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Purpose: In the last few decades, the effects of globalisation has changed the way many companies carry out their activities. Greater emphasis are now placed on project management in a dynamic and effective atmosphere. As a result of this, companies try to understand how culture influences decision making in project teams in different countries. The purpose of this research is to investigate how culture influence decision making in project teams through an empirical study of telecommunication industry in Nigeria and Sweden by using Hofstede's framework on cultural dimensions.

Research Questions: (1) How does culture influence decision making in project teams?

(2) what are the similarities and differences in decision making in project teams between Nigeria and Sweden?

Approach: The research design for this study includes literature review and qualitative method. The primary data was collected using semi-structured interviews with project managers and workers in project teams. The secondary data was collected through articles, journals and books. Data from the findings were analysed using coding.

Results & Conclusions: It was found that culture influence decision making in project teams. In Nigeria, decision making in teams is more relax type because people try to avoid conflict by not hurting another person’s feelings while in Sweden decision making is more of a participating type in which each member in team has to be consulted and a consensus is arrived at before making the decision. Nigerian team values respect for senior colleagues and prefer hierarchy where codes of conduct exist, formality and inflexibility at work when compared to Sweden.
**Contribution of the study**: We recommend that prospective project managers of the mixed Swedish-Nigerian project team should encourage a participative involvement of all the members of teams in decision making and high degree of flexibility at work. This will lead to an efficient and effective project teams. The fact that this study was based on an important field of studies - project management, we could recommend that the impact of culture on project management could be explored in future research.
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1– INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the background of the research area as well as the problems discussion accompanied by purpose and research questions.

1.1 Background

In the modern society, there is the need to comprehend the influence and dynamics of culture on projects in regards to decision making (Müller et al., 2009). According to Müller et al., (2009), since the world is an interdependent one, this explains why some products can be conceived in one culture, produced in another and marketed to another. These are being realised with the use of an improved transportation and communication systems.

Culture has a fundamental role to play in the achievement of these projects. Many researchers have tried to elaborate on the definition of culture. Culture is implied comparison which is employed to investigate the identity of a business (Schwartz & Davis, 1981). It is about how people view the business, but also how the individual (employees) working in the organisation understand it. On the other hand, Greckhamer (2011) and Kluckholm & Strodtbeck (1961) mention that culture is the pattern of thinking, emotions and behaviours in a society that demonstrate traditional ideas and values and are exhibited in symbols, artefacts and other display of behaviour that are transferred through socialisation processes. Furthermore, Culture is a pattern of beliefs and expectations shared by the organisational members. These beliefs and expectations produce norms that powerfully shape the behaviour of individuals and groups within the organisation (Schwartz and Davis, 1981).

That notwithstanding, variation in culture have been reviewed primarily by harmonising essential values orientations into models of culture and grabbing values that form the culture cognition maps of people as well as social systems (Greckhamer 2011; Hofstede 2001; House et al., 2004; Kluckholn and Stodtbeck 1961). Hofstede’s (1980a, 1991, 2001) model of culture has been used as a foundation in cross-cultural research including decision making in project teams (Greckhamer, 2011). In sum, Hofstede points out five (originally and more widely used, four) work related dimensions that distinguish national cultures: Individualism-Collectivism, Power
Distance, Uncertainty Avoidance, Masculinity-Femininity and Long versus Short-term Orientations (Hofstede, 2001).

Globalisation has infused the basis of business activities in the modern society irrespective of whether companies are operating in national or international markets. The existence of globalisation is more than a business happening, it has become a societal, cultural, political and economical issue (Friedman, 2005 & Gabrielsson et al., 2008). According to Gabrielsson et al., (2008), businesses and their leaders try to merge teams of individuals with different cultural background as they expand business activities into different national markets. There is an unambiguous tendency of the world’s efficient companies gearing towards adopting project management as a “means of working” rather than a tool or methodology (Eve, 2007). According to Müller et al., (2009), there is a motive to understand how a country’s culture has an impact on task in multinational projects especially as these influences are associated to decision making.

Furthermore, project management practice has been subjected to important development worldwide and its development is being recognised by professional bodies, industries, government and academics in the past years (Bredillet et al., 2009). According to Project Management Book (PMBOK, 2000), project management is the practical employment of knowledge, skills, tools and techniques to project operations to meet project requirements. It is accomplished using processes such as initiating, planning, executing, controlling and closing. The work of the projects is managed by project teams and it involves competing demands for; scope, time, cost, risk and quality, stakeholders with differing needs and expectations and identifying requirements (PMBOK, 2000). One of the characteristics of processes in project management is repetitive in nature. This is linked to the fact that the more you know about your project, the better you are able to manage it (PMBOK, 2000).

According to Drouin et al., (2010), disintegration and globalisation in project processes are the aspects pushing many organisations to react to their changing environment by injecting project teams. These teams have specific advantage that is they can be staffed based on members expertise relative to their local availability (Drouin et al., 2010). The introduction of these teams must be followed with accurate actions to guarantee smooth operations and continuity (Drouin et al., 2010). On the other hand, organisational research on teams composed of more than one national culture depicts that such teams are vulnerable to problems such as conflicts,
misunderstanding, poor performance and less trust relative to teams composed of people of a similar culture (Zhang et al., 2007). He suggests that for an effective and efficient team to collaborate, members of the team must be willing to share information and being given the opportunity to participate (Zhang et al., 2007).

Since the last few decades, globalisation has had considerable effects in the way and manner organisations carry out their activities with a greater focus on project management in a dynamic and diverse environment. This has really figured out a peculiar scope of potential research: The understanding of cultural divergence in decision making styles and project teams.

1.2 Purpose

The purpose of this research is to investigate how culture influences decision making in project teams through an empirical study of telecommunication industry in Nigeria and Sweden by using Hofstede’s framework on cultural dimensions.

One of the most pertinent factors in project management is decision making and it could be affected by many factors but that which is more problematic nowadays is culture. This study will provide project managers with knowledge of the influence of culture on decision making in project teams in the telecommunication industry between a western country and a developing country. Furthermore, the similarities and differences in decision making in both countries will give an understanding for the teams and possibly the reasons why people act or response differently to various situations. The results obtained would be beneficial to other countries interested in doing business in Nigeria and Sweden and in project teams.

1.3 Research Questions

Most organisations today place more importance in projects; it would be worthy to investigate an area in which little has been examined of the cultural impact on project management on decision making. Therefore, culture and its impact on decision making in project teams is the main area of concern.
According to some researchers such as Kloppenborg & Opfer (2000 as cited in Sousa-Poza & Henrie, 2005 and Shore & Cross 2005), most of the studies on project management were centred on the tool and techniques while cultural direction has been less examined. According to a research that was conducted by Müller et al., (2007) on the cultural differences in decision making in a mixed-culture project teams based on two countries Sweden and Germany, show that cultural dimensions explain the selection of choices lead management behaviour and decision making in project teams. Therefore, there are few studies on the impact of national culture on decision making in project team in relation to another culture. Furthermore, it would be interesting for project managers to have a broad knowledge of cultural factors that could affect project management taking into consideration culture which could be used to support the framework to investigate the clarity of management issues.

Various issues and problems were suggested by previous research due to cultural differences such as inter-cultural communication (Müller et al., 2007); managing people, solving problems and conflict approach (Trompenaars, 2004) when there is more than one culture in a working process. With globalization, not large size companies but also small and medium size enterprises want to get a broad knowledge of different cultures’ impact on business ethics and how business is done in different areas and with different people.

However, since the last decade have been marked by huge effects of globalization on organizational performance and project management, there is need to understand cultures and different decision making criteria in both Nigeria and Sweden.

Therefore, the research questions for this study are:

1. How does culture influence decision making in project teams?
2. What are the similarities and differences in decision making in project teams between Nigeria and Sweden?

1.4 Limitation:

This study has limited its empirical areas to Sweden and Nigeria which might affect the generalisation of the results. Two countries were chosen based on interest, accessibility, comparability and the level of detail information to be achieved.
This thesis is limited to culture due to the fact that having been studying in Sweden for some years now, we find the Swedish culture interesting but we are not familiar with it and therefore we consider this research a good opportunity to study its culture. Secondly given the differences in culture and decision making, it is important to note that respondents would be employees of two telecommunication companies operating in Sweden and Nigeria. The fact that only two telecommunication company’s employees were interviewed could be considered a limitation. Another limitation of this research is the choice of methodology which was based on a qualitative research method.

1.5 Disposition

Chapter 1 gives the general overview of the research, the background, problem, aim and objectives of the study.

Chapter 2 reviews the literature on cultural differences and decision making within and outside project management

Chapter 3 deals with the research methodology including qualitative research approach as a strategy, tool and technique used in collecting data, data analysis, validity and reliability and limitations of the chosen methodology

Chapter 4 deals with the findings from the respondents in Sweden and Nigeria based on their experiences being involved in different project teams in telecommunication industry.

Chapter 5 is the analysis part of data collected from the empirical findings and the data will be analysed according to country and a comparison would be made to bring out the differences or similarities.

Chapter 6 has been devoted to discussions, conclusions on the result from the data analysed. Problems, limitations, recommendations and implication will be put forward as improvement for further research.
2 - LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter looks at literature and previous studies related to this area of study. There are diversified insights and opinions on projects, culture and decision making aspects. The chapter is divided into three main categories: projects, culture and decision making in project teams and further divided into sub categories. Therefore, this chapter forms the basis for formulating the theoretical framework to carry out the study.

2.1 What is a Project?

Organisations perform their works in the form of projects or operations (PMBOK, 2000). Although these two words (project and operation) might depict some differences in their meanings, there are some similarities in them especially the fact that they are being performed by people, constrained by limited resources and planned, executed and controlled (PMBOK, 2000).

Therefore, projects are often used as a means of accomplishing an organisational strategic plan (PMBOK, 2000). “A project is doing something that has not been done before and which is therefore unique in nature” (PMBOK, 2000). As a result, a project is a short-term endeavour which aims at creating a unique product or service. The use of the words short-term and unique in the definition of a project tries to expatiate that a project has beginning and end. Projects are being run at all levels in the organisation. Examples of projects would include developing new products or service, effecting a change in structure, staffing or style of an organisation, designing a new transportation vehicle, developing or acquiring a new modified information system, constructing a building or facility, building a water system for a community and implementing a new business procedure or process (PMBOK, 2000). These examples could be used to explain how a project could be perceived. A project to develop a new commercial airliner may demand multiple prototypes, a project to bring a new drug to market may require thousands of samples of the drug to support clinical trial and development project (e.g., water and electricity) may be implemented in five geographic areas.
2.2. What is a Project Team?

A project team is a group of individuals who are cooperative in their tasks, who share responsibility for results, who see themselves and who are seen by others as an indiscrète social body entrenched in one or more larger social systems (e.g. business unit or the corporation) and who manage their relationship across organisational boundaries (Cohen & Bailey, 1997; Chiocchio & Essiembre, 2009). Project teams are considered as benefits to organizations comprising of a group of employees that are formally organised, assigned some sovereignty and interdependent with different roles (Rasmussen & Jeppesen, 2006 as cited in Chiocchio & Essiembre, 2009).

Project teams comprise of a group of employees assigned to accomplish a one-time project within a particular time (Taylor, 2010). These teams assemble people with varying knowledge, skills, abilities, behaviours, emotions, experiences etc and they will conventional become productive in doing work such as managing the organization, making decisions, solving problems and developing new products or services than left working individually (Sessa & London, 2011).

Many organisations nowadays as a result of the changing and competitive environment are utilising project teams as a basic framework to achieve their strategic goals (Syed & Murray 2008; Elsass and Graves, 1997; Kirkman and Rosen, 2000) and improve personal performance over time (Murray and Moses, 2005). According to Sessa & London (2011), teams are becoming the fundamental components of organizations. As a result of this, the continual use of teamwork in most organizations has become a springboard to understand team processes leading to effectiveness (Sessa & London, 2011; Ilgen et al., 2005; Kozlowski and Ilgen, 2006). Furthermore, teamwork in organization has influenced a need for higher educational institutions to prepare students to work in teams and become productive team players (Sessa & London, 2011). These project teams could be a group of people performing the work of the project (PMBOK, 2000).
2.3. Project Management (PM)

Nowadays, there is a demand for people who can achieve the right things on time (Larson & Drexler Jr., 2010). This is the importance of efficient and effective project management. According to De Bony (2010), PM is initially used to enhance the structure of the work but increasingly it has developed to a concept. Project management is a combined attempt—an action, or failure to action in an area that is usually affected by another area (PMBOK, 2000). According to PMBOK (2000), project management is the use of knowledge, skills, tools and techniques to project activities to fulfil the project prerequisite.

