View metadata, citation and similar papers at core.ac.uk
brought to you by CORE
provided by Universiti Utara Malaysia: UUM eTheses

BUSINESS DECISION MAKING – A CASE STUDY

A thesis submitted to the Graduate School in partial
fulfilment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Science (Decision Sciences),
Universiti Utara Malaysia

by
Norazura Binti Ahmad

©Norazura binti Ahmad, 2002. All rights reserved

PERMISSION TO USE

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for a post graduate degree from Universiti Utara Malaysia, I agree that the universiti library may make it freely available for inspection. I further agree that permission for copying of this thesis in any manner, in whole or in part, for scholarly purposes may be granted by my supervisor(s) or, in their absence, by the Dean of the Graduate School. It is understood that any copying or publication or use of this thesis or parts thereof for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission. It is also understood that due recognition shall be given to me and to Universiti Utara Malaysia for any scholarly use which may be made of any material from my thesis.

Request for permission to copy or to make other use of materials in this thesis, in whole or in part, should be addressed to:

Dean of Graduate School

Universiti Utara Malaysia

06010 UUM Sintok

Kedah Darul Aman

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In the name of Allah, the Most Gracious and the Most Merciful.

It is with pleasure that I take this opportunity to express my gratitude to those of you who have provided the support and encouragement, which have meant so much to me in this dissertation.

I wish to express my thanks and my appreciation to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ang Chooi Leng. Her guidance was invaluable and her enthusiasm was an inspiration. My thanks also to Dr. Engku Muhammad Nazri bin Engku Abu Bakar as the co-supervisor, for his assistance and ideas towards this dissertation.

I would also like to thank the Dissertation Committee, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Razman Mat Tahar and Assoc. Prof. Dr. Nurahimah Mohd Yusoff for their comments and ideas to improve this dissertation.

I am grateful too, to the individuals who participated in my study. These people not only gave me data, they provided insights into the world of work, which will serve me for years to come. These are the people whose efforts literally made this dissertation possible.

I also owe a great deal of thanks to my family. To my parents, Ayah and Mak, for encouraging me all the years and having confidence that I could succeed. To my brothers and sisters, Along, Akak, Kak Long and Abang Ngah for listening to all my complaints and always encourage me to persevere.

Finally, there are a host of colleagues in Master of Decision Science programme who are also contributed to make my experience at Universiti Utara Malaysia memorable and my dissertation done. My thanks to Coknin, Kak Ita, Ros, Aida, Deqta, Kak Shibah, Kak Kiah, Kak Aza, Kak Sham, Kak Zu, Hisham, Ruzelan and all the others with whom I have shared this road.

Thank you all.

ABSTRAK

Kajian ini adalah suatu kajian kualitatif menggunakan kajian kes. Kajian dijalankan menerusi penelitian terhadap pengalaman para pengurus sebuah syarikat pengeluaran dalam proses pembuatan keputusan. Kajian ini turut cuba memahami proses pembuatan keputusan sebenar di dalam persekitaran perniagaan dan menentukan bagaimana proses tersebut berbeza daripada proses secara teori seperti yang terdapat dalam buku-buku rujukan. Ia juga cuba mengenal pasti faktor-faktor berkaitan yang menyumbang kepada proses pembuatan keputusan efektif dengan fokus kepada faktor manusia seperti ciri psikologi, gelagat dan sikap. Responden kajian terdiri daripada empat pengurus, tiga lelaki dan seorang wanita daripada jabatan yang berlainan. Pengumpulan data adalah menerusi temubual separa-struktur yang dirakamkan dengan keizinan pengurus. Selain temubual, beberapa ujian penilaian telah diberikan kepada para pengurus bagi membantu memahami karektor dan sikap mereka dalam membuat keputusan. Penilaian tersebut terdiri daripada Topologi Personaliti Jung (seperti yang digunakan dalam *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*), penilaian kreatif dan penilaian corak pengurusan konflik. Hasil kajian mendapati bahawa selain daripada kemudahan teknologi informasi komunikasi (ICT) yang digunakan, faktor manusia seperti ciri personaliti dan jenis psikologi turut mempengaruhi pembuatan keputusan. Hasil kajian turut menunjukkan bahawa para pengurus mempamerkan beberapa ciri yang serupa dalam membuat keputusan seperti pintar, tajam pemerhatian, penuh minat, berfikiran terbuka dan inovatif.

Katakunci: Proses pembuatan keputusan, pembuat keputusan, faktor manusia.

