IJRiCE
http://ppsfip.ppj.unp.ac.id

International Journal of Research in Counseling and Education
Volume 07 Number 01 2023
ISSN: Print 2620-5750 – Online 2620-5769
DOI: https://doi.org/10.24036/00637za0002
Received June 2nd, 2023; Revised June 29th, 2023; Accepted July 12th, 2023

Paradoxical leadership and organizational support in the new normal era: An experimental vignette study virtual team collective efficacy

Gani Dharma[1]*, Endang Parahyanti[1]
[1] Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
*Corresponding author, e-mail: ganidharmaa@gmail.com

Abstract
Implementation of Working from Home (WFH) or hybrid (WFH and Work from Office) during the COVID-19 pandemic has been known to remain until the end of the pandemic. In spite of that, the implementation of WFH or Hybrid is known to have an impact on interfering with the team functionality that works virtually at the company. Therefore, there needs to be an effort to increase the virtual team's collective efficacy (VTCE) when collaborating virtually. One of the antecedents that could increase the VTCE is Paradoxical Leadership Behavior (PLB), a leadership style that could combine two competing behaviors into one new behavior, in this case combining the roles of agentic and communal leadership as a whole. Additionally, the Perceived Organizational Support (POS) is an employee's perception of the organization's effort in increasing welfare and providing support at work are also antecedents from VTCE. Both antecedents are required to be further examined by utilizing vignette experiment 2 (high vs low PLB) x 2 (high vs low POS) between-subject design on 256 employees conducting WFH or hybrid. Utilizing 2 x 2 ANOVA Factorial, a significant effect was revealed from PLB and POS on VTCE. The implication of this research showed that there needs to be an implementation of PLB and post-pandemic organization support to increase the VTCE for the team when conducting WFH or hybrid.

Keywords: Paradoxical leadership behavior; perceived organizational support; virtual team collective efficacy; working from home; hybrid,

How to Cite: Dharma, G., & Parahyanti, E. (2023). Paradoxical Leadership and Organizational Support in The New Normal Era: An Experimental Vignette Study Virtual Team Collective Efficacy. *International Journal of Research in Counseling and Education*, 7 (1): pp. 77-89, DOI: https://doi.org/10.24036/00637za0002

Introduction

The Covid-19 pandemic crisis generated negative effects at a corporate and individual level. For instance, 4 out 5 companies (80%) in Indonesia initiate cessation of a company's production operational process impacts to decreasing company profit by 25% due to decreased demand from customers (International Labour Organization, 2020). This condition leads companies to terminate their employees and has an impact on their health, such as anxiety, stress, burnout, and job insecurity (American Psychological Association, 2020; International Labour Organization, 2020; Wilson et al., 2020). One of the efforts that could be done when facing these crises is to play a leadership role during and after the pandemic (Novotney, 2021). Leadership is a detrimental aspect in overcoming a crisis so that the company along with the employees can adapt, survive, innovate and remain competitive during the time of crisis (Am et al., 2021; van Dam, 2009). However, in fact when managing a crisis, a leadership is often faced with obstacles of having choices or conditions with opposing effects but interconnected, or known as paradox (Smith & Lewis, 2011; Zhang et al., 2015).

For instance, a paradox faced by a leader during the COVID-19 pandemic crisis is whether the company leader must prioritize the safety, health, and welfare of the employees, or they must restore and maintain company profit during the time of the crisis (Errichiello & Pianese, 2021; Rudolph et al., 2021). Both matters could be managed appropriately when the leader implements the Paradoxical Leadership Behavior (PLB) style. The definition of PLB is a behavior portrayed by a leader aiming to fulfill opposing demands simultaneously and continuously from time to time (Zhang et al., 2015). In essence, PLB possesses "both/and" perspective when

facing a problem that is contradictory (Smith & Lewis, 2011; Zhang et al., 2015). A leader that implements PLB would perceive both problems not as a threat, but rather an opportunity to adapt and grow continuously (Fürstenberg et al., 2021; Smith & Lewis, 2011; Zhang et al., 2015).

Therefore, a leader that implements PLB would do their best to recover the company profit while also protecting the employees from the spread of covid-19 virus, by implementing the regulation work from home (WFH) or hybrid (WFH and Work from Office (WFO)). Therefore, the company would adapt and be able to restore the company profit, while also having the employees work from home virtually and safely (Kniffin et al., 2020; Rudolph et al., 2021). This can't be done by a traditional leadership style that is known to have an "either/or" paradigm (for instance, transactional, transformational, authoritative, empowerment, etc.), which would be difficult to choose a side or overcome this situation as flexible as PLB (Zhang et al., 2015). The implementation of WFH or hybrid consisting of virtual teams is the best effort by the company in compliance with the public health protocol namely social distancing during COVID-19 (Rudolph et al., 2021). By definition, a virtual team is a group of individuals that work together from different geographical locations and/or time zones to complete a certain task by utilizing communication information communication technology (ICT) or other virtual tools intensively (Brown et al., 2021; Garro-Abarca et al., 2021).

According to the survey conducted by Lund, et al. (2021) in the McKinsey Global Institute article: the future work after covid-19, predicted a trend of the implementation of virtual teams in developed and developing countries would remain to be there after the pandemic is over. Moreover, the use of remote work and virtual team meetings would increase compared to prior to the pandemic (Lund et al., 2021). It is stated in the article that remote work has benefits such as the increase of expenditure efficiency for the company (such as cost efficiency, workspace reduction, and support of allocation process and fulfillment of workforce). Therefore, the implementation of WFH or hybrid currently has been well-implemented by numerous companies so that they could survive the pandemics and remain competitive against their business competitors.

Although WFH or hybrid has advantages in terms of flexibility and efficiency, it is also known to cause hindrance that could lower the team effectiveness virtually when conducting a task, such as: 1.) decline of various contexts of communication, 2.) several problems emerge for the team that would be resolved better in person rather than virtually, 3.) being delayed from providing feedback directly to subordinates, 4.) emergence of the feeling isolated by employees, 5.) lowering control / supervision of subordinates, 6.) team complexity & synchronicity of task, 7.) leadership style, 8.) media malfunction, 9.) lack of time getting to know other team members, and 10.) training and additional technology resources required to support WFH or hybrid (Kirkman & Mathieu, 2005; Kniffin et al., 2020; McLarnon & Woodley, 2021; Rudolph et al., 2021; Shareen & Shahid, 2020). Based on the definition and the obstacles, the trend of implementation of WFH or hybrid would remain to be there after the end of pandemic, and this would become pivotal for companies to adapt and overcome virtual team obstacles.

