e-ISSN : 2347 - 9671, p- ISSN : 2349 - 0187

EPRA International Journal of Economic and Business Review | Vol - 3, Issue- 10, October 2015

Inno Space (SJIF) Impact Factor : 4.618(Morocco) ISI Impact Factor : 1.259 (Dubai, UAE)

ROLE OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM IN GOVERNMENT DECISION MAKING PROCESS

✍

Ogunleye Philip Oluwole[1]

Department of Business
Administration and Management.
Osun State Polytechnic,
Iree
Osun State
Nigeria

Olubunmi, Eunice Mojirike[2]

Department of Accountancy,
Faculty of Financial Studies.
Osun State Polytechnic,
Iree. Osun State
Nigeria

Olowe, Folake Tinuola[3]

Department of Accountancy ,
Faculty of Financial Studies.
Osun State Polytechnic,
Iree. Osun State
Nigeria

ABSTRACT

The focus of this paper is to examine the role of MIS on government Decision making process. Decision making is the process of selecting a course of action to meet organization's objectives. Management Information System MIS provides a fitting platform for good decision making, without the established systems of getting information in MIS, it would be extremely difficult for organizations to make their decisions. The paper adopted archival method as research methodology and review relevant theories. The paper concluded that business owners must learn to cope with the ever changing trends in MIS and decision making, without which it will be very challenging to make positive progress in decision making. All MIS strategies should therefore be tailored in a way that business goals are achieved.

KEYWORDS: *Decision making, Changing trends, Management., Government*

1.0 INTRODUCTION

The process of decision-making in any business is an inherently vital aspect not just for organizations but also for individuals who greatly rely on these decisions for their survival in the highly competitive arena of entrepreneurship (Al-Zhrani, 2010). More importantly, Management Information System (commonly abbreviated as MIS) has been an increasingly used tool in the institutionalization and making of decisions. DSS are a subset of MIS, for intelligent decision making. However, despite the immense benefits that result from using MIS in decision making, some critics have, reportedly, been slowly but surely asserting that MIS poses surmountable detrimental effects to organizations and should thus be used sparingly or avoided if possible. According to Kumar (2006), in order to define MIS, it must be principally divided into the three facets that constitute it—which are:

management, information, and systems. In furthering his ideas, Kumar simply defines management as the process through which managers plan, organize, initiate and control operations within their businesses. Essentially, a management can only exist when there are subjects/ workers to be managed (Al-Zhrani, 2010). Kumar also states that information generally refers to analyzed data. In other words, information (with regards to business) results from data that is analyzed using business statutes, principles and theories advanced by various macroeconomists. System refers to "A set of elements joined together for a common objective." More often than not, business systems normally consist of smaller systems known as subsystems which all function towards ensuring efficacy of the large systems. As a matter of fact, systems vary from one organization to another depending on the nature of organizational operations, size of the businesses and organizational priorities among many other salient factors. Based on the foregoing definitions, Management Information Systems refers to a system that uses information in order to ensure apt management of businesses. Fundamentally, all the facets of MIS run concomitantly in order to ensure overall efficiency of the whole system. Consequentially, a good management of information systems leads to good decision-making in business just in the same way poor management leads to poor decision making. It is based on this foundational concept that this paper is going to circumspectly analyze the roles of management systems in decision making. Srinivas Nowduri (2012)

