

# An Investigation of How and Why Managers Use Tablets to Support Decision Making

## Meng Xiao

Decision Support Systems Laboratory, Faculty of Information Technology  
Monash University  
Caulfield East, Australia

## Rob Meredith<sup>1</sup>

Decision Support Systems Laboratory, Faculty of Information Technology  
Monash University  
Caulfield East, Australia  
Email: Rob.Meredith@monash.edu

## Shijia Gao

Decision Support Systems Laboratory, Faculty of Information Technology  
Monash University  
Caulfield East, Australia  
Email: Caddie.Gao@monash.edu

## Abstract

Managers are very mobile and a large proportion of their work is dealing with decisions. Although many managers currently use tablet computers in their work, there is little research on tablets' role in managerial decision support. This exploratory study aims to investigate how managers use tablets to support their decision-making and the reasons behind it. Anchoring on Task-Technology Fit theory, semi-structured interviews were conducted with 17 managers who use tablets for their work-related decision-making. The study reveals managers' tablet usage patterns in terms of location, tablet applications, decision activities and types. This study has also found that a range of tablet characteristics and decision-task characteristics affect managers' use of tablets to support decision-making at work. This exploratory study contributes to both academia and industry by providing evidence on the tablet decision support area, and affording organisations, tablet vendors and tablet application developers informative findings for further improvement in the provision of tablet-based decision support.

**Keywords** Managers, Technology Use, Tablet, Decision Support, Mobile Decision Support.

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding Author

## 1 Introduction

The popularity of tablet computers grew sharply after Apple first introduced the *iPad* in 2010. While sales of new tablets slowed in 2014 and 2015 (IDC 2015), adoption rates among consumers are high: in January 2014, 42% of US adults owned a tablet (Zickuhr and Rainie 2014). With the widespread consumer adoption of tablet computers, it is common to see employees, including managers, using these devices in the workplace (Willis 2011).

Despite their initial status as a consumer device, tablets offer a wide range of business functionality. The business category was the fastest growing category of applications within Apple's *iOS* App Store in 2014 (Sacco 2015). Managerial users of tablet devices are doing so to read documents and communicate (Mayer et al. 2014), and some are pushing their IT departments to offer greater access to management support systems. Decision-support vendors such as Tableau, Business Objects and Cognos offer versions of their software for tablets, while developers highlight mobile decision-support as a top issue driven by managerial demand at all levels of the organisation including senior executives (O'Donnell et al. 2012).

Managers are an important group of business users with a large proportion of their work dealing with decisions (Simon 1960). However, there is little research investigating the use of tablets by managers to support managerial decision-making.

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. We investigate: 1) the ways in which managers use tablet devices for decision-making; and 2) why they do so. The project is exploratory in nature, and to address these two objectives we conducted semi-structured interviews with 17 managers from a large government authority. We used the task-technology fit (TTF) theory (Goodhue and Thompson 1995) to inform the design of the interview protocol and guide the analysis of the data collected.

The paper is structured as follows. In the following section we review the literature on management support using mobile technology. We also offer a brief outline of the TTF theory as it applies to this study. The research design is then presented, followed by results, discussion and a conclusion.

## 2 Background

### 2.1 Mobile Decision Support

For the purposes of our study, we adopt Mintzberg's (1973) definition of a manager as someone who ensures their organisation achieves its purpose through "planning, organising, staffing, directing, coordinating, reporting, and budgeting" (p.95). As knowledge workers, managers rely on a variety of information sources to inform these activities, including enterprise IT systems such as business intelligence and other management support systems. Managers also tend to be highly mobile, with studies such as Kim (2008) and Yuan et al. (2010) suggesting some managers spend between 30%-60% of their time away from their primary work location.

It follows that mobile technologies may have a significant role to play in the provision of IT-based managerial decision support. Findings from Gebauer and Shaw (2004) support this premise, showing that managerial users of mobile technologies used mobile applications more often than other categories of employees. Mobile technologies are those which are easily transported by their users, in particular those which can be carried on a regular basis regardless of location such as mobile telephones / smartphones, tablets and small notebooks. Some authors also include laptop computers within this definition, although arguably there is a significant difference between the desktop-like experience of using a full laptop computer, and the more ubiquitous but less functional experience of mobile devices operating on mobile operating systems such as *Android* and *iOS*.

