



МЕНЕДЖМЕНТ/MANAGEMENT

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/IRJ.2026.166.108> EDN: TEQSHQ

ANALYSIS OF ADIZES MANAGEMENT STYLES IN RUSSIA: EFFECTIVENESS AND PROBLEMS

Research article

Prokopev A.V.^{1,*}, Gurdzhiyan V.L.², Chernyshova T.N.³, Zhamkova T.G.⁴¹ ORCID : 0000-0002-9225-3042;² ORCID : 0000-0002-1262-0579;³ ORCID : 0000-0002-8232-6922;⁴ ORCID : 0009-0007-4209-4817;^{1, 2, 3, 4} Chuvash State University, Cheboksary, Russian Federation

* Corresponding author (loop711[at]mail.ru)

Abstract

This article explores the application of Adizes' management styles in Russian organizations. Modern competitive market conditions and external instability dictate new management requirements for survival and development. The main challenges facing organizations in the domestic market include low management qualifications, a lack of long-term planning, excessive bureaucracy, and an overload of work regulations. Furthermore, a low corporate culture is a pressing issue, with a lack of trust hindering the implementation of long-term projects and programs. In these circumstances, choosing the right management style can be a key factor in addressing some of these challenges. Based on an analysis of Russian enterprises, it was found that the dominant management style in Adizes is the "Producer" style, which focuses on the precise implementation of production plans. The "Administrator" style is common in government and semi-government organizations. The entrepreneurial style is rapidly gaining popularity in innovative enterprises and start-ups. The "Integrator" style is used in environments where a high degree of interaction and collaboration between employees is essential, i.e., in teamwork. In practice, Russian management exhibits a diversity of styles, but traditional approaches prevail in most organizations. This leads to a slow response to external changes and can hinder innovation. To improve competitiveness, it is important to implement more adaptive and flexible management strategies so that organizations can effectively respond to challenges. Furthermore, it is important to note that achieving management effectiveness requires combining different management styles, depending on the specific needs of each organization.

Keywords: management styles, classification of management styles by Ichak Adizes, producer style, administrator style, integrator style, entrepreneurial style.

АНАЛИЗ СТИЛЕЙ МЕНЕДЖМЕНТА ПО АДIZESУ В РОССИИ: ЭФФЕКТИВНОСТЬ И ПРОБЛЕМЫ

Научная статья

Прокопьев А.В.^{1,*}, Гурджиян В.Л.², Чернышова Т.Н.³, Жамкова Т.Г.⁴¹ ORCID : 0000-0002-9225-3042;² ORCID : 0000-0002-1262-0579;³ ORCID : 0000-0002-8232-6922;⁴ ORCID : 0009-0007-4209-4817;^{1, 2, 3, 4} Чувашский государственный университет имени И.Н. Ульянова, Чебоксары, Российская Федерация

* Корреспондирующий автор (loop711[at]mail.ru)

Аннотация

Статья посвящена вопросам применения стилей менеджмента по Адизесу в практике российских организаций. Современные условия конкурентного рынка и нестабильность внешней среды диктуют новые требования к менеджменту организации для ее выживания и развития. Основными проблемами организаций на отечественном рынке являются: низкий уровень квалификации управленческих кадров, отсутствие долгосрочного планирования, излишняя бюрократизация и перегруженность регламентами трудовых процессов. Кроме этого, остро стоит проблема низкой корпоративной культуры, когда недостаток доверия затрудняет реализацию долгосрочных проектов и программ. В данных условиях выбор грамотного стиля управления организацией может стать тем фактором успеха, который позволит решить определенную часть проблем. Исходя из проведенного анализа российских предприятий было выявлено, что в менеджменте по Адизесу доминирует стиль «Производитель», ориентированный на четкое выполнение производственных планов. Стиль «Администратор» является распространенным в государственных и полугосударственных структурах. Предпринимательский стиль начинает активно набирать популярность на инновационных предприятиях и на уровне стартапов. Стиль «Интегратор» находит применение там, где важна высокая степень взаимодействия и сотрудничества между работниками, т.е. в командной работе. На практике российский менеджмент демонстрирует разнообразие стилей, однако в большинстве организаций преобладают традиционные подходы. Это приводит к замедлению реакций на внешние изменения и может помешать инновациям. Для повышения конкурентоспособности важно внедрять более адаптивные и гибкие стратегии управления, чтобы организации могли эффективно реагировать на вызовы. Кроме этого, необходимо отметить, что для достижения эффективности управления необходимо комбинировать разные стили управления в зависимости от специфики каждой организации.



