

A REVIEW OF MANAGEMENT STYLES

Noor Syakirah Zakaria¹ and Mohd Khairuddin Hashim¹

¹College of Business
Universiti Utara Malaysia

Email: syakirah1525@gmail.com, khairuddin@uum.edu.my

Abstract-As an area of research, management styles have been receiving much attention over the past decades. Management styles have attracted much interest due to the idea that they can influence organizational performance as well as affect how organizations are sustained. However, at the same time, questions concerning their universality, applicability and relevance have also been raised in the literature. Based on the review of previous studies, this paper attempts to identify not only the different styles of management but also to examine their focus and scope. Information from the review suggests that there are at least five common management styles and that they differ from one another.

1. Introduction

Management as a discipline of study and field of practice has so long attracted the attention of practitioners, consultants and scholars. In addition, the review of the literature indicates that the research emphasis on management styles continue to grow over the years. The theoretical as well as research contributions on management styles resulted from the notion that the styles can influence the effectiveness and efficiency of organizations.

The sustainability and growth of both business and non business organizations depend on how well they are being managed. As far as organizations are concerned, some continue to sustain their success while others appear to be less successful. In most of the cases, the successful organizations are able to perform and sustain their operations due to effective management styles. With regard to the unsuccessful organizations, most often, they fail because of mismanagement.

Over the past decades, various management styles have been introduced and presented in the literature. At the same time, numerous studies have also attempted to investigate the management styles that can help companies to improve their performance as well as sustained their competitive advantage. Many of these studies have mainly concentrated on examining the management styles used by successful as well as excellent companies. These studies have attempted to scrutinize the way these companies are managed in an effort to identify as well as learn the styles of management that make them successful (Meggeneder, 2007; Ogbeide & Harrington, 2011; Uche & Timinepere, 2012)

The review of past research reveals that previous studies have identified several specific styles of management adopted by different organizations. Apart from the identification of the various management styles, these studies have also investigated and promoted the styles that are able to

influence the performance of successful companies. Interestingly, each of these studies further claims to have found a specific management style that can contribute to the growth as well as continued success of companies (Harney & Dundon, 2007; Harvey and Turnbull, 2006; Harney and Dundon, 2006; Champoux and Brun, 2003; Cassell et al., 2002; Matlay, 2002a, 2002b, 1999; Dimmock, 1999; Rainnie, 1989)

Although there is increasing evidence that suggests certain management styles are associated to organizational performance, the style adopted by each successful companies tend to differ from each other. Findings of the reviews of previous studies that investigate the management styles of successful companies uncovered that these companies do not necessary adopt the same styles of management. This discovery has raised reasonable doubts among researchers, practitioners, and scholars as to the existence of only one particular type of management style that is suitable to be adopted by other companies to become successful as well (Capon, Farley, Hulbert, & Lei, 1991; Hiltrop, 1996b; Makridakis, 1996)

Further, in their works, Owen (2009), Rosenzweig (2007) and Rivas-Micoud (2006) reveal that searching for a management style that is going to be relevant and applicable to all organizations is ineffective. In view of the fact that each organization is different, these authors claimed that each effective management style tends to only work for one organization at one particular time. According to these scholars, management styles are not universal and each particular company requires a unique style. Management styles are really about what fit and what work for a particular organization at any one time. Moreover, these authors insisted that management styles adopted by organization will change not only from time to time but also will vary from company to company, from business to business, from industry to industry and even from country to country.

This paper reviews management styles as presented and promoted in the literature and previous studies. By reviewing the management styles, the paper attempts to identify the different styles of management as well as provides insights into their scope and focus. For this purpose, the paper is organized as follows. The following Section Two presents the definitions of management styles. Having presented their definitions, Section Three explains the importance of management styles to organizations. Next, Section Four emphasizes on focus and scope of the different styles of management that have been prescribed in the literature. Accordingly, Section Four offers a short conclusion of the paper.

1.1 Definitions of Management Styles

The literature reveals that earlier studies that examined management styles began in the 1960s and 1970s. Past studies on management styles mainly investigated the styles of management in unionized organizations. These studies found that management of these organizations emphasized on consultation and negotiation styles when dealing with their employees and unions. However, following the decline of the number of the unions in the 1980s, organizations began to search for new forms of management styles to help them maintain the relationships between employees and employers (Bacon, 2008).

With regard to the definition of management style, findings of prior studies indicate that various definitions have been used in previous research. Different authors have defined management styles in many different ways. For instance, in a more recent study, Dundon and Rollinson, (2011) referred to management styles as not only a manager's preferred approach to handling matters concerning employees and employment relations but also the styles reflect the way that the manager exercises his or her authority as well as makes decisions.

In an earlier study conducted in the 1980s, Poole (1986) specifically defined management style as "a coherent approach to the problem of motivating and controlling employees, of handling grievance and conducting relationships with organized labour." Following this definition, another study by Purcell (1987) regarded management style as "a distinctive set of guiding principles, written or otherwise, which set parameters to and signpost for management action in the way employees are treated and particular events handled".

In the 1990s, the study by Syed Abdullah, (1991;6) viewed management styles as specific patterns of managerial practices that involved management's philosophy, core values and the way things are done in organizations. In the same period, Blyton and Turnbull (1994) described management style as "the general control and direction of labour exercised by management on a day to day basis". However, the subsequent study by Khandwalla, (1995;18) considered management styles as the distinctive manner in which various business functions such as goal setting, strategy formulation and implementation, organizing, staffing, control, coordination, leadership, and image building are being performed in organizations.

