

The Impact Of Telecommuting On Managerial Styles In Organization

Happiness Chioma Wokocha, PhD

Department Of Management, Ignatius Ajuru University Of Education, Rumuolumeni, Port Harcourt, Rivers State, Nigeria

hwokocha@gmail.com

Abstract: This study examines the impact of telecommuting on managerial styles within organizations, emphasizing the evolving nature of leadership and management practices in remote work environments. It examines various management styles, including decision-making and communication approaches, and their influence on employee engagement, productivity, and organizational culture. The research also reviews contemporary leadership theories, such as transformational, ethical, and authentic leadership, highlighting their relevance in fostering effective remote management. With the rapid adoption of telecommuting driven by technological advancements and global trends, understanding how managers adapt their styles to support virtual teams is critical. The findings suggest that flexible, culturally sensitive, and technologically adept leadership practices are essential for optimizing organizational performance and employee well-being in the modern digital workplace.

Keywords: Communication Style, Decision Making Style, Employee Engagement, Leadership Approach, Managerial Style, Productivity, Telecommuting and Work Environment.

INTRODUCTION

Management style is a managerial parlance often used to describe the "how" of management. It is a function of behavior associated with personality (McGuire, 2005). Management style can be understood as a way to manage an organization. According to Schleh (1977), management style is "the adhesive that binds diverse operations and functions together." It is the philosophy or set of principles by which the manager capitalizes on the abilities of the workforce. Management style is not a procedure on how to do it, but it is the management framework for doing it. A management style is a way of life operating throughout the enterprise and permits an executive to rely on the initiative of the personnel of an entity. Effective management style is the extent to which a leader continually and progressively leads and directs followers to a predetermined destination agreed upon by the whole group. It is the manner of approach to issues of the managers towards achieving the goals of their organization by transforming various resources available to any organization into output through the functions of management (Field & Dubey, 2001). Khandwalla (1995) considered management style as the distinctive way in which an organization makes decisions and discharges various functions of goal setting, formulation, implementation of strategy, corporate image building, dealing with key stakeholders, and other basic management activities.

Telecommuting requires managers to be flexible, communicative, and supportive while fostering a culture of trust and accountability. The shift to remote work led to more empowered teams, but it also presents unique challenges that require thoughtful managerial strategies. Telecommuting is also known as remote work, which encompasses various dimensions that can affect both employees and employers. Mokhtarian (1991) describes the evolution of telecommuters as initially being those who were computer-based information workers, including data processors and professional computer programmers. These workers usually telecommuted full-time and worked from home (Handy & Mokhtarian, 1996). However, telecommuters are no longer just computer users but are increasingly performing tasks related to paperwork, research, reading, thinking, and so on. Further, full-time telecommuters are only a small proportion of all who telecommute, with most telecommuting on a part-time basis. Jones (1996) sees teleworking as when people work away from most of their colleagues and use telecommunications technologies to compensate for their separation. The telephone is perhaps the most widely used telecommunication technology, with answering machines and facsimiles providing the important linkage to the office. The Internet is one of the fastest-growing technologies contributing to the growth of telecommuting. Telecommuting is a work practice where workers substitute a portion of their typical work hours to work away from a central workplace (Allen, Golden & Shockley, 2015). Other terms used to describe such work practices, besides telecommuting, include but are not limited to remote work, work from home (WFH), freelancing, telework, virtual work, etc.

However, the study seek to examine the impact of telecommuting on managerial styles in organization.

LITERATURE REVIEW

TELECOMMUTING

Telecommuting, also known as remote work or telework, has become an integral part of modern employment practices. Defined as performing work duties outside the traditional office environment, primarily from home, facilitated by advances in digital communication and information technology, telecommuting offers flexibility and convenience for employees and organizations alike (Bailey & Kurland, 2002). The evolution of telecommuting has been driven by technological innovations, globalization, and changing workforce preferences, especially evident during the COVID-19 pandemic, which accelerated its adoption worldwide (Kniffin et al., 2021). One of the primary advantages of telecommuting is increased flexibility, which allows employees to better balance work and personal life. This flexibility often results in reduced stress and improved job satisfaction (Gajendran & Harrison, 2007). Employees can customize their work environment, manage their schedules, and reduce commuting time, leading to more leisure or family time. For example, Bloom et al. (2015) found that employees working remotely reported higher levels of productivity and well-being, attributing these improvements to the flexibility and autonomy afforded by telecommuting. Furthermore, telecommuting can help attract and retain talent, especially in urban areas where commuting is a significant burden. Organizations also benefit from implementing telecommuting policies. Reduced office space requirements can lead to significant cost savings on rent, utilities, and other overhead expenses (Nilles, 1998). Additionally, remote work arrangements can enhance productivity, as studies have shown that employees working from home often experience fewer distractions and can work during their most productive hours (Bloom et al., 2015). Companies also gain access to a broader talent pool, unrestricted by geographical limitations, allowing them to hire skilled workers regardless of location. This flexibility can foster innovation and improve organizational resilience in changing economic conditions. Despite its advantages, telecommuting presents notable challenges. A primary concern is the potential for decreased collaboration and communication among team members. When employees work remotely, informal interactions and spontaneous conversations that foster team cohesion are reduced, which may hinder innovation and knowledge sharing (Dennis et al., 2009). Additionally, remote workers often experience feelings of isolation and loneliness, which can negatively impact mental health and engagement (Golden et al., 2008). Managing performance can also be more difficult without direct supervision, leading to concerns about accountability and productivity measurement.