Ключевые слова: стили управления, классификация стилей управления по Ицхаку Адизесу, стиль производителя, стиль администратора, стиль интегратора, предпринимательский стиль.

Introduction

In today's dynamically changing economic climate and increasingly competitive environment, the study of management styles in Russia is becoming especially relevant. Left behind by globalization and international integration, Russian companies and government agencies are faced with the need to optimize management processes. In this context, the classification of management styles developed by Ichak Adizes represents a valuable tool for analyzing and understanding the current management landscape, considering the specifics of Russian practice.

Studying management styles is crucial for both the private sector and public organizations. Private companies strive to improve their competitiveness by implementing effective management practices, which require understanding which management style is most appropriate in each specific case. This applies not only to large corporations but also to small and medium-sized enterprises, which make up a significant portion of the Russian economy. In an unstable political and economic environment, Russian managers are forced to make quick and sometimes difficult decisions, requiring the ability to adapt and apply different management styles depending on the specific situation.

Government agencies are also not left behind: effective management of human resources and material assets requires the implementation of modern approaches and methods. The principles described by Adizes can help optimize processes, foster communication within structures, and improve the overall effectiveness of public administration. However, to implement these styles, it is necessary to understand which of them are most appropriate for the Russian reality, where a combination of different approaches can prove most productive.

Given the differences in cultural, economic, and social contexts, it is important to adapt the Adizes classification of styles to the realities of Russian practice. Researching these styles will not only help identify the most effective management approaches but also identify the challenges faced by managers in Russia. These include a lack of flexibility in decision-making, a lack of a clear strategic direction, and difficulties in communication between different management levels.

Thus, studying Adizes management styles in Russia is not only relevant but also necessary for improving efficiency in both business and public administration. An analysis of current management styles will allow us to draw conclusions about which approaches yield the best results in the Russian market and identify existing challenges that need to be addressed. Identifying such trends will form the basis for developing recommendations for improving management practices in the country and, ultimately, will enhance the competitiveness of both individual organizations and the Russian economy.

Research into management styles in the Russian Federation is also important for developing a new generation of Russian managers who must be able to interpret and utilize various management approaches, drawing on theoretical and practical knowledge. This will form the basis for creating a more effective management environment capable of adapting to changing conditions and fostering sustainable economic growth in the country.

In view of the above, the relevance of this study is obvious and justified by the desire to understand and optimize management processes in Russian companies and government agencies in accordance with the challenges of the time.

Research methods and principles

The classification of management styles proposed by Ichak Adizes is one of the most popular and widely used models in the study of management approaches [1]. Adizes identifies four basic management roles: Producer (P), Administrator (A), Entrepreneur (E), and Integrator (I). Each of these styles has its own unique characteristics, strengths and weaknesses, and specific approaches to solving management problems. This model not only allows us to understand how management functions can be distributed among managers but also demonstrates how a harmonious combination of these styles can lead to organizational success.

The Producer (P) is always focused on results and task completion, initially emphasizing work efficiency. This style is focused on achieving goals, solving current problems, and maintaining high-quality work. However, a drawback of this role is an exaggerated focus on narrow tasks, which can distract from long-term strategies.

The Administrator (A) has strong organizational skills and is concerned with adhering to rules and procedures. This management style is important for creating structure and order in an organization. However, excessive reliance on the administrator can lead to excessive bureaucracy and slow decision-making, which becomes a serious disadvantage in a dynamic market.

The Entrepreneur (E) is characterized by creativity, innovation, and risk-taking. This management style is essential for generating new ideas, developing strategies, and adapting to new conditions. However, excessive impulsiveness and a lack of attention to detail can threaten the stability and predictability of organizational processes.

The Integrator (I) plays an important role in creating and maintaining team spirit, facilitating communication and interaction between various levels and departments of the organization. Integrators foster a positive and harmonious atmosphere, but a lack of decisiveness and an emphasis on balance can hinder progress in critical situations.

