Abstract. With the complexity and dynamics of the organizational environment, paradoxical leadership has attracted the attention of researchers as a new method of leadership. Throughout the status quo, its influencing factors are mainly concentrated in three aspects: individual factors, organizational context factors, and socio-cultural factors. The effects are mainly at the organizational, team, and individual levels. At present, the role mechanism of paradoxical leadership has not yet been clarified, and needs to be further explored by scholars.

1 Introduction

With the intensification of the globalization process and the advent of the era of big data, organizations are changing from a simple, stable, and competitive form to a complex, dynamic, and cooperative form. As a result, conflicting requirements in the organization have become more and more important. The more prominent and lasting [1]. For example, the organization must use existing business and explore new business; both hope that employees work independently and have expectations that they strengthen teamwork; both managers need more authority and they need to strengthen control. In the face of these complex paradoxical issues, a single, one-of-a-kind traditional management approach is in trouble, while a paradoxical leader that emphasizes the harmonious coexistence of mutually opposing elements, and also the other Paradoxical leadership is a process of solving organizational paradoxes based on personal traits and cognition, using a strategy of "Both/And" instead of "Either/Or". In this process, leaders continuously respond to the force of paradoxes over time, dynamically coexisting with the complexity of the environment [2].

This article will systematically review the literature on paradoxical leadership at home and abroad in order to achieve the following research goals: clarify the concept and measurement methods of paradoxical leadership; clarify the theoretical basis of paradoxical leadership; and systematically review the paradoxical leadership. Antecedent and outcome variables.

2 The concept of paradoxical leadership

The term "paradox" actually has a long history. As early as the Spring and Autumn Periods in China and the ancient Greeks in the West, thinkers have begun to pay attention to it. In China, the paradox was first manifested in Laozi's Tao Te Ching: "Everything bears yin and embraces the yang, and the spirit is harmonious." It emphasizes that yin and yang are opposite poles, but the two are interdependent and transformed [3]. In the West, the English paradox is "Paradox", which is a combination of the two roots "Para" and "Doxa", referring to contradictory constant false propositions.

Western scholars then began to study paradoxes in organizational scenarios, and defined paradoxes as: contradictory but interrelated elements in the organization, which seemed logical when isolated, but ridiculous and unnatural when they appeared simultaneously. Reasonable [1]. In recent years, scholars have divided the paradoxes in organizational context into four categories: performance paradox, belonging paradox, organizational paradox, and learning paradox [4]. The research of organizational paradox can be roughly divided into macro and micro levels, the former includes competition and cooperation [5], exploration and utilization [6], stability and change [7], the latter includes learning and performance [8], attention to self and others [2].
Although the research on paradoxes in organizational context has been enriched, the research on paradoxical leadership in the academic field is still in its infancy, and scholars have fewer definitions of paradoxical leadership concepts and have not yet reached a consensus. In order to understand the connotation of paradoxical leadership more accurately, this article will sort out the connotation of paradoxical leadership from the following three perspectives: first, the trait and cognitive perspective. This view defines paradoxical leadership from the characteristics of cognitive paradoxical leadership [9] and cognitive [4]. Second, perspective of behavioral. This view emphasizes that paradoxical leadership exhibits seemingly contradictory but actually interconnected behaviors, which can help leaders to accept and deal with opposite contradictions at the same time in complex situations [2] [10]. Third, the perspective of ability. This view emphasizes the ability of paradoxical leadership to transcend contradictions, which is embodied in the ability to accept, differentiate, and integrate [11].

In summary, due to different research perspectives, scholars have not reached a consensus on the concept of paradoxical leadership. From the combing of the above concepts, we can see that paradoxical leadership is a comprehensive concept that realizes its influence on organizations and individuals through three aspects: personal characteristics and cognition, behavior, and ability.

3 Measurement of paradoxical leadership

There are two main measurement scales for paradoxical leadership: (1) Zhang's five-dimensional behavior scale (2) Jansen's two-dimensional scale. Zhang develop a measure of paradoxical leader behavior in people management using five samples from China. Confirmatory factor analyses support a multidimensional measure of paradoxical leader behavior with five dimensions: (1) Combining self-centeredness with other-centeredness; (2) Keep a sense of distance and intimacy; (3) Uniform treatment of subordinates while allowing personalization; (4) Strictly enforce job requirements while maintaining flexibility; (5) Maintain decision control while allowing authorization. Jansen uses performance dimension and supporting dimension.