Effective literature on PM explains how project management “should be “other than what it really “is” (De Bony, 2010). PM depends on the work arrangement that exceeds acknowledged professional division (Messeghem and Schmitt, 2004 & De Bony 2010). Larson & Drexler Jr. (2010) developed the definition of Project management. PM is the use of the new-fashioned managerial techniques and systems to the accomplishment of a project from start to finish attaining predetermined goals of scope, quality, time and cost. Therefore, project management comprises of four distinct phases which correspond to the product life cycle: defining stage, planning stage, execution stage and termination stage (Larson & Drexler Jr., 2010).

2.4. Cultural Divergence

‘Without culture, and the relative freedom it implies, society, even when perfect, is but a jungle. This is why any authentic creation is a gift to the future’ - Albert Camus

Culture comprises complex influence on many dimensions of human attitude (Soares et al., 2006). Culture is a fundamental part of every society and can be defined as the learned pattern of behaviour and everything which makes up a person’s entire way of living. Culture has been defined by many researchers but an acceptable definition is that of Hofstede (1991) which states that culture is a pattern of assumptions, values and beliefs whose shared meaning is acquired by members of a group. It is also associated with attitudes, beliefs, intentions, norms and values are components of the self (Hofstede, 1991). According to Wild et al., (2012) culture can be defined as a set of values, beliefs, rules and institution held by a particular group of people.
According to Müller & Turner, (2004), Pheng & Leong (1999), it is difficult to give a definite definition that encapsulates the term culture but the definition stated by the PMBOK defines culture as the “totality of socially transmitted behaviour patterns, arts, beliefs, institutions and all the other products of human work and thoughts” (PMI, 2000). On the other hand, one of the most famous and concrete definition was given by Hofstede (1980) that culture is “the collection of program of the mind, which distinguishes the members of one human group from another”. Furthermore, culture is characterised by the following: it is learned that is obtained from members of a group, it is interrelated that is each aspect of culture is related and connected e.g. Marriage, religion, business and culture are shared that its elements and values could be passed from generation to generation (Hofstede, 1980).

2.4.1. Hofstede’s Cultural Framework

Majority of studies around cultural aspects over the last two decades have been influenced by Hofstede’s seminal work on culture. His framework for defining and measuring culture constitutes five dimensions but most four most often used: power distance, individualism versus collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, masculinity versus femininity and long-term versus short-term orientations. Although this study by Hofstede is criticized on various points, it is still applicable by businesses worldwide as guidance for business culture and their environment.

**Uncertainty avoidance (UAI):** It displays the extent to which a culture sense threaten or anxious about doubtful and ambiguous situations (Hofstede et al., 2010). It is “the extent to which people feel comfortable in the presence of vagueness and ambiguity” Yeniyurt & Townsend (2003). According to Warner-Søderholm (2012), uncertainty avoidance is the magnitude to which members of an organization or society attempt to escape uncertainty by depending on established norms, rituals and bureaucratic undertaken. People in high uncertainty avoidance cultures try to reduce the possibility of unforeseen events that could negatively affect the operations of an organization, or society and improve the success of such effects (House et al., 2004; Warner-Søderholm 2012). Hofstede (2001) concludes that people in societies form coping mechanisms to handle the tension produced by excessive uncertainty. Furthermore, Warner-Søderholm (2012) conclude that technology has assisted people to defend themselves
against uncertainty caused by nature and law, and against uncertainty as a result of the behaviour of others and religion and to embrace the uncertainties people cannot defend themselves against. On the other hand, in societies with low uncertainty avoidance such as Singapore there is preference for unstructured situations and ambiguity which favour risk taking (that is starting a business), innovation and acceptance of different views (Ghemawat & Reiche, 2011).

**Individualism vs. Collectivism (IDV):** Individualism culture is the degree to which individuals are mixed in to groups. It depicts comparative preference for the individual in converse to the group (Ghemawat & Reiche, 2011). According to Gudykunst et al., (1996), individualistic cultures stress on the goal of the individual over group goals while collectivistic culture emphasizes group goals over individual goals. Hofstede et al., (2010) states that “collectivism is the degree to which individuals are integrated into groups while in individualist side the ties between individuals are loose; everyone is expected to look after him/herself or his/her immediate family.

**Power Distance:** Power distance is “the extent to which the less powerful members of the organisation and institutions (family) accept and expect that power is unequally distributed” (Hofstede et al., 2010). Members of high power distance such as Malaysia accept status differentiation and expect to show respect to their superiors (Ghemawat & Reiche, 2011). These status differences may exist even in the organization but it could be based on age, social class or family role but on the other hand low power distance cultures such as Denmark are less comfortable with differences in organizational hierarchy or social class and there is more participation in decision making by everyone in the organization (Ghemawat & Reiche, 2011).

**Masculinity vs. Femininity:** According to Hofstede et al., (2010), this refers to the distribution of roles between the genders which is another critical issue for any society to which a variation of solutions are found. According to Ghenmawat & Reiche (2011), masculinity cultures such as Nigeria reflect a dominance of tough values such as achievement, assertiveness, competition and material success associated to male roles while feminist cultures such as Sweden focus on soft values such as personal relationships, care for others, and quality of life and most especially less distinct gender roles. In feminine cultures, firms place a more and stronger importance on the overall well-being of the employees than bottom-line performance than their masculine counterpart.
**Long-term orientation vs. Short-term orientation:** In addition to the original four mentioned dimensions above, Hofstede proposed the fifth cultural dimension. This dimension is called Confucian Work Dynamic after a study of some university students in 22 countries using Chinese Value Survey (Wu, 2006). Three of the four factors were found to be correlated Hofstede’s (1984) cultural dimensions, values associated to long term-orientation are thrift and perseverance whilst those of short-term orientations are respect for tradition, fulfilling social obligations and protecting one’s face. These rated values were linked to the teaching of Confucius. According to Hofstede et al., (2010), the long-term orientation stands for the fostering of virtues oriented toward future rewards in particular, perseverance and thrift while the short-term orientation stands for the tradition of virtues related to the past and present in particular, respect for tradition, preservation of “face” and fulfilling social obligations.

### 2.4.2. Different overview from other cultural researchers

Schwartz (1994) has looked into the inner layer of culture onion after Hofstede’s empirical research which was based on values and tried to define human values as “Fascinating goals”, changes in priority acting as instructions to human lives (Hofstede, 1980; Schwartz, 1994). In his study conducted among teachers and students in more than 40 countries, Schwartz asked the samples to evaluate the importance of 56 values as leading instructions in their lives (Ng, Lee and Soutar, 2007). The analysis of his findings was based on two directions that are individual and cultural directions with the assumption that the values of individuals reflect similar experience as well as their cultural influence (Schwartz, 1994). Based on the studies of Ng, Lee and Soutar (2007), analysing the cultural theories of Hofstede and Schwartz, it was shown that Schwartz framework added values to Hofstede’s 5 dimensions in terms of trade.

Furthermore, in 1993 another culturalist Fons Trompenaars with a Dutch background with another colleague Hampden Turner instituted a new theoretical work based on the way cultures expand the means to handle problems and unforeseen circumstances. They developed a framework comprising of 7 dimensions from an empirical study of 15 000 employees in almost 50 countries (Trompenaars, 1994; Müller & Turner, 2004). Trompenaars’ work was based on the individual and their culture and five of the seven dimensions were related to the way people in a community interact with one another.
These dimensions include: universalism (applying general standards) vs. Particularism (takes particular relationships into account) that is does a universal set of rules hold or can cases be dealt with on individual ground?; affective (need gratification) vs. Neutral (restraint of impulses) – the amount of feelings that is assumed approved to show publicly; individualism (self-orientation) vs. Communitarianism (collectivism-orientation) – society’s prominence of the individual or the community; achieved status (judging people based on what they do) vs. ascribed status (judging others by who they are) – the extent some members of the society is accorded higher status; specific (bounging relations to others to distinct areas) vs. Diffuse (no previous limitations to nature of relations) - the extent we place others in specific areas of life (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1997; Magnusson et al., 2008 and Hofstede, 2009).

Another aspect of the study also pointed out people’s attitudes towards time in culture given rise to the sixth dimension (time as sequence vs. time as synchronization) – the orientation in time toward past-present-future (Trompenaars and Hampden-Turner, 1997 and Magnusson et al., 2008). The last dimension of Trompenaar’s work dealt with people’s relationship with their environment that is do we have the desire to control nature or does nature control us – subjugation-harmony-mastery (Magnusson et al., 2008 & Hofstede, 2009). The internal control looked self-judgement within a person’s mind considering thinking as the most useful tool while the external control is information gotten from our daily life. This is because people have to search for information before making decisions.

### 2.4.3. Criticism on Cultural Theories

It should be taken into considerations that Hofstede’s research was done in the 90s century and we are now in the 21th century where things have changed tremendously. According to Roxas and Stoneback (2004), some researchers feel that the measurements are out of date since the study is was done in the early years of the 20th century. This might led us to the assumption that Hofstede’s ranking no longer hold. According to Baskerville (2003), considering the fact that his research is over 20 years old there is lack of confidence in the believe of stability in cultural differences.

Based on information provided by Hofstede (1980) in his study, he proposed that there is a singular, uniform and monopolistic organisational culture but in reality there is no single IBM
worldwide organisational culture which makes it arguable and not evident as suggested by Hofstede (Parker, 2000; McSweeney, 2002). According to Roxas & Stoneback (2004), Hofstede’s studies could be criticised in the aspects of national. He suggested that national boundaries may not fit the same with cultures. As some researchers believe, there might be some overlapping implications between the dimensions (Roxas & Stoneback, 2004).

Although the criticisms of his study flourish, no other researcher has studies culture in detail or national culture to business perspectives (Roxas & Stoneback, 2004). Studies that focus on business still put into practice Hofstede’s dimensions and recent study are using Hall and Hofstede’s dimensions since they are related to business and are considered quantifiable (Roxas and Stoneback (2004).

2.4.4. Hofstede’s cultural dimensions scoring for Nigeria and Sweden

According to Hofstede’s (1980) study of 50 different countries, the five dimensions ranking for Sweden and Nigeria are illustrated in the figure below in order to see and make a comparison in the differences in culture between the two countries.

Fig 2.1: Comparison of Hofstede’s five Dimensions Ranking for Sweden and Nigeria.

![Figure 2.1: Comparison of Hofstede’s five Dimensions Ranking for Sweden and Nigeria.](image)

Source: Hofstede’s Official Website (2013).
**SWEDEN:** According to Hofstede et al., (2010), Sweden scores low in PDI meaning that Sweden's culture is characterised by independence, power is decentralised and decision making is participative and consultative. Hierarchy is just for convenience only. The Swedish society is more of an individualistic type. The relationship between employer/employee is a based on mutual advantage. It is dominant in femininity caring for others and quality of life. Its culture demonstrates low preference for avoiding uncertainty and stands for the short term orientation culture with respect for tradition. Sweden’s scores on the five dimensions are as follows:

- Power Distance (PDI): 31
- Individualism (IDV): 71
- Masculinity (MAS): 5
- Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI): 29
- Long-term Orientation (STO): 20

**NIGERIA:** Hofstede’s (1980) study amongst 50 countries proves that Nigeria scores high in PDI meaning people accept hierarchy order, inherent inequalities, power is centralized and the employees expect to be guided with what to do. Scoring 30 for individualism indicates that Nigeria is a collectivist society where there is a strong relationship for members in the group, offence leads to shame and loss of face and decision making is hierarchal. People here “live in order to work” and top management makes the decisions. Since there is a preference for avoiding uncertainty, there is always the need for codes or rules, work hard and punctuality is the norm. There is respect for tradition, impatience in achieving output and normative. Nigeria’s scores on the five dimensions are as follows:

- Power Distance (PDI): 80
- Individualism (IDV): 30
- Masculinity (MAS): 60
- Uncertainty Avoidance (UAI): 55
- Long-term Orientation (LTO): 16
2.5. Decision making

Decision making is a mental or cognitive process to choose one action among different alternatives in problem solving process. Mintzberg et al., (1976) defined decision as a set of actions and dynamics factors that needs a stimulus to begin and commitment for ending. Harris (1980), defines decision making as identifying alternatives and choosing best one that fits with objectives of decision maker. He stated all decision making process steps are based on values, beliefs and preferences of decision maker.

