SPCRD GLOBAL
PUBLISHING
Sustainable Solutions

REAL

Review of Education, Administration and Law

Journal homepage: <http://real.spcrd.org> ISSN (Print): 2708-1788 ISSN (Online): 2708-3667

Motivation and Decision-Making Styles at Work: A Comparison of Public Private Sector Managerial Positions

Uzma Irum ^a, Ruqia Safdar Bajwa ^b, Rabia Khawar ^c

^a Department of Psychology, The Women University, Multan, Pakistan

^b Department of Applied Psychology, Bahauddin Zakariya University, Multan, Pakistan

^c Department of Psychology, Government College University Faisalabad, Pakistan

ARTICLE DETAILS	ABSTRACT
History: Accepted 29 April 2020 Available Online 30 June 2020	<p><i>The current study investigated the link between motivation and decision-making strategies of employees working on managerial positions in different organizations of Multan. Additionally, participants were compared across gender, marital status, age groups and organizational set up. The sample included 164 men and 68 women (N = 232, Mage 38.5 years). Work Preference Inventory and General Decision-Making Style Questionnaire were administered in order to measure intrinsic/extrinsic motivation and a range of decision-making styles respectively. Correlational analysis showed significant inverse association of dependent decision-making style with both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation yet only extrinsic motivation proved to be a significant predictor of dependent style in regression analysis. Results of t-test showed that men preferred rationale style women scored higher on dependent and avoidant styles of making decisions than men. Decision making ability of married employees was better than unmarried. Differences across gender and marital status were non-significant on level of motivation and its types. Private sector employees showed greater motivation than public sector employees, however both were alike in decision making except for dependent style that was preferred by public sector employees. Younger group was more intrinsically motivated while older groups were more dependent in decision making as compared with the younger group. Findings are discussed for improvement of organizational set up.</i></p>
Keywords: Work Motivation, Decision Making, Gender Differences, Organization	
JEL Classification: J20, D70, J16	
DOI: 10.47067/real.v3i1.23	

© 2020 The authors. Published by SPCRD Global Publishing. This is an open access article under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0

Corresponding author's email address: ruqiasafdar@bzu.edu.pk

1. Introduction

Decision making is one of the most essential aspects and an elementary chore of organization (Li, 2008). Organizational researchers acclaim that decisions are like the veins of an organization due to its immense significance (Bahrami, Amiri&Parandvar, 2014; Torralba&Palazzi, 2010). As the managers

make decisions, they are faced with several obstacles which can impact positively or negatively on their work. Studies have shown that motivation affects individual's self-regulatory abilities and thus may govern the process of decision making (Hayee& Hassan, 2011). Commonly, motivation serves adaptive actions as it leads the person to perform in conformity to his disposition of survival in addition to other learnt needs, beliefs and objectives. Different decisions about a certain problem could be made in different circumstances, not because of varied accessibilities of the cognitive configurations used directly to face the decision issue, but due to various accessibilities of particular motivational structures (Batelho& Coelho, 1995). Different decision making strategies may correspond to variety of motivation.

Research has demonstrated that analysis of these various decision making styles is very crucial for better consideration of the decision-making process (Thunholm, 2004). Scott and Bruce (1995) have defined decision-making styles as typically learned response formats that people show when they confront a decision making related scenario. They are not enduring characteristics like personality, but ways to respond in a certain manner in a particular decision milieu. They have recommended five decision making styles: the rational style, for searching the facts and logical appraisal of substitutes; the intuitive style, including focus on details and inclination towards intuitions and emotional states; the dependent one reflecting advice and guidance from others; the avoidant style relying on decision-making suspension and reluctance and the spontaneous style, upheld by a sense of immediacy and an impulse to conclude things hastily.

Each style is a different method of weighing alternatives and examining solutions. Every person especially those working as supervisors or leaders in institutions and organizations prefers a different way to contemplate a decision. And this cognitive work out could be affected by several factors, such as the circumstances (Payne, Bettman, & Johnson, 1993), time constraints (e.g., Ahituv, Igarria, & Sella, 1998), nature of the task (e.g., Brehmer, 1992), and personal characteristics including self-motivation and regulation (Bandura, 1997; Ranyard, Crozier, & Svenson, 1997). Many studies have emphasized the importance of self-regulation in decision making process (Kanfer, 2005; Thunholm, 2003) while Higgin (2000) explicated self-regulation as a combination of the nature and value of one's projected outcomes, supporting motivation system which appears to be related to both cognitive and decision styles. Other psychosocial correlates of decision making styles include thinking patterns (Gambetti, Fabbri, Bensi&Tonetti, 2008), sensation seeking, locus of control, and academic achievement (Baiocco, Laghi, & D'Alessio, 2009) any many more. Moreover these styles have been found to predict job satisfaction (Crossley & Highhouse, 2005).