The review of past research indicates not only the existence of various definitions of management styles but also suggests that there is no one universal accepted definition of management style. However, information gathered from the literature review appears to indicate that the focus and scope of management style involve the ways managers plan, organize, manage, control and handle matters related to their employees and employment in their organizations. Table 1 lists some of the formal definitions of management styles as advocated in the 1980s, 1990s and 2011.

Table 1: Definitions of Management Style

Authors	Definition of management style
Poole (1986)	"A coherent approach to the problem of motivating and controlling employees, of handling grievance and conducting relationships with organized labour"
Purcell (1987)	"A distinctive set of guiding principles, written or otherwise, which set parameters to and signpost for management action in the way employees are treated and particular events handled"
Syed Abdullah (1991)	"particular patterns of managerial practices in industrial relations involving management's philosophy and values which reflected in the way things are done"
Blyton and Turnbull (1994)	"The general control and direction of labour exercised by management on a day to day basis"
Khandwalla, (1995)	"the distinctive way in which various functions such as goal setting, strategy formulation and implementation, organizing, staffing, control, coordination, leadership, image building etc are performed".

Dundon and Rollinson (2011)

“A manager’s preferred approach to handling employment relations matters with employees, which reflects the way that he/she exercises authority”

1.2 Importance of Management Styles to Organizations

Various factors influence management styles. The factors that shaped management styles in organizations involve not only external factors such as the government, labour market, economics, and competition but also internal factors that include; core values, purpose, management philosophies of the owners and founders, managers and business strategies of the organizations. Management styles are considered important because they play a key role in determining how organizations are managed and controlled (Bray, Waring, & Cooper, 2011).

In an earlier study, Dimmock (1999) pointed out that organizations need to adopt effective management style to help them direct their businesses effectively. The management style practiced by owners-managers influenced the direction of their organizations through various organizational competencies. In addition, according to Baptiste (2008), management style that provided strong support, developed trust, promoted employee wellbeing at the workplace are known to increase organizational performance as well.

The more recent study by Trask, Rice, Anchors, and Lilieholm (2009) further indicated that information and knowledge concerning management style used by owner-managers in SMEs are also useful in understanding how decisions are made in their organizations. According to the study, the decisions made in SMEs are influenced by the management style adopted by their managers and that the decisions have implications on the success as well as failure of these firms.

In addition, findings of other more recent studies suggested management style as a contingency factor. For instance, findings of the study by Harney and Dundon, (2007) indicated that management style has moderating effects on human resource outcomes of SMEs, specifically with regard to labour productivity. The other studies by Salmiah (2004) and Thau, Bennett, Mitchell, and Beth (2009) have also used management style as a moderating variable to examine how management style at the workplace influence the magnitude of the relationship between independent variables and dependent variables.

Management style is also being recognized as one of the most important fundamentals of employment relations. As an important foundation of employment relations, management style provides the guideline for managers to deal, manage, motivate and control employees at their workplace. In organizations, management style influenced not only work co-ordination, employee commitment, cooperation among employees, employer as well as their community but also organizational performance (Blyton and Turnbull, 1994; Uche and Timinepere, 2012).

Evidence from past studies also suggests that various decisions in organizations that involved policies and management practices are affected by the management styles adopted by the owners and managers of the organizations. Findings of previous studies have also identified management style as one of the key of determinations of employment relations practices. According to these studies, management style used by owners/ managers reflected directly on employment relations

practices such as recruitment, training and development, compensation, grievance procedures and interpersonal relationship (Fee, Hadlock, and Pierce, 2013; Coetzer et al., 2012; Dundon and Rollinson, 2011; J. T. Jones, 2005; Champoux and Brun, 2003; Matlay, 2002a; Dimmock, 1999; Dundon et al., 1999b; Purcell, 1987).

With regard to the influence of management style on organizational performance, Khandwalla (1995:53) noted that: *“Styles have major impact on the performance of the organization and also on the cost the organization pays for its performance. A study of management styles can reveal ways by which organizations can improve their performance as well as ways by which organizations can decrease the cost of performance”*

Other studies conducted in the area of employment relations have also shown the impact of management style on organizational performance. These studies found that both performance and success of organizations depended on effective management style. According to the findings of these studies, better combination as well as coordination between management style and the other management areas such as operations, finance and marketing, substantially influence organizational effectiveness. It was also reported in the studies that successful companies adopted a distinctive management style to handle their employees and that the style also resulted in better organizational performance (Dimmock, 1999; Quang and Vuong, 2002; Trask et al., 2009).

Having presented and explained the various definitions of management styles and their important role in organizations, the following section examines previous studies on management styles.

2. Previous Studies on Management Styles

Over the years, in realizing the importance of management styles to organizations, numerous attempts have been made to investigate the types of management styles adopted by organizations. The review of the findings of past studies indicate that organizations not only adopt different types of management styles but also the styles of management vary between different organizations due to various external environmental factors as well as internal organizational factors (Dimmock, 1999).

Likert (1967) developed and proposed the Likert's System 4 as one of the earliest work on management style. The Likert's System 4 developed by the author consisted of four specific types of management styles. The four specific management styles include; System 1 (exploitative authoritative style), System 2 (benevolent authoritative style), System 3 (consultative style) and System 4 (participative style).

