The relation of the management styles with the managerial efficiency and the ranking in the executive agencies: the case of Mazandaran

Ahmad Jaafarnezhad
Ph.D. of Public Administration, Young Researchers and Elite Club, Qaemshahr Branch,
Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr, Iran
Hamzeh Samadi Miarkolaei
Ph.D. of Public Administration, Young Researchers and Elite Club, Qaemshahr Branch,
Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr, Iran
Email: hamzeh_samadi@yahoo.com
Hossein Samadi Miarkolaei
MSc. in Public Administration, Young Researchers and Elite Club, Qaemshahr Branch,
Islamic Azad University, Qaemshahr, Iran
Email: hossein_samadi_m@yahoo.com

Abstract

The first goal of the current research is to investigate the relation between the management styles and the managerial efficiency. The second goal of the research is to rank managers according to their managerial styles in the Executive Agencies in Mazandaran. Consequently, the data were gathered using questionnaires. The sample size was 150. The collected data were further analyzed by SPSS and Analysis Hierarchy Process (AHP) technique. The findings indicated that there was a significant relationship between management styles and managerial efficiency.

Introduction

Managers, who have applied management theory in their day-to-day practice, have had better chances of managing their organizations efficiently and effectively.

Adizes (2004b) believes it is a myth that some people are born leaders, and others are born followers. He called this "managerial racism." He believes that potentially all people have qualities necessary to be good managers, although these qualities may be dormant because of neglect. This seems obvious, especially when we hear that a good manager can manage anything moving from one technology to another and succeed in other words "From shoes to bubble gum, there is no difference." One merely needs to know planning, organizing, etc. The misconception that a good manager can manage anything has been particularly disastrous for arts organizations, which often fill their boards of directors with people whose experience is exclusively in business, and who attempt to run a theater as they would run, let us say, a soap company. "All you have to do," these people claim, "is to produce what the clients want, budget the production, and sell." This kind of approach has commercialized and destroyed many fine arts organizations (Adizes, 2004b). Management styles play significant role in the progress and development of the organization (Karimi, Hosseinzadeh, & Azizi, 2011). Many leadership models differentiate between two main types of leadership styles: task-oriented and relationship-oriented style also referred as

directive and supportive leadership (Euwema, Wendt, & Van Emmerik, 2007). Due to their variety management, styles have been classified using a series of criteria as follows:

1. Attitude toward responsibility;

2. Authority used by the manager;

3. Organizational initiative and consideration for the workforce;

4. Concern for production and employees;

5. Concern for production, employees, and efficiency;

6. Types of motivations, communication characteristics, nature of cooperation and decision-making strategy (Pop & Pop, 2008)

Literature review

Leadership is defined an observable act or behavior. Leadership behavior is the act of a leader who engages in the course of directing and coordinating the work of a group. This involves such acts as initiating the work, praising or criticizing group members (Bass & Avolio, 1990). Bass & Avolio (1995) and others have identified two types of leaders transformational and transactional. The transformational leaders are those who inspire followers to surpass their own self-interests for the good of the organization, and who are capable of having a profound and extraordinary effect on his/her followers (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1995). Transformational leadership has four components: idealized influence, inspirational motivation, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration (Bass, 1985; Lievens, Van Geit, & Coetsier, 1997; Givens, 2008).

Burns postulated that transformational leaders inspire followers to accomplish more by concentrating on the follower's values and helping the follower align these values with the values of the organization. Furthermore, Burns identified transformational leadership as a relationship in which the leader and the follower motivate each other to higher levels. Transformational leaders work to bring about human and economic transformation. Within the organization, they generate vision, mission, goals, and culture that contribute the organization to "practice its values and serve its purpose" (Givens, 2008).

Transactional leader refers to those who guide or motivate their followers in the direction of established goals by clarifying role and task requirements. Transactional leadership focuses on individual goals rather than common ones (Bass & Avolio, 1995).

Lewin, Lippit and White (1939) identified three styles of leadership: authoritarian, democratic and laissez-faire. In the autocratic style, the leader takes decisions without consulting with others. The decision is made without any form of consultation. In his experiments, Lewin found that this style caused high level of discontent. This style is also called the task centered approach to leadership as the leader is focused on getting tasks completed. He is authoritarian and assumes responsibility for all aspects of the work process. Communication tends to be one-way.

