www.joter.net
ISSN: 2792-0844

Management Styles

Mustafa Aslan[1*], Sinem Sönmez[2]

1- Istanbul Bilgi University, mustafa.aslan@bilgi.edu.tr, ORCID: 0000-0001-8049-3615
2- Bingöl University, sesonmez16@gmail.com, ORCID: 0000-0001-6390-8911
*Corresponding author

Issue Details
Issue Title:
Received: December 14, 2024
Accepted: June 25, 2025
Published: August 04, 2025
Pages: 001 - 018

Cite as: Aslan, M., & Sönmez, S. (2025). Management Styles. *Journal of Theoretical & Empirical Research on Management*, 4, 1-18.

Abstract

The existing management literature largely focuses on upper management styles, overlooking the comprehensive nature of management across all organizational levels and departments. This gap necessitates a broader yet specific classification to understand organizational dynamics holistically. Our paper proposes a classification of management styles into four categories: conservative, reactive, proactive, and predictive. The conservative style emphasizes traditional practices for stability, while the reactive style adapts dynamically to events. The proactive style leans towards innovation and foresight, and the predictive style harnesses data-driven insights for decision-making, representing advanced, analytics-guided management. This new classification promotes integrative strategies for enhanced organizational efficiency.

Keywords: Management Styles, Conservative Management, Reactive Management, Proactive Management, Predictive Management

1. INTRODUCTION

In the rapidly changing business world, management styles play a pivotal role in directing organizations toward sustainable success as they profoundly influence the work culture, employee satisfaction, and overall operational dynamism (Ogbonna & Harris, 2000). Adopting an appropriate management style can foster a conducive environment for innovation, thereby enhancing employees' intrinsic motivation —a factor empirically linked to heightened productivity and organizational commitment (Gagné & Deci, 2005). Moreover, a synergistic alignment between management style and organizational goals can facilitate strategic agility, enabling firms to navigate turbulent market landscapes with resilience and foresight (D'Innocenzo et al., 2016). It is, therefore, incumbent upon organizational leadership to judiciously select and cultivate a management style that resonates with the organizational ethos and leverages the collective potential of the workforce, steering the firm towards a path of sustainable growth and success (Yukl, 2012).

Before proceeding and to grasp the essence of this paper, we may ask a fundamental question: What is Management?

Management can be defined as *the process of utilizing the resources accessible to an organization to achieve its goals effectively and efficiently*. It is important to note that these accessible resources need not be possessed or controlled by the organization as long as they are accessible.

According to Robbins & Coulter (2012:7), an organization is formed by defining its people, structure, and objectives, and then organizing all these elements to function together. From the perspective of organizations, it is necessary to reach organizational goals efficiently and effectively by performing planning, organizing, directing, and controlling functions of the resources accessible to the organization.

In this context, management functions can be summarized as follows:

- Determining organizational objectives
- Planning in line with these objectives
- Organizing resources (including human resources)
- Leading the organization, fulfilling responsibilities, and ensuring coordination and collaboration between individuals, teams, and departments within the organization and other organizations
- Controlling these processes, both in formation and over time, enabling their realization, and making necessary adjustments, including targets and plans, according to changing conditions.

What we mean by "management style" must be related to how all these management functions are carried out. In other words, management style should concern itself with the philosophy and policies that affect organizational actions, rather than merely analyzing results. It should include policies that provide broad foresight on "*how things will be done*" in communication with all organizational stakeholders. Purcell (1987:534) noted that this development occurs more through experiences than through scientific studies. In another study, Okon & Isong (2016:53) referred to any guidance and control activities shown to motivate employees toward objectives as management style.

Management style, in its broadest sense, refers to all the activities that management must undertake to achieve organizational objectives. It is a developed organizational philosophy that concerns how a particular job, process, or situation is organized.

However, in the literature, management style is generally taken as the ways in which managers interact with followers, i.e., leadership styles. Although almost all the styles mentioned in this paper can be found as scattered in the literature, there is no article that has consolidated them under a single heading. This study aims to analyze management styles in the literature and then theoretically discuss why a new classification is needed, as well as what this new classification should entail, including its characteristics and advantages.

1. MANAGEMENT STYLES

Studies concerning management styles trace back to the 1950s, carried out by researchers like Likert, McGregor, Burns and Stalker, Mintzberg, Lewin, and others (Likert, 1932; Lewin, 1935; Lewin et al., 1939; McGregor, 1960/2006; Burns & Stalker, 1961; Tannenbaum & Schmidt, 1973; Khandwalla, 1976; Mintzberg, 1973a; Mintzberg, 1973b; Mintzberg, 1994; Effere, 2005, as cited in Stephen et al., 2018; Mintzberg, 2009; Koçel, 2013; Hindle, 2014; Çubukçu, 2018; Sharma, 2019; Raducan et al., 2020). Some of these studies are explained briefly below:

Likert's (1932) System Model emphasizes the importance of human and capital resources in organizations. Also known as the System 1-4 approach, Likert's model focuses on leadership, motivation, communication, interaction, and decision-making resources. Likert (1932) distinguishes four management philosophies: exploitative autocratic, benevolent autocratic, participative, and democratic. This model primarily focuses on leader-follower interactions rather than management functions or processes.

McGregor's (1960/2006) Theory X and Y is based on the nature of the manager's behavior. An authoritarian approach characterizes Theory X, whereas Theory Y emphasizes a more democratic and participative style. Like Likert's model, this theory centers on leadership rather than management functions.

Burns and Stalker's management theory classifies organizational structures as either mechanical or organic. Their work investigates how external environmental conditions influence the management styles in these structures, with mechanical organizations requiring more rigidity and organic ones more flexibility. This theory, too, does not directly concern management styles.

