

Management: One Too Many Styles

**Mohd Khairuddin Hashim
Sa'ari Ahmad**

College of Business
University Utara Malaysia
Sintok Kedah, Malaysia.

Noor Syakirah Zakaria

University Malaysia Sabah
Malaysia.

Received May 20, 2016

Accepted May 31, 2016

ABSTRACT

From a concept, management has evolved into a discipline of study and has become an important field of practice. Since its emergence, management has long gained tremendous interest among management theorists, consultants and practitioners. The literature however indicates that over the years, management has seen much change not only in terms of its meanings but also its emphasis and styles as well. In particular, over the decades, various styles of management have been identified, presented and promoted in the literature. The existence of numerous management styles has raised the question of their universality, applicability and relevance to organizations. Based on the management literature and previous studies, this paper reviews six specific styles of management as well as identifies the differences in their scope and focus.

Introduction

Organizational performance and sustainability of organizations depend very much on how well they are being managed by their managers. As far as the performance and sustainability of organizations are concerned, some continue to sustain their success while others appear to be less successful. Most frequently, the successful organizations are able to perform and sustain their businesses because their managers have adopted effective styles of management. However, in the case of the unsuccessful organizations, most often, they fail because their managers are not only ineffective but also they mismanaged.

Over the past decades, a variety of management styles have been documented in the literature. At the same time, numerous studies have also attempted to investigate the styles of management that help companies to perform as well as sustain their competitive advantage. These studies have examined the impact of different management styles on the performance of different companies in different industries. In addition, some of these studies have scrutinize the way the excellent companies are being managed in an effort to identify as well as learn the styles of management that make them successful (Foss & Klein, 2014;

Uche & Timinepere, 2012; Ogbeide & Harrington, 2011; Meggeneder, 2007; Marcus, 2006; Joyce, Nohria & Roberson, 2003; Collins, 2001; Collins & Porras, 1994).

Apart from attempting to identify the management styles of successful companies, findings of past studies have also claimed to have found that only certain types of management styles contribute to the growth as well as success of companies (Harney & Dundon, 2006 and 2007; Harvey & Turnbull, 2006; Champoux & Brun, 2003; Cassell et al., 2002; Matlay, 2002a and 2002b, Dimmock, 1999; Rainnie, 1989).

Although there is increasing evidence that suggests certain management styles are associated to organizational performance, there are studies that indicate the style adopted by each successful companies tend to differ from each other. The review of previous studies that investigated the management styles of successful companies unveils that these companies do not necessarily adopt the same style 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 all types of companies for them to become successful as well (Burkus, 2016; Foss & Klein, 2014; Hamel, 2012; Mintzberg, 2011; Makridakis, 1996; Hiltrop, 1996; Capon, Farley, Hulbert & Lei, 1991).

Furthermore, in their works, Burkus (2016), Laloux (2015), Foss and Klein (2014), Hamel (2012), Mintzberg (2011), 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 kinds of organizations is not only impractical but also ineffective. Due to the fact that organizations differ from each other in many ways, each organization will require its own way of management. These authors claimed that each effective management style tends to only work for one organization at one particular time. According to these scholars, style of management is not necessarily universal but each individual organization requires its own unique style. Management style is really about what fit and what work for a particular organization at any one time. Moreover, these authors insisted that over a period time, organizations and their styles of management will evolve through different stages of development. At each different stage of development, each organization will adopt a different style of management.

This paper reviews management styles as presented and promoted in the literature as well as prior studies. By reviewing the literature on 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 presented in five sections. The following Section Two provides the definitions of management and management styles. Having presented the definitions, Section Three explains the importance of management styles to organizations. Next, Section Four examines the scope and focus of the different styles of management that have been documented in the literature. Accordingly, Section Five offers a short conclusion of the paper.

Defining Management and Management Styles

All organizations need management. Without management, organizations cannot function and they will not be able to perform. The late management guru, Peter F. Drucker considered management as a singularly difficult word. According to Drucker (1973), the word "management" is American in origin and the word is hard to translate into other languages. The late guru viewed management not only as an important organ of the organization but also as a function as well as the people who discharge it. The late scholar further emphasized that management also denotes a social position, rank, a discipline and a field of study. More importantly, Drucker underlined the need for management to be defined in terms of its three most important tasks that include the following:

- The first task of management is to determine the specific purpose and mission of the institution, whether business enterprise, hospital or university;
- The second task of management is to make work productive and the worker achieving; and
- The third task of management involves managing social impacts and social responsibilities of the enterprise.

