

Personality Types (A&B) As Determinants of Decision Making Styles of Working and Non Working Women of Mauritius and India- A Comparative Study

¹Nirmala Loung-Poorunder and ²Poonam.R.Das

¹University of Technology Mauritius

²Dr Bhimrao Ambedkar University,
St John's College, Agra, India

Corresponding Author: Nirmala Loung-Poorunder

Abstract

The study was undertaken with the purpose of exploring Decision Making Styles of working and non-working Mauritian and Indian women having Personality Types A&B. Sample comprised of 240 Mauritian women (120 working and 120 non-working) and 240 Indian women (120 working and 120 non-working) aged 18-35. It was an ex post facto study and the subjects were assessed through "Decision-Making Style" (Hellriegel, Slocum, and Woodman) and "Personality Types" (Bortner) questionnaires. Results showed (a) significant difference in Decision Making Styles of both working and non working subjects of Mauritius and India having Type A Personality. However (b) there was insignificant difference between working and non working subjects having Type B personality of Mauritius and India. (c) Sensation and Thinking Decision Making Styles are mostly preferred by working and non working groups of both Personality Types (Mauritian and Indian). (d) The non working subjects of Mauritius and India having Type A Personality differed significantly, non working Indian subjects (47%) were in the category of Intuition and Feeling Decision Making Style.

Keywords: personality types A&B, decision- making styles, intuition, feeling, sensation, thinking,

INTRODUCTION

Life is the art drawing sufficient conclusions from insufficient premises. -Samuel Butler. Decision Making is an important aspect in all human beings life since whatever we do in life depends on the decision we take by choosing among many alternatives in a given situation. As stated by Luthans (1998), "Decision making is almost universally defined as choosing between alternatives. However, viewed as a process, the actual choice activity is preceded by gathering information and developing alternatives." Decision making is a normal process which is fundamental for the survival itself. We are bound to make decisions at each and every step of our lives and usually it involves our perception of what would be best for us on the long run. As rightly mentioned by Hastie and Dawes (2001), "Human beings have an exceptional ability to choose appropriate means to achieve their ends". And Cassel (1972) says that "Decision is a single vehicle alone by which man incites and directs all psychological locomotion within his life-space. It is the nucleus from which and all successes or failures spring."

An individual's personality types also influence decision making styles. People differ in terms of the extent and kind of variations or similarities in psychological aspects such as intelligence, personality, interest, and aptitude, etc. As stated by Baron (2003), 'People are people, and the process of

decision making is essentially the same all over the world. Even if people were to follow the same basic steps when making decisions, there exist widespread differences in the way people from various cultures may go about doing so.'

According to Robbins (1996), "Type A personality consists of aggressive involvement in a chronic, incessant struggle to achieve more and more in less and less time and, if necessary, against the opposing efforts of other things or other people. They are characterized by: Are always moving, walking and eating rapidly; Feel impatient with the rate at which most events take place; strive to think or do two or more things simultaneously; cannot cope with leisure time; and Are obsessed with numbers, measuring their success in terms of how much of everything they acquire."

Friedman (1950), described the characteristics of type B personality are as follows: "live in the moment, friendly, intuitive, spontaneous and patient, motivated by their intuition, try not to be judgmental, accept change better, open to criticism, supportive of other, express positive feeling, have liner chance for stress related disorders." As stated by Leon Mann, (1969), "Type B's are rarely harmed by the desire to obtain a wildly increasing number of things or participate in an endless growing series of events in an ever decreasing amount of time."

Jung. (1923) introduced typology of personality was introduced and this consists of four functions. The orientation associated with each function is as follows: **Sensation**- This type likes to solve problems in standard ways. **Intuition**- This type likes to solve new problems, relying on hunches, spontaneity, and openness in redefining problems until they are solved. **Thinking**- This type tends to be unemotional carefully considers all options, and uses intellectual processes in decision making. **Feeling**- This type tends to be sympathetic and relates well to others and believes in harmonious and pleasant working relationships.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Decision making is an important aspect of life and people have different decision making styles and the investigator wanted to know which style Mauritian women use as compared to Indian women in urban areas and having different working status. In particular the researcher made efforts to seek and explore the impact of personality types on decision making styles, and how people differ when culture and environment change. Past studies in this field have neglected these variables, that is; personality types A and B as potential determinants of decision making, not only within the organisation but also in day-to-day circumstances.

SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY

The study provided light on the decision making styles of working and non-working women of Mauritius and India. Therefore findings would be helpful in counselling people with different types (A & B) of personality in respect to their decision making styles. Findings will expand literature and add new information to areas of psychology.

METHODS AND PROCEDURES

Aim: To compare the Decision-Making Styles of Working and Non-Working Mauritian and Indian women having Types A & B personality.

OBJECTIVES

1. To assess Personality types of the subjects (working and non working women) of Mauritius

RESULTS

Table I showing number of subjects in different Decision Making styles in the category of Sensation and Thinking (ST), Sensation and Feeling (SF), Intuition and Thinking (IT), Intuition Feeling (IF) and Personality types

Personality types	ST		SF		IT		IF		Total	
	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B	A	B
W Indian	37 (64%)	37 (60%)	12 (21%)	16 (26%)	9 (16%)	6 (10%)	0 (0%)	3 (5%)	58	62
W Mau	40 (71%)	29 (45%)	9 (16%)	21 (33%)	2 (4%)	9 (14%)	5 (9%)	5 (8%)	56	64
NW Indian	25 (29%)	14 (42%)	18 (21%)	11 (33%)	3 (3%)	7 (21%)	41 (47%)	1 (3%)	87	33
NW Mau	28 (45%)	30 (52%)	16 (26%)	15 (26%)	6 (10%)	11 (19%)	12 (19%)	2 (3%)	62	58
Total	130	110	64	63	20	33	58	11	263	217

and India.

2. To assess Decision Making Styles of the subjects (working and non working women) of Mauritius and India.
3. To compare Decision Making Styles of working women in Mauritius and India having Type A personality.
4. To compare Decision-Making Styles of non-working in Mauritius and India having type A personality.
5. To compare Decision Making Styles of working women in Mauritius and India having Type B personality.
6. To compare Decision-Making Styles of non-working in Mauritius and India having type B personality.
7. To compare in totality Decision Making Styles of Mauritian and Indian women on the basis of their personality types.

HYPOTHESIS

H1: Women from India and Mauritius (working and non-working) will differ significantly in their decision making styles on the basis of their personality types (A & B).

Ho: Women from India and Mauritius (working and non-working) will not differ significantly in their decision making styles on the basis of their personality types (A & B)

SAMPLE

Sample made of 240 Mauritian women (120 working and 120 non-working) and 240 Indian women (120 working and 120 non-working) aged 18-35

TOOLS

1. Decision making style Questionnaire, Adapted from the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator and a Scale developed by D.Hellriegel, J.Slocum, and R.W. Woodman, "Organizational Behaviour", pp 127-41. By Robbins, S.P (1996).
2. Personality Type Questionnaire, Adapted from R.W. Bortner, "Short Rating Scale as a Potential A Behaviour," Journal of Chronic Diseases (June 1969), pp.87-91. With permission.

TABLE II: Table showing number of subjects in different Decision Making Styles in the category of Sensation and Thinking (ST), Sensation and Feeling (SF), Intuition and Thinking (IT), Intuition Feeling (IF) and Personality Type A for working subjects

	ST	SF	IT	IF	Total
W Indian	37 (64%)	12 (21%)	9 (16%)	0 (0%)	58
W Mau	40 (71%)	9 (16%)	2 (4%)	5 (9%)	56
Total	77 (68%)	21 (18%)	11 (9.6%)	5 (4.4%)	114

$X^2 = 9.94$, $df = 3$, significant at 0.05 level

TABLE III: Table showing number of subjects in different Decision Making Styles in the category of Sensation and Thinking (ST), Sensation and Feeling (SF), Intuition and Thinking (IT), Intuition Feeling (IF) and Personality Type A for Non-working subjects

	ST	SF	IT	IF	Total
NW Indian	25 (29%)	18 (21%)	3 (3%)	41 (47%)	87
NW Mau	28 (45%)	16 (26%)	6 (10%)	12 (19%)	62
Total	53 (36%)	34 (23%)	9 (8%)	53 (37%)	149

$X^2 = 13.35$, $df = 3$, significant at 0.05 level

TABLE IV: Table showing number of subjects in different Decision Making Styles in the category of Sensation and Thinking (ST), Sensation and Feeling (SF), Intuition and Thinking (IT), Intuition Feeling (IF) and Personality Type B for working subjects.