Mintzberg's (1973a, 1973b) Management Style Model stresses that management's essence lies more in "synthesis" rather than "analysis." Mintzberg emphasizes the importance of managers being effective listeners in the information processing process. Although closer to a theory of management style than others, Mintzberg focuses on what managers do, not how they do it, thus not directly addressing management style.

Tannenbaum and Schmidt's Model asserts that leadership behavior changes across a continuum. They emphasize the role and participation of followers in decision-making, describing management style as a structure that varies between a leader's authority and the freedom of followers. This theory also revolves around leadership, not management functions.

Effere (2005, as cited in Stephen et al., 2018) categorizes management styles as authoritarian, oppressive, democratic, affiliative, permissive, indifferent, coaching, visionary, bureaucratic, and defensive, with a focus on interactions between leaders and followers.

Khandwalla's Management Style describes management styles as conservative, entrepreneurial, professional, bureaucratic, organic, authoritarian, participative, intuitive, familial, and sacrificial. Khandwalla (1976) emphasizes the need for an entrepreneurial approach for diversified industries and rapid growth. He also highlights the relevance of different approaches in various contexts. Khandwalla's critique of other styles is that they are not indeed styles, as each one leaves out dimensions identified by other researchers. Perhaps the only classification termed a "management style" is Khandwalla's. Therefore, this translation will focus solely on Khandwalla's classification, examining why it may be deemed insufficient and why a new classification might be necessary.

Khandwalla (1976) defines the dimensions of management philosophy as *Risk-taking, Technocracy and planning, Structuring of activities, and Participation*. He describes management style as "a particular combination of the dimensions of management philosophy."

The risk-taking dimension involves investment, financing, entrepreneurship, and innovation, reflecting the degree of aggressive interaction with the external environment. The structuring of activities dimension represents how managers structure organizational roles and relationships. The technocracy and planning dimension involves managers' commitment to planning and reliance on the advice of technically qualified persons. The participation dimension reflects the degree of commitment to participative management and human relationships at work.

Khandwalla (1976) provided a matrix (Table 1) that depicts the relationship between his proposed eight management styles, the dimensions of management philosophy, and the distinguishing features of each style.

Table 1. Management Styles Proposed by Khandwalla

	Risk Taking	**Structuring of Activities**	**Technocracy and Planning**	**Participation**
Entrepreneurial Style	High	Low to Moderate	Low to Moderate	Low to Moderate
Professional Management Style	Moderate to High	Moderate to High	High	Moderate to High
Bureaucratic Style	Low to Moderate	High	Low to Moderate	Low to Moderate
Conservative-Traditional Style	Low	Low to Moderate	Low to Moderate	Low to Moderate
Professional- Bureaucratic Style	Low	High	High	High
Professional- Entrepreneurial Style	Moderate to High	Low to Moderate	High	Moderate to High
Colleaguial Style	Low to Moderate	Low to Moderate	Low to Moderate	
Middle-of-the-Road Styles	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate	Low to Moderate

Source: Khandwalla, 1976:46

Although Khandwalla's approach may be regarded as adaptable and applicable to a wide range of organizational structures, contexts, and various market conditions, business objectives, and organizational cultures, it may be argued that it is not simple and clear. Because the interplay between the various dimensions and styles can be complex, making it challenging for managers to apply them in real-world scenarios. The model also might not fully capture all the subtleties of human interaction and motivation within a business setting.

When all the studies are examined, it is observed that the management styles mentioned are nourished from the definitions of authoritarian, laissez-faire, and democratic management styles made by Lewin (1938-39). At the core of this study is the attempt to manage and guide employees in line with their objectives through the philosophy and practices adopted by the management. The essential behaviors in these three management styles are based on ensuring the participation of employees. Ensuring this in a way that oscillates between an authoritarian management style and a laissez-faire management style is seen as essential for organizations. The fact that no single or correct management style can be adopted for every condition also makes this necessary. Furthermore, they are based on the leader and follower interaction and cover only one side of management, i.e., leading.

Adopting an authoritarian management style means that employees have little say in decisions and activities and low participation. In the democratic management style, employees also have a say in management decisions. In situations where a laissez-faire management style is adopted, employees are expected to perform their duties and decisions with their own initiative. Taken as a whole, these three complementary management styles play a significant role in forming management philosophy. These concepts, which are often associated with leadership in the literature, essentially constitute the components of management style. The differences influence the reason for considering these as distinct from leadership in terms of power, authority, and position between the two concepts. Therefore, leadership styles are explained separately in the continuation of the study.

2. LEADERSHIP STYLES

Leadership, often considered the backbone of successful organizations, has been studied extensively over the years, and various leadership styles have been identified, each with its strengths, weaknesses, and optimal application settings. While numerous leadership styles exist, no one style is universally superior. Effective leaders often adapt their approach to meet the team's needs, the organization's culture, and the specific challenges at hand. Continuous learning, self-reflection, and adaptability are crucial attributes that enhance leadership effectiveness.

Transformational Leadership: Burns (1978) first introduced the concept of transformational leadership. Transformational leaders inspire their teams with a shared vision of the future. They are charismatic, fostering trust and admiration among their followers. These leaders are known to encourage innovation and are often at the forefront of organizational change.

Transactional Leadership: Also highlighted by Burns (1978), transactional leadership stands in contrast to transformational leadership. Transactional leaders operate on the premise of exchanges or transactions with their subordinates. For instance, they might offer rewards (e.g., bonuses) for completed tasks or punish for underperformance.