In another early study, Poole (1986) identified another four types of management styles based on the unitary and pluralist perspectives. The four types of management styles introduced in the study include; authoritarian, paternal, constitutional and participative management styles. According to the study, the unitary framework is represented by the authoritarian and paternal management styles. On the hand, the constitutional and participative management styles are closely associated to the pluralist framework.

Purcell (1987) was able to single out the following two additional management styles; individualism and collectivism management styles. The individualism style focused on the extent to which personnel policies emphasized on the rights and capabilities of individual employees. While, the collectivism style underscored the extent to which management policies are directed toward inhibiting or encouraging the development of collective representation by employees as well as allowing employees to participate in management decision making.

Dundon and Rollinson (2011) claimed that the earlier works on management styles can be traced to the Fox's scheme which emphasized on the unitary and pluralism management styles. With regard to the unitary and pluralism management styles, the study by Syed Abdullah (1991) indicated that the unitary management style postulated one source of authority and stressed on employees' loyalty. In contrast, the pluralism management style considered many separate and competitive interests of stakeholders in the organizations and also featured on the role of management in ensuring harmony at the workplace.

In an analysis of previous studies on employment relations, Blyton and Turnbull (1994) were able to identify five types management styles adopted by organizations. Among the five management styles identified in the study involved; the traditional style, the sophisticated paternalists/human relation style, the consultative (sophisticated modern) style, the constitutional (sophisticated modern) style and the standard modern style.

Khandwalla (1995) proposed two main groups of management styles, namely; the best and worst management styles. The author indicated that the best management style group consists of the following four styles; participative style, altruistic style, professional style and organic style. Meanwhile, the worst management style group includes; the defective intuitive style, the defective conservative style, the defective authoritarian and the defective professional style. In the study, the author further highlighted two fundamental reasons why styles of management vary from one organization to the other. First, each organization differs in term of their characteristics such as types of organization, purpose, size, environment and history. Second, there are many different ways to manage the various managerial functions in organizations. In addition, as a result of their different characteristics and the availability of various ways to manage, organizations have to make a choice in establishing their goals as well as developing their strategies. With regard to this, each organization needs to adopt a distinctive management style that specifically suits its business requirements and environment.

The study by Menkhoff and Kay (2000) attempted to investigate the management styles adopted by small firms in the Southeast Asia region. According to the findings of the study, the small firms in the Southeast Asia countries, especially among the Chinese owned small firms, tend to exercise the benevolent autocratic management style, emphasized on paternalism to ensure employees loyalty and at the same time stressed on centralized decision making.

At the same time, (Matlay, 2002a) investigated the management styles among SMEs in Britain. Findings of the study indicated that the SMEs in Britain adopted five types of management styles. Among the five types of management styles include; the formal style, the informal style, the mixed formal and informal style, the professional style and the external or agency. According

to the study, the SMEs used these five styles to manage as well as control the employees in their organizations.

The subsequent study by Deery and Jago (2001) examined management styles adopted in medium-sized hotels. In the study, the authors focused on four types of management styles. Evidence from the study suggests that the management of the medium-sized hotels used the following management styles; autocratic style, decisive style, consultative style and the democratic management style.

According to Scase (2003), the two common management styles found in small organizations involved the egalitarian style and the autocratic management style. Owners and managers of small firms that followed the egalitarian style or also known as participative management style (Kennedy, 2002), tend to work alongside their employees. This style established the duties and responsibilities of employees based on mutual adjustment, emphasis on commitment, teamwork and profit sharing. On the other hand, the autocratic management style has an inclination to exploit their employees, particularly in SMEs where their employees are unskilled and have no union to represent them. Employers that used this style are more likely to offer low rates of pay, poor working environment and unfavourable terms and conditions of employment.

The study by Ansari, Ahmad, & Aafaqi (2004) suggested a new management style as a future runner for participative management style. The new management style is known as nurturant-task (NT) management style. The emphasis of this style is on the balance between work as well as the relationships between employees and their superiors. This management style was first introduced in the context of organizations in India. According to Jayasingam & Cheng, (2009) and Ansari, Ahmad, & Aafaqi (2004), this management style is also relevant and applicable to firms in Malaysia due to certain similarities in the working environment of organizations in both countries.

In another study, Ahmad (2005) examined the management styles among SMEs in Malaysia. Findings of the study suggest that not only majority of the Malay employees perceived paternalistic management style as important to them but also reveals that the Chinese and Indian employees viewed paternalistic management style as crucial, particularly in terms of fulfilling their needs and protecting their rights.

The subsequent study on SMEs conducted by Edwards, Ram, Gupta, and Tsai (2006) used two types of management styles that include the authoritarian and participative management styles. At the same, however, the study by Edwards et al. (2006) indicated that SMEs may not necessary adopt the two management styles but use other styles. According to the study, the paternalistic style of management may also be useful to manage employees in SMEs.

Interestingly, the study by Mikhailitchenko and Lundstrom (2006) made an attempt to survey the management styles followed by SMEs in the United States of America, China and Russia. According to the evidence from the study, the SMEs in the three countries adopted four types of management styles. The four types of management styles identified the three countries include; the supervision style, the decision making style, the information sharing style and finally, the paternalistic orientation style.

The study by Trask et al., (2009) found almost similar types of management styles adopted by small firms. The study discovered that the firms adopted management styles that consist of the autocratic style, the authoritarian style, the bureaucratic style, the democratic style and the participative style. Following this, Jain and Premkumar (2010) in their study uncovered the following four types of management styles; the participative style, the altruistic style, the professional style and the organic style.

