

The Impact of Management Styles on Business Decision Making: Exploring the Different Models of Decision Making

Alaegbu Anastecia Nkeiru & Barisua Fortune Nwinee

Abstract

Decision-making is fundamentally a function of a company's top members' prerogative. Any success attributable to an organization depends wholly on the choice of its management styles and their grasp of administrative decisions and approaches to decision-making. Decision makers therefore, need to understand the concepts that ensure rationality and effectiveness in decisions; clarity in decision, time, work, and implementation and in follow-up evaluation needs to be taking into cognizance. Any style so adopted by management is seen to be the adhesive that binds diverse operations and functions together. It is the philosophy or set of principles by which the manager leverages on the workforce. Every organizations needs a better insight on the approach managers adopts in solving real life organization's problems. This paper is a theoretical paper and accessed and explored related literature. The research demonstrated that there are series of management styles which influence decision making styles. Hence, the paper concluded that; management style suggestively affects the degree of decisions made by both individual employees and the management team in an organization.



IJSB

Accepted 10 May 2019
Published 13 May 2019
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.2771707

Keywords: Management Style, Decision making, Rational Model, Situational Management Style, Collaborative Management Style.

About Author

Alaegbu Anastecia Nkeiru (Corresponding Author), Department of Marketing, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

Prof. Barisua Fortune Nwinee, Dean, Faculty of Management Sciences, University of Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria.

Introduction

The business environment is loaded with burdens arising from the dynamics of the world economy. The threats and opportunities occasioned by the uncertainties orchestrated by the business environment which consequently stifled the growth of a good number of enterprises while a few that could not endure the economic storms, explored other frontiers on quality, stance to remain afloat. The decline in the performance and effectiveness of these private enterprises may be attributed to the direction and magnitude of the managerial skills, competences and leadership styles so adopted. For enterprises to remain economically buoyant and virile, it must attain a level that is strategically meaningful in terms of how it applies itself to these supposed turbulent business environments. Management style is construed to be an entrenched mode of operation engendered by organisation's vision statement. It is the general approach of a manager in dealing with people at work and exercising authority over subordinates in an effort to reach organizational goals (Quang, 2002; Hartzell, 2006). Luthans (1992) highlighted types of managers; human-oriented and organization-oriented, promotes collective targeting; trust employees and respect their values (as part of human resource). Human-oriented managers in an organization are employees focused while the organization-oriented managers fixated to goals and missions of an organization. On the contrary, organization-oriented managers rely mostly on organizational rules and regulations and severely control the employees to ensure the exact implementation of the rules and regulations (Reza and Asghar, 2013).

Decision making theory is a separate science, an important branch of modern management science (Hassan and Maher, 2004). The success achieved by any organization depends primarily on the aptitude, efficacious disposition of its management styles and their approaches to decision-making. It is advisably so that managers take responsibilities for the actions and inactions when results go bad without pointing accusing finger on others. This however, decreases trust and respect (Moss et al., 2007). Basically, Managers are responsible for making decision hence, establishing an organized process. This process is crucial for all organizations due to its effect in hindering or facilitating goal execution, job satisfaction, competitive sustainability and overall success (Author's Observation, 2019). Decisions are the prerogative of managers in organization, to the extent that employers allow them to share or participate (Van Loveren, 2007). In specific terms, this paper seeks to identify the prevalent management styles and decision making.

Literature Review

Management Styles

Managers are the heart-beat of any organization and their inputs are always uncommonly taken when seeking the best ways of handling business challenges. As such; Gates, Toyota, Dell and among many others have managed to raise and their organizations to enviable heights. Studies have shown that management styles adopted by any organisation would have significant effect on its strategic position (McGuire, 2005; Robbins, 2003). Management style is best portrayed as a strategy of leadership that is utilized by lower level managers (Namiq, 2018). Namiq, (2018) asserts that management has a broad spectrum of scholarly publication each having different divisions and definition of management style adopted. The managerial style adopted by businesses however, motivates or discourages organisation members hence; determine employees' turnover and their levels of performance. Management style is a managerial terminology often used to describe how well the management is. It is further conceptualised as a function or behaviour associated with personality (McGuire, 2005). This

style can be better understood as a way to manage an organization. According to Schleh (1977), management style is “the adhesive that binds diverse operations and functions together”, a philosophy or set of principles by which the manager capitalizes on the abilities of the workforce. Management style has never been a procedure on how to get things done but a framework for doing things. It is an approach to solving problems and the quest towards achieving the goals of organization, transforming various resources available into output through the functions of management (Field & Dubey, 2001). Khandwalla (1995b) considered management style as the distinctive way in which an organization makes decisions and discharges various functions; goal setting, formulation, implementation of strategy, corporate image building, dealing with key stakeholders and other basic management activities. Other scholars view it as the over-reaching manner in which management exercises control over its subordinates (Dimitrova, 2003). Similarly, Hersey and Blanchard, (1993) assert that management style is the pattern of behaviours that managers display during their work with and through others. It is the general approach of a manager in dealing with people at work and exercising of authority over workers’ in an effort to reach organizational goals (Quang, 2002; Hartzell, 2006) equally, a leadership method a manager uses in administering an organization. It includes controlling, directing, indeed all techniques and methods used by leaders to motivate subordinates to follow their instructions. It can be described as the practice used to direct an organization (Robbins, 2003). Arguably, Effective management style is the degree to which a leader consistently and progressively leads and directs subordinates to a predetermined destination agreed upon by the whole group. This however, can be actualized if the organization is taken from the system perspective. According to Ravindra and Premkumar, (2010), Management styles are collectively learnt behaviours, subject to all the infirmities of human learning. They incorporate both the contents of decision making and the process of decision making and are aligned to goal setting, strategy formulations and strategy implementation. There is a local parlance that says, good decision is as a result of effective management styles. Organization on the other hand, functions effectively when there are persons to communicate with and who are willing to contribute their ideas to accomplish a common purpose. According to Kavanaugh and Ninemeier (2001), there are three factors that determine the type of management style so adopted by organisations; managers’ characteristics, subordinates’ characteristics and the organization environment. More specifically, the personal background of managers such as personality, knowledge, values, and experiences shapes their feelings about appropriate leadership that determine their specific management style. Employees do also have different personalities, back- grounds expectations and experiences, for example, employees who are more knowledgeable and experienced may work well under a democratic management style, while employees with different experiences and expectations may well be better with an autocratic management style.

