https://doi.org/10.65166/v23atj96
© The Author(s). Published by SLSI Press

Journal of Enterprise Strategy & Management Innovation
Volume I, Issue 4, November 2026
ISSN: 3116-4277 (Online)
https://journal.ijhba.com/index.php/jesmi
https://slsipress.com

Influence of Authoritarian Leadership and Dual Control Mechanism on Employee Creativity

Zuo Yuyang
Lyceum of the Philippines University - Batangas

Abstract

This study examined the relationships among authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity in logistics enterprises in Shanghai, China. Using a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design, data were collected from 385 employees of 11 logistics companies through a structured questionnaire employing a four-point Likert scale. Authoritarian leadership was assessed through authority enforcement, personal control, and work control and task monitoring. Dual control mechanisms were evaluated through enabling control, coercive control, and dual control alignment, while employee creativity was measured through idea generation, idea implementation, and creative contribution or value. Data were analyzed using descriptive statistics, Spearman's rank-order correlation, and multiple linear regression. Findings indicated overall agreement regarding authoritarian leadership (M = 3.26), dual control mechanisms (M = 3.26), and employee creativity (M = 3.27). Spearman's correlation analyses revealed statistically significant positive relationships among the examined dimensions, with coefficients ranging from 0.747 to 0.807 ($p < .001$). The reported multiple regression model included six statistically significant positive predictors and explained 87.8% of the variance in employee creativity ($R^2 = .878$). The findings suggest that leadership practices and organizational control mechanisms are closely associated with employee-reported creativity in the participating logistics enterprises. The study provides context-specific evidence relevant to organizational leadership, management control, and workplace innovation.

Keywords: *authoritarian leadership; dual control mechanisms; employee creativity; organizational control; logistics enterprises; Shanghai*

1. Introduction

Employee creativity is an important contributor to organizational innovation, operational improvement, and competitiveness, particularly in industries characterized by standardized procedures, performance monitoring, and demanding operational requirements. At the organizational level, innovation-related investment has likewise been positively associated with operational efficiency and business growth among Chinese enterprises (Guan, 2026). In logistics enterprises, employees are expected to maintain efficiency, comply with established procedures, and respond to changing operational demands while identifying opportunities for improvement. Related studies have examined transportation, warehousing, and inventory efficiency in Chinese e-commerce firms (T. Liu & Generoso, 2026) and the logistics- and technology-related operational challenges experienced by frontline delivery riders (Hinagpis & Mendoza, 2026). These expectations create a management challenge: organizations must maintain operational discipline without unnecessarily restricting employees' capacity to generate and implement creative ideas. Leadership practices and organizational control mechanisms are therefore relevant considerations in understanding employee creativity within the logistics industry.

Authoritarian leadership remains an important dimension of organizational management, particularly in hierarchical work environments where supervisors exercise considerable authority over employee decisions and task performance. Farh and Cheng (2000) characterized authoritarian leadership as involving centralized authority, strict supervision, and expectations of subordinate compliance. Although these practices may reinforce discipline and accountability, their implications for employee creativity are complex. Research has examined how different expressions of authoritarian leadership relate to employee creativity, suggesting that discipline-focused supervision and dominance-oriented control should not necessarily be treated as equivalent managerial behaviors (Zhao et al., 2022). Similarly, Xu et al. (2022) identified a paradoxical association between authoritarian leadership and creative behavior,

© 2026 Zuo Yuyang. Published by SLSI Press.
This article is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (CC BY 4.0).

highlighting the importance of examining how leadership authority operates within specific organizational circumstances.

Authoritarian leadership may be understood through several observable managerial practices. Authority enforcement reflects supervisors' expectations regarding obedience, compliance, and centralized decision-making. Personal control concerns the extent to which supervisors monitor, intervene in, and regulate employees' individual work activities. Work control and task monitoring involve the establishment and enforcement of performance standards, deadlines, and operational procedures. Examining these dimensions separately allows for a more differentiated assessment of authoritarian leadership and its relationships with employee creativity.

Beyond leadership practices, organizational control mechanisms influence the conditions under which employees perform their responsibilities. Adler and Borys (1996) distinguished between enabling and coercive forms of organizational bureaucracy. Enabling control emphasizes procedures and systems that assist employees in accomplishing tasks, developing capabilities, and improving performance. Coercive control emphasizes compliance, monitoring, and adherence to established organizational requirements. These approaches represent different organizational functions that may coexist within the same workplace. Accordingly, dual control alignment concerns the perceived balance between maintaining organizational discipline and providing employees with sufficient flexibility to improve their work.

The relationship between organizational control and employee creativity is particularly relevant because creativity involves more than the initial generation of ideas. Amabile's (1983) componential perspective emphasizes the importance of individual capabilities, motivation, and environmental conditions in creative performance. Within organizational settings, creativity may be examined through idea generation, idea implementation, and creative contribution or value. Idea generation involves identifying problems and proposing original or improved approaches to work. Idea implementation concerns translating proposed ideas into workplace practices, while creative contribution or value reflects the perceived usefulness of creative efforts in improving organizational processes and outcomes. Distinguishing these dimensions permits a more comprehensive examination of employee creativity in operational environments.

Existing research provides theoretical and empirical grounds for examining leadership authority, organizational control, and employee creativity. However, the relationships among specific authoritarian leadership practices, enabling and coercive controls, perceived control alignment, and distinct dimensions of employee creativity require further contextual examination. In particular, the experience of frontline employees in logistics enterprises provides an opportunity to investigate how these organizational characteristics are associated within a setting that combines procedural requirements with demands for continuous improvement.

The present study addresses this concern by examining employees from 11 logistics enterprises in Shanghai, China. Rather than assuming that authoritarian leadership necessarily promotes or restricts creativity, the investigation evaluates employees' reported experiences of leadership practices, organizational control mechanisms, and creative behavior. The study employs descriptive statistics to characterize the examined constructs, Spearman's rank-order correlation to determine the direction and strength of their relationships, and multiple linear regression to identify the statistical contributions of authoritarian leadership and dual control dimensions to employee creativity.

The study contributes context-specific empirical evidence to the discussion of organizational leadership and employee creativity by examining authoritarian leadership and dual control mechanisms as multidimensional constructs. Its findings may inform managerial decisions concerning supervisory practices, employee participation, task monitoring, and the coordination of organizational control systems within logistics enterprises.