Research on the use of mobile technology for management support pre-dates the introduction of tablet computers in 2010 (e.g. Cil et al. 2005). However, there is a lack of research on managerial mobile decision support, with the majority of mobile DSS study focusing on individual consumers and health professionals (Gao 2013). Gao suggests that more mobile DSS research should be conducted on managerial users, especially senior managers. Gao's study also shows a peak in academic papers addressing mobile DSS in 2007 followed by a sharp decline leading to a small resurgence in 2012. This suggests that tablet computing might have revived interest in this area. Tona and Carlsson (2014) also note an increase in the popularity of mobile business intelligence coincided with the introduction of the *iPad* in 2010, and O'Donnell et al. (2012) note that developer interest in mobile business intelligence is strongly driven by senior executive demand for support for the *iPad* platform. Mayer et al. (2014) found that tablets are the dominant preferred platform for mobile access to management

support systems over smartphones, although they note that it is tablet “functionality” rather than tablet devices themselves that is important. Given the potential benefits of mobile decision support, the importance placed on the topic by decision-support vendors and developers, the demand from managerial users as well as the dominance of tablets as a mobile decision-support platform, it is important to understand managerial tablet use for decision support.

To date there has been little empirical research on how tablets are used by managers for decision support and why they do so. Tona and Carlsson (2014) call for more research into the usage of mobile technologies for decision-making, and similarly Mayer et al. (2014) argue strongly for future research and development efforts to focus on managerial usage situations and work styles.

Verkooij and Spruit (2013) conducted a literature review of mobile business intelligence research, identifying six themes in the literature (value creation, application deployment, information security, workforce mobilisation, content delivery and device management) but did not focus on tablet use specifically, or decision-making processes. Kautzner et al. (2015) studied managerial use of tablets, but did not specifically investigate their use for decision support.

Buchana and Naicker (2014) is one of the few empirical studies that has investigated the use of mobile technologies for organisational decision-making. Their use of the technology acceptance model (TAM) as a theoretical framework for their study, however, means that their results focussed on antecedents leading to an intention to use, rather than a detailed understanding of usage behaviour. While their results showed a positive correlation between behavioural intention to use mobile decision support and organisational decision-making, a detailed understanding of the nature of mobile technology use for decision-making tasks was not explored.

Based on the review and discussion above, managers as the most important knowledge workers in organisations and tablets as the most dominant mobile decision support platform, it is important to understand managerial tablet use behaviour for decision support. However, few mobile DSS studies have covered managers’ adoption and use behaviour.

## 2.2 Task-Technology Fit Theory

Because the objectives of our study include understanding how tablets are used by managers to support decision-making, not just why they do so, we have adopted the TTF theory (Goodhue and Thompson 1995), rather than the TAM theory used by Buchana and Naicker (2014). TTF offers constructs that allow us to investigate characteristics of the user (i.e. managers who are individuals with characteristics different from other non-managerial users), the technology (i.e. tablets that have distinguished characteristics such as mobility and multi-touch interfaces), and the task (i.e. decision making that is a special kind of managerial task). TTF has been used previously in studies of mobile technology (Gebauer and Shaw 2004; Gebauer et al. 2010; Lee et al. 2007), as well as DSS (Jarapathirun and Zahedi 2007; Parkes 2012).

TTF posits that the fit between the technology and the task, and the fit between the individual and the technology, determine performance levels when using a technology. Goodhue (1995) argues that “the better fit between technology functionalities, task requirements, and individual abilities will lead to better performance” (p. 1828). In a similar vein, Dishaw and Strong (1999) posit that IT will be used if, and only if, its functions support the user’s task. While this study is not concerned with the two “fits” and managerial decision performance as such, TTF does provide us with a theoretical framework to structure our investigation of how and why managers use tablets for decision making by focussing on the following three constructs:

- i. *Characteristics of tablet devices (technology characteristics)*: features of tablet devices that may contribute to a manager using it for decision support, including physical characteristics such as portability, adaptability, and network connectivity as well as application features such as functionality and user interface design.
- ii. *Characteristics of managerial decision tasks (task characteristics)*: aspects of the decision-making tasks that managers engage in, including ‘structured-ness’, mobility, interdependence, time criticality and the operational, tactical or strategic nature of the decision.
- iii. *Characteristics of the managers (individual characteristics)*: personal characteristics such as demographic attributes and computer expertise, as well as positional characteristics such as managerial level (senior, middle or operational).

Our purpose for adopting TTF is neither to test the theory, nor to measure the final TTF construct of *fit* itself. Rather, the three constructs from TTF described above, rather than the full set of constructs

making up TTF, have been used to inform the design of the interview protocol for the study and guide the data analysis. In short, the three constructs, rather than the full theory, provide a starting point for this exploratory study.