Adizes' classification also considers the interaction of these styles, emphasizing that each is an essential element of successful management. Adizes argues that achieving maximum effectiveness requires a balance between styles and an understanding of when to apply each style. Maintaining this balance is important, as a one-sided approach to management can lead to shortcomings that hinder a company's successful functioning.

From a management perspective, it's important to link management styles to the stages of an organization's life cycle. Adizes identified ten stages of the organizational life cycle. At each stage, a certain style or combination of styles will dominate in terms of management effectiveness. During the first stage, Courtship, the Entrepreneur (E) style will prevail, as the vision for the future organization dominates here. During the second stage, Infancy, the Entrepreneur (E) style also predominates, and the Producer (P) style begins to be applied, as the organization begins production and initial sales. During



the following stage, Go-Go, the Producer (P) style becomes increasingly important due to increased production and sales. However, a deficiency in the Administrator (A) style may arise, hindering management and coordination. The next stage, Adolescence, is characterized by a transition from chaos to systematization. The Administrator (A) style becomes the primary one, as stability is now essential for the organization. The Prime stage is the most balanced in terms of the application of all management styles. Corporate culture begins to form, and the Integrator (I) style becomes essential. In the next stage, Stable, the entrepreneurial spirit weakens, and the Entrepreneur (E) style begins to lose ground. The Aristocracy stage is characterized by the almost complete disappearance of the Entrepreneur (E) style, with the Administrator (A) style dominating the organization. The next two stages, Early Bureaucracy and Bureaucracy, are characterized by the prevalence of the Administrator (A) style over all other styles, often to an exaggerated degree. If management fails to take positive steps to restore the organization's health by re-embracing the Entrepreneur (E) style, this can lead to bankruptcy and the organization's exit from the market [2].

Thus, Adizes' classification not only aids in diagnosing existing management approaches but also serves as a basis for developing strategies aimed at improving organizational performance. Understanding all these aspects enables managers to adapt their actions based on current needs and conditions, which, in turn, increases the chances of successfully leading their organizations. Besides this, Adizes' classification of management styles emphasizes the importance of an individual approach to each style, considering its strengths and weaknesses, and suggests the need to combine different styles to achieve an organization's strategic goals. A fundamental understanding of this classification will allow for a deeper understanding of internal management processes and the identification of appropriate solutions for improving management effectiveness.

Main results

An analysis of management styles used in Russian organizations, based on the Adizes model, reveals both the advantages and disadvantages of existing management approaches. In recent years, Russia has seen a significant diversity of management styles, but most companies still adhere to traditional behavioral models, which often leads to certain management problems [3].

Several dominant management styles can be identified in Russian companies. The Producer (P) style is typically widespread in organizations focused on the strict implementation of production plans. Manufacturers focus on foresight, product quality, and process optimization, which often leads to significant success in manufacturing. However, excessive focus on this style can lead to certain problems for an organization. A characteristic of a manager who relies heavily on the Producer (P) style is that: they don't coordinate, administer, delegate, plan, or control. They don't propose new directions or revolutionary solutions. They don't build a team or develop the capabilities of those around them — they're too busy achieving results [4]. In this situation, other employees in the organization may feel uncomfortable. Their initiative and suggestions have virtually no impact. In such an organization, motivation quickly declines, and organizational culture develops very slowly. In addition, in the rapidly changing Russian economy, this approach can create serious problems, such as a lack of readiness for change and business scaling. As a result of these difficulties, organizations face the risk of stagnation and loss of competitiveness in the market.

The Administrator (A) style is also common in Russian companies, particularly in government and semi-government structures. This approach emphasizes adherence to procedures, regulations, and rules, which positively impact discipline and organizational culture. However, as practice shows, excessive reliance on the administrative style sometimes leads to excessive bureaucracy and a slowdown in decision-making, which negatively impacts operational efficiency. In situations where rapid response to change is necessary, this style may lose its relevance [5]. On the other hand, a lack of application of the Administrator (A) style can lead to management difficulties for an organization, especially during the Adolescence stage, when a transition from chaos to systematization is required. Even with the other strong P, E, and I, the Administrator (A) style will be critical, and the organization's further development may be jeopardized if this style is not adopted promptly [6].