With regard to the three management tasks, Drucker (1973) stressed that these tasks will always have to be done at the same time and within the same managerial action. As for the importance of these tasks, the late guru pointed out that they must also not be influenced by each other and that they all required the same levels of skills as well as competencies.

Apart from the definition of management presented by Drucker, there are other management scholars who have different views on management as well as have described the concept of management differently. For instance, Mintzberg (2011) does not consider management as a science or a profession. According to the scholar, management is a practice that managers need to learn mainly from

their experience and the practice of management is rooted in the organizational context.

Mintzberg further emphasized that management as practice involves tacit knowledge. In order to practice management, the scholar indicates that managers need to learn as well as acquire their tacit knowledge through methods such as on the job training, apprenticeship, mentorship and personal experience. In addition, the author summarizes that the practice of management takes place in the contexts of art, craft and also the use of science. Simply put, according to Mintzberg, the practice of management includes the following three important components; art, craft and science. First, the art in management involves bringing in the ideas, integrating of insights and developing the vision of the organization. Second, the craft in management allows the managers to learn as well as use what they gain from their personal and practical experiences. Third, management adopts the scientific method to analyze the information and knowledge that it needs to manage organizations.

With regard to the definition of management style, the earlier study conducted by 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, the other 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) 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) 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 more recent study by 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. As far as the definition of management style is concerned, the review indicates that a variety of definitions has been used in previous research.

In other words, there is no one universal accepted definition of management style. Each different author tends to define management style in a different manner. Information gathered from the review appears to indicate that the various definitions may have been developed based on the differences in the focus as well as the scope of each management style. The focus and scope of each management style involve the ways in which the managers perform their managerial tasks such as planning, organizing, managing, controlling as well as in handling matters related to their employees, employment, business environment and performance of their organizations. At the same time, there are also other factors that can 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; business mission, core values, purpose, management philosophies of the owners and founders, managers as well as business strategies of the organizations.

Importance of Management Styles to Organizations

Management styles are considered important to organizations because they play a key role in determining how organizations are managed and controlled (Purcell, 1987; Bray, Waring, & Cooper, 2011). According to Dimmock (1999) and Baptiste (2008), organizations that adopt effective management styles are able to manage their businesses well because they become more future oriented, able to improve their organizational

competencies, provide strong support, strengthen trust, promote employee wellbeing at the workplace as well as enhance their organizational performance.

In addition, findings of previous studies have indicated that management style also acts as a contingency factor. For instance, the study by Harney and Dundon (2007) found that management style has moderating effects on human resource outcomes of small and medium-sized enterprises (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 different independent variables and dependent variables.

Findings of past studies have also shown that management style can influence employment relations practices in organizations. According to these studies, management style affect employment relations practices by providing the guidelines for managers to deal, manage, motivate and control employees at their workplace. These studies also indicate that management style influenced work co-ordination, employee commitment, cooperation among employees, employer as well as their community and organizational performance (Blyton & Turnbull, 1994; Uche & Timinepere, 2012). Other studies have also reveal that management style used by owners/managers reflected directly on employment relations practices such as recruitment, training and development, compensation, grievance procedures and interpersonal relationship

(Coetzer et al., 2012; Dundon & Rollinson, 2011; Jones, 2005; Champoux & Brun, 2003; Matlay, 2002a; Dimmock, 1999; Dundon et al., 1999; Purcell, 1987)

Evidence from prior research further suggests that the management styles adopted by the owners and managers of the organizations can affect various decisions that involved policies and management practices. More specifically, the study by Trask et al. (2009) indicated that the

information and knowledge concerning management style used by owner-managers in small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are helpful 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 not only on the success but also the failure of these firms.

Other studies have also been able to show the impact of management style on organizational performance. These studies found that both performance and success of organizations also depended on effective management style. According to these studies, better combination as well as coordination between management style and the other functional areas such as operations, finance and marketing, substantially influence organizational effectiveness. Findings of these studies further indicate that successful companies tend to adopt a distinctive management style to deal with their employees and that the adoption of the distinctive style resulted in better organizational performance (Dimmock, 1999; Quang & Vuong, 2002; Trask et al., 2009).

Having explained the important role of management styles in organizations, the following section examines previous research on management styles.