Dimensions of Management Styles

Several management styles have evolved up till now as managers utilized differing approaches in performing responsibilities in the course of their job duties. Variations of management styles have emerged as technology and innovation evolve on daily basis. Many scholars have identified and described a variety of formal styles of management since the 1950’s. Likert (1967) classified four approaches of management that constitute a continuum of Participative, Paternalistic, Exploitative and Autocratic, and Consultative management style while Burn and Stalker (1961) identified organic and mechanistic styles of management. Furthermore, Minzberg (1973) considered entrepreneurial and strategic planning as forms of

management styles adopted by managers in organizational entities. In recent times, management styles includes Authoritarian, Coercive, Democratic, Affiliative, Permissive, Indifferent, Coaching, Pacesetting, Visionary, Bureaucratic and Defensive styles of management (Effere, 2005). McGuire (2005) came up with charismatic, persuasive, consultative, transactional, transformational and delegating styles and explored basic management styles practised by different managers in the pharmaceutical industry. A survey conducted by Worrall (2004) in United Kingdom found that most managers were bureaucratic and restrictive in their management styles which were not conducive to development of high success cultures for creativity and innovation to flourish in most organizations. Blandchard (1994) condensed management styles into four basic types; directing, supporting, coaching and delegation while Khandwalla (1995) identified ten(10) dimensions of management styles such as conservative, participative, bureaucratic, paternalistic, authoritarian, organic, entrepreneurial, visionary, professional and altruistic. Pascale and Athos (1981) studied the Japanese style of management and came up with paternalism, lifetime employment, seniority, lifelong learning, collective decision making, hard work, co-operation ethics, continuous adaptation and improvement. Harbison and Myers (1969) classified management styles as autocratic, paternalistic, participative and Laissez-faire while another emerging management style is theory z proposed by William Oluchi (Nwadukwe and Timinepere, 2012). Consequently, Degens (1997) advocated for the adoption of management tolerance for learning organizations and knowledge-based companies instead of action-oriented management style. There are several management styles identified and grouped by different management scholars as literature were reviewed in support of this study. It is clearly evident that the classification of management styles is overlapping and homogenous with slight diversity. However, we observed that the variation of management styles arise due to differences in the types of business organization, nature of staff of these organizations, national cultures and settings. Therefore, the study summarizes the management styles thus:

Democratic Management Style

Democratic management influences people in a manner that is consistent with the basics of democratic principles and processes, such as deliberation, equal participation, inclusiveness and self-determination (Dahl, 1989; Fishkin, 1991; Basit, et al. 2017). According to White and Lippitt (1960 cited in Choi, 2007), democratic managers actively encourage and stimulate group decisions and discussions. Kuczarski and Kuczarski(1995 cited in Puni, et al., 2014) characterised of democratic managers as being influential, helpful, knowledgeable, good listeners, encouraging, guiding and respectful a style that is centralised more on people and interaction within the group. Iqbal, et al. (2015) stated that democratic managers make no suggestions, however they enquire the opinions of others. This type of management styles stimulates all team members to participate in making final decision and develop the entire process to reach their goals (Trivisonno and Barling, 2016). One of the major benefits of democratic management style according to Armstrong and Taylor, (2014) is that, the process encourages the development of some additional managers who can majorly motivate the organization and have active involvement on the part of everyone in the team. Democratic managers however, encourage and invite team members to play a significant, perhaps contributory role in the final decision making process but the ultimate power in any case lies in the hands of managers and he directs on what to do, how to do it whereas, employees communicate their suggestions, experiences and recommendations (Skogstad, 2015).

Autocratic Management Style

This type of management style does not have any trust and faith in the subordinates; it is discretionary and never allows participation in the decision-making process. All the decisions and policies of the organization are managers' prerogative and are conveyed down through a chain. Employees do work with fear of being reprimanded and threat, incidental rewards and satisfaction on the physiological and safety levels. The little interactions which occur between the manager and subordinates are often accompanied by fear, suspicion, suspension and threat of being fired. The control process is intensely focused at the level of top management. Often, such situations, informal organization is formed which opposes the organizational goals and objectives (Hersey and Blanchard, 1998). According to Khan, et al. (2015), autocratic management style is where manager retains as much power and decision-making power as possible. Melling & Little (2004 cited in Akor, 2014) stated that autocratic managers are high-handed leaders and are the centre of every activity that goes on in the establishment and all authority emanate from them and ends with them. According to Iqbal, et al. (2015), autocratic managers are championed by an "I tell" philosophy; they tell other people what to do. Nwankwo (2001 cited in Akor, 2014) described this style as a management style where managers exclusively make decisions and production is emphasized at the expense of any human consideration. This style represents all those managers who makes decision without the consent of team members and is usually applied when quick decision is taken and team agreement is not important for attainment of successful results (Boehm, et al., 2015). On rare occasions that little opportunities are given to staff and team members to make suggestions, even if it is in the best interest of the team or organization (Amanchukwu, et al., 2015). An autocratic manager mostly makes selection on the basis of their own judgments and ideas that rarely include follower's advice and these managers have absolute control over the group (Zareen, et al., 2015). According to Iqbal, et al. (2015), autocratic managers give orders without explaining the reasons or future intentions. However, this style of management has its overwhelming advantages which this study does not cover.

Laissez-Faire Management Style

Deluga (1992) proclaimed that laissez-faire management style is associated with unproductiveness, ineffectiveness and dissatisfaction (cited in Koech & Namusonge, 2012). According to Bass & Avolio (1997) and Hartog & Van Muijen (1997), laissez faire managers avoid making decisions, the provision of rewards and the provision of positive/negative feedback to subordinates (cited in Basit, et al. 2017). Jones & Rudd (2007) described laissez-faire management as management in an inactive form characterized by unwillingness to be actively involved and a view that the best leadership comes from disassociation from activities. Cilliers et al., (2008 cited in Ejimabo, 2015) stated that these managers avoid active participation in responsibility of goals setting and avoid being involved when management direction is needed. In this style the performance of workforce entirely relies on team member's ability, skills and capabilities (Adler & Reid, 2008). Team members are free to take decision in their own way and leaders provide complete freedom to subordinates to work as per their own way and take major decisions (Coyle-Shapiro, 2013). Some renowned researchers have stated that Laissez-Faire style had led to increased job satisfaction and better performance of employees, but could be damaging if team does not manage their time well or if they are not self-motivated to do their work efficiently (Martin, 2013). Laissez-Faire management style usually manages to increased chaos in the organization as every individual believes himself or herself as own manager (Monzani, 2015).

Situational Management Style

Situational management style originally was developed by Hershey and Blanchard (1996 cited in McCleskey, 2014) to describe management style and stress the need to connect leadership style to the maturity level of the followers. According to Graeff (1997) and Grint (2011), this theory emphasized that instead of applying just one managerial style, successful managers should adopt management style based on the details of tasks and the maturity of their followers as well as having a rational understanding of a situation (cited in McCleskey, 2014).

