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ABSTRACT

|  |
| --- |
| **Aims:** The aim of this research paper is to systematically review and synthesize empirical studies published from 2020 onward to clarify how micromanagement influences employee performance and well-being, particularly in comparison to autonomy-supportive leadership. The study seeks to identify the psychological and organizational outcomes of micromanagement across diverse contexts, highlight inconsistencies or gaps in the existing literature, and provide actionable insights to inform leadership practices and organizational policies that enhance employee motivation, engagement, and overall effectiveness.**Study design:** This study uses a qualitative approach, primarily relying on a literature review for its methodology.**Place and Duration of Study:** The study was conducted in Bacolod City, Philippines from February 2025-June 2025.**Methodology:** A comprehensive search was conducted across multiple electronic databases including Google Scholar, PubMed, and business management-specific databases. A thematic synthesis approach was employed to identify recurring patterns and contrasting findings. Contextual factors and study limitations were also considered to provide a comprehensive understanding of micromanagement’s impact. **Results:** Micromanagement has been widely documented to negatively impact employee well-being and performance by undermining autonomy, reducing job satisfaction, and increasing stress and turnover rates. Excessive control, according to studies, limits both creativity and motivation while promoting mistrust and disengagement across various industries and cultures. However, emerging evidence suggests that in specific settings—such as high-pressure, process-driven environments or among less experienced employees—micromanagement can enhance performance by providing necessary structure and boosting self-efficacy. These findings highlight the importance of adaptive leadership that balances control with autonomy, tailoring oversight to employee needs and situational demands to optimize motivation, engagement, and organizational effectiveness. **Conclusion:** This review concludes that micromanagement generally harms employee motivation, well-being, and performance across diverse contexts. While it may benefit novices or high-risk tasks, habitual micromanagement is counterproductive. Organizations should promote adaptive, autonomy-supportive leadership to optimize performance and sustain employee psychological health. |
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1. INTRODUCTION

Effective leadership is essential for organizational success, shaping both performance outcomes and employee well-being. Among leadership styles, micromanagement—a behavior characterized by excessive control, close supervision, and limited delegation—has been widely observed to influence employee motivation and job outcomes (Anyanugo et al., 2024; Ryan & Cross, 2023). Given micromanagement’s complex effects, this review focuses on synthesizing empirical evidence regarding its impact on employee performance—including productivity and task execution—and employee well-being—encompassing motivation, job satisfaction, and psychological health. Over the past decades, leaders have employed diverse leadership and management styles to address the varying needs of employees and organizational contexts (Akparep et al., 2019). Recognizing that no single approach fits all situations, managers often adapt their styles accordingly (Oyindobra, O. T., et. Al. (2022). Among these styles is micromanagement.

Micromanagement has been extensively studied for its impact on both employees and organizational performance. Research consistently shows that excessive managerial control leads to negative outcomes such as reduced job satisfaction, increased stress, and diminished motivation (Ryan & Cross, 2023) and Bandar S. Aljabri and Abdullah H. Alharthy (2025). Employees subjected to micromanagement often experience a loss of autonomy, which undermines their confidence and creativity, ultimately impairing their performance and engagement (Marttinen & Kostamo, 2024). At the organizational level, micromanagement is linked to higher turnover rates, lower productivity, and weakened trust between management and staff (Bans-Akutey, 2020 as cited in Marttinen & Kostamo, 2024). These adverse effects highlight the critical need to understand how micromanagement influences employee behavior and organizational outcomes to inform better leadership practices.

The significance of this topic stems from the widespread use of micromanagement across various organizational settings and its profound effects on employee well-being, motivation, and productivity. Despite numerous studies documenting its negative consequences, there remains a lack of comprehensive synthesis that consolidates these findings into a clear, evidence-based understanding of micromanagement’s overall impact (Samakao & Mulenga, 2023). Notably, a recent study at Pearson Management Services Philippines Inc. (Galindez et al., 2024) suggests that micromanagement, though generally viewed negatively, may positively influence employee performance in certain contexts. This mixed evidence underscores the necessity of a systematic review that critically evaluates and integrates current research, identifies inconsistencies or limitations, and offers actionable insights for leadership and organizational policy development.