ABSTRACT

This study is a qualitative research approach involving case study. The study is conducted through an in-depth investigation on the experience of managers in decision making process in a manufacturing company. The study attempts to understand the actual decision making process in business environment and determine how the process differs from the theoretical process laid out in textbooks. The study also tries to identify the pertinent factors contributing to an effective decision-making process focusing on human factors, such as psychological traits, behaviour and attitudes. The respondents of the study comprised of four managers, three male and one female managers from four different departments. Data were collected using semi-structured interviews, which were tape-recorded with permission. Besides interviews, a few assessments were also given to managers to help understand their characteristics and attitudes in making decision. The assessments comprised of Jung's Personality Typology (as operationalized in the *Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*), creative assessment and conflict management style assessment. Findings showed that apart from Information Communication Technology (ICT) facilities, human factors such as personality traits and psychological types also influence decision making. Findings also indicate that managers exhibit a few similar traits in making decision, such as resourceful, observant, enthusiastic, open-minded and innovative.

Keywords: Decision making process, decision makers, human factors.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
PERMISSION TO USE	i
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRAK	iv
ABSRACT	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
LIST OF FIGURES	xi
CHAPTER ONE : INTRODUCTION	
1.1 Decision Making	1
1.2 Statement of the Problem	5
1.3 Objectives of the Study	7
1.4 The Research Question	7
1.5 Significance of the Study	7
1.6 Limitations of the Study	8
1.7 Assumptions of the Study	8
1.8 Summary	9
CHAPTER TWO : LITERATURE REVIEW	
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 Decision Making and Decision Sciences	10
2.3 The Psychology of Decision Making	12

2.4 Personality Effects on Decision Making 14

2.5 Human Behaviour and The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (MBTI) 16

2.5.1 Communication 18

2.5.2 Group Decision Making 20

2.5.3 The Four Preferences 22

2.5.3.1 Introversion/Extraversion 22

2.5.3.2 Sensing/Intuition 22

2.5.3.3 Thinking/Feeling 23

2.5.3.4 Judgment/Perception 23

2.5.4 The Dominant Process 24

2.6 Personality and Traits of Managers 25

2.7 Conclusion 30

CHAPTER THREE : RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 Focus of the Study 31

3.1.1 Statement as a Researcher 33

3.2 Determining the Sample 34

3.2.1 Background of the Organization 35

3.2.2 Background of Respondents 36

3.3 Data Collection 38

3.4 Data Analysis 46

CHAPTER FOUR : DATA INTERPRETATION AND DISCUSSION

4.1 Introduction 48

4.2 Respondents' Perceptions in Decision Making 48

4.3 Comparing Respondents' Procedures in Decision Making with Relevant Theory 63

4.4 Human Factors in Decision Making Process 68

4.5 Communication Process in Decision Making 78

4.6 Group Decision-making 82

4.7 Conflict Management Styles in Decision Making 85

4.8 Good Personality Traits for a Decision Maker 87

4.8.1 Cross-case Analysis of Four Respondents 88

4.8.2 The Corresponding Adjectives Revealed from Personality Description and Creative Assessment 90

4.9 Conclusion 92

CHAPTER FIVE : SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 Summary and Conclusions 93

5.2 Recommendations to the School of Quantitative Sciences 96

5.3 Recommendations to Manufacturing Companies 97

5.4 Suggestions for Future Research 99

5.5 Personal Insights 100

REFERENCE 102

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Personality Inventory 106

Appendix 2: Creative Assessment 110

Appendix 3: Conflict Management Styles 112

Appendix 4: Transcription Symbols 114

Appendix 5: Transcripts 115

Appendix 6: Minutes of Management Meeting 141

Appendix 7: Salient Factors in Decision Making Process Expressed by Respondents 147

Appendix 8: Human Factors in Decision Making Process 148

Appendix 9: Respondent Profiles 149

Appendix 10: Responses on Conflict in Decision Making 150

LIST OF TABLES

	Page
Table 2.1: Six Methods of Group Decision Making	21
Table 2.2: Distribution of Traits among 12 General Areas	29
Table 3.1: Preferences and Dominant Function	46
Table 4.1: Result of the Personality Assessment	72
Table 4.2: Similar Characteristics Revealed from Personality Assessment and Interview (Johan)	74
Table 4.3: Similar Characteristics Revealed from Personality Assessment and Interview (Hashim)	75
Table 4.4: Similar Characteristics Revealed from Personality Assessment and Interview (David)	76
Table 4.5: Similar Characteristics Revealed from Personality Assessment and Interview (Nancy)	77
Table 4.6: Conflict Management Styles of the Respondents	87
Table 4.7: Personality Description and Scoring Adjectives of the Respondents	90

