

THE IMPACT OF PARADOXICAL LEADERSHIP, AMBIDEXTROUS INNOVATION ON ENTERPRISE INNOVATION PERFORMANCE *

QIUYING LEI

Chinese Graduate School,
Panyapiwat Institute of Management,
Thailand
E-mail: 94247038@qq.com

Abstract

By combing the existing research on paradoxical leadership, this paper analyzes the shortcomings of its existing research, and tries to broaden the existing theory of paradoxical leadership by using yin-yang philosophy. At the same time, based on high-order theory, resource-based view, organizational ambidextrous theory and other relevant theories, this paper analyzes the impact effect of paradoxical leadership on enterprise ambidextrous innovation and enterprise innovation performance from the organizational level, and studies the relationship between redundant resources positively regulating enterprise ambidextrous innovation and innovation performance, in order to explore the impact mechanism of paradoxical leadership behavior on enterprise ambidextrous innovation, It provides strong research support for enterprises to think about how to improve innovation performance.

Keywords: Paradoxical Leadership, Ambidextrous Innovation, Innovation Performance

Introduction

In today's fierce business competition, the business environment of enterprises is complicated and changing rapidly, and new contradictions will appear at any time in the work, resulting in new paradoxes. However, the essence of paradox holds that everything has positive and negative two sides. These two sides exist at the same time and struggle with each other, but they are also a balanced relationship of connection or even unity. So when we deal with these seemingly contradictory relationships, it can not be simply seen as a concession or compromise, it is essentially a new solution. In today's business, contradictory conclusions can be drawn from seemingly logical premises; It is also possible to discover that seemingly irreconcilable antagonisms hide a harmonious ecosystem. Today's business leaders are faced with intractable, or seemingly contradictory, demands for both more delegation and more control; Not only to assign staff to work independently, but also to strengthen team cooperation; Constantly improving existing products and developing new ones; They must improve the flexibility and innovation of enterprises to cope with the external dynamic environment while ensuring the existing competitiveness of enterprises. To deal with the challenge of paradoxical management, it is indispensable for leaders to manage organizations effectively.

Especially with the rise of knowledge economy and network economy, the technology life cycle is rapidly shortened, the technology environment is increasingly complex, and it is more difficult to develop and commercialize new technologies. In the context of China's overall supply-side structural reform, it is the only way for enterprises to gain market leadership and achieve economic structural transformation and industrial upgrading to guide enterprises to rationally plan innovation strategies and give consideration to both long-term and short-term development. Enterprises not only need to achieve the acquisition of practical benefits through

* Received: January 18, 2023; Revised: February 20, 2023; Accepted: March 31, 2023

"utilization innovation", but also have a vision, actively explore new technologies through "exploratory innovation", and have the advantage of long-term competition. The choice of technological innovation mode is closely related to the leadership behavior of corporate executives.

To sum up, the senior managers of enterprises need to be able to deal with various paradoxes, and then choose the strategy and mode of technological innovation of enterprises, so that enterprises can obtain short-term operating benefits and have the potential of long-term development. Will paradoxical leadership promote the ambidextrous innovation of enterprises? Whether the innovation performance of enterprises can be improved is the content of this paper.

Research Objectives

The research was conducted based on two objectives as follows:

1. To analyze the shortcomings of paradoxical leadership and
2. Seek to broaden the existing theory of paradoxical leadership by using yin-yang philosophy.

Related Literature Review

Conceptual development

At present, the academic research on paradoxical leadership is still in its infancy, and researchers have little definition of the concept of paradoxical leadership, and no consensus has been reached. It mainly focuses on the following three perspectives:

The first is based on trait and cognitive perspectives. This view holds that paradoxical leadership adopts the mode of thinking of "both" rather than "choose one or the other" (Smith&Lewis, 2011), and that the self-complexity and emotion regulation characteristics of leaders provide a cognitive framework for leaders to identify, accept and integrate contradictions (Waldman&Bowen, 2016).

The second type of view is based on the behavioral perspective. This view emphasizes the seemingly contradictory but actually interrelated behaviors of paradoxical leadership, which is to meet the simultaneous and continuous needs of the contradictory workplace (Zhangetal.,2015; Luo jinlian et al., 2015,2017); Leadership behavior that considers high performance expectations and high management support.