Transformational Management Style

Past studies have constantly reported that transformational management style is more effective, productive, innovative, and satisfying to followers as both parties work towards the good of organization propelled by shared visions and values as well as mutual trust and respect (Avolio and Bass, 1991). This implies that transformational managers believe in sharing of formalized power and more often practice the use of personal power. Transformational managers are charismatic, inspirational, intellectually stimulating, and individually considerate (Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). These managers help individuals transcend their self-interest for the sake of the larger vision of the firm. They believe in people, and they are driven by a strong set of values such as loyalty, trust, and personal attention to employees. Bass and Avolio (1994) revealed that transformational managers who encourage their followers to think critically and creatively can have an influence on their subordinates' commitment. This is further supported by Walumbwa and Lawler (2003) that transformational leaders can motivate and increase followers' motivation and organizational commitment by getting them to solve problems creatively and also understanding their needs. Price (1997) further suggests that employees are far more likely to be committed to the organization if they have confidence with their superiors. In the same vein, other study has drawn a distinction between authentic transformational management style and pseudo-transformational management style (Bass, 1985). It was however, found that pseudo-transformational managers would seek power and position even at the expense of their subordinates' achievements, thus their behaviours are inconsistent and unreliable (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999).

Transactional Management Style

Another type of management style which has been widely used in organizational behaviour is the transactional management style. Burns (1978) who pioneered the study of transactional management style indicated that transactional superiors are those who sought to motivate subordinates by appealing to their self-interests. These managers motivate subordinates to achieve expected levels of performance by helping them to recognize task responsibilities, identify goals and develop confidence about meeting desired performance levels (Bass, 1990). Transactional leaders set goals, articulate explicit agreements regarding what the leader expects from organizational members and how they will be rewarded for their efforts and commitment, and provide constructive feedback to keep every person on task (Howell & Hall-Merenda, 2002). According to Bass and Avolio (1994), transactional managers employ three factors; contingent reward, management-by-exception active and management-by-exception passive. In contingent rewards, manager provides subordinates with material and psychological rewards contingent on the fulfilment of contractual obligations. Bass (1985) emphasized that by providing contingent rewards, a transactional manager might inspire a reasonable degree of involvement, loyalty, commitment and performance from subordinates.

On the other hand, management-by-exception is whereby the superior is vigilant and ensures that subordinates meet predetermined standards. In management-by-exception passive, superior intervenes with subordinates only after non-compliance of standards has occurred or when mistakes have already happened.

Paternalistic Management style

This type of management has confidence and trust together with tolerance such as the confidence and trust of a master towards servant or subordinates. While all the decision and goals determination is performed on top level of the organization, some of the decision are made at lower levels within a prescribed framework and every mutual interaction between the manager and subordinates takes place within the tolerance, fear and caution exhibited by subordinates and leniency of the managers while the control mechanism is determined by the top management. Some also is delegated to middle or lower levels. In this case, usually an informed organization is shaped, but do not always oppose or resist the formal goals of the organization (Hersey and Blanchard, 1998 cited in Reza and Asghar, 2013). Paternalistic management style is a management style in which the manager takes into account the best interest of the employees as well as that of the business. In paternalistic management style, communication is downward, feedback and questioning authority are absent as a respect to superior and group harmony. The manager behaves like a father with the employees (Okon and Isong, 2016). He or she takes care of both the job related challenges and personal challenges of the employees. The relationship between the manager and the employees is just like that of the father to- child-kind of relationship. The manager however, keeps control over the employees and at the same time allows them to be innovative in the way they do their job (Okon and Isong, 2016).

Persuasive Management Style

Persuasive managers maintain control over every aspect of the business indirectly. Instead of giving orders, these managers operate by explaining why tasks need to be carried out in a certain way. Employees tend to feel more involved in the decision-making process under this style; nevertheless, ultimate authority still rests with the manager alone. Persuasive management is a particularly helpful style when complicated tasks need to be carried out in the work place (Brewer, Selden, and Facer, 2000). However, managers who rely too heavily on explaining every task in detail may see their businesses slow to a crawl. A persuasive management style is that of a manager who uses their ability to interpret a situation, people's actions and dialogue, and then strongly urges or convinces them to do a task or achieve objectives the manager's way. This style has many characteristic in common with the autocratic style. The main difference between the styles, however, is that once a persuasive manager makes a decision, they then try to convince a subordinate that what was decided by the manager is in the subordinate's best interests. For example, a marketing department manager who has an idea of increasing sales targets will try to convince the rest of the team that only this idea will improve the sales targets. This type of manager will try to bring people around to their own view, but will also stick to their decision with or without agreement. Just as there are occasions where the use of an autocratic management style would be appropriate, there are also instances where a company will benefit from a persuasive management style. Persuasive management style is a type of management style in which the manager shares some characteristics with that of an autocratic manager. The most important aspect of a persuasive manager is that they maintain control over the entire decision-making process (Okon and Isong, 2016). In persuasive management style, the manager uses their

ability to interpret a situation, people actions and dialogue, and then strongly urges them or convinces them to do a task or achieve certain objectives the manager's way. In the type of management style, employees are not actively involved in decision making process hence, opportunities for employees initiative and commitment are overlooked, leading to low level of motivation and job satisfaction.

Advisory Management Style

This management style has a significant but not complete trust and confidence in subordinates, while the general policies and important decision are made at top level, subordinates are allowed to make decisions at a lower level in so much a special and specialized matters. Communication is flowing from higher levels to the lower levels. Incidental Punishment and reward and to some extent participation are used as a mean of employee motivation. It is often heralded with mutual interactions between a manager and subordinate who often are accompanied by a balanced trust and confidence. Important aspects of control process are delegated to lower levels. Informal organization might be formed as a result; however, it either confirms the organization's goals or to some extent resists it (Hersey and Blanchard, 1998 cited in Reza and Asghar, 2013).

Collaborative Management Style

In this type of management style complete trust and confidence is expressed toward subordinates. Although decision making is largely distributed across the organization; however, it has a kind of integration. Communication is not only from top levels to low levels but between groups and everyone. Employees' motivation is created as an effect of their direct participation in determining economic rewards, goals, methods improvement and performance appraisals in line with the organization goals. Under this type of management style, mutual interaction between a manager and a subordinate is extensive which is accompanied by so much confidence and trust. With regards to control process, there is a collective and extensive responsibility in which the lower levels completely participate. Formal and informal organizations are often the same with respect to this hence; social forces support the efforts for realization of the organization's goals (Reza and Asghar, 2013).