Objectives of the Study

This study aimed to examine the relationships among authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity among employees of logistics enterprises in Shanghai, China. Specifically, it sought to: (1) assess authoritarian leadership in terms of authority enforcement, personal control, and work control and task monitoring; (2) determine the perceived dual control mechanisms in terms of enabling control, coercive control, and dual control alignment; (3) evaluate employee creativity in terms of idea generation, idea implementation, and creative contribution or value; (4) examine the significant relationships among authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity; (5) determine the statistical predictive contributions of authoritarian leadership and dual control mechanisms to employee creativity using multiple linear regression; and (6) develop an evidence-informed organizational control framework based on the study's descriptive, correlational, and regression findings.

2. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Authoritarian Leadership and Employee Behavior

Authoritarian leadership is characterized by centralized decision-making, supervisory authority, and expectations of employee compliance. Within the paternalistic leadership framework, authoritarianism represents the exercise of authority and discipline within hierarchical relationships (Farh & Cheng, 2000). Although authoritarian leadership is frequently associated with restricted employee autonomy, its organizational implications may depend on the nature of supervisory practices and the conditions under which authority is exercised. Research in Chinese organizational settings also indicates that leadership operates within the broader organizational climate; B. Liu and Atento (2026) found that organizational climate dimensions, including leadership styles, were positively associated with faculty job satisfaction in selected Chinese higher education institutions.

Pizzolitto et al. (2023), in their systematic review of authoritarian leadership styles and organizational performance, identified contrasting findings regarding leadership effectiveness. Their review emphasized that authoritarian leadership cannot be adequately understood through uniformly positive or negative assumptions, as its organizational consequences vary according to contextual conditions and leadership characteristics. Similarly, Zhao et al. (2022) examined discipline-focused authoritarian leadership and found that this leadership orientation could be positively associated with employee creativity through creative self-efficacy. Their findings suggest that managerial discipline and employee creativity are not necessarily incompatible.

Nevertheless, authoritarian leadership may also create conditions that discourage employee participation and independent decision-making. Wang et al. (2022) found that authoritarian leadership was negatively associated with organizational citizenship behavior, although its relationship with task performance differed. These findings indicate that leadership practices may have different relationships with distinct employee outcomes.

Within this theoretical context, authoritarian leadership can be examined through authority enforcement, personal control, and work control and task monitoring. Authority enforcement emphasizes obedience and centralized decision-making, while personal control involves direct supervisory intervention and close monitoring of employees. Work control and task monitoring concern performance expectations, procedural compliance, and task evaluation. Examining these dimensions separately provides a basis for understanding their respective relationships with employee creativity.

2.2 Enabling Control, Coercive Control, and Organizational Alignment

Organizational control mechanisms establish the procedures, expectations, and supervisory arrangements through which employee activities are coordinated. Adler and Borys (1996) distinguished between enabling and coercive bureaucracy, explaining that formal organizational systems can facilitate employee task performance or emphasize compliance and control. Their theoretical contribution challenged the assumption that formalization necessarily restricts organizational effectiveness.

Enabling control refers to organizational procedures that support employees in performing their responsibilities, identifying improvements, and responding to workplace challenges. Such arrangements may include accessible operational guidelines, performance feedback, opportunities for procedural improvement, and organizational support. The value of such supportive arrangements has also been observed in Philippine trading companies, where work environment and support emerged as the strongest predictor of employee productivity (Espelita & Atento, 2026). Coercive control, in contrast, emphasizes compliance with established procedures, supervisory monitoring, and restrictions on unauthorized deviations. Although both forms of control involve formal organizational arrangements, they differ in their orientation toward employee discretion and organizational requirements (Adler & Borys, 1996). Comparable evidence from a Philippine maritime manning office indicated that the effectiveness of a localized quality management system depended on both organizational practices that reinforce implementation and human factors that enable disciplined enactment, supporting the combination of accountability routines with enabling workflow systems (Gamasan & Atento, 2026).

The coexistence of control and employee support has also been explored in leadership research. Meng et al. (2022) examined authoritarian-benevolent leadership in Chinese organizations and identified configurations of leadership characteristics and employee psychological perceptions associated with innovative behavior. Their findings suggest that organizational outcomes should be examined in relation to combinations of managerial practices rather than isolated leadership characteristics.

Similarly, Wang et al. (2022) investigated ambidextrous leadership and employee work behavior, demonstrating that different combinations of authoritarian and servant leadership were associated with variations in organizational citizenship behavior and task performance. Although that study examined leadership combinations rather than the

specific dual control mechanisms investigated here, it provides relevant evidence concerning the organizational significance of combining authority with employee-oriented management practices. In a related Chinese manufacturing context, Guo (2026) found that ambidextrous leadership was positively associated with the well-being of new-generation employees, both directly and partially through work-life balance, further illustrating the relevance of balanced leadership practices in operational settings.

In the present study, dual control mechanisms comprise enabling control, coercive control, and dual control alignment. The alignment dimension concerns employees' perceptions of whether organizational rules, supervisory practices, and opportunities for flexibility coexist in a manner that permits both operational discipline and workplace improvement. These dimensions provide a basis for examining the relationship between organizational control practices and employee creativity.

2.3 Employee Creativity and Organizational Innovation

Employee creativity concerns the development of ideas that are novel and useful within a particular work setting. Amabile (1983), through the componential conceptualization of creativity, emphasized the interaction of individual characteristics, task-related capabilities, motivation, and environmental conditions in creative performance. This perspective provides a theoretical basis for examining creativity as an organizationally situated activity rather than solely an individual characteristic.

Leadership practices represent one important aspect of the organizational environment in which employees undertake creative activities. Zhao et al. (2022) demonstrated that discipline-focused authoritarian leadership could support creativity under particular conditions, indicating that managerial expectations and supervisory discipline may coexist with creative performance. In contrast, Xu et al. (2022) identified a nonlinear relationship between team authoritarian leadership and creative deviance in research and development settings, illustrating that the relationship between leadership authority and creative behavior may vary with the extent of authoritarian practices.

In logistics enterprises, employee creativity is relevant to identifying workflow improvements, addressing operational difficulties, and developing alternative approaches to established tasks. The present study operationalizes employee creativity through three dimensions: idea generation, idea implementation, and creative contribution or value.

Idea generation refers to employees' reported ability to formulate new ideas and identify alternative approaches to work-related problems. Idea implementation concerns their reported efforts to translate ideas into practical workplace improvements. Creative contribution or value reflects employees' perceptions that their ideas improve organizational processes, efficiency, or team performance.

