

Yan Yuxin 

Al Farabi business school, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
E-mail: yanyuxin600@gmail.com

ADAPTIVE TEAM MANAGEMENT UNDER UNCERTAINTY: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF EASTERN AND WESTERN MODELS

Abstract. In the modern business environment, characterized by constant uncertainty, instability, and a high rate of change, the ability of organizations to adapt quickly becomes a key factor in their resilience and long-term development. Team management plays a special role in these conditions, since it is teams that ensure the implementation of operational and strategic tasks, the exchange of knowledge, the development of solutions, and the adaptation of business processes. Traditional management mechanisms, based on long-term planning, rigid assignment of functions, and centralized control, prove to be insufficiently effective in conditions of uncertainty. The aim of the study is to conduct a comparative analysis of the principles of team management under conditions of uncertainty and to identify the features of Eastern and Western approaches to leadership, communication, distribution of responsibility, and management decision-making. The methodological basis is comparative analysis and case studies. The Eastern context is presented using the examples of China, Japan, and South Korea, with a focus on collectivist values, hierarchy, long-term orientation, and group harmony. The Western context includes the USA and countries of Western Europe, with a focus on individual responsibility, autonomy, delegation of authority, and horizontal communication. The results show that Eastern practices ensure coordination, cohesion, and stability, but may slow down decision-making. Western practices accelerate response and stimulate initiative, but carry the risk of fragmentation. Neither approach is universally superior. The most promising approach is to develop hybrid models of adaptive management that combine collective responsibility with individual accountability, hierarchical coordination with delegation, and interpersonal trust with institutional transparency. The theoretical significance of the work lies in systematizing the relationship between the cultural context and specific management mechanisms in conditions of uncertainty. The practical significance lies in the possibility of applying the obtained principles by managers, HR managers, and organizational development specialists to build more flexible and culturally sensitive teams in international companies.

Keywords: team management, risk management, comparative analysis, eastern management, western management.

Introduction

The modern business environment is characterized by an increasing degree of uncertainty, instability and a high rate of change. Political and economic crises, geopolitical tensions, technological transformations, digitalization, transformation of labor markets, disruptions of global supply chains and the consequences of the COVID-19 pandemic have significantly changed the operating conditions of organizations. Previously, uncertainty was primarily perceived as a temporary characteristic of individual crisis periods, but now it is becoming a permanent element of the external and internal business environment. In such conditions, the ability of an organization to quickly adapt to changes, make decisions with incomplete information, and maintain the effectiveness of human resources becomes one of the key factors for its sustainability and long-term development.

Team management is of particular importance in conditions of uncertainty. It is the teams that ensure the implementation of a significant part of the operational and strategic objectives of the organization, exchange knowledge and experience, develop solutions to complex problems and

ensure the adaptation of business processes to changing conditions. In an unstable environment, traditional management mechanisms based primarily on long-term planning, strict allocation of functions and centralized control may not be effective enough. Managers have to make decisions with limited information, quickly reallocate resources and responsibilities, keep employees motivated, and at the same time maintain team coordination. Therefore, modern team management involves not only setting tasks and monitoring their implementation, but also building trust, developing communication, ensuring psychological safety, stimulating initiative, managing conflicts, and creating the team's ability to constantly adapt.

In this regard, the comparative study of Eastern and Western approaches to team management is of particular scientific importance. The choice of these management contexts is due to significant differences in cultural, institutional and organizational principles of management practices formation. Eastern countries, especially those in East Asia, are of interest due to the significant role of collectivist values, long-term orientation, hierarchical relationships, respect for leadership status, group harmony, and interpersonal trust. These characteristics can directly influence responsibility allocation, leadership behavior, intra-team communication, conflict resolution, and decision-making in an uncertain environment. At the same time, East Asian countries demonstrate the ability to combine traditional management values with modern tools of digital, innovative and flexible management, which allows us to consider their experience as a significant source of practices for adapting teams to an unstable environment.

The Western managerial context is of scientific interest for comparison due to its more pronounced focus on individual responsibility, employee autonomy, delegation of authority, horizontal communication, initiative and result orientation. Such characteristics can facilitate rapid decision-making, the distribution of initiative among team members, and the rapid change of organizational processes in response to external challenges. Therefore, a comparison of Western and Eastern approaches makes it possible to determine how different principles of organizing teamwork manifest themselves in conditions of uncertainty and what mechanisms allow organizations to remain effective in an unstable external environment.

Within the framework of this study, it is advisable to consider the eastern approach mainly on the example of China, Japan and South Korea, which represent various options for combining traditional cultural principles with modern corporate governance mechanisms. The Western context is represented by the United States and Western European countries, where the practices of decentralization, individual responsibility, delegation of authority, and flexible management have become widespread. This approach avoids an excessively broad juxtaposition of "East" and "West" and focuses on specific management mechanisms. At the same time, the final composition of the countries should correspond to the actual empirical basis of the study.

The relevance of the research is determined by the fact that in conditions of constant uncertainty, organizations need such principles of team management that simultaneously ensure the stability, flexibility and efficiency of management processes. The question of how cultural characteristics of management influence the behavior of managers and employees, ways of communication, distribution of responsibility and decision-making in crisis and unstable situations becomes especially important. Despite a significant amount of research on leadership, organizational culture, risk management, and team effectiveness, existing scientific results remain largely fragmented.

Thus, the research gap lies in the insufficient systematization of the relationship between the cultural context, management principles and the behavior of teams in conditions of uncertainty. The theoretical juxtaposition of individualistic and collectivistic approaches alone does not allow us to determine which specific management mechanisms are most effective in an unstable environment. A comparative analysis of leadership, communication, responsibility allocation, motivation, decision-making, and trust building is needed, taking into account the cultural context.

The scientific novelty of the research lies in the systematization and comparative analysis of the principles of team management in conditions of uncertainty through the prism of Eastern and

Western management approaches. Unlike studies that consider cultural differences primarily at the level of general characteristics of national culture, the present study focuses on identifying their manifestations in specific management processes leadership, intra-team communication, responsibility allocation, decision-making, motivation, building trust and team adaptation. The scientific novelty also consists in identifying the advantages and limitations of various management mechanisms and determining the possibility of their complementarity. This approach allows us to move from a simple juxtaposition of eastern and Western models to identifying elements that can be integrated into a more flexible team management model in the face of uncertainty.

