Typology of Leadership Styles Depending on the Nature of Decision-Making and Business/Person Orientation

**A.A. Galiakberova[a], A.G. Mukhametshin[b], S.P. Dyrin[c],
N.M. Asratyan[d], I.V. Kornilova[e], R.M. Galiev[f]**

[a,b,c,d,e,f] Naberezhnye Chelny State Pedagogical University, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia;
[e] Kama Scientific Center of the Institute of Tatar Encyclopedia and Regional Studies
of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the study is to develop a classification of leadership styles based on a combination of two indicators: the degree of employees' involvement in the decision-making process and the prevailing orientation at the enterprise either towards achieving organizational results or towards ensuring employees' satisfaction. The scientific novelty of the work is in the approach to solving the stated problem, namely, the creation of the authors' typology of management styles (individual authoritarian, paternalistic, collective, communal), based on a combination of the degree of staff participation in making management decisions and target orientation towards business/relationships. **The results** obtained show that this methodology helps to reveal most efficiently the features of management at modern Russian enterprises. This methodology was used as a basis for the analyses of the aspects determining the nature of the leadership. There was revealed its relationship with various socio-economic factors. Long-term longitudinal studies conducted at Naberezhnye Chelny enterprises provided the authors of the article with empirical material, on the basis of which it was concluded that authoritarianism and paternalism were the most characteristic of the modern domestic managers' style. The practical significance of the study is in the possibility of applying its results at enterprises in various sectors of the economy. The proposed classification of management styles can be used as a methodological toolkit in studying the effectiveness of management work at different organizations, as well as in the process of training, retraining and advanced training of personnel.

Keywords: management decisions; management decision making; target orientation to result achievement; target orientation to employee satisfaction; leadership style; typology of leadership styles; individual authoritarian leadership style; collective leadership style; paternalistic leadership style; communal leadership style

INTRODUCTION

Achieving key goals in social development is impossible without increasing management efficiency. Studying the style of modern Russian middle and lower level managers is a necessary condition for increasing the level and quality of management at domestic enterprises.

The growth of interest in the personality of the leader and the style of used leadership was largely influenced by the "managerial revolution" that began in the 50s of the previous century. The essence of this phenomenon was a decrease in the influence of owners on the activities of enterprises and a corresponding increase in the importance of top managers, who were often not the owners of the companies. The institution of owners as a key subject of power at enterprises began to be replaced by the institution of top managers, who began to determine the development strategy of enterprises. It is characteristic that this phenomenon was most typical for large enterprises that determined the state of the world economy as a whole. Under these conditions, it became obvious that the success of an individual enterprise and, consequently, the success of the economy as a whole was largely determined by the personality of the managers and their work style.

The problem of leadership style, despite its fairly deep and long-standing study, continues to have high theoretical and applied relevance. At the same time, the very concept of "leadership style" can be defined as a set of techniques and methods for organizing interaction between the managing and managed subsystems in the organization. The traditional basis for classifying leadership styles is the degree of participation of ordinary employees in the process of preparing and making management decisions. At the same time, the management decision, in our opinion, should be considered in the light of two theses. The first thesis: a management decision always involves a choice of alternatives. A person who does not have the opportunity to choose one or another action option is, by definition, not a subject of action and cannot be classified as a manager. The second thesis: a management decision always contains the obligation of its execution, both for the initiators of the decision and for the persons included in the orbit of their subordination. However, we believe that using only one indicator as the basis for classifying leadership style greatly simplifies the matter. In this article we will try to propose our own typology based on two principles for dividing leadership styles: 1) the degree of involvement of enterprise personnel in management processes; 2) the nature of management's aim orientation either towards achieving an organizational result or maintaining a high level of employees' satisfaction.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The rapid development of sociology and social psychology has become an important factor that has contributed to the growing interest in the personality of a leader. The interest of scientists in the problems of leadership and motivation has made it possible to make a well-known breakthrough in issues related to the sociological and psychological aspects of management.

Even in the period before World War II, the famous German-American psychologist Kurt Lewin touched upon the problem of typology of leadership styles. He took as the basis for the classification of leadership styles the degree of participation of employees in management decision-making. On this basis, he identified authoritarian, democratic and liberal leadership styles [1].

