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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.
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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.
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