The Entrepreneurial style (E), although less common, is gaining popularity in several innovative companies and startups. Representatives of this style are inclined to innovate and develop new business models, which can significantly improve an organization's efficiency and adaptability in an unstable economy [7]. For example, the use of an innovative IT approach to business management has made "Dodo-Pizza" a leader in the Russian fast-food market. The use of modern IT business process management models and a strong customer focus have enabled the company to quickly capture the market and become recognizable in all major Russian cities [8]. However, the risks associated with impulsive decisions and a lack of organization can lead to negative consequences and failed projects.

The Integrator style (I) is ideal for organizations where a high degree of interaction and collaboration between employees is essential. However, as a company grows, implementing the Integrator style may face challenges associated with maintaining team spirit and communication in many employees and an increasingly complex structure. Successful application of the Integrator (I) style can become a powerful competitive advantage for an organization in management. For example, "VkusVill" has abandoned the classic management approach, which is largely present in Russian retail companies such as "Magnit" and "Pyaterochka". These companies employ strict KPIs, strict regulations, and a high degree of control over employees. At "VkusVill", the relationship between management and employees is built on mutual respect and honesty. Teamwork and a high degree of integration prevail, with each employee understanding that if they fail to complete a task, they will let down the team first and foremost, not just the manager [9].

Managers at all levels and employees of enterprises in the Chuvash Republic participated in the study of management styles. A total of 264 respondents were surveyed, representing senior, middle, and lower management levels in the relevant economic entities. Among those surveyed were representatives of industry, transportation, construction, and agriculture. The Adizes test and a survey were used. Adizes's test methodology allows one to determine management style using the PAEI code. The results of the managerial test are presented in Table 1.



Table 1 - Self-assessment of management style by managers

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.60797/IRJ.2026.166.108.1>

| Functions of the manager | Top-level managers, % | Middle managers, % | Lower-level managers, % |
|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------------------|-------------------------|
| P — Producer | 55 | 33 | 78 |
| A — Administrator | 62 | 56 | 42 |
| E — Entrepreneur | 71 | 45 | 35 |
| I — Integrator | 68 | 67 | 70 |

Analysis of the obtained data reveals that paEI is predominant among top-level managers, pAeI among middle managers, and PaeI among lower-level managers. This suggests that managers at all levels have a strong I function, which implies the ability to create a team atmosphere in which people can effectively interact, embrace and share the organization's values, and achieve organizational goals.

Top-level managers also have a predominant E function, which can mean a creative approach to business, the ability to take risks, work in constantly changing conditions, and a long-term orientation.

Middle-level managers emphasize the development of function A, which involves control over the processes taking place in the organization, setting and implementing short-term goals.

Lower-level managers tend to develop the P function, which indicates the need to ensure the effectiveness of the organization by satisfying the needs of customers.

The employee survey revealed similar results, except for the prevalence of Function I among top-level managers. Employees expressed the opinion that this function is predominant among first-line managers (83%), well developed among middle managers (67%), and insufficiently present among top-level managers (40%).

Conversations with employees to clarify the data revealed that this result can be explained by infrequent, often formal, contact with top-level managers. Contact with middle and lower-level managers, however, is almost constant, often informal. Nevertheless, based on the organization's employee perceptions, it can be noted that managers at each level effectively perform at least one function and satisfactorily perform others, thereby complementing each other.

Thus, a mix of styles is observed in Russian management, but most organizations remain influenced by traditional approaches. The need to transition to more flexible and adaptive management styles is becoming increasingly urgent, especially in today's economy, where the pace of change is accelerating significantly. It is important to understand that existing problems, both within organizations and at the management level, require attention and serious analysis. There is a need to develop management potential and improve the skills of managers, which will enable the building of more effective teams and the adaptation of management styles to current market conditions [10]. For the successful functioning of organizations in Russia, understanding which management styles predominate and how they can be adapted to address current challenges and improve overall effectiveness is becoming critical.

Management in Russia faces several serious problems and challenges that hinder the effective functioning of organizations and undermine their competitiveness in the marketplace. One key issue is the lack of a clear management strategy at the company and national levels. Many Russian organizations operate without long-term planning, making them vulnerable to external changes and economic crises. The unpredictability of the economic situation exacerbates this problem, leaving managers in a constant state of reaction rather than proactive action.