### 3 Research Design

Semi-structured interviews were used to collect data because this technique is well suited for exploration of the perceptions and opinions of respondents and it enables probing for more information and clarification of answers (Barriball and While 1994). The interview participants were recruited via the professional links of the researchers. Only managers who use a tablet for work-related decision-making were included in this study. A total of 17 participants from a business unit in a large government authority in Australia took part in the interviews. The summarised participants' demographic information and the tablets they use are shown in Table 1. There was a reasonably even distribution of participant gender, age, managerial level and experience. However, there was an overwhelming preference amongst participants for Apple's *iPad* (16 out of 17, or 94%), possibly reflecting consumer preference in the tablet market.

Gender	Generation	Managerial Level	Managerial Experience	Tablet	
Male	9	'Gen X' 9	Senior 4	Less than 5 years 5	iPad 14
Female	8	'Boomer' 8	Middle 8	5-15 years 7	iPad Mini 2
		Operations 5	Greater than 15 years 5	Dell Win 1	

*Table 1. Participant Demographics*

An interview protocol was developed to ensure each interview session followed a consistent structure and format. The protocol was organised into three main sections: 1) background of participants – to collect demographic data such as age, managerial level, managerial experience and some basic information about participants' current tablet; 2) tablet usage for work – to probe how managers use tablets to support their work; and 3) tablet usage for decision making – to investigate how and why managers use tablets to support their work-related decision-making, such as the reasons they use tablets, the types of decisions they make using tablets, and desired improvements (if any) to the tablet so as to better support decision-making. Most of the interview questions were inspired by or adapted from the prior literature and the theoretical constructs from TTF, as discussed in Section 2.2.

In-person interviews of approximately half an hour were conducted with each participant. With the permission of the participants, all interviews were audio-recorded. Written notes were also taken during the interviews to record participants' key answers and researcher observations.

All audio recordings were transcribed verbatim. Handwritten notes taken during the interviews were also typed into documents. The interview transcripts and transcribed notes were loaded into *NVivo*, a qualitative data management and analysis software package designed to aid users with data analysis (Neuman 2011). A thematic coding approach was employed to analyse the data. The coding process started with the first author reading through each transcript and assigning codes according to the TTF-derived constructs as discussed in Section 2.2. New codes were also created to represent emerging themes that were found to be common among the research participants. This coding was refereed by the second and third authors. Discussions took place where the authors were able to challenge or confirm any questions or issues as they arose. These discussions during the data analysis process improved the consistency and reliability of the coding, and as a result, improve the validity of the findings presented below.

## 4 Results and Discussion

This section presents the results of the data collection and analysis addressing the two research objectives: to investigate 1) the ways in which managers use tablet devices for decision-making; and 2) why they do so.

### 4.1 Managerial Use of Tablets for Decision-Making at Work

The participants exhibited different degrees of tablets usage to support their decision-making. The majority spent less than half an hour per day on average doing so. Only three participants spent more

than one hour per day using tablets to support their decision-making at work. While tablets were used by the participants for various tasks, on average approximately 80% of the time managers spent using tablets for work was for decision support. As Participant 12 said, “*most of my work is dealing with these kinds of activities (decision activities)*”. To illustrate how the managers used tablets to support decision-making at work, we discuss four themes in this section based on the collected data: location, tablet applications, decision activities, and decision types.

#### 4.1.1 Location

The locations where the participants used tablets for decision support included meeting rooms, at home, while commuting, offices, public places such as cafes, and hotel rooms. Meeting rooms and home were the most common locations. For meetings a tablet was considered to be a more professional work device than a mobile phone (Participant 2), and less obtrusive than a laptop (Participant 10). The most common activities supported by tablets in meetings were reading the agenda and looking up information. Participant 17 found the tablet “*indispensable for finding information and reading*”, indicating its usefulness in meetings. A number of participants said taking a tablet to meetings was a normal phenomenon within the organisation. Participants 13 and 17 said that everyone in meetings had a tablet. Tablets were also used at home by managers, most commonly in bed. Participant 11 noted, “*(when I) wake up, I wonder what I need to do today, so I might pick it up and look at email*”.

Evidence suggests that tablets are mostly used when managers were away from their primary work location (only 4 participants out of 17 noted they use a tablet in their office). In addition, the decisions supported with a tablet tended to involve a high degree of mobility. Most managers mentioned when they are able to access their desktop or laptop computers at their primary work location, they tended to use those rather than their tablet. Network connectivity, in particular, the SIM card function, was believed to be an important aspect which assists managers to access information while away from their primary work location. As Participant 17 said, “*if I go somewhere on weekends, if (clients) want me to check something, I can do it with SIM card.*”

#### 4.1.2 Tablet Applications

Participants used various applications on their tablets to support their decision-making. A summarised list of application types is shown in Table 2, with application types grouped into higher-level categories and the number of participants who mentioned using that application type.