Using the four management styles identified earlier by Likert (1967), the study by Nassar, Abdou, and Mohmoud (2011) attempted to determine the relationships between the four management styles and retention among nurses in a private hospital in Egypt. Findings of the study show that the four management styles that include; the consultative style, the exploitative/authoritative style, the benevolent/authoritative style and the participative management style are related to the retention of the nurses at the private hospital.

In a more recent study, Uche and Timinepere (2012) examined the management styles of organizations in the private sector in Nigeria. This study adopted six management styles in their study that consist of participative, paternalistic, authoritarian, entrepreneurial, conservative and bureaucratic management styles. At the same time, findings of the study by Mansor, Wai, Mohamed, and Shah (2012) found that the management in the Malaysian International Bank practiced found four specific management styles that involve; the autocratic style, the democratic style, the paternalistic style and the laissez faire management style.

Table 2 summarizes the management styles as identified in the previous studies. The management styles presented in Table 2 are listed according to the authors who investigated them in their studies.

Table 2: Types of Management Styles

Authors	Management Styles
Likert (1967)	System 1 (Exploitative authoritative) System 2 (Benevolent authoritative) System 3 (Consultative) System 4 (Participative)
Poole (1986)	Authoritarian Paternal Constitutional Participative
Purcell (1987)	Individualism Collectivism
Blyton and Turnbull (1994)	Traditional, Sophisticated paternalists/ human relation, Consultative (sophisticated moderns), Constitutional (sophisticated moderns and standard

	modern.
Matlay (2000)	Formal, Informal, Mixed formal and informal, Professional and external or agency.
Deery and Jago (2001)	Autocratic Decisive Consultative Democratic
Scase (2003)	Egalitarian Autocratic
Mikhailitchenko and Lundstrom (2006)	Supervision style Decision making style Information sharing Paternalistic orientation
Edwards, Ram, Gupta, and Tsai (2006)	Authoritarian Participative
Nassar et al., (2011)	Consultative, Exploitative/ authoritative, Benevolent/ authoritative Participative
Uche and Timinepere (2012)	Participative Paternalistic Authoritarian Entrepreneurial Conservative Bureaucratic

Mansor et al (2012)	Autocratic
	Democratic
	Paternalistic
	Laissez faire

The information presented in Table 2 seems to suggest that in general, organizations do not necessarily adopt the same styles of management. As shown in Table 2, a few of the styles appear to overlap each other while some are distinct styles. As mentioned previously, there are various internal as well as external environmental factors that influence the styles of management adopted in organizations. For instance, the differences in styles may be due to situational factors such as the nature of the organizations, their size, their founders, business environment, nature of employees in the organizations, organizational culture and organizational structure (Jain and Premkumar, 2010; Joshi, 2004; Uche and Timinepere, 2012).

In addition, according to the contingency approach, there is no one best management style for all types of organizations. The contingency approach states that a management style that is effective in a particular organization may not necessary be effective in other organizations (Campbell et al., 1993). This approach posits that for a specific management style to be effective in a particular organization, the management style needs to align or match with the situational factors as well as the context of the organization (Ansari, Aafaqi, & Ahmad, 2009; Campbell et al., 1993; Khandwalla, 1995).

Management Styles As Identified in Past Studies

Findings from the previous studies suggest that basically organizations adopt five types of management styles. These styles are autocratic, participative, nurturant-task management, paternalistic management and laissez-faire. The following section briefly explains each of the five common management styles as identified in the literature.

Autocratic Management

The autocratic management style is also known as the exploitative authoritative styles and the authoritarian style. This management style emphasized on “management by dominance” and stressed more on tight discipline, punishment and management prerogatives when dealing with their employees. The autocratic management style is often associated with task-oriented or job-centred (Alkahtani, Abu-Jarad, Sulaiman, & Nikbin, 2011; Awan & Mahmood, 2010; Khandwalla, 1995; Pavett & Morris, 1995)

As far as the focus and scope of the autocratic management style are concerned, previous studies have identified several important characteristics (Likert, 1967; Menkhoff & Kay, 2000; Pavett & Morris, 1995; Trask et al., 2009). Among the important characteristics include:

- a. Owner-managers makes all decision and most of decision process is more on centralized decision making.
- b. Strictly control of organizational operation.
- c. Downward communication.
- d. Punishment of employees for disobedience or task incomplete
- e. Master-slave relationship.
- f. Emphasis on strict discipline.
- g. Abuse of power for personal ends.
- h. No preference for any participation and involvement among employees.
- i. There is clear differentiation between superior and subordinates.

The review of past research also suggests that the autocratic style is one of the most common management style adopted in previous studies. Findings of past studies indicated that this management style is widely found in government, military organizations as well as small firms. In the case of the small firms, the autocratic management style in these firms have also been previously investigated by past researchers such as Khandwalla (1995) Scase (2003), Jones (2003), Edwards et al., (2006) Edwards et al., (2006) and Trask et al., (2009).

The review of past studies also suggests there is disagreement among researchers concerning the impact of the autocratic management style on organizational performance. For instance, more recent studies have indicated that organizations adopt the autocratic management style to ensure organizational effectiveness (Ansari et al., 2004; Jayasingam & Cheng, 2009). However, the findings from the earlier studies by Khandwalla (1995) and Likert (1967) have suggested that the autocratic style often resulted in ineffective leadership as well as contributed poorly to organizational performance.