Effective leadership is at the heart of every successful organization, shaping not only its performance but also the experiences and well-being of its employees. As Anyanugo et al. (2024) remind us, no single leadership approach fits all situations—effective leaders must be flexible and responsive. At the same time, Deci, Olafsen, and Ryan’s (2022) work grounded in Self-Determination Theory sheds light on how leadership styles deeply influence employee motivation and well-being. They show that while autonomy-supportive leadership nurtures employees’ sense of competence and freedom, controlling leadership styles, such as micromanagement, can increase stress and drain motivation.

Building on this understanding, this systematic literature review aims to synthesize empirical research to clarify how micromanagement influences employee performance, especially in relation to autonomy-supportive leadership. Deci et al. (2022) highlight that autonomy-supportive leadership fosters employee well-being through enhanced job resources, whereas controlling leadership contributes to exhaustion via increased job demands, suggesting a critical gap in understanding how these contrasting styles differentially impact employees. By consolidating and critically analyzing the literature, this review seeks to provide practical recommendations for leadership practices that enhance employee engagement and organizational effectiveness.

To ensure methodological rigor, this review focuses on studies published from 2020 to the present, intentionally excluding grey literature. The majority of reviewed studies converge on the conclusion that micromanagement negatively impacts employee outcomes, including job satisfaction, motivation, creativity, and overall performance. Additionally, micromanagement is frequently associated with adverse organizational consequences such as increased turnover and decreased productivity. Despite a substantial body of literature on these detrimental effects, comprehensive integrative analyses remain limited, particularly in comparison to autonomy-supportive leadership styles. This scarcity highlights the importance of this review in consolidating findings, addressing inconsistencies, and providing actionable insights for leadership aimed at improving employee well-being and organizational success.

By clearly defining the research scope—including relevant keywords, databases, and inclusion criteria—this review aims to fill existing gaps in the literature and offer a valuable resource for organizations seeking to optimize leadership effectiveness and employee performance. Ultimately, the study aspires to support scholars and practitioners in fostering healthier workplace environments and enhancing organizational outcomes through leadership that respects and uplifts the people who drive success.

1. **METHODOLOGY**

A meta-analysis was considered appropriate for quantitatively synthesizing results from studies reporting comparable outcome measures on micromanagement’s effects. Where sufficient homogeneity was found, pooled effect sizes were calculated using a random-effects model, and heterogeneity was assessed by the I² statistic. However, substantial variability in study designs and outcomes necessitated a narrative synthesis for several studies, highlighting key themes related to employee performance and well-being.

The Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT, 2018) was used for quality appraisal. Studies were evaluated against five design-specific criteria and rated as ‘Yes’, ‘No’, or ‘Cannot tell’ for each. To ensure review validity, studies exhibiting major methodological flaws—indicated by more than two ‘No’ or ‘Cannot tell’ ratings—were excluded from the synthesis

**2.1 Identification of the Literature**

This study employed a systematic literature review approach to qualitatively analyze and synthesize existing scholarly work on the influence of micromanagement on employee performance. The initial step involved clearly defining the research question: *How does micromanagement affect employee performance compared to autonomy-supportive leadership?* This question guided the entire review process, including the search and analysis stages.

The literature search was conducted across multiple electronic databases including Google Scholar, Scopus, Web of Science, and Business Source Complete to ensure comprehensive coverage of relevant peer-reviewed literature. The search strategy involved the use of Boolean operators and combinations of key terms such as ‘micromanagement,’ ‘employee performance,’ ‘leadership styles,’ and ‘autonomy-supportive leadership.

The review covered studies published from January 2020 to June 2025 to focus on the most recent and relevant research.