The purpose of the study is to conduct a comparative analysis of the principles of team management in conditions of uncertainty and identify the features of Eastern and Western approaches to leadership, communication, responsibility allocation and managerial decision-making.

To achieve this goal, two tasks have been formulated. The first task is to systematize theoretical approaches to team management in conditions of uncertainty and identify the key characteristics of Eastern and Western management models, taking into account the characteristics of leadership, communication, motivation and decision-making. The second task is to conduct a comparative analysis of the management practices of selected Eastern and Western countries, identify their advantages and limitations, and identify the possibilities for applying and complementing relevant management principles in an unstable organizational environment.

The theoretical significance of the research lies in the expansion of scientific ideas about team management in conditions of uncertainty by combining the provisions of leadership theory, organizational behavior, intercultural management and risk management. The results of the study make it possible to reveal more deeply the role of cultural context in the formation of managerial mechanisms and clarify the relationship between leadership style, intra-team relations, decision-making processes and team adaptability.

The practical significance of the research is related to the possibility of using the results obtained by heads of organizations, HR managers and specialists in the field of organizational development when forming teams, developing leadership models, improving internal communications and choosing decision-making mechanisms in conditions of uncertainty. The results of the comparative analysis can be useful to international companies and organizations forming multicultural teams, as they allow us to take into account differences in employees' ideas about leadership, responsibility, communication and teamwork. In addition, the identified features of the Eastern and Western approaches can be used to form hybrid management practices that combine the advantages of individual autonomy and collective responsibility.

Thus, the study of the principles of team management in conditions of uncertainty is an urgent area of modern management, since the sustainability of an organization increasingly depends on the ability of its teams to adapt to unpredictable changes. A comparison of Eastern and Western experience allows us to identify not only differences in management approaches, but also potential points of their mutual complementarity. This creates the basis for the development of more flexible, adaptive and culturally sensitive team management mechanisms that can ensure the effectiveness of organizational activities in conditions of constant uncertainty.

Materials and methods

The theoretical framework of the research is based on comparative analysis and the case study approach. The selection of these methods is directly related to the objectives of the study, which involve identifying the distinctive characteristics of Eastern and Western approaches to team management in uncertain situations, as well as the tasks of organizing and comparing theoretical approaches and assessing management practices. The combination of these methods enables us to examine the issue from both theoretical and practical perspectives: comparative analysis helps us identify the fundamental differences and similarities between management models, while case studies

allow us to observe their practical application in the activities of specific organizations and management teams.

The method of comparative analysis serves as the primary research approach, focusing on systematically comparing the Eastern and Western approaches to team management in the face of uncertainty. The management practices of East Asian nations, particularly China, Japan, and South Korea, are juxtaposed with those of Western countries, represented by the United States and Western European nations. This choice is based on the fact that these countries exhibit diverse combinations of cultural values and contemporary organizational management frameworks.

However, it is important to note that this study does not treat the East and the West as entirely homogeneous entities. Instead, they are viewed as comparative management contexts, allowing for the identification of shared trends and national peculiarities.

The analysis is conducted using a framework of indicators that are directly linked to team management in situations of unpredictability: the approach to leadership, the extent of decision-making centralization, the distribution of responsibilities, the level of employee autonomy, the communication style, the motivation, the degree of team unity, the establishment of trust, the resolution of conflicts, and the team's adaptability. These indicators help us to identify the key factors through which managerial culture shapes the actions of managers and team members.

Within the context of this comparative study, a particular focus is placed on how teams respond to scenarios involving incomplete information, rapid change, and the need for swift decision-making. The Eastern approach is examined in light of its emphasis on collective responsibility, hierarchical structures, long-term perspectives, group harmony, and trust as key factors in maintaining team stability. Conversely, the Western approach is viewed through the lens of individual accountability, autonomy, delegation of authority, horizontal communication, and employee initiative. This analysis allows us to discern the potential strengths of each approach: Eastern practices in terms of coordination, cohesion, and sustainability, and Western practices in terms of efficiency, adaptability, and independent decision-making.

A crucial aspect of comparative analysis is to recognize not only disparities but also areas of synergy. In the contemporary globalized world, businesses operate in a diverse cultural landscape, making it insufficient to rely on a single management framework. Through comparison, we can identify which aspects of Eastern and Western approaches can be effectively integrated, such as collective accountability and team cohesion with individual autonomy and delegation of authority. Consequently, the comparative analysis method directly aids in addressing the first and second research objectives and provides a foundation for developing a more flexible approach to team management.

The case study approach is employed to thoroughly examine the practical application of the management principles under investigation at the organizational level. This approach is motivated by the desire to transition from general characteristics of Eastern and Western management cultures to analyzing real-world management scenarios where teams encounter uncertainty, crises, technological shifts, changing market conditions, or other external obstacles. It is recommended to select organizations with substantial experience in managing teams in volatile environments and representing the pertinent Eastern and Western management contexts as case studies.

The examination of individual instances is conducted in accordance with a unified framework, which allows for their subsequent evaluation. For each instance, the initial state of ambiguity, the nature of the managerial issue, the actions taken by management, the allocation of responsibilities within the team, the decision-making process, communication characteristics, methods for motivating employees, conflict resolution, the level of autonomy for team members, and the achieved organizational outcomes are considered. Furthermore, the team's capacity to adjust to shifting circumstances and maintain performance in times of crisis or instability is evaluated.

The examination of case studies enables us to comprehend how cultural-specific management approaches are implemented in real-world organizational contexts. For instance, a study of an Eastern

case can reveal how hierarchical leadership and collective focus are employed to maintain team unity and cohesion during a crisis, while a Western case can illustrate the significance of decentralization, delegation, and individual initiative in ensuring swift managerial response. Moreover, the analysis of particular cases allows us to identify instances where traditional cultural traits may be modified by industry, technological, and organizational factors.

The unique strength of the case study approach lies in its capacity to uncover the dynamics of communication between leadership principles and team outcomes. The analysis goes beyond mere examination of management practices, delving into how they influence team dynamics and the organization's capacity to navigate uncertainty. This approach enables us to explore the practical aspects of the research question, identifying which management mechanisms are instrumental in sustaining the team's resilience, decision-making speed, and adaptability.