An accepted definition for decision making is a process of identification of possible actions, recognition of outcomes and their values and choosing one action that raise expected values more than other alternatives and resulting in optimal decision. This process is known as an important skill for managers, leadership or employees.

According to Parkin (1996), literature on decision making is divided to three categories: the body of knowledge is first category that describes decision theories. This category is not match with real human behaviour but can be helpful in decision making process. Second category derived from the psychological perspective describes the real human judgment and decision behaviour. This category investigates on limitation of human behaviour, process of decision making and heuristics and biases. The last category describes decision making process in organization.

There is a gap that exists in most studies on decision making. Most authors emphasize on the effects of culture on decision making but linking Hofstede’s cultural dimension to making decision process have not been investigated before. As proposed by Parkin (1996) and Nielson (2001), the universal dimensions for decision making process, there is a lack of concern in relationship between cultural dimensions on decision making.

According to Hofstede (2001), differences in national culture present different approaches to making decision which is the second category of the study. So we analyze human decision behaviour and judgments in organizations from cultural perspective. According to our objectives, the following review is divided to Decision making process, decision making style and decision making in groups and in last part we propose three decision making theories which are related to culture to analyze human decision making behaviour by providing behavioural preferences which derived from culturally diverse.
2.5.1. Decision Making Process

Decision processes are influenced by perception of actors, their interest and organizational culture (Heraclius, 1994). Decision making process identify step by step stages, when a problem arise to come a solution and imply it. It contains several steps which according to type of problems and individuals who are involved in decision making can be different.


He knows judgment as a reasoned evaluation that influenced by environmental and personal characteristic. Hammond et al., (1975) propose that, in same situation, individuals identify different cues, select different data and perceive different facts and tend to put different weight on them. According to Brehmer (1986) individuals come to different judgments. As a result personal traits and environment are factors to identify different judgment. Nielson (2001) proposed a general model in rational decision making process as illustrated in figure 2.2 below:

![General Model in Rational Decision Making Process](image)

**Fig 2.2: General Model in Rational Decision Making Process adopted from Nielson (2001, pg. 415)**
This model is clockwise in nature which starts from Problem perception steps to problem identification and continue to final step which is Control. The first five steps in this process are critical factors that can be influences from cultural traits:

Problem perception and problem identification are two important and main steps. Other steps are influenced by identifying and defining these stages. The main important part is distinguishing between problem and solution since people sometimes define a solution as a problem. According to Maddalena (2007) initial perception of problem is directly influenced by individuals who are involved in decision making.

Next step in Nielson’s decision making model is searching for alternatives. When individuals come to search for alternatives, various factors have effect on finding alternatives. There are some ways to generate alternatives:

- **Brainstorming**: The characteristics of this method is “Think out” about an issue, There is no permit to evaluate an idea, allow people to think creativity, generate ideas as many as possible and try to combine other’s ideas (Kerr & Tindale, 2003)

- **Survey**: This method presents a series of individual’s ideas about problems and solutions.

- **Discussion group**: Those who are directly involved in decision making, brainstorm their ideas. No judgment is permitted but they should focus on problems and be sensitive to impact of personality

- **Environmental scan**: environmental contain political, geographical, historical, human and financial factors. According to Magdalena (2007), the objective of this section is investigating environment which problem exists in it and identifying factors that influence problems and limiting solutions to be considered.

When individuals come to select alternatives, different factors affect their selection choice such as ethical, political and financial factors.

The choice of alternatives, all options are listed and considered. Questions which can be asked in this stage are: What are the possible outcomes of decisions? (It must be considered in short term and long term period) What are the advantages and disadvantages of the outcomes? What are estimated costs of projects? Maddalena (2007) stated that one of important factors is outcomes
consistent with professionals, organization’s values and personals? To justify actions, outcomes should be compatible with highest principles such as adequate consideration to powerless individuals, relevance of outcomes to value statement, ethics and organizational mission (Maddalena, 2007).

In this study, we use four decisions making models that have different focus on general decision making processes. These models can be used to make decisions and solve problems and can apply to organizations with different characteristics. The figure below provides a comparison of four decision making models and explain their characteristics:

Fig 2.3: A Comparison of four Decision Making Model and their Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Decision Making Model</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>Contributions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic Man</td>
<td>1958</td>
<td>March &amp; Simon</td>
<td>Clear goals, Comprehensive Knowledge of consequence, deduction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Man</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>Simon</td>
<td>More or less knowledge of consequence, Find satisfactory alternative not optimal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muddling through</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>Lindblom</td>
<td>Goals and means are chosen simultaneously, Considering Few dimensions of consequences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accidental Decision</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Enderud</td>
<td>Focus on intuition and creativity, not the result of prior knowledge and experience</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.5.2. Process of decision making in groups

Decision making in groups can be defined as combining individual preferences in a social process to make single group preferences. (Davis, 1969) when groups are involved individuals with diverse cultural values, managers should focus more on conflicts and misunderstanding that can effect on quality of decisions and organizational performance (Salk et al., 2002).

In this study, we explain more comprehensive model to describe relationship between leaders or managers and employees and explain degree of participation according to this relationship. Vroom and Yetton (1973) proposed a model of managerial decision making which is based on
different degrees of participation of different levels in one organization. According to decision
problem is responsibility of manager to select level of involvement. In lowest level, leader makes
decisions without any involvement of this level. Leaders provide merely information to second
level but leaders make decision which may be reflect outcomes. The third level, have the
opportunity of access to information about problem, leaders encourage each individual’s ideas
and suggestions. Leaders make decisions which maybe reflect outcomes. The differences
between forth and third level is that leaders solicits collective ideas and recommendations in
forth level. In fifth level, provide comprehensive information about problem; make final decision
by gathering individuals as a group to come to a solution.

There are some characteristic that agree on appropriate level of this participations: 1) degree of
importance of quality of decision making, 2) degree of clearness in problem, 3) degree of needed
commitment and acceptance of outcomes to imply it. Korsgaard et al., (1995) argue that
managers are participated subordinate in decision making process to raise the quality of
decisions and gain commitment of employees. 4) The extent how members accept autocratic
atmosphere 5) degree of motivation of employees to prefer organization’s goals to their own
goals, 6) the degree of ability of employees to consensus, 7) degree which manager possess
information necessary to make decision alone. Numerous attempts have been done to test the
reliability of this model which most of them resulted in success of this model (Thomas 1990,
Vroom & Jago 1978). Heracleous (1994) proposed some ways to create more effective decision
making condition:

- Despite of conflicting that will arise in groups with different cultures, different backgrounds
  lead to investigate issue from different perspective. This fact leads groups to high interpretive
  potential in group. According to Tindale et al., (2003) compared to individual decision
  making, groups provide more diverse viewpoints that its reflected in the quality of decisions

- To decrease conflicts, subgroups can discuss same issues independently, when groups come
to a result, they can share their viewpoints

- To decrease influence of organizational of culture, consultant can be hired to investigate
  problem independently.
### 2.5.3. Decision Making Style:

Mental attitudes toward decision context were attributed to differences in personality of individuals in groups. Rowe and Mason (1987) defined decision making style as a cognitive process which individuals identify a problem and using information to come to a solution. Decision making style is directly affected by values, attitudes and norms of personality of decision maker. On the other hand business environment have effect on decision making style. In uncertain business environment, most managers prefer to make centralized organizations (Tan, 1999). Also In uncertain environment, government has tight control on enterprises so imposing decision making process of local government cannot be ignored. We can conclude that decision making style in this situation is so autocratic, centralized and individualistic. Although in comparing individual and collective enterprises, individual one is more centralized since decision making is in hands of the owner but in collective one decisions made by management team (Wang, 2003).

Fig 2.4 shows a complete decision making model (DMS) by Rowe and Boulgarides as cited in Jamian et al., (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tolerance for Structure (Managers)</th>
<th>Analytical</th>
<th>Conceptual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoys problem solving</td>
<td>Is achievement-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wants best answers</td>
<td>Has a broad outlook</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wants best control</td>
<td>Is creative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses considerable data</td>
<td>Is humanistic/artistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enjoys variety</td>
<td>Initiates new ideas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is innovative</td>
<td>Is future-oriented</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses careful analysis</td>
<td>N-ACH, is independent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-ACH, needs challenges</td>
<td>and wants recognition</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Need for Ambiguity (Leaders)</th>
<th>Directive</th>
<th>Behavioral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expects results</td>
<td>Is supportive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>is aggressive</td>
<td>Uses persuasion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acts rapidly</td>
<td>Is empathetic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses rules</td>
<td>Communicates easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Uses intuition</td>
<td>Prefers meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is verbal</td>
<td>Uses meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N-POW, needs power</td>
<td>Uses limited data</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive complexity</th>
<th>Task-Technical (Logical)</th>
<th>Value orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>People – Social (Relational)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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This Model has two components, Value orientation and Cognitive Complexity. The complexity dimension divided upper and lower half to complexity and structure which separates manager and leader way of thinking. Value orientation dimension divided to variables, Task oriented (shows logical views) and People oriented (shows relational view).

- **Directive** – This category describes individuals with low tolerance of ambiguity and cognitive complexity. People tend to autocratic orientation, tight control, to dominate other people and structured environment with verbal rules. There are limited alternatives with a rapidly decision making process.

- **Analytic** – Characteristic of this decision style can be defined as greater tolerance for ambiguity, have ability to fix with new situations, enjoy solving problems and searching for best answers. They tend challenge but based-achievement. They tend to establish their own company. They focus on technical decisions so there is a need to uses careful analyses but no need to rapid decision making.

- **Conceptual** – This style is characterized by achievement and future oriented individuals. They are creative, independent and initiates new ideas. This category describe individuals with high cognitive complexity and people oriented view. Trust, commitment and openness are main factors in relationships.

- **Behavioural** – People in this group are friendly, good communicators with deep social concern, people oriented with low cognitive complexity. They focus on short term orientation and avoid conflict. They use limited data and prefer to make meeting for communicating.

### 2.5.4. Culture and Decision Making:

**Collectivism/Individualism dimension:** Based on Hofstede’s dimensions of culture, countries with collectivist society would tend to be more sensitive to groups and its norms. They are influenced by values in group, respect norms in groups but they expect loyalty instead. It’s in contrast by individualistic society which influenced less by groups and focus more on autonomy, independence and their own interest so it is expected to have more conflicts in decision making. On the other hand, Individual oriented culture is more likely to conductive rational decision making approach (Mau, 2000, 2001).
**Power distance dimension:** This dimension presents individuals in countries with high level of power distance are more willing to accept authority in organizations. According to Scott et al., (1993), countries with low power distance participants show concern more about informal norms and learn this norm from their peers more than superiors. On the other hand, greater focus is on superiors and formal norms. Also superiors are expected to act more autocratically than consulting subordinates.

**Uncertainty avoidance dimension:** Individuals with strong uncertainty avoidance can tolerate any deviations in groups or organizational norm. For example according to Ouchis (1981), in type Z organization (Japanese organizations), people intimate individuals who ties with mass of bonds without any deviation. He stated that degree of trust is so low in these firms.

**Masculinity and Femininity dimension:** Masculinity dimension explains how people who tend to act more in individual way, are more competitive and ambitious in groups. Sweden as one of the feminine societies contains more overlapping social rules for men and women. According to Scott et al., (1993) individuals in feminine society less influenced by individuals in groups, professionals or organizational atmosphere.

### 2.6. A Reflection of the Chapter

Despite the recognition of culture’s role in management, there are few literature that mention culture’s role in project management with emphasis on decision making (Shore and Cross, 2005). Furthermore, there is no affirmation to show a comprehensive knowledge or studies on the cultural dimensions which could influence people behaviours in project management. After literature review, Henrie and Souse-Posa (2005), concluded that a definite definition of culture and its effects on project management were lacking. They remarked that most studies on project management focused on tools, techniques while cultural features were disregarded. The evidence proposed by Shore and Cross (2005) and Müller et al., (2007), exhibit that cultural dimensions may be beneficial in explaining the alternatives that direct management behaviour and decision making. It is relevant for the project managers to get knowledge of the cultural factors that could influence project management in general, taking into consideration culture in setting the framework to investigate the breadth of the management process.
3 - METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the various methods used for the research and the reasons for choosing them. The aim of this chapter is to garnish the reader with an in-depth knowledge of interpretation of the procedures and research process. Furthermore, a description of the research approach, chosen type of research, data collection and analysis and finally the worthiness of the research and how our samples were selected.