LIST OF FIGURES

	Page
Figure 2.1: Downward, Upward and Horizontal Communication in Organizations.	19
Figure 3.1: Jung's Personality Typology (The Four Preferences) - as Operationalized by Myers and Briggs.	45
Figure 4.1: Problem-solving Procedures	64
Figure 4.2: Theoretical Decision Making Process	66
Figure 4.3: The Relation Between Communication and Stages of Decision Making at Company Y	80

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Decision Making

Decision making is a process of choosing among alternative courses of action for the purpose of attaining a goal or goals (Turban & Aronson, 2001). The alternatives are the possible decision we can make. However, before evaluating the alternatives, there are a few common steps applicable to all decision-making circumstances. Numerous authors (e.g. Schoderbek, Cosier & Aplin, 1991; Stevenson, 1999; Moody, 1983) share the common notion and have listed the following steps:

1) Identify the problem.
2) Generate alternatives.
3) Evaluate alternatives.
4) Select the best alternative.
5) Implement the chosen alternative.
6) Monitor the results to ensure that desired result is achieved.

The steps above are also known as rational decision-making process. However, in business environment, not every problem could be solved following rational models.

The contents of the thesis is for internal user only

REFERENCES

Aiken, Lewis R. (1993). *Personality – theories, research and applications.* Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc.

Aldredge, James E. (1985). *Communication and decision making theories: Approaches to mitigate the conflicting forces in union-management relation in the Fresno Transit Department.* Ann Arbor: UMI.

Allred, Brent B., Snow, Charles C. & Miles, Raymond E. (1996). *Characteristics of managerial careers in the 21st century.* Academy of Management Executive, vol. 10, no. 4.

Ansoff, H. (1965). *Corporate strategy: an analytic approach to business policy for growth.* London: Penguin.

Bazerman, Max H. (1986). *Judgment in managerial decision making.* John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Borisoff, D. & Victor, David A. (1998). *Conflict management – a communication skill approach*, 2nd. Ed, Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Boynton, Andrew C., Zmud, Robert W. & Jacobs, Gerry C. (1994). *The influence of IT management practice on IT use in large organizations.* MIS Quarterly, vol. 18, no.3.

Brans, J. Pierre (2002). *Ethics and decision.* European Journal of Operational Research, vol. 136, p. 340-352.

Coates, Dennis E. (1991). *The personalities of strong executives.* Executive Development, vol. 4, no.1, p. 20-23.

Cook, Curtis W. & Hunsaker, Phillip L. (2001). *Management and organizational behavior*, 3rd Ed. New York: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.

Cragg, Paul B. & King, M. (1993). *Small-firm computing: motivators and inhibitors.* MIS Quarterly, vol.17, no.1.

Creswell, John W. (1994). *Research design: qualitative and quantitative approaches.* Sage Puclications.

Davis, D. & Cosenza, Robert M. (1993). *Business research for decision making,* 3rd Ed. California : Wadsworth Publishing Company, p.13.

Drummond, H. (1996). *Effective decision making,* 2nd Ed. London: Kogan Page.

Daft, Richard L & Marcic, D. (1998). *Understanding management*, 2nd Ed. Orlando: Dryden Press

Francis, D. (1987). *Organizational communication*. England: Gower Business Skill.

Garnett, John (1987). *The manager's responsibility for communication (notes for managers)*. London: The Industrial Society.

Gilligan, C., Neale, B. & Murray, D. (1983). *Business decision making*. New Delhi: Heritage Publishers.

Gordon, Judith R. (1999). *Organizational behavior – A diagnostic approach*. 6th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Harrison, E. Frank (1999). *The managerial decision making process*. 5th Ed. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Harung, Harald S. (1993). *More effective decisions through synergy of objective and subjective approaches*. Management Decision, vol.31, no.7, p.38-45.

Hassan, M.H., Man, N. & Ang, C.L. (2002). *Penilaian industri terhadap kurikulum program Sarjana Muda Sains Pemutusan*. Prosiding seminar kebangsaan Sains Pemutusan – pemutusan cekap penentu kejayaan. 22-23 Julai 2002.

Hicks, Michael J. (1991). *Problem-solving in business and management – hard, soft and creative approaches*. London: Chapman & Hall.

Kakabadse, A. (1987). *Organisational politics*. Management Decision, vol. 25, no. 1, p. 33-37.