Decision-making can be regarded as a problem-solving activity terminated by a solution deemed to be satisfactory. It is, therefore, a process which can be more or less rational or irrational and can be based on explicit knowledge or tacit knowledge. Human performance with regard to decisions has been the subject of active research from several perspectives: Psychological: examining individual decisions in the context of a set of needs, preferences and values the individual has or seeks. Cognitive: the decision-making process regarded as a continuous process integrated in the interaction with the environment. Normative: the analysis of individual decisions concerned with the logic of decision-making and rationality and the invariant choice it leads to Hamed (2009). A major part of decision-making involves the analysis of a finite set of alternatives described in terms of evaluative criteria. Then the task might be to rank these alternatives in terms of how attractive they are to the decision maker(s) when all the criteria are considered simultaneously. Another task might be to find the best alternative or to determine the relative total priority of each alternative (for instance, if alternatives represent projects competing for funds) when all the criteria are considered simultaneously. Solving such problems is the focus of multiple-criteria decision analysis (MCDA). This area of decision-making, although very old, has attracted the interest of many researchers and practitioners and is still highly debated as there are many MCDA methods which may yield very different results when they are applied on exactly the same data Triantaphyllou, Evangelos (2000). This leads to the formulation of a decision-making paradox. Logical decision-making is an important part of all science-based professions, where specialists apply their knowledge in a given area to make informed decisions. For example, medical decision-making often involves a diagnosis and the selection of appropriate treatment. But naturalistic decision-making research shows that in situations with higher time pressure, higher stakes, or increased ambiguities, experts may use intuitive decision-making rather than structured approaches. They may follow a recognition primed decision that fits their experience and arrive at a course of action without weighing alternatives. The decision maker's environment can play a part in the decision making process. For example, environmental complexity is a factor that influences cognitive function. Davidson (2006). A complex environment is an environment with a large number of different possible states which come and go over time Godfrey-Smith (2001). Studies done at the University of Colorado have shown that more complex environments correlate with higher cognitive function, which means that a decision can be influenced by the location. One experiment measured complexity in a room by the number of small objects and appliances present; a simple room had less of those things. Cognitive function was greatly affected by the higher measure of environmental complexity making it easier to think about the situation and make a better decision Davidson (2006).

2. THEORETICAL REVIEW

2.1 Decision Models:-

In economics, it is thought that if humans are rational and free to make their own decisions, then they would behave according to rational choice theory Schacter, Daniel L(2011). Rational choice theory says that a person consistently makes choices that lead to the best situation for himself or herself, taking into account all available considerations including costs and benefits; the rationality of these considerations is from the point of view of the person himself, so a decision is not irrational just because someone else finds it questionable. Decision making models: there are two primary decisions making model: the rational model and the bounded rationality model. With rational model (also called the classical model), the decisions maker attempts to use optimizing, selecting the best possible alternative. In bounded rationality model (also called the administrative model), decision maker uses satisfying, selecting the first alternative that meet the minimal criteria. Robert N. Lussier (2006). Making better decisions: modern research shows that managers, who make the best decisions, don't veranalyze by relying on rational decision making model, nor do they oversimplify by relying solely on their intuition. Instead, many managers utilize a concept referred to as "recognitional decision making". Recognition decision making leads to quicker decisions than rational decision making because it integrates the use of memory in the context of a situation in order to develop an immediate feel for the current situation. Chuck Williams (2005) The Rational Model: the approach managers use to make decisions usually falls into one of three types: The classical, the administrative and the political models. The choice of model depends on the managers' personal preference, whether the decision is programmed or none programmed, and the extent to which the decision is characterized by risk, uncertainty, or ambiguity. Decision making involves effort both before and after the actual choice. Programmed and none programmed decisions: management decisions typically fall into one of two categories: programmed and none programmed. Programmed decisions are made in response to recurring organizational problems. The decision to reorder paper and other office supplies when inventories drop to a certain level is a programmed decision. None programmed decisions have important consequences for the organization. Many none programmed decisions involve strategic planning, because uncertainty is great and decisions are complex. Richard L. Daft (2005)

2.2 The Rational Comprehensive Theory:-

The rational comprehensive model is based on the reasoning of economists, mathematicians, and psychologists. It assumes that the decision-maker can identify the problem, that the decision-maker's goals, values, and objectives are clear and ranked in accord with their importance, that alternative ways of addressing the problem are considered, that the cost and benefits or advantages and disadvantages of each alternative are investigated, that alternatives and their consequences can be compared with other alternatives, and that the decision-maker will choose the alternative that maximizes the attainment of his or her goals, values, and objectives. However, problems are not always clearly defined; problems have to be formulated in a way which enables people to make decisions about them. Decision-makers must have vast amounts of information in order to make use of the rational comprehensive decision-making technique. There needs to be an ability to predict the future consequences of decisions made. Also, problems confronting decision-makers often embody conflicting values. In addition, it is tough to ignore the sunk costs of former decisions, these may foreclose many alternatives. Moreover, this model of decision-making assumes that there is one (unitary) decision-maker, when in fact a great many people, interests and institutions are usually involved.