Category	Application	Participants (N=17)
Web-based Applications	Web Browsers	17
Communication-Driven Applications	Email Applications	15
	Video Chat Applications	1
Document-Driven Applications	Document Writers	7
	Document Readers	7
	Cloud Solutions	2
Self-Organisation Applications	Calendars	6
	Task Management Applications	2
Analytical Support Applications	Spreadsheets	3
	Remote Access for Business Intelligence	1
Other Decision-Support Applications	Presentation Applications	1
	Graphical Modelling Applications	1
	Social Network Applications	1

*Table 2. Summary of Tablet Application Types for Decision-Making*

The three most common types of tablet applications used by managers to support decision making at work were web-based, communication-driven, and document-driven applications.

Although there is a wide range of applications available on tablets, only several managers used more than five types to support decision-making. Most participants used the default applications shipped by the tablet manufacturer such as built-in web browsers, email applications, and note-taking tools. As Participant 7 says, *“I don’t ask for anything fancy, I am not very technical, so I don’t try too much with it, just use what is there, I don’t have many applications”*. The default applications seem to be adequate for supporting decision activities. Participant 17 said *“some of the applications are already there, the most useful ones are already there, the main applications.”*

A closer examination of the relationship between the managerial levels and the number of tablet applications for decision support reveals that senior managers used many more tablet applications for decision support than middle managers, who in turn used slightly more than operations managers.

A number of managers highlighted the capability of cloud-based applications to support decision-making. Managers were able to access, share, and store content through cloud-enabled applications, keeping the same set of files among multiple devices. Managers used desktops, laptops, smartphones and tablets as a ‘managerial technology portfolio.’ Cloud-based solutions helped synchronise files within that portfolio consistently. Participant 15 said one of the important features of his tablet *“is saving documents to the cloud, it is safe, I can print, that is really nice, that is a really nice feature of Pages, I can really go to parks, work, no need to bring USB keys, laptops... that is really nice.”* Participant 10 mentioned his tablet has *“perfect integration with desktop environment, actually on two levels, I have my stuff integrated both with the desktop environment as well as with my mobile phone, which ensures I can access all my information at any time, and that is the most important thing.”*

#### 4.1.3 Decision Activities

Mintzberg et al. (1976) define a decision as a commitment to action and the decision making process as a set of actions and dynamic factors that begins with the identification of a stimulus for action and ends with a specific commitment to action. Using their phase-model of decision-making, the decision tasks performed by the participants on tablets were classified into four different activities: problem/opportunity identification, information gathering, solution/decision development, and solution/decision selection.

All 17 participants indicated that they used their tablet to look for more information to understand a problem or opportunity. The web browser was used in 10 out of 15 examples to support information gathering. Other applications either accompanied the web browser or were used alone such as spreadsheets, business intelligence applications, document readers, cloud storage, and email.

Approximately two-thirds of the participants had used their tablet to identify a problem/opportunity, or to develop a solution to a problem. Of the examples that involve problem/opportunity identification, 9 out of 12 began with email or email accompanying video chat. The others began with reading meeting agendas, viewing data in a spreadsheet, and viewing a web page, respectively. In supporting the development of a solution or decision, tablet applications were split fairly evenly, with four examples mentioning email, three web browsers, two document readers, one cloud storage, and one spreadsheet.

Only around half of the participants mentioned they used their tablet to select a solution or make a final commitment to a course of action. Email was used in five examples to support the selection of a solution or choice. For instance, Participant 8 said, *“in a meeting ... I would find some [information] ... in email correspondence with other staff that would possibly be a way of solving an issue that I had discovered [during the meeting], and I would use that information to make a decision.”*

A common pattern was found among the responses. Managers all mentioned they used a kind of application to support a particular decision activity. For example, Participant 1 said, *“email received from (client), want to inquiry about something... I have to search for information by using Safari, the Web browser on iPad... I have to use... emails... to recall myself of how I solved the previous similar problem...”*

#### 4.1.4 Decision Types

To understand the types of decisions the participants were making using tablets, two classic decision typologies from Anthony (1965) and Simon (1960) were adopted. Participants were asked to estimate the percentage of decisions they made that were of each type in the two typologies. According to Anthony’s (1965) strategic, tactical/managerial, operational typology, participants estimated 66.47% were operational decisions, 20.29% were tactical decisions, and 13.24% were strategic decisions. Of the 17 participants, 16 participants used their tablets for operational decisions, 13 for tactical, and 9 for

strategic. On the other hand, using Simon's (1960) structured, semi-structured, and unstructured typology, 48.12% of tablet-supported decisions were structured, 33.41% were semi-structured, and 18.41% unstructured. Of the 17 participants, all of them used their tablets for structured and semi-structured decisions, while 13 used tablets for unstructured decisions. This finding contrasts with Er's (1988) characterisation of traditional PC-based DSS users. Where traditional DSS users apply the system to support less-structured and under-specified problems, tablet users tend to use applications to support more structured and clearly specified problems.