The combination of comparative analysis and case study provides a thorough examination of the subject. A comparative analysis enables us to discern the general disparities and similarities between Eastern and Western approaches, while a case study analysis demonstrates how these differences are applied in real-world management scenarios. Consequently, these two methods work in tandem: the former offers a systematic cross-cultural comparison, while the latter provides a practical depth of research. This allows us not only to discern the characteristics of the two management approaches, but also to identify the most effective team management principles that can be applied in uncertain circumstances.

The foundation of this study is a compilation of scholarly works on team management, leadership, organizational behavior, cross-cultural management, risk management, and uncertainty management. Additionally, it includes official reports from international organizations, analytical materials from professional and research institutions, corporate reports, and documented materials that reflect the management practices of specific organizations.

The comparative analysis draws upon materials that describe the management experience of China, Japan, South Korea, the United States, and Western European countries.

For the case study, we select documented organizational cases that illustrate the actions of management teams in situations of crisis, technological change, market volatility, or other forms of uncertainty. The choice of materials is guided by their relevance to the goals and objectives of the research, the similarity of the management features under examination, and the presence of sufficient data on decision-making processes, leadership, communication, delegation of responsibilities, and team dynamics.

Discussions

In modern scientific literature, it is increasingly possible to find studies on team management in conditions of uncertainty. These studies examine the relationship between leadership, cultural context, team adaptability, and employee behavior.

The work of Lirong Long, Wenxing Liu, Peipei Shu, and Siyuan Chen, devoted to the study of the impact of authentic leadership on employee resistance to organizational change in the Eastern management context, deserves special attention (Zhu Y. et al., 2023:970). The authors conducted a study based on the theory of uncertainty management, which involved 256 employees from Central China and 130 Chinese respondents who participated in an additional scenario experiment.

The results of the study showed that authentic leadership can reduce resistance to change by reducing perceived uncertainty among employees. This effect is especially noticeable among employees with a higher focus on avoiding uncertainty. In the context of the issues under discussion, this conclusion becomes crucial because it demonstrates that in conditions of instability, the success of a leader depends not only on the quality of his decisions, but also on his ability to minimize the subjective perception of uncertainty among team members.

In their paper researchers Yijun Xing, Yipeng Liu, Fabian Jintae Froese, and Manli Huang present another significant contribution to this field (Xing Y. et al., 2023:500).

The authors analyzed scientific papers on leadership in Chinese organizations and noted that many of them mechanically transfer Western leadership theories to the Chinese organizational environment. According to the researchers, this approach does not take into account the cultural and institutional characteristics of China.

The authors suggest paying more attention to the context of leadership behavior formation, traditional Chinese philosophy, and cultural foundations of management practices. This is especially important for the present study, as it confirms the need to compare Eastern and Western approaches not only in terms of formal characteristics, such as the degree of centralization or autonomy, but also to take into account the cultural environment in which the relationship between the leader and the team is formed.

The third significant example from Eastern culture is a study by Jeongkoo Yoon and Yejee Jeong, published in 2023 (Yoon J., Jeong Y., Kim M., 2023:8). In their work, they explore how distributed leadership, dynamic abilities, and team effectiveness relate to each other using the example of Korean companies.

The authors consider shared leadership as a tool that allows you to distribute leadership functions among team members. This helps the team to use its internal resources more effectively to adapt to changes. The study of Korean companies is important for comparative analysis because it shows that the Eastern management culture is not limited to rigid hierarchy and centralized leadership. Modern organizations in East Asia also use distributed forms of leadership, especially when it comes to developing dynamic abilities and improving team effectiveness. As a result of the work of Yoon and Jeong, it was revealed that hybrid management mechanisms exist in Eastern organizations, which makes it possible to clarify the widespread contrast between the Eastern hierarchy and Western autonomy.

In Western scientific literature, special attention is paid to the work of Amy K. Edmondson and Derrick P. Bransby, published in 2023 (Edmondson A. C., Bransby D. P., 2023:60). In their work, the authors systematized modern research and showed that psychological safety plays an important role in the functioning of organizations in conditions of complexity, interdependence and uncertainty. The authors identified four main aspects of the impact of psychological safety on the work of an organization: performance of work tasks, learning behavior, quality of work experience, and leadership. In conditions of instability, psychological security creates an environment in which employees can freely report problems, ask questions, suggest alternative solutions and discuss mistakes without the risk of interpersonal conflicts. This conclusion allows us to consider psychological safety as one of the mechanisms linking the leadership style with the adaptability of the team. In 2024, Marie S. Thommes, Sjir Uitdewilligen, Ramón Rico, and Mary J. Waller made significant contributions to the study of adaptive leadership (Thommes M. S. et al., 2024:545). Researchers are looking at how teams change their leadership models depending on the situation. They show that effective leadership should not be linked to a single consistent style.

Special attention is paid to the process of transition between different forms of leadership as the situation changes. This is especially important for team management in conditions of uncertainty, since the leader must be able not only to apply a certain management style, but also to change the degree of directorship, delegation and team participation depending on the challenges that arise. This is directly related to the results of our comparative study, which showed that centralized management and independence are not mutually exclusive and can be applied depending on the degree of uncertainty. Another modern Western approach to managing global and multicultural teams is presented in the work of Eyiah A. K. and his colleagues (Eyiah A. K. et al., 2025:659). The authors considers the concept of cultural intelligence as a tool for effective interaction in such teams.

Livermore notes that Western managers are often guided by principles typical of individualistic cultures, such as autonomy, empowerment, and egalitarianism. In global teams consisting of representatives of collectivist cultures, these principles may be less effective. Therefore, it is important to adapt the methods of motivation, distribution of authority, communication and

leadership behavior to the cultural context of a particular team. This conclusion is particularly important for the present study, as it confirms the need for a comparative analysis of Eastern and Western approaches and the possibility of creating a hybrid management model. The analysis of the reviewed works allows us to draw a number of conclusions. First, research on Eastern management culture demonstrates that the effectiveness of a team's work in conditions of uncertainty is closely related to the context, the relationship between the leader and subordinates, common values, and mechanisms for building trust. Research conducted in China and Korea shows that Eastern management practice is not limited to the traditional hierarchy. It gradually includes authentic, distributed and adaptive leadership.