K. Levin himself considered the most preferable democratic style, based on the principles of collective decision-making and high involvement of staff in management. But over time, this author's position has undergone a certain evolution, since his new research conducted at secondary schools did not confirm that the democratic style always has a positive effect [2].

In our opinion, this was due to the fact that the only criterion that K. Levin was guided by

when identifying management styles was the method of making management decisions. Therefore, the classification he introduced was a scheme for reducing powers in the upper levels of management with the consistent transfer of managerial powers to lower levels up to the complete freedom of workers in decision-making, which is characteristic of a passive (liberal) style.

At the same time, K. Levin's views found many followers. In a number of studies, in particular, R. Tannenbaum and W.H. Schmidt [3], A.G. Vroom, F. Jetton, A. Jago [4] and other ones there were developing concepts of leadership styles in which the central issue was the degree of participation of ordinary personnel in management decision-making.

In contrast to these views, F. Fiedler created the concept of situational leadership and thereby initiated the study of leadership style from the point of view of factors of the internal and external environment in which the enterprise is located [5].

For supporters of this concept, the degree of management efficiency is completely determined by the achievement of the practical tasks assigned to the managed company [6]. Therefore, for the sake of positive production results, in necessary cases, management decisions that narrow the powers of personnel are considered justified and acceptable.

Recognition of enterprise efficiency as the main criterion for successful management has given rise to many concepts aimed at increasing it. In particular, many studies are devoted to such important processes as analysis and management of the life cycle of manufactured products, as well as analysis and management of the life cycle of used technologies [7].

However, despite the importance of the effective operation of an enterprise, it is impossible to reduce all the multifaceted activities of personnel to this alone factor. Using only one, although important, indicator does not allow one to get a complete picture of the possible options for leadership style [8, 9]. The incompleteness of such consideration became obvious due to the fact that in the second half of the twentieth century, an organization began to be viewed primarily as a social system, the most important element of which is a person not just as a subject of production functions, but primarily as an individual with his/her own goals and interests, which must be correlated with the interests of the enterprise.

In this regard, another indicator has been introduced into the typology of leadership styles — the ratio of the value of the result of the enterprise's activities and the value of the person working at this enterprise. This approach to the typology of leadership styles was first proposed by R. Blake and J. Mouton and was subsequently developed in a number of other concepts [10]. However, even in this case, the use of only this indicator does not reflect the entire range of possible management situations at the enterprise. For example, business orientation includes two completely different situations: the arbitrariness of one person in the interests of business, which infringes on the interests of other members of the organization, on the one hand, and the voluntary renunciation of part of his/her interests by an employee, on the other hand, in favor of the interests of the organization. In turn, human orientation can also have different options. An employee can be considered as an independent subject of activity, to whom part of the managerial powers can be delegated, or can be looked upon as a kind of passive object that needs to be taken care of and generally treated from the standpoint of paternalism [11, 12].

In modern scientific literature, both domestic and foreign, there are many works devoted to both the problems of decision-making and leadership style.

In his comprehensive study, M. Selart strives to help readers learn to analyze and develop their own decision-making style. To do this, the author carefully studies all stages, starting with the formulation of the solution problem and

ending with the implementation of the solution. But the author's key idea is to substantiate the inextricable connection between decision-making and leadership style, while most researchers, as he rightly emphasizes, study these problems deeply, but separately [13].

Thus, A. G. Wright, exploring the planning process of strategic decision-making, studies in detail the complex sequence of relevant actions [14] and, in collaboration with P. Goodwin, focuses on analyzing the structure of the decision-making process [15].

E. Witte, having examined a number of industries, comes to the conclusion that shortcomings in the procedures of making complex decisions lead to unnecessary work. To find ways to reduce it, the author develops an original "phase theorem" [16].

B. Widaye expresses a skeptical opinion that there is a direct and obvious connection between decision-making and its results. In his opinion, empirical reality shows a much more complex picture, in which there is room for a wide variety of factors influencing the functioning of organizations [17].

The topics of research that are currently of interest are related to gender [18], environmental [19] aspects of decision making, modern digitalization processes [20], as well as the problems of small business [21, 22].