Servant Leadership: Introduced by Greenleaf (1977), servant leadership emphasizes the leader's role as a servant to others. These leaders prioritize the needs of their team members, focusing on personal growth, well-being, and success.

Autocratic Leadership: Lewin, Lippitt, and White (1939) identified this style where the leader makes decisions unilaterally. While it can be effective in situations requiring rapid decisions, it can also demotivate employees if applied extensively.

Democratic Leadership: Democratic leadership style, which was also identified by Lewin and his colleagues in 1939, actively involves team members in management activities, especially in the decision-making process (Lewin et al., 1939). Because of the involvement in the decision-making process, this style fosters a sense of ownership (Aslan & Atesoglu, 2021) and empowerment among employees.

Laissez-Faire Leadership: Another style noted by Lewin et al. (1939) is that the laissez-faire leader offers significant autonomy to their team members. While this can promote innovation, it can also result in a lack of direction if not managed effectively.

Situational Leadership: Developed by Hersey and Blanchard (1969), this theory posits that leaders should adapt their style to match the maturity level of their followers and the specific requirements of the task. The model suggests four primary leadership styles: directing, coaching, supporting, and delegating.

Charismatic Leadership: House (1977) described charismatic leaders as those who inspire and motivate their followers by their charm and personality. They create enthusiasm but can risk becoming overly focused on themselves at the expense of the team.

Participative Leadership: This style, deeply rooted in democratic leadership, emphasizes group decision-making. Vroom and Yetton (1973b) developed a decision model outlining different degrees of participative leadership.

Bureaucratic Leadership: This style, as described by Weber (1947), is rooted in following organizational policies and rules. Bureaucratic leaders make decisions based on policies and procedures rather than personal judgments.

3. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN LEADERSHIP AND MANAGEMENT

The distinction between leadership and management has been a topic of discussion for decades. Despite their interconnectedness, they embody different aspects of organizational operation. Delineating these differences can provide clarity for organizations to optimize both leadership and management roles.

While leadership and management are different facets of organizational operation, both are indispensable. An effective organization not only requires visionary leaders who provide direction and inspiration but also competent managers to ensure that the vision is realized through well-coordinated efforts. Organizations should strive for a balance, nurturing both leadership and management capabilities, to achieve sustainable success.

Some of the differences between Leadership and Management are listed below:

3.1. In Definitions and Core Concepts

Leadership: Leadership is synonymous with change and movement. As Kotter (1990) noted, leadership is about coping with change. Leaders establish direction by developing a vision for the future; they align people by communicating this vision and inspiring them to overcome hurdles. They motivate, inspire, and guide individuals towards achieving broader objectives and a crafted vision.

Management: According to Drucker (1954), management is rooted in order, consistency, and efficiency. Managers develop and implement systems that maintain the day-to-day operations of the organization. They are concerned with optimizing processes, allocating resources, and solving immediate issues that may arise. Drucker (1954) states that management ensures that the entire system and organization function harmoniously. It is about handling complexity, planning, budgeting, organizing, staffing, and problem-solving to meet organizational objectives.

3.2. Vision vs. Execution

Leadership is Visionary: Leadership is not related to an organization's day-to-day operations but to the possibilities and future. Bennis and Nanus (1985) provided a profound viewpoint, arguing that true leaders can articulate a vision that paints a bright picture of the future of the organization. This vision that is delivered by the leaders is more than just a statement but a strategic direction, which enlightens the path of the members of the organization and gives a clear picture of what the organization should be in the future. This vision provides clarity, purpose, and motivation to organizational members. The leaders are continuously crafting and communicating this vision, and the vision serves as an encouragement that guides individuals in understanding their roles within the larger organizational mission and inspiration that causes them to contribute with passion and purpose.

Management is Execution-focused: While leadership is focused on vision and future planning, the management is focused on operations and is concerned with ensuring that the organization's operations run smoothly. Because the execution of the plans is the core essence of management (Mintzberg, 1973b), in other words, leaders craft the vision, and managers translate it into measurable results. They concentrate on establishing solid processes, developing effective procedures, and establishing structures that allow for efficient execution. These operational frameworks ensure that leaders' broader vision is implemented systematically and organized, bringing the desired future one step closer to reality.

3.3. People vs. Task Orientation

Leadership and People Orientation: Leadership entails far more than simply wielding power or authority. Leadership is fundamentally about human connection and the relationships formed between leaders and their teams. Bass (1990) provided a comprehensive view on this, emphasizing that genuine leadership goes beyond task-oriented directives. Instead, it delves deeply into human emotions and aspirations. According to Bass (1990), leaders play a critical role in inspiring and motivating employees. This motivation is not based on promotion or reward of any kind but on a deep understanding of each employee's needs, aspirations, and potential. Leaders can ignite passion, commitment, and drive in their teams by tapping into these human elements, pushing them to achieve beyond the boundaries of their roles, and fostering an environment of continuous growth and development.

Management and Task Orientation: While leadership thrives on human connections and relationships, management is inextricably linked to the more tangible aspects of a company's operations. Management emerges as a discipline primarily concerned with the mechanics of an organization, drawing on the foundational work of Fayol (1949/1954). Managers, according to Fayol, are the keepers of organizational efficiency. Their primary focus is on the tasks, processes, and systems that serve as the foundation of an organization's daily operations. Managers ensure that resources, whether human, financial, or material, are used efficiently by meticulously designing, monitoring, and optimizing these elements. Their goal is to use these resources most effectively to achieve specific, predefined organizational goals while maintaining operational stability and consistency.