Previous Studies on Management Styles

In realizing the importance of management styles, over the years, numerous studies have attempted to investigate the types of effective management styles adopted by organizations. The review of past studies indicate that organizations tend to not only adopt different types of management styles but also the styles of management vary between different organizations in different industries due to the influence of various external environmental factors as well as internal organizational factors (Dimmock, 1999).

According to the literature, the earlier studies that examined management began in the 1960s and 1970s. However, the emphasis of past studies has been to primarily investigate the styles of management adopted in unionized organizations.

These studies found that management of the unionized organizations focused on consultation and negotiation styles when dealing with their employees and unions. Nonetheless, 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; Dundon & Rollinson, 2011).

The literature reveals that Likert (1967) conducted one of the earliest studies on management styles. The author specifically developed and proposed the Likert's System 4 as one of the initial works that investigated the management styles adopted by organizations. The author introduced the Likert's System 4 as a management system that consisted of four specific types of management styles. The four distinct management styles included in the system are; 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) was able to identify four other 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 other hand, the constitutional and participative management styles are closely associated to the pluralist framework.

The study by Purcell (1987) managed 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.

The review of past research also suggests that some of the earlier works on management styles can also be traced to the Fox's scheme which also emphasized on the unitary and pluralism management styles (Dundon & Rollinson, 2011). 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.

Blyton and Turnbull (1994) later were able to identify five types of management styles adopted by organizations. The authors managed to distinguish the five styles based on their analysis of previous studies that examined employment relations in organizations. Among the five management styles identified in the study include; the traditional style, the sophisticated paternalists/human relation style, the consultative (sophisticated modern) style, the constitutional (sophisticated modern) style and the standard modern style.

In another study, 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 terms 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.

Unlike the previous studies, the subsequent study by Deery and Jago (2001) attempted to examine management styles adopted in medium-sized hotels. In the study, the authors were able to identify four types of management styles adopted by the medium-sized hotels. Evidence from the study suggests that the management of the medium-sized hotels used the following four distinct management styles; autocratic style, decisive style, consultative style and the democratic management style.

Matlay (2002a) investigated the management styles among small and medium-sized enterprises (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.

According to Scase (2003) and Kennedy (2002), there are two common management styles found in small organizations. The two styles are 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 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 and Aafaqi (2004) supposedly presented a new management style as a future runner for participative management style. The new style is known as the nurturant-task (NT) management style. This style emphasizes 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 and Cheng (2009) and Ansari, Ahmad and Aafaqi (2004), this style of management may also be 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) found that the paternalistic management style to be the preferred management styles among employees in Malaysian small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs). Findings of the study suggest that not only majority of the Malay employees perceived paternalistic management as an important style to them but also reveals that the Chinese and Indian employees also viewed the paternalistic management style as crucial, particularly in terms of fulfilling their needs and protecting their rights.

Edwards, Ram, Gupta, and Tsai (2006) subsequently investigated the authoritarian and participative management styles as adopted in SMEs. However, this study discovered that SMEs do not necessarily adopt these two management styles only but may also use other forms of management. According to the findings of the study, although the paternalistic style of management may not be the best management style for the SMEs, this style can also be one of the effective styles in managing certain types of SMEs.

Interestingly, the study by Mikhailitchenko and Lundstrom (2006) made an attempt to survey the management styles practiced by small and medium-sized enterprises (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. Among the four types of management styles identified in 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.

Nassar, Abdou and Mohmoud (2011) attempted to determine the relationships between management styles and retention among nurses in a private hospital in Egypt. The study adopted the four management styles introduced by Likert (1967). According to the findings of the study, the four management styles that involve; the consultative style, the exploitative/authoritative style, the benevolent/authoritative style and the

participative management style were found to be significantly related to the retention of the nurses at the private hospital.

In a more recent research, Uche and Timinepere (2012) attempted to examine the impact of management styles on the effectiveness of organizations in the private sector in Nigeria. The study involved six management styles practiced by the private enterprises in the country. Among the six styles include; participative, paternalistic, authoritarian, entrepreneurial, conservative and bureaucratic management styles. Findings of this study indicate that these management styles are associated to the effectiveness of the private enterprises in the country.

At the same time, in Malaysia, the study by Mansor et al. (2012) investigated the relationship between style of management and employees wellbeing in the Malaysian International Bank (MIB). This study specifically found that the management of the MIB did not practice one style but four distinct styles of management. The four different management styles identified in the study include; the autocratic style, the democratic style, the paternalistic style and the laissez faire management style.