In the democratic style, the leader involves the people in the decision-making, although the final decision may be up to the leader. This style is also called a person-centered approach to leadership. The leader is focused on the team harmony and cohesion. He/she considers opinion of subordinates and strives for mutual understanding.

The laissez-faire style focuses on minimizing the leader's involvement in decision-making, and on allowing people to make their own decisions, although the leaders may still be responsible for the outcome. According to Lewin, Lippit and White the laissez-faire approach is not a real form of leadership at all, but rather a neglect of duty (Lewin, Lippit & White, 1939).

Rensis Likert (1967) identified four management styles: Exploitative authoritarian, Benevolent authoritarian, Consultative and Participative.

In Exploitative authoritarian style managers tend to use threats, fear, and punishment to motivate their workers. Managers at the top of the hierarchy make all the decisions and are usually unaware of the problems faced by those at the lower levels of the organization. Decisions are imposed on subordinates, and motivation is characterized by threats.

Benevolent authoritarian style is less controlling than the exploitative authoritative, In this style motivation is based on the potential for punishment and partially on rewards. The decision making is expanded to lower-level employees allowing them to be involved in policy making. However, it is limited by the framework given to them from upper-level management. Major policy decisions are

still left to those at the top, who have some awareness of the problems that occur at the lower levels. This creates mainly downward communication with little upward communication, causing subordinates to be somewhat suspicious of communication coming from the top.

Consultative style is very closely related to the Human Relations theory. Motivation of workers is gained through rewards, occasional punishments, and very little involvement in making decisions and goals. Lower-level employees, in this system, have the freedom to make specific decisions that will affect their work. Upper-management still has control over policies and general decisions that affect an organization. Managers will talk to their subordinates about problems and action plans before they set organizational goals. Communication in this system flows both downward and upward, though upward is more limited.

Likert argued that the participative style was the most effective form of management. This style coincides with Human Resources theory. This style promotes genuine participation in making decisions and setting goals through free-flowing horizontal communication, creativity, and skills of employees. Managers are fully aware of the problems at the lower-levels of the organization. Everyone accepts all organizational goals because they have been set through group participation. All employees are responsible and accountable for the organizational goals. Managers motivate employees through monetary awards and participation in goal setting. Satisfaction

among employees is the highest out of the four styles. Likert claims that supervisors with the best record of performance tend to be those who are employee centered, focusing on people rather than work (Likert, 1967).

Further, Mintzberg (1975) identifies the following managerial roles:

Interpersonal Roles: Three of the manager's roles arise directly from formal authority and involve basic interpersonal relationships:

(1) Figure-head: First is the figure-head role. As the head of an organizational unit, every manager must perform some ceremonial duties.

(2) Leader: Managers are responsible for the work of the people of their unit. Their actions in this regard constitute leader's role. Some of these actions involve leadership directly—for example, in most organizations the managers are normally responsible for hiring and training their own staff.

(3) Liaison Officer: Until recently liaison role has hardly been mentioned, in which the manager makes contacts outside the vertical chain of command.

Informational Roles: Three roles describe these informational aspects of managerial work:

(4) Monitors: As monitor, the manager is perpetually scanning the environment for information, interrogating liaison contacts and subordinates, and receiving unsolicited information, much of it because of the network of personal contacts. Remember that a good part of the information the manager collects in the monitor role

arrives in verbal form, often as gossip, hearsay, and speculation.

(5) Disseminators: In the disseminator role, the manager passes some privileged information directly to subordinates, who would otherwise have no access to it. When subordinates lack easy contact with one another, the manager may pass information from one to another.

(6) Spokespeople: In the spokesperson role, the manager sends some information to people outside the unit—a president makes a speech to lobby for an organization cause, or a foreman suggests a product modification to a supplier. In addition, as a spokesperson, every manager must inform and satisfy the influential people who control the organizational unit. For the foreman, this may simply involve keeping the plant manager informed about the flow of work through the shop.

Decisional Roles: Information is not, of course, an end in itself; it is the basic input to decision making. One thing is clear in the study of managerial work: the manager plays the major role in the unit's decision making system. Four roles describe the manager as decision maker:

(7) Entrepreneurs: As entrepreneur, the manager seeks to improve the unit, to adapt it to changing conditions in the environment. In the monitor role, a president is constantly on the lookout for new ideas. When a good one appears, he initiates a development project that he may supervise himself or delegate to an employee (perhaps with the stipulation that he must approve the final proposal).