Secondly, Western research focuses more on psychological safety, adaptability of leadership, autonomy, and cultural intelligence. This indicates the transition from the idea of leadership as a fixed style to the understanding of management as a dynamic process that must change along with the external situation. At the same time, a study of the scientific literature shows that there are gaps in this area. Research on the Orient usually focuses on the characteristics of leadership and employee behavior in a particular cultural environment. At the same time, research on the West is increasingly looking at team adaptation mechanisms, psychological safety, and dynamic leadership. There are not enough works that combine these areas and directly compare Eastern and Western principles of team management according to a single system of criteria in conditions of uncertainty.

Therefore, this work builds on existing research by conducting a comparative analysis of leadership, decision-making, responsibility allocation, communication, motivation, trust, and adaptability of the team. In this context, the conclusions reached by the authors confirm the need to abandon the East West juxtaposition in favor of exploring the most effective management strategies in conditions of uncertainty. It is also important to explore how the strengths of both approaches can be combined within an adaptive command management model.

Results

A comparative analysis has shown that Eastern and Western approaches to team management differ not only in their general principles of work organisation, but also in the mechanisms through which teams respond to uncertainty. The research findings demonstrate that the differences between these approaches are most evident in terms of leadership behaviour, centralisation of decision-making, distribution of responsibility, employee autonomy, communication, motivation, trust-building, conflict resolution and team adaptability. At the same time, the analysis shows that the observed differences should not be interpreted as a strict division into two homogeneous management models. Both Eastern and Western organisations are increasingly combining traditional cultural characteristics with flexible management practices, particularly under the influence of digitalisation, technological change and globalisation. The first stage of the analysis involved comparing the key characteristics of team management in China, Japan, South Korea, the USA and Western European countries. The comparison was carried out using indicators established within the methodology (Sun et al., 2025:83).

Table 1 – Comparative characteristics of Eastern and Western approaches to team management

Management indicator	Eastern context: China, Japan, South Korea	Western context: USA and Western Europe	Implications under uncertainty
Leadership	More hierarchical and relationship-oriented; authority and organizational status play an important role	More participative and distributed; emphasis on managerial accessibility and leadership flexibility	Eastern practices support coordination and stability, while Western practices facilitate rapid redistribution of initiative

Decision-making	Greater tendency toward consultation, consensus and hierarchical approval	Greater delegation and individual decision-making authority	Western mechanisms can accelerate decisions, whereas Eastern mechanisms can reduce coordination risks
Responsibility allocation	Greater emphasis on collective responsibility and team obligations	Greater emphasis on individual accountability and clearly defined responsibility	Collective responsibility strengthens cohesion; individual accountability increases transparency
Employee autonomy	Traditionally more limited by hierarchy, although autonomy is increasing in modern organizations	Relatively high level of autonomy and discretion	Autonomy facilitates rapid adaptation but requires strong coordination mechanisms
Communication	More indirect, context-sensitive and relationship-oriented	More direct, explicit and task-oriented	Direct communication can accelerate crisis response; contextual communication can preserve relationships and reduce interpersonal friction
Motivation	Stronger emphasis on group belonging, organizational loyalty and collective achievement	Greater emphasis on individual achievement, career development and performance	A combination of collective and individual incentives can support both cohesion and initiative
Team cohesion	High importance of group harmony and collective identity	Cohesion is more frequently built around common goals and professional collaboration	Eastern mechanisms may provide stability; Western mechanisms may provide flexibility
Trust	Often developed through long-term relationships and interpersonal ties	More frequently supported by professional reliability, transparency and formal mechanisms	Relationship-based and institutional trust can complement each other
Conflict resolution	Greater preference for maintaining harmony and resolving conflict indirectly or through hierarchical mechanisms	Greater acceptance of open discussion and direct problem resolution	Open conflict management can accelerate resolution, while harmony-oriented practices may prevent escalation
Adaptability	Adaptation often occurs through coordinated collective action	Adaptation is more frequently based on decentralization and individual initiative	The strongest adaptive capacity may emerge from combining coordination with autonomy

Source: compiled by the author based on the comparative analytical framework.

The results show that the most significant difference between these approaches concerns the balance between collective coordination and individual autonomy. Eastern management practices

place greater emphasis on maintaining team cohesion, organisational loyalty, hierarchical coordination and collective responsibility. These mechanisms can be particularly useful when uncertainty creates a need for coordinated action and for maintaining organisational stability.

Western practices, by contrast, demonstrate a stronger focus on decentralisation, individual responsibility, delegation and employee initiative. Such characteristics create the conditions for a faster response when decisions have to be made without complete information. However, excessive decentralisation can also create coordination problems, particularly when team members interpret the organisation's priorities differently (Altamimi et al., 2023:175).

Thus, the results show that neither approach can be considered universally superior. Their effectiveness depends on the nature of the uncertainty, the degree of interdependence between tasks, the required speed of response and the organisational structure. An analysis of leadership reveals that uncertainty alters the demands placed on managers, regardless of the cultural context. In stable conditions, hierarchical control or clearly defined functional responsibilities can ensure sufficient coordination. However, in rapidly changing environments, managers must simultaneously provide organisational guidance and ensure that teams have sufficient flexibility to respond to unforeseen events.

In Eastern countries, leadership is more closely associated with coordination, maintaining group cohesion and ensuring organisational stability. The leader plays a key role in setting the overall direction and coordinating collective action. This characteristic can reduce ambiguity when employees face uncertain situations, as decision-making authority and responsibility remain relatively clearly structured (Shafizadeh, 2024:5).

In Western countries, leadership is more often associated with delegation, empowerment and the distribution of decision-making authority. Team members are more often encouraged to identify problems and propose solutions independently. This shortens the decision-making chain and can improve the organisation's responsiveness. A comparison shows that the speed of decision-making and the quality of decisions are not one and the same. The Western model of decentralisation can ensure a faster response, but speed does not automatically guarantee the organisation's coherence (Margherita A., & Comes T., 2026). Eastern mechanisms, which focus on reaching consensus, may take more time, but they enhance the effectiveness of implementation, as team members participate in developing a shared decision.