	ST	SF	IT	IF	Total
W Indian	37 (60%)	16 (26%)	6 (10%)	3 (5%)	62
W Mau	29 (45%)	21 (33%)	9 (14%)	5 (8%)	64
Total	66 (52%)	37 (29%)	15 (12%)	8 (6%)	126

$X^2 = 2.72$, $df = 3$, insignificant at 0.05 level

TABLE V: Table showing number of subjects in different Decision Making Styles in the category of Sensation and Thinking (ST), Sensation and Feeling (SF), Intuition and Thinking (IT), Intuition Feeling (IF) and Personality Type B for Non-Working subjects

	ST	SF	IT	IF	Total
NW Indian	14 (42%)	11 (33%)	7 (21%)	1 (3%)	33
NW Mau	30 (52%)	15 (26%)	11 (19%)	2 (3%)	58
Total	44	26	18	3	91

$X^2 = 0.84$, $df = 3$, insignificant at 0.05 level

TABLE VI: Table showing overall number of Mauritian and Indian subjects in different Decision Making Styles in the category of Sensation and Thinking (ST), Sensation and Feeling (SF), Intuition and Thinking (IT), Intuition Feeling (IF) and Personality Type A.

	ST	SF	IT	IF	Total
Indian women	62 (43%)	30 (21%)	12 (8%)	41 (28%)	145
Mauritian women	68 (38%)	25 (21%)	8 (7%)	17 (14%)	118
Total	130	55	20	58	263

$X^2 = 8.76$, $df = 3$, significant at 0.05 level

TABLE VII: Table showing overall number of Mauritian and Indian subjects in different Decision Making Styles in the category of Sensation and Thinking (ST), Sensation and Feeling (SF), Intuition and Thinking (IT), Intuition Feeling (IF) and Personality Type B.

	ST	SF	IT	IF	Total
Indian women	51 (54%)	27 (28%)	13 (14%)	4 (4%)	93
Mauritian women	59 (48%)	36 (30%)	20 (16%)	7 (6%)	122
Total	110	63	33	11	217

$X^2 = 0.82$, $df = 3$, insignificant at 0.05 level

INTERPRETATION AND GENERAL DISCUSSION

As per **table II** it was found that Indian and Mauritian women having Personality Type A differed significantly in Decision Making Styles. 68 percent of Indian and Mauritian subjects were found to be using the Sensation Thinking combination style of decision making. Individuals high in the **Sensation Thinking** category are more inclined to pay attention to facts, details, and reality. They also tend to select standard solutions that have worked in the past. They tend to use logic and analysis during problem solving. They are also likely to value objectivity and to be impersonal in drawing conclusions. They favour solutions that make sense in terms of the facts, models, and/or principles under considerations.

Only 18 percent of Indian and Mauritian subjects preferred the **Sensation Feeling** Decision Making Style. Individuals high in the **Sensation Feeling** category are more inclined to pay attention to facts, details, and reality and tend to select standard solutions that have worked in the past; however they do so by considering values and feelings in the problem solving process. They are also subjective in their decision making and tend to consider how their decisions could affect other people.

10 percent of Indian and Mauritian subjects were inclined towards the **Intuition Thinking** category Style of Decision Making. These people are more likely to attend to rely on facts, the relationships among the facts, and analyse the possibilities of future events that can be imagined from these facts.

They also exhibit a tendency to develop new, original solutions rather than to use what has worked previously. They tend to use logic and analysis during problem solving. They are therefore objective and tend to be impersonal in drawing conclusions. They favour solutions that make sense in terms of the facts, models, and/or principles under considerations. Only 4 percent of Indian and Mauritian subjects used the **Intuition Feeling** category of decision making. These people are more likely to attend to the meaningfulness of the facts, the relationships among the facts, and the possibilities of future events that can be imagined from these facts. They also exhibit a tendency to develop new, original solutions rather than to use what has worked previously. However they also rely on values and feelings while solving problem. Therefore they are subjective in their approach while making decisions.