The third category is the competency perspective. This definition emphasizes the ability of paradoxical leadership to transcend contradictions, which is embodied in the ability of acceptance, differentiation and integration (Smithetal.,2012). Acceptance emphasizes that leaders remain open to paradoxes, acknowledge that competing demands are an intrinsic part of the organization, and learn to live with them. Differentiation ability focuses on recognizing the differences and unique contributions of each alternative, while integration ability seeks synergies between alternative solutions by developing a culture of trust and openness (Liu Yanjun et al., 2018). To sum up, due to different research perspectives, scholars have not reached a unified understanding of the concept of paradoxical leadership.

Referring to the above scholars' research results on paradoxical leadership, this study defines paradoxical leadership as the leader accepting the paradoxes existing in the organization and adopting seemingly contradictory but actually related leadership behaviors according to situational needs to realize organizational strategic planning.

In order to describe the two aspects of behavior, this paper draws on Zhang(2015) and uses "both... Again....." A term used to describe five dimensions of behavior, including :(1)

both keeping distance and closing distance; (2) Treat subordinates equally and allow personalization; (3) Both insist on self and consider others; (4) Enforce work requirements while allowing flexibility; (5) Maintain decision control and allow autonomy.

Ambidextrous innovation

Since March (1991) proposed the constructs of exploration and utilization from the perspective of organizational learning, exploration and utilization have been widely used in the research of technological innovation, organizational adaptation and competitive advantage (Gupta, 2006). March (1991) defines exploration as activities characterized by search, change, risk-taking, experimentation, execution, flexibility, discovery, and innovation, and utilization as activities characterized by refining, selection, production, efficiency, selection, realization, and execution. Based on the resource-based view, utilization refers to improving existing resources, while exploration is to create a whole new resource bundle (Lubatkin, 2006).

Combined with the research of March (1991) and the ambidextrous theory, innovation is divided into exploratory innovation and utilization innovation. Exploratory innovation is an innovative activity that aims to explore new organizational management practices and discover new technologies, businesses and processes, and meet the needs of emerging customers and markets by seeking new knowledge and developing new products and services (Jansen 2006).

Exploitative innovation is an innovative activity based on existing knowledge, technology and market knowledge, which expands the market of existing products and services and improves the efficiency of existing market channels by improving existing skills and processes, so as to meet the needs of existing markets and customers (Benner & Tushman, 2003). Xu Hui and Li Wen (2013) believe that ambidextrous innovation includes exploratory innovation and exploitative innovation, and exploratory innovation is mainly manifested as product upgrading, product variety increase and new market development. On the other hand, utilization innovation is more about improving and upgrading existing products and consolidating the existing market by reducing production costs and improving organizational processes.

Based on the research of the above scholars, this study holds that ambidextrous innovation means that enterprises carry out exploratory innovation and applied innovation at the same time, and exploratory innovation is mainly manifested in upgrading products, adding new product varieties, expanding new markets, etc. The utilization innovation is more reflected in the improvement of the quality of existing products, the promotion of its universality, the reduction of production costs and the consolidation of the existing market.

Innovation performance

As a specific form of organizational performance, innovation performance is mainly used to evaluate the efficiency and effect of enterprises' increasing innovation activities. Schumpeter put forward the word "innovation", which describes innovation as a novel product, production method, market or source of supply that is different from the past. The organization for economic cooperation and development could be divided into product innovation (about a product or service attributes, and expand function improved significantly or create), process innovation, improve the efficiency of the organization tools), marketing innovation, help enterprises to restore market, increase sales revenue in the position of market activity) and organization innovation, developing the company's ability and vision, improve employee satisfaction and other groups Transformation activities). Scholars have also divided

the connotation and extension dimensions of innovation performance, which can be roughly summarized as process-based division and result-based division.

From the perspective of innovation process, Meeus&Oerlemans(2000) pointed out that the innovation performance of an enterprise is the innovation of products and processes, and the enterprise achieves the economic performance of the organization through innovation.