**2.2 Screening and Eligibility of the Literature**

The initial search yielded 1,200 articles. After title and abstract screening, 250 articles were retained for full-text review. Following full-text assessment against inclusion and exclusion criteria, 14 studies were included in the final synthesis.

Following full-text review, included studies underwent quality appraisal using the Mixed Methods Appraisal Tool (MMAT, 2018 version). Each study was assessed across five criteria specific to its design, rated as ‘Yes’, ‘No’, or ‘Cannot tell’. Studies failing more than two criteria were excluded to maintain methodological rigor and minimize bias.
Depending on the homogeneity of quantitative outcome measures, a meta-analysis was performed where appropriate using random-effects models. For studies with varying designs, populations, or outcomes, a narrative synthesis was employed to qualitatively integrate findings.

**2.3 Analysis of the Articles**

Among the 14 included studies, 64% employed quantitative methods, 35% qualitative, and 1% mixed method. Sample sizes ranged from 30 to over 1,000 participants, covering diverse industries and geographic regions.

Figure 1. PRISMA Flow Diagram. The study selection process was conducted and reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines. A PRISMA flow diagram was used to illustrate the number of records identified, screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, along with reasons for exclusions at each stage.



Table 1. A total of 14 studies met the eligibility criteria and were included in the final synthesis. Table 1 provides a summary of the characteristics of these included studies, detailing their methodology, participant demographics, study context, and primary findings relevant to the influence of micromanagement on employee performance and well-being.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study (Author, Year)** | **Study Design/Methodology** | **Participants & Context** | **Key Findings Related to Micromanagement** | **Notes/Quality (MMAT or summary)** |
| Aljabri & Alharthy (2025) | Quantitative survey | N=500, Saudi labor market | Micromanagement linked to lower job satisfaction, increased stress | Empirical; high relevance to MM effects |
| Caise & Tucker (2023) | Qualitative interviews | N=25, Remote workers, US | Micromanagement reduces trust and autonomy, harms remote work | Qualitative insights on remote work contexts |
| Galindez et al. (2024) | Quantitative case study | N=150, BPO sector, Philippines | Positive impact on performance in high-pressure, process-driven tasks | Highlights context-dependent effects |
| Georgewill & Tantua (2020) | Quantitative survey | N=100, Printing firms, Nigeria | Micromanagement negatively affects morale and productivity | Empirical, regional focus |
| Kamarudin et al. (2023) | Quantitative survey | N=200, Manufacturing industry, Malaysia | Micromanagement lowers job satisfaction and increases dissatisfaction | Recent evidence from manufacturing sector |
| Lee et al. (2023) | Scoping review | Multiple studies, clinical supervision | Micromanagement reduces learner autonomy, increases stress | Review synthesizing clinical supervision studies |
| Marttinen & Kostamo (2024) | Quantitative survey | N=300+, Various industries, Millennials focus | Micromanagement linked to decreased autonomy, motivation | Focus on millennial followership |
| Mookerjee et al. (2022) | Qualitative study | Clinical supervision contexts | Micromanagement restricts autonomy, lowers motivation, increases turnover | Clinical context; qualitative focus |
| Ndidi, Amah & Okocha (2022) | Quantitative survey | SMEs, Rivers State, Nigeria | Micromanagement decreases morale and productivity, increases turnover intentions | Small-medium enterprise context |
| Ryan & Cross (2023/2024) | Quantitative study | N=varied, Multiple industries | Micromanagement increases stress, reduces motivation and trust | Empirical; focus on psychological outcomes |
| Samakao & Mulenga (2023) | Systematic review | Multiple studies, leadership context | Micromanagement disrupts intrinsic motivation, reduces innovation and morale | Consolidated evidence; qualitative synthesis |
| Sinaga (2025) | Quantitative study | Generation Z workers, diverse contexts | Micromanagement can enhance self-efficacy and indirectly job satisfaction among Gen Z | Nuanced demographic effects |
| Solaja et al. (2022) | Quantitative survey | Varied organizational settings | Micromanagement strongly linked to negative productivity and well-being outcomes | Empirical study with broad organizational focus |
| Van de Ridder et al. (2020) | Qualitative study | Clinical teaching teams | Micromanagement creates non-conducive learning environments by limiting autonomy | Qualitative; clinical education focus |

