



The contribution of HR to quality Decision Making in Organizations

Dr Anju Tripathi M.Phil, PhD.

Asst Professor-Economics & OB Mangalmai Institute of Management & Technology Greater Noida,
Gautam Budh Nagar, Uttar Pradesh, India

Every time I asked candidates what the objective of Recruitment & Selection is, I got multiple answers ranging from talent acquisition to hiring the best. But, when I supplement my first question with the statement that every human being is a talent, candidates start scratching their heads with no definite response which is near to the reality.

Recruitment & Selection is the most critical and the core process of the HR function. I seldom think, if we do not have clarity about our core process, then how can we contribute to the process, the first and further, how can we help the organization achieve its business objective.

Is this only with recruitment & selection or with other HR processes, as well?

Boardroom is like a compass to provide right direction to organizations and make them remain sustainable. The objectivity to actions with clear measurable outcomes is the need and mostly are the basis of boardroom compass. HR has to bring objectivity to its every action, like other functions. Unlike other functions, HR doesn't have definite contours which can be looked at and monitored easily, as HR deals with humans and every human is different in their outlook. The current science and psychological evidence are not sufficient to define human behavior and consequently foresee their reasons for actions. This dimension is a bottleneck to HR entering boardroom.

It means, HR has to deal at multiple fronts to enter boardroom and contribute to business.

The first front being building clarity around each of HR's core processes; not only among functional managers but within the function itself. Clarity has to be one and globally accepted. Else, every other person and board shall expect which may be untenable. The second could be laying down norms for HR in contributing to their own processes. In my view, for most of the HR processes, HR is a mere custodian with no responsibility of results. It is primarily due to the readily acceptance of interference of functional managers in almost every HR process due often to their positions in boardrooms. The other front is the mammoth data, HR has to deal

with in its daily life. Every interaction among people in an organization generates data that needs to be first collected, then arranged and analyzed to make it usable. And this is near to impossible. This in my view, is the ultimate reason of HR not able to secure tangibility to its actions.

A boardroom needs tangibility to decide and act. It thus means that above mentioned challenges at first require to be solved. With the technology today around and hopefully, newer ones in coming days, it is possible to build objectivity to HR processes. To mention her, at Kenbox Technologies - an HR Tech company based in India, all efforts are being made in this direction. Many new concepts and technology-based solutions around them have been rolled out. To mention a few here, Kenbox has rolled out concepts like DESSA, MPSC, SGR and TBS etc. so far. In our pursuit, we shall be making every single HR process accountable for their contribution. This advancement at our level will surely make a strong case for HR to enter boardrooms comfortably in the coming days. Boardrooms encounters for HR will be dealt with easily with numbers in their hands. HR automation will not remain a mere mechanical in nature but will be more meaningful and solve business challenges. It will bring concrete evidence of contribution to the table.

In relation to why do HR has to enter boardroom, it is well accepted today, despite all challenges that HR can help in making organizations sustainable. HR is being seen as the biggest value driver, as people are the most valuable asset for any organization. Whatever said and believed, no organization can think of building competitive advantage unless well supported by its HR. In my view, 'HR has to seek direction and give direction'. About seeking direction, it has to be in boardroom to understand nitty-gritty of business requirements from all stakeholders. It has to see and visualize challenges and extend expert support. Every stakeholder faces different types of challenges depending upon the area of their operations. Moreover, stakeholders are more involved in their day-to-day life in shouldering up their respective functional responsibilities. They do not have time and space to understand and design solutions to their people's problems. HR can come in handy to them.

Coming to giving direction, HR is the central to the entire organizations. Functionally and even operationally, it is only the HR function which is near to all employees in organizations. This makes the HR function the best among the equals. By design, every employee is in contact with HR for one or another reason. Unlike other functions, it allows HR to reach out to every single employee of every function easily. This position can be exploited by the boardroom in building clarity around their business policies and strategies including faster dissemination to align all employees to single direction. Organizations have to bring their HR into boardrooms to ensure success. Technology-based HR solutions as being provided by Kenbox Technologies shall make HR entry into boardrooms easy and effective for sure.