Personnel of any organization aspire and work to achieve personal and organizational goals. Motivation is main source of encouraging individuals to contribute their best performance and to facilitate them in obtaining enterprise objectives (Gupta & Joshi, 2004). Motivation and knowledge expedite supportive work environment, essential for the successful performance. Experts distinguish between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The concept of intrinsic motivation has been derived from within the individual as it is defined as performing something for inherent satisfaction rather than separable outcomes (Deci & Ryan, 2000). Extrinsic motivation is regarded as the set of primary or secondary economic rewards, that person get in exchange for his work (Reiss, 2004).

Motivation becomes complicated when different individuals and groups have lack of consensus about the nature of success and factors affecting achievements. People differ in using approaches as some may like thoughtful, rational and organized approaches are while other prefer impulsive, communicative and intuitive reactions. Sources and incentives may also vary across individuals such as priorities about money, appreciation, work enjoyment or opportunity to learning something new.

Variations also exist in ability to regulate motivation, avoid de-motivators and generate the circumstances that may foster success (Mcshane & Glinow, 2009). Gender differences

Motivated workers go above and beyond the direct tasks to deliver better, faster and more of what they desire. They are ambitious, accept challenges, initiate novel ideas and built on it. Motivation has been associated with finding better resolutions, more inventive methods of performing and delivers much better outcome (Pilotto & Young, 2012). Decision making is an important component of dealing with conflicting and challenging situations in an organization. Thus motivational aspects may directly or indirectly exert an influence on decision making approaches of personnel especially the managers and supervisors. Deliberately designed motivational policies enhance employee engagement ((Silvera, 2013), thus indirectly influencing better decision making strategies. While making decisions, choices of leadership and employees could be subjective to their motivational states.

In fact the relationship between work motivation and decision making strategies opted by managers of any organization could be reciprocal and mutually influencing. Cognitive underpinning of motivation may play an important role in taking rightful action such as a decision in a particular situation. Effective goal-directed behaviour could lead individuals perusing for information in both the external and internal environments ([Hills, 2006](#)). Spector (2009) suggested motivation is a prerequisite for employees of an organization in order to perform well in their jobs and take accurate actions. Pohankova (2010) reported that employees' motivation impacts decision making process and consequently influences many other organizational outcomes. Ticu (2013) has also argued the decision-making process aimed to achieve some objectives as having implications for the performers that are observing their needs.

Prior researches in Pakistan have recognized several variables that affect the decision making styles but only a few have explained the relationship between work motivation and decision making strategies. This study, has attempted to comprehend the relationship of different decision making styles with intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Understanding the interplay between motivation and decision making styles would help in attaining organizational and personal goals.

2. Hypotheses of the study

Study was dependent upon the accompanying speculations:

- Intrinsic motivation would be positively correlated with intuitive decision making style while negatively correlated with the dependent decision making style.
- Extrinsic motivation is positively correlated with rational decision making style while negatively correlated with the avoidant and spontaneous choice making styles.
- Male representatives are all the more extrinsically motivated as compare to female workers.
- Male representatives utilize more rational decision making style as compare to female workers.
- Female representatives utilize more dependent and intuitive decision making styles as contrast with male workers.
- Intrinsic motivation is high in private sector workers as contrast with public sector workers.
- Private sector employees utilize more rational and intuitive decision making styles as compare to public sector employees.
- Married employees utilize more dependent decision making style as contrast with unmarried workers.
- Young employees have lower level of work motivation as contrast with the older employees and young managers use intuitive, dependent and avoidant decision making styles while older managers follow rational decision making style.

- Work motivation would predict decision making styles among private and public sector employees.

3. Materials and Method

3.1 Participants

The sample consisted of 232 individuals (164 males, 68 females) working on higher managerial posts in different public and private sector organizations of Multan. They belonged to different age levels ranging from 25 to 65 years ($M = 38.5$ $SD = 3.24$) and were grouped into 3 categories i.e. 25-35, 36-45, 46-65. Convenient sampling technique was used to collect the data.