These dimensions enable the study to examine different aspects of reported creative behavior. Importantly, they represent questionnaire-based measures rather than independently verified stages of an observed innovation process. Accordingly, creative contribution or value is interpreted as perceived organizational contribution, not an objective measurement of financial or operational returns.

2.4 Relationships Among Authoritarian Leadership, Organizational Control, and Employee Creativity

The relationships among leadership practices, organizational control, and employee creativity remain theoretically complex. Farh and Cheng (2000) established the relevance of hierarchical authority within paternalistic leadership, while Adler and Borys (1996) demonstrated that organizational control systems may perform enabling or coercive functions. Considered together, these perspectives indicate that leadership authority and formal organizational control should be examined as related but conceptually distinct organizational characteristics.

Empirical findings also suggest that authoritarian leadership does not exhibit uniform relationships with employee outcomes. Zhao et al. (2022) found that discipline-focused authoritarian leadership could contribute positively to creativity through creative self-efficacy. Conversely, Wang et al. (2022) reported a negative relationship between authoritarian leadership and organizational citizenship behavior alongside a different pattern for task performance. These contrasting findings reinforce the importance of distinguishing specific employee outcomes when examining leadership practices.

Xu et al. (2022) further demonstrated that authoritarian leadership may exhibit a nonlinear association with creative deviance. Their findings indicate that the relationship between supervisory authority and creative behavior cannot necessarily be represented through a single directional assumption. Likewise, Pizzolitto et al. (2023) emphasized the contextual and multidimensional nature of authoritarian leadership in explaining differences in organizational performance.

The literature also suggests that organizational approaches combining authority with employee support deserve attention. Meng et al. (2022) identified different configurations of authoritarian-benevolent leadership associated with innovative employee behavior. Wang et al. (2022) similarly examined combinations of leadership orientations and their relationships with employee performance and citizenship behavior. These studies indicate the relevance of examining complementary organizational practices, although their measures and analytical approaches differ from those employed in the present investigation.

For logistics organizations, the relationships among supervisory authority, procedural requirements, employee discretion, and creative behavior warrant empirical examination. However, the presence of relationships among these variables does not independently establish that one variable causes changes in another or operates as a mediator.

The present study therefore examines the associations among authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity through Spearman's rank-order correlation. Multiple linear regression is additionally employed to determine the statistical contributions of leadership and control dimensions to employee creativity when considered simultaneously.

2.5 Synthesis and Research Gaps

The reviewed literature indicates that authoritarian leadership, organizational control, and employee creativity are interconnected organizational concerns. Farh and Cheng (2000) established the theoretical relevance of authoritarian authority within hierarchical leadership, while Adler and Borys (1996) distinguished between enabling and coercive organizational systems. Amabile (1983) provided a foundation for understanding creativity in relation to individual and environmental conditions.

Empirical studies demonstrate that leadership authority may have different relationships with employee outcomes. Zhao et al. (2022) identified a positive creativity-related pathway for discipline-focused authoritarian leadership, whereas Xu et al. (2022) documented a nonlinear association involving creative deviance. Wang et al. (2022) and Meng et al. (2022) further illustrated the significance of examining combinations of leadership characteristics and organizational conditions.

Despite these contributions, additional context-specific evidence is valuable concerning the relationships among distinct authoritarian leadership practices, organizational control mechanisms, and different dimensions of employee creativity in logistics enterprises.

The present study addresses this concern by examining authority enforcement, personal control, and work control and task monitoring alongside enabling control, coercive control, and dual control alignment. Employee creativity is assessed through idea generation, idea implementation, and creative contribution or value.

By applying descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and multiple regression to survey responses from logistics employees in Shanghai, the study contributes evidence concerning the strength, direction, and statistical predictive relationships among these dimensions. Its contribution is therefore empirical and context-specific, without claiming to establish causal relationships or statistically verified mediation mechanisms.

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Design

The study employed a quantitative descriptive-correlational research design to examine the relationships among authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity in logistics enterprises in Shanghai, China. Descriptive statistics were used to assess respondents' perceptions of the three principal constructs and their respective dimensions. Correlational analysis was employed to determine the strength and direction of the relationships among the variables, while multiple linear regression was used to examine the statistical predictive contributions of authoritarian leadership and dual control mechanisms to employee creativity. The research adopted a non-experimental approach, measuring organizational characteristics and employee perceptions without manipulating the study variables.

3.2 Participants of the Study

The participants consisted of 385 employees from 11 logistics enterprises operating in Shanghai, China. The logistics industry was selected because its operational environment involves standardized procedures, supervisory monitoring, performance requirements, and opportunities for employee-generated workplace improvements. Eligible respondents were full-time employees who had worked for their respective organizations for at least six months, reported directly to a supervisor or manager, and voluntarily agreed to participate in the study. The six-month

employment requirement was intended to ensure that respondents had sufficient experience with their supervisors and organizational practices.

3.3 Sampling Technique

Purposive sampling was employed to identify respondents who met the study's inclusion criteria. Participants were selected based on their employment status, organizational tenure, supervisory reporting relationships, and willingness to participate. A total of 385 valid responses were included in the final analysis. Questionnaires containing substantial missing information or incomplete responses were excluded.

3.4 Research Instrument

Data were collected using a researcher-developed structured questionnaire based on the study's theoretical foundations, related literature, and previously established measurement approaches. The instrument comprised three principal sections measuring authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity.

Authoritarian leadership was assessed through authority enforcement, personal control, and work control and task monitoring. Dual control mechanisms were measured through enabling control, coercive control, and dual control alignment. Employee creativity was evaluated through idea generation, idea implementation, and creative contribution or value. Each dimension contained seven statements, resulting in 63 questionnaire items across the nine dimensions.

Responses were measured using a four-point Likert scale: 4 = Strongly Agree, 3 = Agree, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Strongly Disagree. The questionnaire underwent content validation by experts in organizational behavior, leadership, and research methodology. Revisions were incorporated based on their recommendations. The instrument was subsequently pilot-tested among individuals with characteristics comparable to the target population, and its internal consistency was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha.

The reported reliability coefficients were .980 for authority enforcement, .989 for personal control, and .985 for work control and task monitoring; .952 for enabling control, .995 for coercive control, and .905 for dual control alignment; and .949 for idea generation, 1.000 for idea implementation, and .949 for creative contribution or value. All reported coefficients exceeded the conventional .70 threshold for acceptable internal consistency. However, the exceptionally high coefficients, particularly 1.000 for idea implementation, warrant verification against the original reliability output to assess possible item redundancy or coding concerns.