The review appears to indicate that various styles have been investigated and identified in previous research. Table 1 lists the management styles according to the authors that investigated them in their studies.

Table 1: Types of Management Styles

Authors	Management Styles
Likert (1967)	System 1 (Exploitative authoritative), System 2 (Benevolent authoritative), System 3 (Consultative) and System 4 (Participative)
Poole (1986)	Authoritarian, Paternal, Constitutional and Participative
Purcell (1987)	Individualism and Collectivism
Blyton and Turnbull (1994)	Traditional, Sophisticated paternalists/ human relation Consultative (sophisticated modern), Constitutional (sophisticated and standard modern)
Matlay (2000)	Formal, Informal, Mixed formal and informal, Professional and external or agency
Deery and Jago (2001)	Autocratic, Decisive, Consultative and Democratic
Scase (2003)	Egalitarian and Autocratic
Mikhailitchenko and Lundstrom (2006)	Supervision style, Decision making style, Information sharing and Paternalistic orientation

Edwards, Ram, Gupta and Tsai (2006)	Authoritarian and Participative
Nassar et al., (2011)	Consultative, Exploitative/ authoritative, Benevolent/ authoritative and Participative
Uche and Timinepere (2012)	Participative, Paternalistic, Authoritarian, Entrepreneurial, Conservative and Bureaucratic
Mansor et. al (2012)	Autocratic, Democratic, Paternalistic and Laissez faire
Robertson (2015)	Holacracy

The information presented in Table 1 seems to suggest that in general, organizations do not necessarily adopt the same styles of management. Of the styles shown in Table 1, some appear to overlap each other while the others seem to be distinct styles. As mentioned previously, there are various internal as well as external environmental factors that can 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 business enterprises, their size, their founders, business environment, nature of employees in the organizations, organizational culture and organizational structure (Jain & Premkumar, 2010; Joshi et al., 2004; Uche & Timinepere, 2012; Robertson, 2015).

Furthermore, according to the contingency perspective, 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 enterprise may not necessarily be effective if used in other business enterprises. 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 the Literature

The review of the literature appears to suggest that basically organization stand to adopt at least six types of management styles that have different focus and scope. The six styles include; the autocratic management, the participative management, the nurturant-task management, the paternalistic management, the laissez-faire management and more recently, the

holacracy. The following section briefly explains each of the six common management styles as identified in the literature.

Autocratic Management Style

The autocratic management style which is also known as the exploitative authoritative style and the authoritarian style in the literature is primarily based on command and control. An organization that adopts this management style basically emphasizes on "management by dominance", maintains discipline, enforces punishment and uses management prerogatives when dealing with their employees. The autocratic management style is also often viewed as associated to task-oriented or job-centred (Pavett & Morris, 1995; Khandwalla, 1995; Awan & Mahmood, 2010; Alkahtani, Abu-Jarad, Sulaiman & Nikbin, 2011).

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

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

From the research perspective, the autocratic style appears to be one of the most common

management styles found in previous research. Findings of past studies indicated that this management style is widely found in government agencies, military organizations as well as small firms. The review however indicates disagreement among researchers concerning the impact of the autocratic management style on organizational performance. According to the studies by Ansari et al.(2004) and Jayasingam and Cheng(2009), organizations adopted the autocratic management style to ensure organizational effectiveness. However, the evidence from the earlier studies by Khandwalla (1995) and Likert (1967) have shown that this style of management not only resulted in ineffective leadership but also contributed poorly to organizational performance.

More specifically, the earlier study by Likert (1967) found that autocratic management style was unable to increase organizational performance, especially in term of productivity due to rigidity of this style of management. According to the study, employees in organizations that adopt this type of management style are usually prevented not only from voicing their opinions but also they are not allowed to give out their 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.

Nevertheless, the study by Jayasingam and Cheng (2009) which investigated the autocratic management style adopted among organizations in Malaysia found that this style is no 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 Style

The participative management style or the democratic management style can also be considered as another management style commonly adopted among business enterprises. In the same manner, findings of past studies indicate business enterprises that practiced this management style were able to stimulate better performance in their organizations (Likert, 1967; Khandwalla, 1995; Jain & Premkumar, 2010; Ogbeide & 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 & Harrington, 2011).

