or, less formally, the individual accepts the alternative that is best for him in the described situation. The postulate that commands the choice of action, the best in terms of achieving the goals of the individual, is consistent with an intuitive understanding of rationality. The described postulates concerning the rationality of decisions are insufficient. The postulate of complete sequence, which assumes the transitivity of preferences, is understood only in some cases. Often, a reasonable modification of preferences or the use of good enough strategies leads to inconsistent behavior, which in particular, in no way can be called irrational. Although the above postulates are not perfect, to date no competing proposals have been made [12].

Different categories of decision-making strategies have been identified in the literature. The first category of «compensatory» strategies includes, for example, the pros and cons, according to which the individual evaluates the positive and negative properties of the two alternatives, and the model of differences, according to which the individual evaluates the difference between one option and others. The second category of decision-making strategies consists of «non-compensatory» models, so that the various attributes are analyzed according to the restrictive and elimination criteria: the first identified negative aspect involves the elimination of all alternatives. Thus, in this procedure, less pleasant alternatives are gradually eliminated.

At the decision-making stage, it can be said that two strategies are usually and mainly adopted: the strategy of focusing on the maximum time of decision-making in order to reduce uncertainty, and the strategy of infinity of decision-making. Those who tend to prefer the first strategy receive less information, evaluate the hypothesis less and are satisfied with the acceptable result. Therefore, it will be focused on heuristic solutions. Therefore, when a decision needs to be made, it is necessary to assess the potential risk arising from that decision and, as a consequence, the ability to take the risk. One of the possible mistakes that can be made is the bias of confirmations, that is, convincing oneself that everything that happens will confirm reality, not refute it. When making decisions, especially during times of stress or when too little time is available, people tend to want to reaffirm their beliefs, tend to be biased in researching ideas, focusing on opportunities, and ignoring alternatives [8; 12]. Making a decision is not always easy, especially when you have to choose between two options that have both negative and positive consequences. The ability to estimate the costs and benefits of an option is important when people are faced with a solution that is satisfactory and rational. Situational awareness then comes into play, which helps to clearly and correctly perceive the situation in which the decision is made, by planning and assimilating information from many available sources; a very clear definition of the mental picture of what has

happened so far in such situations, and, finally, predicting the action taken without acting instinctively. Each team member has to make many decisions, decisions can be made randomly or using processes that increase the likelihood of effective choices. The processes by which decisions are made can significantly affect the quality of decisions and team performance. Thus, in order to make an informed choice when choosing team decision-making processes, teams need to know how others thought about decision-making processes. The way team members interact with each other creates an environment for decision-making. The study of the environment focuses on the steps that the team can take to make a decision, nor on how different individual positions will be combined to make a decision. The focus is on how team members listen to each other, how they formulate and ask questions to each other, and how they present their position, an environment in which all team members feel comfortable exchanging ideas and offering solutions that improve the quality of solutions. An individual cannot succeed without being part of a team, and just as a team cannot succeed without an individual; this positive relationship of interdependence becomes the principle that communication and relationships with other people are the main condition for achieving a result, goal or reward [8].