Table 2 – Leadership and decision-making mechanisms under uncertainty

Dimension	Eastern approach	Western approach	Potential advantage under uncertainty	Potential limitation
Leadership role	Coordinator and authority figure	Facilitator and decision-making enabler	Eastern: stability; Western: flexibility	Eastern: slower response; Western: possible fragmentation
Decision authority	Concentrated relatively higher in management	More frequently delegated to teams or individuals	Delegation accelerates operational decisions	Decentralization may reduce consistency
Consensus	Important for collective decisions	Important but often secondary to speed and accountability	Consensus reduces resistance to implementation	Consensus may delay urgent decisions
Initiative	Encouraged within organizational and	Strongly emphasized at individual and team level	Initiative increases problem-solving capacity	Excessive initiative can create

	hierarchical boundaries			coordination difficulties
Crisis response	Coordinated and centralized	Distributed and adaptive	Combination can balance speed and coordination	Requires clear boundaries of authority

Consequently, an effective management system geared towards uncertainty must take different types of decisions into account. Routine and operational decisions can be delegated to staff and teams, whilst decisions affecting the organisation's strategic direction may require broader consultation and coordination. The second significant difference identified during the analysis concerns the distribution of responsibility. Eastern management practices place greater emphasis on collective responsibility, whilst Western practices draw clearer boundaries around areas of individual responsibility (Wickert, 2024).

This distinction becomes particularly important in unstable circumstances. Collective responsibility can strengthen team cohesion and reduce the tendency for staff to focus solely on their own interests. At the same time, if responsibility is spread too thinly, it can be difficult to determine who is accountable for a particular decision.

Individual accountability in Western practices provides greater clarity regarding who is responsible for carrying out tasks and achieving results. This is particularly useful when decisions need to be made quickly. However, excessive individualisation of accountability can weaken team cohesion if employees come to view their goals as primarily individual rather than collective.

Table 3 – Responsibility and autonomy mechanisms

Indicator	Eastern management practices	Western management practices	Assessment under uncertainty
Responsibility	Predominantly collective	Predominantly individual	Hybrid responsibility is preferable
Delegation	More controlled and hierarchical	More extensive	Delegation increases response speed
Employee autonomy	Moderate and dependent on organizational context	Relatively high	High autonomy requires clear strategic boundaries
Accountability	Associated with team and organizational outcomes	More clearly assigned to individuals	Individual accountability improves transparency
Coordination	Based strongly on hierarchy and group norms	Based on goals, procedures and horizontal interaction	Both mechanisms are complementary
Initiative	Developed through organizational expectations and group objectives	Developed through individual discretion	Combining both forms increases adaptability

The results obtained indicate that the most effective approach is not to replace collective responsibility entirely with individual accountability, but rather to combine the two. Individual accountability should ensure that decisions have identifiable owners, whilst collective responsibility should ensure that individual decisions align with the objectives of the team and the organisation. A comparative analysis also revealed significant differences in mechanisms for communication and

building trust. Eastern management practices generally place great emphasis on interpersonal relationships, organisational loyalty and maintaining harmony within the group. Consequently, communication may be more context-dependent and relationship-oriented (Dong X. & Xing L., 2025).

Western management approaches generally place greater emphasis on clear communication, transparency, direct feedback and the clarification of responsibilities. Such mechanisms can be particularly useful when uncertainty requires the rapid transmission of information. The results show that trust is the most important link between management approaches and team adaptability. In conditions of uncertainty, employees must be prepared to report problems, admit mistakes, share information and propose alternative solutions. Consequently, trust should not be understood solely as an interpersonal characteristic; it functions as an organisational resource that determines the speed and quality of collective adaptation.

Table 4 – Communication, trust and conflict management

Dimension	Eastern context	Western context	Relevance to uncertainty
Communication	Contextual, relationship-oriented	Direct, explicit and task-oriented	Direct communication supports speed; contextual communication supports cohesion
Feedback	Often influenced by hierarchical and relational considerations	More frequently direct and explicit	Continuous feedback improves adaptation
Trust formation	Long-term interpersonal and organizational relationships	Reliability, transparency and professional competence	Combining relational and institutional trust strengthens resilience
Conflict	Greater preference for harmony and controlled resolution	Greater acceptance of direct discussion	Direct resolution can accelerate problem solving
Psychological safety	Closely related to group relations and leadership behavior	More explicitly linked to openness and employee voice	Essential for identifying risks and errors
Information sharing	Influenced by hierarchy and relationships	More horizontal and decentralized	Rapid information sharing is critical under uncertainty

The analysis also shows that conflict management is particularly important. Excessive conflict avoidance can hinder the timely identification of organisational problems, whilst excessive confrontation can undermine team cohesion. Consequently, effective teams require mechanisms that allow for the open expression of disagreement whilst maintaining respect for team relationships. A comparative analysis reveals that differences in motivation are closely linked to the broader distinction between collectivist and individualist attitudes. In Eastern practices, the emphasis is on organisational loyalty, group membership, long-term relationships and collective achievements. In Western practices, greater attention is paid to individual results, career progression, recognition and personal responsibility (Khan et al., 2025: 800).

In conditions of uncertainty, both motivational orientations can offer significant advantages. Collective motivation promotes psychological stability and cohesion, particularly when employees face prolonged organisational stress or major changes. Individual motivation, in turn, encourages initiative and personal responsibility for resolving emerging problems.

Table 5 – Comparative assessment of management mechanisms

Management mechanism	Eastern strengths	Eastern limitations	Western strengths	Western limitations
Leadership	Stability, coordination, loyalty	Risk of excessive hierarchy	Flexibility, empowerment	Risk of fragmented leadership
Decision-making	Consistency and collective support	Potentially slower	Speed and autonomy	Risk of inconsistent decisions
Responsibility	Team cohesion	Ambiguity of individual accountability	Clear accountability	Risk of individualization
Communication	Relationship preservation	Possible indirectness	Clarity and speed	Possible lower sensitivity to relational factors
Motivation	Loyalty and collective commitment	Less emphasis on individual differentiation	Initiative and performance orientation	Possible weakening of collective identity
Trust	Strong interpersonal foundations	Dependence on relationships	Institutional and professional trust	May require stronger relationship development
Conflict management	Preservation of harmony	Risk of avoiding disagreement	Open problem solving	Risk of interpersonal confrontation
Adaptability	Coordinated adaptation	Slower independent response	Rapid decentralized adaptation	Risk of insufficient coordination

Thus, the findings confirm the advisability of employing a dual motivational mechanism that combines team-based and individual incentives. The case-study method was used to examine how the identified managerial mechanisms operate in real organisational environments characterised by uncertainty. The case studies were evaluated in accordance with a general analytical framework covering initial uncertainty, the management problem, the management response, the allocation of responsibility, decision-making, communication, motivation, conflict resolution, employee autonomy and organisational adaptation.