Khairul Anwar Mastor (2002). *Personality traits and perceived decisional attributes in decision making process*. Prosiding seminar kebangsaan Sains Pemutusan – pemutusan cekap penentu kejayaan. 22-23 Julai 2002.

Leonard, Nancy H., Scholl, Richard W. & Kowalski, Kellyan B. (1999). *Information processing style and decision making*. Journal of Organizational Behavior, vol. 20, p. 407-420.

Litterer, Joseph A. (1957). *What do companies look for in their executives*? Personnel Administration, vol. 20, no. 6, p. 16-19.

Lussier, Robert N. (1993). *Human relations in organizations – A Skill-Building Approach*, 2nd Ed. Boston: Irwin.

Mallach, Efrem G. (2000). *Decision support and data warehouse systems.* Singapore: McGraw Hill Companies, Inc.

Marcic, D., Seltzer, J. & Vail, P. (2001). *Organizational behavior: experiences and cases,* 6th Ed. Sydney: South-Western College.

Marshall, C. & Rossman, G. (1989). *Designing qualitative research.* California: Sage Publications, Inc.

Mescon, Michael H., Albert, M. & Khedouri, F. (1981). *Management: individual and organizational effectiveness.* New York: Harper and Row.

Miller, Donald S. & Catt, Stephen E. (1989). *Human relations – a contemporary approach.* Homewood: Irwin.

Moody, Paul E. (1983). *Decision making.* USA: McGraw Hill, Inc.

Myers, Isabel B., McCaulley, Mary H., Quenk, Naomi L. & Hammer, Allen L. (1998). *MBTI manual – a guide to the development and use of the Myers Briggs Type Indicator,* 3rd Ed. California: Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc.

Nutt, Paul C. (1989). *Making tough decisions: tactics for improving managerial decision making.* San Francisco: Jossey Bass Publishers.

Patton, Michael Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods,* 2nd Ed. California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Peluang pekerjaan masih luas di Malaysia. Berita Harian. (11.2.2002).

Race, H.H. (1955). *General Electric's approach for manager development.* Personnel Administration, vol. 18, no.6, p. 13-20.

Rajagopalan, N., Abdul M.A Rasheed & Datta, Deepak K. (1993). Strategic decision processes: critical review and future directions. *Journal of Management,* vol. 19, no. 2, p. 349-384.

Rowe, C. (1989). *Analysing management decision making: further thoughts after the bradford studies.* Journal of Management Studies, vol. 26, no. 1.

Sains Pemutusan – UUM universiti tunggal tawar program. Utusan Malaysia. (7.3.2001).

Schermerhorn, John R., Hunt, James G. & Osborn, Richard N. (2000). *Organizational behavior,* 7th Ed. New York: John Willey and Sons, Inc.

Schoderbeck, Peter P., Cosier, Richard A., Aplin, John C. (1991). *Management*, 2nd Ed. Florida: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, Inc.

Schoemaker, Paul J. H. (1993). *Strategic decisions in organizations: rational and behavioral views.* Journal of Management Studies, vol. 30, no. 1.

Simon, Herbert A. (1976). Administrative behavior – a study of decision-making process in administrative organizations, 3rd Ed. New York: Free Press.

Stake, Robert E. (1995*). The art of case study research.* Thousand Oaks: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Stevenson, William J. (1999). *Productions operations management*, 6th Ed. USA: Irwin/ McGraw-Hill.

Stumpf, Stephen A. & Dunbar, Roger L.M. (1991). *The effects of personality type on choices made in strategic decision situations.* Decision Sciences, vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1047-1072.

Taylor, Ronald N. & Dunnette, Marvin D. (1974). *Influence of dogmatism, risk-taking propensity and intelligence on decision making strategies for a sample of industrial managers.* Journal of Applied Psychology, vol. 59, no. 4, pp. 420-423.

Tong, S. Y. (1999). *The personality traits and management styles of middle and upper level managers in private sector – a study in Klang Valley.* Unpublished thesis.

Turban, E. & Aronson, Jay E. (2001). *Decision support systems and intelligent systems,* 6th Ed. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, Inc.

Zainon, F., Ibrahim, H. & Ang, C.L. (2002). *Job opportunities for Decision Sciences graduates by newspaper content analysis.* Prosiding seminar kebangsaan Sains Pemutusan – pemutusan cekap penentu kejayaan. 22-23 Julai 2002.

Zikmund, William G. (2000). *Business research methods*, 6th Ed. Ohio: Thomson Learning.