3.4. Risk-taking vs. Risk Aversion

Leadership Involves Risk-taking: In the ever-evolving landscape of business and innovation, stagnation can often lead to decline. Leadership, in its essence, is about pushing boundaries, challenging the status quo, and venturing into the unknown. Kouzes and Posner (1995) delved deep into this dimension of leadership, positing that true leaders are not just administrators of the present but are visionaries of the future. Such leaders recognize that innovation often requires taking calculated risks. They are willing to explore uncharted territories, challenge established norms, and experiment with novel ideas. Even when faced with uncertainties and potential failures, they are driven by the prospect of long-term gains and the transformative potential of their actions. By taking risks, they set the stage for breakthroughs that can redefine industries and leave lasting legacies.

Management Tends to be Risk Averse: While leadership thrives on exploration and innovation, management is the anchor that ensures an organization's stability and continuity. Management emerges as a discipline that prioritizes consistency, order, and predictability (Robbins & Coulter, 2012). Managers frequently serve as organizational stabilizers in their roles. They meticulously design processes, put structures in place, and supervise operations to ensure they run smoothly and efficiently. They typically seek to minimize uncertainties and variances by using tried-and-true methods that ensure consistent performance and delivery. Their primary goal is to ensure that the organization's operations remain stable and predictable, even in the face of external turbulence, thereby protecting the organization's immediate interests and long-term viability.

3.5. Change vs. Stability

Leadership Drives Change: Leaders are change agents who constantly push the organization forward and adapt to the changing business environment (Kotter, 1990). They recognize the importance of change and either push the organization to shape the future or to evolve, innovate, and reinvent itself to cope. Moreover, envisioning and implementing the change is the core of the leadership. The business world is dynamic, with new challenges and opportunities emerging constantly. Simply maintaining the status quo can result in obsolescence in this volatile environment. Leaders recognize the significance of agility and proactivity. They anticipate market shifts, technological advancements, and changing consumer preferences and guide their organizations to adapt accordingly. Leaders ensure that their organizations remain relevant, competitive, and poised for future success by fostering a culture of continuous learning and evolution.

Management Ensures Stability: While leaders drive change and innovation, there is also a critical need for organizational stability and consistency, and management ensures this organizational stability by coordinating resources, maintaining structures, and achieving equilibrium between various organizational segments. This is where management's role becomes critical (Fayol, 1949/1954). Managers should precisely coordinate the resources (including human, financial, or technological resources) to ensure effective and efficient use and achieve the goals as planned. They ensure the structural integrity of the organization by streamlining processes and ensuring the reliability of systems. Furthermore, they constantly strive to balance various organizational segments harmoniously, ensuring that while the organization is evolving and adapting externally, it remains cohesive and stable internally. This equilibrium ensures that day-to-day operations are unaffected even after implementing more significant organizational changes.

4. WHY IS A CLASSIFICATION OF "MANAGEMENT STYLE" NEEDED?

Khandwalla's (1976) identification of eight management styles provides an essential foundation for understanding upper management dynamics. However, this narrow focus, as Khandwalla himself acknowledges, is primarily concerned with the strategies and approaches of senior executives. This presents a limited view of the vast mosaic of modern corporate structures. However, we now find ourselves in an era of unprecedented organizational complexity and change, making Khandwalla's insights, while invaluable, not comprehensive enough for today's multifaceted corporate realities.

Businesses, both big and small, function on multiple tiers of management and operational activities, each contributing its unique value. Today, organizations are no longer linear entities; they resemble interconnected networks where information flows in multiple directions, and decision-making is often decentralized.

Within an organization, it's a well-accepted truth that management isn't solely the domain of those with grand titles and corner offices. From front-line managers to mid-level supervisors, everyone plays a role in the day-to-day management processes. Furthermore, in the age of collaborative tools and cross-functional teams, even those without traditional managerial roles find themselves in positions where they need to exercise management skills. Their ability to manage projects, stakeholders, or even just their time can significantly impact organizational outcomes.

Every employee in an organization is a valuable asset, leveraging resources like time, expertise, and experience. And as the nature of work evolves with the advent of remote working, gig economies, and digital transformations, the lines between leadership and management blur further. While it might seem that these resources are inherently personal, in a professional setting, they become intertwined with the company's objectives.

Therefore, a classification of management styles that captures these nuances and complexities is no longer just beneficial—it's imperative. Such a classification should span beyond traditional hierarchies to encompass diverse roles and scenarios present in today's dynamic work environment. It should provide a framework that aids individuals in understanding their unique managerial style and how it fits within the broader organizational context.

A well-constructed, comprehensive classification would serve as more than just a theoretical guide. It would bridge the existing knowledge gaps, offering clarity and direction for individuals across the organizational spectrum. By recognizing the expansive and diverse nature of management in modern times, we can pave the way for a more collaborative, agile, and effective organizational culture, where every individual, regardless of their position, contributes to the broader managerial ecosystem.

In sum, as organizations evolve and the nature of work transforms, sticking to traditional classifications of management styles becomes restrictive. To truly capture the essence of management in today's world, we must look beyond the boardroom and encompass the myriad ways in which individuals, at all levels, contribute to the management and leadership of the organization.

5. PROPOSED MANAGEMENT STYLES

We offer four distinct categorizations of management styles: conservative, reactive, proactive, and predictive. These styles—conservative, reactive, proactive, and predictive—each offer distinct pathways to navigate the complex decision-making and strategy formulation process.

One of the persistent challenges in today's multifaceted management world has been adequately capturing the diverse ways in which managers approach decision-making and strategy formulation. There are numerous classifications, but our extensive research and practical experience revealed a need for a streamlined yet comprehensive approach. As a result, we arrived at four distinct management style classifications: conservative, reactive, proactive, and predictive.