While telecommuting offers flexibility, it can blur the boundaries between work and personal life, leading to overwork or burnout if not managed properly (Shockley, 2019). Employees may find it challenging to disconnect from work, especially when their home environment doubles as their workspace. Conversely, others may struggle with maintaining discipline and routine. Research indicates that the effectiveness of telecommuting on well-being depends heavily on individual differences and organizational support systems. Proper training, clear policies, and technological tools can help mitigate these issues (Golden, 2008). The success of telecommuting also hinges on organizational culture and leadership practices. A culture that fosters trust, autonomy, and open communication is crucial for remote work success (Davis, 2019). Leaders need to adapt their management styles to support virtual teams, emphasizing result-oriented performance rather than hours worked. Training managers to effectively lead remote employees and use digital collaboration tools can improve team cohesion and productivity (Wang et al., 2021). Without such cultural shifts, remote work can lead to misunderstandings, decreased motivation, and disengagement. The role of technology is central to the effectiveness of telecommuting. Reliable internet connectivity, secure data access, and collaboration platforms like video conferencing, project management tools, and real-time messaging are essential (Nilles, 1998). Investment in cybersecurity measures is also critical to protect organizational data. As technology continues to evolve, so do the possibilities for seamless remote collaboration. However, disparities in technological access can create inequalities among employees, emphasizing the importance of organizational support in providing necessary tools and training. Looking ahead, telecommuting is likely to become a permanent feature of the workplace landscape. Hybrid models, combining in-office and remote work, are gaining popularity, offering flexibility while maintaining some level of face-to-face interaction (Shockley, 2019). Organizations must develop comprehensive policies that address issues such as performance management, work environment standards, and employee well-being. Additionally, research suggests that remote work can contribute to sustainability goals by reducing commuting-related carbon emissions (Wang et al., 2021). Nevertheless, ongoing challenges such as maintaining organizational culture and ensuring equitable treatment remain pertinent. Telecommuting offers numerous benefits, including increased flexibility, cost savings, and access to a wider talent pool. However, it also introduces challenges related to communication, employee well-being, and organizational culture. The success of remote work depends on effective leadership, technological infrastructure, and supportive policies. As organizations adapt to a rapidly changing work environment, understanding the dynamics of telecommuting will be vital for optimizing its advantages and addressing its limitations. Future research should focus on long-term impacts, best practices for remote leadership, and strategies to foster inclusive remote work environments.

DIMENSIONS OF TELECOMMUTING

The dimensions of telecommuting are productivity, work environment and employee engagement.

Productivity

The impact of telecommuting on productivity can vary; some individuals may find they are more productive at home, while others may face distractions. Productivity has been described as the level of an individual's work achievement after having exerted effort.

They believe that productivity is an individual phenomenon. However, certain environmental factors will have a significant bearing on performance (Hertz et al., 2011; cited in Faith, 2017). Productivity is an average measure of the efficiency of production. It can be expressed as the ratio of output to inputs used in the production process, i.e., output per unit of input. When all outputs and inputs are included in the productivity measure, it is called total productivity. Outputs and inputs are defined in the total productivity measure as their economic values. The value of outputs minus the value of inputs is a measure of the income generated in a production process. It is a measure of the total efficiency of a production process, and as such, the objective is to maximize it (Pooja & Sachin, 2015). According to Pooja and Sachin (2015), productivity is a crucial factor in the production performance of firms and nations. Increasing national productivity can raise living standards because more real income improves people's ability to purchase goods and services, enjoy leisure, improve housing and education, and contribute to social and environmental programs. Productivity growth also more profitable.