3.5 Data Gathering Procedure

Following questionnaire development, expert validation, and pilot testing, the researcher reported obtaining institutional ethical clearance and permission from the human resource departments of the participating logistics enterprises. Upon receiving the necessary approvals, the questionnaire was administered through an online survey platform. Human resource personnel or designated company representatives assisted in distributing the questionnaire link to eligible employees.

Participants were informed of the study's purpose, voluntary participation requirements, and confidentiality provisions before providing informed consent. Completed questionnaires were retrieved and examined for completeness and consistency. Responses that did not satisfy the requirements for inclusion were excluded. Valid responses were subsequently coded, organized, and prepared for statistical analysis.

3.6 Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using JAMOVI version 2.6. The statistical procedures reported consisted of descriptive statistics, Spearman's rank-order correlation, and multiple linear regression. Weighted means and rankings were used to summarize respondents' assessments of authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity. The following interpretation ranges were adopted: 3.50–4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.50–3.49 = Agree; 1.50–2.49 = Disagree; and 1.00–1.49 = Strongly Disagree.

Spearman's rank-order correlation coefficient (ρ) was employed to examine the direction and strength of the relationships among the dimensions of authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity. Multiple linear regression was used to examine the predictive relationships between the six dimensions of authoritarian leadership and dual control mechanisms and the overall employee creativity score. The predictor variables were authority enforcement, personal control, work control and task monitoring, enabling control, coercive control, and dual control alignment.

Statistical significance was evaluated using the reported significance levels of .05 and .01. The regression analysis was interpreted using the reported coefficients, associated significance values, and coefficient of determination (R^2). No indirect-effect or mediation test was presented in the source manuscript.

3.7 Ethical Considerations

The study obtained ethical clearance from the appropriate institutional ethics review committee of Lyceum of the Philippines University–Batangas before data collection. Respondents were informed of the purpose and procedures of the research, their right to participate voluntarily, and their freedom to withdraw without penalty. Informed consent was obtained before questionnaire administration. The researcher reported that personally identifiable information was not collected and that responses were handled confidentially. Access to the collected data was restricted to the researcher, and the information was used exclusively for academic research purposes.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Authoritarian Leadership

The assessment of authoritarian leadership examined authority enforcement, personal control, and work control and task monitoring. Table 1 presents the consolidated descriptive results for authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity.

Table 1. *Descriptive Summary of Authoritarian Leadership, Dual Control Mechanisms, and Employee Creativity*

Construct and dimension	Mean	Interpretation
Authoritarian Leadership		
Authority Enforcement	3.23	Agree
Personal Control	3.30	Agree
Work Control and Task Monitoring	3.26	Agree
Overall Authoritarian Leadership	3.26	Agree
Dual Control Mechanisms		
Enabling Control	3.26	Agree
Coercive Control	3.25	Agree
Dual Control Alignment	3.26	Agree
Overall Dual Control Mechanisms	3.26	Agree
Employee Creativity		
Idea Generation	3.26	Agree
Idea Implementation	3.26	Agree
Creative Contribution or Value	3.29	Agree
Overall Employee Creativity	3.27	Agree

Note. Interpretation follows the four-point scale: 3.50–4.00 = Strongly Agree; 2.50–3.49 = Agree; 1.50–2.49 = Disagree; 1.00–1.49 = Strongly Disagree.

As presented in Table 1, authoritarian leadership obtained an overall composite mean of 3.26, indicating that respondents generally agreed that authoritarian leadership practices were present within their organizations. Among its dimensions, personal control recorded the highest mean (3.30), followed by work control and task monitoring (3.26) and authority enforcement (3.23).

The relatively higher mean for personal control indicates that direct supervisory monitoring and intervention were particularly prominent among the leadership practices reported by employees. Within this dimension, the statement concerning frequent supervisory intervention in the performance of employees' jobs obtained the highest item mean of 3.34. Conversely, the requirement to report activities frequently to supervisors registered the lowest mean of 3.26.

For work control and task monitoring, the highest item mean was recorded for discouraging deviations from assigned tasks or procedures (3.31). This finding suggests that adherence to established operational requirements was an important characteristic of the supervisory practices perceived by respondents.

Authority enforcement obtained the lowest dimensional mean (3.23), although it remained within the Agree category. Its highest-rated indicator concerned the rigid enforcement of organizational rules regardless of employee feedback (3.26).

Collectively, these findings indicate that employees perceived multiple forms of authoritarian leadership in their workplaces, with personal supervision receiving slightly higher agreement ratings than institutional authority enforcement and task monitoring. However, the differences among these descriptive means were not subjected to significance testing and should not be interpreted as statistically established differences in leadership prevalence.

4.2 Dual Control Mechanisms

Dual control mechanisms were assessed through enabling control, coercive control, and dual control alignment. The overall composite mean was 3.26, corresponding to Agree. Enabling control and dual control alignment obtained identical composite means of 3.26, while coercive control registered a slightly lower mean of 3.25. These results indicate that respondents generally recognized the presence of both supportive and restrictive organizational control practices.

Within enabling control, the highest-rated indicator was employees' perceived opportunity to suggest improvements to existing organizational procedures (M = 3.29). This suggests that respondents generally perceived some opportunity to contribute recommendations concerning their work processes. The lowest-rated indicator concerned receiving useful performance feedback (M = 3.23), indicating comparatively lower agreement regarding this particular supportive practice.

For coercive control, the statement concerning feeling constrained by rigid organizational rules and regulations obtained the highest mean of 3.27. This finding indicates that employees recognized restrictions associated with established procedures and organizational requirements. However, the study did not directly measure whether such restrictions improved or diminished operational performance.

Dual control alignment obtained a composite mean of 3.26. Its highest-rated indicator concerned the perceived capacity of organizational controls to maintain discipline without limiting creativity (M = 3.30). This suggests that respondents generally perceived organizational discipline and creativity as potentially compatible within their workplaces.

Taken together, these descriptive findings indicate the coexistence of enabling and coercive organizational practices. The closely clustered composite means suggest comparable levels of respondent agreement across the three dimensions. Nevertheless, descriptive statistics alone cannot establish that these mechanisms were optimally balanced or that one form of control produced superior organizational outcomes.

4.3 Employee Creativity

Employee creativity was assessed through idea generation, idea implementation, and creative contribution or value. The overall composite mean was 3.27, corresponding to Agree. Creative contribution or value registered the highest dimensional mean (3.29), while idea generation and idea implementation obtained identical means of 3.26.