Another significant problem is the low level of management qualifications. While international management and education standards are improving, Russian companies often underinvest in training their employees [11]. This results in many managers lacking the necessary skills for successful management, which, in turn, impacts overall business performance. Negative management experiences, gained in an environment of instability and resource scarcity, also contribute to managerial dissatisfaction and uncertainty, limiting their creativity and innovation.

Furthermore, bureaucracy and regulatory overload are a problem. Many Russian companies experience problems with internal procedures, which sometimes become overly complex and confusing. Excessive reporting and strict regulatory requirements slow decision-making and, consequently, impair the ability to respond to external challenges. Some entrepreneurs note that bureaucracy not only complicates processes but also creates informal barriers to initiative and innovation. This leads to decreased motivation among employees, who perceive that their efforts may prove fruitless.

The third problem is the low level of trust among management stakeholders. The corporate culture of many Russian organizations is plagued by climate issues, such as a lack of openness, insufficient communication between different levels, and even conflicts of interest. When employees lack confidence in their managers' integrity and feel unsupported, this can lead to a loss of loyalty and productivity, as well as high turnover. There is a need to create more transparent communication channels to improve feedback and trust within the organization.

The lack of technological management solutions should also be considered. Many Russian companies still do not utilize modern information technologies that could optimize management and decision-making processes. Amid the global trend toward digital management and automation, many Russian firms are left behind, which, in turn, limits their ability to adapt to market changes.

Thus, management problems in Russia are rooted in a multitude of factors, including a lack of skills, excessive bureaucracy, a lack of strategic planning, and low trust among management stakeholders. Overcoming these challenges will be essential for improving the overall efficiency and competitiveness of Russian companies and their ability to adapt to modern market demands.



Discussion

In the Russian economy, characterized by a high degree of uncertainty, rapid change, and a variety of competitive factors, identifying the most effective management style, according to Adizes is becoming a pressing issue. Based on an analysis of current practices, the Integrator (I) style emerges as one of the most suitable for Russian organizations in today's environment.

The Integrator style emphasizes building strong teams and maintaining trusting relationships between colleagues and management. In the context of Russian corporate culture, where issues of team dynamics and interaction are particularly important, an integrator approach can lead to increased overall productivity and employee satisfaction. Teams managed by integrators are better able to adapt to external changes due to their high level of cohesion and mutual understanding, which is especially relevant in a constantly changing market [12].

Integrators can effectively manage conflicts and maintain a positive team atmosphere. This is critical for Russian companies, which often experience communication and collaboration issues at various levels. By implementing an integrative management style, it is possible to significantly improve internal processes, which, in turn, leads to increased overall organizational productivity. During crises or changes in the external environment, such teams can quickly and flexibly respond to challenges, ensuring the company's long-term survival and development.

Despite the advantages of the integrative style, it's worth noting that its success depends largely on the skill level of managers. Managers with strong leadership skills, the ability to build quality relationships, and the ability to create an atmosphere of trust will be more successful in applying this style. However, achieving this level of skill development in every manager is difficult, making the need for systematic training and professional development a pressing issue for many organizations.

The Integrator style isn't the only approach that can demonstrate high effectiveness. Under certain conditions, combining the Producer (P) and Entrepreneur (E) styles with the Integrator can produce optimal results. Adopting elements of these styles can significantly enhance innovation and productivity, highlighting the importance of finding and maintaining a balance between these approaches.

Ultimately, although the Integrator style demonstrates a high degree of adaptability and effectiveness in the Russian economy, it's important to remember the need for flexibility in applying different management styles. Developing strategies that consider not only the strengths of Integrators, but also other styles will create a more resilient and competitive organization, capable of addressing challenges and successfully adapting to changing business conditions.

Conclusion

An analysis of Adizes management styles in the context of Russian practice revealed key trends, challenges, and innovative approaches that can both positively and negatively impact management effectiveness. Several key conclusions can be drawn from the study.

First, Russian management exhibits a diversity of styles, but traditional approaches, such as the Producer and Administrator styles, predominate in most organizations. This leads to a slow response to external changes and can hinder innovation. To improve competitiveness, it is important to implement more adaptive and flexible management strategies so that organizations can effectively respond to challenges.

Second, the Integrator (I) style was identified as the most effective approach for modern Russian organizations. The Integrator style focuses on developing teamwork, trusting relationships, and open communication. It helps create cohesive teams, which is critical in a highly uncertain and changing market environment. Managers who can effectively integrate different styles and management approaches can achieve significant results and build a resilient organization.