3.2 Instruments

The following scales were used to accomplish the objectives of the study:

3.2.1 General Decision-Making Style Questionnaire (Scott & Bruce's, 1995)

Decision-making style was measured using General Decision-Making Style Questionnaire that consists of twenty five items measuring 5 types of decision making strategies i.e. rational, intuitive, dependent, avoidant, and spontaneous. Urdu version of the measure (Rasheed, 2004) was used in the current study.

3.2.2 Work Preference Inventory (Amabile 1995).

Work Preference Inventory (WPI) was administered to assess intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The inventory has 30 items and has satisfactory internal consistency, great transient test-retest reliability, and validity (Amabile, 1995).

3.3 Procedure

To seek information from employees of various organizations of Multan, a survey comprising demographic information sheet, and both of the measures GDMSQ and WPI was distributed among the participants after obtaining an informed consent. Both public and private organizations (such as banks, hospitals, civil aviation and education departments) were approached for collecting data. The managerial staff of these departments was contacted for volunteer participation in the study. The participants were given the instructions about the aim of the study and the procedure to complete the survey. They were wished to be authentic and were assured of the secrecy of their material and privacy of their responses.

4. Results

The present research sought to study the impact of work motivation on decision making styles among private and public sector employees. Furthermore, this study aimed to investigate the effect of demographic variables (gender, age, department) on work motivation and decision making styles and to find the relationship between the types of motivation and decision making styles. Data were analysed using, Pearson Correlation, Multiple Regression, Independent sample t-test, and ANOVA.

Table 1. Demographic Characteristics of the Sample (N = 232)

Demographics	N	Weighted %
Organizational Setup		
Private	79	34.05
Public	153	65.94
Gender		
Male	164	70.68
Female	68	29.31

Ages		
25-35	134	57.75
36-45	76	32.75
46-65	22	9.48
Marital Status		
Married	188	81.03
Unmarried	44	18.96

Table 1 shows the demographic composition of sample of the study. These various demographics are organizational sector, gender, age and marital status.

Table 2: Association between Intrinsic/Extrinsic Motivation and Decision Making Strategies

Scales	RA	DE	AV	IN	SP
IM	-.010	-.144*	.003	-.093	.068
EM	.057	-.135*	-.056	-.042	-.128

** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

Note: IM = Intrinsic motivation; EM = Extrinsic Motivation; RA = Rational; DE = Dependent; AV = Avoidant; IN = Intuitive; SP = Spontaneous

Intrinsic motivation was found to be significantly correlated with dependent decision making style ($r = -.144, p < .05$) and the inverse relation revealed that employees with higher level of intrinsic motivation are less likely to opt dependent decision making style, whereas none of the other styles significantly correlated with intrinsic motivation. For extrinsic motivation, again the only significant result was obtained for a negative relationship between extrinsic motivation and dependent style of making decisions ($r = -.144, p < .05$).

Table 3: Work Motivation as Predictor of Decision Making (N= 232)

Scale	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	β	<i>T</i>	<i>p</i>
Constant	78.32	4.181		18.711	.000
EXT	.091	.117	.061	.777	.042
INT	-.115	.094	-.096	-1.219	.224

$R^2 = .421; F(2, 229) = .751, p = ns$

Table 3 shows the result of regression analysis for prediction of decision making from their work motivation and its sub scales. Only extrinsic motivation significantly predicted overall decision making while results of intrinsic motivation are not significant.

Results of the independent sample *t*-test showed that men and women did not significantly differ in their scores on WPI total score; $t(230) = 1.56, p = ns$, and its subscales i.e. intrinsic motivation; $t(230) = 1.17, p = ns$, and extrinsic motivation; $t(230) = 1.49, p = ns$. However, significant gender differences exist on some of the decision making styles as indicated in the following table.

Table 4: Descriptive Statistic and t- test for gender differences in Decision Making Styles (N= 232)

	Male (n=164)		Female (n=68)				95 % CI		
Scale	M	SD	M	SD	t	p	LL	UL	Cohen's d
DMSQ	76.71	9.0	77.90	7.34	-0.965	.336	-3.62	1.24	0.12
RA	20.77	3.05	19.28	4.10	3.05	.003	.530	2.46	0.40
DE	15.58	3.31	17.25	3.11	-3.57	.000	-2.59	-.748	0.47
AV	7.21	3.55	9.03	4.25	-3.34	.001	-2.89	-.746	0.44
IN	18.70	3.08	19.18	3.26	-1.05	.294	-1.37	.415	0.13
SP	14.59	4.75	13.31	6.01	1.72	.087	-.187	2.74	0.22

df = 230

Note: CI = Confidence interval; LL = lower limit; UL = upper limit; DMSQ = Decision Making Style Questionnaire; RA = Rational; DE = Dependent; AV = Avoidant; IN = Intuitive; SP = Spontaneous

Table 4 shows a highly significant difference between males and females on Rational, Dependent, and Avoidant subscales of Decision making style Questionnaire. Means and standard deviations further indicate that males use more Rational Decision making style as compared to females and females use more Dependent and Avoidant Decision making styles as compared to males. No significant gender differences emerged for Intuitive and Spontaneous Decision making styles.