(8) Disturbance handlers: While the entrepreneur role describes the manager as the voluntary initiator of change, the disturbance handler role depicts the manager involuntarily responding to pressures. Here change is beyond the manager's control. The pressures of a situation are too severe to be ignored—a strike looms, a major customer has gone bankrupt, or a supplier reneges on a contract—so the manager must act.

(9) Resource allocators: The third decisional role is that of resource allocator. The manager is responsible for deciding who will get what. Perhaps the most important resource the manager allocates is his or her own time. Access to the manager constitutes exposure to the unit's nerve center and decision maker. The manager is also responsible for designing the unit's structure, that pattern of formal relationships that determines how work is to be divided and coordinated.

(10) Negotiators: The final decisional role is that of negotiator. Managers spend considerable time in negotiations: the president of the football team works out a contract with the holdout superstar; the corporation president leads the company's contingent to negotiate a new strike issue; the foreman argues a grievance problem to its conclusion with the shop steward (Mintzberg, 1975 & 1990).

In this study, we focus on Adizes's producer, administrative, entrepreneur, and integrator management styles. According to the classic managements textbooks and best-selling guides, the ideal manager is knowledgeable, achievement-oriented, detail-oriented, systematic, and efficiency-oriented; organized, a logical and linear thinker; charismatic, visionary, a risk-

taker, and change-oriented; and sensitive to people and their needs. He can integrate all the necessary people to achieve goals. He knows how to build a team while making him dispensable. He judges himself by how well his group performs; by how well, together and individually, the group members achieve their goals, and by how well he facilitates the achievement of those goals (Adizes, 2004$_d$: 25).

If the ideal (PAEI) executive does not exist, then what kind of manager can be an effective leader of a complementary team? There are nine important characteristics to look for:

(1) Self-awareness: A good manager must be aware of what he is doing, aware of his style, his code.

(2) Consciousness: He must understand the consequences and meaning of his actions, including the impact his behavior has on other people's behavior.

(3) Well-rounded: no zeros in his (PAEI) code: Can he perform all our roles? The difference between a manager and a mismanager is that one is flexible, the other inflexible. What makes a mismanager inflexible is his inability to perform (and I did not say excel) – and therefore appreciate and respect – all the tasks required of a manager.

(4) Knows strengths and weaknesses; knows his uniqueness: To be able to put together an effective team, a manager must have a balanced view of himself, so that he can find out what kind of people he'll need to complement himself.

(5) Accepts strengths, weaknesses, and uniqueness: Accepting one's weaknesses is a condition for improving. We all have limited energy, and if a manager's energy is spent on rejecting who he is, there will be little or no energy left for adapting and changing himself into who he wants to be.

(6) Can identify excellence and weaknesses in others: In particular, he must be able to identify other people's strengths in areas in which he is weak. Unfortunately, many managers fear excellence in others. Will he hire, utilize, and develop people who are different from him, instead of opting for the security of hiring people who are like himself?

(7) Can accept and appreciate differences in others: Can he see beauty in difference? Can he accept, respect, and nourish it? Is he aware that since he cannot be superior in all four management roles, his subordinates will ideally be superior to him in some respects? Can he experience that without feeling threatened?

(8) Knows how to slow down and relax in difficult situations: On a basic level, being a good manager means knowing how to disagree without being disagreeable. I jokingly say that one way to recognize a good manager is by the depth of the scars on his tongue.

(9) Creates a learning environment in which conflicts can be resolved, by both commanding and granting mutual trust and respect: How does one accept conflict, legitimize it, and harness it? A manager who cannot command and grant trust and respect cannot help resolve the conflicts that necessarily arise in a complementary team. We grow through disagreement, because you have points of view that I do not have. I might not like it, I might feel

uncomfortable with it, but I am learning (Adizes, 2004c).

Real executives, managers, and leaders are also real people. They have strengths. They have weaknesses. They excel in some areas and they fail in others. Adizes found that the four basic styles of management are determined by the permutation of four roles that need to be performed if an organization is going to be healthy; i.e., effective and efficient in both the short and the long run. These four essential roles are: (P)roducing the results for which the organization exists, thus making the organization effective; (A)dministering, for efficiency; (E)ntrepreneuring, for change; and (I)ntegrating the parts of the organization, for long-term viability - or (PAEI) (Adizes, 2004b). In any organization, in any technology, in any culture, of any size, these four roles are necessary for good management. Any time one or more of these roles is not being performed, there will be mismanagement: the organization will be either ineffective or inefficient in the short or long run. In addition, the pattern of mismanagement that will appear is a predictable, repetitive pattern all over the world, regardless of culture, regardless of technology, regardless of the size of the organization. Any permutation of the combined performance of these roles yields a style. A good manager is one in whom all the roles meet the threshold needs of the task, even if he or she does not excel in all roles. A managerial style can be a Producer, (Paei); an Administrator, (pAei); an Entrepreneur, (PaEi); or an Integrator, (paeI), etc. A leader is someone who excels in at least

two roles, one of which is (I)ntegration. According to Adizes's Management Styles we can categorize managers as follows:

1.   Producer Managers: The first role that management must perform in any organization is to (P)roduce results– (P). Why are clients coming to your organization? Why do they need you? What is the service they want? The (P)roducer's job is to satisfy this need, and fulfill this role. The first and most important role that management must perform in any organization is to (P)roduce the desired results for which the company or unit exists (Adizes, 2004b). He is a knowledgeable achiever committed to his discipline, technically a master of his field, industrious and productive. He sells, engineers, runs the production system, or effectively completes research assignments. He is committed to getting the job done. A (P)roducer has a powerful need to achieve. He likes immediate gratification. As a salesman, he wants to close a deal as quickly as he can. As an engineer, he loves to hear the machines humming. As an athlete, he warms up very briefly before suggesting, "Let's play," and he usually pays close attention to the score (Adizes, 2004b).

2.   Administrator Managers: The second role, (A), to (A)dminister, means to see to it that the organizational processes are systematized, that the company does the right things in the right sequence with the right intensity. It is the role of (A)dministrator to pay attention to details, to make the organization efficient in the short run (Adizes, 2004b, Adizes, 2004a).

3. Entrepreneur Managers: Next, a visionary is who can foresee the direction the organization is going to take, someone who can naturally pro-act to constant change. This is the (E)ntrepreneur – the (E) role–who combines creativity with the willingness to take risks. If he performs this role well, the organization will have the services and/or products that its future clients will want and seek, making it effective in the long run (Adizes, 2004$_b$, Adizes, 2004$_a$).

4. Integrator Managers: Finally, management must (I)ntegrate, which means to build a climate and a system of values that will motivate the individuals in the organization to work together so that no one is indispensable. This produces efficiency in the long run (Adizes, 2004$_a$, Adizes, 2004$_b$, Adizes, 2004$_c$, Adizes, 2004$_d$).

In problem-solving, each role focuses on a different imperative: (P): what?; (A): how?; (E): when, and (I): who? If all four questions are not answered before a decision is finalized, then that decision will be only "half-baked." If you (P)roduce results and (A)dminister, but lack the ability to (E)ntrepreneur and to (I)ntegrate, you'll be effective and efficient in the short run–but only in the short run. If you (E)ntrepreneur and (I)ntegrate without (P)roducing and (A)dministrating, you'll be effective and efficient in the long run, but in the short run you will suffer. For a company to be profitable in the short and long run, it needs to perform all four roles well (Adizes, 2004$_b$). The important message is that no one can excel at all of the (PAEI) roles at the same time in every

situation. No one is or ever can be a perfect, textbook manager. Every human being may excel in one or more roles, but never in all four forever and under all circumstances. Good managers, however, must have at least a modicum of ability in each role. If any one of these four roles is missing, a foreseeable pattern of corresponding mismanagement will occur. To evolve from good manager to leader, however, meeting the threshold requirements of each role is not sufficient. For leadership, one must perform at least two roles, one of which is the (I) role. And even then, whether the combination of the two roles will produce a functional leadership style will depend on this manager's specific task or on the phase of his organization in its lifecycle (Adizes, 1999$_a$, Adizes, 2004$_b$). Nor do all countries around the world practice the same managerial process.

The (PAEI) roles develop in a predictable sequence in the lifecycle of any organization. Over time, some roles become more pronounced and other roles less pronounced, creating a pattern of problems that can be foreseen and prevented (Adizes, 1999$_b$; Adizes, 2004$_b$).