1. results and discussion
	1. **Adverse Effects on Employee Performance**

Micromanagement has been widely documented as having detrimental effects on employee well-being and performance across various organizational settings. Marttinen and Kostamo (2024) found that micromanagement significantly undermines employees’ autonomy, which in turn erodes their confidence and creativity. This loss of autonomy leads to decreased job satisfaction and engagement, as employees feel constrained and overly controlled in their work environment. Their study also links micromanagement to increased stress levels, which negatively affect mental health and overall productivity. Similarly, Ryan and Cross (2023) this intensifies job demands and creates a climate of mistrust. Their research highlights how excessive oversight not only reduces motivation but also contributes to higher turnover rates and weakened organizational commitment. Employees under micromanagement often experience frustration and disengagement, resulting in lower performance outcomes and diminished organizational effectiveness which aligns with the results of Kamarudin et al. (2023) and Caise et al. (2023).

Supporting these findings, Samakao and Mulenga (2023) conducted a systematic review that consolidates evidence on micromanagement’s adverse impact on employee motivation. Their review emphasizes that constant monitoring and intervention disrupt employees’ intrinsic motivation by limiting their sense of autonomy and competence. This disruption fosters feelings of helplessness and learned dependency, which further decrease productivity and innovation. Moreover, Samakao and Mulenga note that micromanagement can cause employees to withhold discretionary effort, leading to reduced organizational citizenship behaviors and overall morale. Collectively, these studies provide robust empirical evidence that micromanagement, while sometimes intended to maintain control and quality, often results in negative psychological and performance outcomes for employees, underscoring the urgent need for leadership approaches that balance oversight with autonomy to enhance employee well-being and organizational success.

Recent research by Sinaga (2025) offers a nuanced perspective on its impact among Generation Z employees. The study found that micromanagement does not directly reduce job satisfaction in this cohort but significantly enhances their self-efficacy, or belief in their ability to perform work tasks effectively. This increase in self-efficacy, in turn, positively influences job satisfaction. Generation Z workers, often characterized by limited work experience and a preference for clear guidance, may benefit from the detailed supervision and feedback typical of micromanagement, which helps them build confidence and competence in their roles.

This finding suggests that while micromanagement generally undermines employee well-being, it can have a supportive role for less experienced employees who require more direction and affirmation. However, the positive effects are mediated by self-efficacy rather than micromanagement itself, indicating that the leadership style’s impact depends on psychological factors and employee characteristics. This insight complements the broader literature by highlighting that the adverse effects of micromanagement may vary across employee demographics and experience levels.

Supporting the adverse effects of micromanagement, Ndidi, Edwinah, and Belemenanya (2022) found that in SMEs within Rivers State, Nigeria, micromanaging behavior significantly reduces employee morale and productivity. Their study highlights that excessive control fosters insecurity and disengagement, which not only diminishes motivation but also increases turnover intentions. Such findings reinforce the global relevance of micromanagement’s negative impact across diverse organizational sizes and cultural contexts.

Mookerjee et al. (2022) highlight that micromanagement during clinical supervision severely restricts learner autonomy, which is essential for developing competence and confidence. Their study identifies micromanaging behaviors such as excessive scrutiny, insistence on tasks being done a certain way, and frequent demands for updates, which parallel micromanagement practices in corporate settings. These behaviors undermine employees’ sense of ownership and initiative, leading to decreased motivation, engagement, and professional growth. The authors also note that micromanagement fosters a climate of distrust and frustration, which negatively impacts team morale and increases turnover intentions—findings consistent with Marttinen and Kostamo (2024) and Ryan and Cross (2023). Importantly, Mookerjee et al. emphasize that micromanagement disrupts the balance between supervision and autonomy, which is critical for optimal performance and well-being.