Charismatic Management Style

Charismatic management style is characterised by managers' natural ability to attract people and inspire their commitment to a cause. It is an attempt to fulfil organizational goals by instilling devotion in group members through a charming personality. Charismatic managers involve in self-sacrifice and take personal risks based on their beliefs. According to Congers & Kanungo (1988), some of the characteristics of charismatic management style include high level of self-confidence, possession of an idealised goal that proposes a better future than the status quo (vision), strong convictions about the vision, extra ordinary behaviours, a change agent and the ability to make realistic assessments of the environmental constraints and resources needed to change things. Weber (1978 cited in Mkheimer, 2018) defined charismatic management style as "resting on devotion to the exceptional sanctity, heroism or exemplary character of an individual person". In the same stream, Shamir et al., (1993 cited Mkheimer, 2018) discussed making a charismatic superior require a consciousness of multi-dimensional identity which was significant in this style of management. Empirical studies indicated with respect to the means which the managers use, that the charismatic managers may manage creativity and innovative business basically on their behaviours and personality (House et al., 1991). Other studies have declared that charismatic leaders normally affect their

followers by forming a promising and prosperous future rather than making dissatisfaction comparing with the present situation (Nadler and Tushman, 1990). There is broad clue that charismatic management style controls the level of organizational commitment, increase energy and organize individual's efforts towards strategic objectives, visions (James and Lahti, 2011). Avolio et al. (1993 cited in Mkheimer, 2018) showed that charismatic leaders are appreciative, respectful, dedicated and honest to a course. Similarly, other attempts have created a significant correlation between charismatic management style and group effectiveness as well as rejuvenation (Paulsen et al., 2009).

Visionary Management Style

Visionary management style is a situation in which the superior and subordinates move together towards a desired future as a result of the superior inspiring in vision, and helping others to see how they can contribute to this vision. Nayab & Scheid (2011) opined that a visionary manager dreams about the future and translates such dreams into specific, achievable goals and is able to articulate them with great inspiration to instil the commitment in others. Visionary management style involves the ability to forecast the future, anticipate change and take initiatives towards the attainment of group goals. McLaughlin (2001) posited that a visionary superior may dream wonderful visions of the future and articulate them with great inspiration, but it requires management and heartfelt commitment for a vision to take form in today's world. Visionary or imaginative leadership style is such that is most proper when an organization needs another heading. Its objective likely moves individuals towards a new set of shared visions and goals. Visionary manager however, focuses on where a group is going and does not consider how it gets there in other words the focus is on the destination, not the road, allowing individuals to advance, explore and take risks (Namiq, 2018).

Servant Management Style

Servant management style may be described as a situation in which the superior in a group is not readily noticeable but manages from the background with the primary goal of meeting the needs of the team. This striking characteristic of servant managers allows their team take credit for their efficiency and hard work. Servant management style is founded on the assumption that superiors are first of all servants and then leaders. These superiors lead by example and uphold the "do as I do" principle. Servant management style possess democratic features that encourages participative decision making among group members which is a departure from the traditional management style of dominating subordinates and telling them what to do.

Participatory Management Style

Participative management style sometimes known as consultative management style. This decision making style in management revolves around getting lots of feedback from your workers' before coming to a conclusion and making a decision. As noted in the brief overview of the development of management thoughts, the behavioural school has most directly influenced the development of the concepts of participatory management. The field of organizational behaviour most impacted the practice of participatory management principles and skills (Daniel, 2014). Locke and Schweiger (1979) defined participation management as a process by which influence is shared among individuals who are otherwise hierarchically unequal. According to Wagner (1994), participatory management style balances the involvement of managers and their subordinates in information-processing, decision-making, or problem-solving endeavour. An extensive body of research has shown that participative

management defined as joint decision-making or, at least, shared influence in decision making by a superior and his employees (Koopman and Wierdsma, 1998). Management theorist like Maslow(1954) and Argyris 1957) emphasized the importance of coordinating organisational and human resources to enhance productivity and develop human capital. Studies have shown that participative management style has a positive impact on employees' motivation, job satisfaction and productivity(Spreitzer 1997; Likert 2007). This style keeps employees informed about issues that affect their work, with management and employees sharing in decision making and problem solving tasks. The management acts more like a coach who get their team of employees to work together to improve the overall performance of the organization.

Coaching Management Style

This is a situation in which there is a one-on-one style centre on making people, showing them how to improve their performances and aligning their goals with organization goals thus the both goals congregating on one purpose. Coaching style works best with employees who demonstrate activeness and shows need for more expert advancement. However, boomerang is expected if it goes towards "micro-managing" which will consequently cause losing self-confidence and morale for the employee.

Affiliate Management Style

Affiliate style underlines the significance of collaboration and makes group harmony by strengthening people's communication. It is specifically important when you have to enhance the balance of the team, improve morale, and restore the broken trust and communications in the organization. However, it has its downsides, continuous positive feedback on the group performance might lead to poor performance to go uncorrected and persuade that insignificance will be endured.

Pacesetting Management Style

Pacesetting Management Style is where the manager sets high standards for performance. He or she is obsessive about doing things better and faster and asks the same from everyone, this style destroys work environment, employees will experience overwhelmed by managers needs for excellence. Working guidelines might be clear for the manager, however, they do not clarify them properly and expects people to know what to do and how to thinks, it will lead to morale drop and failure feeling among people. But it has shrouded advantage: quick acquiring of the outcomes within the short time period, there will be a high-energy group with the terrific performance in terms of conducting tasks as well as the quality of the work itself (Namiq, 2018).

Business Decision Making

Making decisions is one of the main activities of a manager. Azeska, et al. (2017) believes that decision making is mandatory for successful execution of any managerial function. The decision-making skills refer to the ability of manager in order to perform decision making process accurately. One step of the decision making process is the decision maker ability to recognize that a decision is necessary and identify the suitable alternatives measures before selecting one. As a consequence, the decision-making process involves recognizing and defining the nature of situation that need a decision, determining alternatives, selecting the "best" alternative, and putting it into action. Further, as part of the decision-making process the manager should determine who will make or share in the decision. Hence, a manager

needs to understand how to make the “best” decision by him or herself, as well as how to most effectively manage process of making decisions that can involve other people (Griffin et al., 2012). People have different unique ways of thinking and learning, as well as a unique style of making decisions. There are four decision making styles according to Rowe and Boulgardies (1983) analytical, conceptual, behavioural, and directive. Moreover, Robbins et al (2010) confirmed these four decision making styles. Decision making style can be rational or intuitive, and it can be also exhibit a higher or low degree of tolerance for ambiguity (Rowe et al., 1983 & Robbins et al., 2010). Analytical style of decision making (thinking–task) has a capacity for abstract; logical thinking; high tolerance for the ambiguity; searches out and verifies large amounts of data and information. Conceptual style of decision making (thinking–people) has a creative capacity; high tolerance for the ambiguity and complexity; values quality; and shares values with colleagues. Behavioural style of decision making (acting–people) is characterized by personal; focuses on individual; low tolerance for the ambiguity; supportive and participative. Directive style of decision making (acting–task) is characterized by focusing on short-term outcomes; appetite for control; low tolerance for the ambiguity; implements the operational objectives systematically and efficiently (Rowe et al., 1983 & Robbins et al., 2010). The Four Quadrant Model of the Brain of Ned Herman, Rowe (Rowe et al., 1989 cited in Azeska, et al. 2017)) conceptualised four styles of decision making. The activity of each quadrant of the brain is the basis for a particular style of decision making. Decision -making is an influential process, where one’s core values and beliefs are important and vital. Decision -making generally conceptualized as a learned response through which an individual approaches important decisions (Misra and Srivastava, 2012). Decision -making is primarily a cognitive process that combines the mental activities of perception, information processing or cognition, that brings a manager close the problem and facilitates him to make judgment (Misra and Srivastava, 2012). Misra and Srivastava(2012) argued that different decision makers make different decisions because individuals use different methods to perceive information (cognitive complexity) and evaluate information (values orientation).