Peter Drucker (1973) has recognized the complexity of the managerial task. "The top management tasks," Drucker writes, "require at least four different kinds of human being." Drucker identifies them as "the thought man," "the action man," "the people man," and "the front man." These are, of course, analogous to the styles of the (PAEI) model. And Drucker also acknowledges, "Those four temperaments are almost never found in the same person

(Drucker, 1973, Adizes, 2004ᵦ, Adizes, 2004ᵧ). An (A)-dominant style and an (E)-dominant style are in conflict, because (A) is conservative and wants control, whereas (E) wants change. A (P)-dominant style and an (E)-dominant style are also in conflict, because (P) requires short-term feedback, whereas (E) looks to the long-term for feedback. (E) and (I) are in conflict, because (E) prefers to create change, which might cause conflict, whereas (I) wants harmony. Furthermore, in all four cases, there is misunderstanding, because each style communicates differently, sometimes even speaking the identical words but with opposite meanings (Adizes, 2004ᵦ). One example is the way different styles express agreement and disagreement. If (E)ntrepreneurs disagree with an idea, for instance, they will usually be very expressive about it. They're expressive even when they agree. (A)dministrators, on the other hand, express disagreement by being silent. That discrepancy alone can cause tremendous misunderstanding and conflict.

Karimi, Hosseinzadeh, and Azizi (2011), in their study, indicated that there is a significant negative relationship between authoritarian management style and productivity among employees, Islamic Azad University in Islamshahr.

Then, Bertrand and Schoar (2003) found that management style is significantly related to performance and that managers with higher performance receive higher compensation and are more likely to be found in better governed firms (Bertrand & Schoar, 2003).

Further, Nsubuga's (2009) study established that there is a strong positive relationship between the leadership style of head teachers and school performance in secondary schools. However, the contribution of the leadership style towards the overall school performance is low. He also indicated that the autocratic leadership style of the school's head teachers has a negative effect on school performance in secondary schools in Uganda. This study has established that there is a very low correlation between the laissez-faire leadership style in secondary schools and school performance in secondary schools in Uganda. His study showed that school performance in secondary schools in Uganda is positively related to the democratic leadership style employed by school head teachers and that the democratic leadership style is the most used style in schools (Nsubuga, 2009).

Methodology

In this study, to collect the data two-sectional questionnaires were used: first section included questions about management styles, and second section-questions about the levels of managerial efficiency. Then, the questionnaires were distributed among managers in the Executive Agencies in Mazandaran. The sample size of the study was 150 ($n=150$). The validity of the questionnaires was tested by Cronbach's alpha (the results are in Table 1). After collecting the data, Pearson correlation coefficient test and Analysis Hierarchy Process (AHP) technique were run to receive both descriptive and inferential results.

Table 1: Reliability statistics

	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items	Number of Cases
Primary Distribution	.854	13	42
Redistribution	.796	13	150

Data analysis and results

The results of descriptive analysis indicated that 59 managers (39.33%) were between 25 and 30 years, 25 managers (16.67%) were between 36 and 45 years, 17 managers (11.33%) were between 46 and 55 years, and 49 managers (32.67%) were more than 56 years. Among them 84 (56%) had Bachelor's degree, 63 (42%) had Master's, and 3 managers (2%) had PhD. As to their experience, 18 managers (12%) had less than 5 years of experience,

47 managers (31%) had 6-15 years of experience, 65 managers (44%) had16-20 years of experience, 20 managers (13%) had more than 20 years of experience.

The results of the inferential statistics revealed that there is a positive significant correlation between management styles and efficiency ($r=0.629; p<0.01$). Thus, H_1 of the present study, that there is a significant relationship between management styles and efficiency, is accepted. Table 2 shows the results.

Table 2: Pearson correlation coefficient: management styles and efficiency

		Efficiency Levels	Management Styles
Efficiency	Pearson Correlation	1	0.629**
Levels	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.000
	N	15	15
Management	Pearson Correlation	0.629**	1
Styles	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0
	N	15	15

**.Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In addition, findings indicated that there is a positive significant correlation between Integrator managers and their efficiency levels ($r=0.535; p<0.01$). Hence, H_2 of the

present study, that there is a significant relationship between Integrator managers and their efficiency levels, is also accepted

Table 3: Pearson correlation test results: Integrator managers and their efficiency levels

		Efficiency Levels	Integrator Managers
Efficiency	Pearson Correlation	1	0.535**
Levels	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.000
	N	15	15
Integrator	Pearson Correlation	0.535**	1
Managers	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0
	N	15	15

**.Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Next, H$_3$ of the present study, that there is significant relationship between Administrator managers and their efficiency is accepted, as well, since r=0.575 and p<0.01. The results are in Table 4.