Earlier on, Likert (1967) indicated that participative management style can help to enhance the productivity of organizations by reducing absenteeism and turnover among employees, increasing quality of work, improving employer-employees relationship and minimizing scrap loss as well as waste. According to Likert, the participative management style, which also known as the 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.

Interestingly, the study by Kennedy (2002) claimed that participative management style is not suitable for managers in Malaysia 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. Furthermore, the other factors such as collectivism, family-orientation, religious obligations and high power distance can also make the adoption of participative management style ineffective (Ansari et al., 2004; Jayasingam & Cheng, 2009; Kennedy, 2002).

However, the studies by Ansari, Ahmad and Aafaqi (2004), Jayasingam and Cheng (2009) and Ismail, Mohamed, Mohd Rafiuddin, Akhbar Khan and Abdul Razab (2010) indicated that participative management style is applicable as well as relevant to business enterprises in Malaysia because this style is considered to be trans-cultural. According to these studies, the participative management style is viewed not only as one of the important forms of management but also employees in Malaysia regard participative management as their favourite style of management.

Although participative management has been accepted as one of the important management styles, it is equally important to know that in reality, it is very challenging to implement this management style in organizations. For instance, in organizations, managers are bound to face critical situations where they are required to exercise their power and authority. In such circumstances, the managers will no longer be able to empower their employees as well as share their power and authority with them (Jain & Premkumar, 2010; Khandwalla, 1995).

Nurturant-Task Management Style

The literature reveals that most of the management styles practiced in business enterprises were adopted from the western business society. The western management styles were developed based on different values and purposes as well as used in different organizational contexts. Dissatisfied with the western management styles, Sinha (1980) proposed the nurturant-task (NT) management style to be used by managers in the Asian business society.

This management style was first introduced among business enterprises in India. Given the similarities shared between Indian and Malaysian business enterprises such as in terms of their collectivist cultures as well as diminishing preference for directives, researchers such as Ansari et al. (2004) and Jayasingam and Cheng (2009) have promoted the NT style as an alternative management style for business enterprises in Malaysia, particularly among the SMEs that have multi-religious and multiracial workforce. According to Kennedy (2002) and Ansari et al. (2004), 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 also they have international perspectives.

The NT management style emphasizes on both nurturance as well as task. The nurturance in this management style solely helps to create a good feeling among employees, especially in making them feel more comfortable, dependent, secure and relaxed. Meanwhile, the task is for the purpose of ensuring that the work that needs to be done by the employees. By combining both aspects, the nurturant-task management style can help to improve the effectiveness of an organization.

The advantages of implementing this management style to both employees and managers include; feeling happy and the joy of successful performance. According to Ansari et al. (2004) and 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 Style

Unlike the previous management styles, the paternalistic management style views the organization as a family and employees as family members or members of the same team. The earlier study by Purcell (1987) found that organizations that adopt the paternalistic management style often used common terms such as "enlightened, benevolent, charitable, caring, humane, family, paternally and welfare" to show that they function as a family unit.

Business enterprises that adopt this management style often undertake the responsibility of looking after the general wellbeing of employees. According to this style, the owner-managers of organizations have the obligation to take care of the needs and common interests of their employees. In return for fulfilling their needs and interests, the employees will pledge to do their best in achieving the organizational objectives established by their managers (Ahmad,2005; Mikhailitchenko & 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 earlier studies on small firms in the United States of America showed that many of these firms adopted the paternalistic style. For instance, according to the earlier report by Bolton et al.(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 away of management in other countries around the world. More specifically, the study Menkhoff and Kay (2000) uncovered that many of the small firms owned by families in the Southeast Asia countries adopt this style of management to ensure loyalty among their employees.

Findings of other previous studies conducted in Malaysia also suggested the importance of the paternalistic management style to business enterprises 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 companies in Malaysia.

In addition, the 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 Style

The laissez-faire management style is also commonly known as the delegated management style. Findings of prior studies indicate that business enterprises 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 organizations.

Management of organizations adopted the laissez-faire management style because they viewed this management style not only as an effective way to manage their organizations but also to improve their organizational performance. Nevertheless, findings of prior studies suggest that the effectiveness of the laissez faire management style depends on several factors such as the characteristics of the firms, 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 (Ansari et. al., 2009; Alkahtani et al., 2011).