Productivity is an overall measure of the ability to produce a good or service. More specifically, productivity is the measure of how specified resources are managed to accomplish timely objectives as stated in terms of quantity and quality. Productivity may also be defined as an index that measures output (goods and services) relative to the input (labor, materials, energy, etc., used to produce the output). As such, it can be expressed as: Hence, there are two major ways to increase productivity: increase the numerator (output) or decrease the denominator (input). similar effect would be seen if both input and output increased, but output increased faster than input, or if input and output decreased, but input decreased faster than output. Organizations have many options for the use of this formula: labor productivity, machine productivity, capital productivity, energy productivity, and so on. A productivity ratio may be computed for a single operation, a department, a facility, an organization, or even an entire country (Pooja & Sachin, 2015).

Work Environment

The home office setup can greatly influence productivity and comfort. Factors include ergonomics, lighting and noise level. Work environment is often perceived as consisting of the work space, equipments, tools and other technological infrastructure of the place of work. Oludeyi (2015) noted that there are other elements like workplace settings, situations, conditions and circumstances. Truly Work environment is a broad concept that connotes the totality of factors tangible and intangible that affects organizational participants positively or negatively. It includes characteristics of the place of work and the job itself like organizational culture, offensive, or choking odor, heat, cold, noise, workload, task complexity, leadership style, Supervisor support, work place conflict and so on. Workers are not disembodied spirits. They are flesh and blood entities that physically, mentally, spatially and socially interact with other elements of the work place to consume input and to produce output towards attainment of organizational goals. Many scholars have attempted conceptualizing the work environment, Perhaps it may be defined in its simplest form as the settings, situations, conditions and circumstances under which people work (Oludeyi, 2015). It is further elaborated by Briner, (2000) as a very broad category that encompasses the physical setting (e.g. heat, equipments etc.), characteristics of the job itself (e.g. workload, task complexity), broader organizational features (e.g. culture, history) and even aspects of the extra organizational setting (e.g. local labour and market conditions, industry sector, work-home relationships). Kohun (2002), defines work environment as comprising the totality of forces, inter personal relationship of the work place, and other influential factors that and or constrain employee's activities and performance. It means that work environment is the sum of the interrelationships of the workplace, physical, spati, technical and other elements of the environment in which the employees work which includes technical, human and organizational environment.

Opperman (2002) was quoted in Yusuf and Metiboba, (2012), as defining workplace environment as composition of three major sub-environments which include the technical environment, the human environment and the organizational environment. According to them technical environment refers to tools, equipment, technological infrastructure and other physical or technical elements of the workplace. The human environment includes the peers, others with whom employees relate, team and work groups, interactional issues, the leadership and management. The human environment can be interpreted as the network of formal and informal interaction among colleagues; teams as well as boss-subordinate relationship that exist within the framework of organizations.

Employee Engagement

Keeping remote employees engaged and motivated can be challenging and may require new strategies, such as virtual team-building activities. The concept of employee engagement itself is a positive one and always associated with the progress and growth aspect of the business organization. There is always a cost aspect linked to the better employee engagement levels starting from the recruitment of the best talent and also the energy and time invested in nurturing and developing such talents (Johnson, 2004). According to the point of view of several scientists, employee engagement is primarily a person's predisposition to participate in particular labor activity, which consists of three components: knowledge, interest, and performance (Meiyani & Putra, 2019). Employee engagement has emerged as a critical focus within organizational research due to its strong link to organizational performance, employee well-being, and retention. Defined broadly, employee engagement refers to the emotional commitment, involvement, and enthusiasm employees have towards their work and organization (Schaufeli & Bakker, 2004). Research consistently demonstrates that higher levels of employee engagement correlate with positive organizational outcomes. Harter, Schmidt, and Hayes (2002) found that business units with highly engaged employees outperform their less engaged counterparts in productivity, profitability, and customer

satisfaction. Similarly, Saks (2006) identified that both job resources and personal resources (like self-efficacy) significantly influence engagement levels, which in turn affect performance. Despite the consensus on its importance, defining and measuring employee engagement remains complex. Some scholars argue that engagement overlaps with related constructs such as job satisfaction and organizational commitment (Macey & Schneider, 2008). Others raise concerns about the potential for superficial engagement or “disengaged engagement,” where employees may appear engaged but lack genuine commitment (Saks, 2006). Moreover, there is ongoing discussion about the causality between engagement and performance whether engagement leads to better outcomes or vice versa. Recent studies advocate for a nuanced understanding, emphasizing that engagement is dynamic and influenced by multiple contextual factors, including work environment, personal traits, and external stressors (Albrecht, 2010).