4 Antecedents of Paradoxical Leadership

4.1 personal reason

Lüscher and Lewis [12] found that it is often the paradoxical nature of leaders that prompts them to explore organizational paradoxes. After combing the existing literature, it is found that they have cognitive complexity, behavioral complexity, and emotional complexity. Individuals with these traits are more likely to accept and use paradoxes. For example, Zhang and others found empirically that holistic thinking and comprehensive complexity are the antecedent variables of paradoxical leadership. [2]. Scholars also argued that easing and open emotions in the face of conflict can reduce the defense and vicious circle that produces side effects [13]; Waldman and Bowen believe that emotional regulation Will directly affect the behavior of paradoxical leadership [14].

4.2 Organization scenario

First, the existence of organizational paradoxes constitutes the objective basis for paradoxical leadership. With the intensification of the globalization process and the advent of the era of big data, organizations are moving from simple, stable, and competitive forms to complex, dynamic, and cooperative forms. The morphological changes of the organization, the contradictory factors in the organization have become more prominent and persistent [1]. Second, the dynamic factors of the organization provide tools for the formation of paradoxical leadership. The dynamic factors as a collective tool enable leaders to Respond to changes in the environment, so that members of the organization can more openly accept the tension of paradox [4]. Finally, the inclusiveness of the organization provides an atmosphere for the formation of paradoxical leadership. For example, Zhang and others have demonstrated that organic organizational structures are paradoxical. Antecedent variables of discourse leadership [2].
4.3 Social culture

People in different social and cultural backgrounds deal with paradoxes in very different ways. Due to the influence of different philosophical cultures, Chinese thinkers put more emphasis on interdependence, balance and coordination; while Western thinkers put more emphasis on mutual opposition and conflict. And tension [3]. For example, Keller et al. used the cooperation and competition between the Chinese and American peoples as an empirical background and found that the Chinese will use the competition and cooperation method more to deal with the paradox tension [15].

5 The consequences of paradoxical leadership

5.1 Organizational level

At the organizational level, innovation performance, dual behaviors and dual innovation capabilities are mainly discussed. Scholars have found that paradoxical leadership can improve the innovation performance of the organization [16]. Yi et al. Through empirical research found that there is a positive correlation between paradoxical leadership and exploratory and developmental innovation [17]. In addition, scholars also constructed a new path to realize the dual innovation ability of the organization from the perspective of paradox [18].

5.2 Team level

At present, team-level research is mainly divided into three aspects: team innovation, team creativity, and leadership effectiveness. With regard to team innovation, Luo Jinxuan used knowledge teams as a sample to find that there is a significant positive correlation between paradoxical leadership and team innovation [10]; Li found that under the guidance of paradoxical leadership, multidisciplinary teams can achieve better innovation performance [19]. About team creativity, scholars found that paradoxical leadership has a significant role in promoting teams [20]. Regarding the effectiveness of leadership, scholars found that paradoxical leadership can alleviate complex contradictions in the environment Adverse effects on leadership, thus achieving leadership effectiveness [21].

5.3 Individual level

First, scholars have demonstrated through empirical research that paradoxical leadership positively affects subordinates' proficient behaviors, adaptive behaviors, and active behaviors [2] [23]. Other scholars have researched and found that paradoxical leadership can promote employees' suggestions (including facilitative and suppressive suggestions) [24]. In addition, the impact of paradoxical leadership on employee behavior is also reflected in employee innovation behavior [25], employee change support behavior [26], and employee dual behavior [27]. Secondly, scholars found that paradoxical leadership can effectively promote employee creativity through empirical research [28]. Finally, they also found a significant positive correlation between paradoxical leadership and job satisfaction of subordinates [29].

6 Conclusion

Based on a review of the existing research literature, it is found that earlier research on paradoxes in the field of management mainly focused on the fields of organization and strategy. Until the past ten years, paradoxical leadership has caused widespread scholars at home and abroad. However, due to the time and complexity of the problem, a complete research system has not yet been formed in the academic field of paradoxical leadership.
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