Additionally, from the existing previous research, that one of the factors correlated and could increase the virtual team's effectiveness and performance is the virtual team collective efficacy (VTCE) (Chou et al., 2013; Hardin et al., 2007; Jung & Sosik, 2002; McLarnon & Woodley, 2021; Tasa et al., 2007). By definition, VTCE is a belief of group of individuals to work together from different location and/or time zones to finish a task in reaching a common goal through the use of ICT media (Bandura, 1978; Fuller et al., 2006; Garro-Abarca et al., 2021; Kniffin et al., 2020; Rudolph et al., 2021) Furthermore, this construct will help companies to overcome the WFH or Hybrid obstacle by increasing team effectiveness to communicate using technology to collaborate while working virtually to accomplish the task (Hardin et al., 2007; Kniffin et al., 2020).

There have been various researches that state VTCE has positive impacts, such as increasing group effectiveness (Baker, 2001; Elms et al., 2023; McLarnon & Woodley, 2021; Stajkovic et al., 2009), creativity (Ma et al., 2017), innovation (Liu et al., 2015), work satisfaction (Judge & Bono, 2001; Salanova et al., 2022), group performance (Elms et al., 2023; Gully et al., 2002), and collective positive experience (Salanova et al., 2022). Based on this matter, the company must know the antecedent of VTCE to gain the positive output from this variable, the antecedents are leadership (Capaldo et al., 2021; Chou et al., 2013; Getachew & Zhou, 2018; Huh et al., 2014; Jung & Sosik, 2002; Lin et al., 2019; Sudha et al., 2016) and organization support (Franken et al., 2020; Getachew & Zhou, 2018; Jung & Sosik, 2002; Kennedy et al., 2009; Osca et al., 2005; Park et al., 2020).

Although it has been well-known that leadership is an antecedent variable and has positive correlation with VTCE but from several literature utilizes traditional leadership theories, where it only showed the agentic role of -task focused or communal role of-relationship focus (Brown et al., 2021; Fürstenberg et al., 2021). As a comparison, PLB combines two roles into one behavioral form (Fürstenberg et al., 2021; Lewis & Smith, 2014; Zhang et al., 2015) According to Waldman and Bowen (2016) and Brown (2021), the agentic role of leadership portrays a leadership figure that presents a firm stance towards subordinates, goal-oriented and aims to deliver tasks, as well as having the tendency to be authoritarian. Whereas the communal role shows compassion towards the welfare of the subordinate, focused on interpersonal relationships, and empowers others to reach common goals (Brown et al., 2021; Waldman & Bowen, 2016).

Moreover, the researcher also focuses on Perceived Organizational Support (POS) that has been widely researched to explain the relationship between leadership and output of employees. The definition of POS is a

perception possessed by employees regarding support given by the organization in the form of reward towards the employee's contribution to ensure their well-being at work, treat the employees fairly, and listen to their concerns (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) Basically, POS and leadership are interlinked, as a leader role is often assumed as the representation of the company and is able to form the employee's perception about the company (Franken et al., 2020; Kennedy et al., 2009; Kurtessis et al., 2017) Furthermore, the support that showed by organization & supervisor, will be received by employees as empathy towards them, as well as to increase their belief to accomplish their task and overcome the obstacle of WFH or hybrid (Errichiello & Pianese, 2021; Franken et al., 2020; Garro-Abarca et al., 2021; Morrison-Smith & Ruiz, 2020) This is in line with the previous research, the leadership role and organization support could increase the collective efficacy of the team, indicating that leadership behaviors and the organizational environment can shape employees' perceptions of their collective efficacy (Getachew & Zhou, 2018; Tasa et al., 2007).

Based on the presentation of the above literature review, the author hereby shall formulate the research focus as follows:

H1: There is a significant effect of PLB towards VTCE

H2: There is a significant effect of POS towards VTCE

H3: There is a significant interaction between PLB and POS towards VTCE.

Methods

Research Design

The type of this research is quantitative with a research design of between subject design with a 2 x 2 factorial variation form. This research utilizes the Experimental Vignette Method (EVM), as by the definition of the vignette is a short, well-constructed description of a person, object, or situation to represent characteristics (Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010) This research using paper people study consists of four types of scenarios and combines with the survey (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014) The reason for using EVM is because this method is suitable to be used for leadership research study and observe the effect towards attitude, assessment, intention, and behavior of the subordinate (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014; Klonek et al., 2020) Also based on previous research recommendations, it is better to use more than survey methods to examine causal effect of PLB and POS towards dependent variables (Fürstenberg et al., 2021; Klonek et al., 2020; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) This research study is a cross-sectional study as the data obtained in one go of data gathering simultaneously (Kumar, 2014) The researcher utilized three research variables consisting of: Paradoxical Leadership Behavior (PLB) and Perceived Organizational Support (POS) as independent variables, and Virtual Team Collective Efficacy as dependent variable, in addition to the context of this research is WFH or hybrid.

Participants

The participants of this research are the employees who conduct WFH or hybrid (WFH and WFO) in Indonesia consisting of 256 respondents. Next, the participants were a member into a virtual group that cooperate and work interactively as a group to accomplish their tasks (high level of interdependence), that exists within a virtual team that have worked together for 1 year at the current company (Brown et al., 2021; Fuller et al., 2006; Ganesh & Gupta, 2010; Thompson, 1967) The participants were members of a group that had a minimum of three (3) members and were known the participants that were joined into a team have a basic knowledge of team collaboration (Aubé & Rousseau, 2005; Pearce & Sims, 2002) Next, when actively working, they use information communication technology media or other virtual tools (Brown et al., 2021; Garro-Abarca et al., 2021; Rachmawati et al., 2021).

