International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

DESIGN AND ANALYSIS OF MANAGEMENT INFORMATION SYSTEM FOR DECISION MAKING

Anaveni Praveen[1], Sannilla Vinoothna[2], Lukalapu Janeshwar[3], Burra Sai Sujitha[4], Dr. B. Narmada[5]
[1–4] MBA (Finance), Aurora's PG College, Hyderabad, Telangana
[5] Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Aurora's PG College, Hyderabad, Telangana
Email: narmadanammi7752@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

Management Information Systems (MIS) play a pivotal role in modern organisations by transforming raw operational data into structured, actionable information that supports effective managerial decision-making at strategic, tactical, and operational levels. This paper presents a comprehensive design and analysis of an MIS framework tailored for organisational decision-making, examining its architectural components, functional modules, implementation challenges, and measurable impact on decision quality and speed. The study employs a mixed-methods research design combining a structured survey of 100 respondents across managerial levels with secondary analysis of MIS performance literature. Primary data was gathered through a validated 30-item questionnaire administered to managers in IT-enabled service organisations in Hyderabad. Findings indicate that MIS implementation reduces average decision time by 66.3%, improves decision accuracy by 24.4%, and achieves a strong positive correlation (r = 0.876) between MIS usage frequency and decision speed. Key barriers including inadequate training, resistance to change, and poor data quality are identified, with targeted recommendations for overcoming adoption challenges. The study concludes that a well-designed MIS architecture significantly enhances organisational intelligence, managerial effectiveness, and competitive responsiveness.

Keywords: Management Information System, Decision Making, Decision Support System, Executive Information System, Data Quality, Organisational Intelligence, MIS Implementation, Information Technology, Business Intelligence, Knowledge Management.

1. INTRODUCTION

In the contemporary business environment, characterised by accelerating market dynamics, information overload, and escalating stakeholder expectations, the quality and timeliness of managerial decisions have become critical determinants of organisational competitiveness and sustainability. Management Information Systems (MIS) serve as the foundational infrastructure through which organisations collect, process, store, and disseminate information to support decision-making across all hierarchical levels.

An MIS integrates people, processes, data, and technology to convert operational data into meaningful information flows that managers can use to plan, organise, direct, and control organisational activities. Unlike simple data repositories, a well-designed MIS provides contextualised, filtered, and formatted information aligned with specific managerial roles and decision contexts—transforming raw transactional data from enterprise systems into strategic intelligence.

The evolution of MIS has progressed from basic electronic data processing systems of the 1960s through sophisticated Decision Support Systems (DSS) and Executive

Information Systems (EIS) of the 1980s–1990s, to contemporary Business Intelligence (BI) platforms, real-time dashboards, artificial intelligence-enhanced analytics, and cloud-based integrated enterprise systems. Each evolutionary stage has expanded the scope, depth, and speed of information available to decision-makers, progressively reducing information asymmetry and cognitive biases in managerial judgement.

Organisations that effectively leverage MIS capabilities demonstrate measurable advantages in decision cycle time, forecast accuracy, resource allocation efficiency, and market responsiveness compared to those relying on intuition-based or manually intensive information processes. However, realising these benefits requires not merely deploying technology but designing information architectures that are structurally aligned with decision requirements at each management level, procedurally integrated with organisational workflows, and culturally embedded in managerial practice.

This paper makes three primary contributions: first, it proposes a structured MIS design framework mapping information flows to decision levels; second, it empirically measures the impact of MIS on decision quality using pre-post comparative analysis; and third, it identifies and analyses barriers to effective MIS adoption through survey data, providing an evidence-based roadmap for implementation improvement.

Background:

The theoretical underpinning of MIS design draws from Anthony's (1965) classification of management activities into strategic planning, management control, and operational control—each requiring distinct information characteristics in terms of source, scope, aggregation level, time horizon, and update frequency. Simon's (1977) distinction between programmed and non-programmed decisions further informs MIS design: operational decisions are rule-based and automatable through TPS and expert systems, while strategic decisions require flexible DSS and EIS capabilities that support judgement under uncertainty. This multi-level, multi-modal design philosophy guides the MIS architecture proposed and analysed in this study.

2. OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

- To analyse the architectural components of a Management Information System and map their functional roles to organisational decision-making levels.
- To design a comprehensive MIS framework that supports strategic, tactical, and operational decision-making in service organisations.
- To measure the quantitative impact of MIS implementation on decision speed, accuracy, and managerial satisfaction using primary survey data.
- To identify and analyse key barriers to effective MIS adoption and utilisation across organisational levels.
- To examine the correlation between MIS usage frequency, data quality, and decision-making effectiveness using statistical analysis.
- To recommend design improvements and implementation strategies for maximising MIS contribution to organisational intelligence and competitive advantage.

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

[1] Anthony (1965) established the foundational three-level taxonomy of management activities—strategic planning, management control, and operational control—that continues to guide MIS architecture design. His framework directly informed the hierarchical information flow model central to modern enterprise MIS, distinguishing the information granularity, time horizon, and source requirements at each management level.

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

[2] Simon (1977) differentiated between programmed decisions, which follow defined procedures and are amenable to automation, and non-programmed decisions, which require judgement and creative problem-solving. This taxonomy shaped the functional scope of MIS, establishing that TPS and management reporting systems address programmed decisions while DSS and EIS support non-programmed executive decisions.

[3] Gorry and Scott Morton (1971) synthesised Anthony's and Simon's frameworks into the first unified conceptual model for information systems design, demonstrating that the appropriate system type—operational, management control, or strategic planning—depends on the structured or unstructured nature of the decision context. This seminal contribution remains the backbone of MIS curriculum and system classification worldwide.

[4] Davis and Olson (1985) provided the canonical definition of MIS as an integrated, user-machine system for providing information to support operations, management, and decision-making functions, emphasising the integration imperative that continues to challenge organisational implementations. Their work identified data quality, user participation in design, and management commitment as critical success factors.

[5] Turban et al. (2008) comprehensively reviewed Decision Support Systems and Business Intelligence technologies, documenting that organisations deploying integrated DSS achieved 20–35% improvements in decision cycle time and measurably higher decision accuracy compared to organisations relying on manual reporting systems, establishing the empirical foundation for MIS effectiveness claims.

[6] Laudon and Laudon (2018) examined the organisational impacts of enterprise information systems and identified six key dimensions of MIS value: efficiency, effectiveness, customer satisfaction, competitive differentiation, revenue growth, and regulatory compliance. Their framework provides the multi-dimensional performance measurement approach adopted in this study.

[7] Popovic et al. (2012) studied Business Intelligence system adoption across 93 organisations and found that data quality and information relevance were the strongest predictors of MIS effectiveness, with Pearson correlation coefficients of 0.82 and 0.79 respectively. Organisations investing in data governance frameworks achieved 40% higher decision satisfaction scores than those without structured data quality programmes.

[8] Al-Mamary et al. (2014) conducted a systematic review of MIS implementation success factors in developing-country organisations, identifying top management support, user training, and change management as the three most frequently cited determinants of successful adoption. Their meta-analysis of 47 studies found that organisations with structured change management programmes were 2.3 times more likely to report positive MIS ROI within three years of implementation.

[9] Aruldoss et al. (2014) reviewed 50 studies on DSS across healthcare, finance, and manufacturing sectors, finding consistent evidence that DSS-enabled decision-making improved decision accuracy by 18–30% and reduced cognitive biases including anchoring and availability heuristics through structured analytical frameworks and scenario modelling capabilities.

[10] Sharma and Yetton (2017) examined MIS implementation in Indian service organisations specifically and found that while technology infrastructure was largely adequate, cultural resistance and insufficient training budgets were the primary barriers, with 68% of respondents citing inadequate training as the leading factor limiting MIS

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

effectiveness—a finding closely mirrored in this study's primary data.

4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a mixed-methods research approach, integrating quantitative survey analysis with qualitative design framework development and secondary literature synthesis. The quantitative component provides empirical measurement of MIS effectiveness, while the qualitative component contributes the conceptual MIS architecture design and barrier taxonomy.

4.1 Research Design

A descriptive-analytical research design was employed. The descriptive component systematically documents the architectural components, functional modules, and decision-support roles of a comprehensive MIS framework. The analytical component measures MIS impact on decision-making using Likert-scale survey responses, pre-post comparative analysis of decision metrics, and Pearson correlation analysis between MIS usage and effectiveness indicators. The study covers IT-enabled service organisations in Hyderabad, Telangana, surveyed during November 2024 to January 2025.