Specifically, the earlier study by Likert (1967) found that autocratic management style is unable to increase organizational performance, especially in term of productivity due to rigidity of management. According to the study, employees in organizations that adopt this type of management style are usually prevented from voicing their opinions and ideas to help improve organizational effectiveness. Moreover, organizations which adopted this management style also faced with high risks of employees turnover and absenteeism.

The other study conducted by Savery (1994) in Australia, also reported that the autocratic management style held by the superiors in organizations was not able to increase organizational productivity. This study found that the autocratic management style was unable to increase organizational productivity due to reasons such as weakness of the communication process and the lack of accurate information.

However, the study by Menkhoff and Kay (2000) found that the autocratic management style, especially benevolent autocratic to be widely used in SMEs located in the Southeast Asia countries, in particular among SMEs in China. According to the findings of the study, the autocratic management style used in these firms was influenced by several factors such as high

power distance and collectivistic culture which are also prevalent in most of the countries in Asia.

Nonetheless, the study by Jayasingam and Cheng (2009) which investigated the autocratic management style adopted among organizations in Malaysia found that this management style is longer relevant to the organizations in the country. Based on the responses from the managers and their subordinates, the study discovered that in Malaysia, employees prefer to perform their work without close supervision or rigid control from their managers.

Participative Management

The participative management style or democratic management style is another common management style adopted by organizations. Similarly, findings of past studies indicate that organizations used this management style to help them stimulate better performance in their organizations (Likert, 1967; Gastill, 1994; Khandwalla, 1995; Jain and Premkumar, 2010; Ogbeide and Harrington, 2011; Alkahtani et al., 2011).

Unlike the autocratic style, this management style encourages employees and lower-level managers to be involved in decision making by sharing their ideas, information, knowledge and views. The managers that pursue the participative management style does not act as bosses but they function mainly as coordinators and facilitators to help build employees commitment, increase their satisfaction and at the same time enhance their performance (Ogbeide and Harrington, 2011).

Earlier on, Likert (1967) indicated that participative management style helps to enhance organizational performance in term of productivity, excessive absence and turnover, increase quality, improve employer-employees relationship and reduce scrap loss and waste. According to Likert, the participative management style (also known as System 4) is able to enhance organizational performance through the following three basic concepts; the principle of supportive relationship, group decision making and supervision and high performance aspirations. These three concepts are able to increase employee's satisfaction and motivation because their need and desires are fulfilled through the supportive relationship. As a result, employees will contribute more to ensure the success of the organization they worked for.

Kennedy (2002) indicated in his work that the participative management style is not a natural management style for managers in Malaysia. This is because this style requires a set of assertive behaviour, greater involvement for subordinates and supportive corporate culture. According to Kennedy, most of the management styles adopted in Malaysia are influenced by humane orientation which emphasised on the relationship with employees. Findings from previous studies have also provided the evidence that suggests the Malaysian culture is more collectivism, family-oriented, focuses on religious obligations and has high power distance. These factors may have influenced the adoption of participative management style in Malaysia (Ansari et al., 2004; Jayasingam & Cheng, 2009; Kennedy, 2002).

Interestingly, the study by Ansari, Ahmad, and Aafaqi (2004) suggested that participative management style is applicable as well as relevant to the organizations in Malaysia because this

management style is trans-cultural. The study further indicated that in certain organizational situation, the adoption of nurturant-task management style is seen as the forerunner of the participation management style.

In a more recent study, Ismail, Mohamed, Mohd Rafiuddin, Akhbar Khan, and Abdul Razab (2010) also supported the notion that the participative management style is considered as one of the important management style used in organizations in Malaysia. With regard to this, the previous study by Jayasingam and Cheng (2009) also revealed that the participative management style is most preferred among employees in the country.

Although it has been suggested that participative management style is able to improve organizational performance, in reality, it is very challenging to practice this management style. This is because in certain crucial situations, managers are required to exercise their power and authority. In such circumstance, the managers will no longer be able to empower their employees as well as share their power and authority with their employees (Jain and Premkumar, 2010 Khandwalla, 1995).

Nurturant-Task Management

The literature shows that most of the management styles adopted in organizations were introduced in the context of the western business society (Ansari, 1990). The western management styles were developed based on different values and purposes as well as to be used in different organizational contexts. Dissatisfied with most of the western management styles, Sinha (1980) proposed the nurturant-task (NT) management style used by managers, especially in the context of Asia.

This management style was first introduced among organizations in India. Seeing certain similarities in the Indian and Malaysian organizations, researchers such as Ansari et al., (2004) and Jayasingam and Cheng, (2009) have proposed that the NT style be considered as another management style to be adopted in the Malaysian context. The similarities identified between the two countries include collectivist culture as well as diminishing preference for directives. Ansari et al., (2004;124) expressed the similarities as follows:

“Subordinates in both countries (Malaysia and India) tend to depend excessively on their superior, with whom they want to cultivate a personalized rather than contractual work relationship. They readily accept the authority of their superior and yield to his or her demands. Work is not valued in itself”

According to Ansari et al., (2004) and Kennedy (2002), the NT management style can be used effectively to manage employees in Malaysia because these employees in general maintain not only their traditional values but they also have international views. In addition, Ansari et al., (2004) and Jayasingam and Cheng, (2009) proposed the nurturant-task management style as an alternative style to be used in the Malaysian context, in particular among SMEs due to factors such as the culture, multi-religious and multiracial workforce found in these firms.