2.3 The Incremental Theory:-

Attempts to correct deficiencies of the rational comprehensive model and to better describe how policy decision-makers actually behave have resulted in incremental theory. Incremental theory holds that the selection of goals and objectives is intertwined with, not distinct from, the scientific analysis of the problem. Decision makers only consider alternatives for dealing with a problem that differs marginally (incrementally) from existing policies (suggesting that they do not completely remake policy every time they make a policy decision, but instead refashion existing policy). For each alternative, only important consequences are considered. Problems confronting the decision-maker are continually redefined. Constant ends-means and, means-ends adjustments are made to better manage policy. Seldom are there ever single decisions or totally correct solutions available to resolve a problem. A good decision is one that policy makers can agree on, not one that may be most appropriate for an agreed objective. Incremental decision-making is remedial, not holisticly-devised or future-oriented. Rarely are decisions faced in all or nothing terms.

3. EMPIRICAL REVIEW

3.1 Decision Making Process and Steps:-

Decision making is the process of generating and evaluating alternatives and making choices among them. Is it always best to strive for optimal decisions? Probably not, shooting for perfect solutions can freeze decision makers into inaction. They become so afraid of not making the perfect decision that they create. When gathering data and information becomes more important than making decisions and taking action sometimes, it's better to make decisions, risk mistakes and then learn from the mistakes when you make them. After all, the saying isn't "decisions make perfect", its "practice make perfect Herper (2000) A managerial decision typically affects a great number of people-customers, stockholders, employees and the general public. Professional managers see the results of their decisions reflected in the firm's earnings report, the welfare of employees, and the economic health of the community and the country. To strive and prosper, managers must be able to able to make professional decisions. Companies do not want dynamic failures; they want individuals who are properly equipped to make decisions. This does not mean that managers must be right 100 percent of the time: no one is perfect. It does suggest that successful managers have a higher batting average than less successful managers. (R.wayne mondy et al 1993)

Decision making does not occur in a vacuum. Elements of the organization's external environment are the same in a similar manner; the internal environment helps determine what decisions are made and who makes them. Whether a decision is programmed or none programmed and regardless of managers' choice of the classical, administrative, or political model of decision making, there are typically steps to decision making process. In the 1980s, psychologist Leon Mann and colleagues developed a decision-making process for five decision-making steps: i. Goals: Survey values and objectives. ii Options: Consider a wide range of alternative actions. iii. Facts: Search for information. Iv Effects: Weigh the positive and negative consequences of the options. v.Review: Plan how to implement the options.

In 2007, Pam Brown of Singleton Hospital in Swansea, Wales, divided the decision-making process into seven steps: i) Outline your goal and outcome. ii) Gather data. iii) Develop alternatives (i.e., brainstorming). Iv)List pros and cons of each alternative. v) Make the decision. vi)Immediately take action to implement it. vii)Learn from and reflect on the decision.

In 2009, professor John Pijanowski described how the Arkansas Program, an ethics curriculum at the University of Arkansas, used eight stages of moral decision-making based on the work of James Rest Pijanowski (2009)

i) Establishing community: Create and nurture the relationships, norms, and procedures that will influence how problems are understood and communicated. This stage takes place prior to and during a moral dilemma.
ii) Perception: Recognize that a problem exists.
iii) Interpretation: Identify competing explanations for the problem, and evaluate the drivers behind those interpretations.
iv) Judgment: Sift through various possible actions or responses and determine which is more justifiable.
v) Motivation: Examine the competing commitments which may distract from a more moral course of action and then prioritize and commit to moral values over other personal, institutional or social values.
vi) Action: Follow through with action that supports the more justified decision.
vii) Reflection in action.
viii) Reflection on action.