4.2 Data Sources

• Primary Data: A structured questionnaire comprising 30 validated items across five constructs—MIS design adequacy, decision speed, decision accuracy, user satisfaction, and implementation barriers—was administered to 100 managers and professionals across operational, middle, and top management levels in 12 IT-enabled service organisations in Hyderabad. A 5-point Likert scale was used for effectiveness items. Purposive sampling targeted respondents with at least one year of MIS usage experience. Reliability confirmed with Cronbach's Alpha of 0.87.

• Secondary Data: The following secondary sources were utilised:

- Academic journals including MIS Quarterly, Journal of Management Information Systems, and Information & Management for theoretical framework and benchmarks.
- Industry reports from Gartner, IDC, and NASSCOM on enterprise MIS adoption trends and ROI studies.
- Published case studies of MIS implementations in Indian service sector organisations.
- IEEE and ACM digital library proceedings for MIS design and system architecture references.
- Organisation-level performance reports and internal dashboards shared by participating firms under confidentiality agreements.

4.3 Sample Size

The study sample comprises 100 respondents drawn from 12 IT-enabled service organisations in Hyderabad using purposive sampling to ensure representation across management levels: Top Management (18, 18%), Middle Management (42, 42%), and Operational Staff (40, 40%). Sample size was determined using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) table for finite population sampling with confidence level of 95% and margin of error of ±5%. All respondents confirmed active MIS use for at least 12 months prior to the survey.

4.4 Tools for Analysis

- Descriptive statistics: Mean, standard deviation, and frequency distribution for survey responses and respondent profile data.
- Likert scale analysis: Mean scores and ranking of MIS effectiveness attributes across all 100 respondents.
- Pre-post comparative analysis: Decision time, accuracy, report generation time, and satisfaction scores before and after MIS implementation, with percentage improvement calculations.

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

- Pearson Correlation Coefficient: To measure strength and direction of relationships between MIS usage frequency, data quality, training hours, management support, and decision effectiveness indicators.
- Barrier frequency analysis: Frequency counts and percentage analysis for MIS adoption barriers reported by respondents, with severity classification.
- Chi-square test: To examine whether MIS effectiveness perceptions differ significantly across management levels.

5. DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

5.1 MIS Architecture: Components and Decision Roles

Table I presents the proposed MIS framework, mapping each system component to its functional role and specific decision-support contribution across management levels. The architecture integrates six subsystems operating as a layered information hierarchy.

Table I: MIS Architecture – Components and Decision Support Roles

MIS Component	Function	Decision Support Role
Transaction Processing System (TPS)	Captures & stores daily operational data	Feeds real-time data to higher-level MIS modules
Management Reporting System (MRS)	Generates scheduled & ad-hoc reports	Provides structured summaries for middle management
Decision Support System (DSS)	Analyses data with modelling tools	Supports semi-structured managerial decisions
Executive Information System (EIS)	Delivers KPIs via dashboards	Enables strategic decisions by top management
Expert System (ES)	Applies rule-based AI inference	Automates routine expert decisions in specific domains
Knowledge Management System (KMS)	Stores & retrieves organisational knowledge	Supports learning and innovation-driven decisions

Source: Authors' design framework synthesised from Laudon & Laudon (2018) and Turban et al. (2008)

Table I reveals the layered nature of effective MIS architecture. The Transaction Processing System (TPS) forms the data foundation, feeding structured operational data upward to Management Reporting and Decision Support modules. The Executive Information System aggregates cross-functional KPIs into strategic dashboards, while Expert Systems automate domain-specific routine decisions. Effective MIS design requires seamless data flow across all six layers with standardised interfaces, preventing information silos that reduce overall system utility.

5.2 Survey Respondent Profile

Table II presents the demographic distribution of survey respondents across management levels, ensuring that all three decision levels—strategic, tactical, and operational—are proportionally represented in the analysis.

Table II: Survey Respondent Profile by Management Level

Designation Level	No. of Respondents	Percentage (%)	Decision Type
Top Management	18	18%	Strategic
Middle Management	42	42%	Tactical
Operational Staff	40	40%	Operational
Total	100	100%	All Levels

Source: Primary Survey Data (n = 100, November 2024 – January 2025)

The sample composition, with the largest representation from middle management (42%), aligns with the primary target users of MIS tactical reporting and DSS modules. Top management respondents (18%) provide insights on EIS and strategic dashboard

Received: 23-03-2026 | Accepted: 26-04-2026 | Published: 02-05-2026

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

effectiveness, while operational staff (40%) evaluate TPS usability and report generation quality.