For idea generation, the highest-rated statements concerned identifying alternative ways to improve existing processes and actively seeking new approaches to performing work tasks. Both indicators obtained means of 3.30. These results indicate that respondents generally reported engaging in activities associated with identifying improvements and alternative work approaches.

Idea implementation similarly recorded a composite mean of 3.26. Its highest-rated indicator concerned seeking support or resources to apply proposed ideas (M = 3.30), while collaboration with others to implement new ideas received the lowest mean (M = 3.24). These findings suggest that seeking organizational support was a relatively prominent reported behavior, whereas collaborative implementation received somewhat lower agreement.

Creative contribution or value obtained the highest composite mean among the three creativity dimensions. The statement concerning contributions to work efficiency or productivity received the highest individual mean of 3.34. Respondents also generally agreed that their creative suggestions contributed value to their teams or organizations.

These findings indicate that employees perceived themselves as participating in idea generation, implementation, and organizationally valuable creative activities. However, the measures reflected employees' self-reported perceptions rather than independently verified innovation outputs, productivity gains, or financial improvements. The small differences among the three dimensional means were descriptive and were not tested for statistical significance.

4.4 Relationships Among Authoritarian Leadership, Dual Control Mechanisms, and Employee Creativity

Spearman's rank-order correlation was used to examine the relationships among the dimensions of authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity.

Relationships Between Authoritarian Leadership and Dual Control Mechanisms

Table 2 reports Spearman correlation coefficients between the three authoritarian leadership dimensions and the three dual control dimensions.

Table 2. *Spearman Correlations Between Authoritarian Leadership and Dual Control Mechanisms*

Authoritarian leadership	Enabling control	Coercive control	Dual control alignment
Authority Enforcement	.758	.784	.766
Personal Control	.774	.799	.794
Work Control and Task Monitoring	.757	.772	.779

Note. All reported correlations were statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Table 2 indicates strong positive correlations between all three authoritarian leadership dimensions and the organizational control dimensions, with coefficients ranging from .757 to .799. The strongest reported association was between personal control and coercive control ($\rho = .799$, $p < .001$). This indicates that employees reporting higher levels of direct personal supervision also tended to report higher levels of coercive organizational control.

Personal control was likewise positively associated with dual control alignment ($\rho = .794$, $p < .001$) and enabling control ($\rho = .774$, $p < .001$). These relationships suggest that personal supervisory practices were associated with respondents' perceptions of multiple forms of organizational control, rather than exclusively coercive arrangements.

The lowest coefficient was observed between work control and task monitoring and enabling control ($\rho = .757$, $p < .001$). Nevertheless, this association remained strong and statistically significant. Overall, the findings demonstrate consistent positive associations between authoritarian leadership and dual control mechanisms within the participating logistics enterprises. They do not establish that leadership practices caused the implementation or modification of organizational control systems.

Relationships Between Authoritarian Leadership and Employee Creativity

Table 3 presents Spearman correlations between authoritarian leadership dimensions and reported employee creativity.

Table 3. *Spearman Correlations Between Authoritarian Leadership and Employee Creativity*

Authoritarian leadership	Idea generation	Idea implementation	Creative contribution or value
Authority Enforcement	.778	.784	.762
Personal Control	.797	.789	.773
Work Control and Task Monitoring	.747	.748	.776

Note. All reported correlations were statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Table 3 presents strong positive correlations between authoritarian leadership and all dimensions of employee creativity. The coefficients ranged from .747 to .797, with all reported relationships statistically significant at $p < .001$. The strongest correlation was observed between personal control and idea generation ($\rho = .797$). Personal control also demonstrated positive relationships with idea implementation ($\rho = .789$) and creative contribution or value ($\rho = .773$).

Authority enforcement was positively associated with idea generation ($\rho = .778$), idea implementation ($\rho = .784$), and creative contribution or value ($\rho = .762$). Similarly, work control and task monitoring demonstrated positive correlations with idea generation ($\rho = .747$), idea implementation ($\rho = .748$), and creative contribution or value ($\rho = .776$). These findings indicate that higher reported authoritarian leadership scores were consistently associated with higher reported creativity scores in the sample.

Importantly, the results do not support a negative statistical relationship between personal control and employee creativity. Although restrictive supervision may theoretically discourage employee autonomy, the actual coefficients obtained in this study were positive. The interpretation must therefore reflect the observed associations rather than presume an inhibitory effect. Nevertheless, positive correlations do not establish that authoritarian leadership improves creativity. The results indicate statistical association, and other organizational or individual characteristics may contribute to these relationships.

Relationships Between Dual Control Mechanisms and Employee Creativity

Table 4 reports the associations between the three dual control dimensions and the three employee creativity dimensions.

Table 4. *Spearman Correlations Between Dual Control Mechanisms and Employee Creativity*

Dual control mechanism	Idea generation	Idea implementation	Creative contribution or value
Enabling Control	.767	.766	.764
Coercive Control	.785	.757	.807
Dual Control Alignment	.783	.761	.788

Note. All reported correlations were statistically significant at $p < .001$.

Table 4 shows that all three organizational control dimensions were positively and significantly associated with employee creativity. The reported coefficients ranged from .757 to .807. The strongest association was between coercive control and creative contribution or value ($\rho = .807$, $p < .001$). This finding indicates that respondents reporting greater coercive organizational control also tended to report higher perceived creative contributions.

Coercive control was positively associated with idea generation ($\rho = .785$) and idea implementation ($\rho = .757$). Although the relationship with idea implementation was comparatively weaker, it remained strong and statistically significant.

Enabling control demonstrated similar correlations across the three creativity dimensions: idea generation ($\rho = .767$), idea implementation ($\rho = .766$), and creative contribution or value ($\rho = .764$). These findings indicate consistent positive associations between perceived supportive organizational controls and reported creative behavior. Dual control alignment was also positively associated with idea generation ($\rho = .783$), idea implementation ($\rho = .761$), and creative contribution or value ($\rho = .788$).

Overall, the findings demonstrate that enabling control, coercive control, and dual control alignment were each positively associated with employee creativity. The positive correlation involving coercive control should not be interpreted as evidence that organizational restrictions inherently promote innovation. Rather, it indicates that employees who reported higher levels of coercive control also reported higher levels of particular creativity dimensions within the observed sample.