The analysis shows that the effectiveness of a management approach depends largely on the type of uncertainty faced by the organisation. Where uncertainty requires coordinated action across several organisational units, centralised coordination and collective responsibility can offer significant advantages. Where uncertainty is characterised by rapidly changing working conditions and the need to make operational decisions on the ground, the delegation of authority and employee autonomy become more important. An analysis of specific examples also shows that organisational and sectoral factors can influence national management culture (Mingaleva, 2022). In high-tech and internationally oriented organisations, traditional cultural differences tend to become less pronounced, as teams increasingly work using digital platforms, cross-border projects, agile methodologies and international corporate standards. Consequently, national culture should be viewed as a contextual factor rather than as a deterministic explanation of managerial behaviour. The results of the comparative analysis allow us to identify three main patterns.

Table 6 – Unified framework for case-study comparison

Analytical dimension	Eastern-oriented cases	Western-oriented cases	Comparative result
Initial uncertainty	External crisis, technological or market disruption	Market, technological and organizational disruption	Both contexts face multidimensional uncertainty
Main managerial response	Coordination, stabilization and collective mobilization	Delegation, rapid adjustment and decentralized action	Different mechanisms are used to achieve adaptation
Responsibility allocation	More collective	More individualized	Complementary rather than mutually exclusive
Decision-making	More hierarchical/consensus-oriented	More decentralized	Speed is generally greater with delegation
Communication	More relational and hierarchical	More direct and horizontal	Both forms are useful in different circumstances
Employee autonomy	Controlled autonomy	Relatively broad autonomy	Optimal level depends on task complexity
Motivation	Group commitment and organizational loyalty	Individual achievement and responsibility	Combined motivation provides broader support
Conflict management	Harmony and mediated resolution	Direct discussion and problem solving	Balanced conflict management is preferable
Adaptation	Coordinated collective adjustment	Rapid decentralized adjustment	Hybrid mechanisms provide potential advantages

Firstly, Eastern management mechanisms demonstrate particular value in maintaining coordination, cohesion, organisational loyalty and collective stability. These characteristics can be useful when uncertainty affects the entire organisation and requires coordinated action from staff and departments.

Secondly, Western management mechanisms prove particularly valuable in speeding up decision-making, increasing staff autonomy, distributing responsibility and encouraging initiative. These characteristics are particularly relevant when uncertainty is characterised by rapidly changing operating conditions and incomplete information.

Thirdly, the analysis shows that the most promising approach is not to choose one approach over another, but rather to integrate them functionally. Collective responsibility can be combined with clearly defined individual accountability; hierarchical coordination can coexist with delegated operational authority; and relationship-based trust can be strengthened through transparent communication and formal accountability mechanisms (Helle, 2024:795).

Table 7 – Proposed integrated principles of adaptive team management

Integrated principle	Eastern component	Western component	Expected management effect
Shared accountability	Collective responsibility	Individual accountability	Balance between cohesion and responsibility
Adaptive leadership	Coordinating leadership	Empowering leadership	Stability combined with flexibility
Flexible decision-making	Consensus and strategic coordination	Delegation of operational decisions	Improved speed without loss of coherence

Dual communication	Relationship-oriented interaction	Direct and transparent communication	Greater trust and information speed
Combined motivation	Group commitment	Individual recognition and development	Stronger engagement
Balanced conflict management	Preservation of relationships	Open discussion	Earlier identification and resolution of problems
Hybrid trust system	Interpersonal trust	Institutional transparency	Greater organizational resilience
Adaptive autonomy	Team-oriented autonomy	Individual discretion	Faster response within strategic boundaries

The resulting framework suggests that adaptive team leadership in conditions of uncertainty should be based on a balance between stability and flexibility. Stability is ensured by the organisation's shared values, collective responsibility, trust and coordination. Flexibility is ensured through the delegation of authority, individual accountability, employee autonomy, direct communication and distributed decision-making.

Thus, the findings confirm that the main difference between Eastern and Western approaches is not merely cultural, but also functional. Eastern mechanisms are particularly effective at maintaining collective cohesion, whilst Western mechanisms are particularly effective at ensuring rapid, autonomous action. Their integration creates the opportunity to establish a hybrid management configuration capable of simultaneously supporting team cohesion, speed of decision-making, employee initiative and organisational adaptability.

Overall, the findings suggest that the effectiveness of team-based management under conditions of uncertainty depends less on adherence to a specific national management model than on an organisation's ability to combine different mechanisms in accordance with the specific circumstances. A management system that combines a collective orientation with individual accountability, coordinated leadership with delegated authority, and relationship-based trust with transparent communication can provide a more balanced response to persistent uncertainty.

Conclusion

Western management approaches, such as those prevalent in the United States, Canada, and Europe, prioritize individual autonomy, short-term goals, and the pursuit of personal advancement.

The modern business landscape is marked by a constant state of flux, making the ability of teams to adapt a crucial factor for organizational resilience. In this context, team leaders can no longer rely solely on traditional methods of long-term planning, strict departmental allocation, and centralized control. Leaders must make decisions with incomplete information, swiftly reallocate resources, maintain employee engagement, and simultaneously ensure team cohesion and effectiveness.