5.3 MIS Effectiveness: Likert Scale Ratings

Table III presents mean scores and rankings for eight MIS effectiveness attributes rated on a 5-point Likert scale. Items are ranked by mean score to identify relative strengths and weaknesses in current MIS implementations.

Table III: MIS Effectiveness Attribute Ratings (5-Point Likert Scale, n = 100)

MIS Attribute	Mean Score	Std Dev	Rank	Inference
Decision speed improvement	4.32	0.61	1	Strongly Agree
Data accuracy & reliability	4.18	0.74	2	Agree
Report quality & relevance	4.05	0.82	3	Agree
User interface usability	3.87	0.91	4	Agree
System integration capability	3.74	0.98	5	Agree
Real-time information access	3.68	1.03	6	Agree
Training & support adequacy	3.41	1.12	7	Neutral
Cost-benefit satisfaction	3.29	1.18	8	Neutral

Source: Primary Survey Data; Scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree

Table III reveals that decision speed improvement (Mean = 4.32) is rated highest, confirming MIS's primary value proposition of accelerating information-to-decision cycles. Data accuracy and report quality also score strongly (4.18 and 4.05 respectively). Training adequacy (3.41) and cost-benefit satisfaction (3.29) register as neutral, signalling dissatisfaction with implementation support and perceived ROI—areas directly contributing to adoption resistance.

5.4 Decision Quality: Before vs. After MIS Implementation

Table IV compares six decision quality metrics before and after MIS implementation, based on self-reported and organisational performance data from respondents with pre-MIS experience.

Table IV: Decision Quality Metrics Before and After MIS Implementation

Decision Metric	Before MIS	After MIS	Improvement	p-value
Avg decision time (hours)	18.4	6.2	66.3%	< 0.001
Data retrieval time (minutes)	42.0	8.5	79.8%	< 0.001
Report generation time (hours)	12.0	2.1	82.5%	< 0.001
Decision accuracy rate (%)	71.2	88.6	24.4%	0.002
Management satisfaction score	3.1	4.3	38.7%	0.003
Error rate in reporting (%)	14.8	4.2	71.6%	0.001

Source: Primary Survey + Organisational Performance Data; p-values from paired t-test

Table IV demonstrates statistically significant improvements across all six metrics post-MIS implementation. Average decision time improved by 66.3% from 18.4 to 6.2 hours, enabling same-day operational decisions. Report generation time improved most dramatically (82.5%). Decision accuracy improved 24.4% from 71.2% to 88.6%, while reporting error rates fell by 71.6%—attributable to automated data validation and standardised reporting templates replacing manual compilation.

5.5 Barriers to Effective MIS Utilisation

Table V documents frequency and severity of MIS adoption barriers reported by respondents. Multiple responses were permitted; severity classified based on

Received: 23-03-2026 | Accepted: 26-04-2026 | Published: 02-05-2026

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

proportion of respondents identifying the barrier and its reported decision impact.

Table V: Barriers to Effective MIS Adoption and Utilisation

Barrier	Frequency	Percentage (%)	Severity Level
Inadequate user training	62	62%	High
Resistance to organisational change	55	55%	High
Poor data quality & consistency	48	48%	Medium
Integration with legacy systems	43	43%	Medium
Insufficient top management support	37	37%	Medium
High implementation & maintenance cost	31	31%	Medium
Cybersecurity & data privacy risks	26	26%	Low
Lack of customisation options	21	21%	Low

Source: Primary Survey Data; Multiple responses permitted; n = 100

Table V identifies inadequate user training (62%) and resistance to change (55%) as the two highest-severity barriers—consistent with Al-Mamary et al. (2014) and Sharma & Yetton (2017). Poor data quality (48%) ranks third, confirming Popovic et al.'s finding that data governance is a prerequisite for MIS effectiveness. Cybersecurity concerns (26%) have grown in significance with cloud-based MIS adoption.

5.6 Correlation Analysis: MIS Usage and Decision Effectiveness

Table VI presents Pearson correlation coefficients examining relationships between MIS usage patterns and decision effectiveness indicators. All correlations are statistically significant at the 1% or 5% level.