Table 4: Pearson correlation test results: Administrator managers and their efficiency

		Efficiency Levels	Administrator Managers
Efficiency	Pearson Correlation	1	0.575**
Levels	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.000
	N	15	15
Administrator	Pearson Correlation	0.575**	1
Managers	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.000	0
	N	15	15

**.Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

As it is clear from Table 5 that there is a positive significant correlation between Entrepreneur managers and their efficiency (*r=0.179; p<0.01*). So, H$_4$, that there is a significant relationship between Entrepreneur managers and their efficiency, is also accepted.

Table 5: Pearson correlation test reuslt: Entrepreneur managers and their efficiency

		Efficiency Levels	Entrepreneur Managers
Efficiency	Pearson Correlation	1	0.179*
Levels	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.028
	N	15	15
Entrepreneur	Pearson Correlation	0.179*	1
Managers	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.028	0
	N	15	15

*.Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Finally, the findings revealed that there is a positive significant correlation between Producer managers and their Efficiency ($r=0.116$). Thus, H_5 is accepted.

Table 6: Pearson correlation test results: Producer managers and their efficiency

		Efficiency Levels	Producer Managers
Efficiency	Pearson Correlation	1	0.116
Levels	Sig. (2-tailed)	0	0.159
	N	15	15
Producer	Pearson Correlation	0.116	1
Managers	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.159	0
	N	15	15

After finding out the relationship between managerial styles and efficiency, AHP technique was applied to rank the managers according to their styles. As a result, Administrative Management Style with final score equal to 0.247 is the first. Integrator Management Style with final score equal to 0.241 is the second, Entrepreneur Management Style with final score equal to 0.139 is the third, and Producer Management Style with final score equal to 0.117 is the last one. The results are demonstrated in the tables below

Table 7: Normalized matrix related to management styles

	Integrator Managers	Administrative Managers	Entrepreneur Managers	Producer Managers
ntegrator Managers	1	1.555	2.329	1.311
Administrative Managers	0.796	1	2.489	2.608
Entrepreneur Managers	0.429	0.314	1	2.005
Producer Managers	0.972	0.487	0.498	1

Table 8: Double comparisons related to management styles

	Integrator Managers	Administrative Managers	Entrepreneur Managers	Producer Managers
Integrator Managers	1	1.555	2.329	1.311
Administrative Managers	0.796	1	2.489	2.608
Entrepreneur Managers	0.429	0.314	1	2.005
Producer Managers	0.972	0.487	0.498	1
Aggregate	3.197	3.357	6.317	6.925

Table 9: Normalized matrix of indicators and weights of double comparisons

	Integrator Managers	Administrative Managers	Entrepreneur Managers	Producer Managers	Average
Integrator Managers	0.312	0.163	0.301	0.189	0.241
Administrative Managers	0.102	0.297	0.394	0.194	0.247
Entrepreneur Managers	0.123	0.093	0.158	0.181	0.139
Producer Managers	0.100	0.145	0.078	0.144	0.117

Table 10: The ranking of indicators related to management styles

Indicators	Final score	Ranking
Administrative Managers	0.247	Rank 1
Integrator Managers	0.241	Rank 2
Entrepreneur Managers	0.139	Rank 3
Producer Managers	0.117	Rank 4

Conclusion and discussions

One of the most important factors for an organization's progress and development is management styles (Karimi, Hosseinzadeh, and Azizi, 2011). The first goal of the present research was to investigate the relationship between management styles (Producer, Administrative, Entrepreneur, and Integrator) with managerial Efficiency in Executive Agencies in Mazandaran. The second aim of the study was to rank managers according to their management styles.

The results of the data analysis showed that there is statistically significant relationship between management styles and the managerial efficiency in Executive Agencies in Mazandaran. These results are similar to the results of Karimi, Hosseinzadeh, and Azizi (2011), who found in their study that there were significant relationship between management styles and productivity (Karimi, Hosseinzadeh, & Azizi, 2011). The results of the current study also coincide with the ones of Warner's (2002) research findings indicating that that there is a positive relationship between transactional and transformational leadership styles and job satisfaction (Warner, 2002). Likewise, the finding are similar to the findings of Bertrand and Schoar (2003), Nsubuga (2009)

In addition, this research has ranked managers according to their management styles using AHP technique. As a result 38 percent of the managers were Administrative, 32 percent were Integrator, 18 percent were Entrepreneur, and 12

percent were Producer managers. These results are similar to the findings of Nassar, Abdou, and Mohmoud (2011) indicating that the percentage of managers with consultative style is higher as compared with exploitative/authoritative management style (Nassar, Abdou, & Mohmoud, 2011).