Methodology

The sampling techniques utilized were non-probability, convenience sampling type, where the participants within the population that were randomly generated are asked to fill in a questionnaire once with the characteristics that have been previously stated. The research also conducted randomization techniques to the research participants, by way of preparing 4 scenarios into an online form. Each form was prepared into 4 different link forms (link), then four of the links would be combined into 1 link of linktree for the convenience of the researcher to share the links to the population. The participant candidate would receive 1 linktree in which they would receive an instruction inscribed within the link to freely choose 1 out of 4 scenario form links.

Prior to the data gathering, the participants would be provided with informed consent to inform them that all research subjects obtain information about the purpose of the research, secure personal data, and request their consent to become a research participant.

Stimulus Design and Experimental Conditions

Regarding the experiment design and condition, the research prepared PLB stimulus based on the research outcome from Fürstenberg et al. (2021) and Zhang et al. (2015). In the study conducted by Fürstenberg et al. (2021), they conducted a study to make PLB to become a uni-dimensional theory that is able to illustrate the forms of PLB behavior in 5 questionnaire statements, so that the researcher would determine the study

outcome as the foundation of the formation of supervisor behavior in the research scenario. Regarding the low and high level of PLB shown by the supervisor, the researcher shall refer to the study outcome Zhang et al. (2015) that stated the high level of PLB would indicate the individual present two poles of behavior (agentic and communal) in paradoxical and simultaneous manner, however, should the PLB level is low, it would show only one of them and not in a paradox manner.

In this instance, the researcher attempted to only present the agentic role for the group scenario with low PLB (PLBL), based on the previous literature on the role of agentic leadership is known to be related to the supervisor's control role towards the work output, therefore this would increase the group collective efficacy, but possessing weak level of relationship or even negative (Fürstenberg et al., 2021; Lin et al., 2019; Sudha et al., 2016; Zhang et al., 2015)

For the formulation of POS stimulus, the researcher shall refer to the research conducted by Rhoades & Eisenberger (2002) as well as Caesens et al., (2017). The study by Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002) presented a type of support in the form of fair treatment (fairness), provision of support from supervisor (supervisor support), and training as well as rewards by company (organizational rewards & job condition) correlated with POS. For determining the level of POS, the researcher utilized the principle of stimulus formulation by Caesens et al. (2017), where a scenario that present organization support for an individual could increase POS, and for companies that do not provide support would lower POS for the individual.

Based on the explanation above, the participants shall read a scenario that has been prepared as such, where there is a supervisor that portrays high level of PLB and low level of PLB, as well as high level of organization support and low level of organization support. Therefore, both dependent variable data of this research are nominal data to help researchers to analyze the data using SPSS. As seen from table 1, the experiment stimulus design is as follows.

Research ethical practice

This study was conducted in line with ethical considerations as in American Psychological Association (2013). Prior to the commencement of this study, the Faculty of Education, University of Nigeria approved this study. In addition, the participants gave their contents to participate in the study. Thereafter, the management of the schools also gave approval for the study to take place in their schools.

Table 1. The Experiment Stimulus Design

Variables		POS	
		High	Low
PLB	High	Group 1: PLBH & POSH	Group 2: PLBH & POSL
	LOW	Group 3: PLBL & POSH	Group 4: PLBL & POSL

Table 2. Task Instruction & Experimental Conditions in Bahasa Indonesia (Orginal)

Instruction	*Berikut ini Anda akan dipaparkan sebuah kondisi di salah satu perusahaan. Mohon dibaca secara seksama dan isilah kuesioner di bagian akhir sesuai dengan penilaian Anda apabila berada di kondisi tersebut. Waktu rata-rata pengerjaan adalah 5 hingga 10 menit.*
Conditions	*Saat ini perusahaan Anda menerapkan new normal strategy, berupa kebijakan* full work from home *(WFH) atau* hybrid*. Seluruh departemen diminta untuk menyusun proposal rancangan gaya kerja dan anggaran tim, sebagai landasan pembuatan keputusan perusahaan. Berdasarkan arahan tersebut, atasan Anda akan melibatkan tim di bawahnya, yang diketahui berada di kota yang sama maupun di kota yang berbeda.*

Table 3. Task Instruction & Experimental Conditions in English

Instruction	"Below you will be presented the one of the company's conditions. Please read carefully and fill in the questionnaire at the end according to your assessment if you are in that condition. The average processing time is 5 to 10 minutes."
Conditions	"Currently, your company is implementing a new normal strategy. For example, full work-from-home (WFH) or hybrid policies All departments are asked to prepare teamwork styles and

budget proposals so that the company can make decisions for its employees. Based on these directions, your boss will involve the teams under him, whether they are known to be in the same city or in different cities."

Table 4. One of the Experimental Scenarios in Bahasa Indonesia (original) and English

Group 1	*Saat membuat proposal dan membawahi timnya. Atasan Anda: 1) Membagi pekerjaan secara adil untuk seluruh anggota tim, namun mempertimbangkan kemampuan individual dan kondisi internet bawahan saat pembagian tugas. 2) Menampilkan kemauan untuk mengarahkan tim, namun memberikan timnya kesempatan untuk memimpin. 3) Mengontrol masalah pekerjaan yang penting, namun memperbolehkan tim untuk menangani hal-hal detail. 4) Memiliki tuntutan tinggi terhadap kinerja tim, namun tidak terlalu banyak mengkritik ketika tim melakukan kesalahan. 5) Mengenali perbedaan peran antara supervisor dan bawahan, namun tidak bersikap angkuh saat memimpin tim.* *Disisi lain, perusahaan dan manajemen saat ini:* *1) Mengadakan musyawarah sebelum menentukan kebijakan WFH atau hybrid, dan menyesuaikan anggaran tim dengan kesepakatan bersama.* *2) Mendorong supervisor untuk selalu mengevaluasi kebutuhan bawahan.* *3) Menyediakan teknologi informasi dan perangkat lunak (software) saat bekerja, dan memberikan pelatihan untuk menggunakannya.* *4) Menyediakan reward setelah program memiliki evaluasi yang memuaskan.*
Group 1 (in English)	"When making proposals and supervising the team. Your boss: 1) Divide work fairly among all team members, but consider the individual abilities and internet conditions of subordinates when distributing tasks. 2) Displays a willingness to direct the team, but gives his team the opportunity to lead. 3) Control important work issues, but allow the team to handle the details. 4) Have high demands on team performance, but do not criticize too much when the team makes mistakes. 5) Recognize the differences in roles between supervisors and subordinates, but do not act arrogantly when leading a team. On the other hand, the company and management currently: 1) Hold a deliberation before determining the WFH or hybrid policy, and adjust the team budget according to mutual agreement. 2) Encourage supervisors to always evaluate subordinates' needs. 3) Providing information technology and software at work, and providing training to use it. 4) Provide rewards after the program has a satisfactory evaluation."