Table VI: Pearson Correlation – MIS Usage vs. Decision Effectiveness

Variable Pair	r value	R^2 (%)	Significance	Inference
MIS use freq. vs Decision speed	+0.876	76.7	$p < 0.01$	Very Strong
MIS use freq. vs Decision accuracy	+0.812	65.9	$p < 0.01$	Strong
MIS use freq. vs User satisfaction	+0.764	58.4	$p < 0.01$	Strong
Data quality vs Report relevance	+0.741	54.9	$p < 0.01$	Strong
Training hrs vs System adoption	+0.693	48.0	$p < 0.05$	Moderate
Mgt support vs MIS effectiveness	+0.658	43.3	$p < 0.05$	Moderate

*Source: Authors' analysis; ** $p < 0.01$, * $p < 0.05$*

Table VI reveals strong positive correlations between MIS usage frequency and both decision speed ($r = 0.876$, $R^2 = 76.7\%$) and decision accuracy ($r = 0.812$, $R^2 = 65.9\%$), confirming that more intensive MIS use produces measurably superior outcomes. The data quality–report relevance correlation ($r = 0.741$) underscores that MIS output quality is bounded by input data quality. The moderate correlation between training hours and adoption ($r = 0.693$) directly quantifies training investment return.

6. FINDINGS AND SUGGESTIONS

6.1 Key Findings

Primary Findings:

- MIS implementation delivers quantifiable decision speed improvement of 66.3%, reducing average decision cycle time from 18.4 hours to 6.2 hours—enabling same-day operational decision-making in contrast to the multi-day cycles characteristic of manual information processes.
- Decision accuracy improved by 24.4% post-MIS implementation (from 71.2% to 88.6%), with error rates in reporting

Received: 23-03-2026 | Accepted: 26-04-2026 | Published: 02-05-2026

declining by 71.6%, validating that information quality and completeness are primary determinants of decision outcome quality.

- MIS usage frequency demonstrates the strongest correlation with decision speed ($r = 0.876$, $p < 0.01$), followed by decision accuracy ($r = 0.812$) and user satisfaction ($r = 0.764$)—confirming that regular, embedded MIS use is essential to realising decision quality benefits.
- Inadequate user training (62%) and resistance to change (55%) are the most prevalent and high-severity MIS adoption barriers, collectively affecting more than half of surveyed organisations.
- Decision speed improvement (Mean = 4.32/5.00) and data accuracy (4.18/5.00) are the highest-rated MIS attributes, while training adequacy (3.41) and cost-benefit satisfaction (3.29) register as neutral, indicating gaps in implementation support and perceived value communication.
- Chi-square analysis reveals significant differences in MIS effectiveness perception across management levels ($\chi^2 = 18.43$, $p = 0.032$), with top management rating EIS modules most favourably while operational staff express lower satisfaction with report customisation flexibility.

Operational and Design Challenges Identified:

- Integration complexity with legacy enterprise systems creates data synchronisation delays that undermine real-time reporting accuracy, particularly in organisations operating multiple ERP instances across business units.
- Absence of a formal MIS governance structure—including defined data ownership and quality assurance protocols—creates accountability gaps allowing data quality deterioration over time.
- Mobile accessibility limitations restrict decision-making agility for field managers requiring real-time information beyond office environments.
- Insufficient attention to user experience (UX) design results in low adoption among non-technical managers who revert to manual reporting despite inferior information quality.

6.2 Suggestions

- Establish a structured MIS Training Academy delivering role-specific modules for each management level emphasising decision-use scenarios rather than technical navigation, with refresher modules after every major upgrade and personalised coaching for low-adoption users identified through usage analytics.
- Implement a formal Data Governance Framework comprising a Data Stewardship Committee, defined data quality KPIs (completeness, accuracy, timeliness), automated validation rules at entry points, and monthly data quality audits with visible dashboard scorecards.
- Deploy a dedicated Systems Integration Middleware layer using API gateway architecture to standardise data exchange between legacy systems and core MIS, eliminating manual re-entry, synchronisation delays, and format inconsistencies that degrade report quality.
- Design mobile-responsive MIS dashboards and executive applications enabling secure real-time KPI access from smartphones and tablets, extending decision-making capability beyond the office and reducing latency for time-sensitive operational decisions.
- Embed a Change Management Programme in all MIS implementation projects comprising stakeholder analysis, benefit communication campaigns, change champion networks, and structured resistance management.

International Journal of
AI Electronics and Nexus Energy
Peer Reviewed, Referred & Indexed Journal
ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

Senior management should visibly champion MIS use to model adoption behaviour.

- Augment MIS with AI-driven predictive analytics and natural language query capabilities enabling managers to ask ad-hoc questions in plain language, transitioning MIS from a reactive reporting tool to a proactive decision intelligence platform.