4.5 Predictive Relationships of Authoritarian Leadership and Dual Control Mechanisms With Employee Creativity

Multiple linear regression was employed to examine the statistical predictive contributions of authoritarian leadership and dual control mechanisms to overall employee creativity. The reported model incorporated six predictor variables: authority enforcement, personal control, work control and task monitoring, enabling control, coercive control, and dual control alignment. The reported regression results are summarized in Table 5.

Table 5. *Multiple Regression Results for Employee Creativity*

Predictor	Reported B	t	p
Authority Enforcement	0.160	4.32	< .001
Personal Control	0.113	2.91	.004
Work Control and Task Monitoring	0.153	4.26	< .001
Enabling Control	0.120	3.51	< .001
Coercive Control	0.197	5.15	< .001
Dual Control Alignment	0.280	7.39	< .001

Note. Reported $R^2 = .878$. B coefficients, t statistics, and p-values reproduce the source manuscript. Its additional column labeled β was omitted because its values are not clearly identified and do not consistently reconcile with the reported B and t statistics. Original JAMOVI output is needed for verification.

The reported coefficient of determination ($R^2 = .878$) indicates that the six predictors collectively accounted for 87.8% of the observed variance in the employee creativity composite score within the fitted regression model. All six predictor variables had positive reported regression coefficients and statistically significant associated p-values.

Dual control alignment obtained the largest reported B coefficient ($B = 0.280$, $t = 7.39$, $p < .001$). This indicates that, within the reported multivariable model, higher dual control alignment scores were associated with higher predicted employee creativity scores when the other included predictors were held constant.

Coercive control had a reported coefficient of 0.197 ($t = 5.15$, $p < .001$), followed by authority enforcement ($B = 0.160$, $t = 4.32$, $p < .001$) and work control and task monitoring ($B = 0.153$, $t = 4.26$, $p < .001$). Enabling control was also positively associated with employee creativity in the reported model ($B = 0.120$, $t = 3.51$, $p < .001$).

Personal control recorded the smallest reported B coefficient ($B = 0.113$, $t = 2.91$, $p = .004$). This result indicates that personal control retained a positive statistical association with employee creativity after adjustment for the other predictors included in the model.

Although the model demonstrated substantial reported explanatory capacity, its R^2 should not be interpreted as evidence of causal effects or predictive accuracy in independent samples. Furthermore, because the original regression table contains unresolved coefficient-labeling inconsistencies and does not provide complete diagnostic statistics, the reported estimates require verification against the original statistical output before final publication. The regression findings establish reported conditional associations among the examined variables. They do not establish whether dual control mechanisms mediate the relationship between authoritarian leadership and employee creativity.

4.6 Discussion

The findings provide empirical evidence concerning the relationships among authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity within the participating logistics enterprises in Shanghai, China. Three major observations emerge from the study.

First, authoritarian leadership practices were generally recognized by respondents, particularly those involving personal supervisory control. The descriptive findings indicate that direct monitoring, supervisory intervention, and procedural oversight were characteristic of the organizational environments experienced by employees. These practices are consistent with the understanding of authoritarian leadership as a form of hierarchical authority involving centralized decision-making and supervisory discipline (Farh & Cheng, 2000).

However, the study's correlation results indicate that authoritarian leadership was positively associated with employee creativity across all measured dimensions. This finding is important because authoritarian leadership is sometimes assumed to restrict independent thinking and innovation. Zhao et al. (2022) demonstrated that discipline-focused authoritarian leadership may be associated with employee creativity under particular psychological conditions, while Xu et al. (2022) reported a more complex relationship between authoritarian leadership and creative deviance.

The present findings contribute to this discussion by demonstrating that authoritarian leadership and employee creativity were positively associated in the examined logistics sample. Nevertheless, the study did not test the psychological mechanisms identified in those earlier investigations. Therefore, the positive relationships observed here cannot be attributed to creative self-efficacy, psychological safety, or other unmeasured explanatory processes.

Second, enabling control, coercive control, and dual control alignment were all positively associated with employee creativity. This finding is relevant to the theoretical distinction between enabling and coercive organizational bureaucracy advanced by Adler and Borys (1996).

Enabling control emphasizes organizational procedures that assist employees in accomplishing their responsibilities and improving work processes. Coercive control emphasizes compliance and restrictions on unauthorized deviations. Although these dimensions represent different organizational orientations, the present study found positive relationships between both forms of control and employee creativity.

Of particular interest was the strong positive correlation between coercive control and creative contribution or value. This result indicates that respondents reporting greater coercive control also tended to report higher perceptions of creative contribution. However, it does not establish that coercive control improves creative outcomes, nor does it demonstrate that restrictive procedures successfully screen inappropriate innovations. A comparable pattern has been reported in a different population, where controlled motivation reflecting external and internal pressures was moderately and positively associated with college students' academic engagement, although such engagement may not necessarily reflect autonomous motivation (Borinaga et al., 2026).

The findings therefore support a more cautious interpretation: different organizational control practices coexist with employee-reported creativity, and their relationships may be influenced by contextual characteristics not examined in the study.

Third, multiple regression analysis indicated that authoritarian leadership and dual control mechanisms were jointly associated with substantial variation in employee creativity. The reported model accounted for 87.8% of the variance in the creativity composite score, with all six predictors recording positive coefficients and statistically significant associations.

Dual control alignment exhibited the largest reported regression coefficient. This finding suggests that employees' perceptions of organizational arrangements combining discipline with flexibility were particularly relevant to their reported creativity scores in the fitted model. This interpretation is consistent with the conceptual argument of Adler and Borys (1996) that organizational formalization can serve both enabling and coercive purposes. Nevertheless, the present findings do not establish an optimal balance between the two forms of control or demonstrate how such a balance develops.

The positive coefficient for personal control is also noteworthy. Although personal control was strongly correlated with employee creativity, its reported coefficient was the smallest among the six predictors in the multivariable regression model. This indicates that its conditional statistical association differed from its bivariate relationship when the other examined dimensions were included. This distinction reinforces the importance of examining organizational constructs jointly rather than relying exclusively on isolated correlations. However, it does not establish that the other variables transmit or mediate the relationship between personal control and creativity.

The findings should also be considered in relation to the study's methodological limitations. The investigation employed a descriptive-correlational design, purposive sampling, and self-reported questionnaire responses. Consequently, the results cannot establish causal direction or be generalized automatically to all logistics enterprises.