The subjects of both countries differed considerably in the Intuition Thinking and Intuition Feeling Styles of Decision Making. 16 percent of working Indians favoured the Intuition Thinking Style of Decision Making compared to only 4 percent of working Mauritians for the same category. 9 percent of working Mauritian subjects was in the category of Intuition Feeling category while no working Indian subjects were in the same category of Decision Making Style.

Type A personality are impatient strive to think and do more things simultaneously are always hurried; however they are not risk takers and therefore their decision making is not wrong even if they may at times take hasty decision decisions. They are objective in their approach and analyse facts and are reality oriented, contrary to general belief Type A Personality may make sound decisions.

The results in **table III** shows significant difference regarding Decision Making Styles between Mauritian and Indian Non Working subjects having Type A Personality. A remarkable difference was seen between Indian and Mauritian non Working women with respect to Intuition Feeling decision making style; 47 percent of non working Indians were found to be in the Intuition Feeling category as compared to only 19 percent non Working Mauritians. The question is that why may be non working Indian women favoured the Intuition Feeling Style of Decision Making? This is so because they rely on instincts and feelings since their cognitive abilities have not been developed due to routine /stereotype works at home. While 45 percent of Mauritian non working women preferred the Sensation Thinking category compared to only 29 percent of Indians in the same category. Non working women are quite independent and use their logic and facts even if they do not work while making decisions. They have a more analytical approach in problem solving.

Table IV and V show no significant difference between working and non working subjects having Type B Personality. As shown in **table IV**, 60 percent of working Indian subjects was in the category of Sensation Thinking Decision Making Style as compared to 45 percent of working Mauritian subjects in the same category. Working Subjects from both countries are high in the Sensation Thinking category. There are other factors operating in the decision making process, intelligence is one of them and the Type B Personality are usually patient, are not hurried and would therefore analyse alternatives well before taking decisions. They would therefore rely on facts and logic though they may sometimes be spontaneous and intuitive. **Table V** shows an insignificant difference between Non Working subjects of both countries having Type B Personality. Here again the percentage of non working subjects of both countries have a preference for the Sensation Thinking category style of decision making; 42 percent (Indian) while 52 percent (Mauritian). The Type B Personality are calm and whether they are working or non working subjects, both display a preference for the Sensation Thinking category showing clearly their tendency for logical, analytical ability in decision making. **Table VI** shows a significant difference between Indian and Mauritian subjects having Type A Personality. It shows a remarkable difference with regard to 28 percent Indian subjects and 14 percent Mauritian subjects in the Intuition Feeling category of Decision Making Style. Indians have 43 percent subjects in the category of Sensation Thinking category while there was 38 percent of Mauritian for the same category under the Type A Personality. It has been found that the Type A Personality overall preferred the Sensation Thinking category while Indians also were inclined to use the Intuition Feeling category of Decision Making Style. Though these personality people are known to be restless and always in a hurry may make meaningful, factual and sound decisions and Indians do consider values and feelings because of cultural differences between both countries.

Table VII shows no significant difference between subjects of both countries having a Type B Personality irrespective of their working status. Therefore Type B personality people do not differ in their decision making style. However there are similarities in Indians and Mauritians since they share almost the same life style, values and culture and this is apparent in the Type B Personality since Type A Personality are unpredictable.

Research work is still in progress and therefore not too many directly related studies were found. The present study also indicates new exploration and findings in Decision Making Styles of people having different Personality Types.

The following studies are congruent with the above findings:

Parker, M.V., and Fischhoff, B. (2005), examined the extent (a) individuals show consistent performances differences across typical behavioral decision making tasks and (b) how these differences correlated with plausible real world correlates of good decision making. The results suggest that poor decision-making on common laboratory tasks is related to real world antecedents and consequences of poor decision-making.

Huitt, W. (1992). Has done a research on Problem Solving and Decision Making: Consideration of Individual Differences using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator. This paper related a model of the problem-solving process to Jung's theory of personality types (as measured by the MBTI) and identifies specific techniques to support individual differences.