Hagedoom&Cloudt(2003) proposed that innovation performance is the achievement of the whole process from the generation of innovative ideas to product improvement or creation. Atuahene-gima (2005) believes that innovation performance is the improvement of enterprise performance, but such improvement is achieved through product or process transformation by means of enterprise innovation. Alegre & Chiva (2008) divided the process of innovation into four aspects to measure innovation performance: user demand responsiveness, product brand awareness, product profit margin and product market competitiveness. Kimer et al. (2009) believe that employee training, technology prediction and utilization can also be counted as part of non-R&D innovation performance. Linton (2009) divides innovation performance into two dimensions: technological innovation of production process and product/service changes, and social innovation introduced by the new social system. Prajogo&Ahme (2010) believe that innovation performance refers to the results and types of product innovation and the speed of change. Hervas-oliver et al. (2011) pointed out that the performance of non-R&D innovation includes search and acquisition of external knowledge, team building of human resources and innovation management. Zheng Gang et al. (2014) believe that innovation performance is not limited to r&d innovation of enterprises, for example, market, management and system are also part of innovation performance. Shen Kezheng (2017) expressed the innovation performance of enterprises as knowledge management, innovation process, input-output, innovation initiative, market orientation and organizational communication.

Yin-yang philosophy

Yin and Yang is the basic category of Chinese philosophy. In philosophy, Yin and Yang are neither solid substances nor inherent objective essence of things, but only represent a corresponding relationship between things. In today's terms, this corresponding relationship is to describe things in the reference system. In the absence of reference, it is "chaos". Once there is a reference, "one" "appears", "two" also "appears". The so-called "two in one" and at the same time "two as one". There is a tai Chi, or Yin and Yang, in everything. Yin and Yang are infinitely divisible; Yin and Yang are infinitely compatible. The core of the Yin-yang theory is "change". "Change" is the essence of the Yin-yang theory. "All things negative Yin and Yang, impulse and thought". Yin and Yang oppose each other, interact with each other, and push each other to maintain a balance, just like the understanding of Yin and Yang in Taijiquan. Chen Xin "Taijiquan picture description? Taijiquan Lane round song" : "I have a pill, black and white phase harmony; It's two points, but it's still one. Big don't carry, small don't break; No beginning, no end, no right, no left." The core of change is, in fact, the same.

Higher order theory

The core view of higher order theory is that organizational outputs such as enterprise strategy and effect reflect the values and cognition of senior executives (Hambrick and Mason,1984; Hoffm and Hegarty,1993). Specifically, senior managers make highly personalized explanations and choices for the organizational situations they face; The behavior of senior managers is the reflection of personality characteristics such as cognition, values and experience. Senior managers determine the formation of organizational strategies and also influence the behaviors of other members of the organization (Tao Jianhong et al., 2013). The

verification and application of higher-order theories need to be examined comprehensively in individual, organization and environment, involving psychology, sociology, strategy and economics and other disciplines.

The influence of executive psychological process on strategic choice needs to be further revealed, and special attention should be paid to the mechanism of executive search, interpretation, analysis and application of information. As summarized by Hambrick (2007), high-order theory has been widely applied in many fields since it was proposed. Starting from the resource-based view, Ireland et al. (2003) believed that the ability of senior managers to allocate and manage resources effectively was closely related to enterprise innovation.

Kweeand (2011) tested the influence of corporate governance mode of senior management team on strategic renewal path, and the research believed that Anglo-Saxon corporate governance mode was more likely to promote the utilization and exogenous strategic renewal path, while RWE corporate governance mode was more likely to promote the exploratory and endogenous strategic renewal path. Hoffman and Hegarty (1993) studied the influence of senior managers on product innovation, market innovation and management innovation, and believed that the professional knowledge of leaders was strongly correlated with the product innovation and market innovation achievements of enterprises. Leaders' general management ability, extroverted professional ability and search activities have strong correlation with product innovation and market innovation, while leaders' general management ability, introverted professional ability, resource acquisition ability and planning and control activities have strong correlation with management innovation. Guo et al. (2013) empirically tested the positive effect of management skills, entrepreneurial skills and management association of business managers on business model innovation.

Some scholars also began to discuss the relationship between leadership personality and corporate strategy from the perspective of personality. To sum up, in the context of continuous research and application of higher-order theories, there are still relatively few studies on the impact of leadership on enterprise strategic choice and performance by returning to the origin of higher-order theories and directly replacing or even representing leadership factors (Hambrick,2007). This has become a new challenge for current academic circles (Hambrick,2007).