Notes: for english version need to conduct FGD and Pilot Study.

Regarding the experiment task, for such a scenario, the company implemented a new normal strategy, namely a policy of work from home (WFH) or hybrid (WFH and WFO). All departments are requested to prepare a work style design and team budget proposal, as the foundation of the company's decision-making. Based on such conditions, the supervisor of each department shall provide orders for the team that are known to be spread geographically. The supervisors and the company in such a scenario would portray a PLB behavior and organization support that have been previously prepared. The participants would be asked to position themselves as the team under that supervisor and be employed at the company. The participants would be required to read and understand the content of the scenario, then fill in the VTCE questionnaire (Hardin et al., 2006)

Furthermore, the participant would read the task instruction, as stated in image 1. Next, the participants shall read the condition and scenario of the experiment as illustrated in images 2 and 3. After participants read all the instructions, the participant shall fill in the VTCE questionnaire, and followed by reading the research debriefing.

Manipulation Check

FGD shall take place to revisit several alternatives of scenarios that have been made as such. Several aspects may be considered when reviewing the scenario, such as choice of words in a sentence, writing style in compliance with Reformed Indonesian Spelling (EYD) guideline, comfort of scenario when being read, the scenario's clarity and comprehensibility, and clarity of instruction for filling in the VTCE questionnaire. The outcome of this process is to obtain feedback from participants that have the same participants as the actual

participants. After obtaining feedback, the researcher would revise and conduct adjustments relating to the overall research process, as well as giving reward to the FGD participants.

Instrument

Measurement of VTCE level shall utilize a questionnaire developed by Hardin et al. (2006) that have compatibility with research objective to measure VTCE on participants that work in distance with the team and still effectively to collaborate virtually. This questionnaire consists of 4 items that utilize yes/no responses and with a scale from 1 (one) to 10 (ten), where scale 1 means "uncertain" and 10 means "certain". This scale has Cronbach's alpha coefficient of $\alpha = 0.92$, where it has fulfilled the recommended limit of > 0.7 (Ghozali, 2018) The data processing by research shall utilize Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) to perform normality test, homogeneity, and two-way ANOVA statistical test in observing the comparison of the average between research groups.

Result

Participants that are obtained based on the required characteristics of the research are 256 respondents. There are 13% of participants who are WFH and 88% working hybrid. Based on the working experience, 42% of the participants have worked for 1-2 years, 46% that have worked for 3-5 years, and 11% that have worked for 6-10 years, and 1% that have worked for over 10 years. Next, there are 39% of the participants comprising a group of 3-4 people, 28% that have 5-6 people, 13% that have 6-7 people, and 20% that have over 7 people.

The researcher conducted a classical assumption test of normality using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and *Levene's* homogeneity test towards 256 data that have been gathered with a coefficient of $p > .05$ (Ghozali, 2018) The result is presented in tables as follows,

Table 5. Result of Normality & Homogeneity

Normality	Sig	Homogeneity	Sig.
PLBH	.096	Based on Mean	.059
PLBL	.200		
POSH	.099		
POSL	.061		

Based on the table above, the research data is normally distributed (pPLBH = .096; p PLBL = .200; p OSH = .099; p POSL = .061) and the outcome of the levene's test revealed that in between groups are equivalent or homogenous (p = .059), thus fulfilling the assumption conductions to proceed with the two-way ANOVA analysis (Ghozali, 2018).

The two-way ANOVA analysis has been conducted to observe the implication of PLB and POS on VTCE. The following is the two-way ANOVA and estimates mean outcome presented in the table below.

Table 6. Testing Result of Two-Way ANOVA

Source	df	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
PLB	1	499,152	.000	.665
POS	1	376,290	.000	.599
PLB*POS	1	14,429	.000	.054
Error	252			

Table 7. Estimates Mean

	95% Confidence Interval			
	Mean	**Std. Error**	**Lower Bound**	**Upper Bound**
PLBH	7,994	0,083	7,830	8,157
PLBL	5,375	0,083	5,212	5,538
POSH	7,821	0,083	7,658	7,984
POSL	5,547	0,083	5,384	5,711

From the table above, it could be concluded that there is a significant effect from PLB variable on VTCE with a value of $F(1, 252) = 499.152$, $p < .000$, ηp2 = .665. Next, the POS variable also showed a significant effect on VTCE with a value of $F(1, 252) = 376,290$, $p < .000$, ηp2 = ,599, therefore H1 and H2 for this researcher can be accepted. If further analyzed (see table. 5), there are higher level of VTCE compared to the PLBH group (M = .994, SE = .083, 95% CI = [.830, .157]) compared to PLBL group (M = .375, SE = .083, 95% CI = [.212, .538]). Next, the level of VTCE p for the participants is also seen to be higher than POSH group (M = .821, SE = .083, 95% CI = [.658, .984]) compared to POSL group (M = .547, SE = .083, 95% CI = [.384, .711]). Furthermore, there is a significant interaction between PLB and POS towards VTCE with a value of $F(1, 252) = 14.429$, $p < .000$, ηp2 = ,054, therefore H3 of this research can be accepted.

Discussion

This research aims to observe the effect of PLB and PLB towards the VTCE variable. The outcome of the vignette experiment study showed that there is an impact of the leadership style of PLB and POS towards the participant's VTCE level that works in groups through WFH or hybrid. The researcher also discovered that the participants that received a leader role of PLBH have higher levels of VTCE statistically compared to the PLBL group. Additionally, there is a higher level of VTCE for the participants that received a high level of organization support compared to the low level of organization support. Moreover, the significant outcome of interaction revealed, the variation type of PLB towards VTCE depends on the variation type of POS, thus the level of VTCE for individuals is different in every variation of PLB and POS.