References

1. Prokushev Y.E., Lomazov V.A. Support for making personnel management decisions based on analysis of individual characteristics of the staff/ Journal of Economy and entrepreneurship, 2014. № 6-1 (59-1), p. 857-862.

2. Janis, I., & Mann, L. *Decision making: A psychological analysis of conflict, choice, and commitment*. New York: Free Press, 1977.
3. Weistroffer H.R., Smith C.H., Narula S.C. Multiple criteria decision support software, Ch 24 in: Figueira J., Greco S., and Ehrgott M., eds: *Multiple Criteria Decision Analysis: State of the Art Surveys Series*, Springer: New York, 2005. – p. 989-1018.
4. March, J. G., & Olsen, J. P. (Eds.) *Ambiguity and choice in organizations*. Bergen: Universitetsforlaget, 1976.
5. Lomazov V.A., Prokushev Y.E. The decision of a problem of an economic multicriteria choice on the basis of a method of the analysis of hierarchies// *Scientific sheets of the Belgorod state university. Series: History. Political science. Economy. Informatics*, 2010P. 7. – №. 14-1-1, p 128-131.
6. Mondy, R.W., & Noe, R.M. *Personnel: The management of human resources*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1987.
7. Pate, L.E. Improving managerial decision making. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 1987, Vol. 2, No. 3.
8. Tumanov V.E. Design of storages of data for systems of business analytics. – Moscow: Internet university of information technologies, 2010. – 615 p.
9. Dessler, G., 2012. *Human Resource Management*, Prentice Hall, 13th ed, pp: 718.
10. Schein, E. *Career dynamics*. New York: Addison-Wesley, 1978.
11. Telnov Y.F., Kazakov V.A., Trembach V.M.// Developing a knowledge-based system for the design of innovative product creation processes for network enterprises// *Business Informatics*, 2020. – № 3, p. 35-53.
12. Staw, B. M. Rationality and justification in organizational life. In B. Staw & L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior* (Vol. 2).
13. Mayo E. *The Human Problems of an Industrial Civilization*. London, Routledge, reprint edition, 2011. – 204 p.
14. Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1980, pp. 45-80.
15. Wheeler, D.D., & Janis, I.L. *A practical guide for making decisions* New York: Free Press, 1980.
16. Bhushan Navneet, Kanwal Rai. *Strategic Decision Making: Applying the Analytic Hierarchy Process*. London: Springer-Verlag, 2004. – 172 p.
17. Batkovsky A.M., Kalachykhin P.A., Telnov Yu. F., Fomina A.V. // Assessment of the level of requirements to key competencies of enterprises under conditions of digital economy// *Radio Industry*, 2019, № 3, p. 91-99.
18. Prokushev Y.E., Golub M. E. // Support for decision making in planning the personnel development// *Global Journal of Pure and Applied Mathematics*, 2016. – № 3, p. 2035-2052.
19. Larichev, O.I., Moshkovich, E.M., 1996. Qualitative methods of decision making. Verbal analysis of decisions. Moscow: Science. Fizmatlit, pp: 208.
20. Litvak, B.G., 2004. Expert technologies in management. Moscow: Business, pp: 400.
21. Lomazov V.A., Prokushev Y.E. Tool support of decision-making at selection and performance appraisal

- taking into account motivation// The online journal Modern Research of Social Problems, 2013. – № 8.
22. Petrovsky A.B., Lobanov V.N. Selection of complex system in the reduced multiple criteria space/ World Applied Sciences Journal, 2014. – № 29 (10), p. 1315-1319.
23. Prokushev Y.E. Personnel Decision Making Study on the Basis of Informational Modeling of Organizational Structure// Herald of the Belgorod University of cooperation, economic and law, 2014. – № 1(49), p. 257-260.