3.1. Research Paradigm

According to Bryman and Bell (2011), a paradigm is a set of beliefs and requirements for scientists in particular discipline influence what should be investigated, how it should be done and how the results should be interpreted. The disciplines of social science have not in any way been distinguished and are more paradigmatic (Bryman & Bell, 2011). This means that they struggle for paradigm position. Therefore, the following research methodology looks at the two struggling paradigms of ontological and epistemological analysis. In this research we assume that influence of culture on decision making is a social phenomenon. An appropriate way to study about this subject is investigating on human behaviour so this study is based on ontological analyses.

3.2. Research Strategy: Qualitative Research

As adverted above, social experiences of people are emotional or intuitive given to the fact that they cannot be assessed using quantitative research tools. Therefore, the collection and analysis of data would be based on words than numbers.

As a research strategy, a qualitative approach will be used which is practically inductive than deductive. According to Bryan and Bell (2011), two approaches exist in relationship between theory and social research that is deductive and inductive. In deductive approach, researchers analyse the hypothesis according to existing theories and transfer the hypothesis to operational terms which are more common in quantitative research.
In inductive approach, the research concludes the implications of the findings according to theories and show how the results can be feedback aforementioned knowledge. This is more common in qualitative research. Therefore, this study takes the form of an inductive approach which explains that theories do not direct the research but on the other hand it is developed as an output of research. Furthermore, more attention is based on the accuracy of the findings and conclusions to convince the readers of the implication (Figure 3.1)

**Deductive Approach**

**Inductive Approach**

Figure 3.1, Deductive and inductive approach shows relationship between theory and social research (Bryan and Bell, 2011)

**Main courses in Qualitative Research**

The main courses are adjusted from the qualitative research model formulated and employed by Prasad (1993) as cited in Bryman & Bell (2011). The followings give a summary of the draft of the research procedure for this thesis.

**Selecting the appropriate subjects (Samples)**

The samples selected for the research are project managers and employees involved in project management between the two large multinational Telecommunication companies and service providers. Some employees of the telecommunication project teams are often assigned with specific tasks to other countries and as a result they are cooperating to work with people from
different cultures. Furthermore, these individuals may sometimes be influenced by their cultural background and might as well have an effect on the decisions in the teams. A total of fifteen people from two companies were chosen to be interviewed.

**Collection of appropriate data**

It should be noted that the interviewees would have diversified outlook or overview concerning cultural influence on team decision making. A semi-structured interview was used as a device for data collection so that we can target the different aspects of the research questions. For further information on data collection both primary and secondary will be deliberated in section below.

**Primary Data**

The primary data has been collected through semi-structured interviews. We chose two prominent companies from two different countries. The primary data collected in Sweden and Nigeria were from the project managers and project team members’ context in the telecommunication companies. We chose Sweden and Nigeria as two countries with so different cultural traits but they had been successful in recent business environment and in telecommunication. Sweden provides competitive market in telecommunication. Telecommunication industry started from 1980 which is before USA and European countries. On the other hand deregulation in mobile phone market in Nigeria allows operating more network providers. One of the authors of this research is from Nigeria who is completely familiar with cultural traits and business environment in Nigeria.

Hofstede’s (1980) framework on the five cultural dimensions was used to enable us to point out the main cultural aspects that are contrasted in the different countries (Triandis, 1989) and that could influence decision styles in those countries. The interviews were conducted with telecommunication project team members from two companies in Sweden and Nigeria. The respondents were asked questions related to culture that could influence decision making in telecommunication project teams. The respondents are assigned by country, accompanied by the
company and respondent number such as S-T1 for (Sweden – company T, respondent 1) and N-M1 for (Nigeria – Company M – Respondent 1).

According to the research questions and objectives, 16 questions were formulated. We categorized the questions into two parts: Participant demography and Cultural aspects on decision making. In the first part we obtained information about background of respondents and in second part we collected information about aspects of culture on decision making. The interview questions were sent to the thesis supervisor for comments. After his approval, questions were sent to the respondents of the two companies operating in Nigeria and Sweden through emails. An interview was conducted through Skype with one of the respondents (S-T6) - program manager on the 21th of May 2013 at 20:13.

For two of our respondents we changed our questions since they needed more explanation. We sent our questions to ten respondents but received responses from seven people. After categorizing the data, we found that we need more responses to obtain further coherent responses. Thus two more interviews were conducted through Skype. The responses have different positions in Nigeria and Sweden which helped us to obtain more rich information and insightful data. We interviewed three project managers, two of them were from Nigeria and one of them was from Sweden. Other respondents from Nigeria were positioned as consultant, coordinator and liaison officers. Product manager, research technician and project pricing specialist were other respondents from Sweden. One of the respondents from Sweden did not give us information about his role in the company. A short history of the applicants is presented in figure 3.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Duration of working</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>N-M1</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>N-M2</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>National product manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>N-M3</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Consultant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>N-M4</td>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>Coordinator and liaison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>S-T 1</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>S-T 2</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Product manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>S-T 3</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Project pricing specialist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>S-T 4</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Did not mention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>S-T 5</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Research Technician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>S-T6</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>Program Manager</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 3.2: Information of samples**
Secondary Data

Secondary data was used to investigate and analyse the research in cultural and decision making subject area to determine knowledge gap with the objective of developing the literature review. The data was collected through comprehensive range of sources such as books, scientific and academic journals, articles, and websites and newspapers. The research done by Müller et al., (2007) on cultural diversity in decision making in mixed German-Swedish project teams has been a springboard for us to carry the research on decision making in Sweden and Nigeria’s project teams and make a comparison of the results. Information from the secondary sources such as books on research methodology acted as a support for us to make enormous contribution to the field of studies especially globalisation.

3.3. Data Presentation and Analysis

According to Robson (2002) selection of methods to collect data is driven by the kinds of research questions so we adopted a Qualitative research method to obtain more detailed information as cited in Eisenhardt (1989). Also according to Robson (2002) qualitative approach gives a more in-depth data. Our research does not contain any hypothesis testing and we are going to present a new theory so that quantitative approach is not useful for the study.

Important information is obtained from the interviews. We read the responses with great concern about quality of data according to our objective, research questions and our primary data. Since data analysis and summary is difficult and challenging, coding was adopted as a tool for analysing the data. A common mistake that exist in qualitative research is that most researchers pay more attention on eloquent expressions but not shared opinion. To avoid, this, coding can be employed to arrange, manage and restore relevant data collected. Identifying important ideas, concepts and behaviours from interactions and responses is a key step in analysing qualitative data. According to this fact and mass of gathered information we decided to use coding data for categorizing and identifying key concepts in gathered information.

To investigate the influence of different cultural aspects on decision making we used open coding according to responses to the interview questions. In other word, the initial step was to
break down information to uncover meaning in responses and interpret them. We investigated responses word by word and categorized data from two countries in separate chart with focus on cultural effects on decision making process. We realized little inconsistency between answers of respondents so we conducted more interviews to obtain more reliable data. Then we compared similarities and differences between two companies. Axial coding was obtained by comparing information from two countries and linking them together. We understood generic relationship in this stage. Finally we selected data which gave us key points. Next step was relating data to our objective and scientific study. In this step, we related secondary data to primary data.

3.4. Reliability and Validity

Reliability refers to consistency of results. Its concern with this questions whether the results of study are repeatable and consistent or not? Reliability makes a research reliable by minimizing errors through a study (Bryman & Bell, 2011). We made several interviews to find whether there is any coherence between interviewees or not. The respondents were interviewed in same condition and semi-structured questions were asked. In some cases, if we found poor coherence between responses after comparing them, we made another interview to get more reliable responses. A detail of these is referred in Appendix B.

Validity is concerned with this question whether or not research measures targeted a concept which is supposed to measure or not? To increase validity, the study needed truthful data and researcher must collect targeted data (Bryman & Bell, 2011). We increase congruence between theoretical framework and our research by using interview questions based on theoretical concepts which we used in this research. Questions are categorized to two parts: Culture and decision making in groups.

To increase external validity which is referred to generalization of results (Bryman & Bell, 2011), sample are chosen from two companies in two different countries. Members of samples were chosen in different ages with different positions in companies.
4 - EMPIRICAL STUDY

This chapter provides an insight of the data and information from interviews, journals and media. Based on data collected, this part of the research examine the cultural influence aspects on decision making and to point out the similarities and differences in the ways decisions are made in project teams between the two countries (Sweden and Nigeria).

4.1. Company Information

The interviews were carried out in two large multinational mobile telecommunication companies, one in Sweden and another in Nigeria. The selected companies deal with telecommunication and mobile service provision business providing varying services to customers such as communications, calling, messaging, information and carrier services and mobile internet.

**Company N-M** is a South African owned multinational mobile telecommunication company operating in more than 13 countries in Africa, Europe and Middle East and has GSM licence in 21 countries. It was incorporated in 1994 to offer voice and data communication products and services and International carrier services to individuals and businesses.

With revenue of SR114.7 billion, it has invested SR19.5 billion in expanding its network infrastructure with an estimated 142 million subscribers. With a vision to be the leading telecommunication provider in developing emerging markets, it has 34,558 employees using 5 different languages as a medium of communication with 55 nationalities. As a result of the vast cultural diversity, it has invested SR246 million on employee development. In Nigeria, it has 1,836 nationals and 50 expatriates. It runs projects such as health, education and culture. The development of some products especially the introduction of the 2G and 3G were carried out in the form of projects. Further investment has been done in fibre optic cables as well as the growing broadband strength on undersea cables used as channels of international voice carrier.
**Company S-T** is a Swedish and Finnish multinational mobile telecommunication company operating in the Nordic and Baltic countries, Eurasia and Spain with a core business to create better communication and opportunities for people and businesses using mobile and broadband communication services. Incorporated in 2003 through a merger of two telecommunication companies operating in the Nordics and it operates in 15 different countries from Norway in the west to Nepal in the East. It is organised into three business areas Mobility, Broadband Services and Eurasian. It is also a leading European wholesale provider with a wholly-owned carrier network with 27,838 employees with 57.2% as men and 42.8% for women at the end of 2012. It was the first operator to launch 4G in 2009 in 9 countries and has many associated companies in Russia and Turkey.

### 4.2. Cultural Organization/Power Distance

As a result of the existence of a tied respect for culture, all Nigerian project managers mentioned that superiority has a vital part to play in Nigerian’s organizational culture. This can be as a result of the high power distance index in Nigeria (as illustrated in fig 2.1) that there is a belief that power is unevenly distributed in the society. Reflecting to the organization of projects there are rules and regulations that have been set, therefore in project teams superiority will influence when compared with the entire company. Most of the Nigerian interviewees mentioned that (except N-M2 who contradicted that as a result of the assigned functions for project teams, superiority is kept behind the project but performs a relevant part in the organization) accepted that according to Nigerians style of doing things, superiority exist and influence in the project teams. This will depend on the position of expertise of the team. The influence of superiority would not exist if all the members in the team are competent and experts in the telecommunication field (N-M1). As mentioned by N-M1, some members would listen to the project managers’ opinions but might oppose the suggestions. On this note, superiority and the position of the company can influence to a great extent each and every process in the project especially decision making in project teams (N-M1, N-M2, N-M3 and N-M4).
Swedish employees had different opinions on superiority in the company. Despite the power distance index for Sweden (fig 2.1) depicting a low powerful circumstance, majority of the respondents stated that superiority in the company has less influence on project management as a whole and specifically decision making (S-T2). According to S-T1, the capability of making a concrete decision is not dependent on superiority but it is more of a consultative and participative meeting. Although as mentioned by most of the respondents it takes more time to arrive at a consensus in his project team because everyone in the team has to be consulted, especially working with his Swedish team and a more credible consensus is arrived at (S-T1, S-T2, S-T4 and S-T5). This makes most of the team members satisfied at the end of the decision making process.