At the same time, there are many works in which the nature of leadership is considered without any connection with decision making. Thus, detailed studies of different leadership styles in different contexts can be found in the works of M. Cerne, S. Batistic and Kenda R. [23], D. Cretu and A. R. Job [24], A. Fries, N. Kammerlander and M. Leitterstorff [25], L. A. Hambly, T. A. O'Neill and T. J. B. Kline [26], W. Liu, D. P. Lepak, R. Takeuchi, and H. P. Sims [27], S. Top, E. Oge and S. Gümüş [28], A. Wang, K. Tsai, S. D. Dionne et al. [29].

And the influence of various factors on the effectiveness of leadership is revealed in the studies of D. Hristov, N. Scott and S. Minoch [30], P. Mishra and R. K. Misra [31], F. Morais, A. Kakabadze and N. Kakabadze [32], Y. L. Wu, B. Shao and G. Schwartz [33], G. A. Yukl [34].

Meanwhile, we consider the most important task in this area the study of the relationship between the nature of decision-making and leadership style.

Contemporary ideas about leadership styles have developed in the context of many research projects. Thus, D. McGregor bases his concept of human behavior on an assessment of the alternative "Theory X" and "Theory Y". The first represents a concentration of negative ideas about employee motivation, while the second, on the contrary, is based on the assumptions about their positive motivation. The research findings indicate a clear preference for "Theory Y," the use of which in management practice increases labor productivity and improves interpersonal relationships [35].

W. J. Reddin developed an original three-dimensional theory (3D model), in which the two main dimensions of leadership, which he called business orientation and relationship orientation, are complemented by a third dimension — effectiveness, which in his interpretation is understood as the result of using the right leadership style in a specific situation. The study came to an interesting result, which shows that successful leadership leads not only to positive production results, but also means the development of the leaders themselves [36].

The original concept of emotional leadership was proposed by D. Goleman, R. Boyatzis and A. McKee, who presented and studied 6 leadership styles in the context of the theory of emotional intelligence: 1) idealistic, where the leader must play an inspiring role, orienting staff towards an image of an attractive prospect, 2) a training role, in which the manager promotes the development of employees' abilities to increase their productivity; 3) friendly, when the manager achieves harmony in relations between employees; 4) democratic, in which staff are involved in

management and give managers advice on how to improve their work; 5) ambitious: the leader sets difficult-to-achieve but interesting goals for himself and his/her employees, however, if poorly implemented, this style can lead to negative results; 6) authoritarian, where the leader acts confidently, clearly in difficult and uncertain situations, but in cases of abuse of power by managers, this style has the most negative impact on the atmosphere and relationships in the organization [37, p. 69–70]. Research has shown that the most effective leaders are those who have mastered multiple styles and are able to implement them in different circumstances.

The problem of leadership style has been actively studied by domestic authors both in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods. Many of them come to the conclusion that the preferred leadership style is determined primarily by the individual psychological characteristics of the leaders themselves and not by the social and state system. At the same time, A. G. Kovalev believes that "as the key characteristics of a leader's personality that influence the choice of leadership style, it is necessary to highlight abilities, will and temperament" [38]. However, empirical data proving the existence of a relationship between the individual psychological characteristics of a leaders and their chosen leadership style is currently insufficient.

Of significant interest are works in which the authors explain management style not only by the characteristics of the manager's personality, but also by a combination of external factors. In particular, I. P. Volkov, trying to explain the reasons why the authoritarian-directive style of management clearly predominates in modern Russian conditions, points to "the lack of discipline and order, the laxity of subordinates and their superiors, ignoring a new boss" [39]. A. V. Kuznetsov also refers to "the behavior of a manager who does not want to share power with subordinates and, as a result, introduce elements of complicity into everyday organizational

practice, the low professional level of subordinates, their lack of confidence in their abilities, and fear of independently completing tasks" [40]. R. L. Krichevsky, in turn, is sure that this is due to the cultural and qualification level of workers: "...the lower the qualifications and culture of the employee, the easier it is to impose on him a tough management style and even, moreover, to cause satisfaction with this style" [41, p. 54]. A. L. Zhuravlev believes that leadership style is determined by twenty-seven factors, and the significant part of which are related to the relationship between managers and subordinates [42]. However, his works do not reveal the dependence of the choice of leadership style on the nature of the aim orientation of management either to achieve an organizational result or to maintain a high level of employees' satisfaction.