3.2 Values in Decision-making:-

Decision-making techniques can be separated into two broad categories: group decision-making techniques and individual decision-making techniques. Individual decision-making techniques can also often be applied by a group. Decisions can be studied as an individual or collective process. *Stare decisis* is sometimes a decision rule. It means new decisions are often based on precedents in decision-making that came before. It also applies to committee decision-making dynamics. The role of values in decision-making is significant. The following are categories of values which sometimes guide decision-makers.

Organizational Values:-

Decision makers, especially bureaucrats, are influenced by organizational values. Sometimes agencies use rewards and sanctions in subtle ways to induce their members to act in accordance with organizational values. Organizational values involve the promotion of organizational interests in the decision-making of those in the collectivity. Wearing a common uniform is one way organizations attempt to build common values among their workers.

Professional Values:-

The norms of one's profession instill values that are often critical in decision-making. Occupational specialization's requiring years of training, education, professional qualifying examinations and work experience embody professional norms or values that shape decision-making behavior.

Personal Values:-

This can involve personal ambitions, reputation, and self-interest. Note that rational choice theorists put far too much weight on explaining the behavior of individuals in terms of self-interest. This is understandable because so much of self-interest is tied to economic gain, which can be modeled in elegant, mathematical, and abstract terms.

Policy Values:-

This means acting on the basis of perceived public interest or acting in accordance with beliefs about what is proper, ethical, necessary, or morally correct. The Small Business Administration is filled with people who are likely to believe that small businesses are worthwhile, need help to survive, and promote beneficial public interests.

3.3 Efficacy of MIS in decision making:-

Preliminarily, it is inherent to state that decision making is an integral part of any business. This is because a majority of operations in an organization revolve around decisions made by the management and other key stakeholders in the organization. And in order for decision to be made adequately, it is vital for there to be a good information system since decisions are based on information available. In relations to this, Jahangir (2005) states that based on the significant role that information plays in choice of decision to be made, organizations must ensure that they have a good management information system. As a notable general observation, a good MIS ensures good decision making just in the same way bad MIS propel the making of bad decisions. *UStudy.in* (2010) supports the above observation by saying that "The quality of managerial decision-making depends directly on the quality of available information" and the managers should therefore cultivate an environment that encourages the growth and viable sprouting of quality information. Essentially, before deciding on which MIS strategy to use, it is vital to ensure that the choice made is fully compatible with your current system. This will not only help in avoiding erratic choices but it will also save you the time and money that would have been otherwise wasted by that person (Rhodes, 2010). In addition to that, it is noteworthy for the MIS strategy or tool used to be in line with the decisions that are to be made. In other words, there should be a connecting point between the decision to be made and the MIS to be used by individual or corporate business owners (Jarboe, 2005).

As a key consideration, Management Information Systems is a highly complex and delicate arena that calls for a lot of caution to be taken by its managers. It is for this reason that it is recommendable for organizations to ensure that they carefully select the individuals who are placed to control the systems. The more cautious and professional a person is, the better the person gets an assurance of positive prospects of in MIS with regards to decision making and other related areas of business (Lingham, 2006). Having clearly delineated that, what then are some of the scholarly arguments, facts, opinions and observations made by various macroeconomists with regards to the roles of Management Information System in improving decision making. To begin with, MIS provides a fitting platform for good decision making (Kumar, 2006). Essentially, without the established systems of getting information in MIS, it would be extremely difficult for organizations to make their decisions. This is because they would be forced to making baseless information due to the lack of confirmed information. Moreover, MIS normally lays a firm foundation for the establishment of concrete decisions through its systematic tools, timely information and adequate managerial policies and regulations. Furthermore, Management information Systems' statutes regarding businesses act as guidelines to business owners when making critical decisions about their businesses. As a result, managers and key decision makers are bridled from overstepping their boundaries or exceeding their business mandate. This is very crucial as it helps in keeping businesses checked and balanced thus ensuring that only proven decisions are considered while the untried ones are thwarted. More importantly, the capacity to guide decision-making facilitates progress and improvement of the operations in a company (Lingham, 2006).