High-performing organizations have remained focused on employee feedback and, as a result, have achieved significant business results through enhanced levels of employee engagement. Attractive and competitive organizations constantly work towards increasing the value of their human resources. The success of any organization depends on human resources. An organization may have equipment and resources but cannot succeed without people. Employee engagement is therefore done to bring about a situation in which the employee, by free choice, has an intrinsic desire to work in the best interest of the organization. Employees who are engaged give organizations crucial competitive advantages, including higher productivity and lower employee turnover (Githinji & Muli, 2018). Aubrey (2005) discussed that while most human resource executives see the need to improve employee engagement, countless have yet to build up tangible ways to measure and tackle this goal. Hay Group (2012) elaborates that engaged employees cannot be expected to take a personal interest in organizational objectives unless an organization treats them as more than factors of production. With organizations increasingly forced to do more with less, tapping into the discretionary effort offered by engaged employees becomes all the more important for business success. Employee engagement aims to bring about a situation in which the employee, by free choice, has an intrinsic desire to work in the best interest of the organization. According to Robinson et al. (2004), an engaged employee goes an extra mile, believes in and identifies with the organization, wants to work to make things better, understands the business context and the bigger picture, and respects and helps colleagues. Alfes et al. (2010) stated that engaged employees perform better, are more innovative than others, are more likely to want to stay with the employer, enjoy greater levels of personal well-being, and perceive their workload to be more sustainable than others. Employee engagement is (Guest, 2014).

Making employees engaged in the organization's responsibilities would be one of the key emerging challenges in the current scenario. It is predicted that human resource departments need to come out with innovative interventions to keep the employees engaged in their jobs (Mike Johnson, 2004). Employee engagement has emerged as the key concept for the commercial success of any business organization that creates an ethical and transparent system (Levinson, 2007). Higher engagement levels would increase the financial wellness of the firm (Baumruk, 2006). A great organizational brand is created by nurturing a culture that promotes a high level of engagement (Martin & Hetrick, 2006). Many research studies have pointed out high levels of positive outcomes for the business organization due to the higher levels of employees' engagement. But still, most of the business organizations have failed in the implementation of engagement systems. More than 400 HR professionals have accepted that implementation of employee engagement is a significant challenge (Tasker, 2004). Higher engagement leads to greater employee productivity, as revealed by many studies (Lockwood, 2007; Watson, 2007; Balain & Sparrow, 2009). Employee engagement refers to the level of commitment, motivation, and emotional investment that employees have towards their organization and its goals. It is a crucial aspect of organizational success, as it directly influences productivity, job satisfaction, and retention rates. Employee engagement is a multifaceted construct with four organizational successes.

MANAGERIAL STYLES

Managerial style refers to the way managers interact with their team, make decisions, and implement policies. Dundon and Rollinson (2011) referred to management styles as not only a manager's preferred approach to handling matters concerning employees and employment relations but also the styles that reflect the way that the manager exercises his or her authority as well as makes decisions. In an earlier study conducted in the 1980s, Poole (1986) specifically defined management style as “a coherent approach to the problem of motivating and controlling employees, of handling grievance and conducting relationships with organized labor.” Following this definition, another study by Purcell (1987) regarded management style as “a distinctive set of guiding principles, written or otherwise, which set parameters to and signpost for management action in the way employees are treated and particular events handled.” In the 1990s, the study by Syed Abdullah (1991) viewed management styles as specific patterns of managerial practices that involved management's philosophy, core values, and the way things are done in organizations. In the same period, Blyton and Turnbull (1994) described management style as “the general control and direction of labor exercised by management on a day-to-day basis.” However, the subsequent study by Khandwalla (1995) considered management styles as the distinctive manner in which various business functions, such as goal setting, strategy formulation and implementation, organizing, staffing, control, coordination, leadership, and image building, are being performed in organizations.

A fairly simple approach is to view management style simply as the way that an organization is managed (Quang & Vuong, 2002, cited in Alan, 2023). Schleh (1997), cited in Alan (2023), referred to management style as the adhesive that binds diverse operations

and functions together. It is the philosophy or set of principles by which you capitalize on the abilities of your people. It is not a procedure on 'how to do,' but is the management framework for doing. A management style is a way of life operating throughout the enterprise. It permits an executive to rely on the initiative of his people (Schleh, 1997, cited in Alan, 2023). Yu and Yeh defined management style as "a preferred way of managing people bind diverse operations and functions together, as well as to exercise control over employees, and is considered as a set of practices that has been adopted either by an individual, a department, or a whole organization" (Dickson, 2005 cited in ALAN, 2023). Others have approached descriptions of management style by attempting to identify various functions of the manager. For example, Quang and Vuong noted that Khandwalla defined management style as "the distinctive way in which an organization makes decisions and discharges various functions, including goal setting, formulation and implementation of strategy, all basic management activities, corporate image building, and dealing with key stakeholders" (Quang & Vuong, 2002, cited in Alan, 2023).