4.2.1. Discussion/Conflict atmosphere

Discussion by the team in meeting proves to be perceptive and relaxed according to the Nigerian respondents. As mentioned by respondents N-M2 and N-M1, discussion in meetings by Nigerian team is not active as western teams that is they tend be very calm and take instructions and solutions from the superior as a means of avoiding conflict. As a result of the calm nature in meeting, they admit decisions made easily and the implementation of these decisions does not take more time (N-M2). As N-M2 also stated that discussion in the westerners’ project teams is more intensive since one member in the group has a contribution in the meeting.

On the other hand, the discussion in the western project teams is participative and consultative. Every member in the team share their opinions and best consensus is arrived at as mentioned by S-T1 and S-T2. As a result of this, there is no room for conflicts since best the alternative is chosen based on the company decision making criteria. Furthermore, respondent S-T1 also mentioned as a project manager he can make certain decisions irrespective of the majority not accepting the right decision.

4.2.2. Collectivism/Individualism

Out of the six interviews that were conducted in Sweden, it is observed that Swedish managers and team members do things more as a team. Each and every issued pointed out has to be discussed in the meeting and decision is made as a group with the project managers as leaders (S-T1 and S-T3). It is noticed that Swedish managers are not decisive enough to make decision
as a result of the lack of confidence (S-T2, S-T3). therefore, there is more of a consultation and assistance from other team members for the best solution for the project assuming that there more people are working together as a team the more convenient it becomes than working alone. Furthermore, the performance of the group is taken into consideration than personal goals (S-T4).

On the other hand, some of the respondents mentioned that although it is seen that they are in a group in a project, issues are discussed in the meeting but the decisions are taken by the project managers (N-M1, N-M3 and N-M4). It is more characterized by the hierarchical way of making decision where the senior managers make the final decision. This is because most Nigerian team members only listen to the project managers and avoid discussing in the meetings (N-M2). as a result of this, it becomes more difficult working with Nigerians in the team because they are not willing to share their opinions during meetings as a result of the respect for their seniors and the fear of hurting one's feeling in the meeting (N-M1).

4.3. Decision Making Style

Respondents from Sweden proposed that decision making process in Sweden is based on consensus. It causes to take more time to make a decision. They claim that Swedish people don't accept a decision without discussion, at last senior manager taking a view on decisions. They mentioned there is a positive atmosphere to discussion. Respondents S-T5 and S-T3 mentioned receptive atmosphere and good temperament between groups members also people are ready to take correction of opinions that does not match with the University’s research guide lines and procedures. S-T5 declared according to projects and designed results, style of making decisions are different but effectively carry out project and achieving desired results with keeping cost low is common factor in all of styles. Respondent S-T3 believes different decision making styles exist in company. He stated “longer serving employees tend to back decisions that will protect legacy applications like in IT projects, whereas employees with lesser serving duration adopt a decision making style as agents of change. Such changes can be in terms of corporate culture or work methodology”.
Nigerian respondents have different view about decision making style in Nigeria. One of respondent (N-M2) claim that employees who are not in top level prefer respect to top managers and play no role in decision making while another respondent from Nigeria (N-M1) stated problems propose among members in a team, they are free to ask questions to get help from others. When they come to a decision, project manager review solution, gave advice or recommend some alternatives. In some cases members in a team are free to get help from professionals outside company. Group thinking is one common factor in making decision process, respondent N-M4 stated it. He mentioned “I try to avoid group thinking in teams “but as he stated team members give high importance to harmony and there is close relationship between team members. He mentioned brainstorming as one way to lead make a decision.

On the other hand, both respondent from Sweden and Nigeria stated a consistent decision making style have been applied in company but majority of respondents express style of making decision can be different according to importance of decision, type of leadership, urgency of a decision, preferred priority in team, difference governs board and different guidelines.

4.3.1. Formal and Informal decision making

S-T1 and S-T2 considered there is formal decision making process in Swedish companies. Relationship among members does not have any effects on making decision. Respondent S-T2 stated all decisions are made base on professional basis. Respondent S-T1 stated that according to style of leadership degree of formality and informality of decision process can be different. With a strong leadership style decision making turns to take a formal type. Three other respondents from Sweden state relationship as one factor that has impact on decision making. S-T3 and S-T4 mentioned there is mutuality between group members in a team which causes making decisions based on loyalty and protection of self-interest, also members have cross functional roles and anyone can take any roles. S-T5 declared as you move up the hierarchical ladder relationship decrease effects of relationship. For junior staff relationship have lots of effect since they make collective decisions but for seniors it decrease since number of seniors are low and they make important decisions. Respondent N-M1 has same idea and stated that relationship is not a matter but he claimed that members can get help from each other to come to
a decision. He stated hierarchy is one important thing that matter in decision making process. Respondent N-M2 declared that formality and informality of decision process is affected by personality of people who take part in this process. An open-minded person can listen to others and take advantages of their idea. On the other hand members can rely better on a professional leader and accept decisions sooner. N-M4 is only respondent who claim there is close relationship between members which effect making decision but he stated they avoid group think in groups.

4.3.2. Authority in decision making

Respondent S-T1 mentioned best decision should not be match with overview of all members so he makes some decision without agreements of all members. He has authority to make final decision even he needed to raise her voice. According to response of S-T5 decision making is position base as seniors always make major decision while juniors make small decisions. This is unlike another respondent from Sweden (S-T4) which stated “We have always implemented an Agile and Lean way of managing project, where individual team have control on the specific task they have embark on a daily basic(Implementing SCRUM). The SCRUM master duty is just to get rid of impediment, when there is one “. Respondent N-M1 mentioned that all of members in a group should be active and take part in discussion. Members of every team have complete authority to make decisions but they should respect hierarchy in team. Respondents N-M3 and N-M4 mentioned authority as important factors in decision making. They believe that ideas and inputs from people with higher hierarchy were debated and pondered up longer.
4.3.3. Decision acceptance and Implementation of decisions among team members

As mentioned above respondent S-T1 stated that all of decisions is not match with all of ideas, also in the case of majority in decision or does not match consensus, it takes time to accept some decisions but he stated over the time they were accepted by push or follow up of manager. Also respondent S-T2 mentioned members always work to deliver services but project leader can apply an integrated plan of delivery activities with timescales to do support when is necessary. Respondent S-T3 declared implementation of decisions is in a vertical approach; from the project board through the project managers to the team leaders and team members. He mentioned even after discussion of all members to come to a solution, always there is mixed feeling as conflicts of interest while respondent 5 believes staff accept decisions since all of decisions are result of combining ideas in groups and after consulting between managers there will be published. Respondent S-T5 mentioned a course is handled to provide policies and procedure to staff but small decisions are handed down on daily rolling basis as the working day/week carries on. Most respondents from Sweden believe that speed of acceptance is same in complex and simple decisions but respondent S-T3 believes that in complex decisions, staff strive to gain more visibility of the logic behind the decisions as a result, they enhance their understanding of the impact of such decisions on their future responsibilities so it takes more time to come to a solution in complex situation.

Both N-M1 and N-M2 respondents mentioned there is a timeline for accepting decisions. As it is clear respondent N-M1 mentioned more consistent pattern for making decisions. As he stated discussion is a must in making decisions in teams so acceptance of decisions is easier but when project manager makes final decision, there is a timeline to operate decisions. Same as respondents N-M1 and N-M3 mentioned discussion and voting as a common way to make a decision while N-M4 stated decisions are made without any heated debate but he believes that there is a positive atmosphere in groups to make a decision. All respondents from Nigeria except respondent N-M1 mentioned speed of acceptance is not same in complex and simple decisions. Respondent N-M2 stated when members face with uncertain and complex problems takes more time to accept it or in some cases reject it since they do not like to deal with uncertain circumstances.
4.3.4. Criteria in decision making

Respondent N-M3 knows Participation of team members and taking final conclusions of majority of members as criteria in making decisions while Respondent N-M4 mentioned assessment and information as criteria. Logical reasoning, timing, cost, quality and needs are other criteria which are mentioned by respondents from Nigeria.

Criteria which were mentioned by respondents from Sweden are: Business Benefits (operational, financial, and reputational); speed of implementation, risk, available resources, strategy, business dependencies, competitive threats, centrality to Project objectives, Quality, Productivity and impact to research project Efficiency and effectiveness of research data collection Development and leverage of resources. Revenue Growth, Cost Cutting, Process Improvement, Quality Optimization. Respondent S-T3 mentioned a matrix for criteria of making decision which called SMART; Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound. All of respondent declared there are almost same criteria in making decision.
5 - ANALYSIS

The following chapter is presented in a cultural outline and five dimensions of team atmosphere for decision making as perceived from the empirical study. As a result of the data analysis, two relevant aspects were found in this study: cultural differences between Nigeria and Sweden in addition with five elements of working in teams and decision making by both Nigerian and Swedish Telecommunication companies investigated. Both Nigerian and Swedish cultures have diverse influence on each of the decision making dimensions. This influence could be used examined using coding to pinpoint the alliance between decision making and cultural aspects of both countries.

5.1. Similarities and differences between Nigeria and Sweden

5.1.1. Cultural Aspects

According to the findings, it is perceived that there are differences and similarities in the cultural aspects between Nigeria and Sweden. Part A of the data analysis in the findings describes the cultural differences between the team working atmosphere of Nigeria and Sweden. Each factor is a reflection of an element of the team working environment as shown in the responses of the interviews. The influence could be maximum - if all ten or at least six respondents cited the importance of the element; average - if five or four acknowledge it and minimum - if three or less respondents refer to the value of the element. In Nigeria, there is more emphasis in superiority in the team. This is as a result of the strong values Nigeria's culture depicts on respect for seniors. This is evidence of Hofstede's score of Nigeria on power distance (refer to fig 2.1). There are fewer score for discussion and conflict for Nigeria due to the fact that most members in the team avoid discussion not hurt anyone's feeling and bring conflict in the group while in Sweden discussion is participative and decision making is consultative irrespective of the nature of the project. Figure 5.1 summarises these elements.
Figure 5.1: Similarities and Difference of Cultural Aspects between Nigeria and Sweden

The similarities and differences could be judged on the various levels of bar chart. The scores range from 0 to 10. A score of 10 depicts greater difference in any of the elements. According to the first element (superiority), Nigeria score 10 meaning they show more value on hierarchy which is related to superiority through respect while Sweden score 5 meaning the fear and respect of superior is on the average.

5.1.2 Decision making

From the findings we can conclude that there are differences between the countries in decision making. Both countries follow consistent decision making model. According to theories which we mentioned before, decision making model in Sweden is based on Economic man who is based on rationality and clear goals. Nigerian use more bounded rationality and they are aware of consequences of different approach but not comprehensive knowledge so we can conclude they use administrative man method. Respondents from two countries oppose decisions when they feel it is necessary, it causes optimal results. In total, the two countries use rationality in making decisions, they have knowledge of consequence, they consider optimal results but degree of rationality and knowledge of outcomes in Sweden is higher than Nigeria.
As a result both countries use rational model to make decisions so we can use rational model which is presented by Nielsen (2001). Respondents from both countries provide information about the five first stages in rational general decision. In two countries first step to make a decision is providing information about problem and make it clear for members in a group. Problem perception and problem identification are two main stages which are valued by managers in Sweden and Nigeria. As one of Nigerian respondents claimed, senior managers directly get involved in making critical decisions so these two stages are disappeared in critical situation in Nigeria. This fact can be related to timing factor which is considered as one of important criteria in making decisions in Nigeria. After perception of problems among group members, searching for alternatives is next steps which are almost same in two countries. Both countries use brainstorm and group discussion to find alternatives. One of Nigerians respondents was too sensitive about group thinking and impact of personality on making decisions. He strives to avoid group thinking.

One interesting fact which we found in our research is that Nigerians project team members try to make effective decision making condition. We can consider it as an important progress in discussion atmosphere in Nigerian companies. They declared group members with different cultural background, provide more diverse viewpoints which raise quality of decisions, they hire consultant to help employees to make decisions and there can be subgroups to investigate problems independently.

According to degree of needed commitment, degree of ability of members to consensus, degree of clearness in problems, degree of possess information by managers and degree of importance of organizational goals for employees, degree of participation in making decisions is different. Both Sweden and Nigeria are concern with these factors. In both countries senior manager make final decision and degree of participation and discussion is different.