Models of Business Decision-Making

There are varieties of business decision making models trending in today’s business world as explored from the literature review. Among them, we considered them in their individual merit and further corroborate the theory so stated. Below are some of the models which this piece of work considers relevant to it.

The Rational Model

The rational manager view assumes a rational and completely informed decision-maker-“economic man” as described by neo-classical micro-economic theory. The process of rational decision-making comprises a number of steps, as highlighted by Simon (1977) thus, Intelligence; finding occasions for making a decision, Design; inventing, developing and analysing possible courses of action, Choice; selecting a particular course of action from those available; and Review; assessing past choices. In classical or perfect rationality, methods of decision analyses are used to attach numerical values or utilities to each of the alternatives during the selection phase. The alternative with the highest utility (or maximum subjective expected utility) is selected. According Kreithner and Kinicki (2001), when using the rational model in this fashion, it is assumed that managers should: know of all possible alternatives, know the consequences of implementing each alternative, have a well organised set of preferences for these consequences and have the computational ability to compare consequences and to determine which is preferred.

The Model of Bounded Rationality

The “satisfying,” process-oriented view is based primarily on Simon’s (1979) work on bounded rationality, admitting that the rational manager does not always have complete information, and that optimal selections are not always required. According to Simon (as quoted by Chase et al., 1998), “human rational behaviour is shaped by a scissors whose two blades are the structure of task environments and the computational capabilities of the actor.” These scissors cut the problem space in to a much smaller area that is feasible to search. Bounded rationality is characterised by the activities of searching and satisfying. Alternatives are searched for and evaluated sequentially. If an alternative satisfies certain stated minimum criteria, it is said to “satisfy” and the search is terminated. The process of searching might be made easier by the identification of regularities in the task environment. Although Simon has been highly acclaimed for the theory of bounded rationality, it still describes (albeit constrained) rational behaviour. Forth is reason, a number of researchers, such as Huber (1981) and Das and Teng (1999), do not distinguish between perfect and bounded rationality in their classification of decision-making models.

The Multiple Perspectives Model

Mitroff and Linstone (1993) proposed the multiple perspectives approach to decision-making as an attempt to “sweep in” all possible perspectives on a problem. It is based on Singer and Churchman’s (1971) concept of unbounded systems thinking, which assumes that any problem is a member of any other problem. The multiple perspectives view classifies perspectives as either being technical, organisational or individual in nature. Analytical models that collect data as a basis of understanding the system would all fall under the technical perspective. Different analysts or modelling projects will come up with different technical views, even if these projects claim to present an objective or rational picture of the situation. Thus, it is encouraged that more than one technical view of a system is obtained. In order to cover the organisational and individual perspectives, as many as possible of the role players and stakeholders should be investigated. Data collection is also to follow the “sweeping in” approach, and especially the organisational and technical perspectives data need to be gained in multiple modes and from as many sources as possible.

The Incrementalist Model

The logical incrementalist view involves a step-by-step process of incremental actions and keeps the strategy open to adjustment. Under Lindblom’s (1959) disjointed incrementalism (“muddling through”) marginal, feasible changes are made, working from the status quo to solve existing problems rather than towards goals. Other researchers describe a process of “muddling with a purpose” (Das and Teng, 1999).

The organisational procedures Model

The organisational procedures view seeks to understand decisions as the output of standard operating procedures invoked by organisational subunits. March (1988) contributed to this theory. Huber (1981) names this view the “program model,” indicating that the decisions are pre-programmed in existing procedures as well as the routinized thinking of the people involved. Das and Teng (1999) refer to it as the “avoidance mode” which views decision-making as a systematic process aimed at maintaining the status quo at the cost of innovation. On the other hand, Krabuanrat and Phelps (1998) regard this view in a positive light, namely as the use of codified organisational experience.

The political Model

The political view sees decision-making as a personalised bargaining process, driven by the agendas of participants rather than rational processes. People differ on the organisation's goals, values and the relevance of information. The decision-making process never ends, but remains a continuous battle between different coalitions. After one group wins a round of the battle, other parties might regroup or become even more determined to win the next round. Influence and power is wielded in a deliberate manner and to further self-interest. The goals of the coalitions are defined by self-interest rather than by what is good for the organisation as a whole. Pfeffer (1981) is one of the major contributors on politics and power in decision-making.

The Garbage Can Model

The garbage can view describes decision-making in an 'organised anarchy' and is based on the work of Cohen et al., (1972). Like the political view, it assumes a pluralist environment with multiple actors, goals and views. The garbage can model emphasises the fragmentedness and chaotic nature of decision-making in organisations, rather than the deliberate manipulations implied by the political view. In the garbage can model, "a decision is an outcome or interpretation of several relatively independent streams in an organisation" (Chen et al., 1972). The streams of problems (looking for solutions and opportunities to be aired), of solutions (looking for issues to which they might provide an answer), and of participants (whose attention is divided and who come and go) meet each other at a choice opportunity, symbolised as a garbage can. When a decision is made, the garbage can is removed. This might happen without having solved all or some of the associated problems in the garbage can. Since participants are the ones generating the garbage, or problems and solutions, the decision made is totally dependent on the make-up of the team of participants in the can.

The Individual Differences Model

The individual differences perspective focuses the attention on the problem-solving behaviour of the individual manager, as influenced by the manager's decision-making style, background and personality. It tries to explain how managers might use different methods or come to different conclusions because of differing personalities, for example apart from Keen and Scott Morton (1978), the individual differences perspective has not received much attention. This is probably because of the overall emphasis elsewhere on organisational (or group) rather than individual decision-making.

Naturalistic Decision-Making Model

Naturalistic decision-making is concerned with investigating and understanding decision making in its natural context. The empirical foundation of naturalistic decision-making differentiates it from other descriptive models, such as the organisational procedures, garbage can or political views. A recent contribution to the field of naturalistic decision-making is that of Klein's (1998) Recognition-Primed Decision (RPD) model. Klein observed and/or analysed over 600 decisions made by people in life-or-death situations, such as firemen, nurses and soldiers. Central to the RPD model is the decision-makers ability to recognise a situation as being similar to that of a previous experience. Part of what is recognised are the appropriate goals associated with such a situation, as well as important cues and what to expect. Decision-makers also recognise a course of action that is likely to succeed. The course of action is evaluated by means of a mental simulation, where the decision-maker visualises how the action is implemented. The script is revised until the

decision-maker is comfortable with it, after which it is implemented. All this can happen in a course of a few seconds. If a situation is not recognised as typical, more energy needs to be spent to diagnose the situation, and additional information will be collected. According to Klein, one of the key factors leading to good decisions is experience. The RPD model supports the idea that experience will increase the person's ability to recognise a situation.