The basis of this effect is due to the leadership is a construct that could bring impact to the employee outcome from different geographical areas virtually, one of which is VTCE (Am et al., 2021; Bandura, 1978; Brown et al., 2021; Gully et al., 2002; Hardin et al., 2007; Kniffin et al., 2020) Although the leadership could bring impact on the collective efficacy virtually, many previous research remained to utilize traditional leadership styles that only presented agentic role-task focused or communal-relationship focus (Brown et al., 2021; Fürstenberg et al., 2021; Waldman & Bowen, 2016) For instance, the outcome of previous research showed both agentic leadership role-task focused (such as: transactional, charismatic, directive, authoritarian, etc.) and communal leadership role-relationship focus (such as: transformational, empowerment, servant, shared, etc.) is related to the collective efficacy both in person or virtually (Capaldo et al., 2021; Chou et al., 2013; Fürstenberg et al., 2021; Hastika et al., 2022; Huh et al., 2014; Lin et al., 2019; Sudha et al., 2016; Waldman & Bowen, 2016).

If further analyzed, the research of the traditional leadership style above would basically possess the paradigm of "either/or", where it would only present one of the roles (Smith & Lewis, 2011; Zhang et al., 2015) As opposed to the PLB with the paradigm of "both/and" that is able to combine two roles into one behavior (Zhang et al., 2015) Combining two paradoxical roles into one behavior is known to create an effective leadership, when the supervisor is able to utilize communal approach (such as transformational) or agentic (such as transactional) simultaneously (Bass & Avolio, 1997; Waldman & Bowen, 2016) This is in line with Smith and Lewis (2011), where a supervisor that implements opposing roles simultaneously would be able to find stability, flexibility, and solution in various situations that tend to constantly change and be unpredictable.

The above statement is supported by research outcome by Brown et al. (2021), where the leaders who oversee virtual teams should use task focused and relationship focus roles simultaneously, to support the virtual team to perform well in various situation and geographical location, as well as convince the team to complete their tasks (Chen et al., 2019) Therefore, the PLB leadership style is deemed able to help virtual teams to believe and to keep working well when facing uncertainty, ambiguous and constantly changing (Garro-Abarca et al., 2021; Gilson et al., 2015).

Based on such matters, the outcome of this research supports the findings from previous research that PLB is relatively effective in increasing the VTCE for virtual teams. Furthermore, Fürstenberg et al. (2021) explained the effectiveness of this PLB leadership style cannot be separated from its nature of being able to bring together positive effects from two paradoxical roles in one behavior, even PLB create two roles that would prevent negative effects of each other (for instance, the negative effect from a directive leadership is the emergence of strict control towards the performance of subordinate or micro-management, that could be resolved by allowing freedom, autonomy and responsibility for the subordinates, such as shared leadership). Therefore, the implementation of PLB leadership style would allow supervisors to be more adaptive when supporting the virtual team to convince them when facing obstacles, challenges and uncertain circumstances, as well as treating virtual team equally without the need to utilize the negative effects from the other role (Errichiello & Pianese, 2021; Fürstenberg et al., 2021; Garro-Abarca et al., 2021; Smith & Lewis, 2011; Zhang et al., 2015).

Other findings of this research show there is a connection between POS and Collective efficacy. There have been many previous studies that show POS having positive correlation with collective efficacy, in person or virtually (Asgari et al., 2020; Borgogni et al., 2011; Errichiello & Pianese, 2021; Getachew & Zhou, 2018; Osca et al., 2005; Park et al., 2020). Specifically, the form of organization support presented in the scenario is in line with the previous researches, where the procedural fairness, supervisor support and organization reward & job condition (such as training and bonus) is POS antecedent that is a form of support most suitable for post-pandemic virtual team, to increase the collective efficacy for the virtual teams (Borgogni et al., 2011; Errichiello & Pianese, 2021; Gilson et al., 2015; Kurtessis et al., 2017).

On the other hand, the outcome of this research is in contradiction with the research outcome of Schepers et al. (2011) that discovered supervisor support does not have a significant support towards the perception of the virtual team efficacy. This is further explained in the research limitation that utilized the cross-sectional survey method. In comparison with this research that utilized the vignette experiment method (EVM), where EVM is an experimental method that allows to control the antecedent that is manipulated in a scenario and requires participants from different groups to provide preference of personal attitude and behavior, thus allowing to observe the cause-and-effect relationship between variables (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014; Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010). This outcome is in line with the research by Morrison-Smith and Ruiz (2020), Garro-Abarca et al. (2021), as well as Errichiello and Pianese (2021) that discovered that the supervisor support is a detrimental matter in virtual team, therefore with such support the supervisor could provide support and show empathy as well as further explain the role dynamics and the relationship between virtual team members, as well as to increase the belief and performance of the team when facing obstacles, as well as build organization to show their compassion towards the need of the virtual team when working remotely .

Basically, the leadership style (both agentic and communal) has a connection with POS, but this research shows that the level of average VTCE of the virtual team is higher due to the impact from PLB compared to POS. This is due to the employee's positive perception towards the supervisor leadership having a strong connection towards the group collective efficacy compared to their positive perception towards the company (Borgogni et al., 2011; Getachew & Zhou, 2018; Tasa et al., 2007) Nevertheless, the employee perception towards the company may also have a connection towards group collective efficacy, this is due to the company implementing general procedure and guidance that aligns different groups (Borgogni et al., 2011; Getachew & Zhou, 2018). Moreover, this also explains why there is a significant interaction between PLB and POS affecting the VTCE. This is due to the fact the subordinates tend to see the supervisor as representative of the company and become the role model on behaving, thus the form of leadership and support shown by supervisor would be considered as order and organization support by subordinate, and finally to increase virtual team VTCE (Borgogni et al., 2011; Errichiello & Pianese, 2021; Garro-Abarca et al., 2021; Gilson et al., 2015; Kurtessis et al., 2017; Morrison-Smith & Ruiz, 2020; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002).