The analysis of domestic authors' works both in the Soviet and post-Soviet periods shows that profound changes in socio-economic conditions in our country have not led to an equally radical change in management style. These researchers also primarily classify leadership styles taking into account the degree of ordinary employees' participation in the process of preparing and making management decisions. How leadership style relates to business/relationship goal orientation is currently under-researched.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The purpose of this study is to develop the authors' classification of leadership styles, based on a combination of two indicators: the degree of employee involvement in the decision-making process and the prevailing orientation at the enterprise either towards achieving organizational results or ensuring employees' satisfaction.

To achieve this goal, the following tasks were set:

1. A development of a classification of leadership styles depending on the nature of decision-making in the work group and the prevailing value orientation towards business/relationships.

2. A study of the prevailing leadership style at sample enterprises.

The sample size of enterprises was determined based on the calculation of the confidence interval using the formula:

$$n = \frac{z^2 pq}{e^2},$$

where n is the sample size; z is the normalized deviation of the estimate from the average value depending on the confidence probability of the result obtained; p — sampling variation; $q = (100 - p)$; e — permissible error.

With a confidence interval level of 95%, the value of the variation determined on the basis of a preliminary qualitative study of the object is equal to 80%, and the desired accuracy of the results is ±10%, the sample size was 28 commercial enterprises. The sample makes up 2.9% of the total number of actually operating commercial enterprises in Naberezhnye Chelny.

The total number of employees at the enterprises we surveyed is 34 thousand people, which is 18% of the total number of personnel of commercial enterprises in Naberezhnye Chelny. The sample calculation was carried out on the basis of three indicators: 1) the form of ownership of the enterprise; 2) the time of formation of the enterprise (enterprises existing since Soviet times and post-Soviet enterprises created after 1991; the type of activity of the enterprise (industrial, construction, trade). The distribution of enterprises selected for the study is representative of the characteristics of the general population of enterprises in the city of Naberezhnye Chelny according to the indicators mentioned.

The respondents were lower and middle managers and ordinary employees. In total, we interviewed 123 low- and middle-level managers, as well as 587 ordinary employees working at commercial enterprises of various forms of ownership in the city of Naberezhnye Chelny in the Republic of Tatarstan (Russia).

The study used the following methods:

1. Analysis of regulatory documents of enterprises.

2. A questionnaire survey of ordinary employees of enterprises based on the tools developed by the authors.

3. Expert survey of lower and middle managers based on the expert sheet developed by the authors.

4. The method of focus groups formed from managers and employees of personnel management services of the surveyed enterprises.

RESULTS

Having conducted a study of the leadership styles used today in Russian enterprises, we offer our own approach to their typology.

The key problem regarding the determination of types of leadership is that the two most important indicators (the nature of the employees' involvement in the decision-making process and the prevailing aim orientation of the enterprise management towards achieving results or employees' satisfaction) should not be considered in isolation, but in unity. In *Table 1*, these indicators are correlated and, on this basis, there are identified the following types of leadership styles:

Table 1

Classification of leadership styles

Nature of decision making / Orientation type	Individual nature of decision making	Collective nature of decision making
Aim orientation is to achieve the result of the organization's activities	Individual authoritarian style	Collective style
Aim orientation is towards employees' satisfaction	Paternalistic style	Communal style

Source: compiled by the authors.

1. A one-person management style presupposes an individual nature of decision-making, and the goal of management is to achieve the results of the organization's activities. The main features of this style are:

• the manager concentrates all the main decision-making powers on himself;

• subordinates receive a ready-made management decision and are obliged to fully implement it;

• a categorical ban on discussion and, especially, criticism by subordinates of adopted management decisions;

• the manager is of little interest in the reaction of his subordinates to the decision made.

2. The collective leadership style presupposes predominantly joint adoption of management decisions and, at the same time, a pronounced focus on achieving previously planned organizational results. The following significant features of this style can be distinguished:

• the most qualified employees of the organization are involved in the process of preparing and making significant management decisions that are important for all personnel;

• the leader organizes the process of discussing and developing options for management decisions, assessing their prospects and importance, and selecting the most appropriate one;

• criticism of management decision options is allowed until the moment it becomes accepted.