Mean comparison of married and unmarried employees indicated non-significant differences on overall level of motivation, $t(230) = 1.15$, $p = ns$, and its style i.e. intrinsic, $t(230) = .98$, $p = ns$, and extrinsic, $t(230) = .99$, $p = ns$. Yet, few significant differences between married and unmarried employees were found for their decision making styles. Married employees ($M = 77.6$, $SD = 8.6$) showed better decision making skills than unmarried employees ($M = 74.3$, $SD = 7.4$) as they obtained higher scores on DMSQ total, $t(230) = 2.32$, $p < .05$. Results on Dependent decision making style also differed significantly, $t(230) = 2.23$, $p < .05$, across married ($M = 16.3$, $SD = 3.2$) and unmarried employees ($M = 15.07$, $SD = 3.3$). Marital status had no significant impact on rest of the decision making styles e.g. Rational ($t(230) = -.93$, $p = ns$), Avoidant ($t(230) = 1.34$, $p = ns$), intuitive ($t(230) = .53$, $p = ns$), and Spontaneous ($t(230) = 1.04$, $p = ns$).

Data were further evaluated for differences between government and private sector employees in their level of motivation and style of making decisions.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics and t-test for Differences across Government and Private Sector Employees on Work Motivation (N = 232)

	Govt. Sector employee		Private sector employee						
	(n= 79)		(n= 153)				95% CI		
Scale	M	SD	M	SD	t	p	LL	UL	Cohen's d
WPI	78.10	11.677	83.63	10.769	-3.603	.000	-8.559	-2.507	0.47
EM	38.82	5.944	40.59	5.590	-2.239	.026	-3.331	-.213	0.29
IM	39.38	7.176	43.04	6.814	-3.807	.000	-5.554	-1.765	0.50

df = 230

Note: CI= Confidence interval; LL= lower limit; UL= upper limit; WPI= Work preference Inventory;

EM= Extrinsic motivation; IM= Intrinsic motivation

Results of an independent sample *t*-test showed that there was a significant difference between government and private sector employees on WPI and its subscales, while mean scores indicated that private sector employees had higher level of motivation as compared to government sector employees.

Furthermore, both sectors were compared for decision making strategies and it was found that government sector employees did not significantly differ from their private counter parts on most of the decision making styles such as Rational ($t(230) = .57, p = ns$), Avoidant ($t(230) = .32, p = ns$), intuitive ($t(230) = 1.35, p = ns$), and Spontaneous ($t(230) = -.50, p = ns$); except for the dependent style. Dependent decision making scores were higher for employees of government sector organizations, $t(230) = 2.85, p < .01$.

One way ANOVAs were computed for identifying differences among young, middle and late adulthood age groups on both WPI score and subscale and decision making style questionnaire along with the subscales.

Table 6: One Way ANOVA for Age Differences among Employees on Work Motivation

		SS	df	MS	F
WPI	Between Groups	3271.179	2	1635.589	14.088***
	Within Groups	26586.321	229	116.097	
	Total	29857.500	231		
Extrinsic Motivation	Between Groups	628.029	2	314.015	10.214***
	Within Groups	7039.954	229	30.742	
	Total	7667.983	231		
Intrinsic Motivation	Between Groups	1092.975	2	546.487	11.719***
	Within Groups	10679.094	229	46.634	
	Total	11772.069	231		

*** $p < .001$

There is a highly significant difference among different age groups of employees on WPI and its subscales. Mean differences were later evaluated using LSD post hoc comparisons and the results indicated that there is a highly significant difference among different age groups of employees on WPI and its subscales. Younger age group was more intrinsically motivated than other two groups while middle aged group was more extrinsically motivated as compared to younger and older groups. Overall motivational level was higher in younger and middle aged groups as compared with the older group.

Surprisingly, no significant age differences emerged on any of the decision making styles expect for dependent one, $F(2, 229) = 11.42, p < .01$; which was mostly used by middle and older age groups as compared with the younger group.