In total, our findings show that Swedish project teams tend to use Analytic decision making style while Nigerian teams tend to apply behavioural decision making style. Swedish teams enjoy discussion, make decision by consensus, use careful analysis, try to make optimal decision and have tolerance to ambiguity. Nigerian prefers to use meeting, have limited data (in comparison of Sweden) and they need structure.
5.2 Culture and Decision making

In countries with high power distance, there is a great focus on superior and formal norms. Sweden and Nigeria comprise different hierarchical levels. Superiority is one factor that has influenced decision-making processes in Nigeria. Despite the discussion atmosphere in the teams, it is the responsibility of senior managers to make final decisions. It can also be in Sweden also but the one important factor that causes differences between Sweden and Nigeria is consensus. Although time is a vital factor, the Swedish project teams pay more attention to decision-making than time as one of important criteria in making decisions so they come to solutions by consensus which requires more time to make a decision.

According to our findings, discussion, conflicts, and flexibility at work in Sweden is higher than in Nigeria. As we mentioned before, both countries tend to discuss about problems but in Nigeria there is instruction to discuss so there is a calm discussion atmosphere to avoid conflicts. Also, as employees participate in making decisions, they implement final decisions without any conflicts. In Sweden, even after group discussion and decision making, there is mixed feeling as conflicts of interest.

Sweden has a rational decision style and there is more conflict (in comparison of Nigeria) in teams in Sweden. These factors show Sweden as an individual society but our findings show a high degree of group task in Sweden and low in Nigeria. Our findings show that Swedish consider the performance of group more than individuals; group members discuss or consult with each other and leaders. Nigerian work on groups, respect norms in groups, harmony, and group thinking is high so managers try to avoid it. They do not share their views since they are afraid of hurting one’s feelings in the meeting.

Nigerian teams take more time to consider a new and complex problem or reject it since they are afraid of facing an uncertain condition. It can be related to a high uncertainly avoidance dimension in Nigeria. On the other hand, speed of acceptance of complex and simple problems is almost the same in Sweden.
6 - CONCLUSION

In this chapter, we present and discuss the conclusion of our study. We also discuss the theoretical and managerial implications, limitations and recommendations for future research.

With the advent of globalisation, the trade barriers that used to exist between two cultures have been eliminated over time, businesses and their leaders are working hard to merge teams with people of different culture as they operate in national or international markets and this has led to the management of varying projects. Although some studies have been done on project management, none or few of them have taken into consideration the cultural aspects (e.g. Henrie and Sousa-Poza, 2005). As a result of the insufficiency in empirical studies in this scope, it has laid the foundation for our research to investigate the cultural influence on decision making in project teams in Nigeria and Sweden. Furthermore, contemporary studies in project management depict the influence of cultural dimensions on project management as cited in Shore and Cross (2005) and decision making in projects in Müller et al., (2007).

Therefore, we have investigated Nigeria and Sweden cultures on decision making in telecommunication project teams with the use of semi-structured interviews in two companies. The data was analysed using coding with the aim to answer the research question of how does culture influence decision making. As a result of this, our findings disclose convincing differences and similarities in decision making approach between Nigerian and Swedish teams.

- The Nigerian teams give priority to specialization of task, well defined hierarchy of authority, formality and inflexibility at work while the Swedish teams pay less value on codes of conduct and high degree of flexibility in group task.

- Participation in decision making through discussion in meetings is lower in Nigeria when compared to Sweden. This is as a result of the fear of creating conflict among team members by not hurting anyone’s feeling. On the other hand, participation and consultation in decision making is common in Sweden. This is why it takes more time to come to a consensus in Sweden than in Nigeria. Furthermore, decision making in Sweden is more decentralised than in Nigeria.
Generally, the Nigerian teams are directed by the respect for superiors and friendship and it is also reflected in their decision making processes. On the other hand, the Swedish teams show preference for individualism and believe in competence other than superiority.

There are some similarities in decision making approach of Nigeria and Sweden. These include: high degree of hard work of all team members, well defined functions and responsibilities in the decision making process, participation of senior managers in decision making for all teams in Sweden and complete authority in Nigeria.

An understanding of the cultural differences and similarities would assist in the appropriate functioning of a combined Nigerian-Swedish project teams. Therefore, keeping in mind the significance and influence of culture and providing members of the teams with an understanding of the mixed-culture, issues such as long deliberations and conflict as a result of misunderstanding can be reduced leading to the effectiveness and efficiency of the project team.

6.1. Theoretical/Managerial Implications

In this study we have found five cultural elements that influence working in Nigerian and Swedish teams (refer to fig 5.1). These elements in relation with Hofstede et al., (2010) cultural dimensions make up the cultural outline of Nigerian and Swedish project teams depicting the variation and interrelationship in team working practice (refer fig 5.1). Despite the significance of the cultural dimensions examined by Hofstede et al., (2010), the elements that make up the cultural outline are seen to be significant for Nigeria and Sweden cultures.

Furthermore, the managerial implications of this study could be approved for prospective project managers of mixed Nigerian-Swedish teams as concerns decision making. The mixed team should comprise all members will who actively participate than listen to their superiors. The degree of formality and flexibility in group discussion should be taken into consideration before engaging in any project work. Some of the criteria such as time, conflict and reaching the consensus should be considered so as to maximise the outcome. Other than making complex decisions on individual basis, it important to involve the entire group in the decision making and the project manager of the mixed team should guarantee unity among the members of the team that might come up as a result of conflict leading to the creation of small groups in the team.
6.2. Limitations

The fact that this study has been outlined to accomplish the purpose of the study and to divert from deviation if possible, the research methodology was confronted with the following problems and restrictions:

- The samples were limited only to telecommunication sector of two companies which on the other hand would have increased the number of other sectors.
- Related to time scarcity limited the number of participants to 10. As a result of the sample size it may be difficult to generalise over the population size.
- The fact only two companies in the telecommunication industry were interviewed could not also be seen as a point of departure to draw a conclusion on some pertinent issues of decision making.
- The fact that this study was based on project teams could be seen a limitation as it did not take into consideration projects and project management.

6.3. Recommendations for future Research

The results of this study present an understanding on the cultural influence in decision making to prospective managers of a combined culture teams. It would be advantageous to managers working with both Nigeria and Swedish combined project teams to make important decisions. As a result, this could lay the foundation for future research.

The fact that this study was based on an important field of studies – project management, we recommend that the impact of culture on project management could be explored in another research. Furthermore, talking about project teams and little discussion on projects could lead to future study on examine the how culture influence decision making in projects.

Therefore considering the number of respondents for this study and the method employed, it is worthy to recommend for future research using this same topic and increasing the number of interviews using many companies so that it could lay a solid base to generalise. Furthermore, it worth noting it could also be suggested that both qualitative (semi-structure interview) and quantitative Questionnaires) methods could be used in investigating on the same topic so as to provide qualified and quantified results.
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APPENDIX A:

Interview Guideline: Cultural Influence on Decision Making in Project Teams: The Case of the Telecommunication Industry

Part 1: Participant Demography

1) Please tell us a general overview of the company and types of project you were involved in
2) What was your role in the projects?
3) How long have you been working in this position?
4) How many projects have you participated in?
5) How many members are there in the project team?
6) How many different project teams have you worked with?
7) Have you studied or worked overseas? How long?

Part 2: Cultural Aspects on Decision Making

1) Please explain how cultural aspects ease decision making in your current projects.
2) What do you consider as differences in working with international team?
3) According to hierarchy in your organization, what is your opinion about the degree of influence on decision making in project team? How positions can affect on decision making?
4) According to relationships among the members in project team, how can you see degree of influence on decision making?
5) Imagine a situation when you feel the decision made is not optimal one, do you oppose the decisions or not
6) Do you hesitate to express your opinion which could result in better outcomes?
7) Do you think that the teams you worked in give importance to team harmony or agreement?
8) How would you describe discussion atmosphere or communication among members of team which will lead to the decision making?
9) According to projects which you were involved in, how do you see effects of different decision styles?

10) What criteria were used in making decisions?

11) According to your experience about working in different project team, same criteria were applied in all of projects?

12) Have you applied any consistent pattern in making decision in project teams in your company?

13) How were the decisions implemented in the project team?

14) How you see implementation of the decisions in the project team?

15) Do you think speed of acceptance in a complex decision is same as simple one?

16) In your opinion, what is the best element in practice decision making process in your company?
APPENDIX B:

RESPONDENT N-M1 (Nigeria – Company M – Respondent 1)

Respondent N-M1 is currently working in the International Carrier Department of a South African multinational mobile telecommunication company operation in more 13 countries in African, Europe and Middle East. She works as the project manager and controller for over 10 months. She has managed 15 projects worth US$ 2 million in a project team comprising 5-10 members depending on the structure of the project. These project teams are not always the same because of the nature of the work, resources and expertise. She happened to work with 5 different project teams with an experience not in only Nigeria; she has studied in Britain for over 4 years.

1) Please explain how cultural aspects ease decision making in your current projects.

Nigeria’s culture boost listening to top level management or project supervisor as a result of strict rules of seniority and hierarchy. Nigerians tend to be flexible and helpful; therefore my experience working with different nationalities in different project teams proves that is more relax working with Nigerians when compared to other cultures. They do not take into consideration any accountability or enthusiastic as other foreigners. Therefore they tend to listen and be calm to take to instruction and solutions to avoid conflicting.

2) What do you consider as differences in working with international team?

After having worked with other nationals, I find Europeans to be more participative in the project role than Nigerian members. They share their opinions without any reservation because of their individualist cultural background but working with Nigerians they tend to be quiet and listen to the senior. Working with other European fasten the project in terms of the decision making process but working with an international teams could be stressful because of language, distance and telephone communication.

3) According to hierarchy in your organization, what is your opinion about the degree of influence on decision making in project team? How positions can effect on decision making?

In the company, there are defined rules for internal project management process. It is the responsibility of the project manager to coordinate and work with the project teams to come up with decision in together with the people who set up the budget and the allocation of
resources act the final decision makers. Therefore the decision is not only made by the project managers but it is also influenced by other external role players. This is to make it easier for the decision making process.

4) According to relationships among the members in project team, how can you see degree of influence on decision making?

This depends on several factors such as the personality of people. An open-minded project sponsor would listen to the project manager while she presents the information to the team. Others might have planned decision in which case it would become difficult to influence their conclusions. If the project manager is considered to be reliable she can influence the decision making process.

5) Imagine a situation when you feel the decision made is not optimal one, do you oppose the decisions or not

As a project manager, I feel there is greater chance of better solution by assigning the project teams to carry out further research on the different alternatives with the use of quality data from a mechanism called decision quality diagram which assists in measuring the best alternative.

6) Do you hesitate to express your opinion which could result in better outcomes?

There is no problem with that since being aware of Nigeria’s culture I am careful the way I present the different choices so as to avoid creating any bad relationship with the project team. I always find a good way to present my opinions not to hurt someone’s feeling since my goal is to attain quality, time and cost so every member’s opinion in the project team is encouraged.

7) Do you think that the teams you worked in give importance to team harmony or agreement?

Yes, there is group exercise to achieve the sense of belonging in the team. As concerns consensus, if none is arrived at in the decision we use another process called phase gate.

8) How would you describe discussion atmosphere or communication among members of team which will lead to the decision making?

Westerners are active and comprehensiveness of the work is apparently defined. There is a formal way of doing this through the internal project management process that looks into the different dimensions when finding a solution for the project.
9) According to projects which you were involved in, how do you see effects of different decision styles?

There is no difference in the decision making styles from my experience but something I find interesting to cite is that most Nigerians whether elderly in terms or longevity in service who are not top level managers prefer to sit behind and play no role in decision making. They preferably support the senior managers’ opinions.

10) What criteria were used in making decisions?

Logical reasoning, timing, cost, quality and needs.

11) According to your experience about working in different project team, same criteria were applied in all of projects?

It is the same.

12) Have you applied any consistent pattern in making decision in project teams in your company?

This is dependent on a number of factors such as style of the project leader and importance of the decision.

13) How were the decisions implemented in the project team?

The project leaders provide a unified plan of delivering activities with time factor and pursuit the delivery process.

14) How you see implementation of the decisions in the project team?

Not everyone will agree on the decision made during the meeting but there is always the rule of majority and others have to accept.

15) Do you think speed of acceptance in a complex decision is same as simple one?