3. A paternalistic leadership style presupposes the individual nature of management decision-making and a primary focus on the satisfaction of the organization's employees. The main indicators of this style are:

• the organization is considered as a special type of family, where concern for the well-being of its members is the leading organizational value;

• the formal leader is viewed as a wise father of the family, invested with the trust of his subordinates;

• the traditional type of power is of great importance;

• the organization strives to achieve a certain balance between the goals of the organization and the goals of employees.

4. Communal leadership style involves a combination of the joint nature of management decision-making and the prevailing goal orientation towards achieving employees' satisfaction. It has the following characteristics:

• the value of employees' interests dominates organizational values;

• informal leaders of the organization with charismatic power are of great importance in the decision-making process;

Our sociological study of leadership styles, conducted in 2019–2021, based on 28 enterprises in the city of Naberezhnye Chelny, shows that today at Russian enterprises the authoritarian leadership style predominates by a large margin.

Table 2

Predominant type of leadership style

Predominant type of leadership style	Share, %
Individual authoritarian style	72.3
Paternalistic style	17.1
Collective style	7.2
Communal style	3.5

Source: compiled by the authors.

Table 2 shows that the individual leadership style is by far the dominant one at the enterprises we surveyed; it was found at almost two-thirds of the enterprises. At modern enterprises the paternalistic leadership style is also of some significance.

It should be admitted that the predominance of a one-person leadership style is characteristic for the activity of all branches and types of enterprises. This is clearly shown by the research results presented in *Table 3*.

The study also did not show any fundamental differences in the dominance of individual leadership style depending on the time of formation of the enterprise (*Table 4*).

Thus, the study showed that at the enterprises we surveyed, an individual leadership style undoubtedly dominates, implying maximum concentration in the

hands of the first manager of decision-making rights and a clearly expressed aim orientation towards achieving results (even at any cost).

DISCUSSION

Let us touch upon some debatable aspects concerning the peculiarities of the one-person leadership style dominance at modern Russian enterprises.

According to W. I. Maslov, "authoritarianism at Russian enterprises is not unique, and authoritarian management methods are common in other countries, in particular in the USA" [43]. This thesis is also shared by a number of other domestic specialists in personnel management. And we think that it is difficult to agree with this statement. Authoritarianism, widespread in American enterprises, is predominantly situational in nature and is determined by the conditions of the internal environment of a particular enterprise. As for authoritarianism at Russian enterprises, it is almost equally represented at enterprises of various types and fields of activity — from mechanical engineering to education.

As noted above, the results of the study show that the individual leadership style prevails everywhere, both at enterprises formed in the Soviet period and at post-Soviet enterprises created after 1991.

Moreover, the leadership style in private post-Soviet enterprises is tougher than in Soviet ones. Post-Soviet enterprises bear the costs of maintaining the social sphere to a much lesser extent. There are clearly more violations of labor laws and safety regulations found here. It is true, that in the last two years, a severe crisis in the labor market has forced employers to somewhat ease the pressure on their employees.

The paternalistic leadership style, according to our research, is characteristic primarily of some small enterprises, mainly engaged in trading activities. A paternalistic management style is also characteristic of small post-Soviet organizations which activities are non-commercial (organizations related to management, etc.).

Thus, based on the results of the study, we can assert that the individual authoritarian management style at modern Russian enterprises does not depend either on the socio-economic system, or the form of ownership, or the period of existence of these enterprises, or on the content of their activities. This suggests that the authoritarian nature of power at Russian enterprises is not determined by the characteristics of the internal environment of the enterprises, but is based on the mental value attitudes of both managers and personnel of enterprises. Moreover, such value-motivational features are characteristic not only of the labor sphere, but also of vertical social relations in Russian society as a whole.

Our research did not confirm the hypothesis that the nature of decision-making in an organization depends on the nature of the leader's sources of power. The results showed that the one-person leadership style is characteristic of organizations with both formal and informal sources of leadership to a comparable extent. Both leaders whose power is based on the authority provided by the position (83.2%) and leaders whose power is based primarily on personal qualities (68.9) prefer a one-person

Table 3

The share of one-man leadership style in enterprises of various types of activity

Type of activity of the surveyed enterprise	Share, %
Industrial enterprises	78.3
Construction enterprises	88.7
Trade enterprises	65.1

Source: compiled by the authors.