References

1. Adizes, I. (1971). Industrial Democracy, Yugoslav Style: The Effect of Decentralization on Organizational Behavior, New York: Free Press, 1971; reprinted by MDOR on Organizational Behavior on Organizational Behavior Institute, 1977.

2. Adizes, I., & Zukin, P. (1977). A Management Approach to Health Planning in Developing Countries, Health Care Management Review, 2, 1.

3. Adizes, I. (1999a). Managing the Performing Arts Organization: Founding Principles in the Management of the Arts. Santa Monica: California, The Adizes Institute Publishing.

4. Adizes, I. (1999b). Managing Corporate Lifecycles. Paramus, N.J.: Prentice Hall Press.

5. Adizes, I. (2004a). The Ideal Executive: Why You Cannot Be One and What to Do About It. Santa Barbara: California, Adizes Institute Publishing.

6. Adizes, I. (2004b). Management / Mismanagement Styles: How to Identify a Style and What to Do About It. Santa Barbara: California, Adizes Institute Publishing.

7. Adizes, I. (2004c). Leading the Leaders: how to enrich your style of management and handle people whose style is different from yours. Santa Barbara: California, Adizes Institute Publishing.

8. Adizes, I. (2004d). The Ideal Executive: why you cannot be one and what to do about it, A New Paradigm for Management. Santa Barbara: California, Adizes Institute Publishing.

9. Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance and beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.

10. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1990). The Implications of transactional and transformational leadership for individual, team, and organizational development. In: W. A. Pasmore., and R. W. Woodman (eds.), Research in Organizational Change and Development, Greenwich CT: JAI Press.

11. Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). Multifactor leadership questionnaire: Manual leader form, rater, and scoring key for MLQ (Form 5X-Short). Redwood city, CA: Ming Garden.

12. Bertrand, M., & Schoar, A. (2003). Managing with Styles: The Effects of Managers on Firm Policies. University of Chicago School of Business.

13. Euwema, M. C., Wendt., H., & Van Emmerik, H. (2007). Leadership styles and group organizational citizenship behavior across cultures, Journal of Organizational Behavior, 28, 1035–1057. DOI: 10.1002/job.496.

14. Givens, R. J. (2008). Transformational Leadership: The Impact on Organizational and Personal Outcomes, Emerging Leadership Journeys, 1(1), 4-24.

15. Karimi, F., Hosseinzadeh, D., and Azizi, G. (2011). Relationship Between Management Style and Productivity of Employees in Islamic Azad University-Islamshahr Unit, World Applied Sciences Journal, 12 (10), 1685-1690.

16. Krejcie, R. V., and Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30, 607-610.

17. Lewin, K., Lippitt, R., & White, R. K. (1939). Patterns of aggressive behavior in experimentally created social climates, Journal of Social Psychology, 10, 271-279.

18. Lievens, F., Van Geit, P., and Coetsier, P. (1997). Identification of Transformational Leadership Qualities: An Examination of Potential Biases, European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 6(4), 415-430.

19. Likert, R. (1967). New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill.

20. Mintzberg, H. (1975). The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact, Harvard Business Review, 53, 4, 49-61.

21. Mintzberg, H. (1990). The Manager's Job: Folklore and Fact: The classical view says that the manager organizes, coordinates, plans, and controls; the facts suggest otherwise, Harvard Business Review, March/April, 163–176.

22. Nassar, M. E., Abdou, H. A., & Mohmoud, N. A. (2011). Relationship between management styles and nurses' retention at private hospitals, Alexandria Journal of Medicine, 47, 243–249.

23. Nsubuga, Y. K. (2009). Analysis of leadership styles and school performance of secondary schools in Uganda. Unpublished Dissertation, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University.

24. Pop, M. T., and Pop, D. (2008). Types of Managers and Management Styles, Annals of the Oradea University, Fascicle of Management and Technological Engineering, Volume VII (XVII), 2604-2610.

25. Warner, J. R. (2002). The Relationship between Leadership Styles of Nurse Managers and Staff Nurse Job Satisfaction in Hospital Settings. Unpublished Dissertation, In partial fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Science in Nursing, Marshall University College of Nursing and Health Professions Huntington, West Virginia, August 9.