A 2014 study by British researchers [5] demonstrated how a team of strategic police officers can use special coping strategies to minimize uncertainty at different stages of decision-making to promote resilience to effectively manage high-risk critical incidents. The researchers presented a model that expands existing research on overcoming uncertainty by applying the RAWFS heuristic (Lipshitz & Strauss, 1997) to identify individual decision-making in uncertainty and the area of decision-making on critical team incidents. Depending on the positive or negative answers, the choice is made from the following set of tactics: R (reduction) – gathering additional information, expert opinion; A (assumption-based reasoning) – analysis of opinions and building on their basis a mental model of decision-making; W (weighing pros and cons) – assessment of the advantages and disadvantages of the analyzed alternatives; F (forestalling) – planning activities to prevent adverse events; S (suppression) – the reduction of uncertainty. The search for tactics, dictated by the answers to these questions, is conducted until a decision is made. The researchers used testing of different coping strategies while making team decisions «in situ» [5], hostage negotiation exercises and included an additional reflection-in-action strategy which helps collective decision-making. The data from this study describe the coding of discourse in three stages: coding of the decision-making phase; coding the uncertainty management strategy; coding the decision as «accepted» or «missed». They found that when assessing dynamic and high-risk situations, police teams deal with uncertainty by relying on a reduction strategy to find more information and to iteratively update these considerations using reflection action based on previous experience. They later moved on to the formulation and use of an assumption-based reasoning plan to mentally model their intended actions and determine the desired strategy by weighing the pros and cons. of each option. In the unlikely event that uncertainty persists, the police officer is guided by a «reduction» from complex to simple in the form of reliance on plans and standard operating procedures or by «foresight» and deliberately postponing decisions when planning emergencies for the worst case script. This study evaluated coping strategies used by a team of strategic police officers to manage uncertainty in high-risk situations. The experiment showed that in order to facilitate adaptive decision-making, a team needs to go through three phases of decision-making, SA, RF and RF, by collectively managing the inherent uncertainty associated with each of these stages. The results showed that uncertainty was managed through the use of specific strategies in each of these phases, which contributed to the progress of decisions. In particular, uncertainty during SA (suppression, assumption-based reasoning) was initially aided on the basis of reduction (R) and assumption-based reasoning (A), and was also iteratively reflected in action; RF (reduction, forestalling) was controlled by considerations (A) based on assumptions and weighing for and against (W); uncertainty during RF (reduction, forestalling) was overcome by reduction (R) (using standard operating procedures) and forestalling (F). In a minority of cases, there was also non-adaptive uncertainty management using suppression during SA (suppression, assumption-based reasoning) and a return to reduction (R) (which led to unnecessary discussion) during RF (reduction, forestalling). Limitations of this study include: the specifics of the hostage negotiation scenario, limited sampling (n = 16), high level of police experience. However, as it turned out, the study provided a number of qualitative data, as well as strict adherence to methodological principles of coding with the involvement of the reliability, such limitations have minimal impact on the result [5; 15]. It is also important to note that in this study, the commander of a police team was required to provide ultimate strategic decisions to resolve the incident with the advice of experienced advisers and one coordinator, all participants in the regulation of rational decision-making had significant experience in negotiation.

Conclusions

Decision-making in the professional activities of a police officer is complex and often accompanied by a high degree of uncertainty. Each time a law enforcement officer chooses at least two options, he tries to calculate the risk of action by assessing the chances of undesirable consequences. A special role in this belongs to the commander, because he is usually a key figure in decision-making in difficult situations. Under the leadership of an experienced commander together with a group of the most qualified employees, the effectiveness of the group is the result of interaction, discussion and division of tasks between them. Mechanisms that contribute to the quality of decision-making are identified: the distribution of tasks, when several law enforcement officers dedicate themselves to one task; the filtering effect that occurs when a strategic team deliberately ignores certain information available to it in order to focus on the most important aspects of the decision, preferring the best choice; compensation, which allows you to rely on a combination of assessments not only of the commander, but also experienced coordinators to mitigate the extremes and get a more plausible average; commitment that arises among group members through the exchange of knowledge and helps to find alternatives.

Thus, the decision-making process in the professional activities of law enforcement officers requires maximum concentration, coordinated team work, maximization of rational decisions and high competencies of management. Given that, according to official world statistics, law enforcement officers are among the most dangerous professions in the world, we see prospects for further research in the field of decision-making in complex uncertain situations.

REFERENCES

[1] Problems *of modern science and practice:* I[st] International scientific-practical conference (September 21-24, 2021). Boston, USA. Retrieved from https://isg-konf.com. doi: 10.46299/ISG.2021.II.I.

[2] Science*, theory and practice:* IV International scientific-practical conference (October 12-15). (2021). Tokyo, Japan. Retrieved from https://isg-konf.com. doi: 10.46299/ISG.2021.II.IV.

[3] *Multidisciplinary academic notes. Science research and practice:* XV International Scientific and Practical Conference (April 19-22). (2022). Madrid, Spain. Retrieved from https://isg-konf.com/multidisciplinary-academic-notes-science-research-and-practice/. doi: 10.46299/ISG.2022.1.15.

[4] Methodological bases of studying the processes of general mental laws in human interaction with the environment. (2022). USA, Boston. Retrieved from https://primediaelaunch.com/. doi: 10.46299/ISG.2022.MONO.PSYCHOL.1.