Table 4

The share of one-man leadership style at enterprises with different periods of activity

Predominant type of leadership style	Share, %
Enterprises created during the Soviet period (before 1991)	68.7
Enterprises created in the post-Soviet period (after 1991)	75.3

Source: compiled by the authors.

management style in terms of decision-making. The collective style is to a certain extent adhered to by leaders whose power is based on personal charm. In organizations of this type, there is a practice of joint discussion of a draft decision (47.4%).

It is typical that when assessing the style used by a manager, the opinions of employees and managers differ significantly. A significant portion of the surveyed managers characterize their own management style as democratic: 43.2% say that they make decisions based on joint discussion with subordinates. However, the veracity of this thesis is strongly doubted by staff assessments. The majority of employees (68.3%) note a directive leadership style in the organization, noting that their manager, as a rule, does not discuss decision options with employees, but only announces decisions made after the fact.

CONCLUSIONS

The study suggests that modern Russian personnel management practice is clearly mixed and integrates Eastern and Western approaches to management. What Russian management practice has in common with the Western (American) model of personnel management is the one-person leadership style that dominates at all types of enterprises. Eastern practice of personnel management is similar to ours in the more informal nature of vertical relationships, relatively weak formal rules governing the relationship between managers and subordinates.

Our research allows us to outline further vectors of scientific research in the field of the specifics of leadership style at modern Russian enterprises. We see the following directions for further research on this issue:

1) research into the mental foundations of power values in Russian society;

2) research on regional characteristics of management style;

3) research into the factors that determine the widespread priority of authoritarian management methods at Russian enterprises;

4) research into the relationship between the personal characteristics of enterprise managers and the leadership style they use.

REFERENCES

1. Lewin K., Lippitt R., White R.K. Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created "social climates". *The Journal of Social Psychology.* 1939;10(2):269–299. DOI: 10.1080/00224545.1939.9713366

2. Lewin K. Dynamic psychology: Selected works. Transl. from German, Eng. Moscow: Smysl; 2001. 572 p. URL: https://djvu.online/file/vfEixmyxCWC 3Q (In Russ.).

3. Tannenbaum R., Schmidt W.H. How to choose a leadership pattern. *Harvard Business Review.* 1958;36(2):95–101. DOI: 10.4324/9781315250601–8

4. Vroom V.H., Jago A.G. On the validity of the Vroom-Jetton model. *Journal of Applied Psychology.* 1978;63(2):151–162. DOI: 10.1037/0021–9010.63.2.151

5. Fiedler F.E. A theory of leadership effectiveness. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co.; 1967. 310 p.

6. Weber J.M. Individuals matter, but the situation's the thing: The case for a habitual situational lens in leadership and organizational decision-making. *Organizational Dynamics.* 2020;49(1):100710. DOI: 10.1016/j.orgdyn.2019.03.003

7. Abhinand G.B., Agrawal A., Prashant S.H. A review of project life cycle management. *International Advanced Research Journal in Science, Engineering and Technology.* 2021;8(6):546–550. DOI: 10.17148/IARJSET.2021.8695

8. Tabassum N., Nayak B.S. Gender stereotypes and their impact on women's career progressions from a managerial perspective. *IIM Kozhikode Society & Management Review.* 2021;10(2):192–208. DOI: 10.1177/2277975220975513

9. Gardner J.W. On leadership. New York, NY: The Free Press; 1990. 220 p.

10. Blake R.R., Mouton J.S. The managerial grid: Key orientations for achieving production through people. Houston, TX: Gulf Publishing Company; 1984. 340 p. URL: https://archive.org/details/managerialgridke00blak

11. Bogardus E.S. A social distance scale. *Sociology and Social Research.* 1933;17:265–271.

12. De Pree M. Leadership jazz: The art of conducting business through leadership, fellowship, teamwork, voice, touch. New York, NY: Dell Publishing Co, Inc; 1993. 228 p. URL: https://archive.org/details/leadershipjazz1993depr

13. Selart M. A leadership perspective on decision making. Oslo: Cappelen Academic Publishers; 2010. 210 p.

14. Wright G. Strategic decision making: A best practice blueprint. Chichester: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.; 2001. 160 p.