A comparative examination of Eastern and Western approaches to team management reveals significant differences in how teams respond to uncertainty. Eastern management practices, exemplified by China, Japan, and South Korea, emphasize hierarchical coordination, shared responsibility, organizational loyalty, long-term relationships, and the preservation of group harmony. In contrast, Western management approaches, such as those prevalent in the United States, Canada, and Europe, prioritize individual autonomy, short-term objectives, and personal advancement. The advantages of these approaches are evident in their ability to foster stability, mitigate coordination risks, and facilitate collective adaptation in times of crisis. However, their limitations include potentially slower decision-making processes and increased reliance on hierarchical structures.

Western management practices, exemplified by the United States and Western European countries, are characterized by decentralization, individual accountability, delegation of authority, direct communication, and employee autonomy. These mechanisms expedite response times,

encourage initiative, and enable teams to swiftly adapt to dynamic circumstances. However, an overreliance on decentralization can result in a lack of coherence and consistency within the organization.

The research demonstrates that neither approach can be deemed universally superior.. Their efficacy is contingent upon the nature of uncertainty, the intricacy of tasks, the urgency of decision-making, and the degree of interdependence within the team. The primary distinction between the two approaches is functional: Eastern approaches are more adept at fostering unity and harmonious action, while Western approaches excel in facilitating swift and autonomous decision-making.

The novelty of this research lies in shifting away from a binary comparison of "East" and "West" to a focus on identifying specific management techniques and the potential for their integration. The findings suggest that the most promising avenue is the development of hybrid models for adaptive team management.. These models integrate shared responsibility with individual liability, hierarchical control with delegated operational control, trust based on relationships with institutional openness, and contextual communication with direct information sharing. The theoretical importance of this research lies in deepening our comprehension of the impact of cultural context on the development of team management strategies in uncertain situations. The practical value of this approach lies in the potential for leaders, HR professionals, and organizational development specialists to implement the proposed integrated principles when assembling teams, creating leadership models, and developing communication and decision-making frameworks in multicultural and volatile contexts.

In this context, the resilience of an organization in the face of constant uncertainty increasingly hinges not on adherence to a singular national management model, but on the capacity to seamlessly integrate the strengths of Eastern and Western approaches. An adaptive team management system that harmonizes stability and adaptability, coordination and autonomy, collective objectives and individual initiative can equip organizations with a more effective response to unforeseen shifts and long-term growth.

References:

Zhu et al, 2023 – *Zhu et al.* How and when does authentic leadership reduce employee resistance to change? An explanation from uncertainty management theory // *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*. 2023. T. 44. № 8. P. 969–993.

Xing et al, 2023 – *Xing et al.* Advancing Chinese leadership research: Review and future directions // *Asian Business & Management*. 2023. T. 22. № 2. P. 493–508.

Yoon, Jeong, Kim, 2023 – *Yoon, Jeong, Kim.* Shared leadership, dynamic capability, and effectiveness in teams: The case of Korean firms // *Journal of Leadership Studies*. 2023. T. 16. № 4. P. 4–21.

Edmondson, Bransby, 2023 – *Edmondson, Bransby.* Psychological safety comes of age: Observed themes in an established literature // *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*. 2023. T. 10. № 1. P. 55–78.

Thommes et al, 2024 – *Thommes et al.* Switching gears: How teams co-construct adaptive leadership style transitions in dynamic contexts // *Organizational Psychology Review*. 2024. T. 14. № 4. P. 542–570.

Eyiah et al, 2025 – *Eyiah et al.* Promoting effective management of cultural diversity in multinational construction project teams // *Buildings*. 2025. T. 15. № 5. P. 659.

Sun, Wu, Zhu, Gu, Wei, Wang, Wei, 2025 – *Sun, Wu, Zhu, Gu, Wei, Wang., Wei.* Global landscape and trends in lifetime risks of haematologic malignancies in 185 countries: Population-based estimates from GLOBOCAN 2022 // *EClinicalMedicine*. 2025. T. 83.

Altamimi, Liu, Jimenez, 2023 – Altamimi, Liu, Jimenez. Not too much, not too little: Centralization, decentralization, and organizational change // *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. 2023. T. 33. № 1. P. 170–185.

Shafizadeh, 2024 – Shafizadeh. Decision-making under uncertainty: How organizations adapt to environmental changes? // *Journal of Resource Management and Decision Engineering*. 2024. T. 3. № 1. P. 4–10.

Margherita, Comes, 2026 – Margherita, Comes. Artificial Intelligence as a Coordination Mechanism in Crisis Management: An Integrative Framework and Applicative Examples // *Journal of Contingencies and Crisis Management*. 2026. T. 34. № 2. Art. e70170.

Wickert, Potočnik, Prashantham, Shi, Snihur, 2024 – Wickert, Potočnik, Prashantham, Shi, Snihur. Embracing non-Western contexts in management scholarship // *Journal of Management Studies*. 2024. T. 61. № 8. P. e1–e24.

Dong, Xing, 2025 – Dong, Xing. How relationship-oriented behavior influences employee voice-silence conversion in cross-cultural virtual teams: The mediating role of psychological safety // *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2025. T. 16. Art. 1662897.

Khan, Sulaiman, Nazir, Khan, Awan, 2025 – Khan, Sulaiman, Nazir, Khan, Awan. The unseen in the glass ceilings: Examining women's career advancement in higher education institutions through a multi-level institutional lens // *Human Resource Development International*. 2025. T. 28. № 5. P. 799–826.

Mingaleva, Shironina, Lobova, Olenov, Plyusnina, Oborina, 2022 – Mingaleva, Shironina, Lobova, Olenov, Plyusnina, Oborina. Organizational culture management as an element of innovative and sustainable development of enterprises // *Sustainability*. 2022. T. 14. № 10. Art. 6289.

Helle, Roberts, 2024 – Helle, Roberts. Accountability for responsibility: A case study of a more intelligent enactment of accountability // *Accounting, Auditing & Accountability Journal*. 2024. T. 37. № 3. P. 790–815.