Furthermore, the study found that successful application of integrative style requires managers with developed leadership skills and high human resources competence. Investments in management training and development are becoming an essential element in adapting to integrative approaches. Organizations striving for success should proactively develop professional development programs for managers to ensure they possess the necessary skills.

It is also important to note that achieving effectiveness requires combining different management styles, depending on the specifics of each organization. In some situations, elements of the Entrepreneurial style can be cultivated alongside the integrative approach, stimulating innovation within the company. Considerable attention should be paid to balancing management processes with external conditions, market specifics, and demand for products or services [13].

Ultimately, to achieve sustainable development, Russian companies need to rethink their management approaches, adapting international practices to local realities. Recommendations for management strategy may include the formation of flexible teams, the implementation of programs to develop teamwork, and the training of management personnel at all levels [14].

Thus, the conducted research highlights the importance of applying an integrative style as a foundation for successful management within an organization. At the same time, the entire management system must remain flexible and ready for change to ensure the necessary adaptability and resilience to the challenges of the modern market. This approach will not only improve internal efficiency but also maintain competitiveness in the international arena.

Конфликт интересов

Не указан.

Рецензия

Все статьи проходят рецензирование. Но рецензент или автор статьи предпочли не публиковать рецензию к этой статье в открытом доступе. Рецензия может быть предоставлена компетентным органам по запросу.

Conflict of Interest

None declared.

Review

All articles are peer-reviewed. But the reviewer or the author of the article chose not to publish a review of this article in the public domain. The review can be provided to the competent authorities upon request.



Список литературы / References

1. Adizes I. Organizational passages – Diagnosing and treating lifecycle problems of organizations / I. Adizes // *Organizational Dynamics*. — 1979. — № 8 (1). — P. 3–25. — DOI: 10.1016/0090-2616(79)90001-9.
2. Mowlanapour R. Investigating organizational characteristics during the first three lifecycle stages using the PAEI framework and the system dynamics approach / R. Mowlanapour, Y. Farjami, F. Saghafi // *Comput Math Organ Theory*. — 2021. — № 27. — P. 35–60. — DOI: 10.1007/s10588-020-09319-4.
3. Björn J.E. A maturity model to guide inter-organisational crisis management and response exercises / J.E. Björn, P. Eriksson // *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. — 2024. — № 106. — DOI: 10.1016/j.ijdr.2024.104413
4. Адизес И. Как преодолеть кризисы менеджмента / И. Адизес. — Москва: МИФ, 2014. — 189 с.
5. Данилевский Ю. От личного контроля к системному управлению: как правильно передать полномочия CEO / Ю. Данилевский // *Форбес*. — 2025. — URL: <https://www.forbes.ru/mneniya/543118-ot-lichnogo-kontrolya-k-sistemnomu-upravleniu-kak-pravil-no-peredat-polnomocia-seo> . (дата обращения: 02.03.26)
6. Danvila-del-Valle I. How innovation climate drives management styles in each stage of the organization lifecycle: The human dimension at recruitment process / I. Danvila-del-Valle, F.J. Lara, E. Marroquín-Tovar et al. // *Management Decision*. — 2018. — № 56 (6). — P. 1198–1216. — DOI: 10.1108/MD-02-2017-0163.
7. Кияткин А. Додо: от подвала до миллиарда / А. Кияткин. — Москва: МИФ, 2025. — 320 с.
8. Щепина Е. ВкусВилл: Как совершить революцию в ритейле, делая всё не так / Е. Щепина. — Москва: Альпина Паблишер, 2019. — 213 с.
9. Narimanova O. Choosing an optimal leadership style at different stages of the organization's life cycle: I. Adizes' theory / O. Narimanova // *Science and innovation 2021: Development directions and priorities*. — 2021. — № 1. — P. 28–35.
10. Khumaryan D. Flexible management in the IT and creative sector: Decentralized Capitalism? / D. Khumaryan // *Journal of Economic Sociology*. — 2022. — № 23 (5). — P. 11–36.
11. Tohidi H. Teamwork productivity & effectiveness in an organization base on rewards, leadership, training, goals, wage, size, motivation, measurement and information technology / H. Tohidi // *Procedia Computer Science*. — 2011. — № 3. — P. 1137–1146. — DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2010.12.185.
12. Juliana C. Performance implications of misalignment among business strategy, leadership style, organizational culture and management accounting systems / C. Juliana, L. Gani, J. Jermias // *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*. — 2021. — № 37 (4). — P. 509–525. — DOI: 10.1108/IJOES-02-2021-0033.
13. Tomova A. Framework for establishing an effective management team within organizations / A. Tomova, B. Andonovic, A. Domitrov // *ENTRENOVA — ENTerprise REsearch InNOVAtion*. — 2024. — № 10 (1). — P. 379–387.