Relationship between Management Styles and Decision-Making

Obviously studies like Riaz (2009) has affirmed that management style has a positive influence on employees' performance and level of decisions that are made. Similarly, Kreitner et al (2004) opined that the style a manager adopts determine individual workers' level of satisfaction. Hence, the paper concludes by proposing that management style significantly affect the degree of decisions made by both individual employees and the management team of an organization. Several studies have investigated the variables influencing the adoption of certain management and decision-making styles. When decisions involve open conflict, a conflict management style is likely to exert a direct influence on its decision -making. Managerial decisions with direct way can affect the personal outcomes and organizational outcomes (Deniz, 2006; Nygren, 2005; Schoemaker, 2010 and Thunholm, 2008). In making organizational decisions, the managers have various styles while making decisions. The styles of decision making and management are differing in its nature, effectiveness, and results (Riaz, 2009). The style of manager in any organization affects the subordinates' personal life and their attitudes related to work.

Managerial decision making style is directly related to life satisfaction (Deniz, 2006), self-esteem (Nygren, 2005 & Thunholm, 2004), self-efficacy (Batool, 2007 & Mau, 2000), and stress (Batool, 2007). Further, decision making style of manager is directly related to organizational outcomes like job satisfaction and the kind of decisions made by the management team (Kreitner et al., 2004), turnover intention, job performance and organizational performance (Certo et al., 2008). The effective organization usually depends on the manager effect who is also a professional decision maker. Thus, decision making is the fundamental and basic function of any manager. This is due to the quality of decisions that made affected by the effectiveness of the managers and consequently, affects the success of the whole organization. The success of the manager in all roles reflects the decisions that he or she made in the organization, the personalities that were involved during the decision making. Also, the manager must be first good decision maker before he or she can be a good planner, organizer, leader and controller in the organization (Rue et al., 2000). Managers' must entertain alternatives, respond to others' objections, coordinate collective actions, and work out compromise positions among other behaviour. Management style may affect relationships by influencing the communication climate. Misra and Srivastava, (2012) argued that a conflict managed effectively could improve decision -making by expanding the range of alternatives, increasing close analysis of decision options, fostering calculated risks and enhancing cohesiveness. The style of decision-making in an organization is the result of the complex interaction of several factors, together with the context and characteristics of the organization, the nature of the choices, and therefore the attributes and preferences of the decision-makers (Misra and Srivastava, 2012). Further, studies like Mkheimer (2018) holds that the charismatic management style brings about charismatic superior which may create appreciation, respect, dedication and honesty. A management charismatic approach could affect both the management style of decision and the behavioural attitudes of the individual employees.

Conclusion

Adopting a single style of management might be impossible as they have advantages and disadvantages, any of them is best for certain situation. Most people prefer managers who are good communicators and friendly people tend to be recognized and respected. Studies have shown that engaging your employees in daily activity will result in moving towards a continuous improvement, the productivity will increase, quality will enhance, turnover ratio will decrease, and it will cause in reducing absence from work, considering all above parameters you will see happiness within the organization, people will work with passion and loyalty as they feel recognized and respected which in return the profitability of the organization will be more and more. Managers are meant to have a clear vision about the goals to be achieved and have passion for the organization along with the ability to inspire trust among the employees as well as making sure that everyone believes in the organization visions and they are excited about it.

References

- Adler, R. W. & Reid, J., (2008). The effects of leadership styles and budget participation on job satisfaction and job performance. *Asia-Pacific Management Accounting Journal*, 3(1), 21-46.
- Akor, P. U., (2014). Influence of Autocratic Leadership Style on the Job Performance of Academic Librarians in Benue State. *Journal of Educational and Social Research*, 4(7), 148-152.
- Amanchukwu, R. N., Stanley, G. J. & Ololube, N. P., 2015. *A review of leadership theories, principles and styles and their relevance to educational management. management*, 5(1), 6-14.
- Armstrong, M., Taylor & S. (2014). *Armstrong's handbook of human resource management practice*. Kogan Page Publishers.
- Avolio, B. J., Waldman, D. A., Yammarino, F. J. (1993). Leading in the 1990s: The four is of transformational leadership. *Journal of European Industrial Training*, 1(5), 9-16.
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B., & Jung, D. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transaction using the multifactor leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 7(2): 441-462.
- Azeska, A., Starc, J., and Kevereski, L. (2017). Styles of decision making and management and dimensions of personality of school principals, (IJCRSEE) *International Journal of Cognitive Research in Science, Engineering and Education*, 5(2), 47-56
- Basit, A., Sebastian, V., and Hassan, Z. (2017). Impact of leadership style on employee performance (a case study on a private organization in Malaysia), *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management*, 5(6) 112-130
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press: New York.
- Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J (1990). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*. 4(1), 231-272.
- Bass, B. M, and Avolio, B. J. (1991). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. California: Sage.
- Bass, B. M., and Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. California: Sage.
- Bass, B. M. and Avolio, B. J. (1995). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *Public Administration Quarterly*. 1(7), 112-121.