The main reasons that we have restricted our classification to these four styles are:

Simplicity and Clarity: While it may be tempting to expand into new categories, it is also critical to provide a framework that is simple to understand and implement. We provide a clear, concise roadmap for managers by focusing on these four styles, avoiding the confusion and overlap that can result from more intricate categorizations.

Coverage of the Management Spectrum: These proposed four management styles cover the entire range of management approaches, from the caution and consistency (conservative style) to the forward-thinking (predictive style) nature of management. Furthermore, we believe that these categories adequately cover the various strategies managers may employ.

Practicality and Relevance: Our goal was to ensure that each style was applicable to real-world scenarios and challenges. We've ensured that each category is not only theoretically sound but also practically relevant by limiting ourselves to these four.

Dynamism and Adaptability: The business world is constantly changing. We provide a dynamic framework that can adapt to changing circumstances by focusing on these four styles. Managers can identify with a specific style or even switch between styles as needed, ensuring resilience and flexibility.

Holistic Decision-making: These decision-making styles do not exist in isolation. They also reflect how managers interact with their teams, assess risks, develop long-term strategies, and deal with immediate challenges. We provide a holistic view of management by defining these four categories, assisting managers in not only making decisions but also understanding their broader implications.

While there are numerous ways to dissect and categorize management styles, our decision to focus on these four—conservative, reactive, proactive, and predictive—stems from a desire to offer a clear, comprehensive, and practical framework. We believe that this classification strikes the right balance, providing managers with the tools they need to navigate the complex landscape of modern management effectively.

The conservative style, emphasizing traditional, tried-and-true practices, offers stability and predictability in business operations (Hitt et al., 2012). On the other hand, the reactive style is distinguished by a dynamic response to unfolding events based on flexibility and adaptability (Mintzberg, 1994). Moving along the spectrum, the proactive style encourages foresight and strategic anticipation, promoting innovation and forward-thinking (Bateman & Crant, 1993). Lastly, the predictive style leans on data-driven insights to forecast trends and make informed decisions, representing the pinnacle of foresighted management guided by analytics and predictive modeling (Shmueli & Koppius, 2011).

www.joter.net
ISSN: 2792-0844

We attempted to explain each of these styles briefly below, along with their characteristics and benefits.

5.1. Conservative Management Style

The conservative management style remains a steadfast approach grounded in traditional business values and practices in the fast-paced business world. The conservative approach is distinguished by a reserved and cautious attitude towards changes, frequently relying heavily on tried-and-true proven methods, practices, and techniques. In high-uncertainty business environments, this management style provides a stable and risk-averse path (Hitt et al., 2012).

Characteristics of Conservative Management Style

- ***Relying on Established Practices*:** The conservative management style is based on tried-and-true practices and traditions that promote business stability and predictability (Tushman & O'Reilly III, 1996).
- ***Slow and Calculated Decision-Making*: While the conservative management style is based on proven practices, it also emphasizes slow and calculated decision-making (Parnell, 2013). This reduces the likelihood of risks by thoroughly analyzing the situation and its implications.**
- ***Resistance to Radical Innovations*:** The managers who adopt the conservative management style generally resist radical innovations. They prefer incremental changes perceived as less risky (Volberda, 1996).

Benefits of the Conservative Management Style

- ***Organizational Tradition and Culture*:** The conservative management style helps organizations preserve the culture and values accumulated and nurtured over the years (Schein, 2010).
- ***Financial Farsightedness*: The** conservative management style often manifests itself in financial farsightedness by advocating controlled spending and avoiding high-risk investments (Brigham & Houston, 2011).
- ***Stability and Predictability*: The** conservative management style yields stability and predictability and fosters a safe and secure working environment (Hitt et al., 2012).
- ***Long-term Sustainability*:** By avoiding risks associated with radical innovations and changes, conservative management can facilitate long-term sustainability for organizations (Tushman & O'Reilly III, 1996).

5.2. Reactive Management Style

Reactive management, characterized by responses to events post-occurrence, remains a common approach. While often viewed negatively compared to its proactive counterpart, a reactive approach has its own merits. Despite being critiqued for a lack of foresight, reactive management has its place in the corporate world, offering flexibility and adaptability in an unpredictable business environment (Mintzberg, 1994).

Characteristics of Reactive Management Style

- ***Response to Immediate Issues*: The** reactive management style is principally characterized by a response-oriented approach, where actions are predominantly driven by events post-occurrence rather than anticipated in advance (Sakiru & D'Silva, 2013).
- ***Flexibility and Adaptability*:** Reactive managers tend to adapt strategies based on the current circumstances rather than sticking to a predefined plan, which can be a significant asset in volatile markets (Volberda, 1996).
- ***Decision-making Under Uncertainty*:** Reactive management involves making decisions under uncertainty, often requiring rapid responses to unanticipated events, a process emphasized in the management literature (Tversky & Kahneman, 1974).

Benefits of Reactive Management

- ***Crisis Management*:** In crisis management, reactive strategies are often indispensable, where swift action is required in response to unforeseen situations (Pearson & Clair, 1998).
- ***Market Fluctuations*:** During unpredictable market fluctuations, a reactive approach allows organizations to adjust their strategies quickly, ensuring survival and potentially leveraging new opportunities (D'Aveni, 1994).
- ***Responsiveness to Market Dynamics*: The** reactive management style fosters responsiveness, enabling organizations to adapt swiftly to market dynamics, an aspect documented in dynamic capabilities theory (Teece et al., 1997).
- ***Reduced Planning Overheads*: The** reactive management style can significantly reduce the time and resources spent on elaborate planning, allowing for a leaner organizational structure (Mintzberg, 1973b).