Study on the impact of paradoxical leadership on firm innovation Performance

Many scholars have studied the perspective of managers' traits. From the perspective of the influence of leader characteristics on enterprise performance, March (1993) believes that to effectively achieve high performance, leaders must exert their ability to balance the forces of all parties. Enterprises fully adopt single exploratory innovation activities, which may lead to high experimental costs and little economic benefits. On the contrary, only focusing on exploitive innovation activities may cause organizations to fall into the sub-optimal level of never reaching the optimal performance and thus lose their leading edge. Relevant scholars have found that Core Rigidities and Competency Traps of enterprises are generated precisely because managers solidify the resources and capabilities of enterprises and constantly emphasize the existing technologies and capabilities of enterprises. Too much emphasis on exploration by leaders may improve the organization's ability to innovate continuously, but at the same time, it is also a high risk, which may lead the enterprise into an infinite cycle of repeated failure of exploratory activities (Levinthal et al., 1993; Zhang Yuli et al., 2006).

For the managers who are able to effectively solve the persistent conflicts among seemingly contradictory but interrelated and interdependent elements of the enterprise, the

enterprise efficiency is usually higher and the enterprise performance is usually better (Hart,1993). Rosenbloom (2000) also found that the sound development of an enterprise is not to coexist in a harmonious state, but to have certain contradictions and conflicts and effectively solve them, so as to improve enterprise management skills, improve enterprise efficiency and improve the quality of strategic execution in the conflict. At the same time, paradoxes should be integrated and coexist as much as possible. Advance and develop in conflict.

Study on the relationship between ambidextrous innovation and innovation performance

As for the outcome variables of ambidextrous innovation, scholars' research mainly focuses on firm performance (including innovation performance, new product performance and financial performance). The relationship between ambidextrous innovation and firm performance has always been the core of ambidextrous innovation research, but the research conclusions about the relationship between the two are not concentrated. The relationship between ambidextrous-innovation and enterprise performance shows positive correlation, negative correlation, non-linear relationship and insignificance, etc. The difference in research conclusions mainly comes from the difference in research context and methodology selection (Junni et al., 2013).

Scholars at home and abroad have paid extensive attention to the relationship between ambidextrous innovation and organizational performance (He & Wong, 2004; Jansen et al., 2005; Cao et al., 2009; Zhan & Chen, 2013; Jin et al., 2016; Dong Baobao et al., 2017), but the results have not been agreed. Researches on the relationship between ambidextrous innovation and organizational performance are mostly carried out from the following points: the contradiction between resource constraints and resource complementarity, the contradiction between path dependence and dynamic evolution of organization, and the organizational contingency view (Zhang Jie et al., 2015). Scholars believe that there are three theoretical bases for the negative correlation between organizational ambidextrous innovation and performance.

First, organizational resources are constrained, and organizational resources are scarce. It is believed that exploratory innovation and exploitative innovation will cause resource competition, which is not conducive to the improvement of enterprise performance. Second, organizational path dependence. Organizations will carry out various innovative activities centering on the existing concepts, behaviors and knowledge base, resulting in a certain lock-in effect, which makes the organization excessively carry out exploratory innovation or exploitative innovation. Third, organizational structure conflict. Exploratory innovation is carried out in organic structure, which requires flexibility of organizational structure.

Exploitive innovation is carried out in mechanical mechanism, which requires stabilization and standardization of organization (March, 1991; Benner & Tushman, 2003; Smith & Tushman, 2005).

Hypotheses

The effect of paradoxical leadership on organizational innovation Performance

Many scholars have studied the perspective of managers' traits. From the perspective of the influence of leader characteristics on enterprise performance, March (1993) believes that to effectively achieve high performance, leaders must exert their ability to balance the forces of all parties. Enterprises fully adopt single exploratory innovation activities, which may lead to high experimental costs and little economic benefits. On the contrary, only focusing on exploitive innovation activities may cause organizations to fall into the sub-optimal level of never reaching the optimal performance and thus lose their leading edge. Relevant scholars

found that the core rigidity and capability trap of enterprises is precisely because managers solidify the resources and capabilities of enterprises and constantly emphasize the existing technologies and capabilities of enterprises. Too much emphasis on exploration by leaders may improve the organization's ability to innovate continuously, but at the same time, it is also a high risk, which may make the enterprise fall into an infinite cycle of repeated failure of exploratory activities (Levinthal, 1993; Zhang Yuli, 2006). For the managers who are able to effectively solve the persistent conflicts among seemingly contradictory but interrelated and interdependent elements of the enterprise, the enterprise efficiency is usually higher and the enterprise performance is usually better (Hart, 1993).