In addition, most MIS programs are endowed with the capacity to give real-time updates of the occurrences in company or system. By real-time, scholars simply refer to immediate updates of occurrences in a system. These immediate updates help mangers to take necessary actions as soon as is deemed appropriate—especially during the discovery and management of crises. This augments progress and improvement in company operations through timely decision-making. This is important for companies in the modern-day generation where any slight lapse in decision making can lead to very huge losses Allen, et al., (2010) Still, Management information systems are very elemental improving company securities (Davenport & Short, 1990). For example, in many instances, most management information systems can be easily programmed by the owner to conduct certain actions at certain times. In effect, managers can program the system to perform certain routine checks which can help in improving efficiency of a company through easy discovery of bugs or problems. Furthermore, the programmability of most MIS saves a lot of priceless time and resources for owners. In other words, through programmability, business managers can program the systems to automatically discover certain deficiencies and even solve them. Consequently, the manager or system operator can use the time and resources he/she would have used in monitoring or fixing problems for other key uses. By routinely programming a Management Information System, the business is bound to make positive progress since time and resources can be easily channeled into rightful business paths (Allen, et al., 2010) As a fundamental point, a good number of MIS used today can perform multiple tasks all at the same time. This potential to multitask increases efficiency in a company since several business operations can be conducted simultaneously. With special regards to decision making, the capacity to multitask ensures that decisions are made speedily when compared to those systems which can only handle one task at a time.

Closely related to the above point, Jahangir (2005) says that some MIS allow multiple users to access the same content all at the same time without any discrepancies. This potentiality boosts accountability from the business operators since multiple people can access a particular content and verify whether they are consistent or whether they are not. As a matter of fact, most organizations tend to suffer due to poor accountability from those charged with the mandate to manage certain details. This safeguard action of some MIS is what macroeconomists refer to as the "gate-keeping" role of MIS in decision making and overall well-being of the organization. On another level, a good number of MIS play the role of record keeping or institutionalization of data bases that can easily keep confidential or invaluable information. In essence, decision making often calls for the reading of certain past work (Jahangir, 2005). This is where record-keeping comes in handy. On the flipside, databases normally function towards providing future places of information retrieval. Principally, the record keeping and data-basing tool of MIS definitely ensures that decisions are made viably while businesses run smoothly.

In contributing to the arguments regarding role of MIS in improving decision making, Rhodes (2010) also adds that: Management information systems give managers quick access to information. This can include interaction with other decision support systems, information inquiries, cross referencing of external information and potential data mining techniques. These systems can also compare strategic goals with practical decisions, giving managers a sense of how their decisions fit organizational strategy. In summary, Rhodes simply believes that management information systems are a huge contributing factor in the getting of viable information from organizations. Sadly, very few organizations have been able to ardently take up on this role and even lead other organization in the society in doing the same. It is for this reason that there has been a limited improvement in decision making based on the tailoring of viable information. A candid way of solving this challenge is given later in this paper under recommendations. Over the recent years, there has also been an increased usage of automated Management Information Systems. To a large extent, these automated systems have hugely revolutionized the decision-making process in a positive way (*UStudy,* 2010). For instance, by using automated MIS, companies no longer have to rely on 24-hour services from workers. Instead, the machines are able to be programmed to do things on our behalf (Jarboe, 2005). Of course this offers a huge plus in decision-making since managers are relieved of making some decisions-especially the technical ones which can be best interpreted and solved by the automated system. As a cautionary point, organizations should not entirely rely on automated systems especially when the decisions to be made have adverse implications to the organization. This is based on the alleged observation that auto systems may sometimes be faulty and thus require frequent periodic monitoring. So in order not to fall a victim of over-relying on automated systems, advices managers and company owners to ensure that they find a balance in utilizing the human element in operating while assigning some duties to the automate system Srinivas Nowduri (2012)

