

Differences between the Purposes of the Dominance Search Model and the Acceptable Decision-Making Search Model

Takaaki Hosoda ^{*}, Hiroyuki Maruyama [†]

Abstract

This study clarifies the differences in the decision-making processes between the dominance search model and the acceptable decision-making search model. For this purpose, we analyzed the behavioral patterns of the two decision-making models based on empirical decision-making cases. We found that, although the upper purposes of decision-making are the same, the two models have fundamentally different lower purposes and, hence, their decision-making processes are very different. Additionally, the lower decision-making purposes of both models are conceptually defined as explicit and implicit, and their differences derive from the behavioral patterns between Japanese and Westerners based on the research results of Nisbett. This research is a very important topic for smooth consensus building with people who have different ways of thinking and so on. This is not only an academic contribution to clarify the nature of cross-cultural decision-making, but also useful in discussing effective approaches to negotiation in business.

Keywords: acceptable decision-making, explicit purpose, implicit purpose, justification.

1 Introduction

Decision-making is defined as the process of selecting a particular alternative for implementation [1]. However, in actual decision-making, it is not easy to select the best alternative. For example, the desire for lower cost often results in lower quality, as well as longer delivery times. In other words, the decision-making process has many attributes to consider and there are often trade-offs among them. Therefore, it is difficult to make a choice. However, this does not mean that decision-making is impossible if we approach difficult problems with intention and purpose.

Normative decision theory prescribes that the decisions based on expected utility theory are the best and that individuals should make such decisions [2]. Multi-attribute utility theory [3], which is a development of expected utility theory, quantifies the preference relationship between alternatives, obtains a multi-attribute utility function corresponding to these preferences, and selects the alternative that maximizes the value of the multi-attribute utility function. This theory makes it possible to derive an optimal solution to a decision-making problem. However, as it is

^{*} Advanced Institute for Industrial Technology, Tokyo, Japan

[†] Waseda University, Tokyo, Japan

- [14] W. Damon, J. Menon, and K. C. Bronk, "The Development of Purpose During Adolescence", *Applied Developmental Science* 7(3), 2003, pp. 119-128.
- [15] R. E. Nisbett, *The Geography of Thought: How Asians and Westerners Think Differently and Why*, London, Nicholas Brealey Publishing, 2005.
- [16] T. Hosoda, and H. Maruyama, "The differences between Japanese and Westerner in terms of "Purpose", *Pan-pacific Management Science*, 2, 2019, pp.67 – 79.
- [17] A. Haruta, and K. Hallahan, "Cultural issues in airline crisis communications: A Japan-US comparative study," *Asian Journal of Communication*, 13(2), 2003, pp. 122-150.
- [18] E. Meyer, *The culture map: breaking through the invisible boundaries of global business*. New York, Public Affairs, 2014.
- [19] W. L. Adair, T. Okumura, and J. M. Brett, "Negotiation behavior when cultures collide: the United States and Japan," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 2001, pp.371-385.
- [20] S. Yamamoto, "Kūki" no kenkyū. Bungei Shunjū, 2018.
- [21] S. Hara, *Nihonjin no kachikan: Ibunka Rikai no Kiso O Kizuku*. Kamakurashunjusha, 2013.