5.3. Proactive Management Style

Although the reactive management style has its own pros, in today's dynamic and competitive business environment, the approach of simply reacting to events as they occur is gradually becoming outdated. Organizations are adopting management practices and strategies that emphasize anticipating and preparing for changes and challenges. This is called the proactive management style. According to Bateman and Crant (1993), this demands a proactive management approach that is suitable for an increasingly dynamic business environment. It uses foresight and strategic planning as tools for responding to problems that arise and steering the direction of the business in the future.

Characteristics of the Proactive Management Style

- ***Anticipation and Foresight*:** Proactive management centers on forecasting challenges and opportunities for the future. Critical analysis and strategic foresight allow managers to steer the organization for a profitable future (Caniëls et al., 2018).
- *Strategic Planning*: **Proactive managers tend to plan the future. They are using tools and tricks so that they could be able to foresee the upcoming threats or possibilities for the company. Such managers navigate their firms strategically across different situations (Grant, 2003).**

- ***Innovation and Continuous Improvement*:** Proactive management also entails a pledge to innovate and continually improve. Adopting this method creates an innovative environment that prompts teams to keep trying to find out how to improve the processes and products (Piercy & Morgan, 1991).

Benefits of the Proactive Management Style

- ***Developing a Forward-Thinking Culture*:** It is very important for management to instill a forward-thinking culture. Under managers, employees tend to become proactive, thus developing an atmosphere where anticipation is appreciated more than over-reaction (Bateman & Crant, 1993).
- ***Utilizing Predictive Analytics*:** Proactive Management includes integrating predictive analytics into strategic planning. Using data analysis enables preview of the markets and prediction of customers' preferences to inform choices in decision making (Shmueli & Koppius, 2011).
- ***Scenario Planning*:** Scenario planning is a widely used strategy tool within strategic management literature that proactive managers use to imagine different possible futures and then plan strategies to cope with them successfully (Schoemaker, 1995).
- ***Risk Mitigation*:** Through anticipatory actions and strategic planning, proactive management substantially reduces the risks associated with unforeseen challenges, facilitating smoother business operations (Grant, 2003).
- ***Competitive Advantage*:** Proactive management fosters a competitive advantage by encouraging innovation and the early adoption of emerging trends, positioning the organization ahead of the competition (Piercy & Morgan, 1991).
- ***Enhanced Responsiveness*:** With a focus on forward planning, organizations can respond more effectively to changes in the market dynamics, showcasing enhanced responsiveness and agility (Caniëls et al., 2018).

5.4. Predictive Management Style

The predictive management style has carved out a pivotal role in the modern business landscape, empowering organizations to navigate future challenges proactively and strategically. This management approach integrates data analytics and foresight into decision-making, enabling leaders to anticipate shifts and devise informed strategies (Trkman, 2010).

Amidst the rapid technological advancements and volatile market dynamics, adopting a predictive management style has become more of a necessity than a choice. By leveraging predictive analytics, this style endows leaders with the ability to anticipate future trends and pave a path guided by data-driven insights (Kiron et al., 2014).

Characteristics of Predictive Management Style

- ***Data-Driven Decision Making*:** Central to predictive management is the reliance on data and analytics to spearhead informed decisions. Leaders mine historical data, market analyses, and trend forecasts to shape strategies that mitigate uncertainties and fortify the organization's resilience (Davenport & Harris, 2007).

- ***Proactivity*****:** A distinguishing factor of predictive management is its proactive stance, encouraging leaders to foresee potential hurdles and devise plans to avoid or mitigate them, a perspective echoed in the proactive leadership theory (Bateman & Crant, 1993).
- ***Foresight*****:** The predictive management style facilitates scenario planning, wherein various future landscapes are envisioned to create a roadmap to desired outcomes, a practice supported by extensive research in strategic management (Schoemaker, 1995).
- ***Agility*****:** Agility is paramount in predictive management. Leaders foster a nimble and adaptive organizational culture, ready to pivot based on predictive insights and emerging trends (Doz & Kosonen, 2010).

Implementation of Predictive Management Style

- ***Leveraging Technology*****:** The implementation of the predictive management style often involves harnessing cutting-edge technologies such as Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) for deep data analysis, thereby providing actionable insights and facilitating informed strategic planning (Provost & Fawcett, 2013).
- ***Developing a Predictive Mindset*****:** Cultivating a predictive mindset across all organizational echelons is critical. This mindset entails nurturing talents to think forward, anticipate changes, and strategize accordingly (Diamandis & Kotler, 2012).
- ***Scenario Planning*****:** Scenario planning, a vital component of the predictive management style, requires crafting diverse future scenarios and formulating strategies to navigate them effectively (Schwartz, 1991).

Benefits of Predictive Management

- ***Enhanced Strategic Planning*****: The** predictive management style facilitates enhanced strategic planning, offering a robust framework to proactively anticipate and respond to market dynamics (Trkman, 2010).
- ***Risk Mitigation*****:** By anticipating potential issues before they arise, the predictive management style significantly reduces business risks, ensuring sustainability and growth in a competitive landscape (Schoemaker, 1995).
- ***Fostering Innovation*****: The** predictive management style encourages innovation by fostering a culture of foresight and readiness to embrace emerging opportunities, aligning with the theory that proactive strategies stimulate innovative solutions (Bateman & Crant, 1993).