The NT management style emphasizes on the combination of task and relationship oriented with a blend of nurturance. The nurturance in this management style solely helps to create a good feeling among employees, especially comfortably dependent, secure and relaxed, however, employees' work may be ignored. Meanwhile, the task orientation helps to ensure work done, but this style may create resistance to build up. As such, the combination of nurturant–task management style can help to improve the effectiveness of an organization.

The advantages of implementing this management style to both employees and their superiors as reported by Ansari et al (2004) include; feeling happy and the joy of successful performance. According to (Ansari et al., 2004; Ansari, 1990), the NT management style is characterized by:

- a. Serves as forerunner for the participative management style.
- b. Cares about employees, shows affection, takes personal interest in employees' well being and above all, is committed to their employees' needs.
- c. Helps their employees to grow up, mature and assume for greater responsibility. Once their employees achieve a reasonable level of maturity, they generate pressure on the superior to change over to the participative management style.
- d. Main focus on productivity over job satisfaction. It believes that purposeful and lasting job satisfaction has a precondition, the productivity of the organization.
- e. Provide clearly defined jobs.
- f. Acknowledge the employees successful task accomplishment.
- g. The NT management style can be symbolized as “Productivity → prosperity → happiness”.

Paternalistic Management

Unlike the previous management styles, the paternalistic management style encourages employees to view the organization as a family or team. The earlier study by Purcell (1987) found that organizations which adopt the paternalistic management style often used terms such as “enlightened, benevolent, charitable, caring, humane, family, paternally and welfare.”

This management style posits that if owner-managers or superiors are concerned with the needs and interests of their employees, the employees are willing to go through all kinds of hardship to achieve organizational goals set up by their managers. Simply put, the paternalistic management style involves the way management should be concerned about the workplace and how they make decisions to fulfil the common interest of all members in the organization (Ahmad, 2005; Mikhailitchenko and Lundstrom, 2006).

According to the studies by Purcell (1987), Khandwalla (1995), and Quang and Vuong (2002), in general, the paternalistic management style have the following characteristics:

- a. Keeping close supervision over their employees.
- b. Owner-managers give more direction to ensure that the work is accomplished.
- c. Control of operation and coordination of workplace activities are tight.
- d. Lack of freedom and less of delegation of power.
- e. Concerned about employees at workplace as well as their family.
- f. Provide social support and socially responsible to employees
- g. Less emphasis on employee career development.

- h. Recruitment and selection of employees is generally based on the recommendation from the current employees in the organization. Normally, the new recruitment comes from the members of the family of the employees.

According to Jones (2003), the paternalistic perspective was also used the earlier studies on small firms in the United States of America. For instance, according to the earlier Bolton Report (1971) small firms tend to regard the relationship between employer and their employees as one 'big family' that work together in a harmonious environment. In addition, the paternalistic management style is also recognized as a management instrument to ensure employees' loyalty, especially in small firms owned by families in the Southeast Asia countries (Menkhoff & Kay, 2000).

Findings from other previous studies conducted in Malaysia also suggested the importance of the paternalistic management style to organizations in the country. For instance, findings of the more recent study by Mansor et al., (2012) as well as the earlier study Ahmad (2005) found that paternalistic management style as one of the important style used by organizations in Malaysia. In addition, the subsequent study by Ahmad (2005) that investigated the management styles among Malaysian companies found that most of their employees that include the Malays, Chinese and India prefer to have a leader or owner-managers who behave like a caring parent, particularly in terms of protecting their rights, interests and also concerning about their needs.

Laissez-Faire Management

The laissez-faire management style is also commonly known as the delegated management style. Findings of prior studies indicate that organizations that practice this management style not only gave their employees the authority and responsibility to make decisions but also they are assigned important tasks in the organization (Alkahtani et al., 2011; Ansari et al., 2009).

According to Ansari et al., (2009) and Alkahtani et al., (2011), managers adopted the laissez-faire management style because they perceive the style as an effective way to improve their organizational performance. However, the effectiveness of the laissez faire management style depends on the characteristics, abilities of the employees and the context in which the management style is used. For example, this management style is useful when the employees in the organization have the capabilities to analyze situations as well as to determine what and how to accomplish the needs of their organization.

Evidence from other past studies also suggests that the laissez-faire management style has other limitation. For instance, in the case of the extreme laissez-faire management style, this style may not function in the contexts of countries where their culture has large power distance and high collectivism as in Malaysia, India and China. However, findings of past research indicate that this management style is found to be useful in countries with low power distance and high individualism as in the USA, Germany and Canada (Ansari et al., 2009).

More specifically, the study by Sim, Ansari, & Jantan, (2004) that examined managers in Malaysia, discovered that the most favoured management style among Malaysian managers was the informational delegation style and not the extreme laissez faire management style. At the same, the other study by Sim et al., (2004) uncovered that too much delegation may be detrimental to work performance in the Malaysian context. However, in the same study, the

authors indicated that the American managers considered extreme delegation style as their most preferred style of management.

3. Conclusion

This paper reviews the management styles as presented and promoted in the literature and previous studies. The review highlights that in general organizations adopted at least five different types of management styles. In addition, evidence from the review showed that the management styles as identified in past studies differ from one and another.

The different styles of management as identified in the review of prior studies seem to suggest that they are not universal, applicable and relevant to all types of organizations. Findings of past studies by Owen (2009), Rosenzweig (2007), Rivas-Micoud (2006), Makridakis (1996), Hiltrop (1996) and Capon, Farley, Hulbert and Lei, (1991) also indicated that the management styles adopted by organizations differ from each other. According to these studies, each management style focuses on what fits and what works for a particular organization at any one time. As such, a specific management style that fits and works well for one particular successful organization may not necessarily be applicable and relevant to another organization.