No, it depends on how complex the decision is where members will have to seek for alternatives or find the problem. This might take more time to carry out risk management though some might reject it since they do not like to deal with uncertain circumstances.

16) In your opinion, what is the best element in practice decision making process in your company? I think the best alternative should be to have the project team members involved in the decision making although it would take some time to come to a consensus but the majority would be satisfied with the outcome of decision.
RESPONDENT N-M2

Part 1

1) Please tell us a general overview of the company and types of project you were involved in?

I am working in MTN Company. MTN is one of the biggest telecommunication companies which is operated in the developing emerging markets and is activated in Mobil industry. I am working as a project manager.

2) What was your role in the projects?

My current role is as National Product Manager. I support projects objectives in line of organizational goals. I give direction to members in team, control risk and communication and employ changes in teams when it is necessary.

3) How long have you been working in this position?

2 Years

4) How many projects have you participated in?

I have participated in 3 projects up to now

5) How many members are there in the project team?

Typically there are 7-10 members in a team according to objectives of project

6) Have you studied or worked overseas? How long?

I studied in University Tampa in Florida in USA. I also was international manager trainee in Eriksson global Service

Part 2: Cultural Aspects on Decision Making

1) Please explain how cultural aspects ease decision making in your current projects.

According to global activity of company, standardization plays important role in managing company. So it can be count as a barrier to cultural influence. But there is some exception that is directly related to human recourse such as Holidays in every country. Also cultural factors cause preventing new and different ideas.

2) What do you consider as differences in working with international team?

In spite of having standardize rules which have been applied in company, culture can affect organizational atmosphere, as an example Nigerian member of team accept decisions more easily and implementation of decisions doesn't take lots of time in comparison with Europeans members.

3) According to hierarchy in your organization, what is your opinion about the degree of influence on decision making in project team? How positions can affect on decision making?
Decisions in every team made by members of team and they have complete authority to make decisions their own but members of team should respect hierarchy in teams which project manager has high authority in team.

4) According to relationships among the members in project team, how can you see degree of influence on decision making? How those relationships affect on decision making? Relationships between individuals don't affect decisions, it is position which plays important role.

5) Imagine a situation when you feel the decision made is not optimal one, do you oppose the decisions or not? Yes, all of team members have the opportunity to oppose. There were some situations which we made special meeting to hear oppositions, if they give logical reason we imply their idea.

6) Do you hesitate to express your opinion which could result in better outcomes? No.

7) Do you think that the teams you worked in give importance to team harmony or agreement? Yes, They do always

8) How would you describe discussion atmosphere or communication among members of team which will lead to the decision making?
All of team members are active and feel free to express their idea. We consider variety of factors which affect on making decision. First of all we presented the plan, and then members are free to discuss or ask questions from professionals. Discussions should be logical.

9) According to projects which you were involved in, how do you see effects of different decision styles?
In some cases, members make a decision first and then consult with professionals. Professionals make them correct or provide some alternatives or correction otherwise Problems propose in team, all members brainstorm and best one suggestion is chose. In some cases, members get help from others outside of company and ask him/her to provide solution

10) What criteria were used in making decisions? Technology and customer requirement are two important factors. We have to fit our objectives with customer needs.
11) According to your experience about working in different project team, same criteria were applied in all of projects? Yes, in most cases

12) Have you applied any consistent pattern in making decision in project teams in your company? Yes, we have completely consistent pattern in making decisions

13) How you see implementation of the decisions in the project team? When decisions are made, I send decisions to technical section to check if need any changes or not. If they determine any changes send them to me again to revise it.

14) How do you see acceptance of decision have been made by employees? Typically most decisions accepted easily, if we encounter any defects, we give members a time line to fix it.

15) Do you think speed of acceptance in a complex decision is same as simple one? Yes

16) In your opinion, what is the best element in practice decision making process in your company? The most important things are all of discussions between members are recorded. This information can be used for improving decision making process or solve technical problems.
RESPONDENT N-M3

Part 1:

1) Please tell us a general overview of the company and types of project you were involved in?

2) What was your role in the projects? Consultant

3) How long have you been working in this position? 2 years

4) How many projects have you participated in? 1

5) How many members are there in the project team? 10

6) Have you studied or worked overseas? How long? Yes, 2.1/2 yrs

Part 2: Cultural Aspects on Decision Making

1) Please explain how cultural aspects ease decision making in your current projects. Solving a decision making problem at SKS microfinance due to a valuation problem. My cultural background enabled me to implement policies based on respect, education, technology as the project involved people of small villages.

2) What do you consider as differences in working with international team? They varied in respect (hierarchy), and certain technical aspects were a taboo.

3) According to hierarchy in your organization, what is your opinion about the degree of influence on decision making in project team? How positions can effect on decision making? The senior management most often has the final say in decisions. This could lead to a poor decision being made as a line manager could have a better idea on that project which may not be considered. Authority

4) According to relationships among the members in project team, how can you see degree of influence on decision making?

5) Imagine a situation when you feel the decision made is not optimal one, do you oppose the decisions or not? Yes through suggestions

6) Do you hesitate to express your opinion which could result in better outcomes? No. for the success of the project
7) Do you think that the teams you worked in give importance to team harmony or agreement? Agreement

8) How would you describe discussion atmosphere or communication among members of team which will lead to the decision making? Calm

9) According to projects which you were involved in, how do you see effects of different decision styles? Different teams have a different approach to decision making which is most favourable to the project. Style

10) What criteria were used in making decisions? Participation from all team members and final conclusions from majority

11) According to your experience about working in different project team, same criteria were applied in all of projects? YES

12) Have you applied any consistent pattern in making decision in project teams in your company? YES

13) How were the decisions implemented in the project team? Carried out as voted after deliberating

14) How you see implementation of the decisions in the project team? Fairly

15) Do you think speed of acceptance in a complex decision is same as simple one? NO

16) In your opinion, what is the best element in practice decision making process in your company? Get every team members opinion and take the best option for the particular project
RESPONDENT N-M4

Part 1: Participant Demography

1) Please tell us a general overview of the company and types of project you were involved in? GSM Communication Company,

2) What was your role in the projects? Coordinator and Liaison

3) How long have you been working in this position? 6 months

4) How many projects have you participated in? Several

5) How many members are there in the project team? 13

6) Have you studied or worked overseas? How long? Yes

Part 2: Cultural Aspects on Decision Making

1) Please explain how cultural aspects ease decision making in your current projects. As negotiators with landlords, it was pretty easy negotiating with them because we could easily see eye to eye.

2) What do you consider as differences in working with international team? AS a coordinator, I worked with communication engineers from India and it was always a heated debate before we arrive at conclusions, because the always say this different with me

3) According to hierarchy in your organization, what is your opinion about the degree of influence on decision making in project team? How positions can effect on decision making? Very important, because ideas and inputs from people with higher hierarchy were debated and pondered up longer.

4) According to relationships among the members in project team, how can you see degree of influence on decision making? Very high I would say, this is because team members that are bonded and very closely knitted easily arrive to a decision, however groupthink are sometimes in place
5) Imagine a situation when you feel the decision made is not optimal one, do you oppose the decisions or not? Yes

6) Do you hesitate to express your opinion which could result in better outcomes? Yes, I strive to avoid groupthink

7) Do you think that the teams you worked in give importance to team harmony or agreement? Unfortunately yes.

8) How would you describe discussion atmosphere or communication among members of team which will lead to the decision making? Brainstorming

9) According to projects which you were involved in, how do you see effects of different decision styles? Agreeability highly influenced by groupthink

10) What criteria were used in making decisions? Information and assessment on hand

11) According to your experience about working in different project team, same criteria were applied in all of projects? Not really

12) Have you applied any consistent pattern in making decision in project teams in your company? Yes

13) How were the decisions implemented in the project team? Team members agree without heated debates

14) How you see implementation of the decisions in the project team? Positively

15) Do you think speed of acceptance in a complex decision is same as simple one? No

16) In your opinion, what is the best element in practice decision making process in your company? Put people with diverse experience, background and outlook on the team.
RESPONDENT S-T1

Part 1: Participant Demography

1. Please tell us a general overview of the company and types of project you were involved in.

   TSIC is a global wholesale telecommunications carrier, with roughly 500 employees. I’ve run and participated in Product Development, Operational Excellence, Technical migration projects among others.

2. What was your role in the projects? I’ve been project manager, program manager and Head of Steering Committee for different projects. Most projects I’ve seen from my position as Head of the Steering Committee.

3. How long have you been working in this position? I was head of our Steering Committee for 2-3 years.

4. How many projects have you participated in? I was responsible for in total 20 projects over 2-3 years as Head of SteerCo. I’ve managed 5-10 Projects as Project manager before that.

5. How many members are there in the project team? Normally a project has around 10-20 project members that spend significant amount of time in the project.

6. Have you studied or worked overseas? How long? I lived in South Africa for two years in my teens and went to high school there; I worked in our London Office for two years.

Part 2: Cultural Aspects on Decision Making

1. Please explain how cultural aspects ease decision making in your current projects.

   Having different cultural backgrounds in the team secures that more aspects of an issue is viewed and discussed prior to reaching a decision.

2. What do you consider as differences in working with international team?

   In purely Swedish teams, a lot of time is spent on reaching total consensus. In mixed international teams, it is more recognized that sometimes a decision needs to be make quickly, and may not always fit everyone’s requirements.
3   According to hierarchy in your organization, what is your opinion about the degree of influence on decision making in project team? How positions can affect on decision making?
In our organizational culture, a lot of time is spent questioning the project team’s decision from other units in the organization. The higher up the project team reports, less “discussions” and second guessing of decisions occur.
4   According to relationships among the members in project team, how can you see degree of influence on decision making? How those relationships affect on decision making? Not at all.
5   Imagine a situation when you feel the decision made is not optimal one, do you oppose the decisions or not? Yes, as a project manager or Head of SteerCo I always need to secure we make the best decisions even if the majority has a different view. As member of a project I raise my voice if I don’t think the right decision is made.
6   Do you hesitate to express your opinion which could result in better outcomes? No.
7   Do you think that the teams you worked in give importance to team harmony or agreement? Yes
8   How would you describe discussion atmosphere or communication among members of team which will lead to the decision making? Most of the time positive, debating workshops.
9   According to projects which you were involved in, how do you see effects of different decision styles?
10  What criteria were used in making decisions? -
11  According to your experience about working in different project team, same criteria were applied in all of projects?
12  Have you applied any consistent pattern in making decision in project teams in your company? Not, very much depending on the project manager and his/her leadership style. Same for SteerCo, with a strong leadership the decisions are more formal; with a looser leadership decisions are less formal.
13  How you see implementation of the decisions in the project team if a decision is not popular, then it is sometimes not implemented with the highest priority. Needs to be pushed and followed up by project management and SteerCo.
14 How do you see acceptance of decision have been made by employees? Over time they are accepted, some may take a while if decision does not match consensus.

15 Do you think speed of acceptance in a complex decision is same as simple one? Yes

16 In your opinion, what is the best element in practice decision making process in your company? Secure less people dependency. Strong role of Business Ownership/Sponsorship in both steering daily work and decisions as a stronger role for Business Unit in the formal project in SteerCo. Now decisions are made mostly by back-office functions, which make decisions take longer time as they lack sense of business urgency.
 RESPONDENT S-T2

Part 1: Participant Demography

1. Please tell us a general overview of the company and types of project you were involved in.
TSIC is a global telecommunications company offering services to Telecom Carriers on a worldwide basis. My projects typically involve projects related to service developments and integration of these into the business.

2. What was your role in the projects? My current role is as Product Manager outlining the needs, but also in taking a Project Manager role in ensuring these are delivered and supported across the business.

3. How long have you been working in this position? 8 months

4. How many projects have you participated in? I’m currently involved in around 5 major projects, all of which have a relatively long lead time associated with them (over 6 months).

5. How many members are there in the project team? Typically there will be around 10-15 members engaged in delivering the Project into the business.

6. Have you studied or worked overseas? How long? I worked in Australia for a year and was also based in Ireland for 2 years running an International start up business during this time.

Part 2: Cultural Aspects on Decision Making

1. Please explain how cultural aspects ease decision making in your current projects.
Cultural aspects from the various team members are a key in understanding and overcoming some of the issues arising with project implementation across a number of countries.