This cross-industry evidence underscores the universality of micromanagement’s adverse effects. Moreover, Ye, L., et al. (2025) emphasize the importance of leadership that supports autonomy and fosters a positive organizational climate, echoing the principles of Self-Determination Theory (Deci et al., 2022). The recommendations for participative and flexible leadership further reinforce the need to move beyond controlling management styles to enhance employee motivation and organizational effectiveness.

Micromanagement’s adverse effects extend beyond traditional organizational settings into professional education environments, as illustrated by Ripley (2020) in clinical teaching teams. The study reveals that micromanagement, often driven by supervisors’ insecurities and mistrust, creates a non-conducive learning environment by restricting autonomy and competence, thereby destabilizing psychological and emotional safety. This harsh environment diminishes learner motivation and performance, paralleling findings in broader workplace contexts where micromanagement reduces job satisfaction and productivity (Marttinen & Kostamo, 2024; Ryan & Cross, 2023). Importantly, micromanagement is often rationalized as necessary for quality and safety, yet it undermines trust and development, representing a hidden curriculum that perpetuates controlling behaviors. Addressing micromanagement through targeted faculty development and coaching to foster self-awareness and autonomy-supportive practices offers a pathway to improve motivation and performance (Ripley, 2020). These insights reinforce the critical need for leadership approaches that balance oversight with empowerment to cultivate healthier, more effective workplaces.

* 1. **Contrasting Perspectives**

Although micromanagement is frequently criticized for its negative effects on employee well-being and organizational outcomes, emerging research reveals that its impact can be more complex and context-dependent. Galindez et al. (2024) conducted a case study within the Philippine Business Process Outsourcing (BPO) sector at Pearson Management Services Philippines, Inc., uncovering a statistically significant positive correlation between micromanagement and employee performance. Their findings challenge the conventional view of micromanagement as purely harmful, showing that in high-pressure, process-driven environments—where strict quality standards and tight deadlines prevail—close supervision can reduce errors and enhance consistency. This suggests that micromanagement may provide necessary structure and clarity, particularly for employees who require guidance or are less experienced, thereby improving focus and productivity.

However, Galindez et al. (2024) caution against overgeneralizing these results. They emphasize that excessive control, if not balanced with autonomy-supportive practices, can still undermine motivation and creativity. This nuanced perspective is echoed by Mookerjee et al., who recognize that while micromanagement is generally detrimental, there are short-term scenarios—such as training novices or managing high-risk tasks—where increased oversight is essential to ensure safety and quality. They further recommend transparent communication about the reasons for close supervision to mitigate negative perceptions and maintain trust between managers and employees.

Adding further depth, Sinaga (2025) explores the differential effects of micromanagement across employee demographics, particularly emphasizing Generation Z workers. Sinaga’s study reveals that micromanagement can indirectly enhance job satisfaction by boosting self-efficacy among younger employees, contrasting with the broader consensus that micromanagement stifles autonomy and motivation (Deci et al., 2022). This finding highlights the importance of individual differences and contextual factors in assessing leadership styles. While autonomy-supportive leadership remains the gold standard for fostering intrinsic motivation and well-being, micromanagement may serve as a transitional approach that supports skill development and confidence-building for less experienced or younger workers but also Bandar S. Aljabri and Abdullah H. Alharthy (2025) mentioned that, those in the 50-60 age group experienced the most significant stress and job dissatisfaction due to micromanagement.

In summary, this balanced view encourages a critical and flexible approach to micromanagement. Organizations are advised to calibrate the degree of oversight based on employee needs, task complexity, and organizational objectives to maximize performance without compromising employee well-being (Galindez et al., 2024). Such context-sensitive leadership fosters a healthier, more effective work environment that leverages the potential benefits of micromanagement while mitigating its risks.