These four management styles demonstrate universal applicability, they may be applied to any management level and any business domain, from quality management to marketing, human resources management, and innovation management. The beauty of these classifications lies in their self-explanatory nature. In most cases, the title is self-explainable: when we say conservative human resources management, we all know the meaning of it: "traditional HR practices that prioritize stability and tested methodologies." Similarly, reactive, proactive, and predictive terms carry intrinsic meanings that clearly indicate their underlying principles. As such, when applied in contexts, whether in marketing, innovation, or any other domain, these styles serve as intuitive frameworks, guiding strategies and operations in a manner that resonates with their inherent characteristics.

While distinct in their core principles, these management styles can be intertwined and coexist within a single organization. For instance, an organization might employ a predictive management style when forecasting market trends while simultaneously using a reactive style in areas where rapid adaptation to current events is crucial. Furthermore, transitions between these styles can occur as the organizations evolve.

Take the realm of quality management, for instance: Toyota's famed 'Kaizen' approach, emphasizing continuous improvement, is a prime example of proactive management. In marketing, companies like PepsiCo, which quickly shifted its advertising strategies in response to real-time events, showcase the reactive style. When it comes to human resources, many traditional firms, like General Electric in its early days, exemplified conservative human resources management, prioritizing time-tested practices and hierarchical structures. On the innovation front, tech giants like Amazon and Google deploy predictive models, utilizing big data analytics to forecast market trends and customer preferences, embodying the predictive style.

6. CONCLUSION

This paper tried to categorize and explain the proposed four cardinal management styles: conservative, reactive, proactive, and predictive. These styles stand as pillars guiding organizational strategies and responses.

The conservative approach includes diverse elements of firmness, convention, and discipline, which have their own merits, including stability, commitment to tradition, and control. This is so, but it also poses difficulties, particularly in a busy business world. Stability needs to be carefully balanced alongside an openness to change and innovation of leadership style. The Conservative Management Style could be perceived as antiquated in modern-day business operations. Nevertheless, this can be seen as an important methodology for those organizations that adhere to stability, traditionalism, and strengthening main principles.

The reactive management style is agile and quick but comes with a natural limitation that requires a response to events after they have already occurred. This often leads to inefficiency, excessive stress, and missed opportunities that managers may never anticipated. The best management style for such a business environment would be one that facilitates quick adaptation to different circumstances. However, it must still be balanced by strategic planning and proactive management for sustainability to be effective in the long run.

Proactive management is a strategy of insight, adaptability, partnership, and creation. In a proactive management style, it would necessitate the development of a learning organization that continuously learns and adapts. Such a proactive approach helps in managing risks, capturing opportunities, building a sustainable competitive advantage, and enhancing organizational agility, which results in more resilient businesses.

Predictive Management Style encompasses using statistical analysis, data mining, and modeling tools for guiding proactive decision-making and planning, which involves embracing the use of analytical tools for predicting future outcomes. The predictive management style has some positives, such as proactive plans, risk management, and the best utilization of resources for the company. Nonetheless, implementing it is not as simple as some would think; it demands good historical information and highly specialized and technological tools as well as expertise to use them. An organization adopting the predictive management style becomes well-informed in its operations with a basis through which it drives innovation, growth, and enhanced efficiency.

References

Aslan, M., & Atesoglu, H. (2021). The Effect of Innovation and Participation as Workplace Values on Job Satisfaction and the Mediating Effect of Psychological Ownership. *SAGE Open*. 11(4). https://doi.org/10.1177/21582440211061530

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.

Bateman, T. S., & Crant, J. M. (1993). The proactive component of organizational behavior: A measure and correlates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 14(2), 103-118.

Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge*. Harper & Row.

Brigham, E. F., & Houston, J. F. (2011). *Fundamentals of financial management*. South-Western Cengage Learning.

Burns, J.M. (1978). *Leadership*. New York: Harper & Row.

Burns, T., & Stalker, G. M. (1961). *The Management of Innovation*. Oxford University Press.

Caniëls, M. C., Semeijn, J., & Renders, I. H. (2018). Mind the mindset! The interaction of proactive personality, transformational leadership and growth mindset for engagement at work. *Career Development International*, 23(1), 48-66.

Çubukçu, M. (2018). Organizasyon Yapısını Belirleyen Faktörler ve Yapının Önemi (Factors Affecting Organizational Structure and The Importance of Structure). *Adnan Menderes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5(2), 175-190.

D'Aveni, R. A. (1994). *Hypercompetition: Managing the dynamics of strategic maneuvering*. Free Press.

D'Innocenzo, L., Mathieu, J. E., & Kukenberger, M. R. (2016). A Meta-Analysis of Different Forms of Shared Leadership–Team Performance Relations. *Journal of Management*, 42(7), 1964-1991.

Davenport, T. H., & Harris, J. G. (2007). *Competing on analytics: The new science of winning*. Harvard Business Press.

Diamandis, P., & Kotler, S. (2012). *Abundance: The future is better than you think*. Free Press.

Doz, Y. L., & Kosonen, M. (2010). Embedding strategic agility: A leadership agenda for accelerating business model renewal. *Long Range Planning*, 43(2-3), 370-382.

Drucker, P. (1954). *The practice of management*. New York: Harper & Row.

Effere, P. (2005). *Management styles London*. A paper written for Trans-Atlantic College.

Fayol, H. (1949/1954). *General and industrial management*. Sir Isaac Pitman & Sons Ltd.

Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.

Grant, R. M. (2003). Strategic planning in a turbulent environment: Evidence from the oil majors. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(6), 491-517.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. Paulist Press.

www.joter.net
ISSN: 2792-0844

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K.H. (1969). Life cycle theory of leadership. *Training & Development Journal*, 23(5), 26-34.