In addition, the differences in the styles of management identified in the past studies may have resulted from the adoption of different research methodologies to collect and analyze the data from the different types of organizations. According to the studies by Makridakis, (1996), Hiltrop (1996), Capon et al., (1991) and (Rosenzweig, 2007) factors such as the selection of samples, types of organizations, methods of measurement and analyses can influence the findings of studies that attempted to investigate the nature of management styles in organizations.

Lastly, given the limitations and differences in the styles of management as well as in view of the uniqueness of each organization, it may be advisable for organizations to develop as well as adopt its own specific management style in order to sustain their business operations.

References

- Ahmad, K. (2005). *Malaysian management styles: Policy, practice and human resource*. London: ASEAN Academic Press.
- Alkahtani, A. H., Abu-Jarad, I., Sulaiman, M., & Nikbin, D. (2011). The impact of personality and leadership styles on leading change capability of Malaysian Managers. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*, 1(2), 70–99.
- Ansari, M. A. (1990). *Managing People at Work: Leadership Styles and Influence Strategies* (First Ed). New Delhi, India: SAGE Publications.
- Ansari, M. A., Aafaqi, R., & Ahmad, Z. A. (2009). Perceived delegation and work outcomes: the moderating role of cultural orientations in Malaysian Business Contexts. *Academy of Management*, August, 1–28.
- Ansari, M. A., Ahmad, Z. A., & Aafaqi, R. (2004). Organizational leadership in the Malaysian context. In D. Tjosvold & K. Leung (Eds.), *Leading in high growth Asia: Managing relationship for teamwork and change* (pp. 109–138). Singapore: World Scientific Publishing Co.
- Awan, M. R., & Mahmood, K. (2010). Relationship among leadership style, organizational culture and employee commitment in university libraries. *Library Management*, 31(4/5), 253–266.
- Bacon, N. (2008). Management strategy and industrial relations. In P. Blyton, N. Bacon, J. Fiorito, & E. Heery (Eds.), *The SAGE handbook of Industrial Relations* (pp. 241–257). London: The Sage Publication.
- Baptiste, N. R. (2008). Tightening the link between employee wellbeing at work and performance: A new dimension for HRM. *Management Decision*, 46(2), 284–309.
- Blyton, P., & Turnbull, P. (1994). *The dynamics of employee relations* (First). London: MacMillan.
- Bolton, J. E., Robbins, E. L. ., Tew, J. H. ., & Tindale, L. V. . (1971). *Report of the Committee of Inquiry on Small Firms*. London.
- Bray, M., Waring, P., & Cooper, R. (2011). *Employment relations: Theory and practice* (Second). Australia: McGraw-Hill.
- Campbell, D. J., Bommer, W., Yeo, E., Fellow, V. S., Student, D., Behling, C., & Green, B. (1993). Perceptions of appropriate leadership style: Participation versus consultation across two cultures. *Asia Pasific Journal of Management*, 10(1), 1–19.
- Capon, N., Farley, J. U., Hulbert, J. M., & Lei, D. (1991). In search of excellence ten years later: Strategy and organisation do matter. *Management Decision*, 29(4), 12–21.
- Cassell, C., Nadin, S., Gray, M., & Clegg, C. (2002). Exploring human resource management practices in small and medium sized enterprises. *Personnel Review*, 31(6), 671–692.

- Champoux, D., & Brun, J.-P. (2003). Occupational health and safety management in small size enterprises: an overview of the situation and avenues for intervention and research. *Safety Science*, 41(4), 301–318.
- Coetzer, A., Redmond, J., & Sharafizad, J. (2012). Decision making regarding access to training and development in medium-sized enterprises: An exploratory study using the Critical Incident Technique. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 36(4), 426–447.
- Deery, M., & Jago, L. K. (2001). Hotel management style: a study of employee perceptions and preferences. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 20(4), 325–338.
- Dimmock, K. (1999). Management style and competitive strategies among tourism firms in the Northern Rivers. *Tourism Management*, 20(3), 323–339.
- Dundon, T., Grugulis, I., & Wilkinson, A. (1999). “Looking out of the black-hole: non-union relations in an SME.” *Employee Relations*, 22(3), 251–266.
- Dundon, T., & Rollinson, D. (2011). *Understanding employment relations*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill.
- Edwards, P., Ram, M., Gupta, S. Sen, & Tsai, C. (2006). The structuring of working relationships in small firms: Towards a formal framework. *Organization*, 13(5), 701–724.
- Harney, B., & Dundon, T. (2006). Capturing complexity: developing an integrated approach to analysing HRM in SMEs. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16(1), 48–73.
- Harney, B., & Dundon, T. (2007). An emergent theory of HRM : A theoretical and empirical exploration of determinants of HRM among Irish small- to medium enterprise (SMEs). In *Advances in Industrial & Labor Relations* (pp. 103–153). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Harvey, G., & Turnbull, P. (2006). Employment relations, management style and flight crew attitudes at low cost airline subsidiaries: The cases of British Airways/Go and bmi/bmibaby. *European Management Journal*, 24(5), 330–337.
- Hiltrop, J. (1996a). A framework for diagnosing human resource management practices. *European Management*, 14(3), 243–254.
- Hiltrop, J. (1996b). The impact of human resource management on organisational performance : Theory and research. *European Management Journal*, 14(6), 628–637.
- Ismail, A., Mohamed, H. A.-B., Mohd Rafiuddin, N., Akhbar Khan, B. Z., & Abdul Razab, M. F. (2010). Gaya kepimpinan penyertaan, tanggapan penghargaan dan prestasi kerja dalam konteks pengurusan kualiti menyeluruh. In *Seminar Kebangsaan 1 Malaysia* (pp. 1–14). Kota Kinabalu: Pusat Penataran Ilmu dan Bahasa, Universiti Malaysia Sabah.
- Jain, R., & Premkumar, R. (2010). Management styles, productivity & adaptability of human resources : An empirical study. *The Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 46(2), 328–344.