After organising the managers based on managerial level, we calculated and summarised the mean of the percentage of each decision type. Figure 1 below shows the result of this analysis. The decision types made by senior managers on their tablets split evenly from strategic to operational while operations managers and middle managers made more operational decisions than the other two types of decisions. Senior managers show a similarly even distribution of structured, unstructured, and semi-structured decisions, while operations managers make many more structured decisions and middle managers slightly more, than the other two types of decisions.




Figure 1. Mean of Percentages of Anthony's (1965) (Left) and Simon's (1960) (Right) Decision Types Sorted by Managerial Level

The figures above indicate that operations managers make more operational and structured decisions on tablets than the other two types of managers while senior managers tend to make more strategic and unstructured decisions on tablets than the other two types of managers. This is consistent with the characterisations of these types of managers by both Anthony (1965) and Simon (1960). However, in the case of all manager types, tablet-based decision support was dominated by use for operational / structured decisions. It is unclear whether this dominance is reflective of a genuine need for support for this mix of decision tasks, or whether usage for more strategic/unstructured decision tasks is hampered by a lack of suitable tablet-based decision support applications.

## 4.2 Reasons for Using Tablets for Decision-Making

All participants claimed that they were not required to use tablets for decision-making as part of their work routine. The most common keyword managers mentioned in relation to the reasons for using tablets for decision making were 'portability' (mentioned by 12 participants), followed by 'convenience' (6 participants), and 'ease of use' (5 participants). To address the research objectives, we have summarised and grouped these concepts into two categories: tablet characteristics and decision task characteristics.

### 4.2.1 Reasons for Use: Tablet Characteristics

The characteristics of a technology and the consequent affordances offered to users are key drivers of its adoption. A number of tablet characteristics were identified during the study that contributed to their use for decision support. These characteristics include portability, usability, network connectivity, and customisability.

Portability is the most evident inherited tablet characteristic from other mobile devices (Kristoffersen and Ljungberg 1999; Liang et al. 2007). A number of participants explicitly and implicitly mentioned the size and weight of tablets. Compared to laptops, tablets are “*smaller, lighter, more portable*” (Participant 6) than a laptop and desktop. Participant 8 said, “*the only reason that I use my iPad instead of my laptop is that I can take it with me*”. In addition, both participants (6 and 12) whose current tablets were *iPad Minis*, the smallest Apple tablet, cited the size of the tablet as one of the most important reasons they used it to support decision making. Participant 12 said, “*I like to take a small tablet to a meeting, rather than taking a big laptop... I like the size of iPad Mini, this is why I use it more*”. Compared to mobile phones, tablets are larger, providing more space for users to interact. Participant 17 mentioned “*how I started using tablet is because I read things on iPhone initially, but the screen size was not big enough, so I bought an iPad*”. This is in line with the argument raised by Ozok et al. (2008) that tablets gained popularity by taking the mobility of laptop PCs one step further and providing a larger screen than smartphones.

McClard and Somers (2000) proposed that applications on tablets should contain features perceived as useful, and comfortable to use. The screen size should be large enough to be usable. Evidence supporting each of these features can be found in the participants’ responses. Usability (ease of use and usefulness) is one of the tablet’s most cited characteristics. Although a number of participants equated usability with portability, others referred to usability in terms of particular tablet applications, screen size and resolution, and user interface. Participant 17 used their tablet for “*a lot of reading*” and they noted that “*the design is very easy to use*” in terms of reading documents. Participant 10, who uses a graphical modelling tool for decision making, said, “*I draw a lot of diagrams, it is extremely simple to draw on tablet*”. The screen size on a smartphone is too small to effectively read a document (mentioned by Participant 17). However, in landscape orientation, a tablet screen is about as wide as a piece of paper and some participants said that it was suitable. The screen size is also better suited to writing than a smartphone’s. Although there were mixed impressions of a tablet’s on-screen keyboard, some managers who compared it to their smartphones were more satisfied with typing on a tablet than on a smartphone. Others mentioned the tablet’s resolution, which is about the same screen resolution as a laptop’s, even on a small *iPad Mini*. Participant 3 noted “*the resolution is good, very clear*”. Also, the user interface was one aspect the managers found easy to use. In particular, the ability to scroll through documents displayed on the screen using the touch interface provided managers with a good user experience, similar to the experience of physically touching a piece of paper. It also offered the ability to navigate by finger gestures such as zoom in, zoom out, and screen switching, without relying on a physical input device such as a keyboard or a mouse. Participant 14 described using their tablet as “*easy to navigate.*”