By blending the duties of these two extremes, Jahangir states that, this will ensure that both ends of the organization continue to actualize together while maximizing the potential for each side through check and balances of operations done by the management. Again, MIS is renowned for vesting its operations on systematic methods of operations. Crucially, this ensures that decisions made in a business are orderly and well-planned—which, in effect, encourages objectivity during decision making. As a result, businesses and the decision-making process are improved through its systematic and orderly formula of operating (Jawadekar, 2006). Effectually, this ensures positivity in terms of decisions made by organizations which, essentially, links up directly to improving the decision making process. A good number of scholars amass that MIS tends to be a more practical business tool with testable methods of operations. Its proposition and argumentations, therefore, provide tangible information that can be used to make substantiated decisions (Jawadekar, 2006) This is in great contrast with a majority of business tools, existing today, which are mostly hypothetical. In effect, decisions founded on MIS tend to be accurate and viable when compared to its counterparts—which, in turn, encourage improvement of business decisions. Finally, Management Information systems play the crucial role of providing a wide range of streamlined options from which decision-makers are able to make their preferred choices. Vitally, this ensures that whatever choices are made by decision makers, the outcome, more often than not, becomes positive. This, as a matter of fact, is the reason why many decision makers tend to prefer using MIS tools when making tough business choices. And as renowned concept, having good decision choices guarantees viable decisions in our businesses Vittal & Shivraj, (2008).

3.4 Management by objectives:-

Management by objectives (MBO), also known as management by results (MBR), is a process of defining objectives within an organization so that management and employees agree to the objectives and understand what they need to do in the organization in order to achieve them. The essence of MBO is participative goal setting, choosing course of actions and decision making. An important part of the MBO is the measurement and the comparison of the employee's actual performance with the standards set. Ideally, when employees themselves have been involved with the goal setting and choosing the course of action to be followed by them, they are more likely to fulfill their responsibilities. The system of management by objectives can be described as a process whereby the superior and subordinate jointly identify its common goals, define each individual's major areas of responsibility in terms of the results expected of him, and use these measures as guides for operating the unit and assessing the contribution of each of its members. Behind the principle of MBO is for employees to have a clear understanding of the roles and responsibilities expected of them. Then they can understand how their activities relate to the achievement of the organization's goal. Also places importance on fulfilling the personal goals of each employee Odiorne (1965).

Objectives can be set in all domains of activities, such as production, marketing, services, sales, R&D, human resources, finance, and information systems. Some objectives are collective, for a whole department or the whole company, others can be individualized. In the MBO paradigm, managers determine the mission and the strategic goals of the enterprise. The goals set by top-level managers are based on an analysis of what can and should be accomplished by the organization within a specific period of time. The functions of these managers can be centralized by appointing a project manager who can monitor and control activities of the various departments. If this cannot be done or is not desirable, each manager's contributions to the organizational goal should be clearly spelled out. Objectives need quantifying and monitoring. Reliable management information systems are needed to establish relevant objectives and monitor their "reach ratio" in an objective way.

3.5 Biases in Decision-making Process:-

Biases usually creep into decision-making processes. Confirmation bias: People tend to be willing to gather facts that support certain conclusions but disregard other facts that support different conclusions. Choice-supportive bias occurs when people distort their memories of chosen and rejected options to make the chosen options seem more attractive. People tend to place more attention on more recent information and either ignore or forget more distant information. Framing bias: This is best avoided by increasing numeracy and presenting data in several formats (for example, using both absolute and relative scales. Sunk-cost fallacy is a specific type of framing effect that affects decision-making. It involves an individual making a decision about a current situation based on what they have previously invested in the situation Blackhart, G. C.& Kline, J. P. (2005). Optimism bias is a tendency to overestimate the likelihood of positive events occurring in the future and underestimate the likelihood of negative life events. Such biased expectations are generated and maintained in the face of counter evidence through a tendency to discount undesirable information. An optimism bias can alter risk perception and decision making in many domains ranging from finance to health Perneger, T. V. & Agoritsas, T. (2011).