Therefore, the hypothesis of this paper is:

H1: Paradoxical leadership has a positive impact on enterprise innovation performance.

The effect of ambidextrous innovation on enterprise innovation performance

Enterprise technology innovation from the combination of different knowledge, skills, such as resources, technology innovation of entrepreneurs' social networks have different resources, thus satisfying the exploratory innovation and utilization type their demand for different resources, namely the exploratory innovation and disparity in the existing market and technology, it is often need to search for diversification and heterogeneity of the knowledge, skills, resources, etc. While exploitive innovation focuses on the perfection and improvement of existing technology and market, which often emphasizes the integrity of knowledge, skills and other resources. Exploratory innovation and exploitative innovation affect the technological innovation performance of enterprises respectively, that is, the technological innovation performance depends on the innovation process. In fact, from the perspective of innovation process and implementation, exploratory innovation requires the investment of new technology, information and other resources and the creation of new knowledge, striving to surpass the existing knowledge and experience of enterprises, and at the same time, it also faces great environmental uncertainty and innovation risks. Exploitative innovation activities require high-quality and recessive knowledge to ensure that enterprises provide more perfect innovative technologies and market solutions to the market, ensure the production efficiency of enterprises, and provide customers with better services. Therefore, enterprises' ambidextrous innovation behavior needs great material and spiritual support from stakeholders inside and outside the organization, otherwise their behavior may die in the innovation process, especially for exploratory innovation with high innovation uncertainty. Therefore, the hypothesis of this paper is:

H2: Ambidextrous innovation has a significant positive impact on enterprise innovation performance.

Conclusion

Based on the higher-order theory, this paper holds that organizational outputs such as corporate strategy and effect are the reflection of corporate executives' values and cognition (Hambrick and Mason, 1984; Hoffman and Hegarty, 1993); Combined with the philosophy of Yin and Yang: things not only in the development and changes on the longitudinal and the matching contrast, instead of on the transverse appear on the consistency, and the contrast before and after contrast to appear on the time series, and then its own appeared inside and outside changes, it is a kind of multidimensional, dynamic, systematic, holistic, even in the holographic nature to the universe, a kind of system theory; From the perspective of

organizational dualism, both organizational research and strategic research emphasize that organizations need to explore new capabilities while making use of existing capabilities, that is, to develop exploratory innovation and exploitative innovation at the same time. On the basis of previous research results, this paper analyzes the internal mechanism between paradoxical leadership and the improvement of enterprise innovation performance, constructs the theoretical logic of "paradoxical leadership -- ambidextrous innovation -- enterprise innovation performance", and proposes the logical main line of this research: First, the most important thing for enterprises to realize innovation competitiveness is to promote enterprises to identify innovation opportunities and effective innovation activities; Second, based on the higher-order theory and resource-based view, this paper empirically examines the impact of paradoxical leadership on enterprise ambidextrous innovation. It is innovative to enrich the research on the relationship between paradoxical leadership and innovation and to perfect the ambidextrous innovation theory.

References

- Alegre J. (2008) Assessing the impact of organizational learning capability on product innovation performance: an empirical test. *Technovation* .28(6): 315—326.
- Antonakis, J. and Atwater, L. (2002) Leader distance: A review and a proposed theory. *Leadership Quarterly*.13: 673-704.
- Atuahene — Gima K. (2005) Resolving the capability — rigidity paradox in new product innovation. *Journal of Marketing*. 69(4): 61-83.
- Barkema, H., Chen, X., George, G., Luo, Y. and Tsui, A. West meets East: new concepts and theories. *Academy of Management Journal*, 2015, 58 (2): 460-479.
- Benner Mary J. (2003) Tushman Michael L., Exploitation, Exploration and Process Management: The Productivity Dilemma Revisited. *The Academy of Management Review*. 28(2): 238-256.
- Boies, K. and Howell, J. M. (2006) Leader-member exchange in teams: An examination of the interaction between relationship differentiation and mean LMX in explaining team-level outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*.17: 246 -257.
- Cheng J L C, Kesner I F (1997) Organizational Slack and Response to Environmental Shifts: The Impact of Resource Allocation Patterns. *Journal of Management*.23(1):1-18.
- Galvin, B. M., Waldman, D. A., and Balthazard, P. (2010) Visionary communication qualities as mediators of the relationship between narcissism and attributions of leader charisma. *Personnel Psychology*.63: 509 -537.
- Greenley G E, Oktemgil M. A. (1998) Comparison of Slack Resources in High and Low Performing British Companies. *Journal of Management Studies*. 35(3):377-398.
- Gupta, A. K., Smith, K. G., and Shalley, C. E. (2006) The Interplay between Exploration and Exploitation. *Academy of Management Journal*. 49(4): 693-706.
- Hagedoorn J, Cloudt, M. (2003) Measuring innovative performance: is there an advantage in using multiple indicators. *Research Policy*. 32(8): 1365-1379.
- Hambrick D C, Finkelstein S. (1987). Managerial discretion: A bridge between polar views of organizational outcomes. *Research in organizational behavior*. 9:369-406.
- Hambrick D C, Mason P A. (1984). Upper echelons: The organization as a reflection of its top managers. *Academy of Management Review*. 9(2):193-206.