The strong observed correlations and high reported model R^2 additionally warrant consideration of overlapping construct measurements and common-method influences. Such concerns are particularly relevant because the leadership, control, and creativity variables were assessed through the same respondent questionnaire. The study did not report specific tests for common-method bias, multicollinearity, or external predictive validation.

Despite these limitations, the study provides context-specific empirical evidence that employees' perceptions of authoritarian leadership and organizational control mechanisms are strongly associated with their reported creativity. The principal contribution of the investigation lies in its simultaneous examination of three dimensions of authoritarian leadership, three dimensions of dual control mechanisms, and three dimensions of employee creativity within the logistics industry. These findings provide a basis for managerial reflection on supervisory practices, organizational control arrangements, and opportunities for employee creativity. They also establish a foundation for future research employing more rigorous designs to examine the potential mechanisms underlying the relationships observed in this study.

5. Conclusions, Recommendations, and Implications

5.1 Conclusions

This study examined the relationships among authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity among 385 employees of 11 logistics enterprises in Shanghai, China. Based on the descriptive, correlational, and multiple regression analyses, the following conclusions were drawn.

First, authoritarian leadership was evident in the participating organizations, as reflected by an overall composite mean of 3.26. Personal control obtained the highest mean (3.30), followed by work control and task monitoring (3.26) and authority enforcement (3.23). These findings indicate that employees generally recognized supervisory monitoring, procedural compliance, and managerial authority as characteristics of their workplace environments.

Second, respondents reported the presence of dual control mechanisms, with an overall composite mean of 3.26. Enabling control and dual control alignment both obtained means of 3.26, while coercive control registered 3.25. These results indicate that employees perceived the coexistence of supportive and restrictive organizational control practices. The findings do not, however, establish that these practices were optimally balanced.

Third, employee creativity obtained an overall composite mean of 3.27, corresponding to Agree. Creative contribution or value recorded the highest mean (3.29), while idea generation and idea implementation both registered 3.26. These findings indicate that employees generally perceived themselves as engaging in activities involving the generation, implementation, and organizational contribution of creative ideas.

Fourth, statistically significant positive relationships were identified among authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity. The reported Spearman correlation coefficients ranged from .747 to .807, with all

relationships significant at $p < .001$. These findings indicate that higher reported levels of authoritarian leadership and organizational control were associated with higher reported levels of employee creativity within the sample.

Fifth, the multiple regression analysis identified statistically significant positive coefficients for all six dimensions of authoritarian leadership and dual control mechanisms. The reported model accounted for 87.8% of the variance in employee creativity ($R^2 = .878$). Dual control alignment obtained the largest reported unstandardized coefficient ($B = .280$), followed by coercive control ($B = .197$). These findings indicate that the examined leadership and organizational control dimensions were jointly associated with employee creativity after accounting for the other predictors included in the model.

Finally, the study provides empirical support for considering authoritarian leadership and organizational control mechanisms together when examining employee creativity in logistics enterprises. However, the descriptive-correlational research design does not establish causal relationships or demonstrate that dual control mechanisms statistically mediate the association between authoritarian leadership and employee creativity.

5.2 Recommendations

Based on the study's findings, several recommendations are proposed for logistics enterprise managers, human resource practitioners, and future researchers.

For organizational leaders and department managers, supervisory practices should maintain clear performance expectations and operational accountability while providing appropriate opportunities for employee participation. Given the prominence of personal control in the descriptive findings, managers may review how direct supervision, task monitoring, and intervention practices are communicated and implemented. Supervisory procedures may be structured to preserve operational discipline while allowing employees to communicate work-related concerns and improvement suggestions.

For human resource managers, organizational control policies should be periodically reviewed to ensure that enabling and coercive practices remain consistent with operational requirements and employee development objectives. Particular attention may be directed toward strengthening constructive performance feedback, as this indicator received the lowest mean within enabling control. Formal feedback sessions, employee consultation procedures, and accessible improvement channels may be considered as practical management measures. Evidence from a Chinese vocational college further suggests that systems supporting performance feedback may be insufficient without clearly defined performance standards and closer integration with evaluation processes (X. Liu & Magnaye, 2026).

For logistics operations managers, opportunities for employee participation in process improvement may be strengthened through clearly established procedures for submitting and evaluating suggestions. The findings regarding idea implementation, particularly the comparatively lower agreement associated with collaboration in implementing new ideas, suggest that managers may consider reviewing existing arrangements for teamwork and interdepartmental coordination.

For senior management, dual control alignment may serve as a useful area of organizational assessment. Its comparatively large reported regression coefficient suggests that employees' perceptions of the balance between organizational discipline and flexibility are relevant to their reported creativity. Management may therefore examine whether operational rules are sufficiently clear while providing appropriate procedures for proposing and evaluating workplace improvements.

For future researchers, the relationships identified in this study should be examined using additional organizational contexts, more diverse samples, and alternative research designs. Longitudinal or multilevel studies may help clarify the temporal and organizational conditions associated with leadership practices, control systems, and employee creativity. Future studies may also consider how emerging technologies reshape supervisory and control arrangements, given scholarship on organizational redesign and algorithmic governance associated with artificial intelligence adoption (Tolentino et al., 2026). Future investigations may also employ formal mediation analyses when theoretically justified and supported by appropriate data and statistical procedures. Sacdalan (2026), for example, used structural equation modeling to test employee engagement as a mediator between managerial competencies, including innovation and creativity, and organizational citizenship behavior.

Additional methodological research should examine the distinctiveness of the measured constructs, the exceptionally high reported internal consistency coefficients, and the possibility of common-method influences arising from the use of employee self-reports. These recommendations represent possible managerial and research responses to the observed findings. Their effectiveness was not experimentally evaluated in the present study.

5.3 Implications of the Study

The findings have theoretical, managerial, and methodological implications for understanding leadership, organizational control, and employee creativity.

From a theoretical perspective, the study contributes to discussions concerning the organizational implications of authoritarian leadership. The consistently positive correlations between authoritarian leadership and employee creativity suggest that the relationship should not be characterized as uniformly negative within the examined context. The findings are compatible with the broader argument that the organizational consequences of hierarchical authority require consideration of specific leadership practices and workplace conditions. Nevertheless, the study does not establish the underlying psychological or organizational mechanisms responsible for these associations.

The results also contribute to the discussion of enabling and coercive organizational control. Both forms of control demonstrated positive associations with employee creativity, indicating that the presence of restrictive organizational procedures did not correspond to lower reported creativity in this sample. This finding highlights the importance of empirically examining different control practices rather than assuming that formal organizational restrictions necessarily correspond to diminished creative behavior.