5. Discussion

This research investigated the relationship between work motivation and decision making styles. It also explored the preferred decision making styles of managers of different public and private organizations.

Contrary to the postulations, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation did not significantly correlate with most of the decision making styles. Both types of motivation were only associated with dependent decision making style. The inverse relationship suggested that employees with higher levels of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are less likely to dependent on others while making a decision.

Thus regardless of the type, overall motivation proved important with regard to autonomy and independence in making decisions. People who are motivated are self-reliant and confident in their capability to make decisions and therefore may not depend on others in choosing the correct option to solve their problems. Their confidence and self-sufficiency could also enhance the efficacy of their decisions. Researches have suggested that intrinsic motivation enriches employees through autonomy, variety and empowerment (Khuong & Hoang, 2015). However regression results revealed that general decision making skills are better predicted by extrinsic motivation while intrinsic motivation did not significantly predicted decision making. This makes sense as in an organizational set up employees typically believe that they are doing something worthwhile especially when they realize that their participation is valued by the authorities. So, extrinsic rewards improve their judgmental abilities. Studies have provided evidence for relationship between motivation and decision making for change management in organizations (Pohankova, 2010).

Gender differences in decision making styles and motivation were analysed using t-test. Findings suggested that male managers use rational decision making styles more often than females, whereas female managers tended to use dependent and avoidant strategies of decision making more frequently as compared to males. Existing literature provides support to this finding as Muyinudeen and Elsadig (2008) found male managers to be more directive, thoughtful logical and daring in decision-making styles, as compared to female managers who were reported as more democratic, participative, dependent, and cautious as compared to males while making decisions. Gender differences were not significant for motivation and its types. Although there has been evidence for gender differences in motivation as male managers had been found to be more autocratic and directive in their leadership styles and said to have higher levels of motivation than women, however not all studies support these differences (Kalkowski, Lynn & Susan, 2004).

The study also evaluated the impact of marital status on decision making and motivation. Here again men and women did not differ in motivation yet few difference were found significant for decision making styles. Married employees demonstrated better decision making abilities in terms of total score on GDMS. They also scored higher on dependent decision making subscale as compared to their unmarried counterparts. Motivation and decision making processes reflect job involvement as well. Marital status may have an impact on job involvement however some studies have not supported this connotation, or even if differences have been observed they are moderated by gender (Cortis & Cassar. 2005)

Level of overall motivation and scores on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation significantly differed across organizational set up as managers working in private sector felt more motivated than those of public sector. Employees of public sector organizations were found to be more dependent in making decisions in comparison with employees of private sector organizations. Rest of the decision making styles were alike across both sectors. Existing research also supported the differences in public and private sector employees. Lower levels of motivation and more dependency in public sectors managers could be attributed to lack of clarity in goals and roles. Boyne (2002) suggested that public bodies had more vague goals and, thus, as Lan and Rainey (1992) pointed out, it could be more challenging to estimate to what extent they are achieved. Additionally, managers working in public sector

organizations give more importance to consultative practices while making decisions and consequently would be more dependent (Nutt, 2006).

Lastly ANOVA results identified significant age difference for motivation while decision making styles were the same across age groups. Younger age groups were more motivated both intrinsically and extrinsically as compared to middle and older age groups. Work motivation has been previously linked with age. Latham (2006) indicated that age and tenure are aspects that have an impact on task motivation. Older people may feel less motivated as they approach towards the end of their careers (DeKoekkoek, Neece, & Patterson, 1997).

6. Conclusions and Implications

The present study has added substantial outcomes in relation to motivation and decision-making literature on organizational set up. Motivation is not essentially the reason of the decision, since the will is the cause, but it offers that will with the direction for each decision. Motivation introduces the determination to the whole decision making process. The findings of present research have suggested that extrinsic motivational factors contribute more to decision making of managers. Gender differences in decision making styles and motivation were also evident. Private sector managers were found more motivated and less dependent as compared to public sector managers. However, careful interpretation of results is needed as the current study did not took several work related indicators into account.

Acknowledgement

We are thankful to all the participants and organizations who participated this study.