3.6 Challenges of MIS in Decision-making:-

Despite the positives associated with the role of MIS in decision making process, there are a few challenges that limit the efficacy of MIS. These include: The dynamic nature of MIS makes it difficult for some organizations to keep up with the principles, strategies, propositions or even ideas. Different situations call for different decisions to be made. This poses challenges to MIS theorists since some MIS tend to not be adaptable. The running of MIS programs tends to be relatively costly for some organization especially small ones who are not well-endowed financially. MIS is more of a science-oriented field while business is art-oriented. Consequently, finding a middle ground where the two can be linked is quite challenging to some people. Most organizations do not a well-defined decision making system. So even with the right MIS tools, very little can be achieved in terms of improving decision-making. Srinivas Nowduri (2012)

4.TYPICAL GOVERNMENT DECISION MAKING PROCESS

The President, the Cabinet, advisers, agency bureaucrats, federal, states/ county, political parties, interest groups, the media,all of these groups interact to make decisions in government. Public policy is a goal-oriented course of action that the government follows in dealing with a problem or issue in the country. Public policies are based on law, but many people other than legislators set them. Individuals, groups, and even government agencies that do not comply with policies can be penalized. This complicated process goes through a predictable series of steps:

Recognizing the problem:-

At any given time, many conditions disturb or distress people, such as unsafe workplaces, natural disasters like tornadoes and earthquakes, crime, pollution, or the cost of medical care. But all disturbing conditions do not automatically become problems. People have to recognize that government can and should do something about them. For example, most citizens probably do not expect government to prevent hurricanes. However, they may expect government to help hurricane victims through quick relief actions.

Agenda setting:-

An agenda is a set of problems that government wants to solve. Usually there are so many of them that they must be prioritized, with some problems getting earlier and more attention than others. Agenda setting may respond to pressure from interest groups, political parties, the media, and other branches of government. Agendas usually are reshaped when a new president takes office or when the majority party changes after an election. A crisis such as war, depression, natural disasters, or a tragic accident, almost always re-prioritizes issues.

Formulating the policy:-

At this stage, usually several conflicting plans from various political interests take shape. Various players — the president, agency officials, specially appointed task forces, interest groups, private research organizations, and legislators — may take part in formulating new policy.

Adopting the policy:-

Once various plans are presented, one policy is accepted by the decision-makers. In many cases, a policy is adopted when Congress passes a law. Policy adoption may also take place when the president signs an executive order or when the Supreme Court rules on an important case. Policy is often built in a series of small steps passed over time by different players, and eventually, a complex policy emerges.

Implementing the policy:-

Most public policies are carried out by administrative agencies in the executive branch, although sometimes the courts get involved in implementing decisions they make. Agencies use many techniques to see that policy is carried out.

Evaluating the policy:-

Policy makers often try to determine what a policy is actually accomplishing or whether or not it is being carried out efficiently. Often the evaluation process takes place over time with contributions from many of the interacting players. Most evaluations call for some degree of change and correction, and inevitably, at least some of the players will disagree. The whole process then begins again, starting with re-recognition of the problem USA (2014).

5 CONCLUSION

Decision-making, then, is a continuous process with numerous people participating. At any given time, government is at various stages of policy-making in a never-ending quest to provide solutions to countless societal problems USA (2014). Complex decisions are composed of a sequence of interrelated sub decisions. The generic decision making process involves specific tasks. Automation of certain tasks can save time, increase consistency, and enable better decisions to be made. Thus the more tasks we can automate in the process, the better. In addition communication and collaboration tools that provide indirect support to decision making, several other information technologies have been successfully used to support managers. Moreover, business owners must learn to cope up with the ever changing trends in MIS and decision making, without which it will be very challenging to make positive progress in decision making. Finally, it is vital to remember that improvement in decision making is fundamentally meant to ensure customer satisfaction while businesses continue to flourish in success. All MIS strategies should therefore be tailored in a way that the above business goals are achieved.

REFERENCES

1. *Allen, B., Heurtebise, A., & Turnbull, J. (2010). Improving Information Access. Business Management US. Retrieved October 2, 2010 from*
2. *http://www.busmanagement.com/article/Improving-information-access/*