* 1. **Comparative Analysis**

Micromanagement has been widely documented as having detrimental effects on employee well-being and performance across various organizational settings. Studies such as Marttinen and Kostamo (2024) reveal that micromanagement significantly undermines employees’ autonomy, eroding their confidence and creativity. This loss of autonomy leads to decreased job satisfaction and engagement with the same findings from Kamarudin, N., et. Al (2023), as employees feel constrained and excessively controlled. Increased stress levels linked to micromanagement further impair mental health and overall productivity. Similarly, Ryan and Cross (2023) characterize micromanagement as a controlling leadership style that intensifies job demands and fosters a climate of mistrust. Their findings indicate that excessive oversight reduces motivation, increases turnover, and weakens organizational commitment, resulting in lower performance and diminished effectiveness.

Supporting these conclusions, Samakao and Mulenga (2023) consolidate evidence showing that constant monitoring disrupts intrinsic motivation by limiting employees’ sense of autonomy and competence. This disruption fosters helplessness and learned dependency, which reduce productivity, innovation, and discretionary effort. Further, Ndidi, Edwinah, and Belemenanya (2022) demonstrate similar negative impacts in SMEs, where micromanagement diminishes morale and increases turnover intentions, highlighting the global relevance of these findings. In professional education contexts, Mookerjee et al. (2022) and Ripley (2020) show that micromanagement restricts learner autonomy, undermining competence development and creating non-conducive learning environments marked by distrust and frustration.

However, emerging research reveals a more complex and context-dependent picture. Galindez et al. (2024) provide evidence from the Philippine BPO sector that micromanagement can positively correlate with employee performance in high-pressure, process-driven environments. Here, close supervision reduces errors and ensures quality, particularly benefiting less experienced employees who require structure and guidance. Similarly, Sinaga (2025) finds that among Generation Z workers, micromanagement indirectly enhances job satisfaction by boosting self-efficacy, suggesting that detailed oversight may support confidence-building and skill development for younger or less experienced employees.

Effective leaders calibrate their oversight to provide necessary guidance without stifling autonomy, promoting decentralized decision-making, continuous learning, and open communication. This balance is crucial because excessive control, as seen in micromanagement, can demoralize employees and reduce performance, while too much autonomy without support may cause inefficiencies. This affirms what Thommes et al. (2024) emphasize which I, teams and leaders co-construct adaptive transitions between leadership styles in dynamic contexts

Deci, Olafsen, and Ryan’s (2022) **Self-Determination Theory (SDT)** underpins this contrast by highlighting how leadership styles impact employees’ basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. Autonomy-supportive leadership nurtures these needs by granting freedom in task execution, providing meaningful rationales, and offering constructive feedback, thereby enhancing intrinsic motivation, job satisfaction, creativity, and performance. In contrast, micromanagement thwarts these needs through rigid oversight and frequent interventions, increasing stress and exhaustion, which diminish motivation and engagement.

Together, these studies underscore that micromanagement’s detrimental effects largely arise from its failure to satisfy fundamental psychological needs, whereas autonomy-supportive and adaptive leadership foster empowering work environments that optimize employee motivation and well-being. The evidence suggests that while micromanagement may have situational utility—especially for novices or in high-risk settings—its habitual use is counterproductive. Organizations should therefore adopt flexible leadership approaches that balance oversight with respect for employee autonomy, tailoring management styles to employee experience, task complexity, and organizational goals to maximize performance without compromising well-being.