References

- Akif, H. & Imtiaz, S. (2012). Effects of subordinate various work behaviours on the motivational level of their bosses. *African Journal of Business Management*, 6 (4), 1769-1771.
- Akram, H.M., Maryam, T. & Amin, F. (2011). Study of the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence (EI) and Management Decision Making Styles. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 12 (7), 1017-1025, 2011
- Aliya, A. H., & Bushra H. (2011). Self-Regulation as Predictor of Decision Making Styles among Managers of Cellular Companies. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 26 (1),
- Andersen, J. A. (2000). "Intuition in managers: Are intuitive managers more effective?" *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 15 (1), 46 – 63.
- Anderson, C.J. (2003). The psychology of doing nothing: forms of decision avoidance result from reason and emotion. *Psychological Bulletin*, 129, 139-167.
- Anuradha, T., & Venkat, R. K. (2000). Leadership in Decision-Making. *Indian Management*, 39 (5), 69-79.
- Arvey, R. D., Bouchard, T. J., Segal, N. L., & Abraham, L. M. (1989). Job satisfaction: Environmental and genetic components. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 187-192.
- Atkinson, J. W., & Birch, D. (1970). *The Dynamics of Action*. New York: Wiley.
- Bacanli, F. (2000). Development of indecisiveness scale. *Turkish Psychological Counseling and Guidance Journal*, 2(14), 7-16.
- Baiocco, R., Laghi, F., & D'Alessio, M. (2009). Decision-making style among adolescents: Relationship with sensation seeking and locus of control. *Journal of Adolescence*, 32, 963-976.
- Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognitive theory of self-regulation. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50, 248-287.
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-efficacy: The exercise of control*. New York, NY: W.H. Freeman.
- Boussif, D. (2010). Decision making styles of Arab Executives: Insight from Tunisia. *Communication of IBIMA*, 2010, 1-10.

- Camic, C. (1992). *The Matter of Habit*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Clark, R. E. (2003) Fostering the work motivation of individuals and teams. *Performance Improvement*, 42(3), 21-29.
- Clark, R.E. (1998). Motivating performance. *Performance Improvement*, 37(8), 39-47.
- Crossley, C., & Highhouse, S. (2005). Relation of job search and choice process with subsequent satisfaction. *Journal of Economic Psychology*, 26, 255-268.
- Dalton, G.L. (1998). The collective stretch; Workforce flexibility. *Management review* 87, pp. 54-59.
- Davis- Blake, A., & Pfeffer, J. (1989). Just a mirage: The search for dispositional effects in organizational research. *Academy of Management Review*, 14, 385-400.
- Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic Motivation*. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E.L. & Ryan, R. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-determination in Human Behaviour*. New York: Plenum.
- Dijksterhuis, A., & Nordgren, L.F. (2006). A theory of unconscious thought. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 1, 95-109.
- Druckman, D., & Bjork, R. (1994). *Learning, Remembering, and Believing: Enhancing Human Performance*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Dur, R., & Zoutenbier, R. (2012). *Intrinsic Motivations of Public Sector Employees: Evidence for Germany*. Tinbergen Institute Discussion Papers 12-135/VII, Tinbergen Institute.
- Eccles, J., & Wigfield, A. (1995). In the mind of the actor: The structure of adolescents' achievement task values and expectancy-related beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 215-225.
- Edwards, W. (1954). The theory of decision making. *Psychological Bulletin*, 51, 380-417.
- Epstein, S., Pacini, R., Denes-Raj, V., & Heier, H. (1996). Individual differences in intuitive-experiential and analytical-rational thinking styles. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71, 390-405.
- Etzioni, A. (1975). *Comparative Analysis of Complex Organizations*. New York: MacMillan publishing Co.
- Ferrari, J. R., Wolfe, R. N., Wesley, J. C., Schoff, L.A. & Beck, B.L. (1995). Ego identity and academic procrastination among university students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 36, 361-367.
- Fischhoff, B. (1982). Debiasing Judgment under Individual Choice Situations. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 4, 39-43.
- Fischhoff, B. (1988). *Judgment and Decision Making*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Fletcher, H. F. & Wearing, A. J. (1992). *Deciding to return to study: A field assessment of the decision making questionnaire*. University of Melbourne, Australia.
- Frost, R.O. & Shows, D.L. (1993). The nature and measurement of compulsive indecisiveness. *Behavior Research of Therapy*, 31, 683-692.
- Gambetti, E., Fabbri, M., Bensi, L., & Tonetti, L. (2008). A contribution to the Italian validation of the General Decision-Style Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 44, 842-852.
- Gerhardt, B. (1987). How important are dispositional factors as determinants of job satisfaction? Implications for job design and other personnel programs. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 72, 366-373.
- Gupta, S.K. & Joshi, R. (2004). *Organizational Behaviour*. Kalyani Publishers, New Delhi.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and human performance*, 16, 250-279.
- Hamideh, S.H, Akbar, E., & Naser, S. Z. (2013). The Relation between employees' style of thinking styles and Decision making styles. *International Journal of Information Technology and Business Management*, 15 (1).
- Haraburda, E. M. (1999). The relationship of indecisiveness to the five factor personality model and psychological symptomology. An unpublished Dissertation, The Ohio State University. Columbus,

OH,.