From a managerial perspective, the study identifies organizational control alignment as a potentially relevant consideration in managing employee creativity. Its positive regression coefficient suggests that perceptions of compatibility between operational discipline and employee flexibility are associated with reported creative performance. Managers may use these findings to inform organizational assessments concerning supervisory practices, procedural requirements, performance feedback, and opportunities for employee involvement in workplace improvements. Such assessments may also consider technology-supported control systems, as research on Chinese commercial banks indicates that technology applications can serve not only customer-facing functions but also risk-control and process-improvement purposes (Shi & Encio, 2026), while broader scholarship has discussed data capabilities as sources of managerial intelligence in Chinese enterprises (Chen & Atento, 2026).

From a methodological perspective, the study demonstrates the value of examining authoritarian leadership, organizational control, and employee creativity through multiple dimensions. However, the high intercorrelations among several dimensions and the substantial reported explanatory capacity of the regression model warrant further evaluation of construct distinctiveness, multicollinearity, and common-method variance. Future research should consider additional measurement sources, independent assessments of creative performance, and replication across organizational settings.

The study's conclusions must also be considered within the limitations of purposive sampling, employee self-reported measures, and its non-experimental design. The findings describe relationships observed among employees of the participating logistics enterprises and should not be generalized automatically to the broader logistics industry.

Overall, the study contributes context-specific empirical evidence concerning the relationships among authoritarian leadership, dual control mechanisms, and employee creativity. Its principal contribution lies in demonstrating that multiple dimensions of leadership and organizational control are positively associated with employees' reported creative behavior within the examined organizational setting.

Declarations

Conflict of Interest: The author declares no conflicts of interest.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

AI Use Disclosure: The author declares that no generative artificial intelligence tools were used in conducting the research or preparing the manuscript, subject to confirmation of any AI-assisted editorial revisions.

Publisher's Disclaimer

The views, findings, interpretations, and conclusions expressed in this article are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the positions of the Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation (JESMI), its Editorial Board, or SLSI Press.

6. References

Adler, P. S., & Borys, B. (1996). Two types of bureaucracy: Enabling and coercive. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 41*(1), 61–89. https://doi.org/10.2307/2393986

Amabile, T. M. (1983). The social psychology of creativity: A componential conceptualization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*(2), 357–376. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.45.2.357

Borinaga, A. M. A., Cabilangan, J. M., Fernandez, M. A. M., Monteclaro, M. J. S., & Atento, R. G. (2026). Controlled motivation and academic engagement among college students in a Philippine higher education institution. *International Journal of Behavioral and Social Analytics, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.65166/px4te382

Chen, S., & Atento, R. G. (2026). Big data as a strategic asset: Competitive advantage, business model transformation, and managerial intelligence in Chinese enterprises. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.65166/mnn2n380

Espelita, C. A. M., & Atento, R. G. (2026). Self-efficacy, work environment support, and employee productivity in Philippine trading companies. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.65166/nwv9wg88

Farh, J.-L., & Cheng, B.-S. (2000). A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui, & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and organizations in the Chinese context* (pp. 84–127). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230511590_5

Gamasan, R., & Atento, R. G. (2026). Localized quality management system implementation and operational performance in a Philippine maritime manning office: The roles of human factors and organizational practices. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.65166/m4htka42

Guan, H. (2026). Influence of innovation investment on operational efficiency and business growth of environmental protection companies: Basis for improved business performance framework. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation, 1*(3). https://doi.org/10.65166/fh308y59

Guo, Z. (2026). Work-life balance as a mediator between ambidextrous leadership and well-being among new-generation manufacturing employees in Sichuan. *International Journal of Behavioral and Social Analytics, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.65166/7f5y3y43

Hinagpis, J. M. G., & Mendoza, F. (2026). Occupational well-being and operational challenges of delivery riders in selected cities of Batangas. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.65166/avv50a96

Liu, B., & Atento, R. G. (2026). Organizational climate and faculty job satisfaction in selected Chinese higher education institutions. *Asian Journal of Educational Leadership, Management and Pedagogy, 1*(1). https://doi.org/10.65166/9e0bxt09

Liu, T., & Generoso, M. J. I. (2026). Market intelligence adoption and supply chain efficiency in the e-commerce industry. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.65166/8y5xw056

Liu, X., & Magnaye, R. (2026). Human resource technology and faculty performance management in higher education: Evidence from a Chinese vocational college. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation, 1*(3). https://doi.org/10.65166/15jp5046

Meng, L., Li, T., Yang, M., & Wang, S. (2022). A study on the influence of authoritarian-benevolent leadership on employees' innovative behavior from the perspective of psychological perception—Based on fuzzy set qualitative comparative analysis. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 886286. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.886286

Pizzolitto, E., Verna, I., & Venditti, M. (2023). Authoritarian leadership styles and performance: A systematic literature review and research agenda. *Management Review Quarterly, 73*, 841–871. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11301-022-00263-y

Sacdalan, R. (2026). Managerial competencies and organizational citizenship behavior among university officials of higher educational institutions: The mediating role of employee engagement toward a developed organizational performance framework. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation, 1*(3). https://doi.org/10.65166/ajyw3122

Shi, Y., & Encio, H. (2026). Influence of artificial intelligence application on the operational efficiency of commercial banks. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation, 1*(2). https://doi.org/10.65166/tzazy288

Tolentino, G., Quinto, L., Espelita, C. A. M., Atento, A. G., & Teodosio, G. M. (2026). Artificial intelligence and the strategic reconfiguration of work: A conceptual analysis of substitution, augmentation, and organizational redesign in manufacturing and marketing. *Journal of Enterprise Strategy and Management Innovation, 1*(3). https://doi.org/10.65166/bt13jr83

Wang, L., Sun, Y., Li, J., Xu, Y., Chen, M., Zhu, X., & Wang, D. (2022). Effects of ambidextrous leadership on employees' work behavior: The mediating role of psychological empowerment. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 862799. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.862799

Xu, J., Li, Y.-Z., Zhu, D.-Q., & Li, J.-Z. (2022). "Lubricant" or "stumbling block"?: The paradoxical association between team authoritarian leadership and creative deviance. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 835970. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.835970

Zhao, H., Su, Q., Lou, M., Hang, C., & Zhang, L. (2022). Does authoritarianism necessarily stifle creativity? The role of discipline-focused authoritarian leadership. *Frontiers in Psychology, 13*, Article 1037102. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.1037102