- Hambrick D C. (2007). Upper echelons theory: An how executives overcome. *Academy of Management Review*. 32(2):334-343.
- Hervas—Oliver J L, Garrigos J A, Gil—Pechuan I. (2011) Making sense of innovation by R&D and non—R&D innovators in low technology contexts: A forgotten lesson for policymakers. *Technovation*. 31(9): 427-446.
- Howell, J. M., Neufeld, D. J. and Avolio, B. J. (2005) Examining the relationship of leadership and physical distance with business unit performance. *Leadership Quarterly*.16: 273-285.
- Jansen Justin JP, Van Den Bosch Frans AJ, and Volberda Henk W. (2006) Exploratory Innovation Exploitative Innovation, and Performance: Effects of Organizational Antecedents and Environmental Moderator. *Management Science*.52 (11): 1661-1674.
- Jones, T. M, Felps, W. and Bigley G. A. (2007) Ethical theory and stakeholder-related decisions: The role of stakeholder culture. *Academy of Management Review*.32: 137-155.
- Kimer E, Kinkel S, Jaeger A. (2009) Innovation paths and the innovation performance of low technology firms-An empirical analysis of German industry. *Research Policy*. 38(3): 447-458.
- Levinthal D A, March J G. (2010) The Myopia of Learning. *Strategic Management Journal*. 14(2): 95-112.
- Lewis, M. (2000) Exploring paradox: toward a more comprehensive guide. *Academy of Management Review*.25 (4): 760-776.
- Linton J D. (2009) De-panelizing the language of innovation. *Technovation*. 29(11): 729-737.
- Lubatkin, M. H., Simsek, Z., Ling Y. et al. (2006) Ambidexterity and Performance in Small-to Medium-Sized Firms: The Pivotal Role of Top Management Team Behavioral Integration. *Journal of Management*. 32(5): 646-672.
- March, J. G. (1991) Exploration and Exploitation in Organizational Learning. *Organization Science*. 2(1): 71-87.
- Meeus MTH, Oerlemans LAG. (2000) Firm behaviour and innovative performance: An empirical exploration of the selection—adaptation debate. *Research Policy*. 29(1): 41-58.
- Nohria N, Gulati R. (1996) Is Slack Good or Bad for Innovation. *Academy of Management Journal*. 39(5): 1245-1264.
- Prajogo D I. (2010) Ahmed P K. Relationships between innovation stimulus, innovation capacity, and innovation performance. *R&D Management*. 36(5): 499-515.
- Rosenbusch, N., Rauch, A. and Bausch, A. (2013) The mediating role of entrepreneurial orientation in the task environment-performance relationship: A Meta-Analysis. *Journal of Management*. 39(3): 633-659.
- Rosenthal, S. A. and Pittinsky, T. L. (2006) Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*. (17): 617-633.
- Smith, W. K. and Lewis, M. (2011) Toward a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *Academy of Management Review*. 36(2): 381-403.
- Waldman, D. A., Ramirez, G. G., House, R. J., et al. (2001) Does leadership matter? CEO leadership attributes and profitability under conditions of perceived environmental uncertainty. *Academy of management journal*. 44(1): 134-143.

Zhang, Y., Waldman, D. A., Han, Y. and Li, X. (2015) Paradoxical leader behaviors in people management: Antecedents and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal*. 58(2): 538-566.