- Hariri, H. (2011). *Leadership styles, decision-making styles, and teacher job satisfaction: an Indonesian school context*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, James Cook University.
- Harren, V.A., (1979). A model of career decision making for college students. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 119-133.
- Harriott, J., Ferrari, J. R. & Dovidio, J. F. (1996). Distractibility, day dreaming & self-critical cognition as determinants of indecision. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 2, 337-344.
- Hengpiya, A., (2006). Teacher Commitment: It's Relationship with Principal Decision making styles as perceived by Teachers in Pattani's selected Islamic Private Schools. Retrieved from www.lib.iium.edu.my/mom2/cm/content/view/view.JSP?
- Hills, T. T. (2006). Animal Foraging and the Evolution of Goal-Directed Cognition. *Cognitive Science*, 30, 3-41.
- House, R. J., Shane, S. A., & Herold, D. M. (1996). Rumors of the death of dispositional research are vastly exaggerated. *Academy of Management Review*, 21, 203-224.
- Ivancevich, J. M., & Matteson, M. T. (1987). *Organizational Behavior and Management*. USA. Business Publications, Inc. ISBN 0-256-05608-0
- Janis, I. & Mann, L. (1977). *Decision making a psychological analysis of conflict, Choice and commitment*, New York: The free press.
- Kahneman, D. (2003). A perspective on judgment and choice. *American Psychologist*, 58, 697-720.
- Katz, D., & Kahn, R. L. (1978). *The social psychology of organizations*. (2nd ed.) New York: Wiley.
- Keeney, R. L., & Raiffa, H. (1976). *Decisions with Multiple Objectives*. New York. J. Wiley and Sons. ISBN 978047146510. S2.
- Klaczynski, P.A. (2001). Analytic and Heuristic processing influences on adolescent reasoning and decision making. *Child development*, 72 : 844-861.
- Kluger, A., & DiNisi, A. (1998). Feedback interventions: Toward the understanding of a double-edged sword. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 7(3), 67-72.
- Letovancova, E. (2002). *Psychológia v manažmente*. 1. vyd. Bratislava. Univerzita Komenského v Bratislave. ISBN 80-223-1725-X.
- Locke, E.A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation. *American Psychologist*, 57(9). 705-717..
- Loo, R. (2000). A psychometric evaluation of the General Decision-Making Style Inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 29, 895-905.
- Luthans, F. (2010). *Organizational Behaviour* (12th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Mann, L., Harmoni, R. & Power, C. (1989). Adolescent decision-making: The development of competence: *Journal of Adolescence*, 12, 265-278.
- Mann, L., Radford, M., Burnett, P., Ford, S., Bond, M., & Leung, K. (1998). Cross Cultural differences in self-reported decision making style and confidence. *International Journal of Psychology*, 33: 325-335.
- Maslow, A.H. (1987). *Motivation and personality* (3rd ed.). New York; Harper and Row.
- McClelland, D. C. (1961). *The Achieving Society*. Princeton, NJ: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- McShane & Glinow, (2009). *Organizational Behaviour* (5th ed.). McGraw Hill.
- Milkman, K.L., Chugh, T., & Bazerman, M. (2009). Highbrow films gather dust: A study of dynamic. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 3(2), 97-109.
- Miller, J. G. (1978). *Living Systems*. McGraw-Hill, New York.
- Miller, J. G., & Miller, J. L. (1990). Introduction: The Nature of Living Systems. *Behavioral Science*, 35, 157-163.
- Mitchell, T. (1982). *Motivation: New Directions for Theory, Research, and Practice*. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 80-88.