Список литературы на английском языке / References in English

1. Adizes I. Organizational passages – Diagnosing and treating lifecycle problems of organizations / I. Adizes // *Organizational Dynamics*. — 1979. — № 8 (1). — P. 3–25. — DOI: 10.1016/0090-2616(79)90001-9.
2. Mowlanapour R. Investigating organizational characteristics during the first three lifecycle stages using the PAEI framework and the system dynamics approach / R. Mowlanapour, Y. Farjami, F. Saghafi // *Comput Math Organ Theory*. — 2021. — № 27. — P. 35–60. — DOI: 10.1007/s10588-020-09319-4.
3. Björn J.E. A maturity model to guide inter-organisational crisis management and response exercises / J.E. Björn, P. Eriksson // *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*. — 2024. — № 106. — DOI: 10.1016/j.ijdr.2024.104413
4. Adizes I. Kak preodolet' krizisy' menedzhmenta [Managing Corporate Lifecycles] / I. Adizes. — Moscow: MIF, 2014. — 189 p. [in Russian]
5. Danilevskij Yu. Ot lichnogo kontrolya k sistemnomu upravleniyu: kak pravil'no peredat' polnomochiya SEO [From personal control to systemic management: how to properly delegate authority to the CEO] / Yu. Danilevskij // *Forbes*. — 2025. — URL: <https://www.forbes.ru/mneniya/543118-ot-lichnogo-kontrolya-k-sistemnomu-upravleniu-kak-pravil-no-peredat-polnomocia-seo> . (accessed: 02.03.26) [in Russian]
6. Danvila-del-Valle I. How innovation climate drives management styles in each stage of the organization lifecycle: The human dimension at recruitment process / I. Danvila-del-Valle, F.J. Lara, E. Marroquín-Tovar et al. // *Management Decision*. — 2018. — № 56 (6). — P. 1198–1216. — DOI: 10.1108/MD-02-2017-0163.
7. Kiyatkin A. Dodo: ot podvala do milliarda [Dodo: From the Basement to a Billion] / A. Kiyatkin. — Moscow: MIF, 2025. — 320 p. [in Russian]
8. Shhepina E. VkusVill: Kak sovershit' revolyuciyu v ritejle, delaya vsyo ne tak [VkusVill: How to Revolutionize Retail by Doing Everything Differently] / E. Shhepina. — Moscow: Al'pina Pablisher, 2019. — 213 p. [in Russian]
9. Narimanova O. Choosing an optimal leadership style at different stages of the organization's life cycle: I. Adizes' theory / O. Narimanova // *Science and innovation 2021: Development directions and priorities*. — 2021. — № 1. — P. 28–35.
10. Khumaryan D. Flexible management in the IT and creative sector: Decentralized Capitalism? / D. Khumaryan // *Journal of Economic Sociology*. — 2022. — № 23 (5). — P. 11–36.
11. Tohidi H. Teamwork productivity & effectiveness in an organization base on rewards, leadership, training, goals, wage, size, motivation, measurement and information technology / H. Tohidi // *Procedia Computer Science*. — 2011. — № 3. — P. 1137–1146. — DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2010.12.185.
12. Juliana C. Performance implications of misalignment among business strategy, leadership style, organizational culture and management accounting systems / C. Juliana, L. Gani, J. Jermias // *International Journal of Ethics and Systems*. — 2021. — № 37 (4). — P. 509–525. — DOI: 10.1108/IJOES-02-2021-0033.
13. Tomova A. Framework for establishing an effective management team within organizations / A. Tomova, B. Andonovic, A. Domitrov // *ENTRENOVA — ENTerprise REsearch InNOVAtion*. — 2024. — № 10 (1). — P. 379–387.