Quang and Vuong pointed out that there is no single management style that applies in all instances and that an organization's "operating conditions" will influence the style that is selected (Quang & Vuong, 2002, cited in Alan, 2023). This assertion is consistent with other indications that management styles are influenced and determined by a number of different factors. Some believe that societal culture has the biggest impact on the management styles selected and used by organizations operating within a society, and there is ample evidence for the proposition that one can find distinctive management styles in different countries.

MEASURES OF MANAGERIAL STYLE

The measures of managerial style are decision making style, communication style and leadership approach.

Decision Making Style

Decision-making style refers to the characteristic manner in which individuals approach, process, and implement decisions. It encompasses habitual patterns that influence how choices are made in both personal and organizational contexts. Understanding these styles is critical because they shape problem-solving strategies, leadership behaviors, and organizational effectiveness (Harrison & Mowen, 2019). As decision-making is a fundamental aspect of human behavior, examining its styles provides insight into individual differences and organizational dynamics. One of the most influential models in understanding decision-making styles was developed by Scott and Bruce (1995), who identified five primary styles: directive, analytical, conceptual, behavioral, and passive. These styles represent distinct approaches to processing information and making choices. The directive style is characterized by efficiency and a focus on task completion, often favored under time constraints or in routine decisions. Conversely, the analytical style emphasizes data collection and systematic analysis, suitable for complex problems requiring detailed evaluation (Scott & Bruce, 1995). The choice of decision-making style has profound implications for leadership effectiveness and team functioning. Leaders employing a conceptual style often promote innovation and strategic thinking, which can lead to organizational growth (Nutt, 2008). However, over-reliance on a single style may hinder adaptability. Teams composed of diverse decision-making styles tend to perform better, as they balance analytical rigor with creativity and interpersonal considerations (Harrison & Mowen, 2019). Organizations can foster improved decision-making by training individuals to recognize and adapt their styles. Decision-making workshops, cognitive-behavioral techniques, and leadership development programs aim to enhance flexibility and reduce biases (Nutt, 2008). Such interventions promote more balanced approaches, encouraging individuals to switch styles as per contextual requirements, thereby improving decision quality and organizational outcomes.

Autocratic: The manager makes decisions unilaterally without much input from the team members. Autocratic decision-making mature work teams. Newly appointed managers often find autocratic decisions the hardest to make.

Democratic: the manager seeks input from team members and makes decisions collectively.

Laissez-faire: the manager takes a hands-off approach, allowing team members to make decisions.

Communication Style

Effective communication is fundamental to successful management, influencing organizational performance, employee engagement, and leadership effectiveness (Hargie, 2011). Management communication styles refer to the manner in which managers convey information, give instructions, and interact with their employees. These styles can significantly impact workplace relationships, decision-making processes, and organizational culture. Over the years, researchers have explored various communication styles in management, emphasizing their importance in fostering a productive work environment. Management communication styles are often categorized into different typologies based on their openness, assertiveness, and responsiveness. One widely referenced framework is the dichotomy between authoritative (directive) and participative (collaborative) styles (Yukl, 2013). Authoritative managers tend to make decisions unilaterally and communicate in a top-down manner, emphasizing control and clarity. Conversely, participative managers involve employees in decision-making, fostering a culture of inclusion and shared responsibility. Empirical studies indicate that participative styles are associated with higher employee satisfaction and motivation (Yukl & Mahsud, 2010). Leadership style is closely linked to communication. Transformational leaders, for instance, utilize open and inspirational communication to motivate followers, encouraging innovation and commitment (Bass & Avolio, 1994). Conversely, transactional

leaders often rely on more transactional, task-oriented communication, emphasizing compliance and routine (Burns, 1978). Research suggests that transformational communication fosters trust and organizational commitment, whereas transactional styles may be effective in routine tasks but less so in fostering long-term engagement (Avolio & Bass, 2004). The choice of communication style directly influences leadership effectiveness and organizational climate.