- Mitchell, T.R., & Beach, L.R. (1976). A review of occupational preference and choice research using expectancy theory and decision theory. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 49, 231-248.
- Mithaug, D.E. (1993). *Self-regulation theory: How optimal adjustment maximizes gain*. Westport Connecticut: Praeger.
- Nygren, T. E. (2000). "Development of a measurement of decision making styles to predict performance in a dynamic judgement/decision making task". New Orleans, LA.
- O'Reilly, C. & Chatman, J. (1986). Organizational commitment and psychological attachment: The effect of compliance, identifications, and internalization of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 71, 492-499.
- Omotola, O. (2012). An investigation into Decision Making Styles practices and preferences of human resource managers in the Banking Industry in Southwestern Nigeria. *European Journal of Business and Management* ,4(11),1-7.
- Organ, D. W., & Bateman, T. S. (1991). *Organizational Behavior*. (4th ed.) USA. Irwin. ISBN 0-256-06667-1.
- Pervin, L. A. (1975). *Personality: Theory, Assessment & Research*. New York: Wiley.
- Peters, T. and Waterman, R. (1982) *In Search of Excellence*. London: Profile Books.
- Pohankova, A. (2010). MOTIVATION AND DECISION-MAKING PROCESS IN MANAGING CHANGE WITHIN THE ORGANIZATION. *Human Resource Management and Ergonomics*, (4), 1-9.
- Rashid, R. (2010). "Decision Making Styles of Managers In Pakistan: Role of Management Status and Organization Sector". *Interdisciplinary journal of Contemporary Research in Business* 2.7 (2010): 182-192.
- Rashid, R., Waheed, A. (2012). Individual's leadership and decision making styles: A study of Banking sector of Pakistan. *Journal of Behavioral sciences*, vol.22 No.3.
- Rayner, S. & Riding, R. J. (1997). Towards a categorization of cognitive styles and learning styles. *Educational Psychology*, 17 ,5-27.
- Robbins, Judge & Vohra, (2013). *Organizational Behaviour* (14th ed.). Prentice Hall.
- Rowe, A. J., Mason, R. O., & Dickel, K. E. (1994). *Strategic management: a methodological approach*. 4th ed. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley.
- Rynes, S. & Lawler, J. (1983). A policy-capturing investigation of the role of expectancies in decisions to pursue job alternatives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 68, 620-631.
- Scott, S.G., & Bruce, R.A. (1995). Decision-making style: The development and assessment of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55, 818-831.
- Shamir, B. (1990). Meaning ,self and motivation in organizations. *Organization Studies*, 12(3) 405-424.
- Singh, R. & Greenhaus, J. (2004). The relation between career decision-making strategies and person-job fit: A study of job changers. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 64, 198-221.
- Snyder, R. A. & Williams, R. R. (1982). Self- theory: An integrative theory of work motivation. *Journal of occupational psychology*. 55, 257-267.
- Spector, P. (2009). *Industrial and organizational psychology*. Translated by Shahnaz Mohammadi. Tehran. Arasbaran publications.
- Spicer, D. P., & Sadler-Smith, E. (2005). An examination of the general decision making style questionnaire in two UK samples. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 20(2), 137-149.
- Spitzer, D. (1995). *Super Motivation*. New York, NY: AMACOM Books.
- Stanovich, K. E., & West, R. F. (2000). Individual differences in reasoning: Implications for the rationality debate? *Behavioural and Brain Sciences*, 23, 645-726.
- Staw, B. & Ross, J. (1985). Stability in the midst of change. A dispositional approach to job attitude. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 70, 469-480.
- Steer, R. M., & Porter, L. W. (1991). *Motivation and work behaviour*. McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Sternberg, R. J., (1997). *Thinking styles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Sung, M. P., Jessica, W. (2012). Driven to service: Intrinsic and Extrinsic motivation for public and nonprofit managers. *Public Personnel Management*, 41.
- Tannenbaum RF, Massarik (1950). Participation by subordinates on the managerial decision making process. *Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science*, 16, 408-418.
- Thunholm, P. (2004). Decision-making style: habit, style, or both? *Personality and Individual differences*, 36, 931-944.
- Thunholm, P. (2008). Decision-making styles and physiological correlates of negative stress: Is there a relation? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 49(3), 213-219. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2008.00640.x. approach. New York: Addison publishing company.
- Ticu, D., (2013). Theories of Motivation in Public Policies Process. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 92, 925-929.
- Tracy, L. (1989). Motivational Interaction between Living Systems. *Systems Practice*, 2(3):333-342.
- Trics, H.M., & Beyer, J.M. (1993). *The culture of work organizations*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J. : Prentice Hall.
- Ugurlu, C.T. (2013). Effects of decision making styles of school administrators on general procrastination behaviors. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 51, 253-272.
- Wood, N.L. (2012). Individual Differences in Decision making styles as predictors of good Decision making. *The Graduate College of Bowling Green State University*.
- Zey, M. (1992). *Decision making: Alternatives to Rational Choice Models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Zeynep Oktug (2012). The Effects of Organizational Trust on Employee Decision Making Styles. *British Journal of Arts and Social Sciences*, 9,