Evidence from other studies also suggests that the laissez-faire management style may have other limitations. For instance, in the case of the extreme laissez-faire management style, this style may not function effectively in the contexts of countries having cultures with high power distance and strong collectivism such as in countries like Malaysia, India and China. However, findings of past research indicate that this management style is effective in countries such as

the United States of America, Germany and Canada which have low power distance and high individualism (Ansari et. al., 2009).

The study by Sim, Ansari and Jantan (2004) which examined management styles among Malaysian and American managers also showed that the most favoured management style among Malaysian managers was the informational delegation style and not the extreme laissez faire management style. This study further reveals that too much delegation may be detrimental to work performance in the Malaysian context. However, in the same study, the authors found that the American managers considered extreme delegation style as their most preferred style of management.

Holacracy

Although the literature review suggests limited research on holacracy, this management style is considered the most recent style to be introduced and adopted in organizations, particularly among young and fast-growing companies. Holacracy was proposed to replace hierarchy in organizations and this style is considered to be a very democratic management style. This style of management attempts to get rid of hierarchy in an organization by specifically focusing on the important role of each individual employee as well as giving them more authority. More significantly, holacracy emphasizes on turning every employee into a leader and democratizes decision making in the organization (Foss & Klein, 2014; Robertson, 2015; Laloux, 2015).

The inability of the traditional management styles to help organizations adapt more quickly in increasingly chaotic global economy triggered the adoption of holacracy among organizations. The proponents of this style of management claimed that the traditional management styles worked well enough only in relatively simple, predictable and static business environment. In addition, the traditional styles lack the social technology to provide the flexibility desired and needed in coping with a business environment that is rapidly changing, dynamic and becoming very complex in nature.

More specifically, Robertson (2015) considered holacracy as a new social technology for governing and operating an organization that is defined by a set of core rules which are distinctly different from those adopted in conventionally managed organizations. More specifically, holacracy involves the following important elements:

- A constitution, which determines the rules of the game and redistributes authority in the organization.
- A new way to structure an organization and define people's roles and spheres of authority in the organization.
- A unique decision making process for updating those rules and authorities.
- A meeting process for keeping teams in sync and getting work done together.

As far as the adoption of holacracy is concerned, the proponents of this new management style claimed that hundreds of organizations of different types and sizes around the world have already started to learn, adopt and practice this new style of management.

Conclusion

This paper reviews the management styles as prescribed in the literature and previous studies. The review highlights that in general, organizations adopt at least six different types of management styles. In addition, the review appears to show that the management styles as identified in past studies differ from each other in terms of their scope and focus.

The different styles of management as presented in the literature seem to suggest that there is no one management style that is 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 et al.(1991) have also indicated that the management styles adopted by organizations tend to differ from each other. According to these studies, each effective management style will emphasize only 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 also resulted from the failure to ground the studies in the context of previous research, articulate a specific theory about the nature of management as well as its relationship to management, using different research methodologies to gather and analyze the data from the different types of organizations. Studies by Makridakis (1996), Hiltrop (1996), Capon et al (1991) and Rosenzweig (2007) have shown that 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 in organizations.

Lastly, given the limitations and differences in the definitions and styles of management as well as in view of the uniqueness of each organization, it is advisable that organizations acquire all the knowledge they can get to develop their own specific management style that will allow their managers to effectively manage their business activities as well as sustain their organizational performance.