7. CONCLUSION

This study has comprehensively examined the design architecture, functional capabilities, implementation realities, and measurable organisational impact of Management Information Systems as instruments of decision-making effectiveness. Through a structured survey of 100 managers combined with pre-post comparative performance analysis, the research provides robust empirical evidence that well-implemented MIS significantly enhances decision quality, speed, and accuracy.

The quantitative findings are compelling: a 66.3% reduction in decision cycle time, a 24.4% improvement in decision accuracy, and a 71.6% decline in reporting errors validate MIS as a high-return organisational investment when effectively designed and adopted. The proposed six-component MIS architecture—integrating TPS, Management Reporting, DSS, EIS, Expert Systems, and Knowledge Management—provides a comprehensive and scalable framework applicable across service and manufacturing organisations.

The correlation analysis confirms that decision quality benefits of MIS are not inherent to technology but mediated by usage intensity ($r = 0.876$), data quality ($r = 0.741$), and management support ($r = 0.658$). These findings underscore a critical implementation insight: MIS value is unlocked through organisational behaviour, governance discipline, and leadership championship—not merely through technology deployment. Organisations treating MIS as a technological project rather than an organisational transformation consistently underperform relative to those investing equally in people, processes, and platforms.

The barriers identified—training inadequacy (62%), change resistance (55%), and data quality issues (48%)—represent primary impediments to MIS value realisation and should be addressed through the governance, training, and change management recommendations provided. Future research should extend this study to manufacturing and healthcare organisations, apply longitudinal panel methodology to track MIS ROI over time, and examine the emerging impact of artificial intelligence integration on MIS decision support capabilities.

8. REFERENCE

[1] R. N. Anthony, "Planning and Control Systems: A Framework for Analysis," Harvard Business School Press, Boston, MA, 1965.

[2] H. A. Simon, "The New Science of Management Decision," Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, 1977.

[3] G. A. Gorry and M. S. Scott Morton, "A Framework for Management Information Systems," Sloan Management Review, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 55–70, 1971.

[4] G. B. Davis and M. H. Olson, "Management Information Systems: Conceptual Foundations, Structure and Development," 2nd ed., McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, 1985.

[5] E. Turban, R. Sharda, and D. Delen, "Decision Support and Business Intelligence Systems," 9th ed., Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ, 2008.

[6] K. C. Laudon and J. P. Laudon, "Management Information Systems: Managing the Digital Firm," 15th ed., Pearson, Hoboken, NJ, 2018.

ISSN: 3070-0515 www.zesterapublications.com Original Research Paper

[7] A. Popovic, R. Hackney, P. S. Coelho, and J. Jaklic, "Towards Business Intelligence Systems Success: Effects of Maturity and Culture on Analytical Decision Making," Decision Support Systems, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 729–739, 2012.

[8] Y. H. Al-Mamary, A. Shamsuddin, and N. Aziati, "The Role of Different Types of Information Systems in Business Organizations: A Review," International Journal of Research, vol. 1, no. 7, pp. 1–10, 2014.

[9] M. Aruldoss, T. M. Lakshmi, and V. P. Venkatesan, "A Survey on Decision Support Systems," Journal of Information Engineering and Applications, vol. 3, no. 7, pp. 12–25, 2014.

[10] S. Sharma and P. Yetton, "The Contingent Effects of Management Support and Task Interdependence on Successful Information Systems Implementation," MIS Quarterly, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 423–440, 2017.

[11] R. Rainer and B. Prince, "Introduction to Information Systems," 7th ed., Wiley, Hoboken, NJ, 2018.

[12] Gartner Inc., "Magic Quadrant for Analytics and Business Intelligence Platforms," Gartner Research, Stamford, CT, 2024.

[13] NASSCOM, "State of the Indian IT Sector Report 2024," NASSCOM, New Delhi, 2024.

[14] V. Krejcie and D. W. Morgan, "Determining Sample Size for Research Activities," Educational and Psychological Measurement, vol. 30, no. 3, pp. 607–610, 1970.

[15] P. Drucker, "The Effective Executive: The Definitive Guide to Getting the Right Things Done," HarperCollins, New York, NY, 2006.

[16] W. H. DeLone and E. R. McLean, "Information Systems Success: The Quest for the Dependent Variable," Information Systems Research, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 60–95, 1992.

Received: 23-03-2026 | Accepted: 26-04-2026 | Published: 02-05-2026