All of the participants regarded network connectivity as an important tablet characteristic for decision support. Although only Participant 8 explicitly mentioned network connectivity as one of her reasons for using a tablet to support decision-making, the concept is present in a number of participants’ answers to other questions. As discussed in Section 4.1.2, the top two categories of tablet applications used by almost all managers who use tablets to support decision making are web-based and communication-driven applications. Both of these application types require good network connectivity. Different forms of network connectivity enable users to access the Internet in different ways. Wi-Fi is the most common. Most participants explicitly mentioned that they have access to Wi-Fi in their workplace and home. A SIM card allows user to access the Internet through a mobile network such as the third/fourth-generation mobile network (3G/4G). However, only six participants made use of the SIM function on their tablet. However, all of the senior managers’ tablets had SIM card functionality. Participant 17 said, “*if I go somewhere on weekends, if (clients) want me to check something, I can do it with SIM card*”. Tethering to a smartphone or mobile hotspot device is another way of accessing Internet when there is no Wi-Fi connection. Participant 14 said, “*if I am somewhere where I do need connection, I use my 3G smartphone. Then I can hotspot to here (tablet).*”

Although in general the participants agreed that adaptation of the tablet applications to their own needs and use situation is a desirable feature, their perceptions on the importance of such customisation capability of tablet applications is mixed. Only Participant 8 mentioned it as a reason for using the tablet for decision-making. One explanation for this could be that for the majority of participants, the use of tablets to support decision-making was voluntary. In such a context a user is likely to have more freedom to customise the tablet and its applications than in a mandatory context. Therefore, it might be natural for them to think they can choose the applications they need to support their decision-making activities because the “*ownership, (of the tablet) is mine*” (Participant 15).

Beyond the tablet’s size and lightness, its overall physical design also affects its adoption. Many agree with Participant 6, who said “*it is more personal than a laptop*”. This theme became evident when



participants talked about their work in meetings. In a meeting where a laptop was being used, other meeting attendees might feel the person was disconnected from the conversation. A tablet is also easier to carry, hold, and keep out of the way: as Participant 10 said, *"I hate taking a laptop with me to meetings, it sits between you and someone else, and that is obtrusive"*. Participant 2 said, *"I would use a tablet in meetings because it would make people think of that I am listening."*

#### 4.2.2 Reasons for Use: Decision Task Characteristics

Apart from the characteristics of the tablet itself, the nature of the decision task also affects the use of the device to support decision-making. Participants bring up task mobility, time criticality, and complexity.

Decision task mobility was the most mentioned characteristic. Gebauer et al. (2010) define mobility as the "extent to which a mobile IS is used at different geographic locations and while the user is in motion" (p. 261). A number of participants emphasised the need to access the tablet while away from their primary work locations. Participant 10 said, *"complex decision-making does not have a particular place or time, it's an ongoing process in your brain, and I need to be able to whip out my whole computation infrastructure at any moment at any place"*. Participant 16 said, *"I use a tablet because it means that it is easier to get information on the spot, so it brings the information to the location which the decision is being made"*. Participant 13 said, *"it is a good way of having a lot of document together, in one place, easy for me to carry around, mobility is the important thing, 'cause I just never know where I am going to use the data, 'cause in meetings, you would go to different locations."*

In terms of time criticality and task complexity, Participant 12 said, *"If I provided a quick answer or solution to something, or one that is not too difficult, that I can easily access resources and answer it, then that is the kind of thing that I would do with tablet. If something needs a bit more consideration, then I probably, would prefer to be... better a desktop, have different things open at once, things like that."* Similarly, Participant 16 mentioned the immediacy of accessing information on a tablet as one of her reasons for making tablet-supported decisions, indicating her decisions had high "immediacy". In short, the reason why some managers used a tablet for decision-making was that the decision task was relatively simple and there was a need to deal with the task quickly.

## 5 Conclusion

Managers are reported to be very mobile (Kim 2008; Yuan et al. 2010) and a large proportion of their work is dealing with decisions (Simon 1960). A tablet, which improves on the portability of laptop computers (Ozok et al. 2008) and possesses greater computing power than a smartphone, is believed to be useful in helping managers make decisions while away from their primary work location. Although many managers currently use tablets for their work, its role in support of decision-making remains unknown. Little research has been conducted in this area. This study examined how and why managers use tablets for their decision-making at work.