15. Wright G., Goodwin P. Structuring the decision process: An evaluation of methods. In: Hodgkinson G.P., Starbuck W.H., eds. The Oxford handbook of organizational decision making. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2008:534–551. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199290468.003.0028

16. Witte E. Field research on complex decision-making processes: The phase theorem. *International Studies of Management and Organization.* 1972;2(2):156–182. DOI: 10.1080/00208825.1972.11656117

17. Vidaillet B. When "decision outcomes" are not the outcomes of decisions. In: Hodgkinson G.P., Starbuck W.H., eds. The Oxford handbook of organizational decision making. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 2008:418–436. DOI: 10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199290468.003.0022

18. Witra W.P.P., Subriadi A.P. Gender and information technology (IT) investment decision-making. *Procedia Computer Science*. 2022;197:583–590. DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2021.12.176

19. Hukkinen J.I., Eronen J.T., Janasik N., et al. The policy operations room: Analyzing path-dependent decision-making in wicked socio-ecological disruptions. *Safety Science.* 2022;146 105567. DOI: 10.1016/j.ssci.2021.105567

20. Wang C., Medaglia R., Zheng L. Towards a typology of adaptive governance in the digital government context: The role of decision-making and accountability. *Government Information Quarterly.* 2018;35(2):306–322. DOI: 10.1016/j.giq.2017.08.003

21. Ogarca R.F. An investigation of decision-making styles in SMEs from South-West Oltenia Region (Romania). *Procedia Economics and Finance.* 2015;20:443–452. DOI: 10.1016/S 2212–5671(15)00095–7

22. Spencer A.J., Buhalis D., Moital M. A hierarchical model of technology adoption for small owner-managed travel firms: An organizational decision-making and leadership perspective. *Tourism Management.* 2012;33(5):1195–1208. DOI: 10.1016/j.tourman.2011.11.011

23. Černe M., Batistič S., Kenda R. HR systems, attachment styles with leaders, and the creativity-innovation nexus. *Human Resource Management Review.* 2018;28(3):271–288. DOI: 10.1016/j.hrmr.2018.02.004

24. Creţu D. Identification of leadership styles in the pre-university educational system. Case study. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences*. 2015;186:535–543. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.058

25. Fries A., Kammerlander N., Leitterstorf M. Leadership styles and leadership behaviors in family firms: A systematic literature review. *Journal of Family Business Strategy*. 2021;12(1):100374. DOI: 10.1016/j.jfbs.2020.100374

26. Hambley L.A., O'Neill T.A., Kline T.J.B. Virtual team leadership: The effects of leadership style and communication medium on team interaction styles and outcomes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes.* 2007;103(1):1–20. DOI: 10.1016/j.obhdp.2006.09.004

27. Liu W., Lepak D.P., Takeuchi R., Sims H.P., Jr. Matching leadership styles with employment modes: Strategic human resource management perspective. *Human Resource Management Review.* 2003;13(1):127–152. DOI: 10.1016/S 1053–4822(02)00102-X

28. Top S., Öge E., Atan Ö., Gümüş S. Investigation relational levels of intensity between paternalistic and servant leadership styles and national culture, organizational commitment and subordinate responses or reactions to the leaders style. *Procedia — Social and Behavioral Sciences.* 2015;181:12–22. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.861

29. Wang A., Tsai C., Dionne S.D., et al. Benevolence-dominant, authoritarianism-dominant, and classical paternalistic leadership: Testing their relationships with subordinate performance. *The Leadership Quarterly.* 2018;29(6):686–697. DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2018.06.002

30. Hristov D., Scott N., Minocha S. Distributed leadership typologies in destination management organisations. *Tourism Management Perspectives.* 2018;28:126–143. DOI: 10.1016/j.tmp.2018.08.003

31. Mishra P., Misra R.K. Entrepreneurial leadership and organizational effectiveness: A comparative study of executives and non-executives. *Procedia Computer Science.* 2017;122:71–78. DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2017.11.343

32. Morais F., Kakabadse A., Kakabadse N. Leading through discontinuous change: A typology of problems and leadership approaches in UK boards. *Long Range Planning.* 2020;53(2):101870. DOI: 10.1016/j.lrp.2019.02.003

33. Wu Y.L., Shao B., Newman A., Schwarz G. Crisis leadership: A review and future research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly.* 2021;32(6):101518. DOI: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2021.101518

34. Yukl G.A. Leadership in organizations. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.; 2012. 528 p. URL: https://nibmehub.com/opac-service/pdf/read/Leadership%20in%20Organizations%20by%20Gary%20Yukl.pdf