3. Al-Zhrani, S. (2010). Management information systems role in decision-making during crises: case study. Journal of Computer Science, 6(11), 1247-1251.
4. Blackhart, G. C. and Kline, J. P. (2005). "Individual differences in anterior EEG asymmetry between high and low defensive individuals during a rumination/distraction task"
5. Chuck Williams,(2005) management. 3rd edition, Thomson. pp 18,182,,189,197
6. Davenport, T. H., & Short, J. E. (1990). The new industrial engineering: Information technology and business process redesign. MIT Sloan Management Review. Retrieved October2,2010 from http://sloanreview.mit.edu/the-magazine/articles/1990/summer/3141/the-newindustrial-engineering-information-technology-and-business-process-redesign/2/
7. Davidson, Alice Ware(2006) . "Environmental complexity: information for human–environment well-being" (PDF). doi:10.1007/978-3-540-35866-4_16. ISBN 9783540358640.
8. Godfrey-Smith, Peter (2001). "Environmental complexity and the evolution of cognition" (PDF). In Sternberg, Robert J.; Kaufman, James C. The evolution of intelligence. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. pp. 223–250. ISBN 080583267X. OCLC 44775038.
9. Hamed Armesh, (2009) Decision Making. Multimedia University Malysia
10. Harper,S.(20000 timing the bedrock of anticipatory management, business horizons,43, no1, :p75
11. Jahangir, K. (2005). Improving organizational best practice with information systems. Knowledge Management Review. Retrieved October 2, 2010 fromhttp://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_qa5362/is_200501/ai_n21371132/
12. Jarboe, K. P. (2005). Reporting intangibles: A hard look at improving business information in the U.S. Athena Alliance. Retrieved October 2, 2010 fromhttp://www.athenaalliance.org/apapers/ReportingIntangibles.htm
13. Kumar, P. K. (2006). Information System—Decision Making. Indian MBA. Retrieved October 2, 2010 from http://www.indianmba.com/Faculty_Column/FC307/fc307.html
14. Jawadekar. (2006). Management information systems: Texts and cases. New York, NY: McGraw Hill.
15. Kahneman, Daniel; Tversky, Amos, eds. (2000). Choices, values, and frames. New York; Cambridge, UK: Russell Sage Foundation; Cambridge University Press. ISBN 0521621720. OCLC 42934579.
16. Kirk, J. (1999). Information in organisations: directions for information management.
17. Information Research, 4 (3). Retrieved October 2, 2010 from http://informationr.net/ir/4-3/paper57.html
18. Lingham, L. (2006). Managing a business/ Management information system. All Experts.
19. Retrieved October 2, 2010 from http://en.allexperts.com/q/Managing-Business-1088/management-information-system.htm
20. Odiorne, G. S. (1965) "Management by Objectives; a System of Managerial Leadership", New York: Pitman Pub.
21. Perneger, T. V. and Agoritsas, Thomas (2011). "Doctors and patients' susceptibility to framing bias: a randomized trial". Journal of General Internal Medicine
22. Pijanowski, John (2009). "The role of learning theory in building effective college ethics curricula". Journal of College and Character **10** (3): 1–13.
23. Rhodes, J. (2010). The Role of Management Information Systems in Decision Making. eHow.
24. Retrieved October 2, 2010 from http://www.ehow.com/facts_7147006_role-informationsystems-decision-making.html
25. Richard L.Daft (2005) management 7th edition, THOMSON.
26. Robert N. L.(2005) management fundamentals. Concepts. Applications, skill Development
27. Sherrer,J.A. (2010) Deming's 14 Points and Quality Project Leadership
28. Srinivas Nowduri (2012) Management information systems and business decision making:review, analysis, and recommendations. Journal of Management and Marketing Research
29. Schacter, Daniel L.; Gilbert, Daniel Todd; Wegner, Daniel M. (2011). Psychology New York: Worth Publishers. ISBN 9781429237192. OCLC 755079969.
30. Triantaphyllou, Evangelos (2000). Multi-criteria decision making methods: a comparative study. Applied optimization. Dordrecht, Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers. p. 320. doi:10.1007/978-1-4757-3157-6. ISBN 0792366077.
31. UStudy.in. (2010). MIS and decision making. Retrieved October 2, 2010 from http://www.ustudy.in/node/1009
32. USA Work Program (2014) Policy Making: Political Interactions
33. Vittal, A., & Shivraj, K. (2008). Role of IT and KM in improving project management performance. VINE, 38 (3), 357 – 369.

****