Based on face-to-face interviews with 17 managers from a business unit in a large government authority, about 80% of managers' work use of tablets dealt with decision activities. The most common locations where managers did so were meeting rooms and at home. None of these locations are their primary work locations. Web-based, communication-driven, and document-driven applications were the most common applications in supporting decision-making. All 17 participants used their tablets for information-gathering during decision making. Managers tended to use communication driven applications to support problem/opportunity identification and solution/decision selection, and used web-based applications to support information gathering. Senior managers used more applications than middle and operational managers. Structured and operational decisions were the most common types of decisions made by managers on their tablet. Also, the results further confirmed that the decision types were in line with the levels of managers, that is, on a tablet, operational managers tended to make more structured and operational decisions while senior managers made more unstructured and strategic decisions. Middle level managers were in between. In addition, four tablet characteristics (portability, usability, network connectivity, and customisability) and three decision task characteristics (mobility, complexity, and time criticality) were found to affect managers' decision to use a tablet to support their decision making.

This research addresses a gap in the area of tablet research, and contributes to the research field of mobile decision support. Tablets are still a relatively new type of mobile technology, and the technology has distinct characteristics from other mobile devices (Kautzner et al. 2015). This study provides a deeper understanding of the use behaviour of this mobile technology and the reasons

behind it. In addition, this study focuses on managers, who are fundamentally different from other employees in organisations. The majority of prior studies on mobile decision support focus on students, general household users, operational workers, and professionals like medical practitioners (Gao 2013). Investigating real managers offers potential value as they represent a group of users who are organisationally powerful and can influence technology adoption and use. Therefore, by focusing on tablets and managers, and investigating decision making which is an important task, this study fills two research gaps in the literature for mobile technology use.

As an exploratory study, this research has laid some of the groundwork for further investigation of tablet-based decision support and business intelligence. In particular, future research should investigate the construct of fit from TTF, looking at the alignment of mobile devices with the type of manager and decision tasks they are engaging in and how this impacts the nature of the decision support technology managers use. Of note is the fact that few managers used formal business intelligence applications on their tablets, preferring instead a more ad hoc approach, using standard communication and information management applications like email, pdf readers and the like. This may be due to a lack of fit between mobile business intelligence applications and the decision tasks of managers, or other organisational issues that inhibit access to these applications. Investigating this issue can inform mobile business intelligence vendors and application developers as to the kinds of affordances that they should focus on in developing their products. This is an area for future research.

A limitation of the study is that only 17 managers were interviewed, all from one business unit of one organisation. The results are therefore suggestive only. That being said, as an exploratory qualitative study that emphasised depth rather than breadth, the number of participants exceeds that recommended by Neuman (2011). Another limitation of this study is the concentration of one specific tablet platform with 16 of the 17 participants using an *iPad* or *iPad Mini*.

## 6 References

- Anthony, R. N. 1965. *Planning and Control Systems: A Framework for Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Barriball, K. L., and While, A. E. 1994. "Collecting Data Using a Semi-Structured Interview: A Discussion Paper," *Journal of Advanced Nursing* (19:2), pp. 328-335.
- Buchana, Y., and Naicker, V. 2014. "The Effect of Mobile Bi on Organisational Managerial Decision-Making," *The Journal of Applied Business Research* (30:4), pp. 1003-1018.
- Cil, I., Alpturk, O., and Yazgan, H. R. 2005. "A New Collaborative System Framework Based on a Multiple Perspective Approach: Inteliteam," *Decision Support Systems* (39:4), pp. 619-641.
- Dishaw, M. T., and Strong, D. M. 1999. "Extending the Technology Acceptance Model with Task-Technology Fit Constructs," *Information & Management* (36:1), pp. 9-21.
- Er, M. C. 1988. "Decision Support Systems: A Summary, Problems, and Future Trends," *Decision Support Systems* (4:3), pp. 355-363.
- Gao, S. 2013. "Mobile Decision Support Systems Research: A Literature Analysis," *Journal of Decision Systems* (22:1), pp. 10-27.
- Gebauer, J., and Shaw, M. J. 2004. "Success Factors and Impacts of Mobile Business Applications: A Discussion Paper," *International Journal of Electronic Commerce* (8:3), pp. 19-41.
- Gebauer, J., Shaw, M. J., and Gribbins, M. L. 2010. "Task-Technology Fit for Mobile Information Applications: Results from a Mobile E\_Procurement Study," *International Journal of Electronic Commerce* (8:3), pp. 19-41.
- Goodhue, D. L. 1995. "Understanding User Evaluations of Information Systems," *Management Science* (41:12), pp. 1827-1844.
- Goodhue, D. L., and Thompson, R. L. 1995. "Task-Technology Fit and Individual Performance," *MIS Quarterly* (19:2), pp. 213-236.
- IDC. 2015. "Worldwide Tablet Market Continues to Decline; Vendor Landscape Is Evolving, According to IDC" Retrieved 26th November, 2015, from <http://www.idc.com/getdoc.jsp?containerId=prUS25811115>
- Jarapathirun, S., and Zahedi, F. 2007. "Exploring the Influence of Perceptual Factors in the Success of Web-Based Spatial Dss," *Decision Support Systems* (43:3), pp. 933-951.