2. What do you consider as differences in working with international team?
Culture has a strong factor on decision making during the development stage. For example some cultures adopt an aggressive approach to decision making and act quickly; whilst other cultures take a more long term view and are reluctant to make a decision unless in possession of all the facts.

3. According to hierarchy in your organization, what is your opinion about the degree of influence on decision making in project team? How positions can effect on decision making?
Decisions made by the higher levels of an organization tend to be acted on more quickly than those at a lower level. People are also less inclined to question decisions made at a high level and focus more on meeting management's needs.

4 According to relationships among the members in project teams, how can you see the degree of influence on decision making?

All decisions are made on a professional basis and relationships between individuals should not be a factor.

5 Imagine a situation when you feel the decision made is not optimal, do you oppose the decisions or not?

Yes, on occasions decisions will be challenged, in many cases this is due to key facts being overlooked or implications not fully understood.

6 Do you hesitate to express your opinion which could result in better outcomes?

No.

7 Do you think that the teams you worked in give importance to team harmony or agreement?

Yes, in some cases this can result in delays whilst solutions are investigated which may turn out to be impractical.

8 How would you describe the discussion atmosphere or communication among members of team which will lead to the decision making?

Open and honest discussion.

9 According to projects which you were involved in, how do you see the effects of different decision styles? Normally reached by a consensus, or senior management taking a view.

10 What criteria were used in making decisions?

- A number of criteria are taken into account including: Business Benefits (operational, financial, reputational etc); speed of implementation, risk, available resources, strategy, business dependencies, competitive threats etc.

11 According to your experience about working in different project teams, same criteria were applied in all of projects?

Generally all decisions will be made taking into account the above factors.

12 Have you applied any consistent pattern in making decisions in project teams in your company?
No, this will depend upon a number of factors such as the urgency to make a decision, style of Project leader etc

13 How were the decisions implemented in the project team?

The project leader will produce an integrated plan of delivery activities with timescales and then follow these up for delivery.

14 How you see implementation of the decisions in the project team?

Team members will typically work to deliver the service, although may raise further concerns during the implementation phase and seek support as necessary.

15 Do you think speed of acceptance in a complex decision is same as simple one?

Yes

16 In your opinion, what is the best element in practice decision making process in your company?

Ensuring that all parties involved understand business needs and requirements. Therefore making a decision in the best interests of the business and working towards a customer focused solution, rather than one which may be preferred for the needs of their individual area
RESPONDENT S-T3

Part 1: Participant Demography

1) Please tell us a general overview of the company and types of project you were involved in? I worked for the carrier division at TeliaSonera, which is involved in the termination of international telecom traffic. Other business activities include the supply of Ethernet capacity, data transit services and collocation services. I was involved in voice capacity pricing projects with direct responsibility for the cost and revenue streams of 40 countries. During this period, I was brought in as emergency resource to assist a group of consultants working to upgrade TeliaSonera’s billing system. I developed tests cases to run simulations for the billing system’s quality assurance.

2) What was your role in the projects?
On the first project, my role was that of project pricing specialist, with focus developing pricing models for traffic termination to assigned destinations. On the second project, my role was that of test analyst.

3) How long have you been working in this position?
I worked in this position for 15 months.

4) How many projects have you participated in?
I have participated in two projects; Voice Capacity Pricing and Billing System Upgrade.

5) How many members are there in the project team?
14

6) Have you studied or worked overseas? How long?
Yes, for five years.

Part 2: Cultural Aspects on Decision Making

1) Please explain how cultural aspects ease decision making in your current projects.
I will like to consider the billing system upgrade project because it involved participants from five European countries, Africa, the USA and India. As the only African on the project, my default mastery of the telecom industry has been hinged on the dynamics of the emerging
markets. My opinion counted a great deal because I always passed my message across with great emphasis on how relevant the billing system could be made to allow for scalability if TeliaSonera decided to venture into emerging markets in Africa. Therefore, every release version of the new billing system had the favourable decision to be embedded with a code to accept integration in a new market.

2) What do you consider as differences in working with international team? I did not see any great difference.

3) According to hierarchy in your organization, what is your opinion about the degree of influence on decision making in project team? How positions can affect on decision making? Given that I was only brought into the billing system project as emergency cover, I never had influence on just the downstream deployment of the test scenarios generated.

4) According to relationships among the members in project team, how can you see degree of influence on decision making?

Among every project team, I noticed a unique sense of mutuality between project team members that extended beyond the corporate environment. Such mutuality might have stemmed from people knowing each other prior to working on the project, and as such decisions were often made based on loyalty and protection of self-interest.

5) Imagine a situation when you feel the decision made is not optimal one, do you oppose the decisions or not? Yes. This is about challenging the status quo for the best interest of overall project performance, given that the majority must not always get it right.

6) Do you hesitate to express your opinion which could result in better outcomes? No, I do not.

7) Do you think that the teams you worked in give importance to team harmony or agreement? Yes, importance is given to team harmony because it is a key pillar in TeliaSonera’s project methodology called TS PROMO.

8) How would you describe discussion atmosphere or communication among members of team which will lead to the decision making? The atmosphere of team conversation has always been friendly to keep everyone on good temperament, especially after a great brainstorming session. This is often done over coffee.

9) According to projects which you were involved in, how do you see effects of different decision styles? My experience with the different decision making styles has been that longer
serving employees tend to back decisions that will protect legacy applications like in IT projects, whereas employees with lesser serving duration adopt a decision making style as agents of change. Such changes can be in terms of corporate culture or work methodology.

10) What criteria were used in making decisions? Several criteria were used (Revenue Growth, Cost Cutting, Process Improvement, Quality Optimisation), but whatever their nature were based on a matrix called SMART; Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, and Time-bound.

11) According to your experience about working in different project team, same criteria were applied in all of projects? Yes the same criteria were used.

12) Have you applied any consistent pattern in making decision in project teams in your company? There has been no consistent pattern because every project has a different governance board, despite every board adhering to the TS PROMO guidelines.

13) How were the decisions implemented in the project team? Decisions were implemented in a vertical approach; from the project board through the project managers to the team leaders and team members.

14) How you see implementation of the decisions in the project team? Decisions were often accepted with mixed feelings as conflicts of interest are always common in corporate projects.

15) Do you think speed of acceptance in a complex decision is same as simple one? No. for complex decisions, team members strive to get more visibility of the logic behind the decisions taken so as to enhance their understanding of the impact of such decisions on their future responsibilities.

16) In your opinion, what is the best element in practice decision making process in your company? The best decision making process will be one in which the project board gets the opinion of at least each member in the functional units when building its risk and opportunity profiling score card.
RESPONDENT S-T4

Part 1: Participant Demography
1) Please tell us a general overview of the company and types of project you were involved in?
2) What was your role in the projects?
3) How long have you been working in this position?
4) How many projects have you participated in?
5) How many members are there in the project team?
6) Have you studied or worked overseas? How long?

Part 2: Cultural Aspects on Decision Making
1) Please explain how cultural aspects ease decision making in your current projects. My Cultural background hasn't been of much influence in decision making in most of my Project. I could say I have been able to quickly adapted to things around me here
2) What do you consider as differences in working with international team? To me there haven't been that much different. I have learnt to adapt to situation I find myself.
3) According to hierarchy in your organization, what is your opinion about the degree of influence on decision making in project team? How positions can affect on decision making? In my type of project, individual team member have a level of influence. I could say it depends on Wow of the team. We have always implemented an Agile and Lean way of managing project, where individual team have control on the specific task they have embark on a daily basic(Implementing SCRUM). The SCRUM master duty is just to get rid of impediment, when there is one.
4) According to relationships among the members in project team, how can you see degree of influence on decision making? The relationships among the project team member have a lot to play. As I have said earlier, it also relies on the Way of working that has been adopted. In my team it quite cross-functional, everyone can take any role within the team.
5) Imagine a situation when you feel the decision made is not optimal one, do you oppose the decisions or not? In an Agile way of managing project it’s a collective decision. We have to come to a definite agreement. Every ones opinion is always considered and analysed, in order to get to final conclusion.
6) Do you hesitate to express your opinion which could result in better outcomes? Most time I come up with my opinion and give a clear reason, which the team members would all analyse to come to a final conclusion.

7) Do you think that the teams you worked in give importance to team harmony or agreement? Yes

8) How would you describe discussion atmosphere or communication among members of team which will lead to the decision making? No suggestion is disregarded; there is provision for critical analysis.

9) According to projects which you were involved in, how do you see effects of different decision styles? It has worked well for us especially in agile and lean way not working.

10) What criteria were used in making decisions? Prioritization and feedback

11) According to your experience about working in different project team, same criteria were applied in all of projects? Most, I will say yes

12) Have you applied any consistent pattern in making decision in project teams in your company? Yes

13) How were the decisions implemented in the project team? Agile and lean way

14) How you see implementation of the decisions in the project team? Well accepted

15) Do you think speed of acceptance in a complex decision is same as simple one? Yes

16) In your opinion, what is the best element in practice decision making process in your company? The present way of working have been effective
RESPONDENT S-T5

Part 1: Participant Demography

1) Please tell us a general overview of the company and types of project you were involved in? I have been involved in a research project called Whitehall 2 longitudinal Studies. This study looks at how stress and health is connecting to working in the civil service over time.

2) What was your role in the projects? I work as a Research Technician

3) How long have you been working in this position? I have been working at this position for 1 year 5 months.

4) How many projects have you participated in? In the past 2 years one major project.

5) How many members are there in the project team? There are 45 members excluding agency and other staff we liaise with on daily basis.

6) Have you studied or worked overseas? How long? Yes I have studied in Norway for 2 and half years.

Part 2: Cultural Aspects on Decision Making

1) Please explain how cultural aspects ease decision making in your current projects. I would say that culture had very little in influencing my decision making during this research project as I had to work following research guideline and laid down University procedures.

2) What do you consider as differences in working with international team? It wasn’t very different as my present team members are from varied ethnic background.

3) According to hierarchy in your organization, what is your opinion about the degree of influence on decision making in project team? How positions can affect on decision making? Decision make is very much position based, where most senior staff make the major decision while junior staff make small decisions.

4) According to relationships among the members in project team, how can you see degree of influence on decision making? For junior staff relationships influence decision making a lot as
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the agreed decision will be based on the collective decision of the entire junior staff. On the other hand as you move up the hierarchical ladder, decision make is not influence very much by relationships as there are few senior staffs to make major decisions.

5) Imagine a situation when you feel the decision made is not optimal one, do you oppose the decisions or not? Yes I do and ear is always given to you even if you’re not the majority.

6) Do you hesitate to express your opinion which could result in better outcomes? No I do not hesitate.

7) Do you think that the teams you worked in give importance to team harmony or agreement? Yes they do.

8) How would you describe the atmosphere of team conversation which will lead to the decision making? The atmosphere is very receptive and welcome and people are also very ready to take correction of adjustments to opinions that do not fall in line with code of practice or the University’s research guidelines and procedures.

9) According to projects which you were involved in, how do you see effects of different decision styles? Each has a different approach as their projects and designed results are different. The common thing about every team I have worked with is that they want the project effectively carried out, achieving desired results while keeping cost very low.

10) What criteria were used in making decisions? Some of the criteria used are; Centrality to Project objectives, Quality, Productivity and impact to research project Efficiency and effectiveness of research data collection Development and leverage of resources

11) According to your experience about working in different project team, same criteria were applied in all of projects? These criteria where used for all teams including some others like; Decision making based on Demand and resources Decision making based on Enhancement of academic synergies

12) Have you applied any consistent pattern in making decision in project teams in your company? Yes I have.
13) How were the decisions implemented in the project team? The decision made where included in policies and procedure and staffs were called upon for a refresher course where we were all detailed updates. Also, small decisions are handed down on daily rolling basis as the working day/week carries on.

14) How you see implementation of the decisions in the project team? Among all the teams I have worked with, team members have hardly disputed any decision made as these decisions were made progressively and usually consulting the team managers before making these decisions who have always liaised the incoming decisions to be made with team members during team meetings before they are actually enacted.

15) Do you think speed of acceptance in a complex decision is same as simple one? Sometimes but rarely as these decisions have always been progressively built up from simple to complex than just throwing complex decision on staff or team members.

16) In your opinion, what is the best element in practice decision making process in your company? The best would be Quality, Productivity and Impact.