Cultural context significantly influences management communication styles. For example, hierarchical societies such as Japan tend to favor formal and indirect communication, emphasizing respect and social harmony (Hofstede, 1980). In contrast, Western cultures like the United States promote direct and explicit communication, valuing individual expression and assertiveness (Hall, 1976). Managers operating in multicultural environments must adapt their communication styles to suit cultural expectations, which can enhance cross-cultural understanding and reduce misunderstandings (Trompenaars & Hampden-Turner, 2012). The effectiveness of a communication style is often reflected in organizational outcomes such as employee performance, satisfaction, and organizational commitment. Studies have demonstrated that open and participative communication styles lead to higher levels of trust, better team cohesion, and increased innovation (Men & Stacks, 2013). Conversely, authoritarian communication can create a climate of fear and compliance, potentially reducing creativity and increasing turnover (Robinson & Judge, 2019). Therefore, management must strategically choose communication styles aligned with organizational goals and employee needs. The advent of digital communication tools has transformed management communication styles. Managers now employ various channels such as emails, instant messaging, video conferences, and collaborative platforms. These tools facilitate rapid and flexible communication but also pose challenges related to clarity and misinterpretation (Daft & Lengel, 1986). The choice of communication style in digital environments requires managers to adapt their approaches to maintain engagement and clarity. Research indicates that transparent, consistent, and empathetic communication enhances virtual team cohesion (Liu et al., 2018). While diverse communication styles can be effective, challenges remain in adapting them to different contexts and individuals. Managers may struggle with balancing assertiveness and empathy or with recognizing cultural differences in communication preferences (Tannenbaum & Salas, 2020). Resistance to change and lack of communication skills can hinder effective management communication. Training programs aimed at developing emotional intelligence and intercultural communication skills are crucial for improving management effectiveness (Goleman, 1998).

Emerging trends suggest increasing emphasis on authentic and transparent communication, especially in remote and hybrid work environments. Leaders are expected to adopt more empathetic and inclusive communication styles to foster trust and psychological safety (Kouzes & Posner, 2017). Additionally, artificial intelligence and data analytics are beginning to influence how managers communicate and make decisions, offering opportunities for more personalized and data-driven management approaches (Brynjolfsson & McAfee, 2014). Communication styles in management significantly influence organizational success, leadership effectiveness, and workplace culture. The choice of style be it authoritative, participative, transformational, or transactional must be tailored to organizational context, cultural environment, and technological landscape. As workplaces evolve, managers who develop adaptable and culturally sensitive communication skills will be better positioned to lead effectively and foster positive organizational outcomes.

Leadership Approach

The concept of leadership has been defined by different scholars in various ways. In fact, there are as many definitions of leadership as there are writers. The literary meaning of leadership in a universal dictionary and thesaurus says that it is the act of leading, the ability to be a leader, and the leaders of an organization or movement collectively. However, the meaning of leadership was further explained by scholars since the dictionary meaning does not explain it fully. Aibieyi (2009), cited in Aibieyi (2014), defines the subject matter as the innovation and initiative of leadership that is creative, adaptive, and agile. Harold Koontz (1988), cited in Aibieyi (2014), defines leadership as the art of influencing people so that they strive willingly and enthusiastically towards the accomplishment of group goals. Heresay and Blanchard (1977), cited in Aibieyi (2014), view leadership as a process of influencing the activities of an individual or a group in efforts towards achievement in a given situation. Unugbro (1995), cited in Aibieyi (2014), defined leadership as the activity of influencing people to strive willingly for group objectives. Chester (1973), cited in Aibieyi (2014), sees leadership as a social influence process in which the leaders seek the voluntary participation of their subordinates in an effort to meet organizational objectives. Katz and Khan (1979), cited in Aibieyi (2014), view leadership as an influential increment over and above mechanical compliance with the routine directives of an organization. Leadership approaches have evolved significantly, from trait-focused theories to contemporary models emphasizing ethics, authenticity, and transformational change. Each approach how leaders influence followers and achieve organizational success. Understanding these diverse theories enables leaders to adapt their styles to different contexts, cultures, and organizational needs. Future research should continue exploring integrative models that combine the strengths of multiple approaches to develop more effective and ethical leadership practices. Leadership is a critical factor influencing organizational success, employee motivation, and change management. Over the years, various leadership approaches have been developed to explain how leaders influence followers and achieve organizational goals. These approaches range from trait-based theories to contemporary transformational models, reflecting an evolving understanding of effective leadership.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, the various management styles and leadership approaches discussed highlight the complexity and dynamic nature of effective organizational leadership. Management style, encompassing decision-making, communication, and behavioral patterns, plays a pivotal role in shaping organizational culture and employee engagement. Similarly, leadership approaches ranging from trait-based and behavioral models to transformational and ethical paradigms provide diverse frameworks for influencing followers and achieving organizational objectives. The evolving landscape, especially with the advent of telecommuting and digital communication, necessitates adaptable and culturally sensitive management and leadership strategies. Leaders who understand and integrate these different styles and approaches, tailoring them to specific organizational contexts and technological environments, are better positioned to foster high performance, innovation, and employee well-being. Ultimately, effective management and leadership require a nuanced understanding of these theories combined with practical application to meet the challenges of modern organizations.