Hitt, M. A., Ireland, R. D., & Hoskisson, R. E. (2012). *Strategic management cases: competitiveness and globalization*. Cengage Learning.

Hindle, T. (2014). *Yönetimde Çığır Açan Fikirler ve Gurular (Translator. Ü. Şensoy).* İstanbul: Türkiye İş Bankası Kültür Yayınları.

House, R. J. (1977). A 1976 theory of charismatic leadership. Leadership: The cutting edge, Leadership: The Cutting Edge: a Symposium Held at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, October 27-28, 1976. Available at: https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED133827.pdf.

Khandwalla, P. N. (1976). The Design of Effective Top Management Style. *Vikalpa, 1*(2), 41-55.

Kiron, D., Ferguson, R. B., & Prentice, P. K. (2014). Raising big data's IQ. *MIT Sloan Management Review*, 55(3), 22-25.

Koçel, T. (2013). *İşletme Yöneticiliği: Yönetim ve Organizasyon, Organizasyonlarda Davranış Klasik-Modern-Çağdaş ve Güncel Yaklaşımla.* İstanbul: 14. Baskı Beta Yayıncılık.

Kotter, J. P. (1990). *A force for change: How leadership differs from management*. New York: Free Press.

Kotter, J. P. (1996). *Leading change*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (1995). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lewin, K. (1935). *A dynamic theory of personality* (1^{st} Edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R.K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 10(2), 271-299.

Likert, R. (1932). *A technique for the measurement of attitudes*. Archives of psychology. Available at: https://archive.org/details/likert-1932

McGregor, D. (1960/2006). *The human side of enterprise*. New York: McGraw Hill

Mintzberg, H. (1973a). Strategy-making in three modes. *California Management Review*, 16(2), 44-53.

Mintzberg, H. (1973b). *The nature of managerial work*. New York: Harper & Row.

Mintzberg, H. (1994). The fa973)ll and rise of strategic planning. *Harvard Business Review*, 72(1), 107-114.

Mintzberg, H. (2009). *Managing.* San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Ogbonna, E., & Harris, L. C. (2000). Leadership style, organizational culture and performance: empirical evidence from UK companies. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(4), 766-788.

Okon, F. I., & Isong, E. U. (2016). Management Styles and Employees' Performance in Small Scale Business Enterprises in Akwa Ibom State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Small Business and Entrepreneurship Research, 4*(1), 51-61.

Parnell, J. A. (2013). Uncertainty, risk, and opportunity: The role of strategic orientation in exploring sustainable business prospects. *International Journal of Sustainable Strategic Management*, 4(2), 175-193.

Pearson, C. M., & Clair, J. A. (1998). Reframing crisis management. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(1), 59-76.

Piercy, N., & Morgan, N. (1991). Strategic Management and Marketing. *European Journal of Marketing*, 25(3), 8-18.

Provost, F., & Fawcett, T. (2013). *Data science for business: What you need to know about data mining and data-analytic thinking*. O'Reilly Media, Inc.

Purcell, J. (1987). Mapping management styles in employee relations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24(5), 533-548.

Raducan, M., Vrabie, T., Colan, A., Colan, G., Cristache, N., & Cristia, V. (XXVI- 2020). The Influence of Management Style and Socio-Cultural Factors on the Education System in the European Union Countries. *Annals of "Dunarae de Jos" University of Galati Fascicle I. Economics and Applied Informatics* , 115-120.

Robbins, S. P., & Coulter, M. (2012). *Management* (11th Edition). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Sakiru, O. K., & D'Silva, J. L. (2013). Leadership styles and job satisfaction among employees in small and medium enterprises. *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, 2(3), 36-43.

Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership*. John Wiley & Sons.

Schoemaker, P. J. (1995). Scenario planning: a tool for strategic thinking. *Sloan Management Review*, 36(2), 25-40.

Schwartz, P. (1991). *The Art of the Long View: Planning for the Future in an Uncertain World*. Currency Doubleday.

Sharma, D. D. (2019). Review of Management Styles- International and Indian Perspective. *Paramana Research Journal, 9*(1), 506-515.

Shmueli, G., & Koppius, O. R. (2011). Predictive analytics in information systems research. *MIS Quarterly*, 35(3), 553-572.

Stephen, E. G., Eke, I. E., & Cinjel, D. N. (2018). Management Styles and Organizational Effectiveness: An Appraisal of Private Enterprises in Northern Nigeria. *International Journal of Sciences: Basic and Applied Research* (IJSBAR), 40(1), 37–49. Retrieved from https://gssrr.org/index.php/JournalOfBasicAndApplied/article/view/8969

Teece, D. J., Pisano, G., & Shuen, A. (1997). Dynamic capabilities and strategic management. *Strategic Management Journal*, 18(7), 509-533.

Tannenbaum, R., & Schmidt, W. H. (May-June 1973). How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review* , 162-180.

Trkman, P. (2010). The critical success factors of business process management. *International Journal of Information Management*, 30(2), 125-134.

Tushman, M. L., & O'Reilly III, C. A. (1996). Ambidextrous organizations: Managing evolutionary and revolutionary change. *California Management Review*, 38(4), 8-30.

Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under Uncertainty: Heuristics and Biases. *Science*, 185(4157), 1124-1131.

Volberda, H. W. (1996). Toward the flexible form: How to remain vital in hypercompetitive environments. *Organization Science*, 7(4), 359-374.

Vroom, V.H., & Yetton, P.W. (1973). *Leadership and decision-making*. University of Pittsburgh Pre.

Weber, M. (1947). *The theory of social and economic organization*. Free Press.

Yukl, G. (2012). *Leadership in organizations*. Prentice Hall.