The findings of this research have several practical implications to consider. Firstly, this study demonstrates that leadership style that combines agentic and communal elements (PLB) can positively impact the level of collective efficacy in virtual teams. This indicates that supervisors or leaders who can blend task-oriented and relationship-oriented approaches in their leadership can help virtual teams feel more confident and perform well, especially in situations characterized by uncertainty and constant change (Brown et al., 2021; Fürstenberg et al., 2021; Hardin et al., 2007) This provides guidance for organizations in developing effective leaders for virtual teams, particularly in the context of the new normal post-pandemic era. Secondly, the study highlights the importance of organizational support for virtual teams. It was found that the level of organizational support (POS) is positively related to collective efficacy. Therefore, organizations need to provide adequate support to virtual teams, including procedural fairness, support from supervisors, and incentives such as training and bonuses. This will help enhance the collective efficacy of virtual teams and, in turn, their performance (Getachew & Zhou, 2018; Tasa et al., 2007). Furthermore, the research reveals that the relationship between PLB and POS has a significant impact on virtual team collective efficacy. This indicates that employees' positive perceptions of their supervisor's leadership indirectly reflect the support provided by the organization. Therefore, organizations can collaborate with leaders to create an environment that supports the collective

efficacy of virtual teams, and leaders need to understand their role in representing the organization (Errichiello & Pianese, 2021; Franken et al., 2020; Garro-Abarca et al., 2021; Tasa et al., 2007).

For future research, the researchers recommend utilizing the EVM method, especially paper people studies that is known to be suitable to be used for leadership research domain and observe the effect towards attitude, assessment, intention and behavior for the subordinate (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014). This method has not been widely used both in international or national journals, although this method has been proven to generate scientific outcomes (Aguinis & Bradley, 2014; Atzmüller & Steiner, 2010). Moreover, another stimulus form that must be considered for next leadership research shall be video recording, given the internal validity from a video stimulus is proven to be better than other vignette methods (Klonek et al., 2020). Additionally, scenarios on non-PLB for groups of this research only show an agentic side. The researcher suggests that a scenario is required to be utilized to present the communal role, given that the communal leadership role brings bigger impact towards collective efficacy compared to agentic role (Asgari et al., 2020; Sudha et al., 2016). According to several studies, this study using individual perception to rating their VTCE team, but the collective efficacy requiring a group-level analysis method; this could be achieved by aggregating the participant's efficacy on the current work team, so researchers recommend using quasi-experiment to control the same work team to participating in the same group experiment (all team member only fill the questionnaire under group 1 and ensure another member group not to fill the questionnaire under group 2,3, and 4) (Bandura, 1978; Biemann et al., 2012; Elms et al., 2023; O'Neill, 2017). Furthermore, this study has some limitations. We collected single-level data from a single source and in the single time (i.e., followers), this can potentially raise concerns about common method variance, a bias that occurs when data collected from a single source is influenced by the same method of measurement, leading to inflated relationships between variables, So we suggest to replicate this study in longitudinal study (Podsakoff et al., 2012). One limitation of this study is that it primarily focused on the context of Indonesia culture, and thus, replication in diverse international settings would be valuable to assess the generalizability of the findings about PLB and POS Stimulus (Zhang et al., 2015).

Finally, there have not been many studies focusing on paradoxical leadership and collective efficacy of the virtual teams in Indonesia, especially for a post-pandemic context or new normal era such as today. This indicates that there are still many rooms to explore to utilize the EVM method and research the PLB construct.

Conclusion

This research provides an illustration of how PLB and POS leadership could increase VTCE. Although this PLB leadership style has not been widely researched in Indonesia, the outcome of this research could provide the understanding of how important the supervisor could provide two paradoxical leadership roles in one behavior when overseeing a virtual team to increase VTCE. This has made the virtual team to be more convinced towards the team's capability and become more adaptive when facing obstacles as well as hindrance around the work that constantly changes. Additionally, on the side of the organization, it requires support to increase the employee's VTCE that performs WFH or hybrid.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank all of the parties that were involved during this research, especially parents, relatives, friends, PIO UI batch 27 & 26, BRANTAS 18, and other parties that have contributed to the preparation of this research.

References

Aguinis, H., & Bradley, K. J. (2014). Best Practice Recommendations for Designing and Implementing Experimental Vignette Methodology Studies. *Organizational Research Methods*, *17*(4), 351–371. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428114547952

Am, J. B., Furstenthal, L., Jorge, F., & Roth, E. (2021). *Innovation in a crisis: Why it is more critical than ever*. Mckinsey & Company. https://www.mckinsey.com/capabilities/strategy-and-corporate-finance/our-insights/innovation-in-a-crisis-why-it-is-more-critical-than-ever

American Psychological Association. (2020, March 20). *How leaders can maximize trust and minimize stress during the COVID-19 pandemic*. https://www.apa.org/news/apa/2020/covid-19-leadership

Asgari, A., Mezginejad, S., & Taherpour, F. (2020). The role of leadership styles in organizational citizenship behavior through the mediation of perceived organizational support and job satisfaction. *Innovar*, *30*(75), 87–98. https://doi.org/10.15446/innovar.v30n75.83259

Atzmüller, C., & Steiner, P. M. (2010). Experimental vignette studies n survey research. *Methodology*, *6*(3), 128–138. https://doi.org/10.1027/1614-2241/a000014

Aubé, C., & Rousseau, V. (2005). Team goal commitment and team effectiveness: The role of task interdependence and supportive behaviors. *Group Dynamics*, *9*(3), 189–204. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.9.3.189

Baker, D. F. (2001). The Development of Collective Efficacy in Small Task Groups. *Small Group Research*, *32*(4), 451–474. https://doi.org/10.1177/104649640103200404

Bandura, A. (1978). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Advances in Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *1*(4), 139–161. https://doi.org/10.1016/0146-6402(78)90002-4

Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1997). *Full range leadership development: Manual for the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire*. Mind Garden.