REFERENCE

- Allen, T. D., Golden, T. D., & Shockley, K. M. (2015). How effective is telecommuting? Assessing the status of our scientific findings. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 16(2), 40-68.
- Albrecht, S. L. (2010). *Handbook of Employee Engagement: Perspectives, Issues, Research and Practice*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Aubrey, C. (2005). *Bringing out the best in people*. New York: McGraw Hills.
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (2004). *Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire Manual*. Mind Garden Inc.
- Alan S. G. (2023). *Management styles*. MacMillan.
- Baumruk, R. (2004). 'The missing link: the role of employee engagement in business success', *Workspan*, 47, 48-52.
- Briner, R.B. (2000). Relationships between Work Environments, Psychological Environments & Psychological Well-Being. *Journal of Occupational Medicine*, 50(5), 299-303.
- Bailey, D. E., & Kurland, N. B. (2002). A Review of Telework Research: Findings, New Directions, and Lessons for the Study of Modern Work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4), 383-400.
- Bloom, N. (2015). Does Working from Home Work? Evidence from a Chinese Experiment. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 130(1), 165-218.
- Blyton, P., & Turnbull, P. (1994). *The dynamics of employee relations* (First). London: MacMillan.
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). *Improving Organizational Effectiveness through Transformational Leadership*. Sage Publications.
- Balain S, Sparrow P (2009), Engaged to Perform: A new perspective on employee engagement: Executive Summary, Lancaster University Management School.
- Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The Second Machine Age: Work, Progress, and Prosperity in a Time of Brilliant Technologies*. W. W. Norton & Company.
- Daft, R. L., & Lengel, R. H. (1986). Organizational Information Requirements, Media Richness and Structural Design. *Management Science*, 32(5), 554-571.
- Davis, A. (2019). *Managing Remote Workers: Challenges and Strategies*. Harvard Business Review.
- Dennis, C. (2009). Telecommuting and Employee Performance: Evidence from a Field Experiment. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), 1188-1198.
- Dundon, T., & Rollinson, D. (2011). *Understanding employment relations*. Berkshire: McGraw-Hill.
- Field, S. & Dubey, S. (2001). 'Leadership styles and Job satisfaction among Human Services workers'. *The Indian Journal of social works*, 48(1), 45-57.
- Golden, T. D. (2008). The Role of Telecommuting in the Work-Family Interface. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 72(3), 258-273.
- Githinji, J. W. & Muli, J. (2018). Employee engagement strategies and employee performance of Air Kenya Limited. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 3(4), 397-412.
- Gajendran, R. S., & Harrison, D.. (2007). The Good, the Bad, and the Unknown About Telecommuting: Meta-Analysis of Antecedents and Outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(6), 1524-1541.
- Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam Books.
- Guest, D. (2014). Employee engagement: A skeptical analysis. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness: People and Performance*, 1(2), 141-156.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture*. Anchor Books.
- Hargie, O. (2011). *Skilled Interpersonal Communication: Research, Theory and Practice*. Routledge.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Sage Publications.
- Johnson, G. (2004) 'Otherwise engaged', *Training*, Vol 41, No 10, p4. (Gallup study, 2004).

- Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2017). *The Leadership Challenge: How to Make Extraordinary Things Happen in Organizations*. Wiley.
- Lockwood NR (2007), 'Leveraging employee engagement for competitive advantage: HR's strategic role', *Society for Human Resource Management Quarterly*, 1/4
- Levinson E (2007a), *Developing High Employee Engagement Makes Good Business Sense*, www.interactionassociates.com/ideas/2007/05/developing_high_employee_engagement_makes_good_business_sense.php
- Liu, S.. (2018). Managing Virtual Teams: The Importance of Social Capital and Communication. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 33(4), 543–556.
- Meiyani, E., Putra, A., 2019. The Relationship Between Islamic Leadership on Employee Engagement Distribution in FMCG Industry: Anthropology Business Review. *Journal of Distribution Science*, 17(5), 19-28.
- Men, L. R., & Stacks, D. W. (2013). The Impact of Leadership Style and Employee Engagement on Organizational Trust. *Public Relations Review*, 39(3), 306–319.
- Harrison, P. R., & Mowen, M. M. (2019). *Fundamentals of Management*. Cengage Learning.
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations across Nations*. Sage.
- Handy, S.L. and Mokhtarian, P.L. (1996a) Forecasting Telecommuting, *Transportation*, 23, 163-190.
- Jones, M. (1996) Teleworking: The Future at Last?, *IA*, November, . 23-31.
- Khandwalla, P. (1995b). 'Effectiveness Management Styles: An Indian Study.' *Journal of Euro-Asian management*, 1(7), 56-60.
- Khandwalla, P. N. (1995). *Management Styles*. New Delhi, India: Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing.
- Kohun, (2002). Workplace Environment and its impact on organizational performance in Public sector Organizations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business System International Systems*, 1(1), 70-81.
- Kniffin, K. M. (2021). COVID-19 and the Workplace: Implications for Employee Well-Being. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 30(3), 239–245.
- Lunenburg, F. C. (2010). Decision-making in organizations. *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, 27(4), 1-9.
- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. Jr. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52(5), 509-516.
- McGuire, R. (2005) 'Which Management Style to Use' London: *The Pharmaceutical Journal* 275 (9)
- Morgeson, F. P., et al. (2010). The Future of Work: How Technology Shapes the Nature of Tasks and Work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(3), 445–467.
- Macey, W. H., & Schneider, B. (2008). The meaning of employee engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(1), 3-30.
- Nilles, J. M. (1998). Managing Telework: Strategies for Managing Telecommuters. *IEEE Engineering Management Review*, 26(2), 22–27.
- Nutt, P. C. (2008). Investigating the success of decision making processes. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(2), 425-455.
- Opperman C. S. (2002). *Tropical business issues. Partner Price Water House Coopers*. International Business Review.
- Oludeyi (2015), *A review of literature on work environment and work commitment: Implication for Future Research in Citadels of Learning*, Tai Solarin University of Education, Ogun State, Nigeria. Tai Solarin University Press.
- Poole, M. (1986). *Industrial relations: Origins and patterns of national diversity* (1st ed.). London: Routledge& Kegan Paul.
- Purcell, J. (1987). Mapping management styles in employee relations. *Journal of Management Studies*, 24(5), 533–548.
- Robinson, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2019). *Organizational Behavior*. Pearson Education.
- Robinson, D., Perryman, S., & Hayday, S. (2004). *The Drivers of Employee Engagement*. Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies. (IES Report 408). Retrieved August 7, 2017, from www.employment-studies.co.uk/system/files/resources/files/408.pdf
- Saks, A. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(7), 600-619.
- Schaufeli, W. B., & Bakker, A. B. (2004). Job demands, job resources, and their relationship with burnout and engagement: A multi-sample study. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 25(3), 293-315.
- Syed Abdullah, S. R. (1991). *Management Strategies and Employee Response in Malaysia: A study of Management Industrial Relations Styles of The US and Japanese Multinational Companies in Malaysian Electronic Industry*. University of Wales College of Cardiff.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1993). Deciding to decide: Development of a prototype for decision-making styles. *Management Science*, 39(5), 639-653.
- Schleh .E.C. (1977). 'A Matter of Management Styles', *Management Review*, 8.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1995). Decision-making styles: The development and validation of a new measure. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 55(5), 818-831.
- Shockley, K. M., et al. (2019). Managing Virtual Teams: Strategies for Success. *Organizational Dynamics*, 48(4), 100679.
- Tannenbaum, S. I., & Salas, E. (2020). *Teams That Work: The Seven Drivers of Team Effectiveness*. Oxford University Press.

- Trompenaars, F., & Hampden-Turner, C. (2012). *Riding the Waves of Culture: Understanding Diversity in Global Business*. Nicholas Brealey Publishing.
- Tasker J (2004), 'Engagement equals productivity', Personnel Today, www.personneltoday.com/articles/2004/10/05/25904/engagement-equals-productivity.html
- Watson Wyatt (2007), *Playing to Win in a Global Economy: Global Strategic Rewards Report and United States Findings*, Watson Wyatt Worldwide
- Wang, B. (2021). *Leading Remote Teams: Strategies and Challenges*. Leadership Quarterly, 32(4), 101434.
- Yulk, G. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. Pearson Education.
- Yukl, G., & Mahsud, R. (2010). Why Flexible and Adaptive Leadership Is Essential. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(2), 81–93.