Ambrien, A., Hasnain N., and Venkatesan, M. (2012), showed that Intuitive Personality Type had a significant relationship with the conceptual decision style. The personality type 'thinking' showed positive correlation with directive decision style, but negative correlation with behavioral. However, the personality type, 'feeling' showed positive correlation with behavioral decision style. Personality type, 'judging' had a significant relationship with analytical decision style, whereas, personality type, 'perceiver' had an inverse relationship with it. Further, it was found that systematic and intuitive cognitive styles had an inverse relationship with behavioral decision style. Though systematic cognitive style had a significant relationship with analytical decision style.

People differ in the way they go about making decisions, and the same person may make decisions in different ways in different circumstances. Arroba (1978) identified six decision-making styles from her sample of managers and manual workers: No thought, Compliant- with expectations from outside, Logical- careful, objective evaluation of alternatives, Emotional- decision made on basis of wants or likes, Intuitive- the decision simply seemed right and/ or inevitable, Hesitant- slow and difficult to feel committed. Janis and Mann (1977, 1982) identified five styles which are directly related to decision quality. They argued that decisions by definition involve psychological conflict, and people have different ways of dealing with that. Specifically, these are: *Unconflicted adherence*: the decision maker continues with the existing course of action, ignoring potential risks. *Unconflicted charge*: the decision maker embarks on whatever new course of action is his or her mind at the time without evaluating it. *Defensive avoidance*: the decision maker avoids the decision by delaying it or denying responsibility. *Hypervigilance*: the decision maker

desperately searches for a solution, and seizes on the first one that seems to offer quick relief. *Vigilance*: the decision maker searches carefully for relevant information and weighs it up in an unbiased fashion.

CONCLUSION

- ❖ The subjects of India and Mauritius having Type A Personality differed significantly in their Decision Making Styles.
- ❖ The subjects of India and Mauritius having Type B Personality did not differ significantly in their Decision Making Styles.
- ❖ The hierarchy of Decision Making Styles was Sensation Thinking, Sensation Feeling, Intuition Thinking and Intuition Feeling for all the groups.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, A., Hasnain, N and Venkatesan, M. (2012), The IUP Journal of Management Research, Vol. XI, No. 2, April 2012, pp. 20-29
http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2156758
- Arnold, J., Cooper, C.L and Robertson, I.T. (1998), "Work Psychology Understanding Human Behaviour's in the workplace", 3rd Edition, Pp 300, 301, Pearson Education Limited, Edinburgh Gate, Harlow, Essex CM20 2JE, England.
- Baron, R.A. (2003), "Behaviour in Organisations", 8th Edition, Published by Pearson Education Inc, Upper Saddle River, New Jersey 07458, USA
- Cassel, R.N. (1972), "The Psychology of Decision Making", the Christopher Publishing House, North Quincy, Mass, 02171 U.S.A.
- Das, R.P., & Talreja, B. (2006), *Journal of Psychological Researchers*, 50, 2, pp95-100.
- Hastie, R and Dawes, R.M. (2001), "Rational choice in an uncertain world", sage publications India PVT,Ltd, M-32 market, Greater Kailash 1, New Delhi 110048 India.
- Huitt, W. (1992), *Journal of Psychological Type*, 24, pp33-44.
<http://www.edpsycinteractive.org/papers/prbsmbti.html>
- Luthans, F. (1998), "organization behavior", 8th Edition, Thomas press Ltd, India.
- Robbins, P.S. (1996), 'Organisational Behaviour', 7th edition, pp.127-141, 144-156, pp102, 103, Prentice Hall, Inc Englewood cliffs, New Jersey 07632.
- Mann, L. (1969), "social psychology", John Wiley and sons Australasia pty ltd Sydney.

McKenna, E. (2006), "Business Psychology and Organisational Behaviour A Student's Handbook", Fourth Edition, Psychology Press, 27 Church Road, Hove, East Sussex, BN3 2FA

Parker, M.V and Fischhoff, B. (2005), Journal of Behavioral Decision Making, Vol. 18, issue 1-27, Published by JohnWiley and sons, Ltd.

http://download.clib.psu.ac.th/datawebclib/e_resource/trial_database/WileyInterScienceCD/pdf/BDM/BD_M_1.pdf