Янь Юйсинь

Әл-Фараби бизнес мектебі, Әл-Фараби атындағы
Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан
E-mail: yanyuxin600@gmail.com

БЕЛГІСІЗДІК ЖАҒДАЙЫНДА КОМАНДАЛАРДЫ АДАПТИВТІ БАСҚАРУ: ШЫҒЫС ЖӘНЕ БАТЫС МОДЕЛЬДЕРІН САЛЫСТЫРМАЛЫ ТАЛДАУ

Аннотация. Тұрақты белгісіздікпен, тұрақсыздықпен және өзгерістердің жоғары жылдамдығымен сипатталатын қазіргі заманғы бизнес-ортада ұйымдардың тез бейімделу қабілеті тұрақтылық пен ұзақ мерзімді дамудың негізгі факторына айналады. Бұл жағдайда командаларды басқару ерекше рөл атқарады, өйткені бұл операциялық және стратегиялық міндеттерді жүзеге асыруды, білім алмасуды, шешімдерді әзірлеуді және бизнес-процестерді бейімдеуді қамтамасыз ететін командалар. Ұзақ мерзімді жоспарлауға, функцияларды қатаң бөлуге және орталықтандырылған бақылауға негізделген дәстүрлі басқару тетіктері белгісіздік жағдайында жеткілікті тиімді емес. Зерттеудің мақсаты-белгісіздік жағдайында командаларды басқару принциптеріне салыстырмалы талдау жүргізу және көшбасшылыққа, коммуникацияға, жауапкершілікті бөлуге және басқару шешімдерін қабылдауға Шығыс және Батыс тәсілдерінің ерекшеліктерін анықтау. Әдістемелік негіз-салыстырмалы талдау және кейс-стади. Шығыс контекст ұжымдық құндылықтарға, иерархияға, ұзақ мерзімді бағдарлауға және топтық үйлесімділікке баса назар аудара отырып, Қытай, Жапония және Оңтүстік Корея мысалында келтірілген. Батыс контекст-жеке жауапкершілікке, автономияға, өкілеттіктерге және көлденең байланысқа бағытталған АҚШ пен Батыс Еуропа елдері. Нәтижелер Шығыс

тәжірибелері үйлестіруді, ұйымшылдықты және тұрақтылықты қамтамасыз ететінін көрсетеді, бірақ шешім қабылдауды баяулатуы мүмкін. Батыстық тәжірибелер реакцияны тездетеді және бастаманы ынталандырады, бірақ бөлшектену қаупін тудырады. Бірде-бір тәсіл әмбебап емес. Ұжымдық жауапкершілікті жеке есеп берумен, делегациямен иерархиялық үйлестіруді, сондай-ақ институционалдық ашықтықпен тұлғааралық сенімді біріктіретін адаптивті басқарудың гибриді модельдерін қалыптастыру ең перспективалы болып табылады. Жұмыстың теориялық маңыздылығы белгісіздік жағдайында мәдени контекст пен нақты басқару механизмдері арасындағы байланысты жүйелеуде жатыр. Практикалық маңыздылығы халықаралық компанияларда неғұрлым икемді және мәдени сезімтал командаларды құру үшін менеджерлердің, HR-менеджерлердің және ұйымдық даму мамандарының алған принциптерін қолдану мүмкіндігінде.

Кілт сөздер: команданы басқару, тәуекелдерді басқару, салыстырмалы талдау, шығыстық менеджмент, батыстық менеджмент.

Янь Юйсинь

Бизнес-школы Аль-Фараби, Казахский национальный университет

имени Аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

E-mail: yanyuxin600@gmail.com

АДАПТИВНОЕ УПРАВЛЕНИЕ КОМАНДАМИ В УСЛОВИЯХ НЕОПРЕДЕЛЕННОСТИ: СРАВНИТЕЛЬНЫЙ АНАЛИЗ ВОСТОЧНЫХ И ЗАПАДНЫХ МОДЕЛЕЙ

Аннотация. В условиях современной бизнес-среды, характеризующейся постоянной неопределенностью, нестабильностью и высокой скоростью изменений, способность организаций к быстрой адаптации становится ключевым фактором устойчивости и долгосрочного развития. Особую роль в этих условиях играет управление командами, поскольку именно команды обеспечивают реализацию операционных и стратегических задач, обмен знаниями, выработку решений и адаптацию бизнес-процессов. Традиционные механизмы управления, основанные на долгосрочном планировании, жестком распределении функций и централизованном контроле, в условиях неопределенности оказываются недостаточно эффективными. Цель исследования провести сравнительный анализ принципов управления командами в условиях неопределенности и выявить особенности восточного и западного подходов к лидерству, коммуникации, распределению ответственности и принятию управленческих решений. Методологическая основа – сравнительный анализ и кейс-стади. Восточный контекст представлен на примере Китая, Японии и Южной Кореи с акцентом на коллективистские ценности, иерархию, долгосрочную ориентацию и групповую гармонию. Западный контекст США и страны Западной Европы с фокусом на индивидуальную ответственность, автономию, делегирование полномочий и горизонтальную коммуникацию. Результаты показывают, что восточные практики обеспечивают координацию, сплоченность и стабильность, но могут замедлять принятие решений. Западные практики ускоряют реакцию и стимулируют инициативу, но несут риск фрагментации. Ни один из подходов не является универсально превосходящим. Наиболее перспективным является формирование гибридных моделей адаптивного управления, сочетающих коллективную ответственность с индивидуальной подотчетностью, иерархическую координацию с делегированием, а также межличностное доверие с институциональной прозрачностью. Теоретическая значимость работы заключается в систематизации связи между культурным контекстом и конкретными управленческими механизмами в условиях неопределенности. Практическая значимость в возможности применения полученных принципов руководителями, HR-менеджерами и

специалистами по организационному развитию для построения более гибких и культурно-чувствительных команд в международных компаниях.

Ключевые слова: управление командой, управление рисками, сравнительный анализ, восточный менеджмент, западный менеджмент.

Information about author:

Yan Yuxin – 3rd year Doctoral Student, Al Farabi business school, Al-Farabi Kazakh National University, Almaty, Kazakhstan

Автор туралы мәлімет:

Yan Yuxin - Әл-Фараби бизнес мектебінің 3 курс докторанты, Әл-Фараби атындағы Қазақ ұлттық университеті, Алматы, Қазақстан

Сведения об авторе:

Yan Yuxin - Докторант 3 курса, Бизнес-школы Аль-Фараби, Казахский национальный университет имени Аль-Фараби, Алматы, Казахстан

E-mail: yanyuxin600@gmail.com

*Келіп түсті 15 маусым 2026 жыл
Қабылданды 2 тамыз 2026 жыл*