- Kautzner, E., Gao, S., Yeoh, W., and Wong, S. F. 2015. "An Exploratory Study on the Factors Influencing Managers' Use of Mobile Tablets," in: *Pacific Asia Conference on Information Systems (PACIS) 2015*. Singapore.
- Kim, S. H. 2008. "Moderating Effects of Job Relevance and Experience on Mobile Wireless Technology Acceptance: Adoption of a Smartphone by Individuals," *Information & Management* (45:6), pp. 387-393.
- Kristoffersen, S., and Ljungberg, F. 1999. "Mobile Use of It," in: *22nd Information Systems Research Seminar in Scandinavia*. Keuruu, Finland.
- Lee, C. C., Cheng, H. K., and Cheng, H. H. 2007. "An Empirical Study of Mobile Commerce in Insurance Industry: Task-Technology Fit and Individual Differences," *Decision Support Systems* (43:1), pp. 95-110.
- Liang, T. P., Huang, C. W., Yeh, Y. H., and Lin, B. 2007. "Adoption of Mobile Technology in Business: A Fit-Viability Model," *Industrial Management & Data Systems* (107:8), pp. 1154-1169.
- Mayer, J. H., Winter, R., Stock, D., and Scholl-Steinepreis, N. 2014. "Management Support Systems on Different Devices - a Business Perspective Accommodating Managers' Growing Range of Use Situations," in: *47th Hawaii International Conference on System Science*.
- McClard, A., and Somers, P. 2000. "Unleashed: Web Tablet Integration into the Home," in: *SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. New York, USA.
- Mintzberg, H. 1973. *The Nature of Managerial Work*. Englewood Cliffs, USA: Prentice-Hall.
- Mintzberg, H., Raisinghani, D., and Theoret, A. 1976. "The Structure of 'Unstructured' Decision Processes," *Administrative Science Quarterly* (21:2), pp. 246-275.
- Neuman, W. L. 2011. *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches*, (7th ed.). Boston, USA: Pearson/Allyn and Bacon.
- O'Donnell, P., Sipsma, S., and Watt, C. 2012. "The "Hot" Issues in Business Intelligence: The View of Practitioners," in: *IFIP Working Group 8.3 International Conference on Decision Support Systems: Fusing Decision Support Systems into the Fabric of the Context*. Anavissos, Greece.
- Ozok, A. A., Benson, D., Chakraborty, J., and Norcio, A. F. 2008. "A Comparative Study between Tablet and Laptop Pcs: User Satisfaction and Preferences," *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction* (24:3), pp. 329-352.
- Parkes, A. 2012. "The Effect of Task-Individual-Technology Fit on User Attitude and Performance: An Experimental Investigation," *Decision Support Systems* (54:2), pp. 997-1009.
- Sacco, A. 2015. "Leading App Stores See Dramatic Increase in Business Apps." Retrieved 26th November, 2015, from <http://www.cio.com/article/2868067/mobile-apps/leading-app-stores-see-dramatic-increase-in-business-apps.html>
- Simon, H. A. 1960. *The New Science of Management Decision*. New York, USA: Harper.
- Tona, O., and Carlsson, S. A. 2014. "The Impact of the Organizing Vision on Mobile Bi Adoption," in: *2014 IFIP Working Group 8.3 International Conference on Decision Support Systems: DSS 2.0*. Paris.
- Verkooij, K., and Spruit, M. 2013. "Mobile Business Intelligence: Key Considerations for Implementations Projects," *Journal of Computer Information Systems* (54:1), pp. 23-33.
- Willis, D. A. 2011. "Ipad and Beyond: The Media Tablet in Business." Retrieved 20th November, 2015, from <https://www.gartner.com/doc/1589917/ipad-media-tablet-business>
- Yuan, Y., Archer, N., Connelly, C. E., and Zheng, W. 2010. "Identifying the Ideal Fit between Mobile Work and Mobile Work Support," *Information & Management* (47:3), pp. 125-137.
- Zickuhr, K., and Rainie, L. 2014. "Tablet and E-Reader Ownership." Retrieved 26th November, 2015, from <http://www.pewinternet.org/2014/01/16/tablet-and-e-reader-ownership/>

## Copyright

**Copyright:** © 2016 Meng Xiao, Rob Meredith & Shijia Gao. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 3.0 Australia License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/australia/), which permits non-commercial use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and ACIS are credited.