4. Conclusion

Based on the comprehensive body of evidence reviewed in this systematic literature review, it is clear that micromanagement predominantly exerts a negative influence on employee performance and well-being across diverse organizational and cultural contexts. Empirical studies such as Marttinen and Kostamo (2024) demonstrate that micromanagement significantly undermines employees’ autonomy, leading to diminished confidence, creativity, job satisfaction, and engagement. This loss of autonomy is compounded by increased stress levels, which adversely affect mental health and productivity. Similarly, Ryan and Cross (2023) highlight how micromanagement intensifies job demands and fosters a climate of mistrust, resulting in higher turnover rates and weakened organizational commitment. These findings are reinforced by Samakao and Mulenga’s (2023) systematic review, which links micromanagement to disrupted intrinsic motivation, learned dependency, and reduced discretionary effort, collectively impairing innovation and morale.

Supporting the global relevance of these adverse effects, Ndidi, Edwinah, and Belemenanya (2022) document similar outcomes in SMEs in Nigeria, where micromanagement diminishes morale and increases turnover intentions. Sector-specific studies in education and clinical supervision (Mookerjee et al., 2022; Ripley, 2020) further confirm that excessive control restricts autonomy essential for competence development, creating non-conducive environments marked by frustration and distrust. These cross-industry and cross-cultural findings underscore the universality of micromanagement’s detrimental impact on employee outcomes.

However, emerging research nuances this predominantly negative picture. Kantachote, K. (2023), government regulations in Singapore, such as the S$5000 security bond and day-off rules, significantly drive employers to micromanage foreign domestic workers, particularly during their off days, due to fears of legal and financial repercussions. Galindez et al. (2024) identify contexts—such as high-pressure, process-driven BPO environments—where micromanagement correlates positively with employee performance by ensuring compliance and reducing errors. Sinaga (2025) further reveals that among Generation Z employees, micromanagement can indirectly enhance job satisfaction by boosting self-efficacy, suggesting that detailed supervision may support confidence-building for less experienced workers.

Theoretically grounded in Self-Determination Theory (Deci, Olafsen, & Ryan, 2022), this review highlights that micromanagement’s harmful effects largely stem from its failure to satisfy employees’ basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence, and relatedness. In contrast, autonomy-supportive leadership nurtures these needs, fostering intrinsic motivation, creativity, and sustained performance.

In conclusion, while micromanagement may have situational utility—particularly for novices or in high-risk tasks—its habitual use is counterproductive, undermining employee motivation, well-being, and organizational effectiveness. Organizations should therefore prioritize leadership development that promotes autonomy-supportive and adaptive styles, calibrating oversight to employee experience, task complexity, and organizational goals. Such an approach optimizes performance while safeguarding employee psychological health, ultimately fostering sustainable organizational success.

1. RECOMMENDATION

Based on the evidence synthesized, organizations should adopt nuanced and context-sensitive leadership approaches to mitigate the negative effects of micromanagement while leveraging its situational benefits. Leadership development programs must prioritize cultivating autonomy-supportive behaviors such as delegating decision-making, providing constructive feedback, and fostering employee growth, which enhance motivation and job satisfaction (Deci, Olafsen, & Ryan, 2022).

Managers should be trained to adapt their level of oversight according to employee experience and task complexity, balancing necessary control with respect for autonomy (Galindez et al., 2024; Ndidi et al., 2022). Habitual micromanagement should be critically assessed and limited, shifting toward trust and empowerment to reduce turnover and strengthen commitment (Ryan & Cross, 2023). Raising awareness through targeted training is vital to educate leaders about the risks of excessive control and to promote autonomy-supportive practices that improve morale, innovation, and retention (Mookerjee et al., 2022). Additionally, organizations should facilitate continuous employee feedback to refine leadership styles and ensure supervision remains responsive and appropriate (Marttinen & Kostamo, 2024).

Finally, given mixed findings on micromanagement’s short-term benefits, further longitudinal and context-specific research is recommended to explore its long-term impact across diverse sectors and demographics (Galindez et al., 2024; Sinaga, 2025).

Implementing these recommendations will help organizations balance control with autonomy, ultimately enhancing employee well-being, motivation, and organizational effectiveness.
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