- Jayasingam, S., & Cheng, M. Y. (2009). Leadership style and perception of effectiveness: enlightening Malaysian Managers. *Asian Social Science*, 5(2), 54–65.
- Jones, J. T. (2005). The determinants of training in Australian manufacturing SMEs. *Education + Training*, 47(8/9), 605–615.
- Jones, O. (2003). The persistence of autocratic management in small firms TCS and organisational change. *International Journal of Behaviour&Research*, 9(6), 245–267.
- Joshi, M. P., Sherman, H. D., & Schermerhorn, J. R. (2004). Strategy implementation styles of Malaysian, Thai and Hungarian Middle Managers. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 9(2), 19–33.
- Kennedy, J. C. (2002). Leadership in Malaysia: Traditional values, international outlook. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(3), 15–26.
- Khandwalla, P. N. (1995). *Management Styles*. New Delhi, India: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing.
- Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organization* (1st ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Makridakis, S. (1996). Factors affecting success in business: Management theories/tools versus predicting changes. *European Management Journal*, 14(1), 1–20.
- Mansor, N. N. A., Wai, C. M., Mohamed, A., & Shah, I. M. (2012). The relationship between management style and employees' well-being: a case of non-managerial staffs. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 40, 521–529.
- Matlay, H. (2002a). Industrial relations in the SME sector of the British economy: an empirical perspective. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 9(3), 307–318.
- Matlay, H. (2002b). Industrial relations in the SMEs: Conceptual and contextual perspectives. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 9(3), 307–318.
- Meggeneder, O. (2007). Style of management and the relevance for workplace health promotion in small and medium sized enterprises. *Journal of Public Health*, 15(2), 101–107.
- Menkhoff, T., & Kay, L. (2000). Managing organizational change and resistance in small and medium-sized family firms. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 8(1), 153–172.
- Mikhailitchenko, A., & Lundstrom, W. J. (2006). Inter-organizational relationship strategies and management styles in SMEs: The US-China-Russia study. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 27(6), 428–448.
- Nassar, M. E., Abdou, H. A., & Mohmoud, N. a. (2011). Relationship between management styles and nurses' retention at private hospitals. *Alexandria Journal of Medicine*, 47(3), 243–249.

- Ogbeide, G. A., & Harrington, R. J. (2011). The relationship among participative management style, strategy implementation success, and financial performance in the food service industry. *Management Strategy and Performance*, 23(6), 719–738.
- Owen, J. (2009). *The death of modern management*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Pavett, C., & Morris, T. (1995). Management styles within a multinational corporation: A five country comparative study. *Human Relations*, 48(10), 1171–1191.
- Poole, M. (1986). *Industrial relations: Origins and patterns of national diversity* (1st ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- Purcell, J. (1987). Mapping management styles in employee relations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24(5), 533–548.
- Quang, T., & Vuong, N. T. (2002). Management styles and organizational effectiveness in Vietnam. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 10(1), 36–55.
- Rainnie, A. (1989). *Industrial relations in small firms: Small isn't beautiful* (First ed.). London: Routledge.
- Rivas-Micoud, M. (2006). *The Ghosn factor*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
- Rosenzweig, P. (2007). *The halo effect*. New York: Free Press.
- Salmiah, M. A. (2004). *Hubungan antara kompetensi pekerja dan prestasi kerja di kalangan kakitangan agensi kerajaan elektronik*. Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Savery, L. K. (1994). The influence of the perceived styles of leadership on a group of workers on their attitudes to work. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 15(4), 12–18.
- Scase, R. (2003). Employment relations in small firms. In P. Edward (Ed.), *Industrial Relations: theory and practice* (Second ed., pp. 470–488). London: Blackwell Publishing.
- Sim, D. L., Ansari, M. A., & Jantan, M. (2004). Delegation and leadership perceptions: A comparison of Malaysian and American Managers. In *Academy of Management* (Vol. 2004, pp. 1–33).
- Sinha, J. B. P. (1980). *The nurturant-task leader. A model of the effective executive*. India: Concept.
- Syed Abdullah, S. R. (1991). *Management Strategies and Employee Response in Malaysia: A study of Management Industrial Relations Styles of The US and Japanese Multinational Companies in Malaysian Electronic Industry*. University of Wales College of Cardiff.
- Thau, S., Bennett, R. J., Mitchell, M. S., & Beth, M. (2009). How management style moderates the relationship between abusive supervision and workplace deviance: An uncertainty management theory perspective. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(1), 79–92.

- Trask, K. M., Rice, R. W., Anchors, S., & Lilieholm, R. J. (2009). Management styles of lumber mill managers in the northern United States. *Forest Product Journal*, 59(3), 29–34.
- Uche, C. N., & Timinepere, C. O. (2012). Management styles and organizational effectiveness : An appraisal of private enterprises in Eastern Nigeria. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(9), 198–204.