- Bass, B. M, Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(1), 181-217.
- Bass, B. M. (1990). From Transactional to Transformational Leadership: Learning to share the vision, *Organizational Dynamics*, 2(4)19-32
- Bass, B.M. and Avolio, B.J. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- Bass, B. M. & Avolio, B. J. (1997). The implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. *Research in Organizational Change and Development*, 4(1), 231-272
- Batool S. (2007). *Relationship between self-efficacy, stress and decision making styles*. Unpublished M.Sc research report. National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Blandchard, K. (1994). *Leadership and the one minute manager*. London: Harper Collins.
- Boehm, S. A., Dwertmann, D. J., Bruch, H. & Shamir, B., (2015). The missing link? Investigating organizational identity strength and transformational leadership climate as mechanisms that connect CEO charisma with firm performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(1), 156–171.
- Brewer, M. B. , Manzi, J., Shaw, J. S. (2000). In-group identification as a function of depersonalization, distinctiveness, and status. *Psychol.Sci.* 4(3), 88–92
- Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership*. N.Y: Harper and Row.
- Burns, T. & Stalker, G.M (1961). *The management of Innovation*. London: Tavistock.
- Certo, T.S., Connelly, B.L., & Tihanyi, L. (2008). Managers and their not-so rational decisions. *Business Horizons*, 5(1), 113–119.
- Chen, G., Gully, S.M., & Eden, D. (2001). Validation of a new general self efficacy scale. *Organisational Research Methods*, 4(1), 62–83.
- Choi, S., (2007). Democratic leadership: the lessons of exemplary models for democratic governance. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, 2(2) 243-262.
- Cohen, M. D., March, J. G. & Olsen, J. P., (1972). *A garbage can model of organisational choice*, reprinted in: March JG, 1988, *Decisions and Organizations*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Conger, J. A. & Kanungo, R. A. (1988). Towards a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, 1(2), 637-64
- Coyle-Shapiro & J (2013). The impact of a TQM intervention on teamwork: A longitudinal assessment. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*
- Daniel, L. S. (2014). *Effects of management styles on employees performance: a case study of Norwegian people's aid*. Yei vocational training centre South Sudan, Bachelor degree in business administration of st. Lawrence university - Kampala (Uganda), 1-85
- Das, T. K. & Teng, B. S., (1999). Cognitive biases and strategic decision processes: An integrative perspective, *Journal of Management Studies*, 3(2), 757–778.
- De Gens, A. (1997). *The Living Company: Habits for survival in Turbulent Environment*. Boston, Mass: *Harvard Business school press*.
- Deluga, R. J. (1992). The relationship of leader and subordinate influencing activity in naval environments. *Military Psychology*, 3(1), 25–39
- Deniz, M. E. (2006). The relationship between coping with stress, life satisfaction, decision making styles and decision self-esteem: An investigation with Turkish university students. *Social Behavior and Personality*. 3(4), 1161-70.
- Dimitrova, D. (2003). Controlling tele-workers: supervision and flexibility revisited', new technology, *Work and Employment* 1(3), 181–195.
- Effere, P. (2005). *Management Styles*. 3rd ed., London: Trans. Atlantic College, p.85.

- Ejimabo, N. O., (2015). An approach to understanding leadership decision making in organization. *European Scientific Journal*, 1(2), 1-24
- Field, S. & Dubey, S. (2001). 'Leadership styles and Job satisfaction among Human Services workers'. *The Indian Journal of social works*, 48 (1) 12-19.
- Graeff, C. L. (1997). Evolution of situational leadership theory: A critical review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 8(2), 153-170
- Griffin R, Van Fleet D. (2012). *Management skills assessment and development*. United states of America, South Western Cengage Learning Co; 7(2), 272-39.
- Grint, K. (2011). A history of leadership. *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*, 1-14. London Sage.
- Harbison, F. & Myers C. A (1969). *Management in the Industrial world: An International Analysis*, in Ewurum U. JF (ed) *Management and Organizational Performance in Igbo Cultural Perspective*, Enugu: Institute for Development Studies, University of Nigeria
- Hartog, D., Deanne, N., Jaap, J., Van Muijen and P. L. Koopman, (1997). Transactional versus transformational leadership: An analysis of the MLQ, *Journal (if Occiiiattonal and Organizational Psychology*, 70(1), 19-3
- Hartzell, D. (2006). *Dictionary of Management*, New Delhi: Academic Publisher
- Hassan, M. (2004). *Leadership is basics, theories and concepts*. The Canadian House of Publication and Distribution, Jordan.
- Hersey, P and Blanchard K. H. (1993). *Management of organizational behaviour: utilizing human resources, (6th ed)*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall Inc.
- Hersey, P., Blanchard, K. H., Johnson, D. E. (1996). *Management of organizational behaviour: leading human resources. 8th ed.*, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.,p.56.
- Hersey, P and Blanchard, K. H (1998). *Management of organizational behavior: utilizing humanresources*. Pretence Hall, Eagle wood cliffs, New Jersey.
- House, R. J., Spangler, W. D., Woycke, J. (1991). Personality and charisma in the US presidency: A psychological theory of leader effectiveness. *Adm Sci Q*, 3(6), 364-396.
- Howell, J. M., Hall-Merenda, K. E. (2002). The ties that bind: The impact of leader-member exchange, transformational and transactional leadership, and distance on predicting follower performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*. 8(2), 680-694.
- Huber, G. P., (1981). The nature of organisational decision making and the design of decision support systems, *Management Information Systems Quarterly*, June 1981
- Iqbal, N., Anwar, S. & Haider, N., (2015). Effect of leadership style on employee performance. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 5(5), 1-6.
- James, K. Lahti, K. (2011). Organizational vision and system influences on employee inspiration and organizational performance. *Creativity and Innovation Management* 2(2) 108-120.
- Jones, D. W. & Rudd, R. D., (2007). *Transactional, transformational, or laissez-faire leadership: an assessment of college of agriculture academic program leaders (deans) leadership styles*
- Keen, P. G. W. & Scott Morton, M. S. (1978). *Decision support systems: An organisational perspective*, Addison-Wesley, Reading (MA).
- Khandwalla, P (1995). Effectiveness management styles: an India Study" *Journal of Euro Asian management*, 1(7), 54-72.
- Kavanaugh, R. R., and Ninemeier, J. D. (2001). *Supervision in the hospitality industry. (3rd ed.)*. Michigan: The Educational Institute of the American Hotel & Lodging Association.
- Khan, M. S. et al., (2015). The styles of leadership: a critical review. *International Institute for Science, Technology and Education (IISTE)*, 5(3), 87-93.
- Klein G. (1998). *Sources of power: How people make decisions*, MIT Press, Cambridge (MA).