[5] Heuvel, C., Alison, L., & Power, N. (2014). Coping with uncertainty: Police strategies for resilient decision-making and action implementation. *Cognition Technology and Work, 16(1).* doi: 10.1007/s10111-012-0241-8.

[6] Omand, D. (2022). *Tselevoe myshlenie: priniatie resheniy po metodike britanskoy razvedki [Target Thinking: Decision-Making According to the Methods of British Intelligence].* (Trans). Moscow: Alpina Publisher [in Russian].

[7] Shvets, D.V. Polenezalezhnist yak kharakterystyka zhyttiediialnosti politseiskykh [Field-independence as a characteristic of police officers vital activity]. *Pravo I bezpeka, Law and security, 3(82),* 219-230. doi: https://doi.org/10.32631/pb.2021.3.25 [in Ukrainian].

[8] Tversky, A., & Kahnemanm D. (1973). Availability: A heuristic for judging frequency and probability. *Cognitive Psychology, 5(1),* 207-233.

[9] Courtney, W. Mangus, & Prashant, Mahajan (2022). Decision Making. *Critical Care Clinics, 38(1),* 37-49. doi: 10.1016/j.ccc.2021.07.002.

[10] Englich, B., Mussweiler, T., & Strack, F. (2006). Playing dice with criminal sentences: the influence of irrelevant anchors on experts' judicial decision making. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32(2),* 188-200.

[11] Janis, Irving L. (1972). *Victims of groupthink; a psychological study of foreign-policy decisions and fiascoes.* Boston: Houghton, Mifflin.

[12] Kozeletskiy, Iu. (2003). *Psikhologicheskaia teoriia resheniy [Psychological decision theory].* Moscow: Progress [in Russian].

[13] Kornilova, T.V. (2003). *Psikhologiia riska i priniatiia resheniy [Psychology of risk and decision making].* Mosow: Aspekt Press [in Russian].

[14] Feys ,Yi., Van Thienen, B., & Van den Bulck, Stijn. (2022). *The complexity of police decisions: A collaborative study on police decision-making in Belgium.* doi: 10.1093/police/paac030.

[15] Lapesa Barrera, D. (2022). Decision Making. In book *Aircraft Maintenance Programs* (pp. 331-334). doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-90263-6_30.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 03.03.2022

Масян А. – аспірант кафедри юридичної психології Національної академії внутрішніх справ
ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6661-2585

Теоретичні основи раціонального процесу прийняття рішень представниками правоохоронних органів

Метою статті є визначення теоретичних основ раціонального процесу прийняття рішень у професійній діяльності правоохоронців. ***Методологічний інструментарій*** *дослідження становить загальна теорія прийняття рішень, що ґрунтується як на диференціації, так й інтеграції аксіоматичної теорії корисності та максимізації раціональності наукових евристик щодо прийняття рішень.* ***Наукова новизна*** *статті полягає у висвітленні основних концепцій поведінки під час прийняття рішень з різноманітними видами пояснення чинників і механізмів поведінки представників правоохоронних органів. Проаналізовано чинники та механізми групового прийняття рішень з метою його оптимальної раціональності й подолання невизначеності. Доведено, що раціональний процес прийняття рішень, що ґрунтується на груповій динаміці, є ефективним для зниження ризику та зменшення кількості помилок у професійній діяльності правоохоронців.* ***Висновки*** *статті полягають в обґрунтуванні ефективності прийняття рішень на підставі командного та індивідуального підходів у професійній діяльності правоохоронців. Стаття описує вихідну точку прийняття рішень у складних, обмежених за часом, невизначених, неоднозначних і мінливих ситуаціях, з якими стикаються представники правоохоронних органів у процесі професійної діяльності. Доведено, що командний підхід зменшує ризик того, що рішення може спричинити небажані наслідки. Описано когнітивні викривлення «пасток розуму» (евристики), які змушують відхилятися від оптимальних стратегій у прийнятті рішень унаслідок суб'єктивних умовиводів. Розкрито роль авторитетної особистості (керівника групи) та професійного досвіду в раціональному процесі прийняття рішень у команді, а також роль власне команди як ресурсу для прийняття рішень.*

Ключові слова: невизначеність; розв'язання проблем; прийняття рішення; управління ситуацією; організація; контроль; командні рішення; когнітивні упередження.