References

1. Ahmad, K. (2005). *Malaysian management styles: Policy, practice and human resource*. London: ASEAN Academic Press.
2. 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.
3. Ansari, M. A. (1990). *Managing People at Work: Leadership Styles and Influence Strategies* (First Ed). New Delhi, India: SAGE Publications.
4. 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.
5. 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.
6. 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.
 7. 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.
 8. 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.
 9. Blyton, P., & Turnbull, P. (1994). *The dynamics of employee relations* (First). London: MacMillan.
 10. Bolton, J. E., Robbins, E. L., Tew, J. H., & Tindale, L. V. (1971). *Report of the Committee of Inquiry on Small Firms*. London.
 11. Bray, M., Waring, P., & Cooper, R. (2011). *Employment relations: Theory and practice* (Second). Australia: McGraw-Hill.
 12. Burkus, D. (2016). *Under new management*. London: Macmillan.
 13. 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.
 14. 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.
 15. 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.
 16. 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.
 17. 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.
 18. Collins, J. (2001). *Good to great*. New York: HarperBusiness
 19. Collins, J. & Porras, J.I. (1994). *Built to last: Successful habits of visionary companies*. New York: HarperCollins.
 20. 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.
 21. Dimmock, K. (1999). Management style and competitive strategies among tourism firms in the Northern Rivers. *Tourism Management*, 20(3), 323–339.
 22. Drucker, P.F. (1973). *Management: Tasks, responsibilities, practices*. New York: HarperBusiness.
 23. 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.
 24. Dundon, T., & Rollinson, D. (2011). *Understanding employment relations*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill.
 25. 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.
 26. Foss, N.J. & Klein, P.T. (2014). Why managers still matter. MIT Sloan Management Review. Fall, 73–80.
 27. Hamel, G. (2012). *What matters now*. New Jersey: Jossey-Bass.
 28. Harney, B. & Dundon, T. (2006). Capturing complexity: developing an integrated approach to analysing HRM in SMEs. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 16(1), 48–73.
 29. 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.
 30. 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.
31. Hiltrop, J. (1996). The impact of human resource management on organisational performance: Theory and research. *European Management Journal*, 14(6), 628–637.
 32. 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.
 33. 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.
 34. Jayasingam, S., & Cheng, M. Y. (2009). Leadership style and perception of effectiveness: enlightening Malaysian Managers. *Asian Social Science*, 5(2), 54–65.
 35. Jones, J. T. (2005). The determinants of training in Australian manufacturing SMEs. *Education + Training*, 47(8/9), 605–615.
 36. Jones, O. (2003). The persistence of autocratic management in small firms TCS and organisational change. *International Journal of Behaviour&Research*, 9(6), 245–267.
 37. 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.
 38. Joyce, W., Nohria, N., & Roberson, B. (2003). *What really works*. New York: HarperBusiness.
 39. Kennedy, J. C. (2002). Leadership in Malaysia: Traditional values, international outlook. *Academy of Management Executive*, 16(3), 15–26.
 40. Khandwalla, P. N. (1995). *Management Styles*. New Delhi, India: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing.
 41. Laloux, F. (2015). The future of management is teal. *strategy + business*, Autumn, 69-79.
 42. Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organization* (1st ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
 43. Makridakis, S. (1996). Factors affecting success in business: Management theories/tools versus predicting changes. *European Management Journal*, 14(1), 1–20.
 44. 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.
 45. Marcus, A.A. (2006). *Big winners and big losers*. New Jersey: Wharton School Publishing.
 46. 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.
 47. Matlay, H. (2002b). Industrial relations in the SMEs: Conceptual and contextual perspectives. *Journal of Small Business and Enterprise Development*, 9(3), 307–318.
 48. 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.
 49. 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.
 50. 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.
 51. Mintzberg, H. (2011). *Managing*. Great Britain: Prentice Hall.
 52. 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.
 53. 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.
 54. Owen, J. (2009). *The death of modern management*. West Sussex, UK: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
 55. Pavett, C., & Morris, T. (1995). Management styles within a multinational corporation: A five country comparative study. *Human Relations*, 48(10), 1171–1191.

56. Poole, M. (1986). *Industrial relations: Origins and patterns of national diversity* (1st ed.). London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
57. Purcell, J. (1987). Mapping management styles in employee relations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24(5), 533-548.
58. Quang, T., & Vuong, N. T. (2002). Management styles and organizational effectiveness in Vietnam. *Research and Practice in Human Resource Management*, 10(1), 36-55.
59. Rainnie, A. (1989). *Industrial relations in small firms: Small isn't beautiful* (First ed.). London: Routledge.
60. Rivas-Micoud, M. (2006). *The Ghosn factor*. Singapore: McGraw-Hill.
61. Robertson, B.J. (2015). *Holacracy: The revolutionary management system that abolishes hierarchy*. London: Portfolio Penguin.
62. Rosenzweig, P. (2007). *The halo effect*. New York: Free Press.
63. Salmiah, M. A. (2004). *Hubungan antara kompetensi pekerja dan prestasi kerja di kalangan kakitangan agensi kerajaan elektronik*. Universiti Utara Malaysia.
64. 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.
65. 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.
66. 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).
67. Sinha, J. B. P. (1980). *The nurturant-task leader. A model of the effective executive*. India: Concept.
68. 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.
69. 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.
70. 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.
71. 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.

You cannot solve a problem with the same mind that created it.

~ Albert Einstein.