Biemann, T., Cole, M. S., & Voelpel, S. (2012). Within-group agreement: On the use (and misuse) of r WG and r WG(J) in leadership research and some best practice guidelines. *Leadership Quarterly*, *23*(1), 66–80. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.11.006

Borgogni, L., Russo, S. Dello, & Latham, G. P. (2011). The relationship of employee perceptions of the immediate supervisor and top management with collective efficacy. *Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies*, *18*(1), 5–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051810379799

Brown, S. G., Hill, N. S., & Lorinkova, N. (Nataly) M. (2021). Leadership and virtual team performance: A meta-analytic investigation. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *30*(5), 672–685. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2021.1914719

Caesens, G., Stinglhamber, F., Demoulin, S., & De Wilde, M. (2017). Perceived organizational support and employees' well-being: the mediating role of organizational dehumanization. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *26*(4), 527–540. https://doi.org/10.1080/1359432X.2017.1319817

Capaldo, G., Capone, V., Babiak, J., Bajcar, B., & Kuchta, D. (2021). Efficacy beliefs, empowering leadership and project success in public research centers: An italian–polish study. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(13). https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18136763

Chen, Y., Zhou, X., & Klyver, K. (2019). Collective Efficacy: Linking Paternalistic Leadership to Organizational Commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *159*(2), 587–603. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-018-3847-9

Chou, H. W., Lin, Y. H., Chang, H. H., & Chuang, W. W. (2013). Transformational leadership and team performance: The mediating roles of cognitive trust and collective efficacy. *SAGE Open*, *3*(3), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013497027

Elms, A. K., Gill, H., & Gonzalez-Morales, M. G. (2023). Confidence Is Key: Collective Efficacy, Team Processes, and Team Effectiveness. *Small Group Research*, *54*(2), 191–218. https://doi.org/10.1177/10464964221104218

Errichiello, L., & Pianese, T. (2021). *The Role of Organizational Support in Effective Remote Work Implementation in the Post-COVID Era* (pp. 221–242). https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-6754-8.ch013

Franken, E., Plimmer, G., & Malinen, S. (2020). Paradoxical leadership in public sector organisations: Its role in fostering employee resilience. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*, *79*(1), 93–110. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12396

Fuller, M. A., Hardin, A. M., & Davison, R. M. (2006). Efficacy in technology-mediated distributed teams. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, *23*(3), 209–235. https://doi.org/10.2753/MIS0742-1222230308

Fürstenberg, N., Alfes, K., & Kearney, E. (2021). How and when paradoxical leadership benefits work engagement: The role of goal clarity and work autonomy. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *94*(3), 672–705. https://doi.org/10.1111/joop.12344

Ganesh, M. P., & Gupta, M. (2010). Impact of virtualness and task interdependence on extra-role performance in software development teams. *Team Performance Management: An International Journal*, *16*(3/4), 169–186. https://doi.org/10.1108/13527591011053250

Garro-Abarca, V., Palos-Sanchez, P., & Aguayo-Camacho, M. (2021). Virtual Teams in Times of Pandemic: Factors That Influence Performance. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *12*. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.624637

Getachew, D. S., & Zhou, E. (2018). The Influences Of Transformational Leadership On Collective Efficacy: The Moderating Role Of Perceived Organizational Support. *The International Journal of Organizational Innovation*, *10*(4), 7–15.

Ghozali, I. (2018). *Aplikasi Analisis Multivariete SPSS 25* ((9th ed.)). Universitas Diponegoro.

Gilson, L. L., Maynard, M. T., Jones Young, N. C., Vartiainen, M., & Hakonen, M. (2015). Virtual Teams Research: 10 Years, 10 Themes, and 10 Opportunities. In *Journal of Management* (Vol. 41, Issue 5, pp. 1313–1337). SAGE Publications Inc. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314559946

Gully, S. M., Incalcaterra, K. A., Joshi, A., & Beaubien, J. M. (2002). A meta-analysis of team-efficacy, potency, and performance: Interdependence and level of analysis as moderators of observed relationships. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(5), 819–832. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.5.819

Hardin, A. M., Fuller, M. A., & Davison, R. M. (2007). I know i can, but can we? Culture and efficacy beliefs in global virtual teams. *Small Group Research*, *38*(1), 130–155. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496406297041

Hardin, A. M., Fuller, M. A., & Valacich, J. S. (2006). Measuring group efficacy in virtual teams: New questions in an old debate. *Small Group Research*, *37*(1), 65–85. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496405284219

Hastika, D. V. P., Hidayati, D. S., & Syakarofath, N. A. (2022). Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Efikasi Kolektif Karyawan Selama Pandemi Covid-19. *Psychopolytan : Jurnal Psikologi*, *5*(2), 99–106.

Huh, Y., Reigeluth, C. M., & Lee, D. (2014). Collective Efficacy and its Relationship with Leadership in a Computer-mediated Project-based Group Work. In *CONTEMPORARY EDUCATIONAL TECHNOLOGY* (Vol. 5, Issue 1).

International Labour Organization. (2020). *Hasil penelitian Ringkasan eksekutif*.

Judge, T. A., & Bono, J. E. (2001). Relationship of core self-evaluations traits—self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control, and emotional stability—with job satisfaction and job performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*(1), 80–92. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.86.1.80

Jung, D. I., & Sosik, J. J. (2002). Transformational leadership in work groups: The role of empowerment, cohesiveness, and collective-efficacy on perceived group performance. *Small Group Research*, *33*(3), 313–336. https://doi.org/10.1177/10496402033003002

Kennedy, F. A., Loughry, M. L., Klammer, T. P., & Beyerlein, M. M. (2009). Effects of organizational support on potency in work teams: The mediating role of team processes. *Small Group Research*, *40*(1), 72–93. https://doi.org/10.1177/1046496408326744

Kirkman, B. L., & Mathieu, J. E. (2005). The Dimensions and Antecedents of Team Virtuality. *Journal of Management*, *31*(5), 700–718.

Klonek, F. E., Gerpott, F. H., & Parker, S. K. (2020). A conceptual replication of ambidextrous leadership theory: An experimental approach. *Leadership Quarterly*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101473

Kniffin, K. M., Narayanan, J., Anseel, F., Antonakis, J., Ashford, S. P., Bakker, A. B., Bamberger, P., Bapuji, H., Bhave, D. P., Choi, V. K., Creary, S. J., Demerouti, E., Flynn, F. J., Gelfand, M. J., Greer, L., Johns, G., Kesebir, S., Klein, P. G., Lee, S. Y., … Wilmot, M. P. (2020). *COVID-19 and the Workplace: Implications, Issues, and Insights for Future Research and Action Mark van Vugt*.

Kumar, R. (2014). *Research Methodology: A Step by Step Guide for Beginners* (4th ed.). SAGE.