35. McGregor D. Professional manager. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Book Co.; 1967. 202 p. URL: https://archive.org/details/professionalmana00mcgr/page/n5/mode/2up

36. Reddin W.J. Management effectiveness in the 1980s. *Business Horizons.* 1974;17(4):5–12. DOI: 10.1016/0007–6813(74)90086-X

37. Goleman D., Boyatzis R., McKee A. Primal leadership: Learning to lead with emotional intelligence. Boston, MA: Harvard Business Press; 2004. 327 p. (Russ. ed.: Goleman D., Boyatzis R., McKee A. Emotsional'noe liderstvo. Iskusstvo upravleniya lyud'mi na osnove emotsional'nogo intellekta. Moscow: Alpina Publisher; 2011. 302 p.).

38. Kovalev A.G. Psychology of personality. Moscow: Prosveshchenie; 1970. 391 p. (In Russ.).

39. Volkov I.P. To the manager about the human factor: Social and psychological practical training. Leningrad: Lenizdat; 1989. 221 p. (In Russ.).

40. Kuznetsov A.V. "Participatory management" and its effectiveness. In: Ideological and psychological aspects of mass consciousness study. Moscow: Politizdat; 1989:178–202. (In Russ.).

41. Krichevsky R.L. If you are a manager: Elements of management psychology in everyday work. Moscow: Delo; 1993. 352 p. (In Russ.).

42. Zhuravlev A.L. Social and psychological dynamics in changing economic conditions. *Psikhologicheskii zhurnal = Psychological Journal.* 1998;19(3):3–16. (In Russ.).

43. Maslov V.I. Strategic personnel management within effective organizational culture. Moscow: Finpress; 2004. 288 p. (In Russ.).

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Alfinur A. Galiakberova — Cand. Sci. (Econ.), Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of History, Geography and Methods of Teaching, Naberezhnye Chelny State Pedagogical University, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3564-9737
ngpi@tatngpi.ru

Azat G. Mukhametshin — Dr. Sci. (Pedagogical), Professor, Professor of the Department of Pedagogy named after Z.T. Sharafutdinov, Naberezhnye Chelny State Pedagogical University, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia
https://orcid.org/0009-0005-6521-9171
magngpi@mail.ru

Sergey P. Dyrin — Dr. Sci. (Sociology), Professor, Professor of the Department of History, Geography and Methods of Teaching, Naberezhnye Chelny State Pedagogical University, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia
https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0422-3804
sdyrin@yandex.ru

Norair M. Asratyan — Cand. Sci. (Philosophy), Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of History, Geography and Methods of Their Teaching, Researcher in the Research Sector, Naberezhnye Chelny State Pedagogical University, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia
https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6075-2018
Corresponding author:
noair.asratyan@gmail.com

Irina V. Kornilova — Dr. Sci. (History), Associate Professor, Professor of the Department of History, Geography and Methods of Teaching, Naberezhnye Chelny State Pedagogical University, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia; Leading Researcher at the Kama Scientific Center of the Institute of the Tatar Encyclopedia and Regional Studies of the Academy of Sciences of the Republic of Tatarstan, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0910-8897
ivkornilova@list.ru

Rustem M. Galiev — Cand. Sci. (Pedagogical), Senior Researcher in the Research Department, Naberezhnye Chelny State Pedagogical University, Naberezhnye Chelny, Russia
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5096-8648
Galiev.RM@gmail.com

Authors' declared contribution:
Galiakberova A.A.— statement of the problem, development of the work concept, administrative support and management.
Mukhametshin A.G.— development of the research structure, literature review, description of the results.
Dyrin S.P.— statement of the problem, development of the work concept, preparation of the materials and conducting a longitudinal sociological study, analysis of the literature, description of the results, conclusions.
Asratyan N.M.— development of the work concept, setting of the objectives, analysis of the literature, description of the results, conclusions, technical design of the article.
Kornilova I.V.— participation in conducting sociological surveys, interpretation of the results.
Galiev R.M.— selection of sources, analysis of the theoretical provisions on the research topic.

Conflicts of Interest Statement: The authors have no conflicts of interest to declare.

Article was submitted on 03.03.2024, revised on 24.07.2024, and accepted for publication on 12.08.2024. The authors read and approved the final version of the manuscript.