- Koech, P. M. & Namusonge, P. G., (2012). The effect of leadership styles on organizational performance at state corporations in Kenya. *International Journal of Business and Commerce*, 2(1), 1-12.
- Koopman, P. L., and Wierdsma, A. F. M. (1998). Participative management. In P. J. D. Drenth, H. Thierry, & C. J. de Wolff (Eds.), *Personnel psychology. Handbook of work and organizational psychology*, 3(7), 297-324). Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- Krabuanrat K & Phelps R, (1998). Heuristics and rationality in strategic decision making: An exploratory study, *Journal of Business Research*, 4(3), 83-93.
- Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A., (2001). *Organizational behaviour*, 5th Edition, Irwin McGraw
- Kreitner R., Kinichi A. (2004). *Organizational behaviour*. 6th ed. New York: McGraw-Hill-Hill Inc.
- Kuczarski, S. S. & Kuczarski, T. D. (1995). *Values based leadership*. Prentice Hall, Inc. Eaglewood Cliffs, NJ
- Likert, R. (1967). *New patterns in management*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.
- Likert, R. (2007). *The Human organization*. 8th ed., New York: McGraw- Hill Inc., 76
- Lindblom, C. W. (1959). The science of muddling through, *Public Administration Review*, 1(9) 79-88.
- Locke, E, A and Schweiger, D, M (1979). Participation in decision- making: one more look. New York: McGraw- Hill Inc., 105.
- Luthans, F. (1992). *Organization behavior (5th. ed.)*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Luthans, F, (2008). *Organizational behaviour*, Boston: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- March, J. G. (1988). *Decisions and organizations*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.
- Martin & S. L. (2013). Directive versus empowering leadership: A field experiment comparing impacts on task proficiency and pro-activity. *Academy of Management Journal*. 5(6), 1372-1395
- Maslow, A. A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York. Harper and Row.
- Mau, W. (2000). Cultural differences in career decision-making styles and self-efficacy. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*. 5(7), 3, 365-78.
- McCleskey, J. A., (2014). Situational, transformational, and transactional leadership and leadership development. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 5(4), 117-130
- McGuire, R. (2005). Which management style to use' London: *The Pharmaceutical Journal*, 2(4) 75, 89
- McLaughlin, C. (2001). *Visionary Leadership*. Retrieved from <http://www.visionarylead.org>
- Melling, M. and Little, J. (2004). *Building a successful customer service culture. a guide for library and information managers*. London. Facet.
- Mintzberg, H. (1980). *The nature of managerial work*. Engle woods, Cliffs, N.J: Prentice-Hall.
- Misra, S. and Srivastava, K. B. L.(2012). Decision-making: Path to Effectiveness, *Human Resource Management Research*, 2(4), 46-52
- Mitroff II & Linstone, H. A. (1993). *The unbounded mind*, Oxford University Press, New York (NY).
- Mkheimer, I. (2018). The impact of leadership styles on business success: A case study on SMEs in Amman. *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review*, 8, 2, 1-9
- Monzani & L. (2015). The moderator role of followers' personality traits in the relations between leadership styles, two types of task performance and work result satisfaction. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 2(3), 444-461
- Moss, H. K., Kinnear, T. L. (2007). *Nothing can eliminate responsibility*. *Super vision*. 6(8), 3-4.
- Nadler, D. A., Tushman, M. L. (1990). Beyond the charismatic leader: Leadership and organizational change. *California Management Review*, 3(2), 77-97.

- Namiq, F. A. (2018). Most effective management style for modern Workplace. *International Journal of Engineering and Management Sciences*, (3), 402-411.
- Nayab, N. & Scheid, J. (2011). *Modern leadership styles in the changing world*. Retrieved from www.brighthub.com
- Nwankwo, J. (2001). *Educational administration. Theory and practice*, Nigeria: Vikas.
- Nwadukwe, Uche. C. and Court Ogele Timinepere (2012). Management styles and organizational effectiveness: an appraisal of private enterprises in Eastern Nigeria. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 2(9) 198-204.
- Nygren, T. E., White, R. J. (2005). *Relating decision making styles to predicting self-efficacy and a generalized expectation of success and failure*. Human Factors and Ergonomics Society 49th Annual Meeting, Orlando.
- Okon, F. I. and 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
- Pascale T. R and Athos A.G. (1981). *The Art of Japanese Management. 4th ed.*, New York: Simon and Schuster
- Paulsen, N., Maldonado, D., Callan, V. J., Ayoko, O. (2009). Charismatic leadership, change and innovation in an R&D organization. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, 2(2), 511-523.
- Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organisations*, Pitman Publishing, Marshfield (MA).
- Puni, A., Ofei, S. B. & Okoe, A., (2014). The Effect of Leadership Styles on Firm Performance in Ghana. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 6(1), 177-185.
- Quang, T., (2002). Conflict management in joint ventures'. *Transitions*, 38, 122
- Ravindra J and Premkumar, R, (2010). Management styles, productivity and adaptability of human resources: An empirical study. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 4(6), 328-344.
- Reza, V., and Asghar, A. (2013). Relationship between Management Styles and Performance of the Managers and Staff of Tax Administration Office of Tehran, *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(3), 2975-2983.
- Riaz, M. N. (2007). *Leadership styles as predictors of decision making styles* (Unpublished M. Phil dissertation). National Institute of Psychology, Quaid-i-Azam University Islamabad, Pakistan.
- Robbins SP (2003). *Organizational behaviour*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Robbins S, Decenzo D, Wolter R. (2010). *Supervision today*. In: Rowitz L. Public health leadership: putting principles into practice. 3rd ed United States of America: Jones & Bartlett Publishers
- Rowe A, Boulgarides J. (1983). *Decision Styles*, In: Griffin R. Van Fleet D. Management skills assessment and development. United States of America: South Western Cengage Learning Co.
- Rowe, A.; Mason, O.; Dickel, K.; Snyder, N. (1989). *Strategic Management – A Methodological Approach*. New York: Addison – Wesley Publishing Company
- Rowe A. and Boulgarides J., (). Decision styles: a perspective", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 4(4), 3-9,
- Russo, J. E. & Schoemaker, J. H. (2002). *Winning decisions: How to make the right decision the first time*, Piatkus, London.
- Schleh. E. C. (1977). A Matter of management styles', *Management Review*, 8(1) 11-19.
- Schoemaker, A. F. (2010). *The relationship between decision-making style and negative affect in college students*. Unpublished MSc Thesis. Drexel University.

- Shamir, B., House, R. J., Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science*, 4(3), 577-594.
- Simon, H. A. (1977). *The new science of management decision*, 2nd Edition, Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs (NJ).
- Simon, H. A. (1979) Rational decision making in business organisations, *American Economic Review*, 6(9) 493-513.
- Spreitzer, G. M. (1997). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 3(8) 1442-1465.
- Thunholm, P. (2010). *Decision-making style: Habit, style or both? Personality and Individual Differences*, 3(6) 931-44.
- Thunholm P. (2008). Decision-making styles and physiological correlates of negative stress: Is there a relation? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*. 4(9), 213-219.
- Trivisonno, M. and Barling, J. (2016). *Organizational leadership and employee commitment. Research Handbook in Business and Management Series*.
- Van Loveren, and Rachael, K. (2007). *The effects of decision-making and leadership styles on relationships and perceived effectiveness in the university development context*.
- Wagner, J. A., III. (1994). Participation's effects on performance and satisfaction: Are consideration of research evidence. *Academy of Management Review*, 1(9), 312-330.
- Walumbwa, F. O., Lawler, J. J. (2003). *Building effective organizations: transformational leadership, collectivist orientation, work-related*
- Weber, M. (1978). *Economics and society*. Berkley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.
- Worall, L. (2004). *The business energy survey*. London: Chartered Management Institute.
- Zareen, M., Razzaq, K. & Mujtaba, B., (2015). Impact of transactional, transformational and laissez faire leadership styles on motivation: A quantitative study of banking employees in Pakistan. *Public Organization Review*, 1(6), 531-549.

Cite this article:

Alaegbu Anastecia Nkeiru & Barisia Fortune Nwinee (2019). The Impact of Management Styles on Business Decision Making: Exploring the Different Models of Decision Making. *International Journal of Science and Business*, 3(3), 210-229. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2771707>
Retrieved from <http://ijsab.com/wp-content/uploads/361.pdf>

Published by