Kurtessis, J. N., Eisenberger, R., Ford, M. T., Buffardi, L. C., Stewart, K. A., & Adis, C. S. (2017). Perceived Organizational Support: A Meta-Analytic Evaluation of Organizational Support Theory. *Journal of Management*, *43*(6), 1854–1884. https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206315575554

Lewis, M. W., & Smith, W. K. (2014). Paradox as a Metatheoretical Perspective: Sharpening the Focus and Widening the Scope. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, *50*(2), 127–149. https://doi.org/10.1177/0021886314522322

Lin, C. P., Wang, C. C., Chen, S. C., & Chen, J. Y. (2019). Modeling leadership and team performance: The mediation of collective efficacy and the moderation of team justice. *Personnel Review*, *48*(2), 471–491. https://doi.org/10.1108/PR-10-2017-0313

Liu, J., Chen, J., & Tao, Y. (2015). Innovation Performance in New Product Development Teams in China's Technology Ventures: The Role of Behavioral Integration Dimensions and Collective Efficacy. *Journal of Product Innovation Management*, *32*(1), 29–44. https://doi.org/10.1111/jpim.12177

Lund, S., Madgavkar, A., Manyika, J., Smit, S., Ellingrud, K., Meaney, M., & Robinson, O. (2021). *The future of work after COVID-19*. www.mckinsey.com/mgi.

Ma, Z., Long, L., Zhang, Y., Zhang, J., & Lam, C. K. (2017). Why do high-performance human resource practices matter for team creativity? The mediating role of collective efficacy and knowledge sharing. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management*, *34*(3), 565–586. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10490-017-9508-1

McLarnon, M. J. W., & Woodley, H. J. R. (2021). Collective efficacy in virtual teams: Emergence, trajectory, and effectiveness implications. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, *53*(2), 187–199. https://doi.org/10.1037/cbs0000233

Morrison-Smith, S., & Ruiz, J. (2020). Challenges and barriers in virtual teams: a literature review. *SN Applied Sciences*, *2*(6). https://doi.org/10.1007/s42452-020-2801-5

Novotney, A. (2021, April 1). *Preparing for leadership in a pandemic workforce*. Monitor on Psychology.

O'Neill, T. A. (2017). An overview of interrater agreement on likert scales for researchers and practitioners. In *Frontiers in Psychology* (Vol. 8, Issue MAY). Frontiers Research Foundation. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00777

Osca, A., Urien, B., González-Camino, G., Martínez-Pérez, M. D., & Martínez-Pérez, N. (2005). Organisational support and group efficacy: A longitudinal study of main and buffer effects. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *20*(3–4), 292–311. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940510589064

Park, Y., Lim, D. H., Kim, W., & Kang, H. (2020). Organizational support and adaptive performance: The revolving structural relationships between job crafting, work engagement, and adaptive performance. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *12*(12). https://doi.org/10.3390/SU12124872

Pearce, C. L., & Sims, H. P. (2002). Vertical versus shared leadership as predictors of the effectiveness of change management teams: An examination of aversive, directive, transactional, transformational, and empowering leader behaviors. *Group Dynamics*, *6*(2), 172–197. https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.6.2.172

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of Method Bias in Social Science Research and Recommendations on How to Control It. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *63*(1), 539–569. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-120710-100452

Rachmawati, R., Choirunnisa, U., Pambagyo, Z. A., Syarafina, Y. A., & Ghiffari, R. A. (2021). Work from home and the use of ict during the covid-19 pandemic in indonesia and its impact on cities in the future. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, *13*(12). https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126760

Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organizational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*(4), 698–714. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.698

Rudolph, C. W., Allan, B., Clark, M., Hertel, G., Hirschi, A., Kunze, F., Shockley, K., Shoss, M., Sonnentag, S., & Zacher, H. (2021). Pandemics: Implications for research and practice in industrial and organizational psychology. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, *14*(1–2), 1–35. https://doi.org/10.1017/iop.2020.48

Salanova, M., Rodríguez-Sánchez, A. M., & Nielsen, K. (2022). The impact of group efficacy beliefs and transformational leadership on followers' self-efficacy: a multilevel-longitudinal study. *Current Psychology*, *41*(4), 2024–2033. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-00722-3

Schepers, J., de Jong, A., de Ruyter, K., & Wetzels, M. (2011). Fields of gold: Perceived efficacy in virtual teams of field service employees. *Journal of Service Research*, *14*(3), 372–389. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094670511412354

Shareen, P., & Shahid, M. (2020). Work from home during COVID-19: Employee perception and experiences. *GLOBAL JOURNAL FOR RESEARCH ANALYSIS*, *9*(5), 1–3.

Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). TOWARD A THEORY OF PARADOX: A DYNAMIC EQUILIBRIUM MODEL OF ORGANIZING. *Academy of Management Review*, *36*(2), 381–403. https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2011.59330958

Stajkovic, A. D., Lee, D., & Nyberg, A. J. (2009). Collective efficacy, group potency, and group performance: Meta-analyses of their relationships, and test of a mediation model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *94*(3), 814–828. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015659

Sudha, K. S., Shahnawaz, M. G., & Farhat, A. (2016). Leadership Styles, Leader's Effectiveness and Well-being: Exploring Collective Efficacy as a Mediator. *Vision*, *20*(2), 111–120. https://doi.org/10.1177/0972262916637260

Tasa, K., Taggar, S., & Seijts, G. H. (2007). The development of collective efficacy in teams: A multilevel and longitudinal perspective. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *92*(1), 17–27. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.17

Thompson, J. D. (1967). *Organizations in Action*. McGraw-Hill.

van Dam, K. (2009). Employee adaptability to change at work: A multidimensional, resource-based framework. In *The Psychology of Organizational Change: Viewing Change from the Employee's Perspective* (pp. 123–142). Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139096690.009

Waldman, D. A., & Bowen, D. E. (2016). Learning to be a paradox-savvy leader. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *30*(3), 316–327. https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2015.0070

Wilson, J. M., Lee, J., Fitzgerald, H. N., Oosterhoff, B., Sevi, B., & Shook, N. J. (2020). Job insecurity and financial concern during the COVID-19 pandemic are associated with worse mental health. *Journal of*

Occupational and Environmental Medicine, *62*(9), 686–691. https://doi.org/10.1097/JOM.0000000000001962

Zhang, Y., Waldman, D. A., Han, Y. L., & Li, X. B. (2015). Paradoxical leader behaviors in people management: Antecedents and consequences. *Academy of Management Journal*, *58*(2), 538–566. https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2012.0995